Address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science
DELIVERED AT DUBLIN, 14TH AUGUST 1878
By William Spottiswoode, M.A., F.R.S., LL,D., D.C.L. President
London Longmans, Green, and Co. 1878 London: Printed by Spottiswoodr and Co. New-Street Square and Parliament Street

Address.

ON looking back at the long array of distinguished men who both in this and in the sister countries have filled the chair of the British Association; on considering also the increased pains which have been bestowed upon, and the increased importance attaching to, the Presidential Address; it may well happen when, as on this occasion, your choice has fallen upon one outside the sphere of professional Science, that your nominee should feel unusual diffidence in accepting the post. Two considerations have however in my own case outweighed all reasons for hesitation: First, the uniform kindness which I received at the hands of the Association throughout the eight years during which I had the honour of holding another office; and secondly the conviction that the same goodwill which was accorded to your Treasurer would be extended to your President.

These considerations have led me to arrange my observations under two heads, viz., I propose first to offer some remarks upon the purposes and prospects of the Association with which, through your suffrages, I have been so long and so agreeably connected; and secondly to indulge in a few reflections, not indeed upon the details or technical progress, but upon the external aspects and tendencies of the Science which on this occasion I have the honour to represent. The former of these subjects is perhaps trite; but as an old man is allowed to become garrulous on his own hobby, so an old officer may be pardoned for lingering about a favourite theme. And although the latter may appear somewhat unpromising, I have decided to make it one of the topics of my discourse, from the consideration that the holder of this office will generally do better by giving utterance to what has already become part of his own thought, than by gathering matter outside of its habitual range for the special occasion. For, as it seems to me, the interest (if any) of an address consists, not so much in the multitude of things therein brought forward, as in the individuality of the mode in which they are treated.

The British Association has already entered its fifth decade. It has held its meetings, this the 48th, in 28 different towns. In six cities of note, viz., York, Bristol, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Plymouth, Manchester, and Belfast, its curve of progress may be said to have a node, or point through which it has twice passed; in the five Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Dublin, Edinburgh, and Glasgow, and in the two great commercial centres, Liverpool and Birmingham, it may similarly be said to have a triple point, or one through which it has three times passed. Of our 46 Presidents more than half (26, in fact) have passed away; while the remainder hold important posts in Science, and in the Public Service, or in other avocations not less honourable in themselves, nor less useful to the commonwealth. And whether it be due to the salubrity of the climate or to the calm and dispassionate spirit in which Science is pursued by its votaries here, I do not pretend to say; but it is a fact that the earliest of our ex-Presidents still living, himself one of the original members of the Association, is a native of and resident in this country.

At both of our former meetings held in Dublin, in 1835 and 1857 respectively, while greatly indebted to the liberal hospitality of the citizens at large, we were, as we now are, under especial obligations to the authorities of Trinity College for placing at our disposal buildings, not only unusually spacious and convenient in themselves, but full of reminiscences calculated to awake the scientific sympathies of all who may be gathered in them. At both of those former Dublin meetings the venerable name of Lloyd figured at our head; and if long established custom had not seemed to preclude it, I could on many accounts have wished that we had met for a third time under the same name. And although other distinguished men, such as Dr. Robinson, Professors Stokes, Tyndall, and Andrews, are similarly disqualified by having already passed the Presidential chair, while others again, such as Sir W. R. Hamilton, Dr. M'Cullagh, and Professor Jukes, are permanently lost to our ranks; still we should not have had far to seek, had we looked for a President in this fertile island itself. But as every one connected with the place of meeting partakes of the character of host towards ourselves as guests, it has been thought by our oldest and most experienced members that we should better respond to an invitation by bringing with us a President to speak as our representative than by seeking one on the spot; and we may always hope on subsequent occasions that some of our present hosts may respond to a similar call.

But leaving our past history, which will form a theme more appropriate to our jubilee meeting in 1881 at the ancient city of York, I will ask your attention to a few particulars of our actual operations.

Time was when the Royal Societies of London and Edinburgh and the Royal Irish Academy were the only

representative bodies of British Science and the only receptacles of memoirs relating thereto. But latterly, the division of labour, so general in industrial life, has operated in giving rise to special Societies, such as the Astronomical, the Linnæan, the Chemical, the Geological, the Geographical, the Statistical, the Mathematical, the Physical, and many others. To both the earlier or more general, and the later or more special societies alike, the British Association shows resemblance and affinity. We are general in our comprehensiveness; we are special in our sectional arrangement; and in this respect we offer not only a counterpart, but to some extent a counterpoise, to the general tendency to subdivision in Science. Further still, while maintaining in their integrity all the elements of a strictly scientific body, We also include, in our character of a microcosm, and under our more social aspect, a certain freedom of treatment, and interaction of our various branches, which is scarcely possible among separate and independent societies.

The general business of our meetings consists first, in receiving and discussing communications upon scientific subjects at the various sections into which our body is divided, with discussions thereon; secondly, in distributing, under the advice of our Committee of Recommendations, the funds arising from the subscriptions of members and associates; and thirdly, in electing a Council upon whom devolves the conduct of our affairs until the next meeting.

The communications to the sections are of two kinds, viz., papers from individuals, and reports from Committees.

As to the subject matter of the papers, nothing which falls within the range of Natural Knowledge, as partitioned among our sections, can be considered foreign to the purposes of the Association; and even many applications of Science, when viewed in reference to their scientific basis, may properly find a place in our proceedings. So numerous, however, are the topics herein comprised, so easy the transition beyond these limits, that it has been thought necessary to confine ourselves strictly within this range, lest the introduction of other matters, however interesting to individual members, should lead to the sacrifice of more important subjects. As to the form of the communications, while it is quite true that every scientific conclusion should be based upon substantial evidence, every theory complete before being submitted for final adoption, it is not the less desirable that even tentative conclusions and hypothetical principles when supported by sufficient prima facie evidence, and enunciated in such a manner as to be clearly apprehended, should find room for discussion at our sectional meetings. Considering, however, our limitations of time, and the varied nature of our audience, it would seem not inappropriate to suspend, mentally if not materially, over the doors of our section rooms, the Frenchman's dictum, that no scientific theory "can be

"considered complete until it is so clear that it can be explained to the first man you meet in the street."

Among the communications to the sections, undoubtedly the most important as a rule, are the Reports; that is to say, documents issuing from specially ap- pointed Committees, some of which have been recipients of the grants mentioned above. These reports are in the main of two kinds, first, accounts of observations carried on for a series of years, and intended as records of information on the special subjects; such for instance have been those made by the New Committee, by the Committees on Luminous Meteors, on British Rainfall, on the Speed of Steamships, on Underground Temperature, on the Exploration of certain Geological Caverns, &c. These investigations, frequently originating in the energy and special qualifications of an individual, but conducted under the control of a Committee, have in many cases been continued from year to year, until either the object has been fully attained, or the matter has passed into the hands of other bodies, which have thus been led to recognize an inquiry into these subjects as part and parcel of their appropriate functions. The second class is one which is perhaps even more peculiar to the Association; viz., the Reports on the progress and present state of some main topics of Science. Among these may be instanced the early Reports on Astronomy, on Optics, on the Progress of Analysis; and later, those on Electrical Resistance and on Tides; that of Prof. G. G. Stokes on Double Refraction; that of Prof. H. J. Smith on the Theory of Numbers; that of Mr. Russell on Hyperelliptic Transcendents; and others. On this head Professor Carey Foster, in his address to the Mathematical and Physical Section at our meeting last year, made some excellent recommendations, to which, however, I need not at present more particularly refer, as the result of them will be duly laid before the section in the form of the report from a Committee to whom they were referred. It will be sufficient here to add that the wide extension of the Sciences in almost every branch, and the consequent specialization of the studies of each individual, have rendered the need for such reports more than ever pressing; and if the course of true Science should still run smooth it is probable that the need will increase rather than diminish.

If time and space had permitted, I should have further particularised the Committees, occasionally appointed, on subjects connected with Education. But I must leave this theme for some future President, and content myself with pointing out that the British Association alone among scientific societies concerns itself directly with these questions, and is open to appeals for counsel and support from the great teaching body of the country.

One of the principal methods by which this Association materially promotes the advancement of Science,

and consequently one of its most important functions, consists in grants of money from its own income in aid of special scientific researches. The total amount so laid out during the 47 years of our existence has been no less than £44,000; and the average during the last ten years has been £1,450 per annum. These sums have not only been in the main wisely voted and usefully expended; but they have been themselves productive of much additional voluntary expenditure of both time and money on the part of those to whom the grants have been entrusted. The results have come back to the Association in the form of papers and reports, many of which have been printed in our volumes. By this appropriation of a large portion of its funds, the Association has to some extent anticipated, nay even it may have partly inspired the ideas, now so much discussed, of the Endowment of Research. And whether the aspirations of those who advocate such endowment be ever fully realised or not, there can, I think, be no doubt whatever that the Association in the matter of these grants has afforded a most powerful stimulus to original research and discovery.

Regarded from another point of view these grants, together with others to be hereafter mentioned, present a strong similarity to that useful institution, the Professoriate Extraordinary of Germany, to which there are no foundations exactly corresponding in this country. For, beside their more direct educational purpose, these Professorships are intended, like our own grants, to afford to special individuals an opportunity of following out the special work for which they have previously proved themselves competent. And in this respect the British Association may be regarded as supplying, to the extent of its means, an elasticity which is wanting in our own Universities.

Besides the funds which through your support are at the disposal of the British Association there are, as is well known to many here present, other funds of more or less similar character at the disposal, or subject to the recommendations, of the Royal Society. There is the Donation Fund, the property of the Society; the Government Grant of £1,000 per annum, administered by the Society; and the Government Fund of £4,000 per annum (an experiment for five years) to be distributed by the Science and Art Department, both for research itself, and for the support of those engaged thereon, according to the recommendations of a Committee consisting mainly of Fellows of the Royal Society. To these might be added other funds in the hands of different Scientific Societies.

But although it must be admitted that the purposes of these various funds are not to be distinguished by any very simple line of demarcation, and that they may therefore occasionally appear to overlap one another, it may still, I think, be fairly maintained that this fact does not furnish any sufficient reason against their co-existence. There are many topics of research too minute in their range, too tentative in their present condition, to come fairly within the scope of the funds administered by the Royal Society. There are others, ample enough in their extent, and long enough in their necessary duration, to claim for their support a national grant, but which need to be actually set on foot or tried before they can fairly expect the recognition either of the public or of the Government. To these categories others might be added; but the above-mentioned instances will perhaps suffice to show that even if larger and more permanent funds were devoted to the promotion of research than is the case at present, there would still be a field of activity open to the British Association as well as to other Scientific bodies which may have funds at their disposal.

On the general question it is not difficult to offer strong arguments in favour of permanent national Scientific Institutions; nor is it difficult to picture to the mind an ideal future when Science and Art shall walk hand in hand together, led by a willing minister into the green pastures of the Endowment of Research. But while allowing this to be no impossible a future, we must still admit that there are other and less promising possibilities, which under existing circumstances cannot be altogether left out of our calculations. I am therefore on the whole inclined to think that, while not losing sight of larger schemes, the wisest policy, for the present at all events, and pending the experiment of the Government Fund, will be to confine our efforts to a careful selection of definite persons to carry out definite pieces of work; leaving to them the honour (or the onus if they so think it) of justifying from time to time a continuation of the confidence which the Government or other supporting body may have once placed in them.

Passing from the proceedings to other features and functions of our body, it should be remembered that the continued existence of the Association must depend largely upon the support which it receives from its members and associates. Stinted in the funds so arising, its scientific effectiveness would be materially impaired; and deprived of them, its existence would be precarious. The amount at our disposal in each year will naturally vary with the population, with the accessibility, and with other circumstances of the place of meeting; there will be financially, as well as scientifically, good years and bad years. But we have in our invested capital a sum sufficient to tide over all probable fluctuations, and even to carry us efficiently through several years of financial famine, if ever such should occur. This seems to me sufficient; and we have therefore, I think, no need to increase our reserve, beyond perhaps the moderate addition which a prudent treasurer will always try to secure, against expenditure which often increases and rarely diminishes.

But however important this material support may be to our existence and well being, it is by no means all

that is required. There is another factor which enters into the product, namely, the personal scientific support of our best men. It is, I think, not too much to say, that without their presence our meetings would fail in their chief and most important element, and had best be discontinued altogether. We make, it must be admitted, a demand of sensible magnitude in calling upon men who have been actively engaged during a great portion of the year, at a season when they may fairly look for relaxation, to attend a busy meeting, and to contribute to its proceedings; but unless a fair quota at least of our veterans, and a good muster of our younger men, put in their appearance, our gatherings will be to little purpose. There was a period within my own recollection when it was uncertain whether the then younger members of our scientific growth would cast in their lot with us or not, and when the fate of the Association depended very much upon their decision. They decided in our favour; they have since become Presidents, Lecturers, and other functionaries of our body; with what result it is for you to judge.

Of the advantages which may possibly accrue to the locality in which our meetings are held, it is not for us to speak; but it is always a ground for sincere satisfaction to learn that our presence has been of any use in stimulating an interest, or in promoting local efforts, in the direction of Science.

The functions of the British Association do not, however, terminate with the meeting itself. Beside the Special Committees already mentioned, there remains a very important body, elected by the General Committee, viz., the Council, which assembles at the office in London from time to time as occasion requires. To this body belongs the duty of proposing a President, of preparing for the approval of the General Committee the list of Vice-Presidents and sectional officers, the selection of evening lecturers, and other arrangements for the coming meeting.

At the present time another class of questions occupies a good deal of the attention of the Council. In the first generation of the Association, and during the period of unwritten, but not yet traditional, law, questions relating to our own organization or procedure either "settled themselves," or were wisely left to the discretionary powers of those who had taken part in our proceedings during the early years of our existence. These and other kindred subjects now require more careful formularisation and more deliberate sanction. And it is on the shoulders of the Council that the weight of these matters in general falls. These facts deserve especial mention on the present occasion, because one part of our business at the close of this meeting will be to bid farewell officially to one who has served us as Assistant Secretary so long and so assiduously that he has latterly become our main repertory of information, and our Mentor upon questions of precedent and procedure. The post hitherto held by Mr. Griffith (for it is to him that I allude) will doubtless be well filled by the able and energetic member who has been nominated in his place; but I doubt not that even he will be glad for some time to come to draw largely upon the knowledge and experience of his predecessor.

But, beside matters of internal arrangement and organization, the duties of the Council comprise a variety of scientific subjects referred to them by the General Committee, at the instance of the Committee of Recommendations, for deliberation and occasionally for action. With the increasing activity of our body in general, and more particularly with that of our various officers, these duties have of late years become more varied and onerous than formerly; nor is it to be wished that they should diminish in either variety or extent.

Once more, questions beyond our own constitution, and even beyond the scope of our own immediate action, such as education, legislation affecting either the promotion or the applications of science to industrial and social life, which have suggested themselves at our meetings, and received the preliminary sanction of our Committee of Recommendations, are frequently referred to our Council. These, and others which it is unnecessary to particularise, whether discussed in full Council or in Committees specially appointed by that body, render the duties of our councillors as onerous as they are important.

While the Government has at all times, but in a more marked manner of late years, recognised the Royal Society of London, with representatives from the sister societies of Dublin and of Edinburgh, as the body to which it should look for counsel and advice upon scientific questions, it has still never shown itself indisposed to receive and entertain any well considered recommendation from the British Association. Two special causes have in all probability contributed largely to this result. First, the variety of elements comprised by the Association, on account of which its recommendations imply a more general concurrence of scientific opinion than those of any other scientific body. Secondly, the peculiar fact that our period of maximum activity coincides with that of minimum activity of other scientific bodies is often of the highest importance. At the very time when the other bodies are least able, we are most able, to give deliberate consideration, and formal sanction, to recommendations whether in the form of applications to Government or otherwise which may arise. In many of these, time is an element so essential, that it is not too much to say, that without the intervention of the British Association many oppor- tunities for the advancement of Science, especially at the seasons in question, might have been lost. The Government has moreover formally recognised our scientific existence by appointing our President for the time being a member of the Government Fund Committee; and the public has added its testimony to our importance and utility by imposing upon our President and officers a variety of

duties, among which are conspicuous those which arise out of its very liberal exercise of civic and other hospitality.

Of the nature and functions of the Presidential address this is perhaps neither the time nor the place to speak; but if I might for a moment forget the purpose for which we are now assembled, I would take the opportunity of reminding those who have not attended many of our former meetings that our annual volumes contain a long series of addresses on the progress of Science, from a number of our most eminent men, to which there is perhaps no parallel elsewhere. These addresses are perhaps as remarkable for their variety in mode of treatment as for the value of their subject matter. Some of our Presidents, and especially those who officiated in the earlier days of our existence, have passed in review the various branches of Science, and have noted the progress made in each during the current year. But, as the various Sciences have demanded more and more special treatment on the part of those who seriously pursue them, so have the cases of individuals who can of their own knowledge give anything approaching to a general review become more and more rare. To this may be added the fact that although no year is so barren as to fail in affording sufficient crop for a strictly scientific budget, or for a detailed report of progress in research, yet one year is more fertile than another in growths of sufficient prominence to arrest the attention of the general public, and to supply topics suitable for the address. On these accounts apparently such a Presidential survey has ceased to be annual, and has dropped into an intermittence of longer period. Some Presidents have made a scientific principle, such as the Time-element in natural phenomena, or Continuity, or Natural Selection, the theme of their discourse, and have gathered illustrations from various branches of knowledge. Others again, taking their own special subject as a fundamental note, and thence modulating into other kindred keys, have borne testimony to the fact that no subject is so special as to be devoid of bearing or of influence on many others. Some have described the successive stages of even a single but important investigation; and while tracing the growth of that particular item, and of the ideas involved in it, have incidentally shown to the outer world what manner of business a serious investigation is. But there is happily no pattern or precedent which the President is bound to follow; both in range of subject-matter and in mode of treatment each has exercised his undoubted right of taking an independent line. And it can hardly be doubted that a judicious exercise of this freedom has contributed more than anything else to sustain the interest of a series of annual discourses extending now over nearly half a century.

The nature of the subjects which may fairly come within the scope of such a discourse has of late been much discussed; and the question is one upon which every one is of course entitled to form his own judgment; but lest there should be any misapprehension as to how far it concerns us in our corporate capacity, it will be well to remind my hearers that as, on the one hand, there is no discussion on the Presidential address, and the members as a body express no formal opinion upon it, so, on the other, the Association cannot fairly be considered as in any way committed to its tenour or conclusions. Whether this immunity from comment and reply be really on the whole so advantageous to the President as might be supposed need not here be discussed; but suffice it to say that the case of an audience assembled to listen without discussion finds a parallel elsewhere, and in the parallel case it is not generally considered that the result is altogether either advantageous to the speaker or conducive to excellence in the discourse.

But, apart from this, the question of a limitation of range in the subject-matter for the Presidential address is not quite so simple as may at first sight appear. It must, in fact, be borne in mind that, while on the one hand knowledge is distinct from opinion, from feeling, and from all other modes of subjective impression; still the limits of knowledge are at all times expanding, and the boundaries of the known and the unknown are never rigid or permanently fixed. That which in time past or present has belonged to one category, may in time future belong to the other. Our ignorance consists partly in ignorance of actual facts, and partly also in ignorance of the possible range of ascertainable fact. If we could lay down beforehand precise limits of possible knowledge, the problem of Physical Science would be already half solved. But the question to which the scientific explorer has often to address himself is, not merely whether he is able to solve this or that problem, but whether he can so far unravel the tangled threads of the matter with which he has to deal as to weave them into a definite problem at all. He is not like a candidate at an examination with a precise set of questions placed before him; he must first himself act the part of the examiner and select questions from the repertory of Nature, and upon them found others, which in some sense are capable of definite solution. If his eye seem dim, he must look steadfastly and with hope into the misty vision, until the very clouds wreath themselves into definite forms. If his ear seem dull, he must listen patiently and with sympathetic trust to the intricate whisperings of Nature,—the goddess, as she has been called, of a hundred voices,—until here and there he can pick out a few simple notes to which his own powers can resound. If, then, at a moment when he finds himself placed on a pinnacle from which he is called upon to take a perspective survey of the range of Science, and to tell us what he can see from his vantage ground; if, at such a moment, after straining his gaze to the very verge of the horizon, and after describing the most distant of well defined objects, he should give utterance also to some of

the subjective impressions which he is conscious of receiving from regions beyond; if he should depict possibilities which seem opening to his view; if he should explain why he thinks this a mere blind alley and that an open path; then the fault and the loss would be alike ours if we refused to listen calmly, and temperately to form our own judgment on what we hear; then assuredly it is we who would be committing the error of confounding matters of fact and matters of opinion, if we failed to discriminate between the various elements contained in such a discourse, and assumed that they had all been put on the same footing.

But to whatever decision we may each come on these controverted points, one thing appears clear from a retrospect of past experience; viz., that first or last, either at the outset in his choice of subject, or in the conclusions ultimately drawn therefrom, the President, according to his own account at least, finds himself on every occasion in a position of "exceptional, or more than usual difficulty." And your present representative, like his predecessors, feels himself this moment in a similar predicament. The reason which he now offers is, that the branch of Science which he represents is one whose lines of advance, viewed from a Mathematician's own point of view, offer so few points of contact with the ordinary experiences of life or modes of thought that any account of its actual progress which he might have attempted must have failed in the first requisite of an address, namely, that of being intelligible.

Now if this esoteric view had been the only aspect of the subject which he could present to his hearers, he might well have given up the attempt in despair. But although in its technical character Mathematical Science suffers the inconveniences, while it enjoys the dignity, of its Olympian position; still in a less formal garb, or in disguise, if you are pleased so to call it, it is found present at many an unexpected turn; and although some of us may never have learnt its special language, not a few have, all through our scientific life, and even in almost every accurate utterance, like Molière's well known character, been talking Mathematics without knowing it. It is, moreover, a fact not to be overlooked that the appearance of isolation, so conspicuous in Mathematics, appertains in a greater or less degree to all other Sciences, and perhaps also to all pursuits in life. In its highest flight each soars to a distance from its fellows. Each is pursued alone for its own sake, and without reference to its connection with, or its application to, any other subject. The pioneer and the advanced guard are of necessity separated from the main body; and in this respect Mathematics does not materially differ from its neighbours. And, therefore, as the solitariness of Mathematics has been a frequent theme of discourse, it may be not altogether unprofitable to dwell for a short time upon the other side of the question, and to inquire whether there be not points of contact in method or in subject-matter between Mathematics and the outer world which have been frequently overlooked; whether its lines do not in some cases run parallel to those of other occupations and purposes of life; and lastly, whether we may not hope for some change in the attitude too often assumed towards it by the representatives of other branches of knowledge and of mental activity.

In his Preface to the Principia, Newton gives expression to some general ideas which may well serve as the key note for all future utterances on the relation of Mathematics to Natural, including also therein what are commonly called Artificial, Phenomena.

"The ancients divided Mechanics into two parts, Rational and Practical; and since artizans often work inaccurately, it came to pass that Mechanics and Geometry were distinguished in this way, that everything accurate was referred to Geometry, and everything inaccurate to Mechanics. But the inaccuracies appertain to the artizan and not to the art, and Geometry itself has its foundation in mechanical practice, and is in fact nothing else than that part of Universal Mechanics which accurately lays down and demonstrates the art of measuring." He next explains that rational Mechanics is the science of motion resulting from forces, and adds, "The whole difficulty of Philosophy seems to me to lie in investigating the forces of Nature from the phenomena of motion; and in demonstrating that from these forces other phenomena will ensue." Then, after stating the problems of which he has treated in the work itself, he says: "I would that all other Natural Phenomena might similarly be deduced from mechanical principles. For many things move me to suspect that everything depends upon certain forces in virtue of which the particles of bodies, through forces not yet understood, are either impelled together so as to cohere in regular figures, or are repelled and recede from one another."

Newton's views, then, are clear: he regards Mathematics, not as a method independent of, though applicable to various subjects, but as itself the higher side or aspect of the subjects themselves; and it would be little more than a translation of his notions into other language, little more than a paraphrase of his own words, if we were to describe the mathematical as one aspect of the material world itself, apart from which all other aspects are but incomplete sketches, and, however accurate after their own kind, are still liable to the imperfections of the inaccurate artificer. Mr. Burrowes, in his Preface to the first volume of the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, has carried out the same argument, approaching it from the other side: "No one Science," he says, "is so little connected with the rest as not to afford many principles whose use may extend considerably beyond the Science to which they primarily belong, and no proposition is so purely theoretical as to be incapable of being applied to practical purposes. There is no apparent connexion between duration and the cycloidal arch, the

properties of which have furnished us with the best method of measuring time; and he who has made himself master of the nature and affections of the logarithmic curve has advanced considerably towards ascertaining the proportionable density of the air at various distances from the earth. The researches of the Mathematician are the only sure ground on which we can reason from experiments; and how far Experimental Science may assist commercial interests is evinced by the success of manufactures in countries where the hand of the artificer has taken its direction from the Philosopher. Every manufacture is in reality but a chemical process, and the machinery requisite for carrying it on but the right application of certain propositions in rational mechanics." So far your Academician. Every subject, therefore, whether in its usual acceptation scientific or otherwise, may have a mathematical aspect; as soon, in fact, as it becomes a matter of strict measurement, or of numerical statement, so soon does it enter upon a mathematical phase. This phase may, or it may not, be a prelude to another in which the laws of the subject are expressed in algebraical formulae or represented by geometrical figures. But the real gist of the business does not always lie in the mode of expression; and the fascination of the formulæ or other mathematical paraphernalia may after all be little more than that of a theatrical transformation scene. The process of reducing to formulas is really one of abstraction, the results of which are not always wholly on the side of gain; in fact, through the process itself the subject may lose in one respect even more than it gains in another. But long before such abstraction is completely attained, and even in cases where it is never attained at all, a subject may to all intents and purposes become mathematical. It is not so much elaborate calculations or abstruse processes which characterise this phase, as the principles of precision, of exactness, and of proportion. But these are principles with which no true knowledge can entirely dispense. If it be the general scientific spirit which at the outset moves upon the face of the waters, and out of the unknown depth brings forth light and living forms; it is no less the mathematical spirit which breathes the breath of life into what would otherwise have ever remained mere dry bones of fact, which reunites the scattered limbs and recreates from them a new and organic whole.

And as a matter of fact, in the words used by Professor Jellett at our meeting at Belfast, viz., "Not only are we applying our methods to many Sciences already recognised as belonging to the legitimate province of Mathematics, but we are learning to apply the same instrument to Sciences hitherto wholly or partially independent of its authority. Physical Science is learning more and more every day to see in the phenomena of Nature modifications of that one phenomenon (namely, Motion) which is peculiarly under the power of Mathematics." Echoes are these, far off and faint perhaps, but still true echoes, in answer to Newton's wish that all these phenomena may some day "be deduced from mechanical principles."

If, turning from this aspect of the subject, it were my purpose to enumerate how the same tendency has evinced itself in the Arts, unconsciously it may be to the artists themselves, I might call as witnesses each one in turn with full reliance on the testimony which they would bear. And, having more special reference to Mathematics, I might confidently point to the accuracy of measurement, to the truth of curve, which according to modern investigation is the key to the perfection of classic art. I might triumphantly cite not only the architects of all ages, whose art so manifestly rests upon mathematical principles; but I might cite also the literary as well as the artistic remains of the great Artists of the Cinquecento, both Painters and Sculptors, in evidence of the Geometry and the Mechanics which, having been laid at the foundation, appear to have found their way upwards through the superstructure of their works. And in a less ambitious sphere, but nearer to ourselves in both time and place, I might point with satisfaction to the great school of English constructors of the 18th century in the domestic arts; and remind you that not only the engineer and the architect, but even the cabinetmakers, devoted half the space of their books to perspective and to the principles whereby solid figures may be delineated on paper, or what is now termed descriptive Geometry.

Nor perhaps would the Sciences which concern themselves with reasoning and speech, nor the kindred art of Music, nor even Literature itself, if thoroughly probed, offer fewer points of dependence upon the Science of which I am speaking. What, in fact, is Logic but that part of universal reasoning; Grammar but that part of Universal Speech: Harmony and Counterpoint but that part of Universal Music, "which accurately" lays down," and demonstrates (so far as demonstration is possible) precise methods appertaining to each of these Arts? And I might even appeal to the common consent which speaks of the mathematical as the pattern form of reasoning and model of a precise style.

Taking, then, precision and exactness as the characteristics which distinguish the mathematical phase of a subject, we are naturally led to expect that the approach to such a phase will be indicated by increasing application of the principle of measurement, and by the importance which is attached to numerical results. And this very necessary condition for progress may, I think, be fairly described as one of the main features of scientific advance in the present day.

If it were my purpose, by descending into the arena of special sciences, to show how the most various investigations alike tend to issue in measurement, and to that extent to assume a mathematical phase, I should be embarrassed by the abundance of instances which might be adduced. I will therefore confine myself to a

passing notice of a very few, selecting those which exemplify not only the general tendency, but also the special character of the measurements now particularly required, viz., that of minuteness, and the indirect method by which alone we can at present hope to approach them. An object having a diameter of an 80,000th of an inch is perhaps the smallest of which the microscope could give any well-defined representation; and it is improbable that one of 120,000th of an inch could be singly discerned with the highest powers at our command. But the solar beams and the electric light reveal to us the presence of bodies far smaller than these. And, in the absence of any means of observing them singly, Professor Tyndall has suggested a scale of these minute objects in terms of the lengths of luminiferous waves. To this he was led, not by any attempt at individual measurement, but by taking account of them in the aggregate, and observing the tints which they scatter laterally when clustered in the form of actinic clouds. The small bodies with which experimental Science has recently come into contact are not confined to gaseous molecules, but comprise also complete organisms; and the same philosopher has made a profound study of the momentous influence exerted by these minute organisms in the economy of life. And if, in view of their specific effects, whether deleterious or other, on human life, any qualitative classification, or quantitative estimate be ever possible, it seems that it must be effected by some such method as that indicated above.

Again, to enumerate a few more instances of the measurement of minute quantities, there are the average distances of molecules from one another in various gases and at various pressures; the length of their free path, or range open for their motion without coming into collision; there are movements causing the pressures and differences of pressure under which Mr. Crookes' radiometers execute their wonderful revolutions. There are the excursions of the air while transmitting notes of high pitch, which through the researches of Lord Rayleigh appear to be of a diminutiveness altogether unexpected. There are the molecular actions brought into play in the remarkable experiments by Dr. Kerr, who has succeeded, where even Faraday failed, in effecting a visible rotation of the plane of polarisation of light in its passage through electrified dielectrics, and on its reflexion at the surface of a magnet. To take one more instance, which must be present to the minds of us all, there are the infinitesimal ripples of the vibrating plate in Mr. Graham Bell's most marvellous invention. Of the nodes and ventral segments in the plate of the Telephone which actually converts sound into electricity and electricity into sound, we can at present form no conception. All that can now be said is that the most perfect specimens of Chladni's sand figures on a vibrating plate, or of Kundt's lycopodium heaps in a musical tube, or even Mr. Sedley Taylor's more delicate vortices in the films of the Phoneidoscope, are rough and sketchy compared with these. For notwithstanding the fact that in the movements of the Telephone-plate we have actually in our hand the solution of that old world problem the construction of a speaking machine; yet the characters in which that solution is expressed are too small for our powers of decipherment. In movements such as these we seem to lose sight of the distinction, or perhaps we have unconsciously passed the boundary between massive and molecular motion.

Through the Phonograph we have not only a trans-formation but a permanent and tangible record of the mechanism of speech. But the differences upon which articulation (apart from loudness, pitch, and quality) depends, appear from the experiments of Fleeming Jenkin and of others to be of microscopic size. The Microphone affords another instance of the unexpected value of minute variations,—in this case of electric currents; and it is remarkable that the gist of the instrument seems to lie in obtaining and perfecting that which electricians have hitherto most scrupulously avoided, viz., loose contact.

Once more, Mr. De La Rue has brought forward as one of the results derived from his stupendous battery of 10,000 cells, strong evidence for supposing that a voltaic discharge, even when apparently continuous, may still be an intermittent phenomenon; but all that is known of the period of such intermittence is, that it must recur at exceedingly short intervals. And in connexion with this subject, it may be added that, whatever be the ultimate explanation of the strange stratification which the voltaic discharge undergoes in rarefied gases, it is clear that the alternate disposition of light and darkness must be dependent on some periodic distribution in space or sequence in time which can at present be dealt with only in a very general way. In the exhausted column we have a vehicle for electricity not constant like an ordinary conductor, but itself modified by the passage of the discharge, and perhaps subject to laws differing materially from those which it obeys at atmospheric pressure. It may also be that some of the features accompanying stratification form a magnified image of phenomena belonging to disruptive discharges in general; and that consequently so far from expecting among the known facts of the latter any clue to an explanation of the former, we must hope ultimately to find in the former an elucidation of what is at present obscure in the latter. A prudent philosopher usually avoids hazarding any forecast of the practical application of a purely scientific research. But it would seem that the configuration of these striæ might some day prove a very delicate means of estimating low pressures, and perhaps also for effecting some electrical measurements.

Now, it is a curious fact that almost the only small quantities of which we have as yet any actual measurements are the wave lengths of light; and that all others, excepting so far as they can be deduced from

these, await future determination. In the meantime, when unable to approach these small quantities individually, the method to which we are obliged to have recourse is, as indicated above, that of averages, whereby, disregarding the circumstances of each particular case, we calculate the average size, the average velocity, the average direction, &c. of a large number of instances. But although this method is based upon experience, and leads to results which may be accepted as substantially true; although it may be applicable to any finite interval of time, or over any finite area of space (that is, for all practical purposes of life) there is no evidence to show that it is so when the dimensions of interval or of area are indefinitely diminished. The truth is that the simplicity of nature which we at present grasp is really the result of infinite complexity; and that below the uniformity there underlies a diversity whose depths we have not yet probed, and whose secret places are still beyond our reach.

The present is not an occasion for multiplying illustrations, but I can hardly omit a passing allusion to one all important instance of the application of the statistical method. Without its aid social life, or the History of Life and Death, could not be conceived at all, or only in the most superficial manner. Without it we could never attain to any clear ideas of the condition of the Poor, we could never hope for any solid amelioration of their condition or prospects. Without its aid, sanitary measures, and even medicine, would be powerless. Without it, the politician, and the philanthropist, would alike be wandering over a trackless desert.

It is, however, not so much from the side of Science at large as from that of Mathematics itself, that I desire to speak. I wish from the latter point of view to indicate connexions between Mathematics and other subjects, to prove that hers is not after all such a far-off region, nor so undecipherable an alphabet, and to show that even at unlikely spots we may trace under-currents of thought which having issued from a common source fertilize alike the mathematical and the non-mathematical world.

Having this in view, I propose to make the subject of special remark some processes peculiar to modern Mathematics; and, partly with the object of incidentally removing some current misapprehensions, I have selected for examination three methods in respect of which Mathematicians are often thought to have exceeded all reasonable limits of speculation, and to have adopted for unknown purposes an unknown tongue. And it will be my endeavour to show not only that in these very cases our Science has not outstepped its own legitimate range, but that even Art and Literature have unconsciously employed methods similar in principle. The three methods in question are, first, that of Imaginary Quantities; secondly, that of Manifold Space; and thirdly, that of Geometry not according to Euclid.

First it is objected that, abandoning the more cautious methods of ancient Mathematicians, we have admitted into our formulæ quantities which by our own showing, and even in our own nomenclature, are imaginary or impossible; nay, more, that out of them we have formed a variety of new algebras to which there is no counterpart whatever in reality; but from which we claim to arrive at possible and certain results.

On this head it is in Dublin, if anywhere, that I may be permitted to speak. For to the fertile imagination of the late Astronomer Royal for Ireland we are indebted for that marvellous calculus of Quaternions, which is only now beginning to be fully understood, and which has not yet received all the applications of which it is doubtless capable. And even although this calculus be not coextensive with another which almost simultaneously germinated on the continent, nor with ideas more recently developed in America; yet it must always hold its position as an original discovery, and as a representative of one of the two great groups of generalised algebras, (viz., those the squares of whose units are respectively negative unity and zero) the common origin of which must still be marked on our intellectual map as an unknown region. Well do I recollect how in its early days we used to handle the method as a magician's page might try to wield his master's wand, trembling as it were between hope and fear, and hardly knowing whether to trust our own results until they had been submitted to the present and ever ready counsel of Sir W. R. Hamilton himself.

To fix our ideas, consider the measurement of a line, or the reckoning of time, or the performance of any mathematical operation. A line may be measured in one direction or in the opposite; time may be reckoned forward or backward; an operation may be performed or be reversed, it may be done or may be undone; and if having once reversed any of these processes we reverse it a second time, we shall find that we have come back to the original direction of measurement or of reckoning, or to the original kind of operation.

Suppose, however, that at some stage of a calculation our formulae indicate an alteration in the mode of measurement such that if the alteration be repeated, a condition of things, not the same as, but the reverse of the original, will be produced. Or suppose that, at a certain stage, our transformations indicate that time is to be reckoned in some manner different from future or past, but still in a way having definite algebraical connexion with time which is gone and time which is to come. It is clear that in actual experience there is no process to which such measurements correspond. Time has no meaning except as future or past; and the present is but the meeting point of the two. Or, once more, suppose that we are gravely told that all circles pass through the same two imaginary points at an infinite distance, and that every line drawn through one of these points is perpendicular to itself. On hearing the statement we shall probably whisper, with a smile or a sigh, that we hope

it is not true, but that in any case it is a long way off, and perhaps, after all, it does not very much signify. If, however, as mathematicians, we are not satisfied to dismiss the question on these terms, we ourselves must admit that we have here reached a definite point of issue. Our Science must either give a rational account of the dilemma, or yield the position as no longer tenable.

Special modes of explaining this anomalous state of things have occurred to Mathematicians. But, omitting details as unsuited to the present occasion, it will, I think, be sufficient to point out in general terms that a solution of the difficulty is to be found in the fact that the formulæ which give rise to these results are more comprehensive than the signification assigned to them; and when we pass out of the condition of things first contemplated they cannot (as it is obvious they ought not) give us any results intelligible on that basis. But it does not therefore by any means follow that upon a more enlarged basis the formulas are incapable of interpretation; on the contrary, the difficulty at which we have arrived indicates that there must be some more comprehensive statement of the problem which will include cases impossible in the more limited, but possible in the wider view of the subject.

A very simple instance will illustrate the matter. If from a point outside a circle we draw a straight line to touch the curve, the distance between the starting point and the point of contact has certain geometrical properties. If the starting point be shifted nearer and nearer to the circle the distance in question becomes shorter, and ultimately vanishes. But as soon as the point passes to the interior of the circle the notion of a tangent and distance to the point of contact cease to have any meaning; and the same anomalous condition of things prevails as long as the point remains in the interior. But if the point be shifted still further until it emerges on the other side, the tangent and its properties resume their reality; and are as intelligible as before. Now the process whereby we have passed from the possible to the impossible, and again repassed to the possible (namely the shifting of the starting point) is a perfectly continuous one, while the conditions of the problem as stated above have abruptly changed. If, however, we replace the idea of a line touching by that of a line cutting the circle, and the distance of the point of contact by the distances at which the line is intercepted by the curve, it will easily be seen that the latter includes the former as a limiting case, when the cutting line is turned about the starting point until it coincides with the tangent itself. And further, that the two intercepts have a perfectly distinct and intelligible meaning whether the point be outside or inside the area. The only difference is that in the first case the intercepts are measured in the same direction; in the latter in opposite directions.

The foregoing instance has shown one purpose which these imaginaries may serve, viz., as marks indicating a limit to a particular condition of things, to the applica- tion of a particular law, or pointing out a stage where a more comprehensive law is required. To attain to such a law we must, as in the instance of the circle and tangent, reconsider our statement of the problem; we must go back to the principle from which we set out, and ascertain whether it may not be modified or enlarged. And even if in any particular investigation, wherein imaginaries have occurred, the most comprehensive statement of the problem of which we are at present capable fails to give an actual representation of these quantities; if they must for the present be relegated to the category of imaginaries; it still does not follow that we may not at some future time find a law which will endow them with reality, nor that in the meantime we need hesitate to employ them, in accordance with the great principle of continuity, for bringing out correct results.

If, moreover, both in Geometry and in Algebra we occasionally make use of points or of quantities which from our present outlook have no real existence, which can neither be delineated in space of which we have experience, nor measured by scale as we count measurement; if these imaginaries, as they are termed, are called up by legitimate processes of our Science; if they serve the purpose not merely of suggesting ideas, but of actually conducting us to practical conclusions; if all this be true in abstract Science, I may perhaps be allowed to point out, in illustration of my argument, that in Art unreal forms are frequently used for suggesting ideas, for conveying a meaning for which no others seem to be suitable or adequate. Are not forms unknown to Biology, situations incompatible with gravitation, positions which challenge not merely the stability but even the possibility of equilibrium,—are not these the very means to which the Artist often has recourse in order to convey his meaning and to fulfil his mission? Who that has ever revelled in the ornamentation of the Renaissance, in the extraordinary transitions from the animal to the vegetable, from faunic to floral forms, and from these again to almost purely geometric curves, who has not felt that these imaginaries have a claim to recognition very similar to that of their congeners in Mathematics? How is it that the grotesque paintings of the middle ages, the fantastic sculpture of remote nations, and even the rude art of the Prehistoric Past, still impress us, and have an interest over and above their antiquarian value; unless it be that they are symbols which, although hard of interpretation when taken alone, are yet capable from a more comprehensive point of view of leading us mentally to something beyond themselves, and to truths which, although reached through them, have a reality scarcely to be attributed to their outward forms?

Again, if we turn from art to letters, truth to nature and to fact is undoubtedly a characteristic of sterling literature; and yet in the delineation of outward nature itself, still more in that of feelings and affections, of the

secret parts of character and motives of conduct, it frequently happens that the writer is driven to imagery, to an analogy, or even to a paradox, in order to give utterance to that of which there is no direct counterpart in recognized speech. And yet which of us cannot find a meaning for these literary figures, an inward response, to imaginative poetry, to social fiction, or even to those tales of giant and fairyland written, it is supposed, only for the nursery or schoolroom? But in order thus to reanimate these things with a meaning beyond that of the mere words, have we not to reconsider our first position, to enlarge the ideas with which we started; have we not to cast about for some thing which is common to the idea conveyed and to the subject actually described, and to seek for the sympathetic spring which underlies both; have we not, like the mathematician, to go back as it were to some first principles, or, as it is pleasanter to describe it, to become again as a little child?

Passing to the second of the three methods, viz., that of manifold space, it may first be remarked that our whole experience of space is in three dimensions, viz., of that which has length, breadth, and thickness; and if for certain purposes Ave restrict our ideas to two dimensions as in plane geometry, or to one dimension as in the division of a straight line, we do this only by consciously and of deliberate purpose setting aside, but not annihilating, the remaining one or two dimensions. Negation, as Hegel has justly remarked, implies that which is negatived, or, as he expresses it, affirms the opposite. It is by abstraction from previous experience, by a limitation of its results, and not by any independent process, that we arrive at the idea of space whose dimensions are less than three.

It is doubtless on this account that problems in plane geometry which, although capable of solution on their own account, become much more intelligible, more easy of extension, if viewed in connexion with solid space, and as special cases of corresponding problems in solid geometry. So eminently is this the case, that the very language of the more general method often leads us almost intuitively to conclusions which from the more restricted point of view require long and laborious proof. Such a change in the base of operations has, in fact, been successfully made in geometry of two dimensions, and although we have not the same experimental data for the further steps, yet neither the modes of reasoning, nor the validity of its conclusions, are in any way affected by applying an analogous mental process to geometry of three dimensions; and by regarding figures in space of three dimensions as sections of figures in space of four, in the same way that figures in piano are sometimes considered as sections of figures in solid space. The addition of a fourth dimension to space, not Only extends the actual properties of geometrical figures, but it also adds new properties which are often useful for the purposes of transformation or of proof. Thus it has recently been shown that in four dimensions a closed material shell could be turned inside out by simple flexure, without either stretching or tearing; and that in such a space it is impossible to tie a knot.

Again, the solution of problems in geometry is often effected by means of algebra; and as three measurements, or co-ordinates as they are called, determine the position of a point in space, so do three letters or measurable quantities serve for the same purpose in the language of algebra. Now, many algebraical problems involving three unknown or variable quantities admit of being generalized so as to give problems involving many such quantities. And as, on the one hand, to every algebraical problem involving unknown quantities or variables by ones, or by twos, or by threes, there corresponds a problem in geometry of one or of two or of three dimensions; so on the other it may be said that to every algebraical problem involving many variables there corresponds a problem in geometry of many dimensions.

There is, however, another aspect under which even ordinary space presents to us a four-fold, or indeed a mani-fold, character. In modern Physics, space is regarded not as a vacuum in which bodies are placed and forces have play, but rather as a plenum with which matter is coextensive. And from a physical point of view the properties of space are the properties of matter, or of the medium which fills it. Similarly from a mathematical point of view, space may be regarded as a locus in quo, as a plenum, filled with those elements of geometrical magnitude which we take as fundamental. These elements need not always be the same. For different purposes different elements may be chosen; and upon the degree of complexity of the subject of our choice will depend the internal structure or mani-fold-ness of space.

Thus, beginning with the simplest case, a point may have any singly infinite multitude of positions in a line, which gives a one-fold system of points in a line. The line may revolve in a plane about any one of its points, giving a two-fold system of points in a plane; and the plane may revolve about any one of the lines, giving a three-fold system of points in space.

Suppose, however, that we take a straight line as our element, and conceive space as filled with such lines. This will be the case if we take two planes, *e.g.* two parallel planes, and join every point in one with every point in the other. Now the points in a plane form a two-fold system, and it therefore follows that the system of lines is four-fold; in other words, space regarded as a plenum of lines is four-fold. The same result follows from the consideration that the lines in a plane, and the planes through a point, are each two-fold.

Again, if we take a sphere as our element we can through any point as a centre draw a singly infinite number of spheres, but the number of such centres is triply infinite; hence space as a plenum of spheres is

four-fold. And generally, space as a plenum of surfaces has a mani-foldness equal to the number of constants required to determine the surface. Although it would be beyond our present purpose to attempt to pursue the subject further, it should not pass unnoticed that the identity in the four-fold character of space, as derived on the one hand from a system of straight lines, and on the other from a system of spheres, is intimately connected with the principles established by Sophus Lie in his researches on the correlation of these figures.

If we take a circle as our element we can around any point in a plane as a centre draw a singly infinite system of circles; but the number of such centres in a plane is doubly infinite; hence the circles in a plane form a three-fold system, and as the planes in space form a three-fold system, it follows that space as a plenum of circles is six-fold.

Again, if we take a circle as our element, we may regard it as a section either of a sphere, or of a right cone (given except in position) by a plane perpendicular to the axis. In the former case the position of the centre is three-fold; the directions of the plane, like that of a pencil of lines perpendicular thereto, two-fold; and the radius of the sphere one-fold; six-fold in all. In the latter case, the position of the vertex is threefold; the direction of the axis two-fold; and the distance of the plane of section one-fold; six-fold in all, as before. Hence space as a plenum of circles is six-fold.

Similarly, if we take a conic as our element we may regard it as a section of a right cone (given except in position) by a plane. If the nature of the conic be defined, the plane of section will be inclined at a fixed angle to the axis; otherwise it will be free to take any inclination whatever. This being so, the position of the vertex will be three-fold; the direction of the axis twofold; the distance of the plane of section from the vertex one-fold; and the direction of that plane, onefold if the conic be defined, two-fold if it be not defined. Hence, space as a plenum of definite conics will be seven-fold, as a plenum of conics in general eight-fold. And so on for curves of higher degrees.

This is in fact the whole story and mystery of manifold space. It is not seriously regarded as a reality in the same sense as ordinary space; it is a mode of representation, or a method which, having served its purpose, vanishes from the scene. Like a rainbow, if we try to grasp it, it eludes our very touch; but, like a rainbow, it arises out of real conditions of known and tangible quantities, and if rightly apprehended it is a true and valuable expression of natural laws, and serves a definite purpose in the science of which it forms part.

Again, if we seek a counterpart of this in common life, I might remind you that perspective in drawing is itself a method not altogether dissimilar to that of which I have been speaking; and that the third dimension of space, as represented in a picture, has its origin in the painter's mind, and is due to his skill, but has no real existence upon the canvass which is the groundwork of his art. Or again, turning to literature, when in legendary tales, or in works of fiction, things past and future are pictured as present, has not the poetic fancy correlated time with the three dimensions of space, and brought all alike to a common focus? Or once more, when space already filled with material substances is mentally peopled with immaterial beings, may not the imagination be regarded as having added a new element to the capacity of space, a fourth dimension of which there is no evidence in experimental fact?

The third method proposed for special remark is that which has been termed Non-Euclidean Geometry; and the train of reasoning which has led to it may be described in general terms as follows: some of the properties of space which on account of their simplicity, theoretical as well as practical, have, in constructing the ordinary system of geometry, been considered as fundamental, are now seen to be particular cases of more general properties. Thus a plane surface, and a straight line, may be regarded as special instances of surfaces and lines whose curvature is everywhere uniform or constant. And it is perhaps not difficult to see that, when the special notions of flatness and straightness are abandoned, many properties of geometrical figures which we are in the habit of regarding as fundamental will undergo profound modification. Thus a plane may be considered as a special case of the sphere, viz., the limit to which a sphere approaches when its radius is increased without limit. But even this consideration trenches upon an elementary proposition relating to one of the simplest of geometrical figures. In plane triangles the interior angles are together equal to two right angles; but in triangles traced on the surface of a sphere this proposition does not hold good. To this, other instances might be added.

Further, these modifications may affect not only our ideas of particular geometrical figures, but the very axioms of the Science itself. Thus, the idea which, in fact, lies at the foundation of Euclid's method viz. that a geometrical figure may be moved in space without change of size or alteration of form, entirely falls away, or becomes only approximate in a space wherein dimension and form are dependent upon position. For instance, if we consider merely the case of figures traced on a flattened globe like the earth's surface, or upon an eggshell, such figures cannot be made to slide upon the surface without change of form, as is the case with figures traced upon a plane or even upon a sphere. But, further still, these generalizations are not restricted to the case of figures traced upon a surface; they may apply also to solid figures in a space whose very configuration varies from point to point. We may, for instance, imagine a space in which our rule or scale of measurement varies as it extends, or as it moves about, in one direction or another; a space, in fact, whose geometric density is not

uniformly distributed. Thus we might picture to ourselves such a space as a field having a more or less complicated distribution of temperature, and our scale as a rod instantaneously susceptible of expansion or contraction under the influence of heat; or we might suppose space to be even crystalline in its geometric formation, and our scale and measuring instruments to accept the structure of the locality in which they are applied. These ideas are doubtless difficult of apprehension, at all events at the outset; but Helmholtz has pointed out a very familiar phenomenon which may be regarded as a diagram of such a kind of space. The picture formed by reflexion from a plane mirror may be taken as a correct representation of ordinary space, in which, subject to the usual laws of perspective, every object appears in the same form and of the same dimensions whatever be its position. In like manner the picture formed by reflexion from a curved mirror may be regarded as the representation of a space wherein dimension and form are dependent upon position. Thus in an ordinary convex mirror objects appear smaller as they recede laterally from the centre of the picture; straight lines become curved; objects infinitely distant in front of the mirror appear at a distance only equal to the focal length behind. And by suitable modifications in the curvature of the mirror, representations could similarly be obtained of space of various configurations.

The diversity in kind of these spaces is of course infinite; they vary with the mode in which we generalize our conceptions of ordinary space; but upon each as a basis it is possible to construct a consistent system of geometry, whose laws, as a matter of strict reasoning, have a validity and truth not inferior to those with which we are habitually familiar. Such systems having been actually constructed, the question has not unnaturally been asked, whether there is anything in nature or in the outer world to which they correspond; whether, admitting that for our limited experience ordinary geometry amply suffices, we may understand that for powers more extensive in range or more minute in definition some more general scheme would be requisite? Thus, for example, although the one may serve for the solar system, is it legitimate to suppose that it may fail to apply at distances reaching to the fixed stars, or to regions beyond? Or again, if our vision could discern the minute configuration of portions of space, which to our ordinary powers appear infinitesimally small, should we expect to find that all our usual Geometry is but a special case, sufficient indeed for daily use, but after all only a rough approximation to a truer although perhaps more complicated scheme? Traces of these questions are in fact to be found in the writings of some of our greatest and most original Mathematicians. Gauss, Riemann, and Helmholtz have thrown out suggestions radiating as it were in these various directions from a common centre; while Cayley, Sylvester, and Clifford in this country, Klein in Germany, Lobatcheffsky in Russia, Bolyai in Hungary, and Beltrami in Italy, with many others, have reflected kindred ideas with all the modifications due to the chromatic dispersion of their individual minds. But to the main question the answer must be in the negative. And, to use the words of Newton, since" Geometry has its foundation in me—"chanical practice," the same must be the answer until our experience is different from what it now is. And yet, all this notwithstanding, generalised conceptions of space are not without their practical utility. The principle of representing space of one kind by that of another, and figures belonging to one by their analogues in the other, is not only recognised as legitimate in pure mathematics, but has long ago found its application in cartography. In maps or charts, geographical positions, the contour of coasts, and other features, belonging in reality to the Earth's surface, are represented on the flat; and to each mode of representation, or projection as it is called, there corresponds a special correlation between the spheroid and the plane. To this might perhaps be added the method of descriptive geometry, and all similar processes in use by engineers, both military and civil.

It has often been asked whether modern research in the field of Pure Mathematics has not so completely outstripped its physical applications as to be practically useless; whether the analyst and the geometer might not now, and for a long time to come, fairly say, "hic artem remumque repono," and turn his attention to Mechanics and to Physics. That the Pure has out- stripped the Applied is largely true; but that the former is on that account useless is far from true. Its utility often crops up at unexpected points; witness the aids to classification of physical quantities, furnished by the ideas (of Scalar and Vector) involved in the Calculus of Quaternions; or the advantages which have accrued to Physical Astronomy from Lagrange's Equations, and from Hamilton's Principle of Varying Action; on the value of Complex Quantities, and the properties of general Integrals, and of general theorems on integration for the Theories of Electricity and Magnetism. The utility of such researches can in no case be discounted, or even imagined beforehand; who, for instance, would have supposed that the Calculus of Forms or the Theory of Substitutions would have thrown much light upon ordinary equations; or that Abelian Functions and Hyperelliptic Transcendents would have told us anything about the properties of curves; or that the Calculus of Operations would have helped us in any way towards the Figure of the Earth. But upon such technical points I must not now dwell. If however, as I hope, it has been sufficiently shown that any of these more extended ideas enable us to combine together, and to deal with as one, properties and processes which from the ordinary point of view present marked distinctions, then they will have justified their own existence; and in using them we shall not have been walking in a vain shadow, nor disquieting our brains in vain.

These extensions of mathematical ideas would however be overwhelming, if they were not compensated by some simplifications in the processes actually employed. Of these aids to calculation I will mention only two, viz., symmetry of form, and mechanical appliances; or, say, Mathematics as a Fine Art, and Mathematics as a Handicraft. And first, as to symmetry of form. There are many passages of algebra in which long processes of calculation at the outset seem unavoidable. Results are often obtained in the first instance through a tangled maze of formulæ, where at best we can just make sure of our process step by step, without any general survey of the path which we have traversed, and still less of that which we have to pursue. But almost within our own generation a new method has been devised to clear this entanglement. More correctly speaking, the method is not new, for it is inherent in the processes of algebra itself, and instances of it, unnoticed perhaps or disregarded, are to be found cropping up throughout nearly all mathematical treatises. By Lagrange, and to some extent also by Gauss, among the older writers, the method of which I am speaking was recognized as a principle; but beside these perhaps no others can be named until a period within our own recollection. The method consists in symmetry of expression. In algebraical formulæ combinations of the quantities entering therein occur and recur; and by a suitable choice of these quantities the various combinations may be rendered symmetrical, and reduced to a few well known types. This having been done, and one such combination having been calculated, the remainder, together with many of their results, can often be written down at once, without further calculations, by simple permutations of the letters. Symmetrical expressions, moreover, save as much time and trouble in reading as in writing. Instead of wading laboriously through a series of expressions which, although successively dependent, bear no outward resemblance to one another, we may read off symmetrical formulae, of almost any length, at a glance. A page of such formulae becomes a picture: known forms are seen in definite groupings; their relative positions, or perspective as it may be called, their very light and shadow, convey their meaning almost as much through the artistic faculty as through any conscious ratiocinative process. Few principles have been more suggestive of extended ideas or of new views and relations than that of which I am now speaking. In order to pass from questions concerning plane figures to those which appertain to space, from conditions having few degrees of freedom to others which have many—in a word, from more restricted to less restricted problems—we have in many cases merely to add lines and columns to our array of letters or symbols already formed, and then read off pictorially the extended theorems.

Next as to mechanical appliances. Mr. Babbage, when speaking of the difficulty of ensuring accuracy in the long numerical calculations of theoretical astronomy, remarked, that the science which in itself is the most accurate and certain of all had, through these difficulties, become inaccurate and uncertain in some of its results. And it was doubtless some such consideration as this, coupled with his dislike of employing skilled labour where unskilled would suffice, which led him to the invention of his calculating machines. The idea of substituting mechanical for intellectual power has not lain dormant; for beside the arithmetical machines whose name is legion (from Napier's Bones, Earl Stanhope's calculator, to Schultz and Thomas's machines now in actual use) an invention has lately been designed for even a more difficult task. Prof. James Thomson has in fact recently constructed a machine which, by means of the mere friction of a disk, a cylinder, and a ball, is capable of effecting a variety of the complicated calculations which occur in the highest application of Mathematics to physical problems. By its aid it seems that an unskilled labourer may, in a given time, perform the work of ten skilled arithmeticians. The machine is applicable alike to the calculation of tidal, of magnetic, of meteorological, and perhaps also of all other periodic phenomena. It will solve differential equations of the second and perhaps of even higher orders. And through the same invention the problem of finding the free motions of any number of mutually attracting particles, unrestricted by any of the approximate suppositions required in the treatment of the Lunar and Planetary Theories, is reduced to the simple process of turning a handle.

When Faraday had completed the experimental part of a physical problem, and desired that it should thenceforward be treated mathematically, he used irreverently to say, "Hand it over to the calculators." But truth is ever stranger than fiction; and if he had lived until our day, he might with perfect propriety have said, "Hand it over to the machine."

Had time permitted, the foregoing topics would have led me to point out that the mathematician, although concerned only with abstractions, uses many of the same methods of research as are employed in other sciences, and in the arts, such as observation, experiment, induction, imagination. But this is the less necessary because the subject has been already handled very ably, although with greater brevity than might have been wished, by Professor Sylvester in his address to Section A. at our meeting at Exeter.

In an exhaustive treatment of my subject there would still remain a question which in one sense lies at the bottom of all others, and which through almost all time has had an attraction for reflective minds, viz., what was the origin of mathematical ideas? Are they to be regarded as independent of, or dependent upon, experience? The question has been answered sometimes in one way and sometimes in another. But the absence of any satisfactory conclusion may after all be understood as implying that no answer is possible in the sense in

which the question is put; or rather that there is no question at all in the matter, except as to the history of actual facts. And, even if we distinguish, as we certainly should, between the origin of ideas in the individual and their origin in a nation or mankind, we should still come to the same conclusion. If we take the case of the individual, all we can do is to give an account of our own experience; how we played with marbles and apples; how we learnt the multiplication table, fractions, and proportion; how we were afterwards amused to find that common things conformed to the rules of number; and later still how we came to see that the same laws applied to music and to mechanism, to astronomy, to chemistry, and to many other subjects. And then, on trying to analyse our own mental processes, we find that mathematical ideas have been imbibed in precisely the same way as all other ideas, viz., by learning, by experience, and by reflexion. The apparent difference in the mode of first apprehending them and in their ultimate cogency arises from the difference of the ideas themselves, from the preponderance of quantitative over qualitative considerations in Mathematics, from the notions of absolute equality and identity which they imply.

If we turn to the other question, How did the world at large acquire and improve its idea of number and of figures? How can we span the interval between the savage who counted only by the help of outward objects, to whom 15 was "half the hands and both the feet," and Newton or Laplace? The answer is the history of Mathematics and its successive developments, arithmetic, geometry, algebra, &c. The first and greatest step in all this was the transition from number in the concrete to number in the abstract. This was the beginning not only of Mathematics but of all abstract thought. The reason and mode of it was the same as in the individual. There was the same general influx of evidence, the same unsought for experimental proof, the same re-cognition of general laws running through all manner of purposes and relations of life. No wonder then if, under such circumstances, Mathematics, like some other subjects, and perhaps with better excuse, came after a time to be clothed with mysticism; nor that, even in modern times, they should have been placed upon an *à priori* basis, as in the philosophy of Kant. Number was so soon found to be a principle common to many branches of knowledge that it was readily assumed to be the key to all. It gave distinctness of expression, if not clearness of thought, to ideas which were floating in the untutored mind, and even suggested to it new conceptions. In "the one," "the all," "the many in one," (terms of purely arithmetic origin,) it gave the earliest utterance to men's first crude notions about God and the world. In "the equal," "the solid," "the straight," and "the crooked," which still survive as figures of speech among ourselves, it supplied a vocabulary for the moral notions of mankind, and quickened them by giving them the power of expression. In this lies the great and enduring interest in the fragments which remain to us of the Pythagorean philosophy.

The consecutive processes of Mathematics led to the consecutive processes of Logic; but it was not until long after mankind had attained to abstract ideas that they attained to any clear notion of their connexion with one another. In process of time the leading ideas of Mathematics became the leading ideas of Logic. The "one" and the "many" passed into the "whole" and its "parts"; and thence into the "Universal" and the "Particular." The fallacies of Logic, such as the well known puzzle of Achilles and the tortoise, partake of the nature of both Sciences. And perhaps the conception of the Infinite and the Infinitesimal, as well as of Negation, may have been in early times transferred from Logic to Mathematics. But the connexion of our ideas of number is probably anterior to the connexion of any of our other ideas. And as a matter of fact, geometry and arithmetic had already made considerable progress when Aristotle invented the Syllogism.

General ideas there were, beside those of Mathematics—true flashes of genius which saw that there must be general laws to which the universe conforms, but which saw them only by occasional glimpses, and through the distortion of imperfect knowledge; and although the only records of them now remaining are the inadequate representations of later writers, yet we must still remember that to the existence of such ideas is due not only the conception but even the possibility of Physical Science. But these general ideas were too wide in their grasp, and in early days at least were connected to their subjects of application by links too shadowy, to be thoroughly apprehended by most minds; and so it came to pass that one form of such an idea was taken as its only form, one application of it as the idea itself; and Philosophy, unable to maintain itself at the level of ideas, fell back upon the abstractions of sense, and, by preference, upon those which were most ready to hand, namely those of Mathematics. Plato's ideas relapsed into a doctrine of numbers; Mathematics into Mysticism, into Neo-Platonism, and the like. And so, through many long ages, through good report and evil report, Mathematics have always held an unsought for sway. It has happened to this Science, as to many other subjects, that its warmest adherents have not always been its best friends. Mathematics have often been brought in to matters where their presence has been of doubtful utility. If they have given precision to literary style, that precision has sometimes been carried to excess, as in Spinoza and perhaps Descartes; if they have tended to clearness of expression in Philosophy, that very clearness has sometimes given an appearance of finality not always true; if they have contributed to definition in theology, that definiteness has often been fictitious, and has been attained at the cost of spiritual meaning. And, coming to recent times, although we may admire the ingenuity displayed in the logical machines of Earl Stanhope and of Stanley Jevons, in the Formal Logic of De

Morgan, and in the calculus of Boole; although as mathematicians we may feel satisfaction that these feats (the possibility of which was clear a priori) have been actually accomplished; yet we must bear in mind that their application is really confined to cases where the subject matter is perfectly uniform in character, and that beyond this range they are liable to encumber rather than to assist thought.

Not unconnected with this intimate association of ideas and their expression is the fact that, which ever may have been cause, which ever effect, or whether both may not in turn have acted as cause and effect, the cul- minating age of classic art was contemporaneous with the first great development of mathematical science. In an earlier part of this discourse I have alluded to the importance of mathematical precision recognised in the technique of Art during the Cinquecento; and I have now time only to add that, on looking still further back it would seem that sculpture and painting, architecture and music, nay even poetry itself, received a new, if not their first true, impulse at the period when geometric form appeared fresh chiselled by the hand of the mathematician, and when the first ideas of harmony and proportion rang joyously together in the morning tide of art.

Whether the views on which I have here insisted be in any way novel, or whether they be merely such as from habit or from inclination are usually kept out of sight, matters little. But whichever be the case, they may still furnish a solvent of that rigid aversion which both Literature and Art are too often inclined to maintain towards Science of all kinds. It is a very old story that, to know one another better, to dwell upon similarities rather than upon diversities, are the first stages towards a better understanding between two parties; but in few cases has it a truer application than in that here discussed. To recognise the common growth of scientific and other instincts until the time of harvest is not only conducive to a rich crop; but it is also a matter of prudence, lest in trying to root up weeds from among the wheat, we should at the same time root up that which is as valuable as wheat. When Pascal's father had shut the door of his son's study to Mathematics, and closeted him with Latin and Greek, he found on his return that the walls were teeming with formula? and figures, the more congenial product of the boy's mind. Fortunately for the boy, and fortunately also for Science, the Mathematics were not torn up, but were suffered to grow together with other subjects. And all said and done, the lad was not the worse scholar or man of letters in the end. But, truth to tell, considering the severance which still subsists in education and during our early years between Literature and Science, we can hardly wonder if when thrown together in the afterwork of life, they should meet as strangers; or if the severe garb, the curious implements, and the strange wares of the latter should seem little attractive when contrasted with the light companionship of the former. The day is yet young, and in the early dawn many things look weird and fantastic which in fuller light prove to be familiar and useful. The outcomings of Science, which at one time have been deemed to be but stumbling blocks scattered in the way, may ultimately prove stepping stones which have been carefully laid to form a pathway over difficult places for the children of "sweetness and of light."

The instances on which we have dwelt are only a few out of many in which Mathematics may be found ruling and governing a variety of subjects. It is as the supreme result of all experience, the framework in which all the varied manifestations of nature have been set, that our Science has laid claim to be the Arbiter of all knowledge. She does not indeed contribute elements of fact, which must be sought elsewhere; but she sifts and regulates them; she proclaims the laws to which they must conform if those elements are to issue in precise results. From the data of a problem she can infallibly extract all possible consequences, whether they be those first sought, or others not anticipated; but she can introduce nothing which was not latent in the original statement. Mathematics cannot tell us whether there be or be not limits to time or space; but to her they are both of indefinite extent, and this in a sense which neither affirms nor denies that they are either infinite or finite. Mathematics cannot tell us whether matter be continuous or discrete in its structure; but to her it is indifferent whether it be one or the other, and her conclusions are independent of either particular hypothesis. Mathematics can tell us nothing of the origin of matter, of its creation or its annihilation; she deals only with it in a state of existence; but within that state its modes of existence may vary from our most elementary conception to our most complex experience. Mathematics can tell us nothing beyond the problems which she specifically undertakes; she will carry them to their limit, but there she stops, and upon the great region beyond she is imperturbably silent.

Conterminous with space and coeval with time is the kingdom of Mathematics; within this range her dominion is supreme; otherwise than according to her order nothing can exist; in contradiction to her laws nothing takes place. On her mysterious scroll is to be found written for those who can read it that which has been, that which is, and that which is to come. Everything material which is the subject of knowledge has number, order, or position; and these are her first outlines for a sketch of the universe. If our more feeble hands cannot follow out the details, still her part has been drawn with an unerring pen, and her work cannot be gainsaid. So wide is the range of mathematical science, so indefinitely may it extend beyond our actual powers of manipulation, that at some moments we are inclined to fall down with even more than reverence before her majestic presence. But so strictly limited are her promises and powers, about so much that we might wish to

know does she offer no information whatever, that at other moments we are fain to call her results but a vain thing, and to reject them as a stone when we had asked for bread. If one aspect of the subject encourages our hopes, so does the other tend to chasten our desires; and he is perhaps the wisest, and in the long run the happiest among his fellows, who has learnt not only this science, but also the larger lesson which it in-directly teaches, namely, to temper our aspirations to that which is possible, to moderate our desires to that which is attainable, to restrict our hopes to that of which accomplishment, if not immediately practicable, is at least distinctly within the range of conception. That which is at present beyond our ken may, at some period and in some manner as yet unknown to us, fall within our grasp; but our science teaches us, while ever yearning with Goethe for "Light, more light," to concentrate our attention upon that of which our powers are capable, and contentedly to leave for future experience the solution of problems to which we can at present say neither yea nor nay.

It is within the region thus indicated that knowledge in the true sense of the word is to be sought. Other modes of influence there are in society and in individual life, other forms of energy beside that of intellect. There is the potential energy of sympathy, the actual energy of work; there are the vicissitudes of life, the diversity of circumstance, health, and disease, and all the perplexing issues, whether for good or for evil, of impulse and of passion. But although the book of life cannot at present be read by the light of Science alone, nor the wayfarers be satisfied by the few loaves of knowledge now in our hands; yet it would be difficult to overstate the almost miraculous increase which may be produced by a liberal distribution of what we already have, and by a restriction of our cravings within the limits of possibility.

In proportion as method is better than impulse, deliberate purpose than erratic action, the clear glow of sunshine than irregular reflexion, and definite utterances than an uncertain sound; in proportion as knowledge is better than surmise, proof than opinion; in that proportion will the mathematician value a discrimination between the certain and the uncertain, and a just estimate of the issues which depend upon one motive power or the other. While on the one hand he accords to his neighbours full liberty to regard the unknown in whatever way they are led by the noblest powers that they possess; so on the other he claims an equal right to draw a clear line of demarcation between that which is a matter of knowledge, and that which is at all events something else, and to treat the one category as fairly claiming our assent, the other as open to further evidence. And yet, when he sees around him those whose aspirations are so fair, whose impulses so strong, whose receptive faculties so sensitive, as to give objective reality to what is often but a reflex from themselves, or a projected image of their own experience, he will be willing to admit that there are influences which he cannot as yet either fathom or measure, but whose operation he must recognize among the facts of our existence.

Notes.

Page 11, line 28. It is worth while to compare the following passage from Plato's "Republic," Book vii. (Jowett's translation):

After plane geometry, we took solids in revolution instead of taking solids in themselves; whereas after the second dimension the third, which is concerned with cubes and dimensions of depth, ought to have been followed.

It is true, Socrates; but these subjects seem to be as yet hardly explored.

Why, yes, I said, and for two reasons; in the first place, no government patronises them, which leads to a want of energy in the study of them, and they are difficult; in the second place, students cannot learn them unless they have a teacher. But then a teacher is hardly to be found, and even if one could be found, as matters now stand the students of these subjects, who are very conceited, would not mind him; that, however, would be otherwise if the whole state patronised and honoured them, then they would listen, and there would be continuous and earnest search, and discoveries would be made; since even now, disregarded as they are by the world, and maimed of their fair proportions, and although none of their votaries can tell the use of them, still these studies force their way by their natural charm, and very likely they may emerge into light.

P. 22, 1. 3. Compare with this the latter part of Plato's "Philebus," on knowledge and the handicraft arts; also Prof. Jowett's Introduction thereto.

P. 25,1. 15. See "Trattato della Pittura," by Leonardo da Vinci; also the Memoir on the MSS. of L. d. V., by Venturi, 1797.

P. 25,1. 24. "The Gentleman and Cabinet Maker's Director," by Thomas Chippendale, London, 1754.

"The Cabinet Maker and Upholsterer's Drawing Book," by Thomas Sheraton, London, 1793.

P. 26,1. 30. See Sorby's Address to the Microscopical Society, 1876.

P. 27, 1. 5. Phil. Trans, of the Royal Society, 1870, p. 333; and 1876, p. 27.

Page 27, line 10. Phil. Trans. 1877, p. 149.

P. 27, 1. 23. "On Attraction and Repulsion resulting from Radiation," Phil. Trans. 1874, p. 501; 1875, p. 519; 1876, p. 325.

P. 27. 1. 26. Philosophical Magazine, April 1878.

P. 27, 1. 28. Philosophical Magazine, 1875, Vol. ii., pp. 337, 446; 1877, Vol. i., p. 321; 1878, Vol. i., p. 161.

P. 28, 1. 7. Poggendorff's Annalen, Tom. xxxv., p. 337.

P. 28. 1. 9. Royal Society's Proceedings, 1878.

P. 28, 1. 18. The Papers on the Telephone are too numerous to specify.

P. 28, 1. 19. See various Papers in "Nature," and elsewhere, during the last twelve months.

P. 28, 1. 25. Royal Society's Proceedings, May 9, 1878.

P. 28, 1. 32. Phil. Trans., Vol. 169, pp. 55 and 155, and other Papers catalogued in the Appendix to Part II. of the Memoir.

P. 30, 1. 4. See Maxwell "On Heat," chap. xxii.

P. 32, 1. 1. Grunert's Archiv., Vol. vi., p. 337; also separate work, Berlin, 1862.

P. 32, 1. 1. "Linear Associative Algebra," by Benjamin Peirce, Washington City, 1870.

P. 33, 1. 1. Sir W. Thomson, "Cambridge Mathematical Journal," vol. iii., p. 174. Jcvons' "Principles of Science," Vol. ii., p. 438.

But an explanation of the difficulty seems to me to be found in the fact that the problem, as stated, is one of the conduction of heat, and that the "impossibility" which attaches itself to the expression for the "time" merely means, that previous to a certain epoch the conditions which gave rise to the phenomena were not those of conduction, but those of some other action of heat. If, therefore, we desire to comprise the phenomena of the earlier as well as of the later period in one problem, we must find some more general statement; viz., that of physical conditions which at the critical epoch will issue in a case of conduction. I think that Prof. Clifford has somewhere given a similar explanation.

P. 38, 1. 13. S. Newcomb "On Certain Transformations of Surfaces." American Journal of Mathematics," Vol. i., p. i.

P. 38, 1. 14. Tait "On Knots." Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh," Vol. xxviii., p. 145. Klein, "Mathematische Annalen," ix., p. 478.

Page 48, line 31. Royal Society's Proceedings," February 3rd, 1876, and May 9, 1878.

P. 53, 1. 17. For example, in Herbart's "Psychologie."

P. 53, 1. 19. A specimen will be found in the Moralia of Gregory the Great, Lib. I., c. xiv., of which I quote only the arithmetical part:

"Quid in septenario numero, nisi summa perfectionis accipitur? Ut enim humanæ rationis causas de septenario numero taceamus, quæ afferent, quòd idcirco perfectus sit, quia exprimo pari constat, et primo impari; ex primo, qui dividi potest, et primo, qui dividi non potest; certissimè scimus, quòd septenarium numerum Scriptura Sacra pro perfectione ponere consuevit. . . . A septenario quippe numero in duodenarium surgitur. Nam septenarius suis in se partibus multiplicatus, ad duodenarium tenditur. Sive enim quatuor per tria, sive per quatuor tria ducantur, septem in duodecim vertuntur. . . . . Jam superiùs dictum est, quòd in quinquagenario numero, qui septem hebdomadibus ac monade additâ impletur, requies designatur; denario autem numero summa perfection is exprimetur."

P. 54, 1. 2. Approximate dates B.C. of—

Balquhidder, Rob Roy, &c.
Sketch Suggested by a Regent Visit
By the Rev. James Macgregor, D.D.,
Oamaru.
"As Taitnreach leam aoibhneas a bhroin."—*Ossian.*
Dunedin: Printed at the "Daily Times" Office, Corner of High and Dowling Streets.

Works by the Same Author.

Text-book for Youth, Christian Doctrine, *Twelfth Thousand*. ELLIOTT, Edinburgh. PRICE, 1s.
Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, with Introduction and Notes. PRICE, 1s. 6d. *Second Edition* of Five Thousand. J. T. CLARKE, Edinburgh.

Balquhidder, Rob Roy, &c.

Sketch suggested by a recent visit by the Rev. James MacGregor, D.D., Oamaru.

This paper was prepared as a stop-gap, in place of an address about Perthshire by Dr Stuart. I have thought it best to send it to the Press without material alteration. Hence I retain the form of (colloquial) address to the Gaelic Society of Dunedin:—

I must begin with answering the question, everywhere meeting me, How do you like this Colony?—Immensely. All that I see strikes me at once with wonder and with delight. I am especially struck, so that I can hardly believe my eyes, by the maturity and completeness of things here, in town and country. But I am more deeply impressed by the conditions affecting the permanent prosperity of a community. Yours is truly "a good land," in the sense in which that description was applied to Palestine of old. The Bible text in which the phrase occurs is a singularly appropriate description of the Middle Island. You have the vast advantage of having had a very high class of original settlers here. The public institutions have at the foundation of them a large amount of generous wisdom. A Scotchman of the old school sees with delight, here realised for the first time in history, John Knox's idea of national education. The face of Nature hereabouts is enchantingly beautiful and picturesque. Your New Edinburgh is no unworthy name-daughter of the old Scottish Dunedin. If only the people of the land be good, and this be in a real sense a holy land, it is well fitted to be a happy land—a new land of song.

In this "basket of silver" a Gaelic society is an "apple of gold." It not only encourages to the study of Celtic language and literature: it provides for a craving of the heart for sym-pathetic flow and reflow of natural affection among kindred Celts—whether Lowland Scots or Highland, whether Gaelic-speaking or not. On a mountain between Lochalsh and Lochcarron I have seen a monument, set up by some young men where they parted from a friend going away to India, with this inscription: "*An là 'chi 's nach fhaic*" ("the day of seeing and of not seeing"). "In sight and out of sight" was the promise of their faithful affection. And "out of sight," if the affection be faithful, it has most of delight in [*unclear:* occasions] thinks that she will wear her plaid, because the Duke of Argyle's heart, when he sees it, will "warm to the tartan." "You are right there, Jeannie," says "his Lordship's Grace;" "my heart will be cold in death before it cease to warm to the tartan."

On my way to the lecture-room in Dunedin, I heard one gentleman say to two others *Tha breacan aige codhiubh*—"He has a plaid whatever." "Whatever" (witness, "a princess of Thule") is a great word in Lewis; and a greater word there is "moreover" (powerfully pronounce *mirrofir*). Hence the fallowing vision in the experience of one who sailed from styorneway to Skye along with an excursion party of Lewis people (who had eyes deep and blue as the sea, and copious Gaelic). Falling half asleep on a holiday he saw the steamer swarming with "whatevers," like multitudinous bees, and here and there a mighty "mirrofir," about as large as a blackcock The same whimsical person asked some shepherds at Anchnasheen whether it is true that in that region the midges are hunted with dogs and silted as a "winter mart." They only laughed, thinking he was not serious.

Here at the Antipodes a man must be invincibly cold and hard if his heart do not warm and melt when he finds himself among his own kindred, as if he had been at home again, in the old "land of bens and glens and heroes" (*tir nam beann, 's nan gleann, 's nan gaisgeach*).

I had known Balquhidder when I was a very young boy, now more than 30 years ago; and having occasion to revisit it in 1876, at a time when I had much need of "the healing powers of nature" in her solitudes, I found what I had not sought—a lecture to be delivered to Celts in New Zealand.

Balquhidder, in the northern part of the basin of the Forth, lies west by north of Stirling, about 30 miles away. Though thus near the border of the Lowlands, it is at this hour a quiet Highland parish. Callander, its next neighbour to the south and east, no longer answers to that description. In my boyhood there it was a quiet Highland village: everybody spoke Gaelic, and we boys all wore the kilt. But now it is a noisy, fashionable little Lowland town. The Gaelic is no longer the language of the place. The kilt is seen only on imitation or artificial Celts—from London or elsewhere. All seems changed. When I recently sat down in the Churcn there, I did not recognise the face of the congregation in which I was born and bred. So great has been the change within one portion of one short life. But Balquhidder, beginning within some six miles of Callander village, was unchanged from what I had found it long ago. Some circumstances were changed for the better: the land seemed better cultivated, and the houses more neat and comfortable, with corresponding improvements of the Clachan or Kirkton, including a very pretty new church, with handsome new school premises, and the old church made into an ornamental ruin, really prettier than the new one. But in substance the place was unchanged. Of course there was no change on the everlasting hills around. The Gaelic language was, as of old, in use, with the simple and cordial, though slightly ceremonious, Highland manner. The very individuals seemed unchanged. The minister at the manse was the same fine and true gentleman who had shown me much kindness nearly a generation before. At Auchtoo Beg Donald ("blue-eyed") M'Laren was recognised by me half a mile away, just the same man, apparently of the same age, as when in that past age he had flourished as ploughman to Peter Stuart at Auchtoomore. There, too, was his brother Duncan ("brownhead"), sauntering, as

of old, on the way to his sister's, the minister's widow farmeress of Beannoch Aonghais ("Angus' blessing"). All over there was the sweet pervading sense of quiet. It was not the quiet in view of Lord Cockburn when he said, "As quiet as the grave—or Peebles." It was the quiet, not of death, but of life; like that of their own Balvaig ("dumb stream"), slowly and silently gliding through the valley. The very sounds were somehow all but silent. The voices of men, and the bleating of lambs by the wayside, or the more distant wail of the curlew, did not disturb, but intensified, the sense of soothing stillness, so sweet to a dweller in cities who had need of repose. Even the railway train, embodiment and symbol of noise, resistless, seemed to be not noisy as it skirted round by King's House from Strathire to Lochearn-head. Men called it "the innocent." It went almost as slowly as Balvaig. And sometimes it did not go at all; but quietly stopped for a talk with some farmer, or gamekeeper, or shepherd by the way. Any noise it made became a harmonious part of the eloquent stillness—a stillness like that musical effect promised by an enterprising advertiser in Salma-gundi—"the indescribable silence that follows a fall of snow." It is said in the district that no armed foe of Albion has ever succeeded in entering the Highlands through the Leny Pass. The last and sorest material foe of our Home Country—noise, with its distracting tear and wear—appears not to have entered Balquhidder, excepting like Bottom, the stage lion, who would roar you as gently as a sucking dove."

You can perceive that I was prepared to take things on their sunny side. At the Clachan we had the great good fortune to find the minister of the parish, the Rev. Alexander MacGregor, now deceased. He received our party with true Highland hospitality, and laid himself out for the day to be our guide, philosopher and friend. In especial he led us over the churchyard, with its precincts in the hirkton, giving a running antiquarian commentary, the fruit of a life's labour of loving study, on the various things he showed us. For instance, near the eastern door of the now ruinous old church, he stood with us at the foot of a lair, or burying-plot, over which there extended, between us and the door, three horizontal tombstones. And there and then he gave us a full, true, and particular account of the family to which that lair belonged, namely, the family of Rob

"Rob" is not a diminutive like "Bob" nor a colloquialism, like "Robin"; but simply the [*unclear:* Gaelic]

Roy MacGregor; whose own tombstone is the central one of the three, having carved on it a broadsword, the clan-emblem of the fir-tree, and the proud clan motto, *As rioghaill mo dhream Ard-Choille*—"My tribe is royal, Ard-choil"—a motto peculiarly appropriate in Rob's case, because his father had been the proprietor of Ard-choil. Again, a MacLaren tombstone inscription occasioned an account of that famous clan battle, between the MacLarens and the Lenies, which was the great central event in the civil history of Balquhidder before the Mac-Gregors were installed there on an equal footing with the MacLarens. And, again, on the same little platform on which now stand the new and old churches and the churchyard, there has stood every edifice for public worship ever erected in Balquhidder proper. Close to the churchyard, though not within the precints, there is even the conical mound which is known to have been the centre of Druidical worship for the district, which is appropriately bounded on the south by Benledi ("Hill of God")—a sacred name whose origin goes back to pre-Christian times. Thus, as he went on speaking we went on gaining, not only many interesting details of information, but a sort of panoramic view of the whole civil and religious history of Balquhidder from the point of the Churchyard and Clachan, which, historically as well as topographically, has always been the head and heart of the district. Of the things thus set forth by him I swiftly took elliptical notes, which I read to him before we parted, and which he kindly corrected and supplemented to completeness on the spot, afterwards sending me a MS account of a leading event which he had prepared for publication some years before, with free permission to make whatever use of the whole I should think proper. I ought to mention that, in addition to what can be learned from books, and through reasonable divination of the significance of monuments like those in the Kirkton, Mr MacGregor, near the beginning of his ministry, had received the then living tradition of the people from its latest living depository, an aged woman of the clan Gregor in Rusgachan, of Strathire. And now therefore I, having received the tradition from him, and being, I suppose, its only depository now alive, feel entitled to address you, not with the flattering humilities of a descriptive tourist, but with the authority of a qualified *sennachie*, who has brought his story to you from the sources, through a voyage of "semi-circum-plus-a-bit-of-demi-semi-circum-navigation of the earth."

Part of the title of an unpublished poem on the voyage of the Jessie Readman in 1881.

Further, Mrs Findlater, of the Free Church manse of Lochearnhead in Balquhidder improper, sent me a pretty sketch of the old church with its precincts, done by her own skilled hand. For she knew that I had written out my notes of the visit to Balquhidder into a sort of gossiping lecture or article, such as one may prepare for the home circle after a journey which has interested him. Further still, about some antiquarian questions that had risen in the churchyard, I afterwards had the benefit of conversations with Mr Joseph Anderson of the Antiquarian Museum in Edinburgh, the greatest living master of really scientific Scottish archæology, and whose recent Rhind lectures have almost made a new era in real study of Scoto-Celtic antiquities. To these things I now refer, partly in order to apologise beforehand for a certain gossipy quality of this communication, which has survived from the original cast; and partly also in order that you may be assured I do not speak

without book. Literally, indeed, I do in a sense speak without book. My book, the original paper, was lost on my way from old Dunedin to new Edinburgh. It had been carefully placed by me, along with other *keimelia*, in a box which, I suppose, is somewhere; but where precisely, or whether "in earth or ocean's cave," perhaps no creature knows. Still, even the circumstance of my having written it, and the circumstances which occasioned the writing, have made the whole matter clear and distinct in a memory remarkably tenacious of some things.

This introductory part of my lecture I will close with some notes on the literary history of the district. It has a life of literary production at this hour. After going West from Callender through the Pass of Leny, and turning northward alongside of gracefully majestic Benledi, you come upon the foot of Loch Lubnaig, deep and calm. The farm steading of Anie is on your right. The farmer, Robert MacLaren, is a living son of song. He not only sings and beautifully plays on the violin what others have composed, but writes and publishes original verse. His publications are in English. But a genuine Gaelic poet is found at the furthest extremity of Balquhidder improper, in Glenbeich, on the north side of Lochearn, in the person of another MacLaren farmer. Let me now speak of those who live only in their works. You have perhaps heard the song of "Allandu"; or, "Row weel, my boatie, row weel." It seems to me perfect as a sample of true song—melodious eloquence, "music wedded to immortal verse." Well, in a singularly fresh living book about Perthshire, recently published by Mr Drummond, of Perth city, it is stated that, while the music of "Allandu" is by the famous R. A. Smith, of Kilmarnock (or Paisley?), the words are by one Campbell, of whom it is known that he resided somewhere on the side of Loch Lubnaig. After passing Anie, on the east side of the loch, you reach about the middle of it, Ardchullery, at an angle (Lubnaig means "*Bend er*"), where the loch bends to the west and north. Opposite Ardchullery Benledi sends out into the west side of the loch the tremendous promontory of Craig-na-Cohilig, whose rugged grandeur impresses the beholder with an awe that represses his natural feeling of delight in the sublime. Ardchullery was at one time the summer retreat of the famous traveller James Bruce of Kinnaird; and from that he would sometimes cross the loch to Crig-na-cohilig for the purpose of undisturbed prosecution in its wild solitude of studies connected with his world-renowned travels in Egypt and Abyssinia towards the sources of the Nile. But Bruce was an exotic; and Campbell may have been. Let us look for flowers of literature native to the district.

I have not the heart to pass without a word my old acquaintance *Abasdair a Bhaile* ("Alexander of the city" or "town"—perhaps he had at some time been in Glasgow or Edinburgh). When I was a young boy he was an aged man, venerable in character as well as in years. I see him now, with his fine white head and spacious tartan waistcoat, and radiant spherical-silver buttons, coming down like a gracious and spacious Michaelmas moon to kirk or market in Callander from his hamlet of Kilmahog ("fane of St. Hogg"). This is beside the Balquhidder branch of the Teith, almost at the mouth of Leny Pass, where rushing through and from the wildly beautiful pass, the stream is known, not as Balvaig ("dumb stream"), but as Garvald ("rough water"). And this geography brings me round to my literary history. It is reckoned that perhaps the best Gaelic prose in print is that of the *Teachdaire Gaudhealach* ("Gaelic Messenger"), edited by the elder Dr Norman Macleod, of Campsie and afterwards of Glasgow. In that periodical (or was it in its successor, *Cuairteir Nan Gleann*, "Circular of the Glens"?) there are communications from a correspondent who signs himself "*An gaidheal liath ri taobh a gharbh-uilld*" ("the hoary Celt beside the rough water"). At first reading I did not know, nor think of inquiring, who might be this writer; but I afterwards, with pleasure came to know that it was my old acquaintance *Alasdair a Bhaile*.

Let us now go back a hundred years to a native of this district who once conversed in Edinburgh with David Hume—a profoundly-believing Christian with the greatest of sceptics. About a mile west of Callender, on the left hand of your way to Leny Pass, there is the small churchyard of Little Leny, a burying place of the Buchanans, in a lovely angle formed by the junction of two streams, whose united waters there form the Teith. So that Balquhidder is in the "Menteith" district of Perthshire; for one of the two streams, which below Loch Lubnaig is our Garvald, above Loch Lubnaig is the Balvaig of Balquhidder. In that Little Leny there lies the dust of Dugald Buchanan, the sublimest of Gaelic poets after Ossian, and far the greatest master of spiritual song in Gaelic. He, now laid in that burying-place of Buchanans, and having spent his life's prime as a fervent and powerful evangelist in Balquhidder, was born and bred in Laggan, a farm at the head, of Loch Lubnaig, on the west or Benledi side of Balvaig, opposite the village of Strathire in Balquhidder proper.

A suitable monument to Buchanan has been erected in Rannoch, and steps are being taken to preserve his cottage there from decay. An attempt made some years ago to provide a similar monument in Strathire proved abortive through some mismanagement.

The anecdote of his conversation with Hume bears that the sceptic challenged him to produce from the Bible a passage as sublime as Shakespeare's about "the cloud-capt towers," &c., and that Dugald produced from the Book of Revelation that about the great white throne. The anecdote shows at least that in his lifetime he had come to be highly esteemed for literary qualifications. His autobiography, written in excellent Gaelic, gives a deeply moving account of his early soul's exercise about spiritual things, in the manor of John Bunyan's "Grace

Abounding to the Chief of Sinners." But on the natural human life of the time it sheds little or no light; and in relation to spiritual life his hymns, or spiritual songs, few in number, are what has preserved his name as truly venerable and great.

His autobiography with the hymns, or the hymns by themselves (or an English translation by the Rev. Mr Sinclair, of Kinmore), can easily be got at a small price. Publishers, M'Lauchlan and Stewart, Edinburgh. Of the deep, enduring impression they have made on kindred Celts, I am able to give, from the life, an interesting illustration. The great Dr Duff, in his lifetime canonised by Christendom as "the prince of missionaries," in his old age came home from his glorious career in India, and for some years was a professor in the New College of Edinburgh. At the students' dinner-table there one day, when I showed him a cony of Buchanan's poems in Gaelic, he said that he still remembered passages of "The Day of Judgment"—instancing the famous apostrophe to Pilate—from having heard it cantilated in his boyhood at Pitlochrie. And this leads to a closing note on cantilation as a feature of Celtic home culture.

Cantilation—melodious eloquence—appears to be the appropriate form, if not the essence, of true minstrelsy or song. It is fitted to reach the very springs of the life, and hold abiding-place of influence there. More than 30 years ago, one Sabbath afternoon, on a sunny slope of Auchtoomore, beyond Strathire, some three miles to the north of Buchanan's native Laggan, I listened to a cantilation, half-speaking, half-singing, in a rich, kind womanly voice, by Mary Stuart, sister-in-law of the farmer, and cousin of the Rev. Mr Stuart, now minister of the Free Church in Killin. The mere hearing made on my mind an impression that always remained unefaced. After the friction of life had obliterated all the details, I still remembered, wistfully, the pathetic beauty of the whole, which in form was an address, by a child in heaven, to his bereaved parents on earth, for their consolation by the view of his happiness. Often had I wished to hear it again, or at least to see it in print. And deep was my pleasure when, last winter at Home, I found it printed full-length among the spiritual songs of the excellent Peter Grant, of Grantown in Strathspey. His songs are sweeter than Buchanan's; but not nearly equal to them in respect of the highest lyric quality—true fervid Pindaric sublimity,

[When this lecture was first delivered, Dr Stuart of Dunedin recalled to mind that he had heard his mother cantilate that hymn of Peter Grant's. Some time after, I happened to refer to it in connection with the baptism of an infant in Christchurch. The infant, quite well on that Sabbath day, was buried on the following Tuesday; and its mother, who had heard me speak, was, I afterwards found, from Grantown, in Strathspey, and I think, a cousin of Mr P. Grant's children!]

One other note on the literary history of the district will bring us back to the churchyard and parish. A horizontal tombstone covers the mortal part of the Rev. Mr Kirke, who flourished in the latter part of the seventeenth century and towards the beginning of the eighteenth, so that he was for some time contemporary with Rob Roy. On the stone, almost illegible, there are some singularly beautiful verses—

'Stones weep, though eyes be dry,
Fairest flowers soonest die,' &c.

of which Mr M'Gregor had not been able to trace the authorship, though he said the style reminded him of 'Holy George Herbert.' Perhaps the author was Mr Kirke himself. For his wife, who died before him, was buried in that same grave; and the words may have been his elegy or dirge over her. In any case, he, in that lone spot, far away from ordinary aids and stimulants to literary labour, was a laborious student and author he prepared in Gaelic a metrical version of the Psalms, and a translation of the whole Bible, which—I have not seen it—appears to have been simply Bishop Bidell's Irish version turned from the Irish Celtic into the Scottish. These fruits of Kirke's labours are not widely known, having been made to give place to similar works of an 'authorised' committee, with whom the Balquhidder minister is said to have run a long race for priority in finishing the work, a race in which he must have been heavily handicapped, as one translator against several or many. It is interesting to think of the quiet scholar, amid scenes suggestive of violence and terror, indulging in the pleasing pain of scattering flowers of poetry on the grave of his wife, and making his widowed solitude respectable and honourable by the long laborious endeavour to place within reach of his countrymen the means of reading in their own tongue the wonderful works of God. Quiet work like his may have had much to do with bringing, in place of that violence and terror, the happy quiet of the district in our day. *Deus nobis huec otia fecit*, may thus be the true inward history of the process which, in the desolate mountain side over against you, has brought into being, and kept in being and freshness unfading, yon beautiful stripe of green,—the sight of which fills your eye and gladdens your heart, though you should not perceive the living water that trickles down beneath the green, nor even the white stone with which some grateful shepherd has marked the spring from which the living water flows perennial.

The spiritual movement, which makes life below the surface, need not delay us long. There has not, so far

as I know, been in the history of religion in the district much of those notable events, rising above the plane of ordinary experience, which claim a place in history, the memory of the race. Earliest of all, as represented monumentally, Druidism has its monuments, at the extreme south of the district in sacred Benledi, and at the kirk town in the conical mound. In connection with this mound there are two or three expressions, regarding a torch procession with white wands, regarding *Samhainn* or Hogmanay, regarding *Bealtainn* or Whitsuntide, which—in the absence of my notes made on the spot—I now do not venture to expound or reproduce. But I can here give an anecdote which illustrates more matters than one. In the vestry of the new church there is a large oblong box, very strongly made of black oak, and clasped with iron, and having iron rings on the lid, as if for convenience in lowering it into a vault, and raising it thence when wanted. That formidable-looking article is now employed for the innocent purpose of keeping the communion plate of the congregation. It was purchased by an elder at a sale in Edinample House, near the head of Lochearn, where it was accidentally put up to auction among some furniture, which the Campbell family there were selling off by way of clearance. In this way they lost a valuable relic. For it proves to have been the charter-chest of a famous Breadalbane family of Campbells—the family of *Donncha Dabh a churraichd* ("Black Duncan of the cowl"). This Duncan made, especially on neighbouring clans, in his own and following generations, a deep and enduring impression of successful, grasping, cunning rapacity; to which might well apply the proverbial description of a Campbell, 'fair and false.' But in connection with the Balquhidder Druidical mound, he presents a more pleasing face, though not one of perfect ingenuous simplicity. The cattle on a certain farm had somehow become bewitched or diseased. For the purpose of healing, or of exorcism, a woman—I suppose the farmer's wife, or the farmeress—went from Glendochart across the watershed of Larickeelie, and down the gloomy Glenogle into Balquhidder, and brought home a bag full of the soil or the sand of that mound at the Clachan. On this account she was brought before the ecclesiastical authorities on the criminal charge of having dabbled in the 'black arts.' If you wonder at this, Dr Kennedy of Dingwall will show you, in his book on "The Days of the Fathers of Ross-shire," that, as still appears on the certified records of the Court, the Protestant Presbytery of Lochcarron once had certain of the people of Lochcarron and Lochalsh under discipline for a practice of sacrificing bulls to the Virgin Mary on an island in *Inch Maree* (Mary's Loch). A singular mixture of Paganism and Romanism in a Protestant community! Yes; but what do you think of this? About ten years ago, in Walls, of Shetland, I was told by the Free Church Minister that in a little island under his charge the people there were then in the habit of going to a witch for paid advice or assistance about the weather, as seriously as they would go for groceries to the merchant's store; and that a neighbour of his had come to him—the *minister!*—for the loan of a pony to carry him to a wizard, whose advice and assistance he desired to have on account of a running sore in his leg! On that occasion the pony showed himself a sounder divine than the minister: after the minister had granted the man's request, the pony threw him over his head, so that the nefarious journey did not come off. The woman's case, then, was not altogether singular. Black Duncan got her off by some specious if not gracious sophistry—'fair and false;' and he dismissed her with the admonition, 'Do not bring home any more bags of sand across Larickeelie';—'not guilty; but she must not doit any more.'

The recent religious history, judging from the present ecclesiastical temper of the people, has probably been what is suggested by the spiritual songs of Dugald Buchanan and the cantilation of Mary Stuart; that is, of the ordinary type of Evangelical Protestantism, or Protestant Evangelism. Of Popish controversy there I, do not know any incident, unless it be the flowing, in which Rob Roy took a leading part, and that not discreditable. Rob himself was In later life a Romanist. From Speymouth, on the north-east coast, to Barra, remotest of the outer Hebrides, there stretches across Scotland a belt of native Romanism, which appears not to have been at any time reached and overflowed by the advancing tides of reformation, either from the north or from the south. The Romanists are on good terms with their Protestant neighbours, and are regarded and treated by these simply as neighbours and friends, of the Romish communion. Such, apparently, was the case with Rob Roy. The minister of the parish had, it was alleged, been too heavy and harsh upon the parishioners with his teinds. So Rob caught hold of him, took him to a public-house or country inn, constrained him to eat and drink at least as much as was good for him, and extracted from him a promise to be thenceforward more easy upon the people about the tiends; Rob graciously promising that he would every year send to the manse a pair of good cows—a promise which, I understand, he faithfully fulfilled, though I have not heard where the cows came from before he sent them.

Now let us go back far beyond good Mr Kirke, and the Reformation, and the very name of Pope and Rome, to the first introduction of Christianity into the district. The old church, now a ruin, was built somewhere in the seventeenth century, on the site of what had been a Romish church before the Reformation. The lair of Rob Roy's family is manifestly in what had been the foundation of the chancel. But on the same site there had previously been the chapel, or wood or turf meeting-house, of the Culdees. And here comes in my story. When, not many days ago, I first came in sight of New Zealand, I found myself saying to myself *Beannach Aonghais*. And the reason or cause of that mental ejaculation is in my present story. I have spoken of the farm of

Beannach Aonghais ('Angus' Blessing'). It is on the way from King's house, within less than a mile of the clachan, and is known to geographers and other clever blockheads as Middle Auchleiskin. But Donald Maclaren and other Balquhidder 'old identities' will know it only as Beannach Aonghais. Moreover, in a field there there is a stone called *Clach Aonghnis* ('Angus' Stone'), in whose form they see a resemblance to the bust of a man with arms raised up, in the attitude of blessing. And, as we shall find, the great annual fair was called *Feill-Aonghais* ('Angus' Festival'); as *Fèil-mo-chessag* ('Kessog's Festival') is at this hour the name of a corresponding fair in Callander, where there is also a *Tom-mo-chessog* ('Kessog's Mound'). The exposition of all that Angus geography is this. Angus, the Culdee Evangelist, was the first man who came to Balquhidder with the Gospel. On his way westward from King's house he could not see the whole district, up to the furthest 'Braes' of Balquhidder, until he had reached the spot now doubly called by his name. Then and there he saw the whole scene of his intended labours lying full in his view. And then and there he lifted up his hands, and blessed the land to which he had devoted his life. Angus the Culdee, I learned from Dr Maclauchlan of Edinburgh, is an authentic historical personage, whose name occurs in some of the old Irish hagiographies of Culdeeism—'The Book,' I think, 'of Bangor,' (or 'Derry?'). Of his having really been the Evangelist of Balquhidder there can, I suppose, be no reasonable doubt. And every one will admit that the manner of his introduction to the district, as indicated by the local tradition, was fine, with a certain heroic simplicity of longing affection. I am not sorry to remember that when I first saw this land of yours my first spontaneous impulse was to say in my heart, *Beannach-Aonghais*,

Of the character of the civil history, even in post-Reformation times, a significant indication is found in a row of remarkably fine plain trees. They are alone in Balquhidder, in the sense that there is no other such plantation of nearly their age. They are known to have been planted in the reign of James VI. of Scotland, before he went (in 1603) to be James I. of England. And their solitariness, in the sense explained, is a monument of the troubles of the generations following, in which men had little opportunity or heart for ornamental or useful plantation of trees. On this side of that date I will refer only to one historical anecdote, and beyond only to one other, before I go on to the grand event of the battle between the Maclarens and the Lenies.

My modern anecdote has reference to the royal name of Stuart; and on this account ought to come foremost. Up the southern branch of the Teith—the branch which comes down from Glengyle through Lochs Caterin, Achray, and Vennacher to Little Leny—at the Brig of Turk, there is the mouth of Glen-finglas, which from that strikes north-westward, having Benledi and her spurs between it and the Balquhidder district on the east and north. In that glen there is a race of Stuarts claiming to be royal, as having sprung, no matter now, from the good Regent Murray. Some of them had at some time crossed the watershed, between the head-waters of the two branches of the Teith river, and settled in Glenbuckie, from which a mountain stream goes leaping and brawling down into quiet, slow Balvaig, just opposite the Kirkton, beside beautiful *Sròn-var*. Mr Macgregor, when arranging the old church into an ornamental ruin, and digging into a family lair of the Glenbuckie Stuarts, inside the church, at the foot of the north wall,—east end—found a human skull, which had a hole in the solid bone, and a pistol bullet within. And thereby hangs a tale, which I will now unfold. In 1745, Stuart of Glenbuckie went away to join the rebel army of Prince Charles Stuart, then, I think, camped in and round the Castle of Doune. On his way through Menteith he went to spend the night with his friend Buchanan of Auchmar, who was confederate in the plot of rebellion. He did not leave that house alive. Next morning he was found dead in bed, with a hole in his skull, and an empty pistol on his pillow. On behalf of Buchanan it was suggested that the two friends had been comparing notes about the prospects of the rebellion, that Stuart had become persuaded there was no hope of success, and that his despair had driven him to suicide. But in Balquhidder the more popular theory was, that the friends had quarrelled over their cups, that Buchanan had shown some symptoms of a disposition to shrink back from the enterprise when the testing time came, that Stuart had reproached him for treacherous cowardice, perhaps threatened to inform upon him to the prince at Donne, and that therefore Buchanan had murdered his sleeping guest through revengeful terror. Buchanan aid from that time shrink back. But he did not escape the consequences of his previous complicity with treason. Though there was against him no conclusive evidence of overt rebellion, yet the complicity was proved by means of private papers of his own, which had somehow reached the King's advocate, or public prosecutor, at Carlisle; and he was executed as a traitor. The vivid recent resurrection of that old tragedy, of which the memory had far lapsed into oblivion, is not unimpressive.

My ancient anecdote concerns the MacNabs. Their part in the history of Balquhidder was only circumstantial. On a horizontal tombstone in the churchyard a family have put on record the boast, that they are noble in lineage, being sprung from a certain Abbot of Paisley who was a son of the Earl of Glasgow. In that case they must have been illegitimate originally, asan Abbot of Paisley could not have legitimate offspring. And so the base boast is galling to us of the clan Gregor; because those Balquhidder MacNabs were probably of that clan, who adopted such names of neighbouring clans as MacNab, Dochart, and Drummond, when their own proper name was proscribed under penalty of death. After consulting the Rev. Dr Maclauchlan of

Edinburgh, I am established in the opinion that the paltry boast is really a mistaken one. The MacNabs, or children of the Abbot, really derived their name and lineage, not from a Romish abbot but from a Culdee abbot, who not only could have legitimate offspring, but was under a sort of obligation to marry and have children; because the Culdee Celtic church offices, like the Levitical and priestly orders of Israel, ran in the line of blood. Hence many Celtic names which really are only by-names, *e. g.*, MacTaggart (priestson), and MacGregor (shepherdson), the proper name of the clan being *Sliochd Albainn*, 'race of Alpine.') But I must not tell only that story about the Abbotsons; for

Of all the Highland clans, MacNabs the maist faroshious,
Except the MacIntyres, MacCraws, and MacIntoshes.

Here, then, is a story that will please them, or appease them. When leaving Callander westward you pass the Dreadnought Hotel, which at one time was known as the Head Inn, and still is literally a 'head' inn, in this sense, that over the front door there is carved a detruncated human head, under which is inscribed 'Dreadnought,' a motto of the MacNabs. Now come with me north to King's house, and thence eastward to Lochearn. Your way north to King's house through Strathire is like a street that leads perpendicularly on to the middle of the main street of a city. At King's house you are almost exactly at the middle of the main valley of Balquhidder. Between two lines of mountains, like the houses on the two sides of a street, that valley stretches across the Strathire one, at right angles, about sixteen miles, eight westward to the 'Braes' of Balquhidder proper, and eight westward to beautiful St. Fillans, at the furthest extremity of Loch Earn, in what I will call Balquhidder improper. I may mention that, corresponding to Loch Earn on the east, which begins at Lochearnhead, about two miles from King's house, there is on the west, beginning at the Kirkton, about equally far from King's house, a series of smaller lochs, *Con, Voil*, and some other whose name I have forgotten. And the eastern part of the long central valley deserves to be called improper Balquhidder; for it is not in the basin of the Balvaig, Leith, Froth, but in the basin of the Earn and the Tay. Although the watershed near King's house is nearly imperceptible in elevation, yet there it is; so that, while at King's house all running water is on its way to Stirling and Edinburgh, a mile eastward it all running water is on its way to Perth and Dundee. Now go with me for once—in a boat—so far through that improper Balquhidder as to reach a little island near St. Fillans. There sleeps a memory whose awakening will please and appease the 'faroshious' sons of the Abbot, Romish or Culdee.

There there dwelt a robber, much at his ease; because he had with him the only boat on the Loch; so that when he had robbed a passing traveller or party he had only to slide away in his boat to his island, where he could enjoy the spoil at his leisure, though an army should be raging for his apprehension on the shore. But we all know what became of the man who was too clever: he perished of spontaneous combustion, consumed by his own excessive cleverality. Away in the north, on Loch Tay side, near the delicious *Innis Bhuidh* (or 'Yellow Island') of Killin, a chief of MacNab's dwelt with his seven sons. When the festive Christmas season drew near, he and they were all in 'doleful dumps,' because the means of festivity, which they had sent for to the Lowlands, had been appropriated from its convoy by that robber on Lochearn. The old man gave some expression of bitter scorn about the sad lot of him, who had seven stalwart sons loafing and sulking at the fireside, pusillanimously enduring insult as well as injury from a scoundrel like that. They said nothing—like King Saul—but they did a thing which pleased him and appeased him. They went to the Loch (Tay) side, found a boat there, laid it on their shoulders, carried it over the mountain and down Glentarbin (or Glenbeich?) to Loch Earn; and in this way were enabled to reach the robber, and cut off his head, which they carried home to ther father, who thereupon said to his children, 'Dread Nought.'

Now for the great battle between the Maclarens and Lenys. This we shall place vaguely in the Middle Ages. It must have been very early in the clan history of those ages. For, as we shall see, it was only on the day of battle that the Macgregors were instated in Balquhidder on an equal footing with the Maclarens; and it was only after that day that the Buchanans came in place of the Lenys in what previously had been the country of the Lenys—that is, down about the Pass of Leny, and between that and Callander. We have seen that the Buchanan burying-place is called Little Leny. I may add that the mansion of the head Buchanan family there is called Leny', or Leny House; and also that, up in the heart of Balquhidder, beyond Balvaig westward from King's house, at the corner where Strathire loses itself in the main valley, there is a *Sròn-Lànaidh* ('Leny Promontory'), not unconnected with our story;—all which goes to show that in what is now a Buchanan country, towards Callander on the south, at the time of our story there was a race of Lenys in full commanding force. Well,—

One St. Kenock's fair or festival-day in Callander, a Balquhidder Maclaren, supposed to be half-witted, was grossly insulted by a Leny, then and there 'crouse like a cock on his ain midden-head,' who struck the solitary stranger on the face with a switch, which he had clipped in the foul mud of the road or street. The outraged Maclaren said that no Leny would have dared to do that on *Fèill-Aonghais'* day in the clachan of Balquhidder. And so there came to be a wager of battle between the two clans, to be fought at that place and time.

The field of battle was between the elevation on which the church stands and Balvaig on the plain. The

plain is here the narrow upper end of a meadowy bog which stretches the whole way from King's house to the Kirkton; perhaps two miles in length and one mile across at the broadest, and so flat that the river flowing through is dumb by nature and by name, ana the two southern boundaries of *Sròn-Lànaidh*, opposite King's house, and *Sròn-vàr*, opposite the Kirkton, may have got their name of *Sròn* ('promontory': *nase*, or *ness*, or *nish)* from a fancied resemblance of the plain on which they abut to a little island sea. At the upper end it becomes narrowed to perhaps from 500 yards to nothing, by a bending of the church ground down upon the river, which at that point is no longer a Balvaig, but comes down a rapid stream, partly from Glenbuckie on the south, and partly from an opposite glen on the north, as well as from Lochs Con and Voil on the west. And at the very corner, at the upper end of this narrow, there is a deep, dark pool, now called the 'Pool of Corpses' (I have forgotten the Gaelic name), from the tragic event of that day of battle.

The battle was lost and won before it was fought or begun. The Lenys, fatally bad tacticians that day, ranged themselves on the narrow plain with their backs to the river. The Maclarens thus had doubly the advantage of the ground; not only in the downward slope for a rush of assault upon the foe, but also because, if only they could outflank them a little on their (the foe's) right, furthest down stream, and should have strength enough to push them back and roll them up into the corner with its deep, dark pool, then they (the foe) would be caught in the river as in a deadly not. The Maclarens saw the advantage, but were not able to make it available through lack of sufficient force. And so they sought the assistance of the MacGregors, who had gathered to the festival, and were watching the battle as interested but unconcerned spectators. They gave their assistance, on this condition, that thenceforward the MacGregors should have right to enter the church and take their places there at the same time as the Maclarens—not. as hitherto, after them as their betters—a curious vindication or achievement of social equality.

N B.—The *genteel* thing is, not to be late in entering church, and taking one's seat, but to be early.

The result was that the Lenys were outflanked, overmastered, pushed back upon the river, rolled up into the corner, and hurled into 'the pool of death' (so called from that hour). There they all perished excepting two. One of the two, who escaped across the stream, was pursued by a tall and swift Macgregor, of the subname of *Ciar* ('mouse brown'), who slew him on a spot, still pointed out, near Sròn-Lanaidb (which perhaps received its name from this event). The other, who somehow broke or slipped through the array of his enemies, ran what must to him have been a terrible race for life eastward along the north side of the river, through the long meadowy bog of the plain; but he, too, was overtaken and slain, a little beyond King's house, as you turn down into Strathire.

The tradition that the Lenys were in effect annihilated as a clan is completed by the representation that the Buchanans came into their place, through marriage of a Buchanan with an orphan heiress of the chief of the Lenys, slain in the great clan-fight with the Maclarens. And it is corroborated by the fact, that in what is shown by names of places to have at one time been a Leny country, while Buchanans have abounded for generations back, through these generations the Leny name of persons has been utterly unknown. But probably the 'annihilation' was only like the 'annihilation' of the Picts by the Scots under Kenneth MacAlpine, a destruction of the corporate power and existence of the tribe, with a consequent disappearance of its name—the individual survivors assuming the name of those who came next into power in the country of the 'broken' clan.

In the ballad of Sir Patrick Spens, we read about "the auld moon wi' the new moon in its airms." My notes on the Clan Gregor and Hob Roy may appear to be really another lecture within my lecture on Balquhidder; and thus I may be blamed for giving too much of a good thing. Donald Maclaren, postman in Balquhidder, who wanted to be made an elder of the Church, sat down to watch a dead body through the night, along with Donald Ciar, who did not want to be an elder. After refreshments, Maclaren proposed that they should sing the 119th Psalm until they were weary. Ciar objected, "We are not commanded to go beyond our ability." Trusting that I am not transgressing this maxin, I go on to complete my picture of "the auld moon wi' the new moon in its arms."

The MacGregor country of Rob Roy's time was in the Trossachs district of Perthshire, about the head waters of the southern branches of the Forth, and towards Loch Lomond, whose waters go down Strathleven into Clyde. Thus Rob himself, in his early prime, was of Craigrayston and Inversnaid; and his elder brother was of Glengyle. But you can hardly approach Balquhidder without becoming aware that that is a MacGregor country at this hour. In my young days there were six James MacGregors in the little cross-street of Callander in which I was born. In Auchtoo hamlet, over against King's House of Balquhidder, I suppose that a majority of the crofters and cottars were MacGregors, mostly of the subnames of Ciar and MacAlpine. Between the two sections of that hamlet, westward, there is the burying-place or "chapel," and a little eastward of King's House, at Edinchip, there is the mansion of that family which now claims the hereditary chieftainship of the clan—a family whose ancestor, Sir John Murray MacGregor, Bart., at the beginning of this century gave (A.D. 1818), gratuitously, to Highlanders the excellent edition of Ossian's poems in Gaelic by Hugh MacLaughlan of Aberdeen.

Rob's father had been proprietor of Ardchoill. We are thus carried northward beyond even Balquhidder, in

which Rob and his family settled in the later period of his life. One of his ancestors was a Dugald Ciar Mòr ("Big"), who is remembered as the perpetrator of a foul murder of students, whom fatal curiosity had drawn to look on a battle (A.D. 1580) in Glenfruin, in which a section of the clan Gregor signally defeated a far larger force of Lochlomondside Macfarlanes. The chief in command on that occasion was Alexander Macgregor of Glenstrae. And this Glenstrae, at that time,—with their most beautiful castle of Kilchurn of Lochawe—the central site of the clan, is the northernmost site affecting our present story. An enthusiastic clansman in Edinburgh—Mr Donald MacGregor, of the Royal Hotel—has a dav-dream about gathering the clan back into Glenstrae. He will have to go far in search of some of them. And I have told him that none but the pauper lunatics will go back. For the "Gregaloch" is no longer "landless, landless, landless," and Glenstrae is singularly bleak and ungenial. It is situated far up in the central high land from which flow the head waters of the Awe, and Forth, and Tay. And it is over the watershed between Awe and Forth, at the head of the uppermost "braes," where Rob Roy had his farm in later life, that the MacGregors appear to have first come into Balquhidder.

Another enthusiastic clansman, a Maclaren in London, has placed on a horizontal tombstone in the churchyard a sort of vengeful "testimony" against the MacGregors, on account of their having set fire to some 16 or 18 houses of the Maclarens', of Invernertie, in the "Braes," and burned the inmates along with their homes. That must have been very early, before the clan had got instated in the district, and when they needed to clear a place for themselves. Their warmest friend must own that the manner of effecting a clearance, by burning Maclarens with their homes, was at best peculiar and informal. It took place so long ago that one may hope it never happened. In any case the sore must have been healed before the great clan-fight between the Maclarens and the Lenies, when the aid of the Macgregors enabled the former to "annihilate" their foes. Our fire and sword Maclaren in London is thus far behind the age, in respect of knowledge as well as of charity.

Still the clan in those early times was restless, because it had become unfortunately landless. For its own original lands, centring in Fortingall, it had neglected to obtain parchment titles such as came into use under the feudal system, and held only by the old Celtic tenure of the sword. Hence neighbouring clans, the Campbells especially, were able to apply the letter of the law to dispossess them of lands which had been theirs from time immemorial. Consequently, they had to move from district to district; they got into strife with clans jealous of their approaches or encroachments; and at last they came into a position of outlawry, extending over the centuries from Ciar Mar to Rob Roy, which has made their history quite unique among the clan histories of Scotland. During that long period they were proscribed as a clan, were given over to fire and sword of enemies with sanction of royal authority, and their very name prohibited upon pain of death,—so that Rob Roy, *e. g.*, had (in the Lowlands) to call himself Robert Campbell. Their long, successful resistance to every attempt to suppress them may have tended to form in them elements of character truly valuable, as Scotland was hammered into a character of stubborn unconquerable tenacity by the 314 pitched battles of the wars of independence. But the attempts to repress them at the same time occasioned a restlessness on their part, with occasional acts of ferocity, which to others may have seemed to justify a series of acts of proscription, now read as curiosites of legislative barbarism.

An illustrative sample of that history is given by Sir Walter Scott, in his "Legend of Montrose," especially the Introduction and Notes. Drummond of Drummond-Earnach, king's forester, was murdered by a roving band of MacGregors, in revenge for a supposed injury to their clan. Then they drove his sister, the lady of Stewart of Ardvoirlich, into insanity, by showing her, on her own table, her brother's detruncated head, with bread and cheese between its teeth, in mockery of what they deemed the shabbiness of her (enforced) hospitality, and then the Balquhidder MacGregors, in the church, solemnly "homologated" (as the Scotch say) the murderous deed, laying their hands upon the gory head. If such wild work was the result of proscriptions, it was the cause of further proscriptions. From that wild work we gladly turn to the comparatively quieter times of Rob Roy. Let mo first introduce my old acquaintance *Iuin Dubh na Cùile* (Black John of the Nook). When I knew him in early boyhood he must have been over 80 years of age. The Cùil was a little farm he had got free of rent from Sir John Murray MacGregor, whom he had accompanied to Ireland for the repression of the rebellion in 1792: where he may have foregathered with my grandfather, who also had volunteered for that little war and came home disgusted with the Irish because they would not fight, but at Vinegar Hill threw down their arms and ran away, shouting "More pikes to the front, or ould Ireland is gone." Black John must have been a favourite with the baronet, and presumed on his favour. Thus, when, one bad year, Sir John was making a reduction of rents to his tenantry, Cùil—who paid no rent—said that he would not press for reduction, but would be satisfied if another field were added to his farm! Yet his cleverness appears not to have brought him prosperity. It is said that at one time his stock was reduced to one swift and powerful wether, which he stalked like a deer, and shot with the rifle he had brought home from the wars. Copious in pawky and witty speech, he was said to have brought home, not only a rifle, but a long bow—in his mouth. But, as an Irishman said of "Gulliver's Travels," that there were some things in the Dean's book he really could not believe, so Black John of the Nook may sometimes have lighted upon a truth. Thus, as to the great steep wall of mountain that stretches east and west

along the north side of the valley as approached at King's House, he told me that twice within his memory that green mountain face had all been dark with heather—heather so tall that a man could wade in it over his thighs. He also told me as to population, that in his youth there would come down from the "Braes" with a funeral as many young men as could now fling the whole population of Balquhidder into Balvaig. I have lingered to speak about him for this purpose among others, that I wish to give full effect to the fact that he, the man who was so familiarly known to him who now addresses you in middle life, must, by my reckoning, have for about 20 years lived in Balquhidder along with Ronald, the youngest son of Rob Roy, who, if my memory serve me right, died about 1780, in the ninety-sixth year of his age. But what follows may bring the matter still further home to our feeling of nearness in time.

Ronald, greatly esteemed for his Christian character, had a son who practised as a physician in Greenock. Some of his sons, who repaired and completed the family lair in Balquhidder, were general officers in India. Not of their stock is the Mr MacGregor, of the "Rob Roy" canoe, who is so well-known for his exploits as a solitary navigator, and is distinguished as a Christian philanthrophist in London. He is a son of that Colonel Macgregor, of whom you may have read in the thrilling narrative of the burning of the Kent East Indiaman. He, in fact, is the then infant boy who was saved from the flames. But among Rob Roy's great grandchildren are the world-renowned shipbuilding Lairds of Birkenhead; one of whom, Mr Macgregor Laird, died in Africa in an enterprise like that of David Livingstone, intended to spread by means of commerce through that benighted continent the blessed light of Christian civilisation.

My informant (the Rev. Mr MacGregor) named several other families known to be great grand children of Ronald—though one of them, a solicitor, bears the name of Gregory. They all are of the 'upper-middle' class, and well-esteemed for their personal character.

You thus can understand that in my time the Balquhidder tradition of Rob Roy was quite living and fresh. And the hero of that tradition was a wholly different being, not only from the desperate "Highland Rogue" of ancient hue and cry, but even from the "noble savage" warrior of recent romance and song, such as Wordsworth's tall talk about, "The eagle he was lord above, but Rob," &c. You can hardly believe that the real hero of tradition was in temper not a man of war, but emphatically a man of peace. Thirty years ago *Donncha Ciar* ("Duncan the Mouse-brown), of Auchtoo, gave me many a "yarn" about Rob Roy. This *sennachie*, who delighted in narratives of Rob's prowess with hand and foot, yet in spite of himself always brought into view a character which was essentially that of quiet, neighbourly goodness and kindness. So the Rev. Mr MacGregor told me that Rob was remarkable for kindness to the poor, and was universally esteemed for his good qualities by gentle and simple—a thing which was strikingly shown at his funeral (A.D. 1738). He is supposed to have been born about 1660. His funeral was the last in Balquhidder conducted with the old Celtic ceremonial of bagpipe music, and solemn public procession. And it was attended not only by the neighbours in the district, but by the whole gentry of the region around, excepting the Duke of Montrose—an exception which may have been regarded as discrediting, not the dead lion, but the living dog.

I have said that on his tombstone there is a sword. It is, Mr J. Anderson told me, in form the true old Scottish broadsword, differing in form from the full-dress "broadsword" of imitation or artificial Celts in recent times. Mr Macgregor thought that it may or must have come down to Rob from a time before Bannockburn. But Mr Anderson assured me that Rob's sword must have been made in the 15th century, not in the beginning of the 14th; a thing about which he was certain, because of old times the *gows* ("Smiths") of successive ages had so many successive manners or fashions of workmanship, so that now a skilled archæologist can confidently assign its proper age to any such piece of their work. Another tombstone occasioned another such inquiry and result. It now is placed inside of the old church, immediately in front of the site of the pulpit, where I heard Mr Macgregor preaching some 30 years ago. There it had been placed at an earlier date; but had become displaced at the instance of one of my friend's predecessors in office, because women standing on that stone when their children were being baptised had some superstitious expectation of benefit from it in resect of fertility. It thus came to be flung away, and had disappeared underground among a heap of accumulating *debris*, until it was excavated and replaced in course of Mr Macgregor's labours of restoring into ruin picturesquely trim. On the slab there is an image of a minister of religion, which, from the dress, he took to represent a Culdee abbot—perhaps the protevangelist Angus himself. And in this opinion he felt fortified by the shape of a cross engraved on the slab—a shape distinctively Greek or Oriental, not Latin or Occidental. It will be remembered that to all appearance it is from the East that the primitive Culdee Christianity went to Scotland and Ireland. But that argument likewise the terrible Mr Anderson showed to be lame. In church architecture, he said, the various forms of the cross are no conclusive evidences of respectively Greek and Latin authorship; and in proof of this, instancing the Maltese cross, which is a variety of the species Greek, he laid before me, in the great work of the late Dr Stewart, more than one Maltese cross on the Norman cathedral of Elgin

Now, coming back to the sword of Rob Roy. It shows that he was in some sense a professed man of the sword. For the sword was placed over him by his own choice, or by that of his friends, although it had been

carved on the slab as early as the fifteenth century. The stone of which the slabs are made, though found in the district abundantly—the primitive gneiss—is extremely hard, and thus difficult to work. Therefore it was convenient to find one ready made. And that was easily found; because, when one family had died out of the district, the family lair, with the old memorial slab, could without difficulty be appropriated by survivors or successors. But a family of standing so good as Rob's would not accept a present of a stone that was not in its character fitted for a monument of him.

The fir-tree on the tombstone, probably added when the stone was appropriated by Rob's family, is manifestly of more recent workmanship than the sword.

We therefore may rest assured that the sword was fitted and intended as an appropriate emblem of one leading aspect of his character and life. Thus on other slabs in the churchyard we find other characters or pursuits represented by their appropriate symbols: *e. g.* the *Gow*, ("smith"), by his bellows and anvil: and the *tailor*, perhaps, by his sheers and his goose ("clothes-*smith*," from the German *Schmieden*, "forge," "fabricate," giving the name to all skilled handicraftsmen—whence the countless multitudinousness of the clan Smith). But the fact of Rob's having thus been a man of the sword by no means shows that he was at all a swashbuckling sworder, or in any way characteristically a man of strife. A sword occurs often on other monuments, ordinarily along with the symbol of some special profession, such as that of the blacksmith or the arrow-maker (*Macalisteir*, Fletcher, *Flechier*, Fr.) Its prevalence only reminds us how stirring and perilous were the old times in that district, where now so peaceful, in God's acre, "the rude forefathers of the hamlet sleep." In those times every capable man had to be a man of the sword, and to be known to be able as well as willing to use it trenchantly; as the nation which will be at peace must hold itself manifestly prepared for war. And one good effect of the habit thus occasioned is shown by the singular fact that Rob Roy, through his long life in a stormy period, is not known to have once in anger shed a drop of human blood. For, with many occasions for strife, he had in him the qualifications of a most formidable fighter. Calm, keen, swift, resolute, skilful, he was at the same time "light footed and heavy-handed," of extraordinary strength and agility, proverbial through following generations for manly powers as an athlete. And with the broad-sword he was confessedly without a rival; so that, even in sport, he himself was never touched with antagonistic sword but ones; and on that occasion he is supposed, out of State policy connected with the Jacobite cause, to have allowed his peaceful adversary an advantage which he could easily have withheld from him. If such a man, in such times as his were, and in a career so agitated and often stormy as his, never once shed human blood in anger, he surely must have been at heart a man of peace, while all the more able to play the man of peace because he notoriously was a most capable man of war. In truth, he appears to have been far too warlike to be quarrelsome: as he will be slow to strike who knows that his hand is a "dead hand."

Though Rob's disposition was peaceful, his character as a capable warrior has naturally left the most vivid impression. The traditional impression is illustrated by the following story—which I have read in a book on Rob Roy—of a tour of Rob and a select party of friends far into the North-west Highlands, to the region—

Where the hunter of deer and the warrior strode
To their mountains surrounding the sea,—

That is, to the Sound of Skye; or, more precisely, to the Loch Duich branch of Lochalsh, known as the country of 'the wild MacRaes.' At Sheriff-Muir one of these MacRaes met Rob Roy in command of five hundred MacGregors. Here, you may remember, Rob played the politician when pressed to play the warrior. He and his men calmly looked on the battle now at its crisis. While strong considerations weighed in favour of the Argyll side, old political feelings drew him and his men towards Marr's. And at bottom they seriously hated the Campbells from of old. For that race, to them and other clans in the South-west Highlands—a race powerful, politic, ever grasping—had long been the *bête noir* of existence; as Sir Walter's 'innocent,' speaking of a life otherwise completely happy, confessed that he was 'sair forfauchten wi' the bubbly-jock' (male turkey). And so, when at the crisis of the battle urgently entreated to go and help the bubbly-jock, Rob would not move, but simply said, 'If they canna' do it without us they canna' do it with us.' One fiery Celt imputed this to pusillanimous weakness on Rob's part. That 'wild MacRae,' whom he has recognised and 'interviewed' this day, knows better, and will deem Rob's inaction a probably 'masterly inactvity.'

They had met thirty years before. And this MacRae, then a tough and fell fighter, apparently with as many lives as a cat, had left the meeting with a rifle-bullet through his body—shot, however, not by Rob, but by one of his party of tourists. The occasion of the tour and meeting was this. From far Loch Duich the 'wild MacRaes' had come down,

A band of fierce barbarians from the hills,
Sweeping the flocks and herds

Of quiet people in Perthshire, peacefully reposing under the guarantee of Rob's contract of blackmail—or cattle insurance, 'unlimited.' This would never do. So he invited the select party aforesaid to accompany him on that walking excursion to the North-west Highlands—armed for possible battle. On their way they had one skirmish with the marauders, in which the Sheriff-Muir *redivivus* got his quietus for a time. But they did not overtake the main body and the missing cattle until they had reached the Saddle, where you enter the head of Loch Duich from the head, of Glenshiel. There they found the missing cattle, all but two that had unfortunately been eaten—the thieves, poor fellows, had perhaps been very hungry. They went away home with them to Perthshire; no doubt, like John Knox after visiting Queen Mary, 'with a reasonable merry countenance,'—having previously, and decisively, so to speak, punched the heads of 'the wild MacRaes.'

The above story I cannot trace to any authentic source. It may be a pure fiction of romance. The MacRaes I have known in their own country are the grandest samples of manhood I have anywhere seen.

His practice of black-mail has occasioned the mistaken view that Rob was something like a commonplace lawless robber in his life. It must be remembered that he was by birth and up-bringing a gentleman of good standing. The fir-tree on his tombstone, the emblem of the clan, still bears traces of being of much more recent execution than the sword; as if it had been placed there when the old stone with the sword was appropriated by Rob or his family. The motto accompanying is not that which I have cited, *As Rioghall neo dhreams Ardchoille*, speaking of descent from Gregory the son of Alpine, king of the Scots; but another one, referring to some king's deliverance from a wild boar that had turned upon him in hunting. A young chief of the clan Gregor, seeing the king's deadly peril, sprang to the rescue, with a fir-tree which he had torn up for a weapon. Politely asking leave to strike the 'redding stroke'

The 'redding stroke' is proverbially dangerous. MacNab of MacNab was once appealed to for help by a tinker's wife under discipline by her husband. He therefore set himself to fight the husband. But, when he was getting the upper hand, *the wife* sprang upon him in defence of her lord, and tore off his bag-wig, along with the hair it inclosed.

in the fray, he was graciously permitted, in a phrase which thenceforward was a motto of the clan—'E'en do, and spare nocht.' It bears, you perceive, a certain character of trenchancy,—more so than the considerate response of a Highlander at Waterloo, to a Frenchman who cried for 'quarter':—'I hae na time ta quarter ye tha noo; a'll jeest cut ye in twa.' But though Rob had the trenchancy, he personally had a more direct special interest in the old Gaelic motto, with its reference to 'Ardchoille'; for Ardchoil, as I have said, had once belonged to his father. Further, his elder brother was head of the family of Glengyle, one of the claimants to the hereditary chieftainship of the clan. After that brother's death he was tutor, or plenipotentiary guardian, of Glengyle during his nephew's minority. His occupation as a cattle drover was then familiar in the practice of men of gentle blood. His long series of annexations, of money and cattle from the Duke of Montrose, was by himself and others regarded as justifiable reprisals, under a clan system which permitted private war, on account of a ducal injustice which had ruined Rob in his business, so that, as Bailie Nicol Jarvie says, he was driven to the hillside, 'a broken man.'

He had gone into some sort of cattle-droving partnership with the Duke. A fraud by an agent in this business ruined him he always held that the Duke ought to have borne a proportion of the loss, and he therefore paid himself back out of the Duke's rents and other goods. Hence the Duke of Argyle said to Montrose, 'It I countenance Rob Roy, you *maintain* him.'

I have never heard of any one action of his which by Highland gentlemen of his time would be regarded as we regard an act of robbery or theft, making due allowance for the custom of private war—a custom inseparable from the Celtic clan system. His spoliations, though technically unlawful under the Lowland constitution, and though on this or that occasion they should have been intrinsically unjust, fall, in an estimate of his character and conduct, to be regarded simply as forcible acts of what he and others regarded as justice, in a form sanctioned by the use and wont constitution of the community as it existed then and there. The notion of a Balquhidder harum-scarum Robin Hood, underlying the representations of prose and poetic fiction, is really no better than a romancing popular hallucination.

Then and there the custom of black-mail was warranted by a system of public policy, whose abstract legitimacy no one called in question. It was in effect cattle insurance against robbery or theft. And in order to this effect it was necessary that the insurer should be able, with an armed force, to keep watch and ward over the land and cattle insured, to pursue and punish robbers, and in this way to act as if he had been regularly commissioned by the National Government to act as the captain of an armed police.

Hence in certain public proclamations Rob was designated '*Captain* Robert Campbell or MacGregor.' He might abuse this position, for purposes of extortion or concealment of crime; as also may a regularly commissioned officer of Government. Or he might push his business by force, as an insurance manager now may push his business by fraud. But the possibility of abuse adheres to many an innocent usage. The ostensibly serious flaw was, that that manner of insurance was not authorised by law, and that the individual or community undertaking it in that maimer had no regular commission from the nation. And that flaw was not really serious, at least in relation to the question of personal character. For under the clan system, then still in operation, the national Government stood in a loose and ill-defined relation to the clans and their chiefs. Rob, you will remember, died before the abolition of heritable jurisdictions (1747), when the chiefs became lairds, owners of the soil which had belonged to the clan, and the clan was placed under the direct and sole authority of sheriffs, or others commissioned by the nation. And before that time every clan was a sort of little nation by itself, owning no magistracy but that of its own chiefs, asserting a right to make war or peace with other clans or districts, and acknowledging in the national Government only a vague suzerainty which, according to varying circumstances, might practically amount to either everything or nothing. (Jut-side of every clan association there would always be a number of individuals without a chief, or other close connection. And in such circumstances, the action of a capable captain like Rob Roy in forming a band of associates, and acting as their military head for civil purposes, was no more an offence against ordinary morality, or even against consuetudinary Celtic law, than the similar action of such a chief as Hyder Ali before Britain had established a really effective government of India.

The soundness of this reasoning appears to be evinced by Hob's own career, through a life in which he was really respected and trusted by his well-conducted neighbours, to an honoured old age, and a memory of affectionate respect in the tradition and in the heart of the people of his own country.

Sir W. Scott's estimate of Rob, apart from romance, is as follows:—'The character of Rob Roy is, of course, a mixed one. His sagacity, boldness, and prudence, qualities so highly necessary to success in war, became in some degree vices, from the manner in which they were employed. The circumstances of his education, however, must be admitted as some extenuation of his habitual transgressions against the law; and for his political tergiversations, he might plead the example of men far more powerful, and less excusable in becoming the sport of circumstances, than the poor and desperate outlaw. On the other hand, he was in the constant exercise of virtues, the more meritorious as they seem inconsistent, with his general character. Pursuing the occupation of a predatory chieftain,—in modern phrase, a captain of banditti,-Rob Roy was moderate in his revenge, and humane in his successes. No charge of cruelty or bloodshed, unless in battle, is brought against his memory. In like manner, the formidable outlaw was the friend of the poor, and, to the utmost of his ability, the support of the widow and the orphan—kept his word when pledged—and died lamented in his own wild country, where there were hearts grateful for his beneficence, though their minds were not sufficiently instructed to appreciate his errors.' Good Sir Walter here appears, in his kind wishfulness to apologise for Rob, to minimise him too much into something of a picturesque cateran like the Bean Lean of Waverley Rut his estimate of the man, his career, and its finale, is on the whole a fair one.

But how was it with his children?

Sir Walter brings this matter into view in a manner at once amusing and affecting. Thus, when honest Baillie Jarvie presses upon his cousin the offer to give his sons an apprenticeship to weaving, the haughty Celtic gentleman breaks out into scornful rage. But on reflection, he confesses that his heart is sometimes sore when he thinks of the future of his boys. It is said that some such interchange of sentiment actually took place between Rob and a real cousin—Doctor Gregory, of Aberdeen, head of a long illustrious line in the intellectual aristocracy of Britain.

The story, however, is, that it is Rob who proposed by a High and training in warlike and other exercises, to make a man of a son of Dr Gregory, who afterwards became a famous professor.

And reflection on that future of his children must, to a man of his forecasting sagacity, have been bitterly depressing. Such reflections are expressed in Göthe's fine tragedy, by Götz of the Iron Hand, who, just when chivalry was passing over into discredited outlawry, himself could go on in the old way while maintaining the respect of himself and others, but had dark forebodings of the fate in store for his son. And Rob was pre-precisely in such a position. He was on the safe side of a dividing line between one state of society and another. His sons were, after his death, on the unsafe side. Not only so far as they imitated his irregular practices, they were against the law, now precisely defined and made applicable to all. They were in a position which, more and more, was reckoned dishonourable by ordinarily decent neighbours and friends. They were thus on a steep and slippery incline—from what was deemed compatible with the character of an honourable gentleman, to what, in the common estimation of themselves and others, was tainted with the vulgarity as well as immorality of the common robber or swindler. In their history, too, we have a commentary on our abstract moralising.

Ronald, as we have seen, lived his long life as a Christian citizen of the new time; and his example has been followed with beneficent distinction by at least four generations of his posterity. But that may have been by the extraordinary grace of God, perhaps operating on the youngest son through a salutary terror occasioned by the sad fate of all his brothers. One of these, Coll, is happily not known to fame beyond this, that when quite a youth he was shot to death by a King's party, or soldier, in Dunkeld. Two others, Duncan and Robert *(Robin Oig*, 'Young Rob,' a mispronunciation by the Lennox and Menteith Lowlanders), as is still seen at full in the Justiciary Records of Scotland, were tried for an infamous crime, and Robert was hanged in the Grassmarket of Edinburgh. Not so sad inexpressibly, but yet very very sad, is the story of *Seumas Mòr* ('Big James.') he alone appears to have inherited the trenchant ability, as well as valour, of his father. At the battle of Preston pans, he and MacDonald of Keppoch were foremost on Charles Edward's side in the resistless and shattering rush of the Highlanders' army on the King's; and he continued to direct, and even threaten, his men after he was laid low on the field with five wounds, including two shots through the body. After the collapse of the rebellion, he appears to have been employed in some subtle (and 'shady') negotiations between State parties. But he is last found at Paris, among other broken-hearted followers of Prince Charles, writing a miserable begging letter to some who had neglected him,—avowedly in a state of utter destitution And there is no apparent reason to doubt that *Seumar Mòr*, the hero of Prestonpans, the son of Rob Roy, then and there, in a Parisian garret, died in extremity of want, if not literally of starvation!

That woful family history was really an evolution out of Rob Roy's own career. If his children reaped the whirlwind, he had sown the wind. The conventional Rob Roy, of Sir Walter Scott and others, may be parted from with a smile, and shake of the head—'a mad wag, my masters!'—in the spirit of Bailie Jarvie's memorable description of a sadly mixed character, 'he was ower guid to ban, and ower bad to bless, like Rob Roy.' But that implies a very great underestimate, not only of the awful calamities in which his example involved his children, but also and especially of his own masculine ability and natural worth. A man so clear and far-seeing cannot be excused from forecasting the natural consequences of his conduct. A man so resolute and strong, with somuch of good, both by nature and by habit, is deeply guilty, no matter what are the circumstances which warrant his detailed actions, if he persevere in a course whose native results to his children are so dismally tragic. Our interest in that celebrated person is partly caused by those circumstances. Sir Walter is fond of quoting the *dictum* of Mrs Montague, that the most interesting natural scenery is found where the mountains pass into the plains. He applies this to illustrate the peculiar interest, represented by his Waverley, of the transition stage in human manners and customs from two types so strongly contrasted as the ancient Highland and the modern Lowland or English. And that peculiar interest is deepened in Rob Roy's case by the peculiarities in his case,—of a high-born Highland gentleman, beggared and broken through treacherous injustice, driven beyond the pale of public law, and yet maintaining throughout a character of recognised distinction, in respect not only of sheer force but of amiability and worth. But to make him on this account a mere stage hero of romance, to be excused because his character and career have been romantic, is to degrade him. He is appreciated only when he is condemned severely. For no one failing to condemn him as deeply faulty, in relation to great fundamental duties of man to man can be in the right mental attitude towards him, of regarding him as a real man, of great and varied powers, rarely gifted with 'the kingly governing faculty.' When *such* a man leaves a heritage of inevitable woe to his children, no sentimental emotion heals our bitter grief, even, when poets sing his praises, and tradition loves his memory, after his contemporaries have laid him in a singularly honoured grave.

Vignette

Statuta Synodi Diœcesanœ, Dunedinensis,
Anno 1879, Promulgata.

Euntes Do Cete Omnes Gentes

Dunedin: Typis, Woodifield, Jolly & Co., Via Dicta Octagon. MDCCCLXXIX. Imprimatur: # P. MORAN, EPIS. DUNEDIN.

Statuta Synodi Diœcesanæ, Dunediensis.

Pars Prima De Personis Ecclesiasticis.

Titulais I., De Vita Et Honestate Clericorum.

Caput I. De Perfectione Sacerdotali.

1. Omnes nostros in sortem Domini vocatos cum Tridentinis Patribus exbortamur, sic vitam moresque suos componere, "ut habitu, gestu, incessu, sermone, aliisque omnibus rebus, nil nisi grave, moderatum ac religione plenum præ se ferant; levia etiam delicta, quæ in ipsis maxima essent, effugiant; ut eorum actiones cunctis afferant venerationem." (Con. Trid. Sess. XXII. De Reform, c. 1.)

2. Severè prohibemus omnes et singulos clericos ne adsint publicis ludis theatrico more factis. A cursu publico equorum, a publicis conventibus ubi non decet sacerdotem videri, absint.

3. Abhorreant sacerdotes a divulgandis suorum fratrum defectibus, tùm inter semetiposos, tùm maximè inter laicos.

Caput 2. De mediis ad Perfectionem Sacerdotalem acquirendam.

1. Cum nihil sit quod magis ad vitæ sanctitatem animæque salutem conducat quam mentalis oratio, sacerdotes nostros universos et singulos obtestamur, ut quolibet die, per horæ dimidiam vel saltem quartam partem meditationi vacent, et hoc tam salutare exercitium primo mane, quantum fieri poterit, peragant. Nec quotidianam diligentem conscientiæ discussionem negligant. Domesticos parietes et templum Dei diligant.

2. Abhorreant clerici ab otiositate quæ, sacra scriptura et luctuosa experientia testibus, plena est periculo et vitiorum ferè omnium fons atque origo.

3. Maximam erga S. S. Eucharistiam venerationem et devotionem habeant, eamque verbis et factis promovere studeant. Necnon Sacratissimo Cordi Jesu sint devotissimi, tota enim nostra Diœcesis Illi specialiter consecrata est.

4. Cum Immaculata virgo et Mater divinæ gratiæ precipue diligat sacerdotes, in quibus plenior reluceat imago Filii sui, qui sacerdos est in æternum, redament sacerdotes matrem suam amore principali in Christo Jesu.

5. Quandoquidem præcipuum perfectionis sacerdotalis subsidium æstimentur sacri secessus, præcipimus et mandamus ut omnes nostri sacerdotes saltem semel in quoque biennio, secessum spiritualem communem habeant, qui per dies circiter quinque duret, temporibus et locis in literis convocationis indicandis. Quicumque per literas nostras vocati, adesse non poterunt exercitiis communibus, sine mora per literas Nobis notum facient quonam impedimento detineantur.

6. Eos qui, propter rationes a Nobis approbatas, communi et solemni secessu dispensati fuerint, in Domino hortamur, ut spirituale damnum pro viribus resarcire curent, privatis saltem quatuor dierum exercitiis obeundis, aut apud unum ex proximis sacerdotibus, aut in Collegio S. Aloysii apud Waikari.

Caput 3. De Scientia Colenda.

Ad scientiam ecclesiasticam colendam, nostri sacerdotes discutient sive privatim, sive per collationes, ubi haberi poterunt, quasdam theologicas quæstiones a Nobis propositas, et ad Nos remittent in Scriptis summam deliberationum.

Caput 4. De Vestitu Clericali.

In omni vestitu color tantum niger vel subniger adhibeatur; collare Romanum geri debet; clerici omnes Diœcesis nostræ cum in publicum prodeunt semper vestes deferant statui suo congruentes, easque mundas et non laceratas.

Caput 5. De Prudenti Regimine Domus.

1. In domo, suppellectili, aliisque omnibus, abstineant missionarii ab avaritia, prodigalitate, nimiaque lautitia. Tota domus Christianam simplicitatem, et contemptum vanitatum præ se ferat.

2. Quicumque ad opera domestica ancillis indigent, adeo pias, modestas, simplices ac talis ætatis eligant, ut nemini scandali vel oblocutionis ansa præbeatur.

3. Summopere, cavendum est, ne famulus, aut ancilla quidpiam auctoritatis in missione habeat, vel in re

ctiam minima se missionis regimini immisceat.

4. Coram illis et aliis quibuscumque, sive laicis sive clericis, de missionis seu parochiæ administratione et præsertim de conscientiæ casibus, sacerdotes prudenter et cautè confabulentur.

Caput 6. De Negotiis Secularibus.

1. Clerici multo magis quam laici cavere debent, ne bonis temporalibus cor apponant, illisve adhæreant.

2. In bonorum suorum administratione, caveant clerici quid-quid ordini sacerdotali dedecori esse possit, aut laicis offensioni; sicque hac in re agant, ut omnes laici sentiant se cum viris justis et benignis agere.

3. Præcipimus ut omnes sacerdotes nostræ Diœcesis testa-menta sua rite confecta et signata habeant et in cis maxime optandum est ut unus saltem sacerdos pietate, prudentia, aliisque virtutibus ecclesiasticis præditus, curator vel executor constituatur.

4. Cum experientia constat plura et gravia incommoda ali-quando oriri si sacerdotes se negotiis sæcularibus implicent, eos enixe hortamur ut, quantum prudentia suggesserit, in testamentis fidelium condendis sese non immisceant; nec eorum, curatores vel executores evadant sine consensu Ordinarii in scriptis obtento. Orphanorum vel aliorum tutores sese constitui non sinant, nisi Episcopi consensus accedat.

5. Cum pacis præcones sint, lites pro se vel pro ecclesiis non suscipiant, nisi vera necessitas cogat.

6. Sciant negotiationem propriè dictam clericis à saeris canoni-bus esse prohibitam.

7. Non intendimus tamen prohibere ne nostri sacerdotes accipant partes, quas vocant obligationes seu actiones, in commer cialibus et industrialibus societatibus, solide fundatis et honeste administratis, modo id non flat, cum intentione negotiandi.

8. Severe autem prohibemus ne illi participes fiant in societatibus aurifundinarum aliisve similibus quæ habeant suspicionem dehonestatis ant Cambrii.

Vignette

Titulus II. De Variis Clericorm Muneribus Seu Officiis.

Caput 1. De Missionum Rectoribus.

1. A freqentiori extra missionem suam exitu et absentia, etiam ad partem diei tantùm, rector abstineat. A sua missione abesse non præsumat sive rector sive vicarius ejus, ultra quadraginta novem horns, nisi de licentia Episcopi in Scriptis data. Quodsi missionis rector inevitabiliter cogatur a sua missione, die Dominica aut Festo de præcepto abesse, non omittat quamprimum certiores nos facere.

2. Satagant missionum rectores, ubicumque fieri potest, conficere librum status animarum, juxta methodum Ritualis Romani, quo in libro uniuscujusque familiæ Caput et membra describantur, aliaque prudenter notentur quæ pro missionis directione visa fuerint utilia.

Caput 2.

1. Vicarii omnes rectori suo ex corde obediant. Sint erga omnes missionis personas affabiles et urbani, apud nullum laicum intimi aut assidui, per missionem et familias discurrentes, in domo rectoris non dominantes, sed ubique graves, modesti et prudentes.

2. Officia sibi juxta loci consuetudinem et ordinationes nostras imposita, ad amussim adimpleant. Studium ament et cubiculi tranquillitatem, atque in concionibus et præsertim Catechesibus præparandis graviter versentur. Infirmos et ægrotos vesitent, eos imprimis quibus exeuntium sacramenta administraverint, aut quornm cura illis specialiter fuerit eommissa. Non solum in dominicis et festis, sed etiam diebus ferialibus hora et loco a rectore designandis, missam celebrent, nisi legitimè fuerint impediti.

Caput 3.

1. Sacerdotes exteri, si sint noti, non ultra octo dies; si ignoti, semel aut iterum, modo habeant literas commendatitias Ordinarii sui, ad missam celebrandam admittantur.

2. Quodsi diutius in Diœcesi commorari cupiant, exhibeant oportet testimoniales literas a Nobis subsignatas.

3. Rectores neminem omnino in ecclesiis suis concionari permittant, nisi de liccntia Ordinarii in Scriptis

concessa vel aliunde rector certior factus sit Ordinarium consentire.

Vignette

Pars Altera. De Rebus Ecclesiasticis.

Tituls 1. De Verbi Prœdicatione.

1. Mandat C. Tridentinum ut qui animarum curam habent, singulis Dominicis diebus et Festis Solemnibus sacra eloquia inter missarum solemnia explanent. Præcipimus igitur missionum rectoribus ut, per se vel per vicarium, populo explanent, singulis diebus Dominicis et Festis Solemnibus, Evangelium aut aliquam partem doctrinæ Christianæ.

2. Omnes et singulos sacerdotes enixè hortamur, ut se ad munus prædicationis disponantes, adhibitâ præparatione, lectione scilicet, studio, meditatione et oratione, sacram doctrinam, cursu consecutivo, quantum fieri poterit, in suis prædicationibus tractent. Catechismo Con. Trid. magno cum fructu uti possunt.

3. Quum plebis Christianæ salus a debitâ puerorum et radium catechizatione pendeat, hanc sacram functionem rectores et eorum vicarii inter potiores curas habeant, eique sedulo implendæ omnibus viribus intendant.

4. Eapropter, omnes tam rectores quam eorum vicarii saltem semel in hebdomada, pueros et puellas, fidei rudimenta et obedientiam erga Deum et parentes, ut loquitur Con. Trid., edoceant, idque potissimum die Dominica in ecclesia aliove loco honesto. Insuper instituere conentur, præcipue in locis rarò a sacerdote visitatis, catechismi scholas. Ne relinquant laicis etiam religiosis, munus explanandi catechismum pueris aut puellis, sed ipsi missionarii diligenter peragant.

5. Ut omnes pueri et puellæ ad regulariter catechismum frequentandum exstimulentur, habeant catechizantes registrum, in quo nomina singulorum inscribantur, cum brevi adnotatione diligentiæ vel negligentiæ, scientiæ aut ignorantiæ.

6. Quia, dicente Benedicto XIV. "uniformitate nihil est optabilius," mandamus, ut non alii adhibeantur catechismi quàm triplex forma catechismi *Butlerii*.

7. Monemus sacerdotes omnes et fideles nostræ curæ commissos, de omni opera impendenda ut Scholæ Catholicæ, ubi fieri potest, erigantur, in quibus auctoritas Ecclesiæ pienè recognoscatur, et ea institutionis methodus servetur quæ primariò sempiternam animarum salutem spectans, vera Religionis dogmata cum literariæ rei scientia atque progressu sapienter componat.

8. Easdem scholas Missionarii sæpe visitent, Consilia magistris, monita scholaribus tradant, graviter eos instruendo.

Vignette

Titulus II. De Sacrosanctis Ecclesiæ Sacramentis.

Caput 1. De Sacramentis in Genere.

1. Ut qua decet sanctitate, reverentia ac diligentia sacrosancta Ecclesiæ Sacramenta tractentur, id perpetuo curare debent missionarii ut integre, caste pièque vitam agant, ne dum aliorum inserivunt saluti, sibi æternæ damnationis sint ministri. Si quis igitur, quod Deus avertat, fuerit peccati mortalis sibi conscius, ne sacramenta administrare audeat, nisi prius veræ contritionis actum elicuerit; quodsi habeat copiam confessarii, et temporis locique ratio ferat, sacramentalem confessionem instituât.

2. In administratione cujuslibet sacramenti, omnes et singulos ritus, cæremonias, et preces servent ac recitent exacte et fideliter; nihil enim de eis, juxta decretum C. Trid., sine peccato a ministro pro libitu omitti aut mutari potest, si aliquid de accidentalibus omittatur, sacramentum quidem conficitur, sed juxt qualitatem et conditionem omissorum peccat minister; si vero aliquid de substantialibus ommittatur sacramentum non conficitur et peccat graviter minister. Rituali Romano ad formam editionis Hibernicæ, Americanæ, aut Anglicanæ omnes utantur.

3. Nullum sacramentum conficiant, vel ministrent, nisi præmissa brevi oratione; pie sacramenta dispensent

non præcipitanter aut ex consuetudine, in scandalum et offensionem fidelium, sed cum summa gravitate, religiosè, et animo intento in id quod faciunt, et dicunt, ita ut adstantes, et ritus ecclcsiæ et ipsum ministrum venerentur.

4. Præcipimus ut sacerdos, dum extra ecclesiam sacramenta administrat, saltem stolâ utatur, intra vero ecclesiam, præter stolam veste talari et superpelliceo indutus sit. In administrando autem pœnitentiæ sacramento vestis talaris cum stola sufficit, saltem pro tempore.

5. Caveant omnes sacerdotes vel omnium rerum inopes, ne pro administrandis sacramentis quidquam vel minimum quovis modo exigant; neve etiam verbis vel signis, directe vel indirecte, aliquid petant. In iis verò, quae justo aliquo titulo ex communi Theologorum opinione et probata praxi accipi possunt, ut sunt beneficium stolæ, stipendia sacrorum &c., conentur ita se gerere ut sese immunes ab omni avaritiæ suspicione præstent.

6. In administrandis sacramentis non difficiles et morosos, sed e contra faciles ac promptos, benignos et hilares, se exhibeant; ab omni personarum acceptione diligentissime caveant atque abhorreant. Meminerint quoque se ex officio teneri administrare Baptismum et Pœnitentiam Christi fidelibus morbo contagioso vel peste affectis, etiam cum morbi contrahendi discrimine; ncque se difficiles exhibeant circa aliorum sacramentorum administrationem, præsertim in iis casibus in quibus, ex sententia Theologorum, obligatio ea dispensandi magis urgere dignoscitur. Expedit autem ut, in his casibus, utantur remediis, vel adhibeant cautelas quas indicant medici, ne et ipsi morbo corripiantur cum gravi missionis detrimento.

7. Ne oblivioni tradantur omnia præcepta et monita, quæ in Rituali Romano, tum generatim tum in singulorum sacramentorum administratione servanda præscribuntur, enixe exhortamur ut omnes et singuli missionarii nostri, unà saltem aut duabus vicibus in anno, instructiones in Rituali Romano datas perlegant.

8. Missionarii frequenter fideles hortentur ut sacramentorum doctrinam sedulò addiscant, et ipsimet eorum divinam institutionem et fructus eximios sæpius et opportune inculcent, item eorum cœremonias atque dispositiones pro digna eorum susceptione requisitas explicent.

Caput 2. De Sacramentis in Specie.

Articulus 1. De Sacramento Baptismi.

1. Baptismi Sacramentum in Ecclesia semper administretur, nisi baptizandus sit in periculo mortis, vèl distantia (ut puta sex millia passuum), difficultas itineris, aliave rationabilis causa, aliter requirat.

2. Præcipimus ut, ad sponsorum in Baptismo officium, nonnisi Catholici bonæ famæ admittantur. Si contigerit parentes aliquem elegisse patrinum, aut patrinam, qui Catholicus non sit, moneantur parentes privatim. Tenetur verò sacerdos alium, si adsit, substituere, sed hoc cum multa prudentia et sine offensione est faciendum.

3. Preces et cæremoniæ, quæ propter circumstantias fuerunt omissæ, semper postea sunt supplendæ.

4. Habeant pastores omnes Registrum Baptismale solidè compactum, in quo, post cujusvis Baptismi cæremoniam, perspicuis planè literis inscribantur.

- Dies mensis et annus collati Baptismi, et tempus nativitatis infantis.
- Nomen illius.
- Nomina et prænomina patris et matris.
- Nomina et prænomina patrinorum, tum principalium adstantium et sacra fonte levantium.
- Nomen baptizantis propria manu scriptum.

Notabiliter hac in re negligentes monitos volumus se suspensioni ferendæ sententiæ, obnoxios esse futuros.

5. Benedictio post partum nunquam in privatis domibus, semoto casu necessitatis, neque mulieribus extra matrimonium parientibus, est impertienda; pro hâc benedictione accuratè sequenda est forma Ritualis Romani.

6. Omnis fœtus quocumque tempore gestationis editus baptizetur, vel absolutè si constet de vita, vel sub conditione, nisi evidenter pateat eum vita carere.

7. Moneantur parentes et ii ad quos spectat, ut juxta Ritualis Romani præscriptum, quamprimum fieri poterit, infantes baptizari curent, et, ubi facilis patet ad ecclesiam accessus, ne ultra septimum ab ortu diem differri sinant.

8. Cum Baptisma ad salutem necessarium sit, et Dei benignitate factum est ut a quolibet homine validè conferri possit, curent sacerdotes ut singuli fideles, præsertim verò obstetrices, modum illius administrandi norint, ut in casu necessitatis illud rite conferant.

9. In ecclesiis saltem locorum notabilium habeatur quamprimum fons baptismatis.

Articulus 2. De S. Sacramento Eucharistiæ.

1. Præcipua diligentia curent pastores ut pueri et puellæ dispositi sint, antequam ad primam ipsorum

communionem accedant.

2. Habeat unusquisque Missionarius Pyxidem argenteam intùs deauratam, cum corporali et purificatorio, quæ omnia, in bursa ex serico confecta sunt reponenda, Hostiæ renoventur et purificetur Pyxis unaquaque octava die. Quando Corpus Domini ob necessitatem in domo sacerdotis asservatur, semper sit in loco sub clavi, et ad hoc unicè destinato. Quando ad infirmum defertur, bursam in qua reponitur Pyxis, gerat sacerdos in parte vestis interiori et cordi proxima. Dum sacramentum portat, ne versetur in colloquiis intempestivis, sed potius mens ejus in sancta meditatione exardescat. In cubiculo infirmi, si sit possibile, cum linteo panno, candela et aqua benedicta præparentur. Hostiæ pro populi communione sint semper circulares nec nimis parvæ.

3. Frequenter et diligentissimé hujus S. Sacramenti dogma, dignitas, excellentia, mirabiles effectua et virtutes", necnon dispositions ad ejus fructuosam receptionem requisitæ, fidelibus exponantur. Graviter quoque moneantur de necessitate et modo gratiarum actionis post communionem, et quidem pia quædam exercitia seu preces, a communicatis post missam dicendæ eis præscribantur.

4. Sæpe hortandi sunt fideles ad frequentiorem hujus S. Sacramenti receptionem cujus necessitas pro vita nostra spirituali a Christo Domino omnibus adultis ita proponitur: "Nisi manduca- veritis carnem Filii hominis et biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis." Necnon admonendi sunt hoc ab ecclesia districtè præceptum esse, ut omnès utriusque sexus, postquam ad annos discretiouis pervenerint saltem semel singulis annis, Tempore Paschali, Eucharistiam reverenter suscipiant.

5. A nullo crimine magis deterreri debent fideles quam à sacrilega Christi Corporis manducatione. Sciant igitur omnes eam probationem ante receptionem communionis necessariam esse, ut nemo sibi conscius peccati mortalis, quamtumvis sibi contritus videatur, absque præmissa sacramentali confessione, ad sacram Eucharistiam accedere debeat, quemadmodum injungit Con. Trid. (Sess. 13 c. 7 de Eucharistia.)

6. At simul incitandi atque urgendi sunt fideles ad hunc cibum cœlestem debitâ cum præparatione accipiendum; quæ autem, aut qualis sit hujusmodi præparatio aptissime docet Catech. Romanus, quem missionarii sæpius consulant.

Articulus 3. De Sacramento Pænitentiæ.

1. In ecclesiis sacramentales fidelium confessiones excipiantur non autem in privatis ædibus, nisi ex causa rationabili; quæ cum intercesserit, studeat confessarius decenti loco munus suum exequi.

Sedes confessionalis, patenti, conspicuo, et apto Ecclesiæ loco posita, cancellis inter pœnitentem et Sacerdotem sit instructa. Ibidem, ante ortum solis et post ejus occasum, quantum fieri poterit, lumen apponatur.

In sacristia aliove loco, quamvis ecclesiæ contiguo, non sunt confessiones excipiendæ, nisi surdastrotrum et aliorum qui in ecclesiæ loco consueto confiteri non valent.

2. Feminarum confessiones excipere extra sedem cancellatam suprà descriptam non licet, nisi causa necessitatis et cum his cautelis: 1. Si audiantur in privatis domibus, apertum sit, quotiescumque fieri poterit, cubiculi ostium. 2. Si in sacristia vol alio loco contiguo audiantur, sedes adhibeatur qualis supra, et locus ita sit apertus, ut aditus ad ipsum liberè pateat, et ut sedes ab extra videri queat. Hæ ordinationes et cautelas etiam respectu monialium sunt observandæ. Sacerdotes possunt confiteri ubicumque sibi visum fuerit.

Articulus 4. De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis.

1. Quamvis infantibus nondum rationis usum adeptis, et amentibus quos ab ortu nunquam mentis compotes fuisse constat, Extrema Unctio conferri non possit, pueri et puellæ tamen, qui peccare potuerint et ideo Sacramenti Pœnitentiœ capaces existant, tam salutari remedio, in supremo vitæ discrimine, non priventur; sed prius confessi, et virtutem hujus sacramenti edocti, oleo sancto liniantur.

2. Curent etiam missionarii, ut pueri et puellæ, qui ad annos discretionis pervenerint, in periculo mortis Viatico muniantur, licet ad Eucharistiam nondum admissi fuerint.

Articulus 5. De Sacramento Matrimonii.

1. Cum Matrimonii Sacramentum, testante Apostolo Paulo, magnum sit, mirificam unionem quæ Christum inter et Ecclesiam existit, representans, curent sacerdotes, quibus animarum cura commissa est, ut fideles ad illud ea qua decet pietate recipiendum ritè disponantur, ea omnia accuratè servantes, quæ in Missali et Rituali Romano necnon in His Statutis præscripta sunt.

2. Omnen curam impendant ut contrahentes fidei rudimenta sciant eosque hortentur ut sua peccata diligenter confiteantur, et S. S. Eucharistiæ Sacramento reficiantur, eosque edoceant Christianè et piè in statu conjugali conversari.

3. Hinc eorum agendi rationem, quæ non raro obtinet in hac regione, reprobandam censemus, qui, nulla datá notitia, ad sacerdotem se conferunt, ut sine mora conjungantur. Ad hoc malum præ- cavendum requirimus ut saltern aliquot dies, nisi necessitas aliter suadeat, sacerdotem de proposito Matrimonio certiorem faciant, tum

ut rite instruantur in üs omnibus quæ ad hoc Sacramentum pertinent, tum ut opportuna de eorum libero statu inquisitio fiat antequam ad Matrimonium celebrandum procedatur.

4. Matrimonia Catbolicorum cum acatholicis, sen matrimonia *mixta* semper exhorruit et justissimis de cansis prohibet Sancta Mater Ecclesia. Ab üs igitur contrahendis Sacerdotes prudenter et quantum in Domino possunt, fideles deterreant.

5. Si sacerdos mixtas nuptias impedire non potuerit, saltern curandum illi erit, "ut iliæ non aliter contrahantur, nisi impetrata Ecclesiæ dispensation, et conditionibus solitis religiose servatis" (Breve Greg. xvi. 27, Maii. 1832 ad Epis. Bavariæ).

6. Sciant quoque Sacerdotes hæc matrimonia, juxta S. S. PP. decreta, extra ecclesinm, nullo adhibito ritu Sacro, celebranda esse.

7. Iusuper non eis licebit hisce matrimoniis assistere, si ad eorum notitiam devenerit contrailentes, vel ante vel post matrimonium contractual coram ipsis, se sistere velle coram ministro hæretico, vel officiali civili.

8. Ut autem Catholici ab bisce sacrilegis connubiis magis et magis deterreantur, declaramus eos omnes gravis peccati se reos reddere, qui corani ministro Protestante vel officiali civili mixtum matrimonium in posterum contrahant.

9. Quod si, per summum nefas, vir Catholicus et mulier Catholica, sacerdotum neglecto ministerio et spreta Ecclesiæ auctoritate, coram ministro heterodoxo vel officiali civili contrabere andeant, sciant se excommunicationem majorem co ipso incurrere, cujus absolutio ordinario reservatur.

10. Unusquisque missionarius sub pœna suspensionis tenetur servare aut habere in missione librum, in quo notanda sunt nomina omnium qui matrimonio junguntur, et nomina testium, item dies, mensis, et annus quibus celebratæ sunt nuptiæ. Dispensatio, si qua fuerit concessa, ibidem notetur.

11. Si sponsi ex eadem aliena missione, sive diversis alienis missionibus advenerint, ut matrimonium contrahant (non agatur de vagis) missionarius non debet, semoto casu necessitatis, ad matri- monii celebrationem procedere, absque prævia licentia in scriptis obtenta a proprio rectore utriusque sponsi; et in omni casti, dimi-diam pecuniæ partem, celebrationis causa a sponsis datam, remittere tenetur missionario qui regulariter celebrare matrimonium deberet.

Vignette

Titulus III. De Festis, Jejuniis Et Indulgentiis.

1. Festa de præcepto servanda in hac Diœcesi sunt sequentia nempe Circumcisionis, Epiphaniæ, Ascensionis, Corporis Christi; S. S. Petri et Pauli, Assumptions B. V. Omnium Sanctorum et Nativitatis D. N. J. C.

2. Missionariorum est plebem suam congruo tempore monere de obligatione jejunandi in Quadragesima, in Quatuor Anni Temporibus, necnon in vigiliis Nativitatis D. N. J. C. Pentecostes, Gloriosa) Assumptionis B. V. Omnium Sanctorum, et Solemnitatis S. S. Petri et Pauli.

3. Abstinentia a carnibus in omnibus feriis sextis inculcanda est.

4. Quandoquidem sanctarum Indulgentiarum usus sit Christiano populo maximè salutaris, et sacrorum conciliorum auctoritate probatus (C. Trid. Sess. 24 dec. de Indulg.) summopere curent sacerdotes omnes, maxime curam animarum habentes, ut illum explicent foveantque. Indulgentiæ itaque quas infra hebdomadam lucrari possunt fideles dominica præcedente populo denuntientur atque commendentur.

5. Nemo præsumat, sub quocumque prætextu, novas indulgentias promulgare aut fidelibus commendare, nisi licentia ordinarii fuerit petita et obtenta (Con. Trid. Sess. 22, de Reform, c. IX.) Eadem cautela adhibeatur in introducendis novis devotionibus, quæ generali usu non sunt probatæ.

6. Miracula nova non admittantur, nisi recognoscente et approbante Ordinario juxta C. Trid. præceptum (Con. Trid. Sess. 25, de Invoca. Sanctorum.)

Titulus IV. De Divinis Officiis.

Caput 1. CONSTITUTUM GENERALE.

In ecclesia, sacellis, et sacristiis, semper regnent silentium, modestia, reverentia, et recollectio ipsius cleri et ministrorum laicorum; loca sacra, altaria, et omnia qua; ad Divinum cultum pertinent, si non splendida et pretiosa, saltem munda sint et nitida.

Caput 2. De Augustissimo Missæ Sacrificio.

1. Omnes sacerdotes, semel saltem in anno, diligenter perlegant Rubricas generales, quæ initio Missalis Romani apponuntur; et de hac re eorum conscientiam oneramus.

2. Sub nullo prætextu audeat sacerdos Missam celebrare sine calice et patena intus deauratis.

3. Nullus sacerdos Missam celebrare præsumat sordidis aut laceratis vestibus, stragulæ vestes altaris nonisi ex lino conficiantur, quæ mundissimæ et omnino integræ serventur.

4. Districte prohibetur ne quis sacerdos publice missam celebret aut ocreatus aut sine veste talari.

5. Pueri qui Missæ inserviunt, bona fama, et moribus modestis sint insignes. Doceantur responsa clare, distincte et accurate enunciare, cæremonias cum omni gravitate et decore observare, et superpelliceo utantur, superpelliceum vero ex lino vel ex gossipio conficiatur, et illius formæ quæ in nostra Ecclesia Cathedrali usitata est.

6. Celebrationi Missæ ad minus vigiliti quinque minuta aut circiter impendant et ultra horam dimidiam eam non protrahant, ne molestiam populo afferant.

Caput 3. De Sacris Reliquiis,

Nemo sanctissimæ Crucis, Beatæ Mariæ Virginis, sanctorum aut Beatorum reliquias publicè venerandas exhibeat, nisi prius Ordinarli auctoritate recogaitas et approbatas. In processionibus autem Beatorum reliquiæ minime circumferantur.

Caput 4. De Variis Expositionibus et Processionibus S. S. Sacramenti.

1. Episcopi mandatum aut assensus requiritur, ut intra vel extra sopta Ecclesiæ instituantur processiones cum S. S. Eucharistia item ut S. S. Echaristia publicè adoranda exponatur, exceptis casi-bus quos rubrica et decreta Apostolica determinant.

2. Exponi potest solemniter S. S. Sacramentum una vice per mensem, et in festis Prasentationis DNJ Ch. et primi Ecclesiæ Patroni, atque etiam Assumptions B. V.; insuper et in festo ac diebus infra octavam Corporis Christi, et in oratione 40 horarum, quæ expositiones fieri possunt per divina officia, imo per totani diem arbitrio sacerdotis.

3. Detur Benedictio cum S. S. Sacramento non frequentius quam singulis Dominicis et Festis de præcepto, et cum uno tantum signo crucis, insuper quoties facta fuerit processio, aut expositio ejusdem S. S. Sacramenti. Cæterum fiat album in singulis ecclesiis, in quo inscribantur dies in quibus Benedictio cum S. S. Sacramento permittitur.

Caput 5. De Cantu et Musica.

1. Cantum planum et firmum, seu Gregorianum, in cultus divini officiis foveri et promoveri volumus.

2. Ubi cantus harmonicus adhibetur, curent Missionarii ut sit gravis ac decorus; invigilentque ne levitatemi spiret. Severè prohibemus ne cantiones mundanæ, ad sacros concentus transferantur.

3. Usus linguæ vulgaris solummodo ante vel post, non autem intra functiones liturgicas, permittitur.

4. In benedictione S. S. Sacramenti cantus unius solummodo vocis, præsertim mulieris, dissuadetur.

Caput 6. De Sepulturis et Exequiis.

1. Missa, quando poterit, ante sepulturam et præsente cadavere, pro defuncto celebretur.

2. Cadavera, terræ tradita, nunquam exhumentur Nobis inconsultis.

Caput 7. De Fundationibus.

1. Tituli fundationum sedulo custodiantur, et in libro speciali ad integrum exarentur ne postea e memoria labantur.

2. Ex præceptis Urbani VIII, et Innocentii XII. teneatur in patenti sacristiæ loco tabella, in qua descripta sint singularum fundationum onera, eo qnidem ordine quo adimplenda sunt. Habeatur insuper in sacristia liber, in quo tum singula onera, tum ratio eorum adimpletionis, ipsæque fundationes, distincle et accurate adnotata sint.

3. Missarum celebrandarum perpetua onera non suscipiantur, sine consensu Ordinarii in scriptis expresso.

Titulus V.

Caput 1. De Ecclesiis et Oratoriis Publicis Ædificandis, Restaurandis et Conservandis.

1. Cum sacri canones prohibeant, ne nova tempia sine Ordinarii Auctoritate erigantur, nemo de nova Ecclesia vel novo oratorio publico extruendo, aut de veteri ædificio novis constructionibus ampliando vel ornando, aliquid statuat vel moliatur sine consensu Episcopi.

2. Imo nullam magni momenti constructionem aut reparationem sive ecclesiæ, sive presbyterii, sive scholæ, etc., liceat suscipere quin prius obtineatur consensus ordinarii, ejusque approbatio et formæ et pretii æstimati operis propositi, scriptis expressa.

3. Ubi veteri ecclesiæ vel sacello novæ constructiones sunt addendæ, curandum est ut eæ cum regulis artis et genere seu Stylo, ut aiunt, ipsius ædificii conveniant. Atque ad hoc attendendum est in omnibus tum externis tum internis ædificiorum reparationibus.

4. Patronos seu titulos Missionibus aut ecclesiis canonicè designàre ad Episcopum pertinet.

Caput 2. De Sacra Supellectili.

1. Calices, patenæ, et vasa sacra ad S. S. Eucharistiam conservandam adhibita, quotannis mundentur extrinsicus et suo splendori restituantur; calices autem, si aurum amiserint, denuo inaurentur, et consecrentur.

2. Vascula sacrorum oleorum nitida sint oportet, et distinctis inscriptionibus munita. Deponantur sub clavibus in loco decenti ecclesiæ vel sacristiæ aut domus sacerdotis.

3. In sacristia unaquæque res locum suum habeat, vasa sacra, alia pretiosa supellex sic recondantur, ut præcaventur furta sacrilega; ornamenta decenter complicata aut extensa ponantur ordinatius in armariis et scriniis. Ibidem tabula quædam in loco conspicuo exhibeat nomen Patroni vel Tituli Ecclesiæ, itemque nomen Episcopi pro tempore sedentis.

Caput 3. De Cemeteriis.

In medio cemeterii crux alta erigatur ubi fieri poterit.

2. Cæmeteria sepibus ita concludantur ut equis, porcis et ejusmodi animalibus nullus pateat accessus.

3. Ubi fieri potest, habeantur regulæ, ab ordinario approbatæ et ad mentem decreti à Gubernio nuper lati confirmandæ.

Caput 4. De Confraternitatibus.

1. Nulla confraternitas, quovis nomine nuncupata, in diœcesi nostra instituatur, aut instituta alicui archiconfraternitati aggregetur, quin prius approbatio vel consensus noster obtentus fuerit, uti præscribit Clemens VIII., in constitutione, "Quæcumque, de die 7 Decembris 1604."

2. Hortamur ut, per omnes nostræ diœcesis Missiones, pia ad propagandam fidem societas extendatur et promoveatur, quæ in aliis regionibus cum tanto religionis profectu existit.

Titulus VI. De Rebus Ecclesiæ Temporalibus.

Caput 1. De Recta Bonorum Temporalium Administratione.

1. Rectores advigilent, ne domus quam inhabitant, horti, prædia aliaque bona quibus utuntur, detrimentum patiantur. Solliciti quoque sint, ne ulla servitus, in successorum suorum præjudicium introducatur.

2. Collectas quocumque titulo vel prætextu sive per extraneos, sive per nostros extra propriam uniuscujusque missionem, fieri prohibemus, sine ordinarii licentia.

3. Mandamus ut sacerdotes, in scriptis, die 30 Januarii uniuscujusque anni, Ecclesiarum vel missionum reditus, id est proventus ex prædiis, domorum locatione, bonis fundatis. aliisque fontibus, et expensas ordinario exhibeant. Omnibus ecclesiarum administris præcipimus, et locorum, quæ ab Episcopo pendent, curatoribus, ut bonorum tàm mobilium quam immobilium, quæ ad ecclesias vel ad loca pia prædicta pertinent, inventorium

conficiant. In hoc inventorio diligenter vasa sacra, sacramque, supellectilem describant; prædia quoque Ecclesiæ si quæ sint, domos, scholas, reditus denique permanentes recensebunt, onera autem non omittant, quibus ecclesia vel loca pia subjiciantur.

4. Ne sacerdotes nostri aere alieno sese gravent, sedulò caveant ne ullum inceptum tentent nisi habeant facilitates illud perficiendi, aut saltem clarè prævideant quomodo illas obtinere possint.

5. Sub pæna suspensionis ipso facto incurrendæ prohibemus ne sacerdotes et clerici nostri pecuniæ summam, excedentem quinquaginta libras (vulgo fifty pounds sterling) per annum mutuo sumant, sine nostro consensu in scriptis obtento. Ob gravissimas rationes districte prohibemus etiam pœna suspensionis ne quivis ex missionariis nostris mutuo petat ultra id cui solvendo bona sua paria sunt.

6. Nullus clericus libros ex propria composition, de rebus divinis aut ecclesiasticis typis mandet vel evulget, absque prævia, examinatione et approbatione nostra; qui hanc regulam seu decretum infregerit suspensionis pœnam subeat.

Caput 2. De Sustentatione Cleri et Episcopi.

1. Missionarios hortamur, ut fidelibus sibi commissis exponendam curent multiplicem qua obstringuntur obligationem, bonorum quæ Deus ipsis largitus est, congruam partem erga sacri cultus ministerium retribuendi.

2. Ne autem, hac occasione, sacerdos aliquis minus prudens in populum rei pecuniariæ causa invehat, quod sacrum ministerium dedecet, invigilabit Ordinarius et efficacibus mediis impediet.

3. Declaramus administrationem eorum quæ pro sacrorum ministrorum sustentatione vel cultus Divini decore offeruntur, auctoritati ecclesistiacæ suhjacere.

4. Concilium Australiense secundum, anno 1869, sequens decretum habuit; "Quum justum sit Episcopum, qui omnium saluti invigilat, ab omnibus in diœcesi fidelibus ea accipere, quæ ad idoneam ejus sustentationem, et onera sui muneris perferenda necessaria sunt, statuimus eum, in hunc finem, partem redituum omnium ecclesiarum, in quibus animarum cura exercetur, exigere posse." Super quo decreto rescripsit S Congregatio Romana: "Super eodem decreto mens fuit hujus Sacri Concilii Episcopis suadendum esse, ut hac de re pertractent in Diœcesanis Synodis, in quibus collatis inter se comitiis, sacerdotes curam habentes animarum conveniant de certa pensione ordinario quotannis tribuenda. Ejusmodi autem adsignatio vel distributio, cum fuerit ab ordinario recognita et probata, ceu lex Diœcesana ab omnibus servanda evulgabitur."

5. Quam regulam sequentes, partem æquam omnium redituum Ordinario quotannis ad Episcopi sustentationem a singulis missionum rectoribus tribuendam esse decrevimus.

6. Per reditus hie intelliguntur collectiones factæ inter missas et vesperas, foribus ecclesiarum ante missas et vesperas, collectiones ad Pascha et Natale Domini; et quidquid ex sedium locatione, necnon quidquid sacerdotibus baptismatis vel matrimonii causa offertur.

8. Quoniam omnino oportet sustentationi clericorum ægrotantiam et provectæ ætatis providere, statuims ut ex reditibus omnium missionum (exceptis regularium missionibus), Una per centum (vulgo one per cent.) per annum, in Ærarinm Infirmorum et Senium inter Clericos Diæcesis Dunedinensis impendatur, cujus Ærarii, Episcopus et duo sacerdotes in Synodo electi Cura tores et fiduciarii erunt.

9. Quoniam Patres Tridentini, Sess. 23, c. 18 decreverunt ut a quolibet Episcopo prope suam Cathedralem Ecclesiam, aut alio convenienti loco, Collegium seu Seminarium instituatur ubi clerici omnibus liberabilibus artibus et ecclesiasticis excolantur institutis, et ne ejusmodi Seminaria ex redituum defectu, ullo unquani tempore pereant, statuerunt ut ex reditibus Mensæ Episcopalis et Capituli, et quorumlibet beneficiorum diœcesis, certa pecuniæ summa detrahatur, et quoniam non existunt tales fontes redituum in hac diœcesi, igitur præcipimus collectam pro Seminario semel in anno in posterum, die Dominica, in omnibus ecclesiis et stationibus hujus Diœcesis faciendam esse, et summam collectam statim ad Episcopum mittendam.

10. Hæc omnia et singula decreta et instructiones, una saltem vice in singulis annis, attente legenda esse ab omnibus nostris Missionariis volumus.

Hæc decreta et constituta approbamus et confirmamus,
Patitrius Moran,

Episcopus Dunedinensis.
Apud Dunedin,

Hac die

26 Januarii, 1879.

Dunedin:

Typis, Woodifield, Jolly & Co.,
Via Dicta Octagon.
MDCCCLXXIX.

LASCIA DIR LE GENTI.

[That dense population in extreme distress inhabited an island where there was an Established Church which was not their Church, and a territorial aristocracy, the richest of whom lived in distant capitals. Thus they had a starving population, an absentee aristocracy, and an alien church; and, in addition, the weakest executive in the world. That was the Irish question. Well then, what would honourable gentlemen say if they were reading of a country in that position? They would say at once, the remedy is revolution. But the Irish could not have a revolution; and why? Because Ireland was connected with another and a more powerful country. Then what was the consequence? The connection with England thus became the cause of the present state of Ireland. If the connection with England prevented a revolution, and a revolution was the only remedy, England logically was in the odious position of being the cause of all the misery in Ireland. What, then, was the duty of an English Minister? To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force. That was the Irish question in its integrity. The moment they had a *strong executive, a just administration, and ecclesiastical equality*, they would have order in Ireland, and the improvement of the physical condition of the people would follow.—*Extract from Mr. D'Israeli's Speech in 1844, as given in Lord Russell's Letter to Rt. Honble C. Fortescue M.P.*]

I requote this passage, quoted in a pamphlet entitled *Ireland*, which I published in 1868, as an useful introduction to what follows, as it places us at once in the very heart of the matter. One material change has been effected since the above date; ecclesiastical equality has been given. The grievance of the alien church has been removed. With this exception the words are as applicable now as in 1844, or in 1868.

For, old and yet ever new, the Irish difficulty is again upon us in its full intensity. The disestablishment of the Irish Protestant Church and the Land Act of 1870, which to many seemed a final settlement, are shown to have been ineffectual, as it might have been foreseen, as it was foreseen, that they would be. The gain from the former act is evident. It takes away a complication and so leaves the true issue more distinct. There has been also gain from the land legislation, but the principal advantage derived from it is indirect. More active treatment is proved, by the comparative inefficiency of that legislation, to be necessary.

I may remark that had the treatment of the Irish Church been more drastic, more consonant to principle, a greater progress might have been made in regard to the land. The funds of that intrusive and unjust institution should have been, with due regard to vested interests, applied in aid of a wise handling of the land question, such for instance as that proposed by Mr. Bright.

Be this as it may, the land question is still open, and to its settlement will be directed the efforts of our statesmen. I shall not touch it here in any of its details, for I think, as a whole even, it is subordinate to other considerations. Whilst a wise and bold measure of change might do much as a palliative and procure a healthier atmosphere for the discussion of further advance, I conceive the time to be past, if there ever was such a time since the Revolution of 1688, when any particular measure of reform could satisfy the requirements of the Irish nation. There has been an instinctive consciousness of this fact underlying all the more recent relations of the two countries, betraying itself from time to time in the deliberate as well as in the more impatient utterances of our public men and writers, and forming the ultimate impulsion of the successive leaders of the Irish nation.

The strong political discontent, which now confronts the English Government, derives support and energy, but not its origin, from the physical distress which is recognised as existing. As time passes, that discontent assumes more definite shape, and reveals more plainly its true source. It presents itself under two aspects, the inter-connection of which is easily seen. It is at once social and political. It aims, that is, at a very great change in the existing order of society. It aims also at national independence in some adequate form. And as its character and aims, so its origin is twofold. As social, its root is in the hereditary, deep-seated, and growing dislike to the exceptional land system of England which has been forced upon Ireland. As political it arises, no doubt, primarily from the patent evils which the dependence on a stronger power has occasioned and occasions, but it is also an outcome of the wholesome craving for a separate state life, which, in spite of existing counteractions, is the permanent characteristic of European political order, distinctly traceable in all the great Western nations—both historically and actually.

The connection of the two aspects above given, and of the two demands which correspond to them, lies directly herein, that, without a large amount of national independence, the social changes which are desired are unattainable; the efforts made to attain them seem in the immediate future useless; they are a hope ever anew deferred. For a settlement of the land question of Ireland in accordance with the actual demand must react on Great Britain; and the territorial aristocracy of Great Britain is not slow to see that this is so. It is not the Irish only who are a dislanded and "dishorned" nation, but the English, Welsh, and Scotch; and the wiser the scheme propounded for securing the end to be kept in view, viz., "the remarrying the land of Ireland to the people of

Ireland," the more certain is it to tell on the other three home constituents of our composite Empire.

Deep in the very constitution—the aristocratical constitution—of the English Government lies then the real Irish difficulty. This is true historically—it is true also in practical politics; and when to enable them to deal with it, the Irish seek for autonomy (the word is manifestly as applicable here as in Bulgaria or in Roumelia), there comes in the one great national prejudice, fundamental and most powerful, that, come what may, Ireland must remain in her present connection with England, an integral part of the Empire, not a self-existent nation. No English Government will venture in face of this prejudice to propose repeal. All Irish statesmen who see the necessity of repeal must use language and avow ends which are open to the charge of sedition.

Hence the relations of the two countries, I might say of the two Governments, the informal Irish and the highly organized central Government, are under these conditions very difficult. For any English ministry with the best intentions—and I do not believe that the responsible statesmen of either party have of late had other than good intentions—and with the clearest insight which can conceivably co-exist with the above-mentioned national prejudice,—will yet possibly find itself unable to carry the measures which it may deem advisable. Whilst the Irish statesmen who see that national self-existence is the ultimate goal of their exertions, must feel that they are face to face with a resistance against which all the ordinary methods of political influence break without effect. On both sides, the greater the insight the less would seem the hope.

Where is the exit from this political blind alley, all violence being set aside, and only such measures advocated as are within the province of peaceful statesmanship, such statesmanship, however, being conceived capable of a revolutionary vigour?

The spirit of coercion is abroad—of violence that is from the side of the established Government. To their honour, the present occupants of power stem as yet the rising exasperation, though unfortunately yielding to it so far as to institute this ill-advised prosecution. Be the result of that act what it may, it is, as force as been justly said to be, no remedy. Have we not seen, each half generation, to say the least, these coarser means applied, and a temporary lull secured; and, the pressure removed, as with our Government it cannot but be, the resurrection of the spirit which had been exorcised, the renewal in louder tones of the previous demands? This has been the political experience of the last half century—the almost exact period during which even the intention of justice on the part of England can be traced. It is this perpetual recurrence of the evil which is the peculiar opprobrium of our statesmanship, and the indication of the true direction for its future efforts.

Less than ever do temporary imperfect remedies hold out any prospect of advantage. For, of late years, there has been introduced an additional complication, many additional complications I might truly say. Three I will name. First, the greater rapidity of communication and consequent increase of publicity. The whole human family has become more highly organic, so that each part's suffering is more instantly felt by the other parts. Secondly, and in part as a consequence, the influence of opinion is more sensitively felt, the opinion of other people as well as home opinion. Europe has sought to make this influence powerful in regard to Turkey—but it is a motor evidently available elsewhere than in Turkey, and the proverbial secular mismanagement of Ireland is brought to the bar of national judgments in the Eastern and the Western world, in Asia, no less than in Europe and America. Thirdly, the Irish famine has left our statesmen a legacy. In shortsighted satisfaction, we exulted over the removal by emigration of a large proportion of the Irish people. So the then Government saw with pleasure the expatriation of the soldiers of Cromwell. But a century later and the recoil came. American independence was in no obscure manner connected with that expatriation. So, but without the slow lapse of a century, comes the punishment in the present case. The Irish in America are a constant stimulus to their nation which will leave it no rest till it stands free and its own mistress, in full possession of itself, at home upon its land.

I write as an Englishman, from the standpoint of our national duty, appealing to the higher conscience of this nation, to its sense of shame for past misdeeds, past neglect, past lukewarmness, to its consciousness that the effects of such a past can only be slowly cancelled, to all the latent nobleness which I believe in, and which duly evoked might issue in a resolution that, cost what it might to its pride or its interest, the true advantage of Ireland, and Ireland only, should be the rule of its action.

I urge no special measures. I confine myself to the more general, comprehensive issue. It is for the Irish people when made *sui juris*, mistress of its own destinies, to decide on the best mode of its agricultural settlement. It is to the making it *sui juris* that I direct myself—to the gratification of the supremely just demand that Ireland be an independent nation with full self-control.

That for a time there remained a formal dependence on the English Crown, a connection of some kind or other, would be indifferent, if the completeness of independent state existence, the essential object, were secured. All must acknowledge the difficulty of the intermediate steps. But with an avowal of readiness to accept the ulterior end, with an avowal of the determination to work towards such end, the intervening stages would become indefinitely easier. The order, to all so desirable, would be more certainly attainable, disorder having lost its sole temporary justification or palliation. The irritation of ultimate denial removed, temperate

discussion of the best form of outward union, or of the best mode of effecting separation becomes possible. Mutual conciliation on the part of two states in such close juxtaposition would equally in the present, and with an eye to the future, be the dictate of good sense, and the furtherance of the interests of both, in the fullest signification of the term, would be the common interest of both.

The task is: to reconstitute a state with whose separate existence and self-growth we have so long interfered, without any success in transforming it into the image of ourselves, as has been desired. It is a task which is being undertaken elsewhere, and with certainly not stronger motives. Its urgency in each several case is matter for consideration. When the actual condition is tolerable, such condition may well endure till the deeper changes have been wrought from which this particular change, viz., the restoration of political independence, will spring as a perfectly natural consequence. In Ireland, the condition is not tolerable. More than half the nation, I take the cautious estimate of a very moderate statesman, idolizes the man who is demanding a new state of things.

In Ireland we have but one choice,—are we not becoming convinced of it,—the choice between a revolution effected peacefully and one accompanied by violence. No doubt we may tide over this particular explosion as we have tided over others, but if we read aright the facts of the case in all their integrity, we may be sure that it will return upon us. The tenacious memory of the Irish people, daily evidenced to the most inattentive, their geographical position, the circumstances of the whole political world in which we are living, all the doctrines which are current, the vague doctrine of nationality co-operating here with the determinate doctrine of the state as conceived by a sound political philosophy, all point to the conclusion, that, sooner or later, the solution I am advocating must be adopted, and if so, why not at once, with all due deli-berateness and precaution?

The empire of England is of most composite order, an aggregate of elements which have not been as yet, nor can ever be, welded into one organic whole. This, I feel sure, is a conviction the force of which grows daily, as the result of our dominant philosophical thought, and of the practical experience of our better statesmen. We are, however, appealed to, and the language goes home to the vast majority as yet of both parties, not to be inferior to our fore- fathers who won that empire, to defend it, and to hand it on with all that it involves as a great inheritance to our children. Variously interpreted by different minds, this is the general substance of the appeals to which we have been accustomed.

I will enter on no criticism, confine myself to no mere negation of the prevailing form of Imperialism. I put forward quite a different form, one assuredly of not less noble aspiration, nor making less demand on our intellect and morality. Not unmindful of the past, whilst we would rise superior to it, we should bend ourselves to the work of repairing what has been wrong in it, supplying its deficiencies where it has been weak; not exerting a merely defensive energy, but the higher energy of reconstruction, of creation, of organizing within the limits which we have reached a new and better order. Not, then, any longer as the centre of an oppressive system,—oppressive in some cases as regards its parts, in others, as regards other nations,—oppressive, that is, within itself, and in proportion to its success tending to be oppressive without,—but as the free originator of a new life for a number of independent states, should the England of the present and succeeding generations at once atone for, and justify, its glorious but chequered antecedents.

More immediately, and especially, is it desirable that this should be done for Ireland, and the first condition of its doing is that, as a people, we renounce all determination to hold Ireland against her will—a most difficult act of self-renunciation, but one that, if accomplished, is full of promise.

One serious objection will be urged. It is a matter of self-defence to us to hold Ireland. Independent, she is a danger. I should not accept this contingent danger as a sufficient dissuasive. But neither do I think that there is any real danger. Independent of England, and independent on the hypothesis of her being so by the aid of England, why should Ireland be hostile to England? Why should she, in the second place, invite a foreign power to make her the basis of its operations, and if seized against her will what value would there be in her as such basis? What power again is there into which, if her own mistress, she would be willing, given all her past history and character, to incorporate herself? It is impossible to shut out all contingencies, but within the bounds of moderate prevision is there really any sufficient danger to warrant those who accept this ground for her retention? I add that, if separate from England, there would cease all the motives for other nations interfering with her, which are connected with her dependent position. She would be as little involved in any English concerns as Switzerland; of very far less interest to England as a question of danger, than some of the other minor Continental states. Are we not, in our feelings and reasonings, on this head too much under the influence of older political associations and ideas, which are undergoing, if with extreme slowness, a transformation, and adapting themselves to the new order which is felt to be appearing in the horizon. Prudence may require us not to ignore too soon the old, but political wisdom has ever consisted in a due apprehension of the new which is being brought to the birth. But, as I said above, the possibility of ulterior danger would not weigh with me as an adequate deterrent from the policy I am advocating.

That there are grave difficulties in the state of Ireland itself I am well aware. There have always been such in the way of great changes. The establishment of the Union was not an easy task, nor the means by which it was effected delicate. Bring to the efforts of repeal and consequent reconstruction an equal energy, and the obstacles would not be found insurmountable.

In our government all resolves itself into a determination of the national will to uphold such change as the best deliberative wisdom, be it of one man or many, may think desirable. All resolves itself therefore into a modification of the national feeling and judgment. To this end each in his degree may contribute.

It were no mean result to have done with this festering sore in our national existence, which weighs upon our conscience and enfeebles our action. It were a gain of a high order to Humanity to have restored to its due perfection one of her immediate organs. I say restored, for the time was when to the general welfare of Europe Ireland largely contributed. She was a luminous spot in a darker world. The nation which through its statesmen shall make her the equal of others in a world which has become brighter will need no extrinsic compensation for any sacrifice.

In the complex organism of Humanity, as in the simpler organism of the human body, all members suffer when one suffers. The more perfect each is, the more it contributes to the welfare of its adjacent members and of the whole. In the past the rough processes of state unification have interfered with the unities which have been crowded into one political bond, and there has been a consequent blanching of the parts and diminution of their separate vitality. This may have been necessary. Is it so any longer, or are there not cases in which it is not so, in which the counter-process is indicated? It is my contention that Ireland is precisely a case of this kind, a case for the revision, in the interests of Humanity, of an unwholesome union. If rising above the bias of patriotism, as it is usually understood, we place ourselves at the standpoint of our aims and obligations as men, we shall have little difficulty in arriving at this conclusion, however various may be our judgment as to the immediate means. To the servants of Humanity all will be welcome that enriches and beautifies her continuous existence, and we can hardly question that it would be enriched and beautified by the re-integration of one of her organs, by its recovery of its own life, not, it may be feared, without considerable pain, but with an overbalance of ulterior good. In this spirit the surrender of cherished feelings which her service often involves, the progressive effort which it demands, will equally be accepted. Many have to surrender much in regard to Ireland, and the effort of her reconstitution will be great, but our past imposes both upon us, and in the acceptance of this inherited combination lie at once our duty and our wisdom.

Richard Congreve.

17 Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.
28 *Frederic* 92.

(1 *December*, 1880.)

P.S.—It is clear that repressive measures will be proposed when Parliament meets. All will depend on their character and accompaniments. Order and coercion are different ideas, and the firm maintenance of order, in its due measure, will be easy in proportion as it is kept distinct from all admixture of political compression, in proportion, that is, as it has no taste of the permanence of English rule and Irish dependence; in a word, in proportion as it is order pure that is the aim. It needs no prophetic power to foresee that whilst those other ideas are dominant there will be war between the two countries, not peace; war in one form or another. Whilst the Austrians held Italy we could accept and admire the social interdict enforced against them by the Italians. Why should we not allow for a similar social interdict aimed at our own intolerable supremacy—intolerable to the Irish, I mean. It is the only form of war left to a people held down by superior strength, a tenure of Ireland which would be as repulsive to us as to the Irish were we true to our history and professions. Yet even moderate men like Mr. Shaw-Lefevre tell us that the primary consideration is the upholding of the Queen's Government—which means, can mean, nothing but the absolute denial of the Irish wish for national independence. The outlook must be gloomy with such teaching in the ascendant.

Retrospect and Prospect.
A Sermon Preached in the Church of St. Mark, Opawa, Canterbury, New Zealand,
On Sunday, April 23, 1882,
By the Rev. George James Cholmondeley, Incumbent.
Published at the Request of the Parishioners
Christchurch: Printed by the Lyttelton Times Company Limited, Gloucester Street, 1882.

OF all those terse and expressive prayers of our English Liturgy—which are called Collects, because they collect, as it were, and sum up, in a few easily remembered words, some great Christian doctrine, and the

petition for some urgent need—there is none which so nearly concerns the laity of the Christian Church, and yet is so often forgotten by them, as the second for Good Friday, in which we offer our supplications and prayers before God "for all estates of men in Mis Holy Church, that every member of the same, in his vocation and ministry, may truly and godly serve Him." Not of the clergy exclusively or even chiefly, but of you, my brethren, you the mass of this congregation, to many of whom it probably seems strange to be told that you have a ministry in the Church of Christ, are these words spoken. It is not ordination, but baptism, which makes us members of Christ, limbs, that is, of that great body whereof He is the head; bound, therefore, to make some exertion for the health and welfare of the whole, to do something, acccording to our powers and opportunities, for the service of Christ and of our brethren; *for as we have many members*, or limbs, *in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another*. It is not ordination, but baptism, in which Christians are consecrated as *kings and priests to God* in which they are called to be *a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that they should shew forth the praises of Sim who has called them out of darkness into His marvellous light*.
BISHOP COTTON,

Retrospect and Prospect.

"This one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."
—PHILIPPIANS III., 13 14.

FOR several years past on the Sunday before our annual parish meeting, I have taken the opportunity of referring from this place to some matters connected with the position and welfare of the Parish, and the notice addressed to you to-day inviting you to meet to-morrow evening to elect Church Officers and receive a statement of the Parish accounts, provides another occasion for a similar address. I will therefore depart to-day from the themes usual to this pulpit, and refer to a few matters affecting our welfare as a congregation.

At Easter, we reach the end of our parochial year. Now, the end of one period is always the beginning of another; retrospect is ever bound up with prospect. It is this that always makes the end of any time so important to us—that it gives us the opportunity of making a new departure, opening to us new hopes, new talents, new mercies, enabling us to amend what has been amiss, and to renew in a better spirit, and with a more vigorous resolution, the work which is given us to do. Standing as we are, in this position, the words of St. Paul which I have just read to you, are full of lessons to us as a congregation, and as individuals. They give us a maxim to take with us into our new parochial year.

Let us briefly notice, how memory, hope, and work, are here united.

This thought is well brought out in a suggestive and interesting sermon on this text by ALEXANDER MACLAREN, in "Sermons Preached in Manchester."

The remembrance of the past has its great and precious uses. Not for nothing did God bestow upon us the precious gift of memory. What like memory destroys our self-conceit and stimulates our hopeful thankfulness! But we must beware of allowing any pensive, sentimental indulgence in it, either to foster a spirit of complacency and Tain confidence, or, on the other hand, to depress our spirits, to lead us to distrust God's help, and to relax our struggle against our besetting sins. St. Paul, who in this sense forgot *the things behind*, bids us to *reach forth to the things before*. Hope, which spurred men on to great deeds even in heathen times, was sanctified by Christ, and fixed upon a sure foundation. Past blessings are but earnests of future joys; past achievements of good are stepping-stones to greater victories; and even past sins, truly repented of and long forsaken, may inspire us with the sure and certain hope of the final conquest of all sin. Expectation rather than retrospect is naturally the posture of the young—they look forward to the distant future and think little of the brief past. But as we advance further into the ever-deepening valley of life, and its gradually rising rocks begin more and more to overshadow us, we begin almost unconsciously, to look more frequently back upon the path we have trodden in the wilderness, and to think less of the course to be traversed before we reach the goal. But these words of cheerful hope and unwearied devotion are the words of *Paul the aged*. As he affectingly tells us, they were written by him *in bonds*: in the face of an impending crisis. For nearly thirty years he had endured that storm of affliction, that pressure of labour, which followed the day of his conversion; now they are soon to be followed by the rest and calm of Heaven. And yet he says—*I suffer myself not to think of the completed portion of my Christian course, but, as a runner in your games, I stretch and strain every muscle and sinew to reach the goal*.

These noble words contain appropriate and practical lessons for us all. They tell us that, as Christian men and women, our business is with the present and the future, rather than with the past. They cheerfully and persuasively say to us—Dwell not in the darkness of departed joys, of unsuccessful efforts, or of wasted and

neglected opportunities, but let the thought of the future rouse you to a greater diligence and to a more sustained exertion. Let hopes for the future and lessons from the past alike lead to diligent work in the present. *"This one thing I do, forgetting those things that are behind, and, reaching forth unto those things that are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."*

It will soon be twenty years since I was appointed Pastor of the Parish of which Opawa was then a portion; three years before the erection of this church. To me, in the retrospect, it seems but yesterday; but twenty years are a long time in a man's life, a long time in the rapidly changing scenes of a young Colony. Restlessness, enterprise, activity, progress, in the departments of politics, science, commerce, and religion, have been almost everywhere, the most marked phenomena of this eventful period. The spread of commerce, the construction of railways, steam navigation, agricultural progress, industrial enterprise, and a multiplicity of other influences have combined to change this land from the New Zealand of twenty or thirty years ago into a highly civilised country, and all are still directly tending to increase our comforts and conveniences, and to augment our wealth and prosperity.

The history of a Parish, like the life of its Clergyman, is seldom marked by any great events or striking incidents. Far removed from stirring scenes and events, our parochial life has gone on quietly and smoothly, with little to attract attention or to make our annals interesting. But the lapse of twenty years, has necessarily wrought many changes, and in looking round on this congregation, I notice only some five or six persons who were resident here, when I came to the Parish. Besides those changes which time uniformly and inexorably brings to all, there are other changes peculiar to the experience of each. Neither your homes or mine have been exempt from joys and sorrows. I have witnessed prosperity and success in life, and sometimes loss and vicissitude. I have looked upon many lives leavened by the influence of Christ's Spirit, and I have seen the gloom of many a bed of sickness and death brightened by a calm resignation, a humble faith, and a sure and certain Christian hope. I have witnessed sorrow over some who have grown up to disappoint the promise of earlier years, and I have seen joy over others who have *turned from their evil ways, so that iniquity became not their ruin*. In no spirit of mock humiliation, in no insincere self-depreciation, I acknowledge how unworthy and imperfect my labours among you have been, and to Him who places the *treasure* of the ministry *in earthen vessels*,

2 Cor. iv. 7

to Him I can only say as my ministerial, no less than my personal prayer—"*Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified*."

Psalm cxliii. 2.

The past year has been chequered by many joys and sorrows, but in looking back upon it we must be thankful that *by the good hand of our God upon us*, sickness has made comparatively few inroads amongst us, and all we who worshipped here a year ago *are alive unto this day*. While the signs and tokens of a revived religious zeal and earnestness are on every side, we may, I think, in our own small sphere, note with pleasure some marks of progress, some tokens of awakened attention to the claims of religion. The results a Minister of Christ ought to look for are not such as can be seen now; they are, from their very nature, invisible to the eye of man *The day of Christ* is the time when *his work will be made manifest of what sort it is*.

1 Cor. iii. 13.

But we must not be unthankful for any visible signs of good amongst us as a congregation. Evidences of zeal and liberality, examples of punctuality and reverence in the House of God, earnest attention during the reading and preaching of God's Holy Word, increase in the number of our worshippers and communicants—these things are good; we ought to thank God for them, and recognise in them the tokens of His favour, the pledges and earnests of what He is able and ready to do in the midst of us, if we only know and are wise to improve *the day of our visitation*.

Now, what would St. Paul say to us, both pastor and people, under the circumstances in which we stand? He would urge us to beware of trusting to any trifling progress already made. He would bid us to put away, as the most insidious of evils, all feeling of self-satisfaction. He would remind us how little we have done after all, in proportion to our many helps and advantages—how far we are removed from the standard which is placed before us. In this way let us forget the past and look forward to the future, not boasting ourselves of any supposed improvement, but taking up the encouragement of any progress we witness, as the cheering light by which to look at all that yet remains to be accomplished, and praying that God will help us by His Spirit to do our work more faithfully.

If there is some reason to hope that God's work is progressing amongst us, there is yet much to humble us before Him. Our communicants, though increasing, are not so numerous as they should be, and no adequate proportion of those confirmed become regular attendants at the Lord's Table. Here, as elsewhere, there are many who regard themselves as members of our communion who rarely worship amongst us. They stay not away from dissatisfaction, but from unconcern; not from any feeling of dislike, but, I fear, in too many cases,

from a slothful indisposition to strive against an indolent habit. We have much need to ask ourselves why is it that we are not more "*glad, when it is said unto us, Let us go into the house of the Lord*?" Why is it that His Courts are not fuller of joy and blessedness? Why is it that obstacles prevent many from entering them, which would not stand in the way, if they were going to some entertainment, some neighbour's house, some public amusement? Let us take heed, lest with a fatal facility we dispense ourselves from public worship, on grounds which, though plausible now, will not stand in the light of the Great White Throne. I am referring to no peculiarity of our own parish. The evil is a great and growing one, a characteristic of the present age. If infidelity slay her thousands, indifference slays her tens of thousands. Is it not, alas! true that there are fewer instances than formerly in which the family comes forth from its door on Sunday—as a family—for the purposes of Christian instruction, prayer, and praise? Is it not, alas! true that we see fewer instances than formerly, of the husband kneeling beside the wife at the Lord's Table? I appeal to you, as Christian men and women, to reflect upon the importance of example in the matter of public worship. Here *our light must shine before men*, and our conduct must exert openly and in the face of day an influence for good or for evil. I ask you, by your example, by your influence, by your exhortations, and by your prayers, to uphold the sacred character of the Lord's Bay, and, when the church bell gives forth its invitation, to show by your alacrity in obeying it, that you share the pious sentiment expressed by the Psalmist when he paid—"*One dag in thy Courts is better than a thousand*." Why should we despair of seeing this House of God filled twice on the Lord's Day by worshippers eager for a more fervent devotion, stirred by a deeper sense of need, stimulated by a surer hope of acceptance?

We must all note with thankfulness the improvement in our congregational music, a result due to those who have exerted themselves to infuse new life into this important part of public worship. We owe it to the zeal and liberality of some members of our congregation, that an organ is soon to replace the harmonium, which has hitherto been in use. All, I doubt not, will be ready to have a share in providing the funds that are yet required for its purchase, It will be an important help in making the praise of God more perfect in our united worship. The praise of God is the noblest of all exercises of the faculties of man. "To set forth His most worthy praise" is a chief part of public worship because He has said "

Psalm 1. 23.

Whoso offereth Me thanks and praise he honoureth Me." When we think of those passages of Scripture in which not only the people of Israel with all their national instrumental music, but the whole of the animate creation "*everything that hath breath*" is summoned to unite in the praise of Jehovah;

Ps. lvii. 8-11, cviii. 1-6, cl.

when we remember that the Saviour Himself though "*a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief*" sang an hymn with his disciples on *the night on which he was betrayed*;

Matt. xxvii. 30.

when we call to mind that St. Paul speaks more than once of *psalms and hymns and spiritual songs*;

Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16.

and that from the glimpses of heaven vouchsafed to us in the Book of Revelation, praise seems beyond everything else to be the occupation and delight of the heavenly worshippers;

Rev. iv. 8-11, v. 11-14.

we must surely admit that it is a sacred duty, on the part of all persons, to endeavour to join, as God enables them, in this part of our worship. Let us all in good earnest set it before ourselves as a real and high object to make the services of this House of God as attractive, as animated, as hearty, and as vigorous as possible. Suffer mo to exhort all, to avail themseles of the large and highly privileged share which our Church assigns to them in the performance of her public service. Let no one be afraid to be heard in making the responses, or be ashamed of speaking them aloud. Each one can add something to the heartiness of our worship, and do something to give a still more real life to our matchless Liturgy.

A Confirmation will, I hope, be held in this church towards the close of the year, and I purpose holding classes of candidates as the time for it draws nearer. I should now, be glad to meet a class of young people for religious instruction and the study of the Bible. My intention is that the class should be inclusive of those who intend to present themselves at the approaching Confirmation, but by no means limited to them. It will give me pleasure to receive the names of all who desire to join such a class.

I need scarcely remind you that the national system of education, dealing as it does with our children as the children of this world, and not as heirs of a better kingdom, and so leaving out the "one thing needful," enhances the importance of the Sunday School as a piece of parochial machinery, and consequently makes it more incumbent upon us to promote its efficiency. The success of our Sunday School suffers much from irregular attendance, and I take this opportunity of publicly asking all parents, whose children attend it, to take care that they are regularly sent, and to support and encourage those who patiently labour in this unobtrusive field of usefulness, content to render services which are often but little valued, but which are discharged

heartily, as to the Lord, and not unto men."

Col. iii., 2-3.

Many of you, I think, will learn with surprise and disappointment, that the offerings collected in the church during the past year are less by some £42 than the offerings of the year that preceded it. For my part, I cannot but regard this circumstance, as an unsatisfactory feature of a year in which there has been a considerable increase in the number of worshippers, and an advance in the material prosperity of all classes of the community. An analysis of our offertory statistics shews, that we, as a congregation have not attained to an adequate observance of the apostolic rule, "*Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him*."

1 Cor., xvi. 2,

It is not, perhaps, so generally known as it ought to be, how numerous are the demands upon the Church Expenses Fund. Organist's salary, sexton's wages, and lighting are perhaps the most obvious, but they are only three among several items which have to be provided for, and which call for increased contributions. If the Scriptural duty of honouring God with our substance, is recognised by all, and some self-denial exercised in the fulfilment of it, there will be no difficulty in providing for the various expenses connected with our public worship, our school, our sick, our poor, and in rendering assistance to objects of a wider range.

Let us listen to the call that invites us to reach forward in thought and prayer to the prospect which is placed before us, and to reflect that as we are *members of the body of Christ*, every single member of that body has some part to fulfil, some function to perform. What is equally wanted in the Church at large, as well as in our own parish, to raise the standard of our work and to make us more truly prosperous, is a more united and corporate action, a stronger feeling of brotherhood, a deeper sense of personal responsibility, a firmer impression in the mind of each, that a portion of the honour of religion in the world, and of the efficacy, purity, and truth of his own Church, is entrusted to his hands. By hearty co-operation in good works, by the exercise of our various gifts and energies in the service of Christ and His Church—for which there is a wide scope in a parish—a new bond of spiritual brotherhood may be formed and cemented amongst us, and we shall approach nearer to the Scriptural idea of a Christian congregation, which is not, as alas! too often a modern congregation is—the concourse of atoms which are brought together in church, only to fly apart and shrink from mutual association the moment they are out of it—but a body so organised as that each and every member is made useful to the whole body, and the particular gift which God bestows on the weakest and most insignificant (for *He hath set the members in the body as it hath pleased Him*) is so appreciated and applied, that *the head* or *the eye*, the most intelligent or most discerning, cannot say to that weak member, "*I have no need of thee*."

1 Cor. xii.

Whatever view we may take of the tendencies of the age in which our lot is cast, we must all admit it to be an age of restless activity. Change follows change with unexampled rapidity, the fundamental principles of thought, belief, and action are laid bare to the most searching investigation, and intellectual difficulties and religious perplexities arise with which our fathers were not troubled. In these days of feverish restlessness and religious excitement, days in which many are crying *Lo here and Lo there!* measuring the spread of God's kingdom by the flocking of the multitude, by the balance-sheet, and the statistics, mistaking the visible shaking of the bones for the rising up of the mighty living host, it is well for us to remember who has said—*"The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation, the Kingdom of God is within you."* Deep, deep within, in that secret shrine which no stranger enters is the true work of God done. Of the Church, of the Ministry, and of each individual soul, the prophetic words are alike true, *in quietness*, not in excitement; *and in confidence*, not in mistrust, *shall be your strength*.

Isaiah xxx. 15.

I am not conscious of much change having passed over my religious views since I came among you. That the person of Christ is the centre of all life, that His word is the only foundation of doctrine and instruction, that *"there is one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus,"* that "*His blood cleanseth us from all sin,"* and that to believing prayer is given the sufficient aid of the Holy Spirit—such is *the word of the truth of the Gospel*—such, however feeble its utterance, has been, and with God's help will be, the staple and purport of my preaching among you. I know there are some in this Nineteenth Century to whom these truths appear effete, narrow, and old-fashioned; but let us cling to them in their simplicity, in their fulness, and in their strength, and let us beware, *lest haply* in despising them, *we be found even to fight against God*.

I must now bring to an end these collective thoughts; they refer to the congregation rather than the individual, but they are not without their individual, personal application. May God impress upon my own heart, the words I have spoken, for I know that I need as much as you do *"to stir up the gift of God that is in me*,"

2 Tim. i. 6.

to brace myself for a heartier and more earnest service.

Let me request your attendance at the meeting to-morrow evening, as there is need of the help of each, so there is a corresponding responsibility on the part of each to give it. I know that the cares and occupations of life are engrossing and exhausting, but surely it is good for any one to be called out of himself, out of his absorbing work, or worldly ambition or personal pleasures, to do something, something real, however humble, in the service of Christ, and of His Church. No man's personal religion can be done for him by deputy, and no man's Church institutions ought to be ordered for him, without his active and intelligent interest in their regulation. Let me as a fellow-sufferer and a fellow-sinner, beg of you to beware of "*weariness in well-doing*,"

Gal. vi. 9.

of that apathy which is one of our greatest trials and dangers, which leads too many to leave off personal work and think to condone for forsaken labour, by willingness to subscribe or direct. And let us not forget to offer up, one for another, the frequent, earnest prayer, that He "by whose Spirit the whole body of the Church is governed and sanctified" would enable us all, pastor and people, "in our several vocations and ministries, truly and godly to serve Him, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Vignette

Remarks ON WHAT IS REVEALED IN the Bible Concerning the Wages of Sin
Is that Death Everlasting?
"Thy Word is Truth."
ST. JOHN XVII., 17.
Price-Sixpence,
Any Profits will be applied to some Charitable Purpose.
Wellington: Lyon and Blair, Publishers and Printers, Lambton Quay. 1882.

Vignette

THE following remarks are the result of much anxious thoughtful inquiry, for many a year, into the meaning of those Scriptures which speak of a punishment for sin. The writer has purposely placed our Lord's words on the title-page, as he holds that all Scripture, being inspired of God, is true; that Scripture is the word of God, and does not contain the word of God only. But any interpretation of Scripture is not inspired. He would ask, if these remarks are noticed, that it may not be assumed that there is here a covert wish to qualify, or to alter, what is said so plainly by the Lord Jesus; or that he would in any way suggest that God's word, or any portion of that word, is not thus truth; or that he would take anything from the dread penalty to be endured by the transgressor. Scripture reveals a punishment—God's word, not man's opinion, must determine what it is. If man teaches, as of God, what is not of God, such teaching will lead to unbelief in all of the Bible.

The Bible always declares that God will punish sin both here and hereafter. This punishment is called, "The wages of sin," Romans vi., 23; "The fruit of their own way," Proverbs, i., 31. It is said in many places that the punishment after death will be very terrible, St. Mark, ix., 44, &c., &c.

I.—BUT IS THERE ADDED TO THIS SEVERITY ENDLESSNESS?

1. Our natural feeling is against such a duration. We hesitate to receive the idea that sin, done by a finite man, should be punished by an infinite doom.

2. Our natural feeling concerning God is also against it. God is pleased to measure His love by a father's love for his children, St. Luke xi., 13. Most certainly no earthly parent would inflict such a punishment upon his child for any evil.

3. God has been pleased to justify His actions by an appeal to this our sense of right and wrong dealing. In Ezekiel xviii., He defends Himself against the unjust charges of the Jews. Again in Micah vi., 3, there is an appeal to man from God; where God would also justify His fair dealing.

II.—DID THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH TEACH THIS DOCTRINE?

1. Justin Martyr, A.D. 150, in his Dialogue with Trypho, speaks of his Instructor teaching, "That the evil will be punished so long as God wills them to exist and to be punished." Bishop Lincoln's Justin Martyr, 1836, p. 99,

2. St. Augustine, about A.D. 400, writes, "That some, nay very many," (*non-nulli immo quam plurimi*) did not in his day hold this doctrine. He calls them "our tender-hearted ones," (*nostri misericordes.)* He adds that this matter must be "quietly treated," *(pacifice disputandum*.) Aug. de Civitate Dei, xx., 25.

3. St. Gregory of Nyssa, writes in his "Catechical Oration," "Our Lord in His Incarnation, was benefiting, not only him who was lost, but even him who wrought this destruction against us," * * * "In the same way, in the long circuits of time, when the evil of nature, which is now mingled and implanted in them, has been taken away, whensoever the restoration to their old condition of the things which now lie in wickedness takes place, there will be an unanimous thanksgiving from the whole creation, both of those who have been punished in the purification, and of those who have not at all needed purification." * * He speaks of the Incarnation as "both liberating man from his wickedness, and healing the very inventor of wickedness." Farrar, Mercy and Judgment, 1881, p. 257.

St. Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, A.D. 372, was one of the most eminent theologians of that age. He defended the Church against the Arians, and drew up the Nicene Creed, at the Council of Constantinople. He died A.D. 396.

4. As far as is known nothing was decided upon this matter in the first four General Councils. And if the teaching of the Church had always been distinct upon this point, it would be a strange thing, that Justin should have been instructed as he was; that Augustine did not at once urge this fact as an unanswerable argument against those tender-hearted ones who held a different belief; or that St. Gregory should have so written; and that the doctrine is not in their creeds.

III.—Does the Church of England Hold this Doctrine?

1. Our Reformers held it certainly, but they teach in the 6th Article, that nothing is to be considered as an article of the faith which cannot be proved by "most certain warrant of Holy Scripture."

2. In 1562, A.D., the 42nd Article of 1552, A.D., was removed. This ran, "All men shall not be saved at the length. They also are worthy of condemnation who endeavour at this time to restore the dangerous opinion that all men, be they never so ungodly, shall be at length saved, when they have suffered pain for their sins a certain time appointed of God."

3. The language of the Privy Council Judgment, February, 1864, runs, "We do not find in the formularies * * * any suchdistinct declaration of our Church upon the subject, as to require us to condemn as penal the expression of hope, by a clergyman, that even the ultimate pardon of the wicked, who are condemned at the day of judgment, may be consistent with the will of Almighty God."

IV.—Does the Bible Teach this Doctrine?

If it does, there is at once an end to all argument on the matter. Every text bearing upon the subject must be carefully examined to ascertain this point. The Revised version will be here always used.

St. Matthew iii., 12: "The chaff He shall burn up with unquenchable fire." Here, the allusion is to the burning-up of the chaff of a threshing floor. The flame of such a fire is fierce, unquenchable, while it lasts; but it is soon exhausted. The analogy would seem to be that the punishment of the wicked will be severe but not necessarily everlasting. The chaff is utterly consumed, and the text might be held to teach annihilation of the wicked after punishment. It is not well to give the especial meaning of endlessness to one word when all else is figurative; and when such meaning is contrary to the action described. The fire of the threshing floor is extinguished; it is not endless.

St. Matthew, v., 22: "Shall be in danger of the hell of fire;" or, more literally, "The Gehennah of fire."

As the Revisors have kept the word Hades (St. Luke, xvi., 23), so should they Gehennah.

Our Lord is here speaking of the three Jewish sentences—that of the Judgment; that of the Council; the Casting into Gehennah of the body of the criminal. This Gehennah was in the Vale of Hinnom; a fire there burned up the city refuse.

St. Matthew, v., 29: "Into hell" (Gehennah). The meaning would be, in the minds of those who heard Jesus, that such an one would be utterly condemned. The nature of the condemnation which God would inflict, and its duration, are not spoken of.

St. Matthew, vii., 19: "Cast into the fire." All that is said here is the evil tree shall be burned; the evil doer condemned.

St. Matthew, viii., 12: "Cast into the outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The severity of the punishment is here spoken of, but not the duration.

St. Matthew, x., 28: "Fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Gehennah). These words might be used as if teaching annihilation, but not endlessness of the punishment.

St. Matthew, xii., 31-32: Sin against the Holy Spirit "Shall not be forgiven, neither in this world (or age) nor in that which is to come." The Jews spoke of the dispensation of the Christ as that which was to come. Our Lord most certainly will condemn this sin, whatever it may be, in the Day of Judgment. But He does not say what that condemnation will be, nor of what length. The corresponding passage, St. Mark, iii., 29, runs, "Hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin." The literal rendering is, "Has not forgiveness for the age," &c. The literal meaning of #####o# (aionion) is eternal, age-long. The argument from this use of this word will be particularly noticed at the end of these texts from St. Matthew.

St. Matthew, xiii., 42: "And shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." The tares are burned-up and exist no more. Here, annihilation might be taught, but not any endlessness of the fire.

St. Matthew, xiii., 50: As at 42 v.

St. Matthew, xviii., 8: "Into the eternal fire" #####o# (aionion).

St. Matthew, xviii., 9: "Into the hell of fire" (the Gehennah of fire). This passage is figurative; for how can anyone be halt in heaven, where all is perfect? If figurative words are used when heaven is spoken of, why are the latter words to be taken literally, and be said to teach an endlessness of punishment? As before, the severity, but not the duration of the punishment, is enforced.

St. Matthew, xxii., 13: "The outer darkness." No duration is given. As before, here is the severity of the punishment, not its duration.

St. Matthew, xxiii., 33: "The judgment of hell" (Gk., the Gehennah), escape, it is here said, the severest sentence of the Judge; as above, chap, v., 22.

St. Matthew, xxv., 30: The same as chap, xxii., 13 v.

St. Matthew, xxv., 41: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels." 46 v.: "And these shall go away into eternal punishment; but the righteous into eternal life." As this passage is the one chiefly insisted upon by those who hold the endlessness of punishment after death, it must be very carefully considered. The argument is, "the life" called "eternal" is confessedly endless; the punishment, called also "eternal," must be also endless.

1. The word eternal is ###### (aionios), and is formed from the word #### (aion), meaning age; and the literal meaning of the adjective is lasting for an age, for a definite period, not everlasting. Other Greek words could have been used which have not any uncertainty of meaning, as that used Hebrews, vii., 16—"After the power of an endless life" ########o# (akatalutou).

The following will show how much more frequently aion, and its derivations, are used than other words, which could have been used. The list is believed to be approximately correct:—Aion, used 122 places; Aidios, Romans i., 20: Jude, 6; Eis to dienekes, Hebrews x., 12,14 Akatalutos, Hebrews vii., 16; Aperantos, 1 Timothy i., 4; Aparabatos, Hebrews vii., 24; Asbestos, St. Matthew iii. 12: St. Luke iii, 17: St. Mark ix., 43,44, 46, 48.

2. The word #### (aion) is used of our Lord's kingdom: St. Luke, i., 33, "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever" ### #o## ###### (eis tous aionas), "and of His kingdom there shall be no end" o## #o### ###o# (ouk estai telos). But St. Paul writes, 1 Corinthians xv., 24: "Then cometh the end, when He shall deliver up The Kingdom to God, even The Father." Verse 28: "Then shall The Son also Himself be subjected to Him, that did subject all things unto Him, that God may be all in all." If then the words, thus used of our Lord's Kingdom, must here mean only that The Kingdom shall last in all its completeness, until the end of the ages, and not that The Kingdom is everlasting, why may not the same phrase have a like limited meaning, when it is used of sins' punishment?

3. In v. 46, the word for punishment is #o##o## (kolasin), and the proper meaning of this word is pruning, chastising for improvement. Justin Martyr, writing of Gehennah, says: "Gehennah is the place where the wicked shall be chastised," using the verb corresponding to #o##o##. Apol. I., p. 66 B. Bishop Lincoln, p. 103.

4. In v. 82, the word used is "kids"; and in v. 33 "kidlings"; words expressing affection, and not abhorrence.

5. Once only, Hebrews x., 29, the word *##μ####* (tiraoria) is used. This word can only mean vengeance, and yet then may be even in a *#o#####* (kolasis), a *##μ####* (timoria), a just punishment for evil done, and therefore a *##μ####* (timoria), which yet shall be for the chastisement and reformation of the offender.

6. Our Lord's words are, v. 34, "Come ye blessed of my Father;" but v. 41, "Depart from Me ye cursed"—not cursed of my Father, as before. The Life depends upon God's blessing, but the Judgment depends upon the judgment of the Lord Jesus. In St. John, v., 22, He saith: "For neither doth the Father judge any man, but He hath given all judgment unto the Son." May not then every sentence end when the Kingdom of the Judge shall end. The judgment, which is for ever, as is the Kingdom,—*### #o## ###### ### ######*—(eis tous

aionas ton aionon), lasting the full length of the Kingdom, but then ceasing?

St. Mark ix., 45 to end. Much of this passage has been noticed above. The following words are new:—"Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." This passage is confessedly figurative, and why should any particular phrase be accepted literally? It would seem that here, as in St. Matthew iii., 12, the intensity of the fire is intended; that the worm, whatever that may be, will not die during anything of the punishment. What is told, v. 49, tends to this conclusion, that the punishment is not everlasting, "Every one shall be salted with fire." Even without the commonly found words, which are omitted in the Revised Version, "every sacrifice shall be salted with salt," the reference is to the salted sacrifices of the Law. But all the salted sacrifices were Peace-offerings, which were accepted of God; not Sin-offerings, which were utterly consumed, as accursed. Salt was not used with the Sin-offering.

St. Matthew, xxvi., 24: "Good were it for that man if he had not been born." His punishment would be of such severity that it would have been better for him never to have lived. If Judas ever reached heaven, could he ever forget the past? Memory will not be extinguished of that which has been done rightfully, why of evil done.

St. Luke, xvi., 23. The parable is clearly figurative, for the rich man, before the Resurrection, speaks as if his soul were clothed with a body. His brethren also are alive. The gulf was then fixed, but there is nothing said of the permanence of the gulf after the Resurrection.

2. St. Peter, ii., 9: "Under punishment," *#o###oμ##o##* (kolazomenous); literally under chastisement. See above on St. Matthew xxv. If the literal meaning of the word is used here, St. Peter shows that the condition of the wrong doer is not fixed at the time of his death.

Revelations, ending chapters. It is said that these chapters indicate a finality. There is judgment and nothing more. "The wicked judged are to retain their filthiness and unrighteousness"—Revelations xxii., 11. And this is their very punishment. They will now learn the evil of sin, and be forced to hate what once they loved. But there is nothing to set aside any teaching from the rest of the Bible. If there be any possibility of an ending to sin taught there, here is nothing against such teaching.

The above noticed passages are those chiefly advanced by those who hold that the punishment for sin is everlasting. Other passages must now be examined, which show, as it would appear, that this punishment is not everlasting.

Romans v. St. Paul here teaches a very opposite doctrine, if his careful, and frequently repeated, words are to be taken literally, and not explained according to a preformed conclusion. It should be remembered that from our Lord's words, St. John xvi., 12-16, we should expect to find a fuller exhibition of God's grace in the Epistles than in the Gospels. And, also, in such an enquiry it is far better, safer, to rest on a general meaning, gained from a whole passage, than on isolated texts.

1. The Apostle distinctly states that grace will overcome sin: Romans v., 20. But it is impossible to understand how there will be this overcoming, if many be lost. In each age of the world the believers have been few, the unbelievers many. Sin seems to have abounded over grace alway as yet, and it always will so abound if all these unbelievers are for ever lost.

2. In the 15th verse the words: "The many died" mean confessedly that all have died, but why shall not the same words have exactly the same force in the corresponding half of the sentence?

In the 18th verse: "All men" of the first half of the verse is equivalent also to "all men" in the second half.

In the 19th verse: "The many" and "the many" are of equal value.

Yet those who hold that sins' punishment is everlasting make the first words to mean all, without any restriction; but the second words to mean not all, but those only who accept a profferred life.

1 Corinthians xv., 24-26: St. Paul here teaches that every enemy shall be "abolished."

Phillippians ii., 9-10: St. Paul teaches that God hath highly exalted Jesus, that every tongue should "confess that He is Lord to the glory of God the Father." The confession would seem to be that of praise in all; not of praise in some, and of fearful reverence in others. See St. Gregory's teachings above II. 3.

Colossians i., 20: St. Paul shows that God would "through Him reconcile all things to himself"—"whether things upon the earth."

St. Luke xii., 47-48: Our Lord here speaks of a gradation in this punishment, contrasting the few and many stripes. So St. Matthew xi., 20-25. But there could not be this contrast if the light and heavy punishment were both everlasting. The weight is not so much the penalty, but that it shall be for ever.

V.—Other Suggestions Against an Everlasting Death.

1. It is said that the Bible nowhere speaks of grace offered to the lost. But none now can believe, and pass

from death unto life, without God's grace. Why should not a similar grace be offered unto those who have at length learned that of which before they knew nothing—the bitterness of sin? I cannot suppose that any of these lost would then refuse to escape from the wrath which had come upon them. Before, they knew nothing of sin's death; they could not, and would not, seek to escape from sin. I do not think that the joy of heaven would be perfect for the redeemed if this offer of grace could not be. Memory would still remind them of their lost, even in the midst of their own joy.

2. The Bible says very little definitely of the condition of the blest or the lost. The state of both is chiefly described by figures. We could not understand any more exact description. But if figures are used to describe the nature of the punishment, why not to describe its duration?

3. The opposite doctrine, that the punishment is "eternal," but not "ever-lasting," seems to clear up much that is full now of difficulty. The thought, "Why did a God of infinite mercy and of power, permit sin?"—which has been a cause of bitterness to many, silenced hardly by the reply, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right," seems here to be answered. God permitted it, because He intended to overcome it by His grace. The recovery, even of the lost angels, would be a grace abounding most exceedingly. See St. Gregory, II. 3, above.

4. Those who now hold that this punishment is everlasting, differ widely from those, who in past time very commonly held that, with this, there was a literal punishing by fire. Most hold now that the punishment is spiritual. If there has been so great a change in the minds of Christians concerning the nature of this punishment, may there not be a like change, as from a common mistake, as to its duration.

5. Confessedly, much of Heathenism was imported into Christianity after the times of Constantine. The Heathen taught an endless punishment. This their doctrine may have then crept into the Church, as it does not seem to have been held by the Church before Constantine. See II. above.

6. Those who object now to Christianity, and to the character of God, on the supposition that there is an endless punishment for sin, could not object to the teaching that there is a punishment, the duration of the punishment proportionate to the character of the sin. They do not object to God's justice but to His (supposed) injustice.

7. Nor is there encouragement given to sin in this definition of sin's punishment. St. Paul writes, Romans vi., 1: "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid." No exhibition of God's love can lead to evil necessarily. The concealment of His love has led to evil. And that which is true must be spoken, no matter what may be the result.

8. *The wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Jesus Christ our Lord*. Romans vi., 23.

Postscript.

Some have said that, as in the Scriptures the word eternal is applied to God, if the word be not equivalent to everlasting, a limit is placed to the existence of God. But Scripture saith that God is eternal and everlasting; that sin's death is eternal but not everlasting. Scripture shews that God is everlasting. See Exodus iii., 14; 1 Timothy, vi., 16, &c.

The words "everlasting fire" at the end of the Athanasian Creed should be "eternal fire." The adjective for fire is the same as in St. Matthew xxv., 46.

Some have said that Satan is the author of the doctrine of such an ending to sin's punishment. These should shew that Adam knew clearly that endlessness was attached to the words he had heard, "Ye shall surely die." If he did not know this, the objection is irrelevant. What Satan urged was, 'What you understand by that word die shall not happen."

The Author will gladly reply to *any temperate letters addressed to him through his publishers*.

Vignette

The Sabbath
Presidential Address to the Glasgow Sunday Society
Delivered in st Andrew's Hall
October 25, 1880
By John Tyndall, F.R.S.
London Longmans, Green, and Co. 1880 London: Printed by Spottiswoode and Co., New-Street Square and Parliament Street

Preface.

I HAVE been so strongly, and I might add so practically, urged to allow this Address to be printed in a

pamphlet form, that I could not reasonably refuse to do so.

A few paragraphs have been added since its publication in the November number of the 'Nineteenth Century.'

JOHN TYNDALL.

ATHENÆUM CLUB:

December 1880.

The Sabbath.

IN the opening words of a Lecture delivered in this city four years ago, I spoke of the desire and tendency of the present age to connect itself organically with preceding ages. The expression of this desire is not limited to the connecting of the material organisms of to-day with those of the geologic past, as set forth in the doctrines of Mr. Darwin. It is equally manifested in the domain of mind. To this source, for example, may be traced the philosophical writings of Mr. Herbert Spencer. To it we are indebted for the series of learned works on 'The Sources of Christianity, by M. Renan. To it also we owe the researches of Professor Max Müller in comparative philology and mythology, and the endeavour to found on these researches a 'science of religion.' In this relation, moreover, the recent work of Principal Caird

Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion.

is highly characteristic of the tendencies of the age. He has no words of vituperation for the older phases of faith. Throughout the ages he discerns a purpose and a growth, wherein the earlier and more imperfect religions constitute the natural and necessary precursors of the later and more perfect ones. Even in the slough of ancient paganism, Principal Caird detects a power ever tending towards amelioration, ever working towards the advent of a better state, and finally emerging in the purer life of Christianity.

In Prof. Max Müller's *Introduction to the Science of Religion* some excellent passages occur, embodying the above view of the continuity of religious development.

These changes in religious conceptions and practices correspond to the changes wrought by augmented experience in the texture and contents of the human mind. Acquainted as we now are with this immeasurable universe, and with the energies operant therein, the guises under which the sages of old presented the Maker and Builder thereof seem to us to belong to the utter infancy of things. To point to illustrations drawn from the heathen world would be superfluous. We may mount higher, and still find our assertion true. When, for example, Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy Elders of Israel are represented as climbing Mount Sinai, and actually seeing there the God of Israel, we listen to language to which we can attach no significance. 'There is in all this,' says Principal Caird, 'much which, even when religious feeling is absorbing the latent nutriment contained in it, is perceived [by the philosophic Christian of to-day] to belong to the domain of materialistic and figurative conception. The children of Israel received without idealisation the statements of their great lawgiver. To them the tables of the law were true tablets of stone, prepared, engraved, broken, and re-engraved; while the graving tool which inscribed the law was held undoubtingly to be the finger of God.' To us such conceptions are impossible. We may by habit use the words, but we attach to them no definite meaning. 'As the religions education of the world advances,' says Principal Caird, 'it becomes impossible to attach any literal meaning to those representations of God, and his relations to mankind, which ascribe to Him human senses, appetites, passions, and the actions and experiences proper to man's lower and finite nature.'

Principal Caird, nevertheless, ascribes to this imaging of the Unseen a special value and significance. It provides an objective counterpart to religious emotion, permanent but plastic—capable of indefinite change and purification in response to the changing moods and aspirations of mankind. It is solely on this mutable element that he fixes his attention in estimating the religious character of individuals or of nations. 'Here,' he says, 'the fundamental inquiry is as to the objective character of their religious ideas or beliefs. The first question is, not how they feel, but what they think and believe; not whether their religion manifests itself in emotions more or less vehement or enthusiastic, but what are the conceptions of God and divine things by which these emotions are called forth?' These conceptions 'of God and divine things' were, it is admitted, once 'materialistic and figurative,' and therefore objectively untrue. Nor is their purer essence yet distilled; for the religious education of the world still 'advances,' and is, therefore, incomplete. Hence the essentially fiuxional character of that objective counterpart to religious emotion to which Principal Caird attaches most importance. He, moreover, assumes that the emotion is called forth by the conception. We have doubtless action and reaction here; but it

may be questioned whether the conception, which is a construction of the human understanding, could be at all put together without materials drawn from the experience of the human heart.

While reading the volume of Principal Caird I was reminded more than once of the following passage in Renan's *Antéchrist*:—'Et d'ailleurs, quel est l'homme vraiment religieux qui répudie complètement l'enseignement traditionnel à l'ombre duquel il sentit d'abord l'idéal, qui ne cherche pas les conciliations, souvent impossibles, entre sa vieille foi et celle à laquelle il est arrivé par le progrès de sa pensée?'

The changes of conception here adverted to have not always been peacefully brought about. The 'trans-mutation' of the old beliefs was often accompanied by conflict and suffering. It was conspicuously so during the passage from paganism to Christianity. In his work entitled 'L'Eglise Chrétienne,' Renan describes the sufferings of a group of Christians at Smyrna which may be taken as typical. The victims were cut up by the lash till the inner tissues of their bodies were laid bare. They were dragged naked over pointed shells. They were torn by lions; and finally, while still alive, were committed to the flames. But all these tortures failed to extort from them a murmur or a cry. The fortitude of the early Christians gained many converts to their cause. Still, when the evidential value of fortitude is considered, it must not be forgotten that almost every faith can point to its rejoicing martyrs. Even these Smyrna murderers had a faith of their own, the imperilling of which by Christianity spurred them on to murder. From faith they extracted the diabolical energy which animated them. The strength of faith is, therefore, no proof of the objective truth of faith. Indeed, at the very time here referred to we find two classes of Christians equally strong—Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians—who, while dying for the same Master, turned their backs upon each other, mutually declining all fellowship and communion.

Thus early the forces which had differentiated Christianity from paganism made themselves manifest in details, producing disunion among those whose creeds and interests were in great part identical. Struggles for priority were not uncommon. Jesus himself had to quell such contentions. His exhortations to humility were frequent. 'He that is least among you shall be greatest of all.' There were also conflicts upon points of doctrine. The difference which concerns us most had reference to the binding power of the Jewish law. Here dissensions broke out among the apostles themselves. Nobody who reads with due attention the epistles of Paul can fail to see that this mighty propagandist had to carry on a lifelong struggle to maintain his authority as a preacher of Christ. There were not wanting those who denied him all vocation. James was the head of the Church at Jerusalem, and Judeo-Christians held that the ordination of James was alone valid. Paul, therefore, having no mission from James, was deemed by some a criminal intruder. The real fault of Paul was his love of freedom, and his uncompromising rejection, on behalf of his Gentile converts, of the chains of Judaism. He proudly calls himself 'the Apostle of the Gentiles.' He says to the Corinthians, 'I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they of the seed of Abraham? So am I. Are they ministers of Christ? I am more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft.' He then establishes his right to the position which he claimed by recounting in detail the sufferings he had endured. I leave it to you to compare this Christian hero with some of the 'freethinkers' of our own day, who flaunt in public their cheap and trumpery theories of the great Apostle and the Master whom he served.

Paul was too outspoken to escape assault. All insincerity and double-facedness—all humbug, in short—were hateful to him; and even among his colleagues he found scope for this feeling. Judged by our standard of manliness, Peter, in moral stature, fell far short of Paul. In that supreme moment when his Master required of him 'the durance of a granite ledge' Peter proved 'unstable as water.' He ate with the Gentiles, when no Judeo-Christian was present to observe him; but when such appeared he withdrew himself, fearing those which were of the circumcision. Paul charged him openly with dissimulation. But Paul's quarrel with Peter was more than personal. Paul contended for a principle, determined, at all hazards, to shield his Gentile children in the Lord from the yoke which their Jewish co-religionists would have imposed upon them. 'If thou,' he says to Peter, 'being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as the Jews?' In the spirit of a true liberal he overthrew the Judaic preferences for days, deferring at the same time to the claims of conscience. 'Let him who desires a Sabbath,' he virtually says, 'enjoy it; but let him not impose it on his brother who does not.' The rift thus revealed in the apostolic lute widened with time, and Christian love was not the feeling which long animated the respective followers of Peter and Paul.

We who have been born into a settled state of things can hardly realise the primitive commotions out of which this tranquillity has emerged. We have, for example, the canon of Scripture already arranged for us. But to sift and select these writings from the mass of spurious documents afloat at the time of compilation was a work of vast labour, difficulty, and responsibility. The age was rife with forgeries. Even good men lent themselves to these pious frauds, believing that true Christian doctrine, which of course was *their* doctrine, would be thereby quickened and promoted. There were gospels and counter-gospels; epistles and counter-epistles—some frivolous, some dull, some speculative and romantic, and some so rich and penetrating,

so saturated with the Master's spirit, that, though not included in the canon, they enjoyed an authority almost equal to that of the canonical books. The end being held to sanctify the means, there was no lack of manufactured testimony. The Christian world seethed not only with apocryphal writings, but with hostile interpretations of writings not apocryphal. Then arose the sect of the Gnostics—men who *know*—who laid claim to the possession of a perfect science, and who, if they were to be believed, had discovered the true formula for what philosophers called 'the absolute.' But these speculative Gnostics were rejected by the conservative and orthodox Christians of their day as fiercely as their successors the Agnostics—men who *don't know*—are rejected by the orthodox in our own. The martyr Polycarp one day met Marcion, an ultra-Paulite, and a celebrated member of the Gnostic sect. On being asked by Marcion whether he, Polycarp, did not know him, Polycarp replied, 'Yes, I know you very well; you are the first-born of the devil.'

L'Eglise Chrétienne, p. 450.

This is a sample of the bitterness then common. It was a time of travail—of throes and whirlwinds. Men at length began to yearn for peace and unity, and out of the embroilment was slowly consolidated that great organisation the Church of Rome. The Church of Rome had its precursor in the Church *at* Rome. But Rome was then the capital of the world; and, in the end, that great city gave the Christian Church established in her midst such a decided preponderance, that it eventually laid claim to the proud title of 'Mother and Matrix of all other Churches.'

With jolts and oscillations, resulting at times in overthrow, the religious life of the world has spun down 'the ringing grooves of change.' A smoother route may have been undiscoverable. At all events it was undiscovered. Many years ago I found myself in discussion with a friend who entertained the notion that the general tendency of things in this world is towards an equilibrium of peace and blessedness to the human race. My notion was that equilibrium meant not peace and blessedness, but death. No motive power is to be got from heat, save during its *fall* from a higher to a lower temperature, as no power is to be got from water save during its descent from a higher to a lower level. Thus also life consists, not in equilibrium, but in the passage towards equilibrium. In man it is the leap from the potential, through the actual, to repose. The passage often involves a fight. Every natural growth is more or less of a struggle with other growths, in which, in the long run, the fittest survives. In times of strife and commotion we may long for peace; but knowledge and progress are the fruits of action. Some are, and must be, wiser than the rest; and the enunciation of a thought in advance of the moment provokes dissent or wins approval, and thus promotes action. The thought may be unwise; but it is only by discussion, checked by experience, that its value can be determined. Discussion, therefore, is one of the motive powers of life, and, as such, is not to be deprecated. Still one can hardly look without despair on the passions excited, and the energies wasted, over questions which, after ages of strife, are shown to be mere foolishness. Thus the theses which shook the world during the first centuries of the Christian era have, for the most part, shrunk into nothingness. It may, however, be that the human mind could not become fitted to pronounce judgment on a controversy otherwise than by wading through it. We get clear of the jungle by traversing it. Thus even the errors, conflicts, and sufferings of bygone times may have been necessary factors in the education of the world. Let nobody, however, say that it has not been a hard education. The yoke of religion has not always been easy, nor its burden light—a result arising, in part, from the ignorance of the world at large, but more especially from the mistakes of those who had the charge and guidance of a great spiritual force, and who guided it blindly. Looking over the literature of the Sabbath question, as catalogued and illustrated in the laborious, able, and temperate work of the late Mr. Robert Cox, we can hardly repress a sigh in thinking of the gifts and labours of intellect which this question has absorbed, and the amount of bad blood it has generated. Further reflection, however, reconciles us to the fact that waste in intellect may be as much an incident of growth as waste in nature.

When the various passages of the Pentateuch which relate to the observance of the Sabbath are brought together, as they are in the excellent work of Mr. Cox, and when we pass from them to the similarly collected utterances of the New Testament, we are immediately exhilarated by a freer atmosphere and a vaster sky. Christ found the religions of the world oppressed almost to suffocation by the load of formulas piled upon them by the priesthood. He removed the load, and rendered respiration free. He cared little for forms and ceremonies, which had ceased to be the raiment of man's spiritual life. To that life he looked, and it he sought to restore. It was remarked by Martin Luther that Jesus broke the Sabbath deliberately, and even ostentatiously, for a purpose. He walked in the fields; he plucked, shelled, and ate the corn; he treated the sick, and his spirit may be detected in the alleged imposition upon the restored cripple of the labour of carrying his bed on the Sabbath day. He crowned his protest against a sterile formalism by the enunciation of a principle which applies to us to-day as much as to the world in the time of Christ. 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.'

Though the Jews, to their detriment, kept themselves as a nation intellectually isolated, the minds of individuals were frequently coloured by Greek thought and culture. The learned and celebrated Philo, who was contemporary with Josephus, was thus influenced. Philo expanded the uses of the seventh day by including in

its proper observance studies which might be called secular. 'Moreover,' he says, 'the seventh day is also an example from which you may learn the propriety of studying philosophy. As on that day it is said God beheld the works that He had made, so you also may yourself contemplate the works of Nature.' Permission to do this is exactly what the members of the Sunday Society humbly claim. The Jew, Philo, would grant them this permission, but our straiter Christians will not. Where shall we find such samples of those works of Nature which Philo commended to the Sunday contemplation of his countrymen as in the British Museum? Within those walls we have, as it were, epochs disentombed—ages of divine energy illustrated. But the efficient authorities—among whom I would include a short-sighted portion of the public—resolutely close the doors, and exclude from the contemplation of these things the multitudes who have only Sunday to devote to them. Taking them on their own ground, we ask, are the authorities logical in doing so? Do they who thus stand between them and us really believe those treasures to be the work of God? Do they or do they not hold, with Paul, that 'the eternal power and Godhead' may be clearly seen from 'the things that are made'? If they do—and they dare not affirm that they do not—I fear that Paul, in his customary language, would pronounce their conduct in shutting us out to be 'without excuse.'

I refer, of course, to those who object to the opening of the Museums on religious grounds. The administrative difficulty stands on a different footing. But surely *it* ought to vanish in presence of the public benefits which in all probability would accrue.

Science, which is the logic of nature, demands proportion between the house and its foundation. Theology sometimes builds weighty structures on a doubtful base. The tenet of Sabbath observance is an illustration. With regard to the time when the obligation to keep the Sabbath was imposed, and the reasons for its imposition, there are grave differences of opinion between learned and pious men. Some affirm that it was instituted at the Creation in remembrance of the rest of God. Others allege that it was imposed after the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and in memory of that departure. The Bible countenances both interpretations. In Exodus we find the origin of the Sabbath described with unmistakable clearness, thus:— 'For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. *Wherefore* the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it.' In Deuteronomy this reason is suppressed and another is assigned. Israel being a servant in Egypt, God, it is stated, brought them out of it through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm. '*Therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.' After repeating the Ten Commandments, and assigning the foregoing origin to the Sabbath, the writer in Deuteronomy proceeds thus:—'These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and the thick darkness, with a loud voice; and he added no more.' But in Exodus God not only added more, but something entirely different. This has been a difficulty with commentators—not formidable, if the Bible be treated as any other ancient book, but extremely formidable on the theory of plenary inspiration. I remember in the days of my youth being shocked and perplexed by an admission made by Bishop Watson in his celebrated 'Apology for the Bible,' written in answer to Tom Paine. 'You have,' says the bishop, 'disclosed a few weeds which good men would have covered up from view.' That there were 'weeds' in the Bible requiring to be kept out of sight was to me, at that time, a new revelation. I take little pleasure in dwelling upon the errors and blemishes of a book rendered venerable to me by intrinsic wisdom and imperishable associations. But when that book is wrested to our detriment, when its passages are invoked to justify the imposition of a yoke, irksome because unnatural, we are driven in self-defence to be critical. In self-defence, therefore, we plead these two discordant accounts of the origin of the Sabbath, one of which makes it a purely Jewish institution, while the other, unless regarded as a mere myth and figure, is in violent antagonism to the facts of geology.

With regard to the alleged 'proofs' that Sunday was introduced as a substitute for Saturday, and that its observance is as binding upon Christians as their Sabbath was upon the Jews, I can only say that those which I have seen are of the flimsiest and vaguest character. 'If,' says Milton, 'on the plea of a divine command, they impose upon us the observances of a particular day, how do they presume, without the authority of a divine command, to substitute another day in its place?' Outside the bounds of theology no one would think of applying the term 'proofs' to the evidence adduced for the change; and yet on this pivot, it has been alleged, turns the eternal fate of human souls.

In 1785 the first mail-coach reached Edinburgh from London on Sunday, and in 1788 it was continued to Glasgow. The innovation was denounced by a minister of the Secession Church of Scotland as 'contrary to the laws both of Church and State; contrary to the laws of God; contrary to the most conclusive and constraining reasons assigned by God; and calculated not only to promote the hurt and ruin of the nation, but also the eternal damnation of multitudes.'—Cox, vol. ii. p. 248. Even in our own day there are clergymen foolish enough to indulge in this dealing out of damnation,

Were such a doctrine not actual it would be incredible. It has been truly said that the man who accepts it sinks, in doing so, to the lowest depth of Atheism. It is perfectly reasonable for a religious community to set

apart one day in seven for rest and devotion. Most of those who object to the Judaic observance of the Sabbath recognise not only the wisdom but the necessity of some such institution, not on the ground of a divine edict, but of common sense.

'That public worship,' says Milton, 'is commended and inculcated as a voluntary duty, even under the Gospel, I allow; but that it is a matter of compulsory enactment, binding on believers from the authority of this commandment, or of any Sinaitical precept whatever, I deny.'

They contend, however, that it ought to be as far as possible a day of cheerful renovation both of body and spirit, and not a day of penal gloom. There is nothing that I should withstand more strenuously than the conversion of the first day of the week into a common working day. Quite as strenuously, however, should I oppose its being employed as a day for the exercise of sacerdotal rigour.

The early reformers emphatically asserted the freedom of Christians from Sabbatical bonds; indeed Puritan writers have reproached them with dimness of vision regarding the observance of the Lord's Day. 'The fourth Commandment,' says Luther, 'literally understood, does not apply to us Christians; for it is entirely outward, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, all of which are now left free by Christ. If a preacher,' he continues,' wishes to force you back to Moses, ask him whether you were brought by Moses out of Egypt? If he says no; then say, How, then, does Moses concern me, since he speaks to the people that have been brought out of Egypt? In the New Testament Moses comes to an end, and his laws lose their force. He must bow in the presence of Christ.' 'The Scripture,' says Melanchthon, 'allows that we are not bound to keep the Sabbath, for it teaches that the ceremonies of the law of Moses are not necessary after the revelation of the Gospel. And yet,' he adds, 'because it was requisite to appoint a certain day that the people might know when to assemble together, it appeared that the Church appointed for this purpose the Lord's Day.' I am glad to find my grand old namesake on the side of freedom in this matter. 'As for the Sab- bath,' says the martyr Tyndale, 'we are lords over it, and may yet change it into Monday, or into any other day, as we see need; or may make every tenth day holy day, only if we see cause why. Neither need we any holy day at all if the people might be taught without it.' Calvin repudiated 'the frivolities of false prophets who, in later times, have instilled Jewish ideas into the people. Those,' he continues, 'who thus adhere to the Jewish institution go thrice as far as the Jews themselves in the gross and carnal superstition of Sabbatism.' Even John Knox, who has had so much Puritan strictness unjustly laid to his charge, knew how to fulfil on the Lord's Day the duties of a generous, hospitable host. His Master feasted on the Sabbath day, and he did not fear to do the same on Sunday. 'There be two parts of the Sabbath day,' says Cranmer. 'One is the outward bodily rest from all manner of labour and work: this is mere ceremonial, and was taken away with other sacrifices and ceremonies by Christ at the preaching of the Gospel. The other part of the Sabbath day is the inward rest or ceasing from sin.' This higher symbolism, as regards the Sabbath, is frequently employed by the Reformers. It is the natural recoil of the living spirit from the mechanical routine of a worn-out hierarchy.

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, demands for a stricter observance of the Sabbath began to be made—probably in the first instance with some reason, and certainly with good intent. The manners of the time were coarse, and Sunday was often chosen for their offensive exhibition. But if there was coarseness on the one side, there was ignorance both of Nature and human nature on the other. Contemporaneously with the demands for stricter Sabbath rides, God's judgments on Sabbath-breakers began to be pointed out. Then and afterwards 'God's judgments' were much in vogue, and man, their interpreter, frequently behaved as a fiend in the supposed execution of them. But of this subsequently. A Suffolk clergyman named Bownd, who, according to Cox, was the first to set forth at large the views afterwards embodied in the Westminster Confession, adduces many such judgments. One was the case of a nobleman 'who for hunting on the holy day was punished by having a child with a head like a dog's.' Though he cites this instance, Bownd, in the matter of Sabbath observance, was very lenient towards noblemen. With courtier-like pliancy, which is not without its counterpart at the present time, he makes an exception in their favour. 'Concerning the feasts of noblemen and great personages or their ordinary diet upon this day, because they represent in some measure the majesty of God on the earth, in carrying the image as it were of the magnificence and puissance of the Lord, much is to be granted to them.'

Imagination once started in this direction was sure to be prolific. Instances accordingly grew apace in number and magnitude. Memorable examples of God's judgments upon Sabbath-breakers, and other like libertines, in their unlawful sports happening within this realm of England, were collected. Innumerable cases of drowning while bathing on Sunday were adduced, without the slightest attention to the logical requirements of the question. Week-day drownings were not dwelt upon, and nobody knew or cared how the question of proportion stood between the two classes of bathers. The Civil War was regarded as a punishment for Sunday desecration. The fire of London, and a subsequent great fire in Edinburgh, were ascribed to this cause; while the fishermen of Berwick lost their trade through catching salmon on Sunday. A Nonconformist minister named John Wells, whose huge volume is described by Cox as 'the most tedious of all the Puritan productions about the Sabbath,' is specially copious in illustration. A drunken pedlar, 'fraught with commodities' on Sunday, drops

into a river: God's retributive justice is seen in the fact. Wells travelled far in search of instances. One Utrich Schrœtorus, a Swiss, while playing at dice on the Lord's Day, lost heavily, and apparently to gain the devil to his side broke out into this horrid blasphemy: 'If fortune deceive me now I will thrust my dagger into the body of God.' Whereupon he threw the dagger upwards. It disappeared, and five drops of blood, which afterwards proved indelible, fell upon the gaming table. The devil then appeared, and with a hideous noise carried off the vile blasphemer. His two companions fared no better. One was struck dead and turned into worms, the other was executed. A vintner, who on the Lord's Day tempted the passers-by with a pot of wine, was carried into the air by a whirlwind and never seen more. 'Let us read and tremble,' adds Mr. Wells; At Tidworth a man broke his leg on Sunday while playing at football. By a secret judgment of the Lord the wound turned into a gangrene, and in pain and terror the criminal gave up the ghost.

You may smile at these recitals, but is there not a survival of John Wells still extant among us? Are there not people in our midst so well informed regarding 'the secret judgments of the Lord' as to be able to tell you their exact value and import, from the damaging of the share market through the running of Sunday trains to the calamitous overthrow of a railway bridge? Alphonso of Castile boasted that if he had been consulted at the beginning of things he could have saved the Creator some worlds of trouble. It would not be difficult to give the God of our more rigid Sabbatarians a lesson in justice and mercy, for his alleged judgments savour but little of either. How are calamities to be classified? Almost within earshot of those who note these Sunday judgments, the poor miners of Blantyre are blown to pieces, while engaged in their sinless weekday toil. A little further off the bodies of two hundred and sixty workers, equally innocent of Sabbath-breaking, are entombed at Abercarne. Dinas holds its sixty bodies, while the present year has furnished its fearful tale of similar disasters. Whence comes the vision which differentiates the Sunday calamity from the week-day calamity, seeing in the one a judgment of heaven, and in the other a natural event? We may wink at the ignorance of John Wells, for he lived in a pre-scientific age; but it is not pleasant to see his features reproduced, on however small a scale, before an educated nation in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Notwithstanding their strictness about the Sabbath, which possibly carried with it the usual excess of a reaction, some of the straitest of the Puritan sect saw clearly that unremitting attention to business, whether religious or secular, was unhealthy. Considering recreation to be as necessary to health as daily food, they exhorted parents and masters, if they would avoid the desecration of the Sabbath, to allow to children and servants time for honest recreation on other days. They might have clone well to inquire whether even Sunday devotions might not, without 'moral culpability' on their part, keep the minds of children and servants too long upon the stretch. I fear many of the good men who insist on a Judaic observance of the Sabbath, and who dwell upon the peace and blessedness to be derived from a proper use of the Lord's Day, generalise beyond their data, applying the experience of the individual to the case of mankind. What is a conscious joy and blessing to themselves they cannot dream of as being a possible misery, or even a curse, to others. It is right that your most spiritually-minded men—men who, to use a devotional phrase, enjoy the closest walk with God—should be your pastors. But they ought also to be practical men, able to look not only on their personal feelings, but on the capacities of humanity at large, and willing to make their rules and teachings square with these capacities. There is in some minds a natural bias towards religion, as there is in others towards poetry, art, or mathematics; but the poet, artist, or mathematician who would seek to impose upon others not possessing his tastes the studies which give him delight, would be deemed an intolerable despot. The philosopher Fichte was wont to contrast his mode of rising into the atmosphere of faith with the experience of others. In his case the process, he said, was purely intellectual. Through reason he reached religion; while in the case of many whom he knew this process was both unnecessary and unused, the bias of their minds sufficing to render faith, without logic, clear and strong. In making rules for the community these natural differences must be taken into account. The yoke which is easy to the few may be intolerable to the many, not only defeating its own immediate purpose, but frequently introducing recklessness or hypocrisy into minds which a franker and more liberal treatment would have kept free from both.

'When our Puritan friends,' says Mr. Frederick Robertson,' talk of the blessings of the Sabbath, we may ask them to remember some of its curses.' Other and more serious evils than those recounted by Mr. Robertson may, I fear, be traced to the system of Sabbath observance pursued in many of our schools. At the risk of shocking some worthy persons, I would say that the invention of an invigorating game for fine Sunday afternoons, and healthy indoor amusement for wet ones, would prove infinitely more effectual as an aid to moral purity than most of our plans of religious meditation.

The moods of the times—the 'climates of opinion,' as Glanvil calls them—have also to be considered in imposing disciplines which affect the public. For the ages, like the individual, have their periods of mirth and earnestness, of cheerfulness and gloom. From this point of view a better case might be made out for the early Sabbatarians than for their survivals at the present day. Sunday sports had grown barbarous; bull-and bear-baiting, interludes, and bowling were reckoned amongst them, and the more earnest spirits longed not only

to promote edification but to curb excess. Sabba-tarianism, therefore, though opposed, made rapid progress. Its opponents were not always wise. They did what religious parties, when in power, always do—exercised that power tyrannically. They invoked the arm of the flesh to suppress or change conviction. In 1618 James the First published a declaration, known after-wards as 'The Book of Sports,' because it had reference to Sunday recreations. Puritan magistrates had interfered with the innocent amusements of the people, and the King wished to insure their being permitted after divine service to those who desired them, but not enjoined upon those who did not. Coarser sports, and sports tending to immorality, were prohibited. Charles the First renewed the declaration of his father. Not content, however, with expressing his royal pleasure— not content with restraining the arbitrary civil magistrate—the King decreed that the declaration should be published 'through all the parish churches,' the bishops in their respective dioceses being made the vehicles of the royal command. Defensible in itself the declaration thus became an instrument of oppression. The High Church party, headed by Archbishop Laud, forced the reading of the documents on men whose consciences recoiled from the act. 'The precise clergy,' as Hallam calls them, refused in general to comply, and were suspended or deprived in consequence. 'But,' adds Hallam, 'mankind loves sport as little as prayer by compulsion; and the immediate effect of the King's declaration was to produce a far more scrupulous abstinence from diversions on Sundays than had been practised before.'

The Puritans, when they came into power, followed the evil example of their predecessors. They, the champions of religious freedom, showed that they could, in their turn, deprive their antagonists of their benefices, fine them, burn their books by the common hangman, and compel them to read from the pulpit things of which they disapproved. On this point Bishop Heber makes some excellent remarks. 'Much,' he says, 'as each religious party in its turn had suffered from persecution, and loudly and bitterly as each had, in its own particular instance, complained of the severities exercised against its members, no party had yet been found to perceive the great wickedness of persecution in the abstract, or the moral unfitness of temporal punishment as an engine of religious controversy.' In a very different strain writes the Dr. Bownd who has been already referred to as a precursor of Puritanism. He is so sure of his 'doxy' that he will unflinchingly make others bow to it. 'It behoveth,' he says, 'all kings, princes, and rulers, that profess the true religion to enact such laws and to see them diligently executed, whereby the honour of God in hallowing these days might be maintained. And, indeed, this is the chiefest end of all government, that men might not profess what religion they list, and serve God after what manner it pleaseth them best, but that the parts of God's true worship [Bowndean worship] might be set up everywhere, and all men compelled to stoop unto it.'

There is, it must be admitted, a sad logical consistency in the mode of action advocated by Dr. Bownd and deprecated by Bishop Heber. As long as men hold that there is a hell to be shunned, they seem logically warranted in treating lightly the claims of religious liberty upon earth. They dare not tolerate a freedom whose end they believe to be eternal perdition. Cruel they may be for the moment, but a passing pang vanishes when compared with an eternity of pain. Unreligious men might call it hallucination, but if I accept undoubtingly the doctrine of eternal punishment, then, whatever society may think of my act, I am self-justified not only in 'letting' but in destroying that which I hold dearest, if I believe it to be thereby stopped in its progress to the fires of hell. Hence, granting the assumptions common to both, the persecution of Puritans by High Churchmen, and of High Churchmen by Puritans, had a basis in reason. I do not think the question can be decided on *à 'priori* grounds, as Bishop Heber seemed to suppose. It is not the abstract wickedness of persecution, so much as our experience of its results, that causes us to set our faces against it. It has been tried, and found the most ghastly of failures. This experimental fact overwhelms the plausibilities of logic, and renders persecution, save in its meaner and stealthier aspects, in our day impossible.

The combat over Sunday continued, the Sabbatarians continually gaining ground. In 1643 the divines who drew up the famous document known as the Westminster Confession, began their sittings in Henry the Seventh's Chapel. Milton thought lightly of these divines, who, he said, were sometimes chosen by the whim of members of Parliament; but the famous Puritan, Baxter, extolled them for their learning, godliness, and ministerial abilities. A journal of their earlier proceedings was kept by one of their members. On the 13th of November 1644 he records the occurrence of 'a large debate' on the sanctification of the Lord's Day. After fixing the introductory phraseology, the assembly proceeded to consider the second proposition: 'To abstain from all unnecessary labours, worldly sports, and recreations.' It was debated whether 'worldly thoughts' should not be added. 'This was scrupulous,' says the naive journalist, 'whether we should not be a scorn to go about to bind men's thoughts, but at last it was concluded upon to be added, both for the more piety and for that the Fourth Command includes it.' The question of Sunday cookery was then discussed and settled; and, as regards public worship, it was decreed 'that all the people meet so timely that the whole congregation be present at the beginning, and not depart until after the blessing. That what time is vacant between or after the solemn meetings of the congregation be spent in reading, meditation, repetition of sermons,' &c. These holy men were full of that strength already referred to as imparted by faith. They needed no natural joy to brighten their lives,

mirth being displaced by religious exaltation. They erred, however, in making themselves a measure for the world at large, and insured the overthrow of their cause by drawing too heavily upon average human nature. 'This much,' says Hallam, 'is certain, that when the Puritan party employed their authority in proscribing all diversions, and enforcing all the Jewish rigour about the Sabbath, they rendered their own yoke intolerable to the young and gay; nor did any other cause, perhaps, so materially contribute to bring about the Restoration.'

From the records of the Town Council of Edinburgh, Mr. Cox makes certain extracts which amusingly illustrate both the character of Sabbath discipline and the difficulty of enforcing it. In 1560 it was among other things decreed that on Sundays 'all persons be astricted to be present at the ordinary sermons as well after noon as before noon, and that from the last jow of the bell to the said sermons to the final end.' In 1581 the Council ordained that 'proclamation be made through this burgh, discharging all kinds of games and plays now commonly used the said day, such as bowling in yards, dancing, playing, running through the high street of hussies, bairns, and boys, with all manner of dissolution of behaviour.' The people obeyed and went to church, but it seems they chose their own preachers. This gala-vanting among the kirks was, however, quickly put an end to; for in 1584 it was ordained 'that all freemen and freemen's wives in times coming be found in their own parish kirk every Sunday, as also at the time of the Communions, under the pain of payment of an unlaw for every person being found absent.' In 1586 the Council 'finds it expedient that a bailie ilk Sunday his week about, visit the street taverns and other common places in time of sermon, and pones all offenders according to the town statutes.' Vaging (strolling) in the High Gate was also forbidden, and no bickering in the streets was to be allowed. Dickson, the town trumpeter, 'to be warded and put in the irons for passing on the Sundays at his own hand to the May-plays at Kirkliston.'

These restrictions, applying at first to the time of divine service only, were afterwards extended to the entire Sunday. Sabbath profanation resembled hydraulic pressure, and broke forth whenever it found a weak point in the municipal dam. The repairing and strengthening of the dam were incessant. Proclamation followed proclamation, forbidding the practice of buying and selling, the opening of eating and coffee-houses, and prohibiting such sports as golf, archery, row-bowles, pennystane, and kaitchpullis. The gates of the city were ordered to be closed on Saturday night, and not to be opened before four o'clock on Monday morning. At the time these edicts were published the Provost complained of the little obedience hitherto given to the manifold acts of council for keeping the Sabbath. A decree on January 14, 1659, runs thus:—'Whereas many both young and old persons walk, or sit and play on the Castle hill, and upon the streets and other places on the Sabbath Day after sermons, so that it is manifest that family worship is neglected by such, the Council appoint that there be several pairs of stocks provided to stand in several public places of the city, that whosoever is needlessly walking or sitting idly in the streets shall either pay eighteenpence sterling penalty or be put in the stocks.' The parents of children found playing are fined 6*d*. a head. 'And if any children be found on the Castle hill after supper, to pay 18*d*. penalty or to be put in the stocks.' Even this drastic treatment did not cure the evil, for thirty years later the edict against 'vaging' on the Castle hill had to be renewed. At the same time it was ordered that the public wells be closed on Sunday from 8 A.M. till noon; then to open till 1 P.M., and afterwards from 5 P.M. None to bring any greater vessels to the wells for the carrying of water than a pint stoup or a pint bottle on the Lord's Lay. Our present sanitary notions were evidently not prevalent in Edinburgh in 1689. Mr. Cox remarks that 'these ordinances were usually enacted at the instance of the clergy.' It would have been well had the evils which the Scottish clergy inflicted on their country at the time here referred to been limited to the stern manipulation of Sabbath laws.

In Massachusetts it was attempted to make Sabbath-breaking a capital offence, but Governor Winthrop had the humanity and good sense to erase it from the list of acts punishable with death. In the laws of the colony of New Plymouth, presumptuous Sabbath-breaking was either followed by death or 'grievously punished at the judgment of the court,'

In 1646, the 'Confession' being agreed upon, it was presented to Parliament, which, in 1648, accepted and published its doctrinal portion. There was no lack of definiteness in the Assembly's statements. They spoke as confidently of the divine enactments as if each member had been personally privy to the counsels of the Most High. When Luther in the Castle of Marburg had had enough of the arguments of Zuinglius on the 'real presence,' he is said to have ended the controversy by taking up a bit of chalk and writing firmly and finally upon the table, 'Hoc est corpus meum.' Equally downright and definite were the divines at Westminster. They were modest in offering their conclusions to Parliament as 'humble advice,' but there was no flicker of doubt either in their theology or their cosmology. 'From the beginning of the world,' they say, 'to the Resurrection of Christ, the last day of the week was kept holy as a Sabbath while from the Resurrection it 'was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath.' The notions of the divines regarding the 'beginning and the end' of the world were primitive but decided. An ancient philosopher was once mobbed for venturing the extravagant opinion that the sun, which appeared to be a circle less than a yard in diameter, might really be as large as the whole country of

Greece. Imagine a man with the knowledge of a modern geologist uttering his blasphemies among these Westminster divines! 'It pleased God,' they continue, 'at the beginning to create, or make of nothing, the world and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.' Judged from our present scientific standpoint, this, of course, is mere nonsense. But the calling of it by this name does not exhaust the question. The real point of interest to me, I confess, is not the cosmological errors of the Assembly, but the hold which theology has taken of the human mind, and which enables it to survive the ruin of what was long deemed essential to its stability. On this question of 'essentials' the gravest mistakes are constantly made. Save as a passing form, no part of objective religion is essential. Religion lives not by the force and aid of dogma, but because it is ingrained in the nature of man. To draw a metaphor from metallurgy, the moulds have been broken and reconstructed over and over again, but the molten ore abides in the ladle of humanity. An influence so deep and permanent is not likely soon to disappear; but of the future form of religion little can be predicted. Its main concern may possibly be to purify, elevate, and brighten the life that now is, instead of treating it as the more or less dismal vestibule Of a life that is to come.

The term 'nonsense,' which has just been applied to the views of creation enunciated by the Westminster Assembly, was used, as already stated, in reference to our present knowledge, and not to the knowledge of three or four centuries ago. To most people the earth was at that time all in all, the sun and moon and stars being set in heaven merely to furnish lamplight to our planet. But though in relation to the heavenly bodies the earth's position and importance were thus exaggerated, very inadequate and erroneous notions were entertained regarding the shape and magnitude of the earth itself. Theologians were horrified when first informed that our planet was a sphere. The question of antipodes exercised them for a long time, most of them pouring ridicule on the idea that men could exist with their feet turned towards us, and with their heads pointing downwards. I think it is Sir George Airy who refers to the case of an over-curious individual asking what we should see if we went to the edge of the world and looked over. That the earth was a flat surface on which the sky rested was the belief entertained by the founders of all our great religious systems. Even liberal Protestant theologians stigmatised the Copernican theory as being 'built on fallible phenomena and advanced by many arbitrary assumptions against evident testimonies of Scripture.'

Such was the view of Dr. John Owen, who is described by Cox as 'the most eminent of the Independent divines,'

Newton finally placed his intellectual crowbar beneath these ancient notions, and heaved them into irretrievable ruin.

Then it was that penetrating minds, seeing the nature of the change wrought by the new astronomy in our conceptions of the universe, also discerned the difficulty, if not the impossibility, of accepting literally the Mosaic account of creation. They did not reject it, but they assigned to it a meaning entirely new. Dr. Samuel Clarke, who was the personal friend of Newton and a supporter of his theory, threw out the idea that 'possibly the six days of creation might be a typical representation of some greater periods.' Clarke's contemporary, Dr. Thomas Burnet, wrote with greater decision in the same strain. The Sabbath being regarded as a shadow or type of that heavenly repose which the righteous will enjoy when this world has passed away, 'so these six days of creation are so many periods of millenniums for which the world and the toils and labours of our present state are destined to endure.'

Cox, vol. ii. p. 211, note.

The Mosaic account was thus reduced to a poetic myth—a view which afterwards found expression in the vast reveries of Hugh Miller. But if this symbolic interpretation, which is now generally accepted, be the true one, what becomes of the Sabbath Day? It is absolutely without ecclesiastical meaning; and the man who was executed for gathering sticks on that day must be regarded as the victim of a rude legal rendering of a religious epic.

There were many minor offshoots of discussion from the great central controversy. Bishop Horsley had defined a day 'as consisting of one evening and one morning, or, as the Hebrew words literally import, of the decay of light and the return of it.' But what then, it was asked, becomes of the Sabbath in the Arctic regions, where light takes six months to 'decay,' and as long to 'return'? Differences of longitude, moreover, render the observance of the Sabbath at the same hours impossible. To some people such questions might appear trifling; to others they were of the gravest import. Whether the Sabbath should stretch from sunset to sunset, or from midnight to midnight, was also a subject of discussion. Voices moreover were heard refusing to acknowledge the propriety of the change from Saturday to Sunday, and the doctrine of Seventh Day observance was afterwards represented by a sect.

Theophilus Brabourne, a sturdy Puritan minister of Norfolk, whom Cox regards as the founder of this sect, thus argued the question in 1628: 'And now let me propound unto your choice these two days: the Sabbath Day on Saturday or the Lord's Day on Sunday, and keep whether of the twain you shall in conscience find the more safe. If you keep the Lord's Day, but profane the Sabbath Day, you walk in great danger and peril (to say the

least) of transgressing one of God's eternal and inviolable laws—the Fourth Commandment. But, on the other side, if you keep the Sabbath Day, though you profane the Lord's Day, you are out of all gun-shot and danger, for so you transgress no law at all, since neither Christ nor his apostles did ever leave any law for it.'
The earth's sphericity and rotation, which had at first been received with such affright, came eventually to the aid of those afflicted with qualms and difficulties regarding the respective claims of Saturday and Sunday. The sun apparently moves from east to west. Suppose then we start on a voyage round the world in a westerly direction. In doing so we sail away, as it were, from the sun, which follows and periodically overtakes us, reaching the meridian of our ship each succeeding day somewhat later than if we stood still. For every 15° of longitude traversed by the vessel the sun will be exactly an hour late; and after the ship has traversed twenty-four times 15°, or 360°, that is to say, the entire circle of the earth, the sun will be exactly a day behind. Here, then, is the expedient suggested by Dr. Wallis, F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford, to quiet the minds of those in doubt regard- ing Saturday observance. He recommends them to make a voyage round the world, as Sir Francis Drake did, 'going out of the Atlantic Ocean westward by the Straits of Magellan to the East Indies, and then from the east, returning by the Cape of Good Hope homeward, and let them keep their Saturday-Sabbath all the way. When they come home to England they will find their Saturday to fall upon our Sunday, and they may thenceforth continue to observe their Saturday-Sabbath on the same day with us!'

Large and liberal minds were drawn into this Sabbatarian conflict, but they were not the majority. Between the booming of the bigger guns we have an incessant clatter of small arms. We ought not to judge superior men without reference to the spirit of their age. This is an influence from which they cannot escape, and so far as it extenuates their errors it ought to be pleaded in their favour. Even the atrocities of the individual excite less abhorrence when they are seen to be the outgrowth of his time. But the most fatal error that could be committed by the leaders of religious thought is the attempt to force into their own age conceptions which have lived their life, and come to their natural end, in preceding ages. History is the record of a vast experimental investigation—of a search by man after the best conditions of existence. The Puritan attempt was a grand experiment. It had to be made. Sooner or later the question must have forced itself upon earnest believers possessed of power, Is it not possible to rule the world in accordance with the wishes of God as revealed in the Bible?—Is it not possible to make human life the copy of a divine pattern? The question could only have occurred in the first instance to the more exalted minds. But instead of working upon the inner forces and convictions of men, legislation presented itself as a speedier way to the attainment of the desired end. To legislation, therefore, the Puritans resorted. Instead of guiding, they repressed, and thus pitted themselves against the unconquerable impulses of human nature. Believing that nature to be depraved, they felt themselves logically warranted in putting it in irons. But they failed, and their failure ought to be a warning to their successors.

Another error, of a far graver character than that just noticed, may receive a passing mention here. At the time when the Sabbath controversy was hottest, and the arm of the law enforcing the claims of the Sabbath strongest and most unsparing, another subject profoundly stirred the religious mind of Scotland. A grave and serious nation, believing intensely in its Bible, found therein recorded the edicts of the Almighty against witches, wizards, and familiar spirits, and were taught by their clergy that such edicts still held good. The same belief had overspread the rest of Christendom, but in Scotland it was intensified by the rule of Puritanism and the natural earnestness of the people. I have given you a sample of the devilish cruelties practised on the Christians at Smyrna. These tortures were far less shocking than those inflicted upon witches in Scotland. I say less shocking, because the victims at Smyrna courted martyrdom. They counted the sufferings of this present time as not worthy to be compared with the glory to be revealed; while the sufferers for witchcraft, in the midst of all their agonies, felt themselves" Godforsaken, and saw before them instead of the glories of heaven the infinite tortures of hell. Not to the fall of Sarmatia, but to the treatment of witches in the seven- teenth century, ought to be applied the words of your poet Campbell:—

Oh! bloodiest picture in the book of time!

The mind sits in sackcloth and ashes while contemplating the scenes so powerfully described by Mr. Lecky in his chapter on Magic and Witchcraft. But I will dwell no further upon these tragedies than to point out how terrible are the errors which our clergy may commit after they have once subscribed to the creed and laws of Judaism, and constituted themselves the legal exponents and interpreters of those laws.

The sufferings of reputed witches in the seventeenth century, as well as those of the early Christians, might be traced to panics and passions similar in kind to those which produced the atrocities of the Reign of Terror in France.

Turning over the leaves of the Pentateuch, where God's alleged dealings with the Israelites are recorded, it strikes one with amazement that such writings should be considered binding upon us. The overmastering strength of habit, the power of early education—possibly a defiance of the claims of reason involved in the very

constitution of the mental organ—were never more forcibly illustrated than by the fact that learned men are still to be found willing to devote their time and endowments to these writings, under the assumption that they are not human but divine. As an ancient book, claiming the same origin as other books, the Old Testament is without a rival, but its unnatural exaltation provokes recoil and rejection. Leviticus, for example, when read in the light of its own age, is full of interest and instruction. We see there described the efforts of the best men then existing to civilise the rude society around them. Violence is restrained by violence medicinally applied. Passion is checked, truth and justice are extolled, and all in a manner suited to the needs of a barbaric host. But read in the light of our age, its conceptions of the Deity are seen to be shockingly mean, and many of its ordinances brutal. Foolishness is far too weak a word to apply to any attempt to force upon a scientific age the edicts of a Jewish lawgiver. The doom of such an attempt is sure; and if the destruction of things really precious should be involved in its failure, the blame will justly be ascribed to those who obstinately persisted in the attempt. Let us then cherish our Sunday as an inheritance derived from the wisdom of the past; but let it be understood that we cherish it because it is in principle reasonable, and in practice salutary. Let us up-hold it, because it commends itself to that 'light of nature' which, despite the catastrophe in Eden, the most famous theologians mention with respect,

Melanchthon writes finely thus: 'Wherefore our decision is this: that those precepts which learned men have committed to writing, transcribing them from the common reason and common feelings of human nature, are to be accounted as no less divine than those contained in the tables of Moses.'—Dugald Sewart's translation. Hengstenberg quotes from the same reformer as follows: 'The law of Moses is not binding upon us, though some things which the law contains are binding, because they coincide with the law of nature.'—See Cox, vol. i. p. 389. The Catechism of the Council of Trent expresses a similar view. There are, then, 'Data of Ethics' over and above the revealed ones.

and not because it is enjoined by the thunders of Sinai. We have surely heard enough of divine sanctions founded upon myths, which, however beautiful and touching when regarded from the proper point of view, are seen, when cited for our guidance as matters of fact, to offer warrant and condonation for the greatest crimes, or to sink to the level of the most palpable absurdities.

In this, as in all other theological discussions, it is interesting to note how character colours religious feeling and conduct. The reception into Christ's kingdom has been emphatically described as being born again. A certain likeness of feature among Christians ought, one would think, to result from a common spiritual parentage. But the likeness is not observed. Christian communities embrace some of the loftiest and many of the lowest of mankind. It may be urged that the lofty ones only are truly religious. To this it is to be replied, that the others are often as religious as their natures permit them to be. *Character* is here the overmastering force. That religion should influence life in a high way implies the pre-existence of natural dignity. This is the mordant which fixes the religious dye. He who is capable of feeling the finer glow of religion would possess a substratum available for all the relations of life, even if his religion were taken away. Religion, on the other hand, does not charm away malice, or make good defects of character. I have already spoken of persecution in its meaner forms. On the lower levels of theological warfare such are commonly resorted to. If you reject a dogma on intellectual grounds, it is because there is a screw loose in your morality; some personal sin besets and blinds you; the intellect is captive to a corrupt heart. Thus good men have been often calumniated by others who were not good; thus frequently have the noble become a target for the wicked and the mean.

These reflections, which connect themselves with reminiscences outside the Sabbath controversy, have been more immediately prompted by the aspersions cast by certain Sabbatarians upon those who differ from them. Mr. Cox notices and reproves some of these. According to the Scottish Sabbath Alliance, for example, all who say that the Sabbath was an exclusively Jewish institution, including, be it noted, such men as Jeremy Taylor and Milton,' clearly prove either their *dishonesty* or ignorance, or inability to comprehend a very plain and simple subject.' This becomes real humour when we compare the speakers with the persons spoken of. A distinguished English dissenter, who deals in a lustrous but rather cloudy logic, declares that whoever asks demonstration of the divine appointment of the Christian Sabbath 'is blinded *by a moral cause* to those exquisite pencillings, to those unobtruded vestiges, which furnish their clearest testimony to this Institute.' A third writer charitably professes his readiness 'to admit, in reference to this and many other duties, that it is quite a possible thing for a mind that is desirous of *evading the evidence* regarding it to succeed in doing so.' A fourth luminary, whose knowledge obviously extends to the mind and methods of the Almighty, exclaims,' Is it not a principle of God's Word in many cases to give enough and no more—to satisfy the devout, not to overpower the *un-candid?'* It is of course as easy as it is immoral to argue thus; but the day is fast approaching when the most atrabilious presbyter will not venture to use such language. Let us contrast with it the utterance of a naturally sweet and wholesome mind. 'Since all Jewish festivals, new moons, and Sabbaths,' says the celebrated Dr. Isaac Watts, 'are abolished by St. Paul's authority; since the religious observation of days in the 14th chapter to the Romans, in general, is represented as a matter of doubtful disputation; since the observation

of the Lord's Day is not built upon any express or plain institution by Christ or his apostles in the New Testament, but rather on examples and probable inferences, and on the reasons and relations of things; I can never pronounce anything hard or severe upon any fellow-Chris- tian who maintains real piety in heart and life, though his opinion on this subject may be very different from mine.' Thus through the theologian radiates the gentleman.

Up to the end of the eighteenth century the catalogue of Mr. Cox embraces 320 volumes and publications. It is a monument of patient labour; while the remarks of the writer, which are distributed throughout the catalogue, illustrate both his intellectual penetration and his reverent cast of mind. He wrought hard and worthily with a pure and noble aim. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Cox at Dundee in 1867, when the British Association met there, and I could then discern the earnestness with which he desired to see his countrymen relieved from the Sabbath incubus, and at the same time the moderation and care for the feelings of others with which he advocated his views. He has also given us a 'Sketch of the Chief Controversies about the Sabbath in the Nineteenth Century.' The sketch is more compressed than the catalogue, and the changes of thought in passing from author to author, being more rapid, are more bewildering. It is to a great extent what I have already called a clatter of small arms, mingled with the occasional discharges of mightier guns.

To this latter class belong in an especial manner the writings of Sir William Domville, whose son, the excellent Honorary Treasurer of the Sunday Lecture Society, is carrying out practically and efficiently the views of his father.

One thing is noticeable and regrettable in these discussions, namely, the unwise and undiscriminating way in which different Sunday occupations are classed together and condemned. Bishop Blomfield, for example, seriously injures his case when he places drinking in gin-shops and sailing in steamboats in the same category. I remember some years ago standing by the Thames at Putney with my lamented friend, Dr. Bence Jones, when a steamboat on the river, with its living freight, passed us. Practically acquainted with the moral and physical influence of pure oxygen, my friend exclaimed, 'What a blessing for these people to be able thus to escape from London into the fresh air of the country!' I hold the physician to have been right, and, with all respect, the Bishop to have been wrong.

Bishop Blomfield also condemns resorting to tea-gardens on Sunday. But we may be sure that it is not the gardens, but the minds which the people bring to them, which produce disorder. These minds possess the culture of the city, to which the Bishop seems disposed to confine them. Wisely and soberly conducted—and it is perfectly possible to conduct them wisely and soberly—such places might be converted into aids towards a life which the Bishop would commend. Purification and improvement are often possible, where extinction is neither possible nor desirable. I have spent many a Sunday afternoon in the public gardens of the little university town of Marburg, in the company of intellectual men and cultivated women, without observing a single occurrence which, as regards morality, might not be permitted in the Bishop's drawing-room. I will add to this another observation made at Dresden on a Sunday, after the suppression of the insurrection by the Prussian soldiery in 1849. The victorious troops were encamped on the banks of the Elbe, and this is how they occupied themselves. Some were engaged in physical games and exercises which in England would be considered innocent in the extreme; some were conversing sociably; some singing the songs of Uhland; while others, from elevated platforms, recited to listening groups poems and passages from Goethe and Schiller. Through this crowd of military men passed and repassed the girls of the city, linked together with their arms round each other's necks. During hours of observation I heard no word which was unfit for a modest ear; while from beginning to end I failed to notice a single case of intoxication.

The late Mr. Joseph Kay, as Travelling Bachelor of the University of Cambridge, has borne strong and earnest testimony to the 'humanising and civilising influence' of the Sunday recreations of the German people.

It may appear uncivil and inappropriate for a person invited to come amongst you as I have been, to seek to establish contrasts with other countries unfavourable to your own; but let me take an extract from an account of Scotland written by a Scot, a short time prior to the date of my visit to Dresden. 'A tree,' says this writer, 'is best known by its fruits. What are these in the present instance? The protracted effort to enforce a stern Sabbatical observance *per fas et nefas* has no doubt evoked an exceedingly decorous state of affairs on Sunday; but in a great measure only so far as external appearances are concerned. Puritanism with its uncompromising demands has had a sway of three centuries in Scotland; and yet at this moment, in proportion to the population, the amount of crime, vice and intemperance is as great, if not in some details greater, than it is in England. But the most frightful feature of Scotland is the loathsome squalor and heathenism of its large towns. The combination of brutal iniquity, filth, absence of self-respect, and intemperance visible daily in the meaner class of streets of Edinburgh and Glasgow fills every traveller with surprise and horror.'

Great changes for the better have been made since 'Edinensis' wrote the pamphlet here quoted.

Here we touch the core of the whole matter—the appeal to experience. Sabbatical rigour has been tried, and the question is: Have its results been so conducive to good morals and national happiness, as to render criminal

every attempt to modify it? The advances made in all kinds of knowledge in this our age are known to be enormous; and the public desire for instruction, which the intellectual triumphs of the time naturally and inevitably arouse, is commensurate with the growth of knowledge. Must this desire, which is the motive power of all real and healthy progress, be quenched or left unsatisfied, lest Sunday observances, unknown to the early Christians, repudiated by the heroes of the Reformation, and insisted upon for the first time during a period of national gloom and suffering in the seventeenth century, should be interfered with? To justify this position the demonstration of the success of Sabbatarianism must be complete. Is it so? Are we so much better than other nations who have neglected to adopt our rules, that we can point to the working of these rules in the past as a conclusive reason for maintaining them immovable in the future? The answer must be, No. My Sabbatarian friends, you have no ground to stand upon. I say friends, for I would far rather have you as friends than as enemies—far rather see you converted than annihilated. You possess a strength and earnestness with which the world cannot dispense; but to be productive of anything permanently good, that strength and earnestness must build upon the sure foundation of human nature. This is that law of the universe spoken of so frequently by your illustrious countryman, Mr. Carlyle, to quarrel with which is to provoke and precipitate ruin. Join with us then in our endeavours to turn our Sundays to better account. Back with your support the moderate and considerate demands of the Sunday Society, which scrupulously avoids interfering with the hours devoted by common consent to public worship. Offer the museum, the picture-gallery, and the public garden as competitors to the public-house. By so doing you will fall in with the spirit of your time, and row with, instead of against, the resistless current along which man is borne to his destiny.

Most of you here are Liberals; perhaps Radicals, perhaps even Democrats or Republicans. I am a Conservative. I deprecate insurrections and revolutions, though, having their archetypes in nature, they are to be expected from time to time. The first requisite of true conservatism is foresight. Humanity grows, and foresight secures room for future expansion. In your walks in the country you sometimes see a wall built round a growing tree. So much the worse for the wall, which is sure to be rent and ruined by the energy which it opposes. We have here represented not a true, but a false and ignorant conservatism. The real conservative looks ahead and prepares for the inevitable. He forestalls revolution by securing, in due time, sufficient amplitude for the national vibrations. He is a wrong-headed statesman who imposes his notions, however right in the abstract, on a nation unprepared for them. He is no statesman at all who, without seeking to interpret and guide it in advance, merely waits for the more or less coarse expression of the popular will, and then constitutes himself its vehicle. *Untimeliness* is sure to be the characteristic of the work of such a statesman. In virtue of the position which he occupies, his knowledge and insight ought to be in advance of the public knowledge and insight; and his action, in like degree, ought to precede and inform public action. This is what I want my Sabbatarian friends to bear in mind. If they look abroad from the vantage-ground which they occupy, they can hardly fail to discern that the intellect of this country is gradually ranging itself upon our side. Statesmen, clergymen, philosophers, and moralists are joining our standard. Whether, therefore, those to whom I appeal hear, or whether they forbear, we are sure to unlock, for the public good, the doors of the museums and galleries which we have purchased and for the maintenance of which we pay. But I would have them not only prepare for the coming change, but aid and further it by anticipation. They will thus, in a new fashion, 'dish the Whigs,' prove themselves men of foresight and common sense, and obtain a fresh lease of the respect of the community.

As the years roll by, the term 'materialist' will lose more and more of its evil connotation; for it will be more and more seen and acknowledged that the true spiritual nature of man is bound up with his material condition. Wholesome food, pure air, cleanliness—hard work if you will, but also fair rest and recreation—these are necessary not only to physical but to spiritual well-being. The seed of the spirit is cast in vain amid stones and thorns, and thus your best utterances become idle words when addressed to the acclimatised inhabitants of our slums and alleys. Drunkenness ruins the substratum of resolution. The physics of the drunkard's brain are incompatible with moral strength. Here your first care ought to be to cleanse and improve the organ. Break the sot's associations; change his environment; alter his nutrition; displace his base imaginations by thoughts drawn from the purer sources which we seek to render accessible to him. For two centuries, I am told, the Scottish clergy have proclaimed walking on Sunday to be an act of 'heaven-daring profaneness—an impious encroachment on the inalienable prerogative of the Lord God.' Such language is now out of date. If we could establish Sunday tramways between our dens of filth and iniquity and the nearest green fields, we should, in so doing, be preaching a true gospel. And not only the denizens of our slums, but the proprietors of our factories and counting-houses, might, perhaps, be none the worse for an occasional excursion in the company of those whom they employ. A most blessed influence would also be shed upon the clergy if they were enabled from time to time to change their 'sloth urbane' for healthy action on heath or mountain. Baxter was well aware of the soothing influence of fields, and countries, and walks, and gardens, on a fretted brain. Jeremy Taylor showed a profound knowledge of human nature when he wrote thus:—'It is certain that all

which can innocently make a man cheerful, does also make him charitable. For grief, and age, and sickness, and weariness, these are peevish and troublesome; but mirth and cheerfulness are content, and civil, and compliant, and communicative, and love to do good, and swell up to felicity only upon the wings of charity. Upon this account, here is pleasure enough for a Christian at present; and if a facete discourse, and an amicable friendly mirth, can refresh the spirit and take it off from the vile temptation of peevish, despairing, uncomplying melancholy, it must needs be innocent and commendable.' I do not know whether you ever read Thomas Hood's 'Ode to Rae Wilson,' with an extract from which I will close this address. Hood was a humorist, and to some of our graver theologians might appear a mere feather-head. But those who have read his more serious works will have discerned in him a vein of deep poetic pathos. I hardly know anything finer than the apostrophe in which he turns from those

That bid you baulk
A Sunday walk,
And shun God's work as you should shun your own;
. . . . . .
Calling all sermons contrabands
In that great temple that's not made with hands;

to the description of what Sunday might be, and is, to him who is competent to enjoy it aright:—

Thrice blessed, rather, is the man, with whom
The gracious prodigality of nature,
The balm, the bliss, the beauty, and the bloom,
The bounteous providence in every feature,
Recall the good Creator to his creature,
Making all earth a fane, all heav'n its dome!
To *his* tuned spirit the wild heather-bells
Ring Sabbath knells;
The jubilate of the soaring lark
Is chant of clerk;
For choir, the thrush and the gregarious linnet;
The sod's a cushion for his pious want;
And, consecrated by the heaven within it,
The sky-blue pool, a font.
Each cloud-capp'd mountain is a holy altar;
An organ breathes in every grove;
And the full heart's a Psalter,
Rich in deep hymns of gratitude and love!

Spottiswoode & Co., Printers, New-street Square, London.

A few thoughts and Facts Concerning "The Sabbath" and its Due Observance.

By William, Colenso.

(Reprinted from "The Hawke's Bay Herald.")

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."—JESUS.

"Speak thou the TRUTH. Let others fence,
And trim their, words for pay;
In pleasant sunshine of pretence
Let others bask their day.

Guard thou the FACT: though clouds of night
Down on thy watch-tower stoop;

Though thou shoulds't see thine heart's delight
Borne from thee by their swoop.

Face thou the WIND. Though safer seem
In shelter to abide,
We were not made to sit and dream;
The safe must first be tried."

A Few Thoughts and Facts Concerning "The Sabbath" and its Due Observance.

"I speak as to wise men, judge ye what I say."
—Paul.

I. Introductory.

IN your issue of September 9th, you give a pretty full and clear account of a sermon preached the day before by the Rev. D. Sidey in the Presbyterian Church, Napier, on "Sabbath Observance." I trust, therefore, you will allow me the like courtesy of giving publicity to a few of my thoughts (or matured convictions) on this subject in your columns. I wish to make them public for several reasons. Before, however, that I briefly give those reasons, I would say,—that I have greatly desired to make known what I believe on this head in a series of lectures in Napier, admission free; where I should have more scope, and where what I should state could be taken down (by Mr Harding or some other equally competent writer), and, if approved of by my audience, printed: and did I belong to any one Public Denomination among us, I think I should have done so. Now my reasons for making known my convictions on this subject, are, (1) I believe, that whatever knowledge any man has gained,—whether by enquiry, experiment, travel, good luck, study, deep research, or experience, in whatever branch of science or knowledge,—that he Bhould not keep it locked-up in his own breast, but should seek to make it known to his fellow-men: (2) especially if he reasonably believes such to be for their future welfare: (3) more particularly so, if (as in my own case) he should be nearing the allotted "three score years and ten" of man: To such a person and at such a time, the wise saying of the ancients is most appropriate and should act as a spur,—"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." (4) Further, I utterly disbelieve that unreasonable remark, which we so often hear, viz, that things of great—or of momentous—interest to mankind,—things popularly believed as more pertaining to the soul and to a future state of being, (generally lumped together as "religious matters,") should *not* be entered on in the columns of a news-paper! Why not? Can this be *reasonably* answered? For my own part I verily believe, that it would be far better for us all, if more of truth of science of reason and of *true* religion were taken up in all our papers in a proper spirit,—especially in those which are looked upon as family Papers. And so with theatres and theatrical performances; these should be sought to be raised from their present low standard (especially here in Napier), by the reasonable and intelligent and by the religious portions of the community uniting and endeavoring to do so. For do what we may, man will have amusements as well as instruction,—such are natural to him and cannot be abolished. Let such, however, who oppose this view (and, no doubt, there are some who do so, as they believe, conscientiously, religiously,) let *such* just quietly ask themselves the question,—Where did Jesus, and, after him, his disciples, teach and make known their views and opinions? Was it not in the streets and highways, in the desert and on the mountain, in the houses of the Pharisees and in the courts of the temple, in the village of Mary and Martha and at the grave of Lazarus, by the pool of Siloam and the sea of Galilee, on land or on the water, on Mar's hill at Athens or in the school of Tyrannus at Ephesus,—wherever "a multitude" was found to listen, among whom were, sometimes, a few followers, but always plenty of enemies and scoffers. As then, so now. Principles have not altered, these are permanent; outward things, such as rules and methods, have, these are changing. Can it be reasonably supposed, that if the art—the great Science—of Printing, with all its advantages and blessings, was then known,—and if Jesus and his disciples knew how to write for the Press, that they would not have done so?

Sure I am, that he,—one of the greatest of Reformers and a true Protestant,—would have done so gladly, if he could have found any Jewish Editor of a Paper willing to print his articles. Neither Jesus nor his followers would have entertained such a thought for a moment, as that his teachings—even the holiest and highest—could be lowered or contaminated by being published to the world in the columns of a newspaper. Such a notion was the very antagonistic opposite of all his and their teaching. And why? Because Great is truth and must prevail. Indeed he had early said to his followers "What ye hear in the ear" (from me, when we are alone, or it may be travelling together,) "proclaim upon the housetops,"—as an Oriental Muezzin or public crier;—or, in other and modern words,—Make known through the *Daily Press*.—

The great Jewish doctor Ebn Ezra said,—God has given the Law to men of intelligence only, and those who have no intelligence have no Law." (This saying involves a beautiful principle.) Most intelligent men have their own peculiar studies, their own particular knowledge; indeed, this, in a higher or lower degree, belongs to all craftsmen and trades. Hence, with our fathers, in order to secure it to their children, the 7 years apprenticeship. Now without boasting (all such ill becomes *me*,) I may perhaps be allowed to say, that there are a few (and only a few) things, during a long and active life, of which I trust I know a little, viz.:—

- The Polynesian language, and, in particular, the *Maori* dialect.
- The Botany of New Zealand.
- This subject of the Sabbath (and with it two or three other kindred matters).

And therefore it is, as I have said before, that I wish to make known what little I have gained on this head—of the Sabbath.

And if any one among us should still be inclined to ask, (1) How should I particularly know such a subject? my answer must be, Because I have for *many years* painfully and closely studied it, in all its bearings, and with the help of every aid. And if the further question should arise,—(2) Do you think you understand it better and know it more than the Rev. D. Sidey, or the Rev. Mr Irvine, or the Rev. Messrs Oliver and Lock wood, or Archdeacon Williams, or even Bishop Stuart? My quiet answer must be (if I am to speak what I believe to be the truth)—YES: (1) Because I have, as I have already said, made it my *particular* study,—having had ample means, in desire, time, books, and opportunity, which all those persons have not so largely possessed: (2) Because I am older: and (3) Because I am, (thank GOD!) set free from all Denominational and Ecclesiastical bias and prejudice,—rules, or "blinkers." Did I not thus firmly believe I were an ass to undertake to write upon this subject.

And, lest any one should deem me to be boasting (a thing I hate), let me add,—Just look at our English Surgeons, or Physicians; they are all alike "Doctors"; yet one has paid extra attention to diseases of the ear,—and is, therefore, an acknowledged Aurist; another to those of the eye,—and is, therefore, an Oculist; another to Midwifery,—and is, therefore, looked-up to in all such matters; now all these are alike "Doctors," yet each possesses his own peculiar skill and knowledge in that *which* he made his particular branch of study. While, to the churchman, in addition, I would also say,—Bear in mind the words of the Poet (not David) in the 119 Psalm (w. 99, 100),—"I am wiser than my enemies; I have more understanding than all my teachers." On which verses Canon Perowne, in his new translation of the Psalms (2nd Edition), strikingly remarks,—"The teachers whom he has outstript may have been those whose disciple he once was;—or he may refer to authorized teachers, to whom he listened because they sat in Moses' seat, though he felt that they had really nothing to teach him." *(Verb. sap.)*

I purpose, then, prosecuting my subject thus:—

- Introductory.
- Historically.
- Ecclesiastically.
- Reasonably (including, (1) Theologically, and (2) Humanly).
- Concluding Remarks.

I cannot close this first, or Introductory part of my subject better, than in the glowing words of a true man and a great modern writer—EMERSON: whose name, I am happy in knowing, will be perpetuated here in Napier. He says,—"There is a persuasion in the soul of man that he is here for cause, that he was put down in this place by the Creator to do the work for which He inspires him, that thus he is an overmatch for all antagonists that could combine against him.———Napoleon said well, "My hand is immediately connected with my head but the *sacred* courage is connected with the heart. The head is a half, a fraction, until it is enlarged and inspired by the moral sentiment. For it is not the means on which we draw, as health or wealth, practical skill or dexterous talent, or multitudes of followers, that count, but the aims only. The aim reacts back on the means. A great aim aggrandises the means. The meal and water that are the commissariat of the *forlorn hope* that stake their lives to defend the pass are sacred as the Holy Grail, or as if one had eyes to see in chemistry the fuel that is rushing to feed the Sun."

II. Historically.

(Before the Birth of Christ.)

HERE, one great difficulty presents itself at the very threshold, namely, the popular opinion respecting the Bible. I call it, the popular opinion; and yet it may not quite amount to that. Be this as it may, it is that notion, that the Bible is peculiarly *one* book,—comprising an entirety or *complete whole in itself*; that as such it is also *the only* Revelation, or *direct* Word of God to man. I can very well understand how ready some good folks are to bristle up, and to shew fight, at even the bare mention of a doubt of such being the case; and I can make every allowance for them, aye, and sympathise with them,—for I once so believed and so acted myself. And I did not readily give in, either,—until long (oh! very long) and painful and prayerful research and study brought me to see clearly that such a position was no longer tenable,—*could not*, in fact, *be any longer truthfully held or supported*,—and so I was obliged to give in, after contesting every position inch by inch. But have I, as a Christian, really lost any truth,—any good thing, thereby? No, by no means; very far from it, as I hope to shew in the end. This much, however, in passing, I will here say, that the Sacred Volume,—notwithstanding its unhistorical character, its variance with scientific certainties, its discrepancies, and contradictions,—the more it is studied the more Divine it seems, the more full of real support and solid comfort for the soul of man.

I must, however, remind my reasonable and thoughtful readers,—to consider (briefly) a few needful facts respecting the Bible.—

- It is a volume containing writings made by many and different writers, extending over a period of several hundred years.
- That many of the several separate books themselves were not written by a single individual, but by several persons, and that, too, from time to time; and that the writers of many of those books are wholly unknown.
- That, in addition to what Protestants know as the Old and the New Testaments, there are also the ancient books called (by them) "the Apocrypha,"—in which, however, are to be found some Divine passages, as much so as any we read in the Canonical writings; which are received alike with the other books by both the extensive Roman and Greek Christian Churches,—comprising, by far, the larger part of Christendom.
- That at the time of the Jewish captivity under Nebuchadnezzar (600 years before Christ), their sacred books had been burnt, and that thus the Jews account for their reproduction.—

This tradition stands recorded in the second book of Esdras, where Esdras, or Ezra, is introduced as saying, "*Thy Law is burnt:* therefore no man knoweth the things that are done of Thee, or the works that shall begin. But, if I have found grace before Thee, send the Holy Ghost into me, and I shall write all that hath been done in the world since the beginning, which were written in Thy Law; that men may find Thy path, and that they, which live in the latter days, may live." And Ezra further says that his prayer was heard, and he received a command to retire into a private place with five men, "ready to write swiftly, and many tables of box-wood to write upon.—And they sat forty days, and they wrote in the day what he told them, and at night they ate bread."

In this way Ezra is supposed, in the tradition of the Jews of that age, to have recovered the very identical words of the Pentateuch. And several of the ancient Fathers of the Early Christian Church seemed to have fully believed this strange story. Thus Clement of Alexandria says:—

"When the Scriptures had been destroyed in the captivity of Nebuchadnezzar, in the time of Artaxerxes the King of the Persians, Esdras the priest, having become inspired, renewed again and produced prophetically all the ancient Scriptures."—

And Irenæus says:—

"In the time of Artaxerxes, the King of the Persians, He inspired Esdras the priest to Bet in order again all the words of the former prophets, and restore to the people the legislation by Moses."

And Jerome says:—

"Whether you choose to say that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, or Esdras the renewer of the work, I make no objection."

But the truth is, that we know nothing certainly about this. Here I will briefly quote from *The Bible and its Interpreters*, by the learned Dr. Irons, Prebendary of St. Paul's, London; he says, "There is no proof that Ezra did it." And even if we allow that Ezra did all which is ascribed to him, yet then, as Dr. Irons justly observes,—"It is on the gifts and inspiration of the transcribers in Ezra's day, that we are really depending,—gifts and inspiration, which yet are a mere hypothesis, of which the possessors tell us no single word! And before Ezra's day we are thus owning, unmistakeably, that the literary history of the Old Testament is lost! Let all those, who would identify this with God's entire Revelation, see to what they have brought us?"

But, I would say, let us not do this For, while I agree entirely with this author—that "a more hopeless,

carnal, and eventually sceptical position, it is impossible to conceive," than that "which identifies the Written Word with God's *only* Revelation" of Himself to man,—and because I believe it to be so unsound and dangerous,—I will do my best, God helping me, to shew you "a more excellent way."

To return:—the first direct mention of the Sabbath in the Old Testament as a rule to man, is at the giving of the Manna to the Israelites in the Wilderness (Ex. 16.). Shortly after, however, we have it more fully stated as a Law among the ten Commandments given on Mount Sinai (Ex. 20). And here let me call your par- ticular attention to *the reason* assigned for so keeping the Sabbath:—"For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: *therefore* the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it." This, however, is very differently given in Deuteronomy (5. 15),—"And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched-out arm: *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." And note further, that *both* statements are equally said to be the very words of God, and to have been engraved by Him in stone.

How is this great discrepancy to be reasonably accounted for?

Did Moses really write those 5 Books called the Pentateuch?

In our *English* translation they are termed the first (second, or third, &c.) Book of Moses, but that is an addition, such not being in the original. Such, however, may mean *about Moses;* just as the Books of Samuel, Job, Esther, &c., are *about* them, and were not written by them.

It is highly doubtful if the first four were written by Moses; and it is all but absolutely certain the 5th. (or Deuteronomy) was never written by him.

If Moses wrote the *first* account of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai (in Exodus), is it possible that he could have forgotten what was then said when he wrote the *second* account (in Deuteronomy)? and so set down contrary words, and say, that God uttered them? If Moses did not forget, could he have dared to alter them? And, if he either forgot, or dared to alter,—what becomes of the so-called Inspiration, the Infallibility, the entire truthfulness of the story? But if, as I have said above, the book of Deuteronomy was *not* written by Moses, then we can see clearly how another person, writing some hundreds of years after, could thus write; *provided that he did not himself regard the* 10 *Commandments in their original form as Mosaic and Divine and therefore inexpressibly holy;* for if he did, then he could no more have dared to change them than Moses himself. Moreover, if such a Commandment concerning the Sabbath was so given—amid earthquakes and thunderings and lightnings—and with the penalty of death recorded for doing any work, or even kindling a fire in any house (Ex. 31. 15) on the Sabbath-day, how comes it to pass that the Sabbath was *not* observed by the Jews? Especially with that dreadful story in Numbers (15), of the man found gathering sticks in the wilderness on the Sabbath-day having been put to death, and that sentence too as being immediately pronounced by the Lord!

But who can possibly believe that such a command as that ever proceeded from the Ever-Blessed God? a command, too, which would appear to have been powerless to prevent the Evil, which it proposed to cure,—which did not hinder the people at large from defiling the Sabbath with pollutions infinitely worse than that of gathering a few sticks for a fire,—"Your new moons and Sabbaths I cannot away with: *Your hands are full of blood."* (Is. 1.) And what a noble work is that of Modern Biblical Criticism, which enables us to regard the Bible with true reverence, as containing the words of a Divine Revelation, without therefore maintaining that it has been supernaturally protected from all the defects and faults of human productions,—which relieves the character of God our Heavenly Father, from the dark stains, which such narratives as these must in any reflecting mind attach to it, if believed to be divinely-guaranteed statements of infallible truth! For here, in this very story we have a proof that it was not written by Moses.—The words are, "*While the children of Israel were in the wilderness"*—how could these words be written by *Moses*, who *never came out* of the wilderness, who "died there in the land of Moab"?

But now, with respect to the Jewish Sabbath, it is very noticeable that, except in the Pentateuch itself, where the laws are thickly laid down for its observance, as an express Divine Institution, there are no signs of its having ever been kept with strictness, or of any attempt having been made, by the most pious Kings or prophets, to enforce the keeping of it, *before* the time of King Josiah,—that is shortly before the Babylonish Captivity. On the contrary, in the very few passages in which the Sabbath is mentioned at all, it is put upon the same level as the day of the "new moon." Not at all as having any peculiar honour,—as having been enjoined by express Divine authority amidst the terrors of Sinai. Thus, in the affecting story of Elisha and the Shunammite mother, whose child was dead, she determines to "run to the man of God, and come again." Upon which her husband says, "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither *New Moon* nor *Sabbath*." (From which story it may also be fairly inferred, that they commonly *rode* on the Sabbath.) So, also, the prophet Isaiah (i. 13, 15); Amos (viii. 4, 5); and Hosea (ii. 11.) Again, in the book of Chronicles,—a book written *after* the return of the Jews from the Captivity, (or 1000 years after Moses,)—brief mention is made of the Sabbath but always with the new moons and feasts; but great care must be exercised in using this book. Here I will briefly quote from Dr. Irons:—"The writer of the book of Chronicles gives us certain statements of the authorities

referred to for the history of his people. But he does not say who was authorised to draw up the summaries of the story, which now are called 'Books of Samuel,' and 'Kings,' or his own 'Chronicles.' In fact, the writings of Samuel, Nathan, Gad, Ahija, Shemaiah, Iddo, Azariah, Hanani, Jehu, Elijah, and Chosai, and the Chronicles of Isaiah and others (all referred to as the *literary* basis of the National History), *have perished without exception.* The outlines which survive are by another hand and *have been drawn with a design of their own*. Nothing can exceed the plainness, with which the sacred author of the Chronicles acknowledges that *they, who seek mere History, must look for it elsewhere. He is writing for another purpose. . .* The results are simply and undeniably these—that after the Jewish Captivity in Babylon (within a hundred years of that event) the merely *historical*, as distinct from the *sacred*, records of their nation—having no doubt been examined—*disappear*, and the *religious Books*, called Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, *are found in their present form."*

The two books of Chronicles, in a very great part of their contents, are not historically true,—they are written, as Dr. Irons says, "with a design of their own;" and that "design" is, evidently, to blot out as much as possible from the earlier history of the people, as it is written in the older Books of Samuel and Kings, the plain signs which those Books exhibit, that the Law of Moses—the laws of the Pentateuch—were habitually disregarded by the very best of the Kings of Judah, and to represent them as in force all along. Now this fact—that of the unhistorical character of the narrative in the Chronicles—is one of the greatest importance, therefore it is that I so dwell upon it. For you cannot possibly acquire a clear idea of the real History of Israel, (from the time of the conquest of Canaan down to the Captivity,) unless your minds are disabused of the traditionary notion, as to the infallible accuracy of every line and letter in the History of the Chronicler, while yet his statements repeatedly contradict the statements of the older Books and even his own. You may easily satisfy yourselves on this point, by merely reading your Bible, carefully, with *open* eyes and *clear* understandings, employing a Bible with the marginal references and making use of them.

You will find that the Chronicler never gives a hint of David's sins of adultery and murder,—nor of Solomon's taking many heathen wives, and of their turning away his heart from the Living God: he says nothing of Solomon going after "Ashtaroth, the goddess of the Zidonians, and after Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites," of his "building a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon."

Again, the writer of the Book of Kings tells us that "Abijah, the son of Reho- boam, walked In all the sing of his father, which he had done before him, and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God" (1 K. 15),—and mentions only that "there was war between Abijah and Jeroboam" (*v.* 7);—but the Chronicler, writing centuries afterwards, says not a word about Abijah's wickedness, but makes him lead out a host of "400,000 chosen men" against 800,000 chosen men of Jeroboam, mighty men of valour." Abijah is then described (by the Chronicler,) as addressing this immense host of 800,000 men in most pious language, declaring that in Judah the Law was strictly obeyed;—and calling on them not to fight against God. However, they did fight, and in this *one* battle, we are told, Abijah's 400,000 warriors slew of Jeroboam's 800,000,—*"five hundred thousand* chosen men." (2 Chron. xiii,)

Now let me here call your attention (1) to the actual size of these two petty kingdoms, which, together, formed what is called the Holy Land. (As many, I know, have not yet considered this.) Those two kingdoms together, were not so large as the small tract of country extending from Napier to Cape Palliser, and from the Ruahine mountain range to the sea. While that of Judah, alone could be comprised between Napier and Takapau. (2) The total loss of the Allied army in the great and memorable battle of Waterloo, including "British, Germans, Hanoverians, Brunswickers, Prussians, and Belgians," was 4,172 men. (From *Alison.)*

Thus, once more, the Chronicler tells us, (1 ch. xxiii.) that when David was old the Levites were numbered, 38,000,—of whom 24,000 were to set forward the work of the House of Jehovah, 6,000 were officers and judges, 4,000 were gatekeepers, 4,000 choristers;—that is, he reckons 24,000 ministering Levites, 4,000 gatekeepers, and 4,000 choristers, for a small tent, probably not so large as one of our own Napier churches, just exactly half the size of the Temple of Solomon, and might hold, if crowded, perhaps, 300 people! He also tells us of *one* Levite family, in which there were "2700 chief fathers and 1,700 officers"—altogether 4,400 rulers—out of one single family of the tribe *of* Levi! Possibly the key to all this (and much more of the same kind) is, that *he was a Levite himself*:—there is a great deal in Chronicles in support of this.

But I forbear. I have brought forward all this (long known to *me),* to show you how the truth stands in respect to the Books of Chronicles; and you will find much more of the same kind for your-selves, *if you, will only thoughtfully read, the narrative and compare it with what is written in other places.*

In the after times however of the history of Israel, we find the later prophets—Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the *later* Isaiah—laying great stress upon the observance of the Sabbath as the sign of Jehovah's covenant with Israel; and so, too, in the Book of Nehemiah, written after the return from the Captivity, we find mention made of Jehovah having "made known unto them his holy Sabbath," and of strenuous efforts being made to prevent the desecration of the Sabbath by labor and traffic. (N. ix., xiii.)

[Here I must remind my readers that this "*later* Isaiah," (or the unknown prophet, whoever he was that wrote the last 27 chapters of the present Book of Isaiah,) must not be confounded with the *older* and former Isaiah, who wrote the earlier portion of the Book which goes by his name; the former was contemporary with Hezekiah (B. C. 710): the later Isaiah lived some 200 years after,—*after* the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar; (as a proof, see Is. 64, 10, 11: 63, 18:) and it is from him that we have some of the most beautiful utterances in the Old Testament.]

That very ancient Book of the Jews, the Talmud, (in general use long before the birth of Jesus,) contains, as might be expected, several excellent remarks concerning the Sabbath, together with many rules for its observance. The learned and unprejudiced modern *Jew* Commentator, Dr. Kalisch, says,—"The Talmud distinguishes 39 chief labours which are forbidden on the Sabbath; but in cases of illness, and in any, even the remotest, danger, a deviation from the rigorous precepts is permitted; and in general were these principles followed,—'The Sabbath is delivered into your hand, not you into the hand of the Sabbath:' and, 'The least danger of life invalidates the Sabbath.'" (Talmud, *Mishna Joma.)* Further, Dr. Kalisch says, "that the Sabbath was a day of holy assembly; but it was also a day of recreation of joy and of convivial meetings." (Pointing out Luke 14. 1, 12.) "Fasting was expressly forbidden."

Having mentioned the *Talmud*, and given the foregoing striking quotation from it, (which will serve to remind my readers of Mark ii. 27, 28,) and as the Book itself is so *very little* known among us, I am tempted to make a few more quotations, which may also serve a similar purpose.—

The Talmud denounces swearing, or oath-taking, and recommends "a simple Yes Yes, or No."

- "Do not to others what you would not have others do to you."
- "A single light answers as well for a hundred men as for one."
- "The place honours not the man, 'tis the man who gives honour to the place."
- "Deem nothing impossible."
- "Man sees the mote in his neighbour's eye, but knows not of the beam in his own."
- "First learn, and then teach."
- "Charity is greater than all,—is more than sacrifices."
- "Who gives charity (alms) in secret is greater than Moses."
- "The Bible was given us to establish peace."
- "He who raises his hand against his fellow in a passion is a sinner."
- "God allows the poor to be with us ever, that the opportunities for doing good may never fail."
- "When our ancestors in the wilderness were saved from death by gazing upon the brazen serpent, it was not the serpent which killed or preserved. It was the trustful appeal to the Father in heaven."
- "The men of Nineveh believed in God's mercy, and though the decree had been pronounced against them, yet they repented; therefore, neither sack-cloth nor fasting will gain forgiveness, but repentance of the heart and good deeds."

There are also numerous parables, and similar stories, strongly reminding one of those later ones of the New Testament.

In these later times, then, of the history of Israel, the Sabbath was kept with, great strictness, by some devout men, as Nehemiah, and by others who, like the Pharisees, made a great profession of religion, but substituted too often outward observances like this for the inward service of the heart which God delights in. But in earlier days we find no trace of this spirit,—no sign that the Sabbath was put on a higher level than the New Moon. And this fact is accounted for, when we find that the first copy of the Decalogue, as well as the second, dates from a late age in the history of Judah,—that it was never really binding on the Jews, as the traditionary view supposes, as having been uttered by the Divine Voice, under a tremendous sanction, from the top of Sinai. Let us now consider what Nature also teaches us as to the duty or the wisdom of setting apart one day in seven.—

And here I will first quote the words of that eminent *Jewish* scholar upon this point (Dr Kalisch, already mentioned, in his Commentary on Genesis):—

"The simple and obvious explanation of the holiness of the number seven is, that the Ancient Israelites, as most of the Eastern nations, counted originally their months after the course of the Moon, which renews itself in four quarters of seven days each, and after this time assumes a new phase These periodical and extraordinary changes of the Moon produced a powerful impression upon the susceptible minds of the ancient nations: they excited them to reflections on this wonderful phenomenon, and everything connected with it assumed in their eyes a peculiar significance. Hence the day of the *New Moon* was generally celebrated with some distinguishing solemnity, which, like all festivals, is regulated and fixed in the Mosaic Law; and the New Moon is, in the Old Testament, frequently mentioned with the Sabbath. . . . . But the division of the week into seven days was known and adopted by the most different nations, as the Assyrians, Arabs, Indians, Peruvians, (but not the Persians,) and many African and American tribes, which never came into intercourse with the Israelites, and

later by the Greeks and Romans, who followed the Egyptians. We must therefore recognise therein, not an exclusively theocratical, but a general astronomical arrangement, which offered itself to the simplest planetary observation of every people."

And, similarly, the ancient Talmud:—"In ancient times the men called 'wise' placed their faith and dependence upon the planets. They divided these into seven, apportioning one to each day of the week. Some nations selected for their greatest god the sun, other nations the moon, and so on, and prayed to them, and worshipped them. They knew not that the planets moved and changed according to the course of nature, established by the Most High, a course which He might change according to His will, and into their ignorant ideas many of the Israelites had entered. Therefore, as they considered the planets as seven, God made many other things depending on that number, to show that as He made them, so had He made the planets. The seventh day of the week he made the Sabbath."

In this way, then, the seven days' week appears to have originated, among so many different nations in all parts of the Earth; by their common observation of the time, which it takes for the moon to pass from one of her chief phases to another, which interval is to all appearance seven days, though in reality a fraction more. In this way originating the seven-days' week may justly be said to be an institution of the Law of Nature, and therefore one of Divine appointment. We no longer suppose that the Creation of the work took place in six days, with succesive outward Divine utterances, as described in the first chapter of Genesis. Yet for all this, and notwithstanding that the Hebrew writer may have held mistaken notions about the time, manner, order, of the creation,—about the nature, magnitudes, and distances of the Sun, Moon, and Stars,—he discerned the eternal under-lying truth when he wrote, "And God said,"—"said," not with outward audible utterance, on the fourth day of the Creation, but said in the depth of the Divine Mind, conceived in eternity as a Divine Idea, and expressed in time by that Divine Word, "by which all things were made,"—"Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons and for days and for years; and let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so." The day, then, is given to us by Nature, and therefore by Nature's God, for labour, and the night for rest. And so is it with regard to the week and the weekly rest.

Further: it is true the lunar month, in which the Moon goes through her different phases, consists really of 29½ days, so that from one chief phase to another would be a fraction more than seven days. Still with rude nations this difference would not be noticed. And, "that the seven days' week really originated among as many different nations in all parts of the earth from watching the phases of the Moon, is indicated by the fact that the Peruvians not only divide the lunar month into halves and quarters by the Moon's phases, but they have also a period of *nine* days, the approximate *third* part of a lunation, thus showing the common origin of both, and so the Romans had the *ninth* day of the month, which was a holiday even for slaves, and the Greek lunar month, consisting alternately of 29 and 30 days, was divided into sets of ten days." (Prof. Baden Powell, *Christianity without Judaism*.)

So, also, Dr. Hessey in his Bampton Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford; he says:—"To what, it may be asked, is the division of time by weeks of seven days to be traced? I answer, without hesitation, to man's observation of those 'lights in the firmament of heaven,' which God placed there to divide the day from the night,' and of which He said further, 'Let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years.' It required *no special revelation* to direct men to these, as convenient indicators of time. The coarse of the Moon, and especially the appearance of the New Moon, would suggest a division, roughly stated, of months of twenty eight days. This, perhaps, would be the first and most prevalent division. It certainly was all but a universal one; for it is found even where *weeks* were alone unknown, and where they are still unknown,—among the aborigines of the New World.— — — —Our purpose is merely to show that a septenary division of time might have suggested itself to man's reason, acting upon the luminaries, which we find God's Providence intended for his guidance in such matters; *without any special revelation*, much less any hint of the Sabbath being necessarily implied in the existence of such a division."

Another able writer observes, on this point:—"The phases of the Moon supply a familiar mark of time to the simplest and rudest nations,—the phenomena of the new and full Moon, especially, being such that men cannot fail to notice and employ them as the natural rule of their calendar. And, if a two-fold division of the month is thus a matter of necessity to an ordinary observation, a four-fold division also is at least inevitably suggested by the Moon's intermediate phases.—*Thus we have the week of seven days*. It is almost impossible, then, to avoid the conclusion to which we are pointing, when once we have discarded (as the majority of thoughtful men have consented to discard) the notion of an actual six-day's period of creation. So long as that notion was maintained indeed, and was considered as a necessary part of religious belief, we could respect and even sympathise with the fixed determination to see nothing in the facts we have referred to beyond a singular coincidence. But now that we perceive ourselves both permitted and compelled to regard the seven Mosaic days as a figure of speech, an accommodation to some previously existing mode of thought, we are prepared to listen

in a totally different attitude of mind to what reason and history have to say." (Quoted in Cox's *Literature of the Sabbath Question*, i. p. 290.)

Yes:—no doubt that is true. That "the week of seven days," was really the object of the weekly Sabbath among the Hebrews is still more plain from the fact that the New Moon was—at least in the olden times—regarded by them as a more important day than the ordinary Sabbath, and accordingly, in addition to the usual daily sacrifice, the Levitical Law provides a "burnt-offering" on *the New Moon* of "two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs," with a kid for a sin-offering,—whereas *on the Sabbath* the additional sacrifice was *only* a burnt-offering of "two lambs." (N. 28, 9. 11.) The New Moon, in short, was the first Sabbath of the month, which was specially announced by trumpet sounds, and gave the law, as it were, for the rest, the first, eighth, fifteenth, and twenty-second days of every month being kept as days of rest, and the next Sabbath being the first of the following month; though, as the lunar changes are completed—not in 28, but—in 29½ days, it would seem that the last week of the month must have contained sometimes eight and sometimes nine days, and probably lasted until the New Moon was seen. Hence the New Moon is always named *first* in connection with the Sabbath by the prophets before the Captivity,—as I have already shewn. It was only about the time of the Captivity that greater stress was laid upon the observance of the Sabbath. And here, I would observe, that it must be clearly understood that with the Hebrews (as with other Oriental nations), the terms *month* and *moon* were alike: they having 13 months, or moons, in their year, and not like the moderns 12.

Before, however, I leave this part of my subject on which so much depends, I would call attention to *two* wonderful modern discoveries, bearing on the matter before us,—which have justly created such a sensation among thoughtful and intelligent men, viz. (1) the finding of the engraved MOABITE STONE; and (2) the decyphering of the cuneiform writing, or inscriptions, engraved on the ASSYRIAN TABLETS of burnt clay. Truly we have "*sermons in stones*, and good in everything," to a degree that Shakespeare never dreamt of! I can, however, only just refer to them here; each, to do it justice, would take much time and writing. From those wonderfully preserved *Assyrian tablets*, (dug out of the ruins of the palace-library of the ancient Kings of Assyria, and written several thousand years ago! and only lately decyphered,) we learn very many things of the first consequence in Biblical Criticism, the same being highly elucidatory of the Old Testament narrations, and of their sources. But, what I would particularly notice now is, those tablets which contain the great astrological and astronomical work of the ancient Babylonians,—"composed for Babylonian Kings before the 16th century B.C.,"—or, more than a 100 years before the Jews left their slavery in Egypt. These are full of statements about the moon and the other planets and the stars, and their conjunctions and eclipses; and how they were predicted and watched for, and regularly noted down at their observatories, and sent in punctually to the Royal Court. The Babylonian Year was divided into 12 months of 30 days each, with an intercalary (or additional) month every 6 years. (Thus: *Ancient Babylonia*, 12 × 30 = 360 × 6 = 2160 + 30 = 2190: *Modern European*, 365 × 6 = 2190.) How astonishingly accurate! being *quite correct!!* and that, too, with-out the aid of the telescopes and the hundred other helps of modern discovery invention and science. Further: with them "according to the lunar division, the 7th., 14th., 19th., 21st., and 28th., were *days of rest*" (Sabbaths), "on which certain works were forbidden." So that, we see, what with our scholars and reasonable men a few years ago was but a belief, a conjecture, a possibility,—based, however, on a direct logical conclusion,—now passes into a certainty. The Assyrian names of the months also closely agree with the Hebrew, beginning also with "Nisan (*Nisannu*, Assyrian).

Very much more may be reasonably expected and looked for from those interesting remains; at which many highly-skilled scholars from all countries are now hard at work, which will tend more and more to throw light on our Bible,—both the Old Testament and the New. This saying may seem strange to some, viz., that those very ancient Babylonian and Assyrian records can throw any light on the *New* Testament, whatever they may do on the *Old* one; therefore, I will just give an instance. There is "the holiness of the number *seven*;" with "the song of the *seven* evil spirits (or demons) which haunt or enter into a man at once,"—with the proper demoniacal "exorcism, &c., for driving them out." One tablet has it,—

"The Song of the Seven Spirits."
They are seven! they are seven!

In the depths of ocean they are seven!
In the heights of heaven they are seven!
In the ocean stream in a palace they were born.
Male they are not: female they are not!
Wives they have not! Children are not born to them!
Rule they have not! Government they know not!

Prayers they hear not!
They are seven, and they are seven! Twice over they are seven!

"This wild chant touches one of the deepest chords of their religious feeling. They held that seven evil spirits at once might enter into a man: there are frequent allusions to them, and to their expulsion, on the tablets. One runs thus:—

"The god (. . . .) shall stand by his bedside:
Those seven evil spirits he shall root out, and shall expel them from his body.
And those seven shall never return to the sick man again."—

Compare this with what is said of Mary Magdalene, (Mark 16. 9: Luke 8. 2,) and of the last state of an unfortunate man, (Mat. 12. 45: Luke 11. 26,)—also of the number *seven* in many other passages.—Here I would remark, that it is very noticeable, that this peculiar demoniacal lore, or at least the beginning of it, the Jews appear to have brought back with them when they returned from Babylon; for we never road of any reference to the existence of a devil in any of those parts of the Bible, which were written *before* the Babylonish Captivity.—Thus, the moving of David to number Israel (2 Sam. 24.), is, in the older book ascribed to Jehovah, but in the *later* book of Chronicles (1 Ch. 21.) is ascribed to Satan. And so in the time of Jesus (as is seen, for example, constantly in Josephus) the belief in the possession of men by demons, was thoroughly established among all the Jews, with the exception of the Sadducees alone.—

The *Moabite Stone* was lately found among the ruins of Dibon in the land of Moab, on the E. side of the Dead Sea. It had engraved in really good old Hebrew (or, more properly speaking, Phenician) characters, a most interesting record of 3 series of events in the reign of Mesha King of Moab. For nearly 3000 years that stone had lain there exposed to all the elements uncared for! and now it was found with all its inscriptions most beautifully preserved. Among other things we find the following, which may be here very briefly noticed.—(1) It was erected about the year 890 B.C., (only 75 years after Solomon's time,) by Mesha King of Moab, as "a stone of salvation and thanks to their god Chemosh, for enabling Mesha to see his desire upon his enemies, and to deliver his people from their enemies the Israelites," to whom they had been tributary. (Just as Samuel is said, 230 years before, to have erected a similar stone, "Ebenezer," for the Israelites, on their defeating the Philistimes (1 S. 7. 12.) (2) In the Moabites beating the Israelites, they took away from them, some towns and country and many people, and also their golden vessels from Nebo, one of their high places, which the Israelites had dedicated to their national god Jehovah,—and these the Moabites now dedicated to the services of their god Chemosh. (3) The whole is given in very plain language, nothing high-flown or stilted; almost remarkable, in this respect, for an *Oriental* production; occupying altogether 34 lines of inscription. (4) But its plain statement varies astonishingly from the wonderful account of the *same* transaction—*the same war*—as given us in the Book of Kings (2 K. 3). (5) And then conies the question.—Which of the two is the *correct* statement? One thing is certain,—They Cannot Both be True.

Now with the many, among "religious" people,—including, I fear, not a few Ministers and Sunday School Teachers,—the "Bible" statement *must* be true.

Notwithstanding, two or three wee things, I may, perhaps, be allowed to call their attention to.—

1. The Moabite Stone was engraved and erected *at the time*, to commemorate that particular deliverance; it was a public thing open to all, all could see it, all might read it in their own tongue. But the Jewish story was written (as I have already shewn) some 450 years after,—after, too, the return of the remnant of the Jews from their long Captivity; and its writing was altogether more of a private character.

2. The Moabites never again became tributary to the Israelites, although living so very close to them; so that one might reasonably infer the Jews had had enough of it on that occasion. Besides the Israelites were *bound*, by their Levitical laws (Deut. 23. 3), never to be neighbourly with them; which old spite, it appears, they also endeavored to renew after their return from the Captivity (Neh. 13. 1), although their most famous king, David, was descended from Ruth the Moabitess! who was his great grandmother; and, to the care of the King of Moab, David had also sent his parents for protection, when in great trouble from Saul. (1 Sam. 22. 3. 4.)

3. The yearly tribute which Mesha the King of Moab had to pay to Israel according to the story in the Bible (2 Kings, 3.), was "100,000 lambs, and 100,000 rams, with their wool." Now this petty kingdom of Moab only comprised a small tract of country, about 40 miles long by 10 broad, (just like a narrow slip extending from Napier to Waipawa,—but nothing like it, in its grass, or water, or in its general fertility,)—and most of my readers here in New Zealand can better understand *all about* that amount of *annual* tribute (200,000 sheep) from such a sterile tract of country on the shores of the Dead Sea, than very many others in England and elsewhere. But read *attentively* the whole story, in that chapter of 2 Kings already mentioned; and I fear that the Hebrew story, as it there stands, will appear to be a fiction; apparently part of some legendary account handed

down from the olden time concerning Elisha.

(Time of Jesus and his Apostles.)

Let us now proceed to enquire,—(1) How Jesus and his followers *acted;* how they kept "the Sabbath" of their nation. Like good Jews they upheld the national Institutions, (Luke 2.21: 22.7, 8, 13, 14,)—often going into the synagogues on "the Sabbath-day," as "his custom was," to read and to teach,—which office, according to the Jews, was alike open to all. They kept the Sabbath, however, in a liberal way. We find him on a Sabbath-day going to a feast at the house of a chief Pharisee (or ruler), where there were a great company of guests, (which must have certainly caused the servants a deal of unnecessary labour in preparing the banquet and in waiting upon the guests,) and where there was also a scramble for the chief seats. But this kind of convivial meeting on the Sabbath, was allowed by the Pharisees, as we have already seen. On that occasion, the scrambling which Jesus saw was evidently the cause of two of his noted parables respecting a supper, or feast, delivered at that time,—and, also, of the rule which he then gave for the proper giving of a feast. (Luke 14.). Indeed Jesus often so acted,—laying hold of passing events, and so suiting the word to the time, or occasion. Again, we find that through his liberal mode of acting on several Sabbaths, both Jesus and his disciples were often charged with having "broken the Sabbath," and with having "done that which was not lawful on the Sabbath-day"; and it was this (among other things) which so greatly enraged the Pharisees against him. We are told of several remarkable cases of healing performed by Jesus on the Sabbath-day;—as, the man with the withered hand,—the woman who had been bowed for 18 years,—the impotent man, who had spent a dreary 38 years in that state,—the man with the dropsy,—and the blind man. Now (1) these cases were all old, long-standing ones; not peculiarly dangerous and pressing ones of the day immediately affecting life; and, therefore, they might have well stood over until the following day, or week; and (2) they were not only cured on the Sabbath-day, but that in the most public manner, mostly in the synagogue (or "Church") itself before all the Congregation; and, sometimes, accompanied with other "work," (as, in the *making of clay*,—and in the ordering the impotent man to *carry his bed*,—and the blind man to *go to Siloam* and w*ash,)* which must also have additionally galled the Jews. Then, again, we have recorded by three of the Evangelists, their *walking* through the corn-fields on the Sabbath-day, and their *gathering* the corn, and *rubbing-out* the grain as they went for food; and the memorable reply of Jesus,—in almost the very words of the Talmud (already quoted by me), which, no doubt, he had often heard and read,—"The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." (Mark 2.) Where were these Corn-fields? Scarcely *within* "the Sabbath-day's journey" allowed by the Jews; which was only six *stadia*=2000 paces, or, about, 6 furlongs, (not quite as far as the "Maori Club" on the White Road is from the Government Buildings,)—so that, it appears, that in this respect *(of distance)* the Sabbath was also broken. Now in all this we perceive a certain something done openly, all tending to lessen "the traditions of the elders" and the Pharisaic sanctity of the Sabbath.—

(2) How, or what, did Jesus *teach* concerning their Sabbath, in all his many teachings, discourses and parables? Hero, however, we can gain but little, because there is but little recorded. There is "the sermon on the Mount" (as it is called), but it is worthy of notice, that while very many subjects are therein mentioned and brought forward, including several of the "ten Commandments,"—there is *nothing* concerning the Sabbath. There is, however, his noble and open and oft-repeated statement, that "it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath-days" (Mat. 12.12); further illustrating his meaning by the works of lifting a sheep out of a pit, and of leading an ox or an ass to water; which, with that precious saying already mentioned ("The Sabbath was made for man, &c."),—one would think would have been quite enough for his followers for all time!

There is also a highly curious and characteristic saying of Jesus about the Sabbath,—which is not found in our New Testaments, and is only found in *one* very ancient Greek manuscript and in *one* equally ancient Latin one (known to scholars as *Codex Bezæ*), which date from the 5th century, and therefore holds a place among the five oldest Greek Mann scripts. As far as I know, it has not been translated and printed in English, but I will give a translation. It is an additional verse coming after Luke 6.4, (the 5 *v.* being placed in those two manuscripts after the 10 *v.,)* and runs thus:—"In the same day, Jesus seeing a certain man tilling his ground on the Sabbath, said unto him, Man, if indeed thou knowest what thou art doing thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not thou art cursed, for thou art a transgressor of the law."—Does not this strongly remind us of Paul's saying,—"Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." (Rom. 14.22.)—Which may indeed be grounded on it; much as Paul has given us a peculiar saying of Jesus,—Acts 20.35. And it may also be further noticed, that the very peculiar and strong Greek word for *"Curse*," used here,—is only used twice besides in the whole New Testament,—viz. in John 7.49, (where the Pharisees used it concerning the people who *knew not the law*,—from which very circumstance Jesus might have adopted it;) and, again, in Gal. 3. 10, 13, (where Paul uses the word in his strongly emphatic way;)—it is not the word commonly used in the New Testament for curse. The same Greek word which is in Rom. 14.22. translated *"Happy"* I have here

translated *Blessed;* as in Mat. 5. 3—11. Some of our first modern Greek Scholars and Commentators believe in the originality and authenticity of that saying of Jesus.

3. What Jesus further said concerning the Sabbath, incidentally or otherwise, in his many questionings concerning the "Commandments," made to those who came to him. Here, again, we find our-selves at a loss; although Jesus seemed to have pretty closely questioned several who came to him about their keeping of the Commandments"; as in the very particular case of one who, on coming to Jesus to enquire what he should do to obtain eternal life, called him *"Good* Master"; (and, was, apparently, first rebuked by Jesus for giving to him that title of *Good*,—which belonged *to God alone;)* Jesus told him, that if he would enter into life he should keep the "Commandments"; and then Jesus repeats *six* out of "the 10 commandments" to him,—but excludes all mention of that peculiarly great one among the Jews—the Sabbath (Mat. 19. 18.)

This remarkable interview is also mentioned in three of the Gospels, (Mat. 19, Mark 10, Luke 18,) with but little variation. Mark also gives another and a similar one, (12. 28—34,) which I have ever considered as one of the truly grand conversations related in the Gospels. Here, the inquirer asks, "Which is the *first* Commandment of all?" Jesus replies,—as a true Jew,—saying,—(in sublime and beautiful language, quoted from the Old Testament, and well-known among the later Jews, as the standard article of their belief, and their war-cry in battle,)—"The first is, Hear O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the *first* Commandment." And then Jesus adds,—"And the *second* is like, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other Commandment greater than these." And his questioner also answers discreetly and beautifully; insomuch that he was highly praised by Jesus for so doing. Yet here, again, we find not a word about *the Sabbath*,—that great and peculiar institution of the Jews!

(1) Why is this omission,—if that of the Sabbath were indeed really given from the burning summit of Mount Sinai, amid lightnings and thunderings and earthquakes? (2) If that of the Sabbath were, as Nehemiah and the few later prophets repeatedly say, the sign of the Covenant between the Israelites and God?

Moreover, here arises an important question to the *thoughtful* mind:—(1) Why did Jesus when asked—What was the *first* commandment of all? Why did he not quote from the "ten Commandments," giving the *first* of them,—if such had been really spoken by the majestic voice of God from Sinai, and engraved by His holy fingers on stone? (2) Again, when Jesus also adds the *second* (great) commandment,—Why are the "10 Commandments" (including that of the Sabbath), again passed by? (3) And why are *all* (even including *those "ten")* said to hang on *these two*?—which were *not* given openly by God himself with dreadful pomp and terror on the burning mountain (as recorded in Exodus), but merely quietly written down, many many years after, by some unknown yet inspired scribe in the books of Deuteronomy (6) and Leviticus (19).

It is of no use attempting to blink the facts before us If those so-called "ten commandments," said to have been so spoken by the *One* Unchangeable and Blessed GOD Himself, and by Him also engraved in stone; If such had ever really been so spoken and so given,—Jesus could never have overlooked them never have spoken thus.—

(Time of the Apostles.)

WE are come down now to the time of the Apostles, *after* that of Jesus; and, in like manner, we will quietly prosecute the enquiry.—

1. How did the Apostles *act*, with especial reference to the Sabbath?

Of *their* positive doings *re* the Sabbath-day, we have very little indeed recorded;—but of those of Paul ("the Apostle of the Gentiles") we have a fair share.—And, in briefly considering Paul's actions and teachings concerning the Sabbath-days, we must ever bear this in mind,—that Paul was (as he himself tells us), one of the straitest (narrowest) religious sect among the Jews, "a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee."

(1) At first we find Paul commonly, during his travels, going into the Jewish synagogues (or Churches) on the Sabbath-day, and teaching (that is, exhorting and preaching) therein, after the manner of the Jews; (viz., at Antioch, Acts 13.14—16, etc., at Thessalonica, Acts 17.2, and at Corinth, Acts 18. 4;) just like Jesus himself did at Nazareth (Luke 4. 16) and other places before him, as we have already seen.

(2) After several years of travel and teaching we find Paul returning to Jerusalem, and there "with the Apostles and elders" assembling to consider certain grave matters pertaining to the Jewish Religion; for the Pharisee believers of Jerusalem had said,—"It was needful to command the Gentile believers *to keep the law of Moses*." This, however, Peter, who was also present, strongly opposed, terming it "a tempting of God"—to seek "to put a yoke on the neck of the disciples" (the Gentile believers), "which," said Peter, "neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." And so we find this first and best Council, composed of Jewish Christians, after having thoroughly discussed those important matters *concerning the keeping of the Law of Moses*, laying down *four simple rules only* for the Gentile Christians,—on whom "they (the Apostles) would lay no greater burdens than these (four) necessary things"; and this decision, they also declared and wrote, had "seemed good to the Holy

Spirit as well as to themselves" acting together.

Now, (1) If the keeping of the Sabbath-day was really a *Divine* Institution, does it not seem strange that nothing was then said about it? Seeing, too, (2) that such comparatively small matters—as the abstaining from things strangled, and the eating of blood-(both long ago broken and thrown aside!) should have been then sent forth as rules, or decrees? (3) Therefore, it must follow, that the keeping of the Sabbath-day was not, in the opinion of the Holy Spirit and of the Apostles, any great matter.

3. After this, on several occasions, we find Paul writing to the various churches, or congregations, of Christians; and particularly laying down what to avoid ("works of the flesh"), and what to follow and do. Now it is highly noticeable,—(1) that in those long lists of evil works and practises given by him (viz., Gal. 5. 19—21, Eph. 5. 3, Col. 3. 5, etc.,) we find *nothing* of "Sabbath-breaking"! Although, in his "lists," Paul is sometimes so diffuse as to state the same thing (generically) under different heads (specifically): (2) that in what he plainly directs the Gentile Christians to do,—(viz., Eph. 5, 6: Col. 3, 4: 1 Thess. 5, &c.,)—although he even, at times, quotes from "the Law of Moses" (Eph. 6. 2)—yet Paul never once says a word about keeping "the Sabbath"! And, again, (3) in that particularly affectionate portion of his letter to his beloved Philippians (ch. 4),—in which Paul sums up all good things, as it were, saying,—"*Those things*, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, *do*"; here, again, is *no* mention of "the Sabbath."

How is this?—If the strict keeping of "the Sabbath-day" was of such very great importance?

I know very well what kind of answer I shall get to all this evidence that I have hitherto brought forward,—That all such is of a *negative* character, and therefore proves nothing.

Be it so. I come then to the *positive teaching* of the Apostle Paul on this subject. He says distinctly to the Colossians,—"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days: which are a shadow of things to come "(2. 16):—and to the Romans,—"Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." (14. 4)

On those two passages the late Dean Alford of Canterbury wrote, in his new edition of the Greek Testament:—

"If any one day in the week were invested with the sacred character of the Sabbath, it would have been wholly impossible for the Apostle to uphold or commend the man, who judged all days alike worthy of equal honour.— — —I therefore infer that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not recognised in Apostolic times." (On *Rom.* 14. 5.) "If the ordinance of the Sabbath had been, *in any form*, of lasting obligation on the Christian Church, it would have been quite impossible for the Apostle to have spoken thus. The fact of an obligatory rest of one day, whether the seventh or the first, would have been directly in the teeth of his assertion here." (On *Col.* 2.16.)

(I bring this forward now,—as it is a single comment on *these* particular texts.)

Again, Paul says to the Galatians,—"But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." (4.9—11.) Here, of course, Paul alludes to Jewish festivals as commanded by "the Law of Moses," of which the Sabbath days, the New Moons, and the Sabbatical years were examples. And note, how depreciatingly how loweringly Paul speaks of those very things which he once believed to be so high and so holy—*Wheatly* here well observes,—"the Christians were no more obliged to observe the Jewish festival, than they were oncerned in the mercies therein commemorated, and this is the reason that when the Judaizing Christians would have imposed upon the Galatians the observation of the Jewish festivals, as necessary to salvation; Paul looked upon it as a thing so *criminal* that he was afraid the labour he had bestowed upon them to set them at liberty in the freedom of the Gospel had been *in vain*."

In concluding this part of my subject, I would again remark,—it is very noticeable that, throughout the New Testament, there is not a single instance of any stress whatever being laid on the strict observance of the Sabbath-day. Jesus himself and the apostles (as we have seen) observed it,—but in a very liberal kind of way; they never, in any act or work recorded in the Gospels or Epistles, inculcate, either by example or by precept, a Sabbatarian spirit. Rather, so far as their words and acts imply anything in this respect, they tend to discourage and discountenance such a spirit. And expressly, in the famous decision of the Church at Jerusalem, which was forwarded to the believing Gentiles at Antioch, by the hands of Paul and Barnabas, Judas, and Silas, they laid no "burden" on them of Sabbatical observances.—

III. Ecclesiastical.

(1. *Primitive*.)

AFTER the time of the Apostles we find that the early Christians did not specially and as a rule keep the Sabbath-day holy. No doubt those who were Jews, or descendants of Jews, for some time longer kept up their weekly assembling on that day; but such observance,—not having been appointed by the Apostles and left free (as we have seen),—naturally fell into neglect. Bingham says,—"If it be inquired, why the ancient church continued (for a time) the observation of the Jewish Sabbath, when they took it to be only a temporary institution given to the Jews only, as circumcision and other rites of the law; (which is expressly said by many of the ancient writers, particularly by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Eusebius;) it is answered by learned men,—that it was to comply with the Jewish converts, as they also did in the use of many other indifferent things, so long as no doctrinal necessity was laid upon them. For the Jews being generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still maintained a mighty reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath,— —and were therefore very loth it should be laid aside. For this reason, it seemed good to the prudence of those times, (as in other of the Jewish rites so in this,) to indulge the humour of that people, and to keep the Sabbath as a day for religious offices; but when any one pretended to carry the, observation of it further,—either by introducing a doctrinal necessity, or pressing the observation of it after the Jewish manner, they resolutely opposed it as introducing Judaism into the Christian religion." Some, indeed, kept *both days*, the Jewish Sabbath and the Sunday; yet in rites and ceremonials a difference was made, and the preference was given to the Lord's-day (or Sunday) above the Sabbath. "For first," (Bingham continues,) "we find no Ecclesiastical laws obliging men to pray standing on the Sabbath; nor, secondly, any imperial laws forbidding lawsuits and pleadings on the Sabbath; nor, thirdly, any laws prohibiting the public shows and games; nor, fourthly, any laws obliging men to abstain wholly from bodily labour. But, on the contrary, the Council of Laodicea has a canon for-bidding Christians to Judaize, or rest on the Sabbath, any further than was necessary for public worship; but they were to honour the Lord's day, and to rest on it as Christians; and if any were found to Judaize, an anathema is pronounced against them.— — —For this reason the sect of the Ebionites were condemned for joining the observation of the Sabbath according to the Jews, with the observation of the Lord's day after the manner of Christians. Against such the Council of Laodicea pronounces anathema, that is,—such as taught the necessity of keeping the Sabbath a perfect rest with the Jews. And in this sense we are to understand what Gregory the Great says, That antichrist will renew the observation of the Sabbath." (*Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, lib. xx.)

And this, to me, appears as an additional witness,—of no distinct rule, no law, having been ever laid down by any express apostolic authority respecting the keeping of the Sabbath, or substituting (as some will have it) the first day of the week to be kept *Sabbatically* instead of the seventh. For when the early Christians met together on the first day of the week, they did not dream of taking the 4th Commandment, and putting that forward as prescribing a rule for the religious observance of the first day. That the *first* day of the week, "the day of the Sun," *was* observed from very early times among Christians, as a day on which they specially assembled for religious purposes, we know from un-doubted authority. But no writer of the first three centuries has attributed the origin of Sunday observance to any apostolic authority.—"In the first century, Barnabas (or whoever else wrote the epistle ascribed to him), Justin Martyr, A.D. 147, Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, A.D. 170, Tertullian, A.D. 192, Clement of Alexandria, A.D. 192, Origen, A.D. 230, Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 250,—all mention or allude to the religious observance of the Sunday; but not one of them even hints that it originated in any precept of Christ, or in any recommendation of the Apostles, either by precept or example. Yet, had any such precept been given, or example set, it is incredible that it should not have been known in the times of the writers above-named, and hardly to be believed that, if known, it would not have been mentioned by them, or by some of them." (Sir "Wm. Domville, *The Sabbath.)*

I may here quote, also, the words of Justin Martyr,—in his famous *Apology* for the Christians, made to the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius,—"We all of us assemble together on the day of the Sun, because it is the first day in which God changed darkness and matter and made the world. On the same day also Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead. For he was crucified the day before Saturn's day; and on the day after Saturn's day, which is the day of the Sun, he appeared to his apostles and disciples, and taught them what we now submit to your consideration."

St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 345, says, to his flock,—"Turn thou not out of the way into Samaritanism or Judaism, for Jesus Christ hath redeemed thee; henceforth reject all observance of Sabbaths, and call not meats, which are really matters of indifference, common or unclean."

St. Jerome, A.D. 392, also says:—

"On the Lord's day" (and, note well, this shows you the manner of its observance amongst the early Christians,) "they went to church, and returning from church they would apply themselves to their allotted works, and make garments for themselves and others. The day is not a day of fasting, but the day is a day of

joy; the church has always considered it a day of joy, and none but heretics have thought otherwise." So that the early Christians did not think it was wrong to make garments for themselves and others on the Lord's-day. Such an idea never once entered into their heads! As a modern Divine correctly remarks, (on those words of Jerome,)—"There was no Sunday League in those days, and the only Sabbatarians were Jews. It is curious to observe, that whilst the modern Christians have seldom-converted the Jews, the Jews have con verted modern Christians in whole sects to Sabbatarianism."(!!)

(2. *Time of the Reformation*.)

QUOTATIONS without number might be made from the writings of eminent Divines (Reformers), in the Church of England and in other Churches, expressly protecting, and in the strongest terms, against Christians entertaining the idea that the Law of Moses was in any sense binding upon them, and most particularly in reference to the 4th Commandment. Thus *Tyndal*, (the first translator of the Bible into English, who was burnt as a Martyr at Antwerp, A.D. 1536) says:—

"As for the Sabbath, we are lords over it, and may yet change it into Monday, or into any other day, as we see need, or may make every tenth day holy-day only, if we see cause why. Neither was there any cause to change it from the Saturday, but to put a difference between us and the Jews. Neither need we any holy day at all, if the people might be taught with-out it."—

Thus, also, *Luther* says,—in his usual stirring impulsive way, which made men say "that his words were half-battles, that they had hands and feet." He says:—

"As for the Sabbath or Sunday, there is no necessity for its observance. And if we do so, the reason ought to be, not because Moses commanded it, but because Nature likewise teaches us to give our-selves, from time to time, a day's rest, in order that man and beast may recruit their strength, and that we may go and hear the word of God preached." And elsewhere he writes:—"Keep the Sabbath holy for its use both to body and soul. But, if anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake,—if anywhere anyone sets up its observance upon a Jewish foundation,—then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on the Christian spirit and liberty." Again he says:—"For only faith in God, and love toward our neighbour, are necessarily required, all other things are free;—so that we may freely observe them for one man's sake, and omit them for another man's sake, as we shall perceive it to be profitable to everyone.—We see the same example commonly in Christ, but specially Matt. 12 and Mark 2, where we read that he suffered his disciples to break the Sabbath, and he himself also, when the case so required, did break it, when it was otherwise he did keep it, whereof he gave this reason, —The son of man is lord even of the Sabbath. Which is as much as to say,—the Sabbath is free, that thou mayest break it for one man's sake and commodity, and for the sake and commodity of another thou mayest keep it."

Melancthon, also, says:—"The Scripture has abrogated the Sabbath, since it teaches that after the revelation of the Gospel all the Mosaic ceremonies may be neglected."

And so *Calvin*.—"In this way we get rid of the trifling of the *false* prophets, who in later times instilled Jewish ideas into the people, alleging that nothing was abrogated but what was *ceremonial* in the commandment, while *the moral part remains*, viz., the observance of one day in seven." We also read of Calvin, that,—"on one occasion when good John Knox paid him a visit on Sunday afternoon, he found the holy man enjoying a game at bowls."

And the *Homily* of the Church of England, "on the place and time of prayer," contains these words:—

"Albeit this commandment of God doth not bind Christian people *so straitly* to observe and keep the *utter* ceremonies of the Sabbath-day, as it was given to the Jews, as touching the forbearing of work and labor in time of great necessity, and as touching the precise keeping of the seventh day, after the manner of the Jews. — — — — Yet, notwithstanding, whatsover is found in the commandment *appertaining to the Law of Nature*, as a thing most godly, most just, and needful for the setting forth of God's glory, it ought to be retained and kept of all good Christian people."

Mr Sidey, in his published sermon (already referred to), says:—"The *right keeping* of the Sabbath has always been a distasteful thing to men of a despotic spirit, and many have been the expedients to which they have resorted to prevent it. In no one of these have they shewn greater skill *to hinder liberty and intelligence*, and those conditions of society which tended to conscientiousness, than in the conversion of the Sabbath into a day of pastime. Charles I. proclaimed the "Book of Sports" to reconcile the English people to their distresses. *(Sic!) By this they were required to spend the large part of the day in amusements*, and those who *complied* with the edict were specially *rewarded* for so doing, while those who *refused* were subjected to *pains* and *penalties*. In this work he was powerfully helped by Laud, if *he was not directed to it by this prelate*, for reasons of a kindred character." (I have quoted this at full length, as I intend *to cut it up*, to shew how easily things are twisted to suit purposes!)

On the foregoing statements of Mr Sidey I would remark,—(1) That Mr Sidey is a wee bit wrong in his

English History (both civil and ecclesiastical), as well as in his Chronology; and (2) also, in several of his severe and unfounded charges; and (3) as a matter of course in his conclusions therefrom.

(1) For it was *not* King Charles I. who issued and proclaimed "the Book of Sports,"—but his father, King James I., a Scotsman, and a countryman of Mr Sidey's!—who issued it in 1618; at which time Laud was quietly and unobtrusively living at his college, St. John's, Oxford; and had nothing to do with it. Moreover, it should not be overlooked, that James himself, a Presbyterian, when King of Scotland, (only a few years before,) actually wrote a letter to Queen Elizabeth in behalf of two Presbyterian English ministers, whom he considered rather hardly treated.

(2) And what does King James say?—"For his good people's lawful recreation, his pleasure was, that, *after the end of Divine Service*, they should not be disturbed, letted, or discouraged from any *lawful* recreations; such as dancing either of men or women; archery for men, leaping, vaulting, or any such harmless recreations; nor from having of May-games, Whitsunales, or Morris-dances, and setting up of Maypoles, or other sports therewith used, so as the same be had *in due and convenient time, without impediment or let of Divine Service*; and that women should have leave to carry rushes to the church for the decoring of it, according to their old custom; withal prohibiting all unlawful games to be used on the Sundays only, as bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, and bowling."—

Now I cannot understand why Mr Sidey should say—"the English people were *required* to spend the large part of the day in amusement;" there is nothing of the kind in the King's injunction.

Again: Mr Sidey says, "those who *complied* were *rewarded*, those who *refused, suffered*":—that, however, does *not* appear from the State paper: and I also find, from Church History, that while there was more or less of arguments for and against, and many fears among the ministers of that period, as to their being obliged to read the said Royal Declaration in their several churches,—"That, after so long and so much talking, — — —their own fear proved at last their only foe; the King's goodness taking away the subject of their jealousy: so that *no minister was enjoined to read the book in his parish*, wherewith they had so affrighted themselves."

(3) Further,—I cannot conceive how Mr Sidey could have written, that such a declaration on the part of the King, was done "*to hinder liberty and intelligence*:" for, it seems to me, viewing English society *as it was then*, to be wholly and altogether *the other way!*

Let us just briefly see what the Historian says about it; how was that peculiar edict brought about; how came it to pass?

In 1616, King James visited his native country Scotland. And the quaint old Church Historian Fuller, (no friend of the High-Church, or Laudian, party,) writes:—"King James, having, last year, in his progress passed through Lancashire, took notice, that by the precisen ess of some magistrates and ministers, in several places of his kingdom, in hindering people from their recreations on the Sunday, the papists in this realm being thereby persuaded that no honest mirth or recreation was tolerable in our religion. Whereupon, May 14th, the Court being then at Greenwich, he set forth his Declaration" (given above). And then,—after noticing several arguments in use, both for and against it,—he goes on to say:—"However, there wanted not many, both in Lancashire and elsewhere who conceived the Declaration came forth seasonably, to suppress the dangerous endeavour of such who now began in their pulpits to broach the dregs of Judaism, and force Christians to drink them. So that those legal ceremonies, long since dead, buried, and rotten in the grave of our Saviour, had now their ghosts, as it were, walking; frighting such people with their terrible apparitions, who were persuaded by some preachers to so rigorous observation of the Sabbath, that therein it was unlawful to dress meat, sweep their houses, kindle their fires, or the like. Yea, and in Lancashire especially the Romanists made advantage of this strictness to pervert many to popery, persuading them, that the Protestant religion was one where no lawful liberty was allowed. And no wonder if many common people were hereby fetched off unto them; 'starting aside as a broken bow,' chiefly because overbent for lack of lawful recreation."—So, we may perceive, that the Judaizing Sabbatarians and precisians were really the cause of all this!

Fifteen years after, viz., A.D. 1633—King Charles was *obliged* to republish his Father's Declaration; but on this *second* occasion (Laud being now Archbishop), our Historian says,—"there was *no* express mention in this Declaration that the Minister of the Parish should be pressed to the publishing of it—which, however, was in that of King James. As before, so now: the Sabbatarian sect being the sole cause of it (as may be read at large in Church History). Our Historian says:—"Now (A.D. 1633) the Sabbatarian controversy began to be revived, which broke forth into a long and hot contention. Bradborn, a minister of Suffolk, began it, setting forth a book entitled, 'A Defence of the Sabbath-day maintaining therein, l. The 4th Commandment simply and entirely moral. 2. Christians, as well as Jews, obliged to the everlasting observation of that day. 3. That the Lord's day is an ordinary working-day. The Bishop of Ely was employed by his Majesty to confute Mr Bradborn's erroneous opinion.—And Mr Bradborn, perceiving the unsoundness of his own principles, became a convert, conforming him self quietly to the Church of England."

Just in this juncture of time (A.D. 1634) a Declaration for Sports, set forth the fifteenth of King James, was

revived and enlarged. "For, his Majesty, being troubled with Petitions on both sides, thought good to follow his father's royal example.— — — — —It was charged on the Archbishop of Canterbury (Laud), at his trial, that he had caused the reviving and enlarging of this Declaration. He denied it, yet professing his judgment for recreations on that day, alleging the practice of the Church at Geneva allowing shooting in longbows, &c., thereon; adding also, that, though indulging liberty to others, in his own person he strictly observed that day." It further appears, "that the Church of Geneva went about to remove the observance of the Sabbath to Thursday; but, it seems, it was carried in the negative."

This "Declaration," or "Book of Sports," (on which, owing to Mr Sidey, I have been obliged to dwell,) must not for a moment be judged of by us, or compared with our manners and customs in the present day; save as to its *principles:* these are sound. We have seen that Calvin himself played at bowls for recreation on "the Sabbath;" and that the Church at Geneva (John Knox's own) allowed of archery, etc.—

I perfectly understand Mr Sidey's *last* words (quoted by me),—but as they have a meaning somewhat foreign to my subject, I let them pass.

(3. *Modern.)*

I particularly note Mr Sidey's phraseology—"the *right* keeping of the Sabbath." I fear, however, that Mr Sidey means by those words almost the very opposite of what I should mean by them;—aye, of what the Reformers and the Primitive Church, the Apostles and Jesus himself, meant by them: as I have endeavoured to shew.

In stating what I believe Mr Sidey to mean, I have no need to go back to those times of James and of Charles, to fetch the *precise* doings of the Sabbatarians of *those days*. I will just shew, (1) from first and unimpeached Scottish testimony, what a wretched thing the strict keeping of the Sabbath in Scotland was, in the last century; and is still, I fear, in not a few benighted places.—First, however, observing, that the Presbyterian Church of Scotland lays down the law in its "Shorter Catechism," that—

"The Sabbath is to be sanctified by a holy resting *all that day* even from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days, and spending *the whole time* in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in the works of necessity and mercy." And it goes on further to declare, that—"The 4th Commandment forbiddeth the omission or careless performance of the duties required, and the profaning the day by idleness, or doing that which is in itself sinful, or by unnecessary thoughts, words, or works, about our worldly employments or recreations."

In that Church a Decree was passed so lately as June 7, 1709, in the following terms:—

"The General Meetings of the Kirk-sessions of Edinburgh, taking to their serious consideration that the Lord's-day is *profaned*, by people's *standing in the streets*, and *raging [strolling] to fields and gardens and to the Castle-hill*, as also by *standing idle gazing out of windows, . . .* and finding that there are divers acts for preventing the profanation of the Lord's-day; therefore the General Sessions do resolve to see to the execution of these good acts, — — — and do seriously exhort parents and masters of families, *to keep their children and servants within doors upon that holy day*, and to take care that all belonging to them do sanctify the same, and punctually attend the public worship of God; with notification, that notice will be taken of such as shall be found transgressing, and they called before the Kirk-Session and censured for the same, and, if they do not amend, they will be referred to the Civil Magistrate to be punished."

One of those "good acts," to which this document refers, was probably that passed in 1705, "against the Profanation of the Lord's Day," wherein—"taking into their serious consideration the great frequency of the offence, by multitudes of people *walking idly upon the streets of the city of Edinburgh, the Pier and Shore of Leith, in St. Ann's Yards, and the Queen's Park,*———and being deeply sensible of *the great dishonour done to the Holy God*, and of the open contempt of God and Man manifested by such *heaven-daring profaneness*, to the exposing of the nation to the heaviest judgments,—therefore they do in the fear of God earnestly exhort all the reverend brethren, &c., to contribute their utmost endeavours in their stations for suppressing such *gross profanation of the Lord's Day*, by a vigorous and impartial, yet prudent, exercise of the discipline of the Church."

It has been well-observed on the fore-going, and therefore I quote it here:—If those Inquisitors had been in authority at Jerusalem when our Lord Jesus Christ 'vaged' through the cornfields on the Sabbath, they undoubtedly would not only have accused his disciples, as the Pharisees did, of profaning the sacred day by plucking the ears of corn and rubbing them in their hands, but would have outdone that most strict of Jewish sects, by denouncing both him and his followers as Sabbath-breakers, on the score of the 'vaging' itself."

And, again, by the same author:—"Those who know the dark and filthy 'closes' of Edinburgh, as they are even in these days of sanitary reform, may judge how far the laws of health could be observed by persons confined all day with no better recreation than theological reading and Sunday 'tasks,' to dark, ill-aired houses, in localities so filthy. Above all, think of the imprisoned children, thus trained to glorify God, and to delight in

His Service!—impatient wretches, deprived of the lively exercise to which Nature impels the young for their good,—withdrawn from the solar light, so conducive to their healthy growth, and reduced by indigestion, ennui, discontent, and the horrors of the Catechism, to an extremity of peevishness and disobedience,—which their tormented parents deplore as unquestionable symptoms of the corruption of human nature, brought into the world by the Fall, and of the evil instigation of the archenemy of mankind!" (Cox, *Sabbath Laws, &c.)*

A few years before that time last mentioned, it was ordered by the Town Council of Edinburgh, (apparently with reference to Nehemiah 13. 19,) that—"to the effect, people may be restrained from vaging abroad upon the Sabbath, none be suffered to come in or out at any of the ports of this burgh from the Saturday at night till the Monday at morning, nor be found vaging in the streets, or repairing to the Castle-hill of this burgh, under the pain of imprisonment, and farther punishment of their persons at the will of the magistrate." And, when it was also ordered, that the public wells should be closed on Sunday from 8 A.M. till noon, and from 1 P.M. to 5 P.M.,—"none to bring any greater vessels to the wells for carrying of water, than a pint stoup or a pint bottle upon the Lord's Day." (Cox, *loc. cit.)*

Here some one may say,—"That was a century and half ago! and even in Scotland things are changed very much for the better since then. In England, happy England! there are no laws which forbid 'vaging' on Sunday; and here in Napier, we have very little of this." Bide a wee,—is my reply; you shall hear and know more yet, shewing, that this crying evil, this remnant of Judaism or worse, this Sabbatarian superstition is still seeking to impede the progress of the physical, moral, and religious welfare of the whole community.

(2) I will now show what, more recently, some of the best ministers of the Scotch Kirk have said about it.—

The Rev. W. C. Smith, a minister of the Free Church, in a speech at Edinburgh, November 10, 1865,—on their miserable "observance of the Sabbath,"—says:—"No street lamps were allowed to be lighted on the darkest Sunday nights, because it was held that nobody had any right to be out of doors at such hours. The Assembly forbade any person taking a walk on the Sabbath, or looking out of a window, and therefore all the blinds were pulled down; and there is great reason to fear that the spurious con-science thus created indemnified itself, for all the gnats it was forced to strain at, by swallowing a variety of camels. No one who knows anything of those days,—*with their universal smuggling and their universal lying*,—will place much reliance on the law of constraint *which was* substituted for the law of conscience.*"*

But I have also the testimony of a more widely-known man and eminent minister of the Established Church of Scotland, the late Dr Norman M'Leod, with reference to the actual present state of the Sabbatarian question in Scotland. His words are of more weight, because they were addressed by him to a body of the Ministers of his own Church,—many of whom, however, as a matter of course opposed him. Dr M'Leod first shows, that though professing to keep the Sunday strictly as a Sabbath, and solemnly enjoining their hearers to keep it, in obedience to the 4th Commandment, they did not really do this themselves! He says:—

"We do not keep the day . . . . . we do not attempt to keep it, even in regard to work. Our servants and our ministers all do what no person living under the 4th Commandment would have dared to have done. This is simply a notorious fact. What effect has this? I think it has this effect, very strongly, of weakening morality. I think this course a most angerous one. You are laying burdens upon the shoulders of the people that they cannot bear. You are training men up to one of the worst habits, that of believing in their consciences that a thing is wrong, and yet making it so that they are constrained to do it."

But besides this "weakening of morality,"—this sense of a discrepancy between the doctrine solemnly taught from the pulpit and in Catechizing, and the actual practice of the teacher himself, when a great *convenience* is treated by him as a *necessity*,—this divine proceeds to speak of the direct evils, which have followed from the efforts still made to maintain the Sabbatarian system in the Church of Scotland. He goes on to say:—

—"The 4th Commandment has produced in our country notorious Judaism—Judaism of the worst description, for which I have no respect whatever. Look at the Judaism of the nineteenth century: look at it, for example, in some parts of our own country in the north. I chal- lenge any Free Church Minister that he would dare to be seen using a razor and a brush on Sunday morning. He would not dare to do it.— — — There is this slavery to the letter over a great part of the country. The clergy themselves have become slaves: they have forged their own chains, from which they cannot escape. They have done so, I think, with perfect honesty, drilling the people in the 4th Commandment and its details, until they are now in a position from which they cannot emancipate themselves.— — — But is this Judaism confined to different parts of the country? No: I think you see much of it in our own town. I grant you that there is freedom expressed in the sentiments that have been uttered to-day, which people would not have dared to have uttered twenty years ago: but I think that this is owing in a great measure to the freedom in Church-matters of Christian laymen, who are not so bound as we are. Let us be thankful for it. But I think that there is a vast deal of what I am complaining of in our City of Glasgow. What can be more Judaical than the stringent rules that are sometimes laid down? You may go and hear the organ or any musical instrument in the church; yet you dare not use the same instrument in the house.

Then again, in regard to "walking on Sanday,"—I ask you what sentiments with some prevail! I myself lately mentioned, in a speech about a north park for Glasgow, that I thought on Sunday evening the people might walk out. This was commented upon, and, I must say, what was uttered made me, I might almost say, tremble for the condition we are in in Scotland, and think that we are standing on the edge of a slippery precipice,—that consequences may ensue of which men are not aware, as a resistance against such ignorance and such cruelty. — — — What did the General Assembly itself dare to say, in a pastoral address within my own memory, in 1834, when it spoke of 'walking' on Sunday, as 'an impious encroachment on one of the inalienable prerogatives of the Lord's Day?' This is what I call Judaism."—

When a minister of the Scotch Kirk can speak thus freely in the ears of his brethren, it is a sign that a great change has passed already over the thoughts and feelings of that Church,—that light is beginning to break, upon this, as upon other subjects, on the eyes of intelligent Christians in Scotland.—

Of course, the larger part of the Presbytery present at that meeting, were against him; but some expressed sentiments on that occasion, which shows that a great departure had already taken place in pious minds in that country from the rigidity and strictness of the old Scotch system.

Thus one said:—"The municipal authorities of Glasgow, the responsible guardians of the working-classes, while they have of late years provided, in their spacious parks, a lounge during weekdays for the rich, have wisely and befittingly intended these also, as an innocent resort for the working-man and his family, when the Sabbath services of the day are over. And, if he be faithful in worshipping his God in the temple of grace, I for one delight to see him quietly and decorously ending his summer day in the vestibule of Nature."—

Another said:—"I am not here to forbid, even if I could forbid, and I am glad that I cannot, the hard-wrought mechanic to get away from the very sight of the smoky scenes of his daily toil, and to enjoy the air, and the sunlight, and the joy of the fair earth. I am glad to meet, as I often do, pale-faced men and women, with their children in their arms or toddling by their side, on a Sabbath afternoon; for I know they are likely to go home more thankful, and cheerful, and good, than if they had been shut up all the day in some small apartment, opening off from a dirty common stair."—

And a third observed:—"One would suppose from the way he (Dr. McLeod) spoke, that the people were in such terror of the 4th Commandment, that they dared not breathe the fresh air on the Sabbath evening,—that they were compelled to sit in their ill-ventilated houses, and not daring, from fear of this hated statute, to go to the door. There may have been the time when this was the case in Glasgow, and there may be *some parts of the country in which this is the case still*. But, if anyone sees the Green on a Sabbath evening, or the Dennistown suburb, or the West-End Park, he will see quite enough to satisfy him that the 4th Commandment exercises no such power over the people, and that this is only a dream of the imagination."

I have thus quoted, rather largely for my space, what that eminent and liberal-minded man, Dr. McLeod, and a few of the more intelligent at that meeting of Presbytery said, with reference to the great question of "Sabbath Observance;"—hoping that some of my good Presbyterian friends,—or readers of these lines,—may be the more inclined to heed what some of the best of their own ministers have said upon it. And, further, to those who may wish to know a little more of Dr. Norman McLeod's sentiments on this important subject, I would say,—"Read (if you have not already done so) his little interesting work called the *Starlinq*, where you will find what bigotry did in Scotland, (wearing, of course, as she always does, a truly righteous and orthodox dress!) in putting a right good and true Christian man—an elder, too!—out of the Church, merely because he simply hung out a little cage containing the poor bird of his only bairn (lately deceased) on the old nail by the side of his door on the Sabbath! I very early got a copy of that book by Mail, which I lent to Sir Donald McLean, and I shall not readily forget how very much he was taken with it, nor his sensible words to me respecting it,—the story being so true, to the very life! The book should have a place in all our country Libraries.

3. And lest anyone *here* enjoying liberty—away from the Old Country—should think, or say, that, Times are altered there *now*; that the Sabbatarian superstition is dead; I will further shew, what a small benighted party *there*, at *present*, are even *now* attempting!—By this last English mail I have received an account of the unsufferable insolence of a small party in Scotland, calling themselves "the Sabbath alliance;" which speaks volumes, and which clearly unfolds what some (with liberty and conscience in plenty on their tongues) mean as to "the right keeping of the Sabbath."

"SABBATH DESECRATION IN SCOTLAND.—The annual meeting of the Sabbath Alliance was held in Edinburgh, on Juno 20. The Rev. Dr Robertson, who presided, said, they could not shut their eyes to the fact that Sabbath desecration was increasing among the people. — — — From the Report it appeared that the North British Railway Company ran twice as many passenger trains on Sabbath, as all the other Scotch companies together.— — —The report went on to say,—'Some special incidents took place in the course of the past year which caused considerable *anxiety* and *pain* to many Christian people in Scotland. During the Queen's visit in September to Loch Maree, SHE and the Princess Beatrice, the Duchess of Roxburghe, and other members of

the suite, were conveyed on the Sabbath across the loch in a six-oared boat to the Isle Maree, *where a considerable time was spent*.— — —It was *gratifying* to the committee to be informed, that the boatmen who usually ply on the loch *refused to go*, and that the hotel-keeper had been obliged to employ his own servants: also, that the *worthy* innkeeper at Auchnasheen had *refused* to send, or even to convey letters to Loch Maree on the Lord's Day. Your committee feel they would be guilty of a dereliction of duty were they to withhold their protest against such proceedings. They cannot but feel *deeply-grieved* that the Royal Family should so *frequently* manifest disregard for the *sacred* day of rest." The Report then mentioned the arrival of the Prince of Wales at Hamilton Palace on Sunday, the 13th of January last, as another instance of Sabbath desecration. The Rev. G. Philip, Edinburgh, in moving the adoption of the Report, said, that there was a great deal of desecration of the Sabbath, not only by *glaring acts*, such as those mentioned, but by idleness,—that was shewn on Sabbaths by the number of persons *seen standing idly on the streets*. The Report was adopted,— — —the meeting considering that the principles of *Sabbath observance* were intimately connected with the *prosperity* of the country."

How strongly this reminds us of those Pharisees of old, who said,—"This man is not of God because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." *(John* 9. 16.) Those men should have the rough and ready old Scotch King, James I. (already mentioned), her Majesty's ancestor, to deal with them and teach them common manners, and not a quiet Lady like our present gracious Queen. (*Vide* the conference at Hampton Court before King James I., A.D. 1604.)

I say, therefore, that if such—or anything like it—is what Mr Sidey means by "the right keeping of the Sabbath,"—then I have no hesitation in saying, rather than *that*, I would prefer to see King James' "Declaration and Book of Sports" again republished with authority among us; or see the Sunday kept at Napier as it is generally on the Continent.

It is a curious thing, and worthy of a passing notice, that throughout the whole world of Christians of various churches and denominations, *three* little Highland countries are at present given to the Sabbatarian superstition! Ethiopia, Armenia, and Scotland. At this very day in the Highlands of Ethiopia there is a so-called Christian Kingdom, dating back from a very early age, where both days are kept in the same manner and with equal strictness, the seventh day and the first,—the Sabbath of the Jews and the Lord's day of the Christians. And in the mountains of Armenia, we find another church, the Nestorian, in which, as a modern traveller says:—"The Sabbath is regarded with a sacredness among the mountain tribes, which I have seen among no other Christians of the East. I have repeatedly been told by Nestorians of the plain, that their brethren in the mountains would immediately kill a man, for travelling or labouring on the Sabbath; and there is abundant reason to believe that this was formerly done, though it has ceased since the people have become acquainted with the practice of Christendom on the subject." (Prof. Baden Powell, *Christianity without Judaism.)*

I fancy that great civiliser *Steam*, whether by water or by land—as the "iron horse," will work wonders, ere long, in the way of opening the eyes of our Northern Countrymen, and help to cure them of this debasing superstition.

But do not mistake me; for in thus writing I am well aware of the existence of a branch of the Sabbatarian party in England, although it is but a very small, and (I hope) a daily lessening one. We know with what painful strictness the Sabbatical view of the Sunday has been carried out in several excellent families, often with the most serious detriment to the religious life of the children; while the general effect upon ordinary persons, of the graver and more decent sort, though not themselves professing to be more especially religious, has been truly and painfully described by the celebrated Mr Wilberforce *(Practical Views of Christianity,)* as follows:—"The Sunday is, to say the best of it, a *heavy* day; and that larger part of it, which is not claimed by the public offices of the Church, *dully draws on in comfortless vacuity*, or, without improvement, is trilled away in vain and unprofitable discourse.— — — — —How little do many seem to enter into the spirit of the institution, who are not wholly inattentive to its exterior decorums! How glad are they to qualify the rigour of their religious labours! How hardly do they plead against being compelled to devote the *whole* of the day to religion, claiming to themselves no small merit for giving up to it a part, and purchasing, therefore, as they hope, a right to spend the remainder more agreeably!— — — —Even business itself is recreation compared to religion; and *from the drudgery of this day* of sacred rest, they fly for relief to their ordinary occupations."

A few years ago some of the Bishops of the Church of England addressed a circular letter to the Directors of the English Railway Companies, calling upon them to put a stop to the practice of sending out "Excursion Trains" on Sundays.—Seeking thus to debar their poorer brethren, who have no means of escaping from the crowded towns on the week-day, from any access, with their wives and families, to the blessings of the country, brought now within their reach by God's good gift of railways; where they might see the wonders of God in creation and feel the soothing influences of Nature, when perhaps the voice of the preacher may have failed to reach them? Here the lines of one of our great English poets (Southey) seem so very applicable that I cannot help quoting them.—

- Go thou and seek the House of Prayer!
- I to the woodlands bend my way,
- And meet Religion there!
- She need not haunt the high-arched dome to pray,
- Where storied windows dim the doubtful day;
- With liberty she loves to rove
- Wide o'er the heathy hill or cowslip'd dale,
- Or seek the shelter of the embowering grove,
- Or with the streamlet wind along the vale.

And just so, again, another great poet of our own day (Tennyson),—

And forth into the fields I went,
And Nature's living motion lent
The pulse of hope to discontent.

I wondered at the bounteous hours,
The slow result of winter showers:
You scarce could see the grass for flowers.

I wondered, while I paced along;
The woods were filled so full of song,
There seemed no room for sense of wrong.

Our artizans, then, if the circular in question could have had its way, were to have been denied the refreshment for the over-wrought body, that solace for the wearied mind, which the sight and taste of these pure joys of Nature are, by God's own gracious ordinance, especially meant to give them. The rich might drive each day of the week along the green lanes, amidst the scented hay or the golden corn,—might "hear the wild music of the wind-swept grove," or "mark the billows burst in silver light;" but the poor, on *the only day* on which they can (if they will) have a share in this enjoyment of nature, which their Father's gracious care has abundantly provided for them,—a gift of this new time, a compensation, as it were, for some of the evils which our modern civilization has brought with it,—the poor were to have been deprived of their rightful liberty and enjoyment, under the mistaken notion of promoting the due observance of Sunday! Happily the Directors laid that unwise address quietly on the shelf, and gave *no reply* to it.—(Would that some here in Napier had duly remembered *this.)*

It must not be overlooked, that, both in England and in Scotland, (as we have already in part seen,) no small portion of the continuance of this Sabbatarian error *is owing to the two National Churches*. (1) That of Scotland, through her common teaching and *Shorter Catechism* (as I have already fully shown); and (2) that of England, through the enjoined reading of the 4th Jewish Commandment (together with the others) in the ears of the people, in the ante Communion Service from the Communion Table (which some of her Ministers—Jewishly, Heathenly, or thoughtlessly,—like to miscall "the Altar"!!) At which reading by the Minister, the people have this prayer also put into their mouths,—"Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep *this law*." As one has said very truthfully and very forcibly,—"Consider the *weekly recitation* of the 4th Commandment, and the *response* to it, without one word of comment or qualification on the part of the Church; notwithstanding that no one believes a *Jewish* Sabbath to be either binding upon Christians or possible in modern life, and not the strictest Puritan of us all, not even Scotland herself, ever thinks of observing it as such. The immense variance, between the letter of this law and the most rigid practical interpretation of it, confounds all English ideas of sabbath- keeping and sabbath-breaking, creates unnecessarily an awful *malum prohibitum*, and lays snares in the paths of innumerable honest men and women. If the 4th. Commandment be indeed a law of the Christians, it is too certain that all Christians deliberately break it. But, if it be a law of the Jews only, then all the scandal is chargeable upon those, who professing to have Divine Truth in their keeping, recite this law weekly from "the altar," as if it were part of the Sermon on the Mount! Such inconsistencies, *to those who will reflect upon them*, will appear far more important, and more fruitful of evil consequences, than most of us are aware of."—Here we are carried back to Dr Norman McLeod's truthful remark;—"What effect

has this? I think it has the effect of *weakening morality*."

A similar admission, in fact, is made in a volume of "Replies to Essays and Reviews," published under the express sanction of the late Bishop (Wilberforce) of Oxford, saying:—"Some schoolbooks still teach the ignorant that the earth is 6000 years old, and that all things were created in six days. No well-educated person of the present day shares in the delusion.————Whatever be the meaning of the six days, ending with the seventh's day's mystical and symbolical rest, *indisputably we cannot accept them in their literal meaning*. They serve, apparently, as the divisions of the record of Creation, lest the mind may be too much burdened and perplexed by all these wonderful acts; but *they as plainly do not denote the order of succession of all the individual creations*." Such is the statement made, under the authority of the (High-Church) Bishop of Oxford. And thus we can now no longer receive this account in Genesis as a record of historical or scientific fact. We see that it is only the attempt of a devout philosophic mind of those ancient times, to express in words the ideas, which either had arisen in his own mind, or which perhaps he had derived from others, as to the creation of the Universe.

But, with the historical truth of the account of the Creation, is abandoned also the very basis, upon which the observance of the 4th Commandment is based in the Book of Exodus. If it can no longer be believed that "in six days" God made the Universe, and rested on the seventh, then the whole basis of the traditionary reason for Sabbatarian observance falls at once to the ground. No reasonable man can any longer suppose that these other laws were actually uttered with a Divine voice from the heights of Sinai; and, as I view it, all Church of England Ministers do wrong if they leave their congregations *in doubt* about this matter,—if they do not tell them plainly that, in reading those Commandments, beginning with the statement, "God spake these words and said,"—they are merely reading, in obedience to the directions of their Church, a passage from the Bible just as they read by the same authority the Psalms or the Athanasian Creed,—without committing themselves individually to the Psalmist's *curses* on his enemies, or to the *damnatory sentences* of the unknown writer of the latter document.

It has often (especially of late years) been a matter of both surprise and pain to me, to see how commonly (habitually?) the Ministers of the Church of England read those words containing the old notion of the Creation of the World "in six days," without any attempt at disabusing the minds of their congregations respecting it. Can it possibly arise from their training and habit? or from thoughtlessness,—the *not caring* to think, or the *suppressing* of thought? Surely, *some*, at least, of those Ministers *must know* that such was not the case; that modern science has utterly disproved it? If so; why not (occasionally) tell their congregations as much, and teach them the truth! I need hardly repeat that, with our present knowledge,—*which is the gift of God*—it is no longer possible to regard these narratives as statements of matter-of-fact, historical, occurrences that no doubt now remains in the mind of any intelligent, well-educated person, that *not* even the *one* world in which we live—much less, the mighty Universe, of which it forms such an insignificant part—was made "in six days," as the Bible statements, honestly interpreted, most certainly imply. But if, on the contrary, some of these ministers still believe in the absolute truth of that old Hebrew notion,—all I can say is,—that it is no wonder that they find the people generally to care so little about "going to Church," and about their teachings, seeing they are so very far behind their flock, *so utterly ignorant of the truth*,—even in things which are commonly well-known now-a-days to school-boys.

I can only truthfully say for myself,—that were I now ministering to a Congregation, I could no more coldly [or "impressively"] read, pass by, or slur over, those strange aberrant formularies and portions of Church services (above mentioned), together with the old legends in the lessons from the Bible, *without explaining them* and telling my congregation *why* I read them,—than I could wilfully bear false witness against my neighbour, or defraud my creditors!

Of those Sabbatarians among us here in Napier,—who, with or without any thought on the subject, signed the Document against the calling of the Mail Steamers here on Sundays,—how many of them are there (I should like to know), who, when the English Mail arrives here on a Saturday evening or night,—as is commonly the case,—are really *willing* to wait patiently till (say) the Monday *afternoon* before getting their letters? for, of course, if their views are correct, the Post Office Officials should not work until the Monday. Again: of those Sabbatarians how many are there who on the Sunday morning are *quite* willing and agreeable (without kicking the cat or scolding the maid) to go without Milk for their or their children's breakfast, &c., on the Sunday? Did they ever consider, when sipping their Hyson or Coffee at breakfast,—how many poor souls have really transgressed the ancient Jewish Law of "Sabbath Observance," in many hours of heavy toil and work from before daylight, at Clive and at Taradale in milking, and in bringing their milk into town, to enable them to have a nice cup of tea or coffee, and their little ones a cup of milk? As Capt. Cuttle said, I would they would "just take a note of it."!

One thing more I feel inclined to mention, as it has a considerable bearing on our subject of "Sabbath observance;" particularly that side of it,—*the regular attendance at Church*, which, with some, is of the very

greatest importance; especially now that such attendance is also become a matter of money and of commercial speculation: for much of this, however, my fellow-townsmen will have to thank themselves. [I pretty well know that I shall displease a few by my plain remarks and statement, but that I must *(again)* bear.] I allude to the horrid money collections, which are now, at *every* "Divine Service," never omitted, accurately made, and thought very much of. And, I may further say,—that I think I have a right to bring this matter forward, from the fact of my being the *only* European here who has always consistently opposed it; and I began early to do so. It was in the autumn of 1851 that the late Bishop of Lichfield, Dr. Selwyn, who was then the Bishop of New Zealand, paid his visit here. He staid a week at my house (Waitangi), and on the Friday he informed me, that he wished a Collection (or "Offertory") to be made on the following Sunday in the Church. This took me wholly by surprise; for (1) it had never occurred here before; and (2) the whole congregation of Maoris were utterly without money; I might, perhaps, have a few old coins in my desk, which had not seen the sun for years. On the Saturday I told the Bishop of our situation, and, also, of my disliking his proposal (for many reasons), but that of course made little difference to him. So, on the Sunday, when the Bishop began to read the Sentences in the Ante-Communion Service, he beckoned to his Maori travelling compapanion Rota, who came up to the Table, took from the Bishop a small black velvet bag (into which the Bishop put his gift) came to me, from whom he got nothing, and then, having tried some half-a-dozen of the Maoris (who looked on in astonishment!) and also getting nothing from them, Rota returned with his bag to the Bishop. Again: soon after the opening of the first-built little part of S. John's Church here in Napier, some 15—16 years ago, a meeting of the Church Congregation was called, and the Rev Mr St. Hill wished to introduce the money collection or "Offertory;" this I again opposed as being the very opposite of the principles of the Gospel, and as mocking the poor who came to Church, [nearly all of us *were* poor in money in those days!] but I could only succeed in doing away with that of the Evening Service; and this was agreed to, but only held for a time! I remember saying on that occasion, that I for one would give £5. a year to have *no* collection on Sundays,—which was more than I should give supposing I attended every Sunday in the year and gave the customary shilling. A year or two after that I let the Churchwardens know, that I would keep to the old English rule, and only give on the Communion Sunday (*viz.* the first Sunday of the month). But Mr Churchwarden Tiffen would, not-withstanding, persist in shoving his plate into my pew every Sunday,—of course he got nothing from me; however I very soon cured him of that, for I told him, that I would carry to Church copper pennies (the true big *old* coin!)—and if he ever shoved in his plate again (save on the Communion Sunday), he would get a big copper with a jingle! (my pew too being then next to his,) and I knew that others would follow suit. Mr Tiffen being "wise," kept out of it, and I was never again troubled with that plate.—For my own part I can conscientiously say, that I would *not* minister in a congregation where such an open support was given to Mammon and to Little-mindedness, to Pride-of-Life and to Backbiting. 'Tis in such matters that "the Devil" (whether that of Mr Oliver or any other person) is truly well served, and *he* laughs to his heart's content!! By all means let every Church—every Denomination—support its own Minister,—and *support the faithful one* WELL; but let that "be done decently and in order,"—and *not* at the expense of mocking *the poor*,—to whom the Gospel is *not now* preached. For it is evident,—both from *Advertisements*, and from the touting for and boasting of *Money* collections,—that it is with too many Churches just as with the Theatres and other like performances,—*Come with money in your pocket or you will not be welcome*. And this (such alas! is human nature) will be sure to act as a powerful lever in the matter of keeping up the "Sabbath Observance" and the going to Church; possibly more so than the 4th Commandment and the thunders of Sinai! But when the time of solemn thought and of reaction comes, the Congregations will always have it in their power to put all such sordid trafficking down,—by *just acting as I did*

Of one thing, however, I feel quite sure,—and from it I derive no small comfort,—that the time is coming when,—not only in this matter of "Sabbath Observance" but in all similar and kindred matters affecting *true* Religion and the whole well-being of Man,—the human race will no longer submit to be ruled or guided,—catechized, preached to, and prayed for, by any mere assuming family or clique of pretentious persons, but will assert their own inalienable birthright, and choose for themselves and for their children able and fitting guides and teachers both lay and clerical. And truly good and wise will the Ministers of the various Churches be in that day, if they heartily assist in bringing all needed Reform to pass.

No doubt, interested folks in Church and in State will ever strongly oppose this;—as, indeed, they have always done,—for no true Reform ever comes from *within*! and they may also, *for a time*, succeed; but such will not, can not, prevent the needed Reform,—scarcely, in-deed, delay it,—and will only serve to make it the more complete and effectual when brought to pass.

Already, I may truly say, light is breaking all around, *the result of Modern Biblical Criticism*: and to this I would especially call the attention of all thoughtful members of the Church-of-England. They may see it in the *three* great works in reference to the Bible, which have been taken in hand by leading men in that Church under competent authority, viz. (1) The *new Lectionary*; (2) the *new Bible Commentary* "by Bishops and other clergy

of the Anglican Church": and (3) in the *new* and *corrected* authorised *version of the Bible* (not yet completed);—all however the results of Modern Bible Criticism; all professedly based upon the latest results of learned, as well as devout, study of the sacred oracles.

Take, for instance, the *New Lectionary*, (which, I believe, is in use here,)—some, perhaps many, of the hearers of its lessons read will have hardly noticed this fact, that now for the first time in the History of the Church of England the first 3 verses of the *second* chapter of Genesis are publicly read for a Sunday lesson in connection with the *first* chapter of that Book, as the closing portion of the account of the Creation contained in that chapter. Some of the regular congregation will have hardly perceived any difference has been made in that lesson for Septuagesima Sunday,—will have taken for granted that the same words were read on that day in their ears, which have been always read year after year ever since they were old enough to enter a church, and centuries before they were born. But a change has really been made by the lawful authority in that Church—small in appearance, but momentous in its consequences—one which opens up the whole question of Modern Biblical Criticism before the eyes of the whole congregation. But *why* is the Lesson for Septuagesima Sunday now for the first time made to end with the third verse of the 2nd Chapter of Genesis? A glance at the Bible will shew at once the reason. It is because the matter contained in these three verses is precisely similar in character to that contained in the whole first chapter,—and *quite distinct* from that which follows in the rest of the second chapter and in the third. The attention of thoughtful persons is thus directed to the fact, that there are TWO accounts of the Creation in the Bible; written by *different persons*, and at *different times* in the world's history, and *widely differing the one from the other*. The old division of chapters, sanctioned by use and the pious ignorance of past ages, which has hitherto obscured the truth for most English readers, is once for all deliberately set aside, and reason and scholarship are at last allowed their due rights even in the treatment of Holy Scripture. As I view it, it is the duty of all the intelligent members of the Church of England to understand clearly the truth of this matter, which is now brought before them by the highest authorities; and it is certainly the duty of the Ministers (as many of them at least as are really able and willing to do so), to set that truth in a plain intelligible form before the eyes of their congregations. This little Lectionary, though simple in appearance, yet, being established by law in the Church of England, will be found, on close consideration, to involve principles which will tend to revolutionise the whole system of traditionary teaching, admitting light and air into the long shut up, darkened and musty, chambers.—

Moreover, the *new Bible Commentary* (a portion of which *has only just been seen by me*,) admits that we have *no correct copy of the Ten Commandents* as really uttered by the Divine Voice on Sinai; and that "the *two distinct statements*" of them in Exodus and Deuteronomy, *though "differing from each other* in several weighty particulars," *are "apparently of equal authority*." and "each is said, with reiterated emphasis, to contain the words that were actually spoken by the Lord, and written by Him upon the stones.———It has been generally assumed that the whole of one or other of these copies was written on the Tables of Stone. Most commentators have supposed that the original document is in Exodus, and that the author of Deuteronomy wrote from memory, with variations suggested at the time. Others have conceived that Deuteronomy must furnish the more correct form, since the Tables must have been in actual existence when that Book was written. But *neither* of these views can be *fairly* reconciled with the statements in Exodus and Deuteronomy, to which reference has been made. *If either copy*, as a whole, *represents* what was written on the Tables, it is obvious that *the other cannot do so*." We are also told,—that the Ten Commandments were, probably, originally uttered all in the same *terse* form as those which now remain, as, "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," &c., and were, *afterwards*, considerably enlarged by Moses,—a supposition which is, of course, entirely opposed to the usual traditionary notion. Thus, for instance, the 4th Commandment, as uttered by Jehovah on Sinai, was merely the brief injunction, "Remember the Sabbath-day to sanctify it"; it was Moses who *afterwards added* the further details, "Six days shalt thou labour, &c.,"—but with the wonderful and perplexing *variations* and *additions*, in the *two* different accounts given in Exodus and in Deuteronomy as to the reason for keeping the "Sabbath;" and *both* equally said to have been authoritatively given by Jehovah himself! Further, this Bible Commentary instructs its readers that, generally, wherever they read in the Pentateuch, "And Jehovah spake unto Moses saying," they are to conclude—not that there was any audible utterance, but only—that Moses felt himself moved by an inward Divine impulse to enact certain laws, *which*, however, *he not infrequently copied "from existing and probably very ancient and widely spread heathen institutions;—adopting existing and ancient customs*, with significant additions, *as helps* in the education of his people." And this Commentary also informs its readers, that "*it is by no means unlikely that there are insertions of a later date*, which were written or sanctioned by the Prophets and holy men, who *after the Captivity* arranged and edited the Scriptures of the Old Testament." (*B. C.* I. pp. 335, 494, 717, &c.)

The *new Translation of the Bible* is progressing, but it lies at present hidden in the secret chamber and not yet communicated to the world. May I live to see it published! I noted, however, that one of the most eminent of the translators, and a Bishop in the English Church, said openly in Convocation when this work was

begun,—"I must own it is my belief that, when the Authorised Version has received all the amendments of which it is capable and which it absolutely requires, this will be found to have effected a very great change in many parts of the Bible; and I think that one effect of this will be that it will deprive many of the clergy, and perhaps still more of Dissenting Ministers, of some of their most favourite texts. We ought not to conceal from ourselves that it will very materially alter the text of Scripture."

Three small matters, all, however, though diverse in kind, being steps in the right direction and highly significant, have also lately taken place here, at which I rejoice:—(1) The opening of our Athenæum News Room on Sunday afternoons: (2) The running of no less than 18 separate trains (going and returning) from Dunedin on the Sunday, between the hours of 9 morning and 6 evening: and (3) the alteration made by the Presbyterian Church, in doing away with their Sacramental *Fast-day* before that of their Church Communion.

To these I might justly and properly add, as a *fourth*,—the great and good matter of State Education—civil and scientific, reasonable and *truly religious*,—recently undertaken by the Government of our Country: but this is yet in its infancy, and would require a whole paper to do it justice. Thus much, however, I would say, as it bears greatly on our subject of "Sabbath Observance,"—that the sooner the various and dissonant *old* Church *Catechisms* are altered, (like the *new* Bible Commentary, and the *new* translation of the Bible,) and so made conformable to truth, and to truthful religious and scientific teaching, the better for the children, (especially those at Sunday Schools,) and for the future generation,—aye, for the rising state of New Zealand.—And here I would call attention to some solemn words of a late Archbishop of the English Church,—words well worthy of being weighed by all Teachers,—whether of Sunday or of Day School,—by religious as well as scientific Teachers of all classes:—"He who propagates a delusion, and he who connives at it when already existing, both tamper with Truth. We must neither lead nor leave men to mistake falsehood for Truth. Not to undeceive, is to deceive. The giving, or not correcting, false reasons for right conclusions, false grounds for right belief, false principles for right practice,—the holding forth or fostering false consolations, false encouragements, or false sanctions, or conniving at their being held forth or believed,—are all pious frauds. This springs from, and it will foster and increase, a want of veneration for Truth: it is an affront put upon the Spirit of Truth." On these words I would ask *one* question—of *Ministers* and Sunday School Teachers. How can we serve the Living and True God, except so far as we are servants of the Truth? And how can we be servants of the Truth, if we knowingly shut our eyes to facts which *we do not like*, because they *conflict with our preconceived notions*; and if we not only do this ourselves, but attempt to close, or to keep shut, or to throw dust in, the eyes of others under our influence, that they may not be able to see the facts which God's wise Providence, in this age of the world, has made known to us for our instruction and guidance in life?

Lastly, (before that I leave this part of my subject,) I will say, after more than 20 years serious study of the matter before me,—that it is my conviction, that these three facts may now be regarded as established by a very general consent of competent Modern Scholars, *not pledged* to the support of traditionary views,—(1) That no part of the original story of the Exodus can have been composed *before* the time of SAMUEL: (2) That Deuteronomy was written not long before the Babylonish Captivity: and (3) that the Levitical legislation originated during the Captivity; by which the notion of the Mosaic authorship and infallible Divine authroity of the whole, or indeed of any portion, of the Pentateuch is shown to be untenable.

IV. Reasonably.

Including (1) *Theologically* and (2) *Humanly*: or, in plainer words,—for the Glory of God and the Good of Man.

"The Sabbath,"—the Lord's Day, the Sunday, the Day of Rest,—like all other good things,—"*was made* FOR *man*," by his bounteous Creator. Let us ever bear this in mind.

And, *first*, let us seek to be delivered from a slavish spirit in respect to the old abrogated Jewish Sabbath-day; toss it overboard, have done with it: then, *secondly*, seek to realize that true "liberty" wherewith the Gospel of Jesus has made us free: and, *then*, we shall be able clearly to comprehend the true, the deep, meaning of those words,—"*The Sabbath was made* FOR *man*."—

For it is only by so doing that we can arrive at the true enjoyment of the Sunday as a Day of rest, *a Day of refreshing!* and learn to keep it in spirit and in truth with thankfulness of heart as a truly enjoyable day, a day which the Lord hath blessed; a day of strength-recruiting, a day of true refreshment both to body and soul, a day of worship, a day of social rejoicing, a day which the Bountiful Father has pre-eminently instituted for the good of his creature man!

The old saying still holds good,—"*Tot capita tot sensus*" (So many heads so many minds),—but, notwithstanding, by all (I suppose) this will be allowed,—that the *day* is given to us by Nature, and therefore by Nature's God, for labour, and the *night* for rest; this is certain,—

"He appointed the Moon for seasons;
The Sun knoweth his going down.— — —
Man goeth forth unto his work,
And to his labour until the Evening,'

As a rule, then, there is a law laid upon us by the ordering of our Creator, that we should wake and work by day, and rest and sleep by night. It is, however, a law not meant to be enforced with strict severity, as if we might never work by night or sleep by day: it is a law made known by a wise Father to intelligent children,—by the Divine Reason to His reasonable creatures. The law of the interchange of day and night was "made *for* man,"—not man for the law. The law of daily toil and nightly rest is to be our *rule*, our general guide,—though we are left at full liberty, of our own free will, when we see occasion for it to depart from it. We know that, if we do depart from it constantly, without something to compensate the breach of Nature's law, we shall suffer the consequences. It is God's Law that the daytime shall be the time of labour for the *individual*, as well as the time for social *common* work, for the setting forward of those labours which concern the welfare of the whole community. And so is it with regard to the week and the weekly rest. We need—at all events, in civilized communities, where there is such continual tension of the brain, and draining of the nervous energy—the recurrence of days of rest,—rest, not to be enforced upon us, from the necessity of a positive law, but rest commended to us by the wise provisions of our gracious Creator, and approved by universal experience to be a source of infinite blessing,—the right of the poor man as well as the rich,—as needful, in fact, for the wants of our physical, social, moral, and religious nature, as the rest by night after the toil of the day. "God has spoken this word to us," *not* from the burning summit of Sinai, but in His Fatherly Wisdom and Goodness, and woe be to us if we refuse to heed His teachings. At the time of the French Revolution it was tried to alter every *seventh* (day of rest or ceasing to labour) to every *tenth* day, but it was found on trial not to answer, and was pronounced by scientific men and physiologists, who had studied man's nature and natural wants, to be insufficient.

I conclude, then, with all reasonable confidence, that one day out of seven has been graciously indicated by the Creator as a day of rest for labouring and weary men;—that, although the Hebrew philosopher in Genesis had no real historical basis for inserting in his cosmogony a sacred reason for the custom, which he found already existing among his people, and the observance of which he desired to enforce among them, yet there was a deeply grounded substantial truth in his assertion,—"God blessed the Sabbath-day and sanctified it."

Let us consider in what sense, with reference to what wants of his nature,—"*the Sabbath*"—or day of rest—"*was made for man."*

1. It is good, first, for his *physical* nature, that his nerves may be relaxed, the pressure taken off his brain, the sweat of toil wiped off his brow. We all feel that, while regular and constant employment is upon the whole the best condition for the health and vigour of all the faculties, it may be too constant—too wearying and exhausting—for body or mind. This becomes most evident, when a break intervenes, and *after the holiday* the tasks of daily life are renewed with a fresh spring of energy. This is felt most strongly indeed at the time of youth, when labours for the most part are carried on by compulsion, whether of parents or teachers, or of masters and employers. But it is not confined to youth alone: and, whether the muscles or the mind are at their full stretch, we know that they are the more fit for use after rest, or after such a change of action as amounts to rest. For *inaction* is not by any means always the rest of waking human creatures, and to the *young* it is often irksome in the extreme,—and physically, as well as morally, injurious. Hence it is that to them the *Holy Day—or* Sunday, through the ignorance of parents and of Ministers,—is too often the very contrary of a *Holiday* (which it should be), and the notion of Heaven, *as an eternal Sabbath*, most distasteful and disheartening; while the *righteous* rebellion of all their faculties and powers against the Sabbatarian restraints imposed upon them,—which is merely *the voice of that very nature which God has given them*,—has been too often most ignorantly and cruelly interpreted into a sinful aversion of the mind from God and his Laws! or to the listenings to the suggestions of the tempter or "Devil"!! [Whose *true personality*, with or without horns and hoofs, bat's wings, and tail, has lately been so energetically preached to wondrous credulous audiences here in Napier!!!] I need not say, to intelligent men, with what *serious* consequences, in too many cases, *to the whole future life of the child*. I believe, that to this cause,—perhaps as much as to any other,—may be traced *the fact*, that so many children of *pious*, but *unwise*, parents grow up ungodly and profane. Their whole notions of *religion* have been distorted from the first; their nature has been thwarted, their ideas of right and Wrong confounded, their *true* spiritual growth dwarfed and stunted; till at length all their views about Religion have become embittered, gloomy, and morose; *they hate the very thought of it*, and turn with distaste from all mention of that "other God," whom they have been taught and coerced to worship in a wretched servile way

according to "the letter," *instead*, of the *One* only Living and True God;—our common loving Father, whose true service is delight, and only "in spirit and in truth," and therefore ever in accordance with reason,—God's best gift to man.

I say, then, for our *physical* nature we all need, as a rule, the rest of Sunday; but that rest should consist of REFRESHMENT *of body and mind*,—of a recruiting of both bodily and mental strength, as well as of mere relief, or cessation, from the six days' toil. That *refreshment*—we must never forget—will be found differently under different circumstances; *even as our common natural tastes differ for different hinds of food*. And let no man judge his brother in this matter; to his own Master each much stand or fall. What is really wanted in this respect,—instead of mere dull inaction, or keeping quiet within doors,—is such pleasant exercise of mind or body, as shall best relieve the burdened system, and leave it best fitted for the other uses, for which the Sunday rest is needed.—

But it may be, that you have had to work hard all the week (or working days), and on the Sunday morning you still *feel too tired* to rise and go to some Church—of which you may be a member, or a regular attendant. Don't think for a moment you are doing what is right in *so* rising and *so* going to Church, and there spend your time sleepily; if you do so, you do what is wrong before God, who wishes you to take care of your body; your first duty (in such a case) is to remain in bed and rest. *Nature tells you so;* and you dare not resist her powerful voice. Rest is sweet for the wearied jaded body, therefore use the Sunday's rest bountifully as it is bountifully given you for your bodies. Just so, again, with others, whose minds have in their varied mental occupations during the week been fully on the stretch; if you were to go to Church you would, in all likelihood, feel that you could not attend to anything as you ought to do:—*Don't then go*, but take a walk, or a ride, or whatever kind of relaxation (which is your mind's true rest) you feel will do you the most good, and strengthen and brace your mind for the duties of the coming week.

2. It is good for our *moral* nature, which requires rest no less than our physical. It is good that men should be able—at all events, for one day in seven—to shake off their secular chains, and realise that they are not bound as slaves for ever to cash-books and ledgers, to buying and selling, to the labors of the office, the bank, the workshop, and the study,—that they have a right, the very humblest and poorest among them, to go forth on this day in the dignity of Nature's freed men, cleansed from the dust and stains of the weekly labors, released from its necessary, but often heavy, drudgery, clothed in their best, and lightened, as much as may be, of the burdens and cares of life, to enjoy the sun- light and the breeze, the sight of the broad earth, the sea, and the sky, to walk among the fields and flowers, the corn-lands and pastures, and hear the song of birds, the ripple of the babbling stream, or, it may be, the mighty sound of ocean's murmurings or tossings,—and to say with child-like reverence and confidence,—"It is our Father's Hand which made them all!"

"Poor sons of toil! oh, grudge them not the breeze
That plays with sabbath flowers; the clouds, that play
With sabbath winds; the hum, of sabbath bees;
The sabbath walk; the sky-lark's sabbath lay:
The silent sunshine of the sabbath day!"

3. Thirdly, our *religious* nature needs the day of rest, that we may have time to turn our thoughts within, and see how we are ripening for Heaven; see how we are making ready for the great account, and growing in the tempers of the children of God; that we may specially commune, each with his own soul and with the Great Creator; may seek His Face may study His Word and His Works,—may "acquaint ourselves with God, and be at peace." The true child of God will, indeed, have such communion with his Heavenly Father each day of his life. But, on other days, the cares and duties of the world intervene; they must more or less distract his thoughts, and engage his time, and they must be allowed to do so: for they are part of that six days' work which God gives them to do, as He gives them also the day of rest.

On Sundays we may all meet together in the House of Him who is the Father of all! For this—Common Worship—is the highest and noblest of all the occupations of Sunday. It is true, very true, men may, and do, worship God in the closet at home,—or as they walk abroad, in the depths of the forest, by the babbling stream, by the margin of the sea, or on the mountain top, or side. But in Religion, as well as in many other matters, it is not good for man to be always alone,—it is not meant that he should be so. And the presence of many worshippers, joining together in common prayer and praise to the great Father of all,—feeding together on the same living bread,—drinking together freely from the same wine and milk, "without money and without price,"—bringing together their burdens of sorrow or of sin, their cares and troubles, or, it may be, their songs of deliverance, their tribute of thanksgiving, to the Adorable Source of all Light, and Life, and Blessing,—this union of many hearts tends to strengthen and deepen the Religious feeling of all; it helps us to realise more

fully the fact that our spiritual being is a glorious reality,—that Communion is possible,—is actually taking place,—between the Father of spirits and His children upon earth; that we are members together of one great Family, one Church of the Living God.—Yes: such happy seasons have been known—both in England and in New-Zealand; such may, yea *will*, be known again. But before that *can* possibly take place *a great change* is needed; a change affecting almost everything connected with Public Worship *as it is now*; a change in which both the Minister and the Congregation are all equally concerned; and that desirable change will again be known among the Churches when those who worship therein (including those who serve) shall become—as the old Hebrews had it—WHOLE-HEARTED in the matter of God's Service. *Then* Sundays will be as they should be—Holy days and Holidays and Happy days: days of rejoicing and of refreshment. As dear George Herbert beautifully (though quaintly) says:—

"The Sundays of man's life
Threaded together on time's string,
Make bracelets to adorn the wife
Of the eternal glorious King.
On Sundays Heaven's gate stands ope;
Blessings are plentiful and ripe,
More plentiful than hope.

Thou art a day of mirth:
And, where the week-days trail on ground,
Thy flight is higher, as thy birth:
O let me take thee at the bound,
Leaping with thee from seven to seven.
Till that we both, being tossed from earth,
Fly hand in hand to heaven!"

4. Lastly our *social* nature needs above all the Sunday,—and for this end, we may reasonably believe, it is specially indicated. The Sun and Moon are set in the heavens to be for "signs" and for "seasons," not to single individuals but to *all*,—to all the human family together, and alike to all. How greatly are the joys of the Sunday-walk, of the Sunday-recreation, of the Sunday-holiday, intensified, by sharing them with others, with the members of our family, it may be, reunited from time to time; or with friends and neighbours, breathing with us the fresh air, and freedom, the cheering delights, of the day of rest! What support it also gives to the moral sense of man's higher nature and destiny, of his dignity above the brutes that perish, when by common consent the business of daily life is broken off, that all may meet together on that day at least, cleared from the week's defiling dust, not as masters and servants, as lords and laborers,—not as poor trembling slaves with scrupulous consciences under a "hateful" *Jewish* Law believed to be Divine!—but as fellowmen, upon the common ground of their humanity! and all alike as children of the One Great and ever loving Father.

Much has been done of late years in England towards the clearing away of some of the hindrances which prevented the larger number of the bulk of the people from enjoying to the full the Sunday rest—the Sunday *refreshment*—as He, who framed their being, has meant them to enjoy it; and it is to be hoped, that the Imperial Legislature there will soon clear away also the remaining ones. So that the people generally will no longer be debarred from access, during at least some part of the Sunday, to purer sources of delight in Gardens and Museums, in Aquariums and Galleries, where the wonders of Nature and the beauties of Art, the interesting remains of Antiquity, and the marvels of Science Discovery and Invention, are stored; and, therefore, will not be, (as heretofore,) any longer impelled to seek other pleasures, of a gross and sensual kind,—more destructive to body and soul than continued honest labor; aye, driven (as they too long have been) by sheer vacuity of mind, having no power, even if they would, to devote the "*whole* day" to religious thought and worship, being utterly incapable of such prolonged mental exertion,—having the Sunday on their hands, and not knowing what to do with it.

From the Annual Report of the Royal Gardens at Kew (London),—which have been lately thrown open to the Public on *Sundays* as well as on week-days,—I find the Director, Sir J. D. Hooker, says,—"The number of visitors to the Royal Gardens continues to increase annually; but always very many more on the *Sunday* than on any other day of the week. Total number on Sundays during the year, 359,237: total number on weekdays, 340,189: greatest Sunday attendance (June 21st) 23,117." And yet, notwithstanding such immense crowds

largely composed of working people, the greatest order prevailed, and no injury was done to the plants: all being more or less delighted at the wonderful display of Nature's varied stores; which no doubt to some—and perhaps not a few—led on to higher and clearer views of the Great Creator of all!

But still the glory of the Christian Sunday is Common Worship. And, whatever may be done, publicly or privately, to enlarge and to elevate the enjoyments of the working-classes on the Sunday, God forbid that it should not be done with a due regard to the Worship of Almighty God, which especially irradiates and dignifies the day, and casts a bright ray over all the week besides. For what is to be desired is, not that the Sunday should be secularized, but that the true Sunday spirit,—the spirit of Christian Trust and Hope, and Joy,—the spirit of child-like love and child-like confidence,—the spirit of devout delight in the Word and in the Works of our adorable Creator,—and the spirit of brotherly love to help one another,—shall so penetrate our whole being, with the help afforded by the Sunday rest, that the secular six days' work may be ennobled, purified, and sanctified.

The time is at hand, I trust, when the Heads of the Church of England both at Home and in the colonies, (to say nothing of those of other Churches,) instead of attempting with feeble hand to stay the wave of progress, will devote themselves heartily to the true work, which especially falls to their lot in the present day, and, instead of desperately clinging to that which is untenable in the traditions of the past, will endeavour "with just and firm hand" (to use the words of Mr Gladstone,) "to sever the *transitory* from the *durable*, and the *accidental* from the *essential*, in old opinions;" and, among other similar matters, will come to rest the observance of the Sunday on its *true* grounds,—physical, social, moral, and religious,—and not on the unsound, unreal basis, on which not a few of our fellow-Christians are still resting it;—will see how the happy healthful freedom of the Sunday may be best enjoyed by the working classes, without sacrificing its religious blessings,—how the great works of human genius, the works of God-gifted men, and the still greater works of creative wisdom, may be enjoyed in our Parks and Gardens, Museums and Galleries, without therefore emptying the various Churches and Chapels, or interfering with the proper rest of others. Aye, and that they will not overlook the smaller simpler matters, which largely affect the great bulk of the "lambs of their flocks" on Sundays,—to say nothing of their influence on them in after life. Such as, for instance, their being able *openly* and *honestly* to spend their Sunday holiday penny, in apples or in nuts, in lollies or in peppermint drops,—without going by a round-about and tortuous way to do it! through back-doors, and with hurried anxious glances up and down the street or lane, and by closing the doors stealthily after them that no one may see them! such, too, being often done, on their way to or from the Sunday School. Both Ministers and Parents, I fear, have long overlooked these *sad beginnings*,—this sure *neutralising* of *all sound* Sunday School Teaching,—this "*weakening of morality*," as Dr. N. M'Leod truly calls it. Here is a case in point, to hand this very day while I am writing these words, in one of the latest English Papers just received by the S. F. Mail,—which I quote entire as therein given.

"GUILDFORD BOROUGH BENCH.

On Monday before the Mayor (Mr Alderman Crooke), Mr Alderman Triggs, Mr Alderman Upperton, Mr D. Haydon, Mr G. Small piece, Mr J. Weale, and Mr J. T. Sells, the following cases were heard:—

THE LORD'S DAY ACT.—Mrs Jane Triggs, a widow, keeping a small tobacconist and sweet-stuff shop in North-street; was summoned, at the instance of Mr Superintendent Law, under the Act of Charles IL, for exercising her worldly calling on the Lord's Day. It appeared that *a sergeant went into the defendant's shop on a Sunday and purchased a pennyworth of peppermint*. A number of boys in the shop were also committing a like *crime*. The Mayor advised the defendant to close her shop on Sunday, but looking at the almost obsolete nature of the Act, the Bench declined to convict."

Now, while I honour and admire the noble conduct of that largo and liberal Bench of English Magistrates, (who seem to have mustered strong and in a body on that occasion,)—what suitable words can I find in the English language to express my utter disgust at the conduct of those two over-officious police officers,—Superintendent Law and his fitting mate the Sergeant,—in their crusade against that poor widow! I have little doubt that they themselves, when boys, spent with much glee in like manner their Sunday holiday penny! And here I may also briefly add, as bearing on the foregoing,—that there was only *one* other case before that full Bench on that day,—*viz.* that of a man charged by a constable as being drunk and disorderly on the Saturday night. This, however, was amply and completely disproved by several witnesses, in spite of the exertions of Superintendent Law; so that "in the end the Mayor said, the conduct of the constable would be referred to the Watch Committee, and the defendant was discharged without a stain on his character. The decision was received with loud cheers by a crowded Court. In the course of the hearing Mr White (the counsel for the defendant) took exception to the interference of Superintendent Law with one of the witnesses, and threatened if it were repeated to retire from the case."—*Sussex Daily News*, Oct. 9th.

To return: We must never forget, that, if God has given us so freely the knowledge of Himself in the Holy Scriptures, which His Providence has "caused to be written for our learning,"—He has *also* given us in this our

day most wonderful illumination by the LIGHT of the different Sciences, which all come to us from Him, who is "the Father of Lights, the Giver of every good and perfect gift." So sudden, indeed, has been the growth of this light, that, even in the childhood of many of us, the very names of many of those Sciences were hardly known. Yet now we stand surrounded, as it were, with the blaze of their commingled radiance; and, in every well-ordered school, lessons will be taught to our young children, with respect to the age of man, the history of the earth's formation, the distribution of animal-species upon the face of it, &c., &c., which will be seen hereafter, as they grow in years and power of thought, if they are not already seen by them, to conflict entirely with certain well-known Scripture statements. You must not send your children to any superior school, where the elementary truths of Geological Science are taught, if you would have them kept in strict bondage to the mere letter of the Bible, and to the old traditionary system of Scripture-teaching.

But no; we dare not do this; we dare not be wiser than God. When he is pleased to give us *light*; we dare not shut our eyes to its shining, and determine still to grope on in obscurity. If the light of Modern Science comes from God—and surely we believe it does—it must be as great a *sin* to despise or to disregard it, as to despise and disregard the Bible. And perhaps this very light of our own days, when the Bible is in every hand, may be given us in God's gracious Providence for this reason among others, that we may not make an *idol* of it;—that we may not read it with unreasoning acquiescence in every line and letter of the book, or rather that series or collection of books, written by different men in different ages, bound up in one, which we call the Bible,—but may read it with an intelligent faith, with the understanding as well as the heart.

Thus we need not be disquieted though the progress of Modern Criticism should take from us much in the Scriptures, which perhaps without sufficient reason we had hitherto regarded as infallibly certain and true,—should show that the Scripture-writers were left to themselves, as men, in respect of all matters which God has meant to exercise our human industry, to be the objects of diligent, painstaking research. Our love must "abound in all judgment," says the Apostle, in spiritual taste, discernment, insight, to "approve the things that are excellent,"—or, as the margin renders it, to "try the things that differ." We must consider for what end the Bible is given to us, namely, to bring our spirits near to God; and we must seek, therefore, the inspiration of its writers, not in matters of Science or History, but in those words of Eternal Life, which come to us with a power that is not of this world, and find us out in our inner being, with messages from God to the soul. And how comforting it is to know that all words of this kind, which God our Father has spoken to us, "at sundry times and in divers manners,'—whether by Prophets and Apostles, or by the lips of Jesus,—whether in the Bible or out of the Bible—stand firm and sure as God Himself is—as our own being is a reality—as our own moral consciousness, to which those living words appeal, is a sign that we are made in God's image!

I repeat, then, the views of God's character and doings, which we derive from the Bible, must be corrected and modified by those which we derive from other sources, by which he is pleased to reveal himself to Man. It is our Father's Will that so it should be—that our love towards Him should abound yet more and. more, in the clearer, fuller, knowledge of Himself, which the study of His Works supplies to us, no less surely than the study of His Word. We cannot be living as true men, we cannot be glorifying God, if we do not make use, according to our powers and opportunities, of each of these means of growing in this knowledge.—In the words of our great English poet—

"Let knowledge grow from more to more;
But more of reverence in us dwell,
That heart and mind according well,
May make one music as before,

But vaster. We are fools and slight;
We mock Thee, when we do not fear;—
O teach Thy *foolish ones* to hear,
Teach Thy vain world to bear *Thy Light!"*

Thus God Himself, "the Father of Lights," by means of the facts which he has enabled us first clearly to ascertain in the present age, takes from us the Bible as an *Idol* which men have set up in their ignorance, to bow down to it and to worship it. But he restores it to us to be reverenced as the work of men in whose hearts the same human thoughts were stirring, the same hopes and fears were dwelling, the same gracious Spirit was operating, thousands of years ago as now. In those days of old there were prophets also, "preachers of righteousness," according to their lights, as well as the lower order of priests to do the common daily task. And

there are prophets still among us, raised up in this as in every age, to speak God's word, the word of truth, to their brethren, whether in the pulpit or out of it. And that Living Word, which is the Light and Life of men, is speaking now to us in all those words of our fellow-men, which have brought us in any degree to the clearer knowledge of Him "whom no man hath seen or can see." But let us be sure that, as it is GOD who teaches us by means of our fellow-men, we may expect that He will speak to us so that we can hear and understand—that He will speak to our hearts and carry inward demonstration to our spiritual being—that *when He speaks His words will come home to us, and will be their own evidence.*

And now I will conclude my Paper with yet another suitable extract from that valuable modern work *On the Bible* by Dr Prebendary Irons, (from which I also quoted in the beginning.)—

"Above all things I earnestly request my fellow-Christians of every class, who may read these pages, to do so with patience and fearlessness, as in God's sight—*even if the course of thought at first seem to them very trying*. For, if what is said be all simply and undeniably TRUE,—then, to be angry with it, is but to 'fight against God.'— — — —Bitter words, and sneers, and persecutions, however refined, will fail. Let the appeal be to facts—to conscience—to reason. Yet a little while, and we must all give our account to Him who is the Truth."

Postscript.

When I commenced this article I did not think of its being reprinted in the shape of a pamphlet; neither did I intend it to be so long. But so many expressed their opinion as to the desirableness of having it put into the form of a little Book that I gave my consent. Could I, however, have foreseen this, I should have written more fully in several places, where (owing to its being for the columns of a newspaper—in which I could not expect to be allowed much room—) I was obliged to shorten considerably my remarks: moreover, I should also have more particularly noted the many quotations I have everywhere given from the works of far abler men than myself, of which I have made great use,—especially as to the edition, the volume, the chapter, and the page. Indeed, I am throughout more of a Compiler than an Original Author, and happy am I in having had it m my power to bring forward so many noble and independent, Christian and Scholarly authorities, Ancient and Modern,—of all ages, of all places, of all classes, and of all opinions—who are as *one* in this great and important question. May their united testimony have that *reasonable* weight with the readers of this little pamphlet which it has had with me!

Napier, Dec. 14, 1878.

Summary.

I. INTRODUCTORY: the cause of this tract,—a Sermon by Rev. D. Sidey on "Sabbath observance," published in the Hawke's Bay Herald of September 9th; reasons assigned for my writing on this subject; a family newspaper believed to be the proper vehicle for all such matters; this view strengthened by the precedents of the Great Teacher and of his disciples; Ebn Ezra's profound saying respecting the Law; particular statement concerning myself and what I venture to deem my peculiar fitness for coming before the public on this occasion; the reasons stated, somewhat analogous to what obtains among Surgeons; Canon Perowne's comment on Ps. 119. *vv.* 99, 100, quoted; manner of taking-up the subject proposed; Emerson's beautiful saying on Persuasion or sacred courage quoted.

II. HISTORICALLY—1. *Before the birth of Jesus* the Bible, what it really is,—not one complete whole in itself; this point long contested (mentally) by me, but found untenable; a few needful facts to be borne in mind respecting the Bible,—its several books not always written by the very persons whose names they bear;—written at various times throughout many hundred years, and often added to and altered; other books of Scripture held by Greek and Roman Churches as equally Canonical, which contain much of Divine Instruction; the Jewish Sacred books (or rather writings, "books" being then unknown), all burnt by Nebuchadnezzar 600 years B.C.; how said to be afterwards reproduced; this strange story allowed by some of the early Christian Fathers; Dr. Prebendary Irons' opinion respecting this story, worthy of serious consideration; the extreme danger of believing the Bible to be God's *only* Revelation of Himself to man; happily no necessity for this; *first* mention of the Sabbath as a rule to man,—afterwards found as a Law among the "10 Commandments"; *two* conflicting versions of these, both equally authoritative; question proposed—Did Moses really write the 5 books called the Pentateuch?; highly doubtful; solid reasons shown for disbelieving it; the great advantage arising from Modern Biblical Criticism, in clearing the character of our God and Heavenly Father; Sabbaths, as

laid down in the so-called Mosaic Laws, not observed by the Jews *before* the Captivity; proofs given; of the writer of the Chronicles; these books fully shewn not to be historically true; Dr. Irons' plain statement concerning them; of their containing monstrous tales as to numbers; the relative sizes of the Kingdoms of Judah and of Israel—or the Holy Land, altogether a small tract extending (say) from Napier to Cape Palliser! the writer of the Chronicles probably a Levite himself, and so intent (like too many priests) on magnifying his Office and class; *After* the Captivity great stress was laid by the Jews upon Sabbath observance; the reader's attention drawn to *two* "Isaiahs,"—widely different persons, who lived 200 years apart, and whose writings are included under the *one* book of Isaiah; the ancient Jewish book—the *Talmud*—adduced; several quotations given from it, shewing the great probability of its having been well-known to Jesus, who also used many of its beautiful sayings, which have been commonly supposed to be original with him; the day of the New Moon, or *first* Sabbath of each month, of greater importance than the following common Sabbaths; Levitical law prescribes far greater sacrifices for the feast of the New Moon, or the *first* monthly Sabbath, which naturally ruled the other and commoner Sabbaths of the lunar month; the septenary division of time, or week, was known and observed by other nations—as Assyrians, Arabs, Indians, Peruvians, Greeks, and Romans; quotations from Dr. Kalisch, the celebrated modern Jewish Commentator on Genesis and Exodus; the Talmud on the weekly division of time,—how it originated with many different nations; Professor Baden Powell on the lunar month; so, also, Dr. Hessey in his Bampton lectures; the Hebrews, like most other Oriental nations had 13 (lunar) months in their year; of two remarkable modern discoveries,—(1) the *Modbite Stone*, and (2) the engraved *Assyrian tablets*,—both wonderfully assisting Modern Biblical Criticism; from the Assyrian tablets we gain much light,—we already know much of their astronomy, which proves to be marvellously correct and agreeing with our own; also, of the holiness of the number 7, as held by them and by the Jews,—cases in point adduced from the New Testament; and, also, of the origin among the Jews of their modern notion of a "Devil," and of demons, which they brought away with them from Assyria; from the Moabite Stone, well engraved in plain grammatical Hebrew, we learn the *truth* of the last war between Moab and Israel,—widely differing from the vamped-up legendary tale of the same war in the Book of Kings; this stone similar to that one raised by Samuel 230 years before and called Ebenezer; a word to Ministers and to Sunday School Teachers, will they hear it? reasons assigned for preferring the Moabitish to the Jewish story; of the yearly tribute of sheep, said, by the Jewish writer, to have been paid by Moab to Israel; the size of the petty kingdom of Moab, only a tract 40 x 10 miles!

2. *Time of Jesus and his Apostles:* Jesus with his followers kept the Sabbath in a free and liberal manner, and not according to the so-called Divine Mosaic laws, nor in accordance with the Pharisees of his day; ample proofs given from the New Testament,—and by other authorities,—shewing his doings and his teachings respecting the Sabbath; more also, on this head, to be gained incidentally from many of his other teachings and doings; in all which Jesus ever shewed himself as the true and faithful servant of the only true GOD; his apposite introduction of the sublime war-cry of his nation noticed; reasonable deduction from the premises, that Jesus did not acknowledge any Divine law from Sinai respecting the observance of the Sabbath.

3. *Time of the Apostles:* Paul, who had been a zealous Pharisee, evidently kept the Sabbath much as Jesus did; proofs of this from the N.T.; first Council held at Jerusalem gave no "burdens" to the Gentile converts respecting the keeping of the Sabbath, hence the Sabbath could not have been of Divine origin; proofs given; Paul, in all his many and varied rules and instructions to several Christian Churches, says nothing about Sabbath observances; and in his Epistles to the Romans and to the Colossians he positively states the Sabbath-day to be no better than any other day; Dean Alford's remark thereon in his Greek Testament; Paul's depreciatory language to the Galatian Church concerning the Sabbath; Wheatly's plain and truthful comment thereon.

III. ECCLESIASTICAL:—1. *Primitive:* for a time the Jewish Christian converts continued to assemble on the seventh (or Sabbath) day; soon, however, fell into neglect, through not having any Apostolical appointment; Bingham's instructive statement thereon; early Ecclesiastical and Imperial laws wholly against the observance of the Jewish Sabbath; hence the sect of the Ebionites, and others, who observed the Jewish Sabbath, were condemned by the Council of Laodicea; Pope Gregory the Great's statement concerning Antichrist and Sabbath observance; no Christian writers of the 1st and 2nd centuries ever attributed the keeping of Sunday to any Apostolical authority; ample proofs given; also, quotations from Justin Martyr, from St. Cyril, and from St. Jerome, all against the observance of the Jewish Sabbath; Jerome, also, incidentally shews how the Sunday was kept in his time,—a day of church service, of joy, and of common work; no Sunday league, no Sabbatarians then!

2. *Time of the Reformation:* quotations from the most eminent of the Reformers,—from Tyndal, from Luther, from Melancthon, from Calvin, and from others,—shewing their liberal views of the Christian Sunday; quotation from Mr Sidey's published sermon, shewing his many errors in a small, compass,—Historically (both Civil and Ecclesiastical), and Chronologically, also in his severe and informal deductions therefrom; of King

James and his "Declaration, or Book of Sports;" quotation from the King's "Declaration;" quotations from the old Church historian, Puller, shewing how all that was brought to pass by the superstitious Sabbatarians, with Fuller's quaint and homely remarks thereon; fifteen years after that King Charles re-published his father's "Declaration," but in a still milder form; obliged to do so through the opposition of the meddlesome Sabbatarian party; of a charge against Archbishop Laud on his trial, and his defence; the Church of Geneva (John Knox's own) allowed of Archery on Sundays, and Calvin there played at Bowls on that day.

3. *Modern*:—On the phrase used by Mr Sidey—"the *right* keeping of the Sabbath;" Mr Sidey's views believed to be the very opposite of those of the Reformers and the Primitive Christian Church, of the Apostles and of Jesus; shewn (1) from the "shorter Catechism" (Presbyterian Church),—(2) Decrees of Kirk Sessions, and Acts of General Assembly Scotch Church,—(3) orders of Edinburgh Town Council,—and (4) statements of some Ministers of the Scotch Kirk, about their severe and "hateful" Sabbath observance laws, made in session before their brother Ministers,—particularly those of Dr. Norman M'Leod, who spoke truly, bravely, thrillingly, as a true servant of God; his remarks in part allowed by the Presbyterian ministers at that gathering, but of course, opposed; their peculiar Sabbath observance system has the dangerous effect of "*weakening morality;*" wretched (sanitary) state of Edinburgh, particularly on the Sunday under that old Kirk system of obsolete Jewish superstition; Dr M'Leod's excellent little work called "*The Starling*," noticed; the late Sir Donald M'Lean's favourable opinion upon it; of the *present* "Sabbath Alliance" party in Scotland, and their insufferably impudent Annual Report, containing language highly disrespectful against Queen Victoria,—a long quotation therefrom; how truly their words are in accordance with those of the Pharisees of the time of Jesus; they ought to have the Queen's ancestor (James I.) to deal with them in his rough and ready way; reference to the Conference at Hampton Court, A.D. 1604; from all such "right keeping of the Sabbath" may Napier (and all N.Z.) ever be free; better, of the two, to have King James' "Book of Sports" republished here; curious, that, throughout all Christendom, only the churches of three petty highland countries,—Ethiopia, Armenia, and Scotland,—cling to the Sabbatarian superstition; all three churches, too, being wholly discordant as to dogmas; *Steam*—the iron horse, the steam ship, and the press—will do wonders, and help to cure; but Sabbatarianism also in England, although only a small insignificant clique; Wilberforce's truthful remarks on the melancholy comfortless British Sunday, quoted; a few English Bishops (some years ago) sought by letter to the Directors of the English Railway Companies to put a stop to excursion trains on Sundays! the Directors did not deign to reply—but wisely put it on the shelf; a selfish lot those English Bishops; apt remarks on their conduct; better had some in Napier not unwisely come forward with their letter to the Directors of the N.Z. Steam Navigation Company, to prevent the calling of our Mail steamers at Napier on Sundays; suitable quotations on *true* Religion from our English poets—Southey, and Tennyson; the Sabbatarian error largely bolstered up or supported by the two national British Churches—of England and of Scotland; already shewn as to Scotland, by her Catechism and Church decrees,—and as to England, by her Ministers repeatedly reading from the Communion Table ["Altar," *sic!*] the old worn-out theory of God having ordered the Jewish keeping of the Sabbath-day, and that because He made all things in six days! Of the carelessness, or thoughtlessness, or "happy ignorance" of such Ministers; pious lies "the weakening of morality"; the Bishop of Oxford's admission respect- ing the creation of the world in six days; the Writer could not (if now ministering to a congregation) allow his congregation to be so deceived, as to the constant using of those old Church phrases without due explanation; a word to Napier Sabbatarians, as to their Sunday letters from England, and their Sunday milk from the country; a word, additional, as to the possible zealous looking after regular Church attendance on the Sabbath, on account of the "bawbees"—or the horrid unchristian and novel Sunday money gatherings, now never omitted! the Writer's particular reasons and right to call attention to this,—from the fact of his having *always* opposed it, and that, too, when single-handed, and at no little cost to himself; the same fully explained; the Writer would not minister in any church where such Mammon worship was carried on; how easily Napier congregations may escape such sordid traffic; how the "Devil" laughs at it! the Gospel is *not* now preached to the *poor*; no room in the church for them any more than in the theatre; come with *money*, or stay away! Of Church reform, of its *sure* approach, yet not likely to begin from within; another word to Ministers; of *Light* breaking all around, the happy result of modern Biblical Criticism; shewn, especially to members of the Church of England, in three great works,—(1) the *New Lectionary*,—(2) the *new Bible Commentary*,—and (3) the *new and Corrected Version of the Bible;* remarks thereon; several striking quotations from the new Bible Commentary on the Mosaic laws, largely supporting what has been herein written; noticeable remark by a learned English Bishop in Convocation respecting the new translation of the Bible; three small matters all lately occurring here in New Zealand in favour of Christian Sunday freedom noticed,—*viz.* opening of the Napier Athenæum on Sundays—running of 18 trains to and from the advanced town of Dunedin on that day—and the Presbyterians formally setting aside their Sacramental fast-day; also, a fourth and a greater one,—that of the State schools, wherein *true* Religion will be taught; the absolute necessity of reforming the Catechisms of the Churches; solemn veracious words of a modern English Archbishop on teaching only the Truth; a home

question to all Ministers and Sunday School Teachers—that is, to those with living tender consciences; the writer's serious conviction respecting the age of the Pentateuch, after more than 20 years' study of this matter, showing its Divine authority as utterly untenable.

IV. *Reasonably*,—including *theologically* and *humanly*: ever hold to this—"the Sabbath was made FOR man;" *first* seek to be delivered from the old slavish Jewish superstition respecting the Sabbath, *then* we may begin to understand it; the Sunday (or seventh day's rest) should be a day of *refreshing;* day given for general labour and night for rest; remarks thereon and reasonable deductions drawn; (1) Sunday's rest good for man's *physical* nature; inaction alone not always rest, shown powerfully in children; Sunday often anything but a day of refreshment to them, owing to injudicious Ministers and parents; the righteous and natural rebellion of children against all restraint set down to their "sinful hearts," or to "the Devil," to the great and lasting injury of the poor child; plain remarks on the *personality* of "Old Nick"—recently preached up here in Napier to credulous hearers! the true rest of Sunday, is *refreshment of body and mind;* the ways of obtaining this are various, differing almost with everyone, so that each must choose for himself; (2) the Sunday's rest is good for our *moral* nature; shewn by its necessity, and by the effect the beauties of Nature and the Works of God have upon us; (3) the Sunday's rest is needed for our *religious* nature; remarks thereon; Common Worship the highest and noblest of all Sunday occupation; men may and do worship God when alone; worship strengthened when done in fitting company; true child of God has constant communion with his Father; truly happy strengthening and sanctified Sunday seasons of Religious worship have often been experienced both in England and in N.Z.; such will be known again, when Ministers and Congregations become Whole-Hearted in that matter; then Sundays will again become days of rejoicing and refreshment; quotation from G. Herbert's beautiful poem on Sunday; (4) our *social* nature needs above all the Sunday's rest; the joys of the Sunday walk, the Sunday recreation, the Sunday holiday depicted; the great benefit arising from Sunday visits to Gardens—Museums—Aquariums—Galleries of Art and Science; quotation from official Annual Report of the Royal Gardens at Kew,—shewing the immense number of Sunday visitors, outnumbering those on *all* the other *six* days of the week taken together; of the great benefits to them; the Imperial Legislature should do all things possible in that direction, as such mental pleasures save from the grosser kinds; also the heads of the various Churches should act together for this purpose, both at home and in the Colonies; apt quotation from Mr Gladstone; both the State and the Churches should not overlook the smaller matters affecting the little wee folk,—who should be helped, honestly and openly, with an innocent face—to spend their well-earned Sunday holiday 1d,—and so avoid the "weakening of morality"; a case in point given; a large Bench of liberal English Magistrates praised; over-officious police condemned; Common Worship the Glory of the Christian Sunday; God has given us the knowledge of Himself in the Scriptures, and now in our day has also given us most wonderful and daily-increasing knowledge in many Sciences, which all alike come from one source—God; as great a *sin* to despise and disregard these gifts as to despise or to disregard the Bible; possibly all this Modern Light is intended (among other things) to teach us *not to make an* IDOL *of the Bible*,—towards which there long has been, and still is a tendency; comforting assurance—that all words of truth, whether in the Bible or out of the Bible, must ever stand—as sure as God himself; we should receive all that is TRUE; quotation from Tennyson; God still speaks in many ways to man,—whether by prophets (preachers and teachers)—in the pulpit or out of the pulpit,—or by priests; when He speaks His words will both be heard and known: *Conclusion*, Dr. Irons' good and Christian advice,—not to be angry,—not to speak or write bitterly against the Truth,—and so be found fighting against God.

Vignette

The Difficulties of Evolution,
Being the First of Two Lectures
Delivered by J. Aitken Connell
To the Dunedin Young Men's Christian Association
At Dunedin, on 8th of August, 1881.
Price-One Shilling.
Dunedin: Published By J. Wilkie & Co, Booksellers, Princesst. 1881.

Preface.

The following Lecture was delivered at the request of the Board of Management of the Dunedin Young Men's Christian Association of Dunedin.

The lecturer does not lay any claim to have done more than collected within a comparatively small compass a statement of some of the more remarkable facts which appear to operate against the doctrine of the derivation of species from preceding forms on the hypothesis of Evolution.

The first lecture comprises only a part of the field, being altogether taken up with the difficulties which lie within the view of the Biologist and Palæntologist. He has been requested by a number of those who heard the lectures to publish them, and sends the first forth alone, in order to ascertain whether there is any demand for them. Should this lecture find readers, the second will be published, which deals with other and interesting branches of the subject, including the doctrine of spontaneous generation, and Evolution as applied to Man.

Glendermid,

17*th October*, 1881.

The Difficulties of Evolution.

Vignette

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

In introducing to your notice this evening, the subject of "The Difficulties of Evolution," I trust you will pardon me, if, before I enter upon any definite statement of these difficulties as they appear to my mind to operate against that doctrine, I take up a little of your time in endeavouring to clear the ground.

At the outset I would ask you clearly to discriminate between that inductive, comprehensive, and exhaustive examination of natural phenomena, by either observation or experiment, and the conclusions which justly and necessarily follow thereupon, on the one hand; (which is properly called science or knowledge); and the curious and frequently fanciful theories and speculations of those who conduct such observations or experiments on the other.

We human beings are so constituted, that it is a very rare, if not an impossible thing, for any one man to be endowed with qualities of mind enabling him to grapple successfully with more than a single department of enquiry. The faculties, also, which are called into operation in pursuing distinct lines of scientific or philosophical research, are exceedingly diverse in their character, and rarely, if ever, met with in their highest development in a single individual. A division of labour is just as necessary here, as in other departments of work; the man of science—properly so-called—should be content to follow the safe paths of observation and experiment, including just and necessary deductions and conclusions; handing over his facts, when he requires a theory of the universe, to the philosopher or metaphysician within whose province alone the consideration and detormina- tion of such a question properly falls. He, and he only, is able to take an impartial view of science as a whole, having his judgment unbiassed by the exigencies or the predilections of any one section. Any man who has reflected at all on the mysteries and difficulties which underlie the—apparently—commonest and simplest things of life, must realise that life itself is too short, even if given to constant study and reflection, to enable even our very greatest men thoroughly to master these mysteries. The man who pursues any one branch of science, particularly experimental science, is specially unfitted to consider difficult, intellectual, or moral problems, by his knowledge of the very certainty which governs all his operations in his own science. He is almost certain to be rash and dogmatic, ready to rush in where angels fear to tread; and altogether the last man in the world whose philosophical theories are at all likely to be sound or true. Yet, what do we find in the present day? It is precisely such men, utterly unfitted by their daily pursuits to enter upon the region of theory and speculation, who have become our most dogmatic theorists, and our wildest speculators in philosophy, and even in religion, Huxley, Tyndall, and Haeckel endeavour to lend weight to their ridiculous speculations in philosophy by the splendour of the name they have so deservedly earned in the fields of natural science. And the worst of it is, that with the great bulk of those who listen to their philosophical prelections, there are not many who can distinguish between the credence which we may safely give them when they open to our admiring gaze the wonders of their respective discoveries in natural science; and the absolute scepticism with which we should receive their crude, and ill-digested attempts to feed us with the pabulum of a materialistic or agnostic philosophy.

There is a constant temptation, too, besetting scientific men to draw conclusions, advance theories and indulge in speculations suggested by the discoveries made by them in small but perhaps well cultivated fields of research, which, on becoming acquainted with the results of the labors of others in different spheres, they themselves are the first to recognise as impossible and absurd.

All men, too, are naturally curious about the deeper mysteries of things. The more ardently any man pursues scientific research, the more certainly is he brought face to face with mystery—with what I believe to be mystery un-fathomable by human faculties at every step.

If he be a devout man he bows his head, like Faraday or Agassiz, in the presence of that Being "whose ways are past finding out," but if he be, on the other hand, one who does not, or *will* not, recognise or acknowledge such a Being, he frequently dashes himself, in his pride, helplessly and hopelessly against the limitations which have been laid upon our faculties, and insists upon some form of words with which decently to veil his ignorance—to cheat himself and others into believing that he has fathomed the unfathomable—and so he prates to an admiring world, of Law, of the uniformity of Nature, of forces, of energies, of doctrines of descent, development, evolution, and what not, of functional activities, of corelations, of differentiations, of integrations, of complexities, of heterogeneities, and so forth, which are mere veils for ignorance.

Doctrines are advanced, such, for instance, as evolution, based almost entirely upon the observations relating to a single science, which, if true, necessarily have a direct bearing upon a vast number of other sciences, if not, indeed, upon all branches of science with which those who advance such doctrines have but a partial, if indeed any, acquaintance. The taunt, therefore, we so frequently hear from the mere scientist—"Oh, you are incompetent to pronounce upon or discuss as to the truth or otherwise of such a doctrine as evolution having no practical acquaintance with biology or palaeontology" is so far from being of any force that we might rather say that a man possessing pre-eminently the ability to pursue such branches of science, was probably destitute of the faculties which would make his judgment on such a speculation worth anything.

In treating this evening of "The Difficulties of Evolution," I propose, in the first place, to point out what I conceive to be certain radical and fundamental weaknesses in the very foundations upon which the whole reasoning rests, and, in the second place, I will endeavour to lay before you specific difficulties which lie against the doctrine, drawn from the sciences of geology, palæontology, and biology, and in my next lecture, from the more certain physical experimental sciences, such as chemistry and astronomy, and then consider the doctrine as applied to man, with difficulties from mental and moral science and philology. Before I enter, however, upon the consideration of these specific difficulties and objections, it is absolutely necessary to define what the doctrine of evolution really is. There are many and various schools of evolutionists, but it will be sufficient for our purpose if we notice three great classes into which the majority may be devided. I will denominate these three schools as—

- Deistic and Christian Evolutionists,
- Extreme Evolutionists,
- Darwinian Evolutionists.

Essentially, evolution, pure and simple, as applied to the organic world of animals and plants, simply means that existing species and all other species before them, have been derived by natural generation and succession from preceding forms, and as almost the whole of existing species differ very widely from those of far back geologic ages, ancient forms have undergone, in the lapse of time, from some cause or causes, wonderful and extensive changes.

The great majority of evolutionists believe that when life was first introduced, or, at any rate, when life first appeared On this planet, it was either in a single simple and lonely organism, or in a few forms, probably of the class "monera," from which all subsequent creatures have been derived.

Some hold a doctrine of evolution quite consistent with Theism, and even to their own minds consistent with revelation and Christianity, such theory being that, whilst all existing forms have been derived by natural generation from pre-existing species, yet the Divine Being foresaw, preordained, and designed all the development by natural law, endowing the first organism or organisms with all the powers and potentialities needful for the complete development of the whole succeeding creation, others going so far as to say that, whilst existing species have been derived from pre-existing forms, yet the change and development is duo to direct, active, present Divine agency. Such a theory as held, for example, by Professor St. George Mivart is certainly quite consistent with a belief in a personal God, and *may be*, though I confess I see not how it can be, consistent with revelation and Christianity. As, however, many pious persons accept this theory, and also accept revelation and Christianity, we are bound to beleive that they have some way of either satisfactorily reconciling both, or of accepting both on separate and sufficient evidence, leaving the question of the reconciliation of difficulties to stand over. This latter position, I am free to admit, is, in my opinion, one of considerable strength, and perfect consistency. This class of Evolutionists I distinguish as Deistic and Christian Evolutionists, and as a rule they will be found adopting rather the theories of Mr. Mivart than those of Mr. Darwin as to the causes of the origin of species, although Mr. Darwin himself evidently believes in the creation by the Divine Being, rather than the evolution of the first organism or organisms.

In the course of my remarks on the difficulties of Evolution, it must be borne in mind that this latter class of Evolutionists is not before my mind, and that some at least of the difficulties which I shall urge against the doctrine are applicable with much less force against the Deistic and Christian Evolutionist than against the other two classes.

2 The Extreme Evolutionists—

Those who believe that the whole of the order at present obtaining on the earth and throughout the universe at large in all things, including of course all living as well as all not living things, is simply a result or consequence of the operation of natural laws which we now find reigning everywhere, and which, so far as we can see, do not require the interference or support of any mind, intelligence, or power other than inheres apparently in matter itself.

When we speak of natural law, we mean a certain invariable order which we find obtaining so far as we have yet pushed our inquiries—throughout the whole domain of nature, and by nature we understand the sum of existing things, including intellectual, moral, and intelligent being, but exclusive of the great First Cause or Divine Being, if there be such, who is not a part of nature, but, on the supposition of His existence, is its Cause, Designer, and Ruler. Extreme Evolutionists believe or maintain that the natural laws, or powers, or forces of nature now in operation, have existed without change far back into the past eternity, and are competent, in the course of their natural, mechanical operation—without either interference or direction from a Divine Being—to account for the present order, physical, vital, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, of nature, including, of course, *man*, and even, we may suppose, if their existence was demonstrated, any other intelligent beings in the universe.

It is noticeable that, in the speculations of this school, the attempt to trace back the harmonious operation of natural law rarely, if ever, reaches further than the "fires of the sun," or at most, the "nebular mist."

Professor Tyndall tells us (Fort. Rev., vol. xviii., pages 596 and 597): "The problem before us is, at all events, capable of definite statement. We have on the one hand strong grounds for concluding that the earth was once a molten mass. *We* now find it not only swathed by an atmosphere, and covered by a sea, but also crowded with living things. The question is, how were they introduced? The *conclusion of science*, which recognises unbroken causal connection between the past and present, would undoubtedly be that the molten earth contained *within it the elements of life, which grouped themselves into the present forms, as the planet cooled*. Were not man's origin implicated we should accept without a murmur the derivation of animal and vegetable life, from what we call inorganic nature. The conclusion of pure intellect points this way, and no other." Again Professor Huxley (Critiques and Addresses, 1873, page 305), speaking of the fundamental position of Evolution, says, "That proposition is, that the whole world living and not living, is the result of the mutual interaction according to definite laws of the forces possessed by the molecules, of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed." Professor Tyndall further tells us that not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body but the human mind itself, emotion, intellect, will, with all their phenomena, all our philosophy, all our poetry, all our science, and all our art—Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, Raphael"—were all once to the scientific eye," potential in the fires of the sun." (Scientific Use of the Imagination, page 453.) The imagination is supposed to have received its ultimate satisfaction, and the intellect to have been sufficiently fed when it reaches these points.

It is evidently assumed, that having reduced us to a nebular mist, with its potentialities, the mind will not demand with such persistent importunity the assignation of a "cause" of so apparently simple a phenomenon, as it does "when it contemplates the present order of things, and possibly the suggestion that the nebular mist must, somehow or other, have had *some* cause, may satisfy a good many minds, and as we cannot possibly imagine what *can have been* the cause of a nebular mist, suppose we call it the "Unknowable First Cause," we shall have satisfied all inconvenient questions.

I confess I myself have felt some surprise, that no attempt has yet been made—at least, that I am aware of—to reduce the nebular mist to a simpler and more easily disposed of substance.

A nebular mist, we may imagine, is at least visible to the eye, that is, if there had been an eye to look at it, and in our imagination we can *see* it with our mind's eye. It would have assisted me much if the suggestion had been made, that the nebular mist, as space is infinite, had, in a far back previous eternity, been resolvable into so finely an attenuated gas, as to be quite impalpable to the keenest sense or even the most powerful imagination, and that still further back—vast unimaginable ages must be postulated—it became finally so utterly attenuated as to vanish altogether. It is one of the most recent discoveries of a certain school, that you can do almost anything if you only allow "sufficient time," and when so many inconvenient difficulties in the way of accepting certain theories are disposed of on the "sufficient time" hypothesis, surely the nebular mist might be resolvable into nothing on the same supposition.

The extreme Evolutionist is usually a Darwinian, but not necessarily. '

3rd. The third class of Evolutionists I will call Darwinian Evolutionists, who account for the origin of species by natural selection or the survival of the fittest.

Until the appearance of this school no consistent theory had been advanced as to the "how" of the origin of species by Evolution, although the doctrine itself was of high antiquity, was advanced in the modern times by Lamark, and adopted by several but not by leading naturalists. It was usually known as the developement theory. Until, however, the publication of Mr. Darwin's "Origin of Species" in 1860, it can scarcely be said to

have had standing room in the scientific world of thought.

Mr. Darwin, however, advanced the theory known as natural selection or the survival of the fittest, supported by a supplementary doctrine known as sexual selection, which took the scientific world by storm, and gained the assent of a great number of eminent naturalists. Mr. Darwin's doctrine, however, was not received by several of the oldest, most experienced, and most eminent naturalists, among whom I may mention—Agassiz, Von Baer, Dawson, and that it has been virtually, although not explicitly abandoned by Mr. Darwin himself, I shall show further on.

The Darwinian doctrine of natural selection may be stated thus:—

1. Every species tends to increase in a geometric ratio, and "as more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with individuals of distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life. (Origin of Species, 6th edition, page 50.

2. It is not improbable that "variations, useful in some way to each being in the great and complex battle of life, should occur in the course of many successive generations."—(Ibid. p. 63).,

3. "*If* such do occur, can we doubt (remembering that many more individuals are born than can possibly survive) that individuals having any advantage, however slight, over others, would have the best chance of surviving and of procreating their kind? On the other hand, we may feel sure that any variation in the least degree injurious, would be rigidly destroyed. The preservation of favourable individual differences and variations, and the destruction of those which are injurious I have called natural selection or the survival of the fittest."—(Ibid., p. 63).

Eminent naturalists, who at first were carried away by admiration for Mr. Darwin's genius as a naturalist, and failed on first perusal to see the weakness of his reasoning, have since found the doctrine inconsistent with the undeniable facts of nature, and have repudiated and written against it, among whom I may mention the eminent naturalist, Professor St. George Mivart.

Meantime, all the difficulties which, up till Mr. Darwin's publication of his Origin of Species, kept the doctrine of development from receiving, as I have said, standing room, still obtain, and up till now are unremoved, unexplained, and unrefuted.

New theories of the origin or past history of things, ought, I submit, always to be received with great caution.

One has only to consider the vast number of totally different theories which have been advanced by, say geologists during this century to come to the conclusion that scientific theories which profess to furnish the true causes and past history of nature, cannot be safely adopted until they have undergone a long and searching examination at the hands of contemporary and succeeding generations of scientific experts.

Mr. Herbert Spencer's essay on Illogical Geology will give the reader a very good idea of what is here meant.

I will now refer to two distinct fundamental weaknesses which affect the whole of the reasoning of the Evolutionist.

It is scarcely necessary to remind you that in coming to the study of any problem, whether scientific or otherwise, it is absolutely necessary that we should recognise and take into due account all the factors or causes which we may deem it likely may affect or govern the result. Nearly all the false conclusions arrived at in science, or indeed inquiry of any kind, may be traced to the want of knowledge, or to the persistent ignoring of some such factor. Now, if for the sake of argument, we suppose it granted that a personal, omnipotent, Divine Being exists whom we are accustomed to call God, has always existed, and will always exist, and that this is at least possible, all sensible men, not entangled in the web of their own foolish sophistry, will freely admit, it follows that given the will he certainly has the power to interfere with the action of natural laws, which are merely the orderly and ordinary methods of operations of this will.

The extreme Evolutionist requires us to believe in the absolute "uniformity of nature," past, present, and future, and "the impossibility of miracles," or indeed of any change or interference with the operation of natural law from the time of the nebulous mist, and I suppose, before, up till the present, and forward to all future time.

Desperate and almost passionate attempts have been made to demonstrate that the belief in this eternal reign of law or of this impossibility of miracle is either a fundamental law of the human mind itself, or at any rate, is so deeply seated there, either as a result of experience, personal or inherited, or from other causes that it cannot, or at least ought not ever to be shaken or dislodged.

Strange, however, to say, the belief in the personal interference of the Divine Being with the operation of natural law, is held tenaciously by the great mass of mankind. Indeed, we might say safely by all mankind, with the exception of those who deny His existence. Every Christian, for example, believes in the historical facts of the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ, which were instances of as distinct interference by supernatural power with the ordinary operations of nature, as it is possible to conceive. It is indeed true (and I think capable

of demonstration that it must needs be so) that there is ordinarily a uniformity in all the operations of nature, so that we can certainly and safely rely upon the truth that the same causes give rise invariably to the same effects, but the introduction of the immediate direct action of the Divine Being, does not in any way contravene this truth, and is neither inconceivable in itself, nor improbable if such immediate action is necessary or desirable for given important ends. On the supposition that man is the creature of God, capable of moral activities and responsible to the Divine Being (a supposition which I again say, at least, may be true) it is difficult to see how he could ever attain to any sufficient knowledge of the Divine Being as a personal God to whom he was responsible, unless by such immediate action by God Himself.

That the operation of natural law is universal, and has been so ever since man made his appearance on the earth, with but few instances of direct divine intervention by no means justifies the conclusion that it always has been so in past ages.

If man is to inhabit the earth, it is absolutely necessary that there should be uniformity in nature, otherwise it would be impossible for him to carry on any operation whatever, either physical, mental, or moral, but until intelligent agents are brought upon the scene, uniform action of the Divine power, does not seem to be either necessary or to possess any advantage over other methods of operation.

The uniformity of the past action of Natural law was accepted by a very few persons in England, prior to the appearance of Mr. Darwin's Origin of Species. All, or nearly all naturalists, as well as the ordinary run of mankind, accepting the belief that each species was a separate Divine Creation. The assumption, therefore, of the past uniformity of operation of natural law, which is absolutely necessary to the position, both of the extreme Evolutionist and—at least from the time of the first dawn of life to the Darwinian—is neither justified by the nature of things nor sanctioned by high antiquity, but is a recent baseless and unwarrantable assumption.

Here, at the very root of Evolutionary doctrine, we have a foundation of sand.

Since writing the foregoing, I have read Professor Huxley's three lectures on Evolution, delivered in New York, 1876, and direct attention to the following extract (American Addresses, Lecture i., page 3):—

"Though we are quite clear about the constancy of the order of nature at the present time and in the present state of things, it by no means necessarily follows that we are justified in expanding this generalisation into the infinite past, and in denying absolutely that there may have been a time when nature did not follow a fixed order when the relations of cause and effect were not definite" (strange confusion in the Professor's mind) "and when extra natural agencies interfered with the general course of nature."

Professor Huxley demands "a great deal of evidence" before he recognises the admitted possibility to be anything more substantial, and then proceeds throughout his lectures to ignore it altogether. Before I conclude I purpose showing that Professor Huxley adopts and believes, on no evidence whatever, much more unlikely possibilities, or rather impossibilities, than this, and yet upon his own confession, this factor which he refuses to take into account may exist, and consequently vitiate his whole conclusions.

As it has recently been asserted by local authority, that the Darwinian theory "is now an established doctrine of science," and if I remember rightly, by another, also local authority, that non-acceptors of Evolutionary doctrine, must be relegated to the companionship of the uneducated classes, it may not be without interest if I quote shortly, contemporary opinion on the subject.

Oscar Peschel, the German Anthropologist, in his work on the Races of Man, published 1876, page 15, has the following passage:—"The gist and novelty of Darwin's doctrine consists in the selection just described (that is) We find not only the beautiful, the graceful, the agreeable, but also the repulsive, the terrible, the ridiculous, and the demoniac represented in animals and plants."

"Darwin, in his book on the Descent of Man, has attempted to overcome this difficulty by a new article of belief, namely, in sexual selections: the female animals being supposed to prefer the male which most actively excites the senses. But in butterflies, particularly in the Spingidae, the lower wings are coloured with peculiar brightness, and are adorned with gaudy eyes; yet, this creature conceals its own decorations when at rest, while all perception of pencilling and colour is precluded by its rapid movements when in flight. Again we find beauties in such members of the animal kingdom as fecundate themselves, and even in the motionless vegetable kingdom. The aspect of an oak during a storm, the mournful appearance of a deodora, the hues of many a coralla, the graceful lines of trailing vines, the fabric of a rose bud, are all capable of affording us æsthetic satisfaction, and yet any idea of the exercise of sexual selection by these objects is absolutely impossible.

"According to the Darwinian theory, the ancestor of modern man must have been a hairy creature, protected from changes of temperature by a furry coat. Yet the loss of this fur could only act prejudicially in the struggle for existence. In the case of birds, the same observation applies to gaudy plumage, which favours the schemes of their enemies, to the boat-like excrescences of their beaks, as well as the trailing tails which hinder flight and incuba tion. Thus it is just the new pith of the Darwinian doctrine, namely, natural selection, which stills remains unaccredited."

It is indeed instructive to note how Mr. Darwin's original statements of his position have been modified,

and in fact, we may say, virtually abandoned in his later writings. Minute variations directly beneficial to the organism preserved under the law of natural selection, are alone in the earlier editions of his Origin of Species, referred to as the causes of specific origin. He says; "Natural selection can act only by taking advantage of slight successive variations, she can never take a leap, but mustadvance by short and slow stages" (5th Ed. Origin of Species p 214.) "Again if it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down. But I can find out no such case." (p. 208.) Again "I have called this principle by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, by the term natural selection." (6th Ed. p. 40.) We now find him in the Descent of Man (Vol. 1, p. 152, as follows:—

"I now admit, after reading the essay by Nägeli on plants, and the remarks by various authors, with respect to animals, more especially those recently made by Professor Broca, that in the earlier editions of my Origin of Species, I probably attributed too much to the action of natural selection, or the survival of the fittest. I had not formerly sufficiently considered the existence of many structures which appear to be, as far as we can judge, neither beneficial nor injurious, and this I believe to be one of the greatest oversights as yet detected in my work." A still more remarkable admission is that in which he says of the causes of change in organism. "We can only say they relate much more closely to the *constitution of the varying organism* than to the nature of the conditions to which it has been subjected. An unexplained residuum of change, perhaps a large one, must be left to the assumed action of those *unknown agencies* which occasionally induce strongly marked and abrupt deviation of structure, in our domestic productions" (Vol. 1, p, 154.) The most astonishing admission, however, is perhaps the following:—"No doubt, man as well as every other animal, presents structures, which, as far as we can judge with our little knowledge, *are not now of any service to him nor have been so during any former period of his existence*, either in relation to his general conditions of life, or of one sex to the other. Such structures *cannot be accounted for by any form of selection*, or by the inherited effects of the use and disuse of parts. We know, however, that many strange and strongly marked peculiarities of structure occasionally appear in our domesticated productions, and if the *unknown causes* which produce them were to act more uniformly, they would probably become common to all the indivduals of the species." Of these passages Mr. Mivart remarks: "If this is not an abandonment of natural selection, it would be difficult to find terms more calculated to express it" (Lessons from Nature, p. 286.) Two other notable admissions of Mr. Darwin, and I have done. He says: "Until reading an article in the *North British Review*, 1867, I did not apprehend how rarely single variations, whether slight or strongly marked, could be perpetuated." (5th Ed. Origin of Species, p. 104.) And lastly, in postscript to the second volume of the Descent of Man, he declares "I have fallen into serious and unfortunate error in relation to the sexual differences of animals, in attempting to explain what seemed to me a singular coincidence in the late period of life at which the necessary variations have arisen in many cases, and the late period at which sexual selection acts. The explanation given is wholly erroneous, as I have discovered by working out an illustration in figures." It is impossible not to give our highest meed of admiration of Mr. Darwin for his candour in making these remarkable admissions, but it would be idle to attempt to question their significance. I commend them to the thoughtful study of those gentlemen who imagine that the doctrine of Natural selection is an established truth of science.

Professor Virchow, in an address delivered a short time ago, before German pathologists, at Munich, took occasion to expose the unscientific character of Evolutionary doctrine, and in particular the remarkably speculative character of Professor Haeckel's teaching, including his theory of plastidule souls, and other advanced and astonishing theories peculiar to that gentleman. Professor Haeckel immediately published a reply making a terrific onslaught, more, indeed, abusive than scientific, in which, being at white heat, he makes some significant statements and admissions.

Speaking of Berlin, containing, as he tells us, the second university of Germany, he says:—"In no other city of Germany has Evolution in general, as well as Darwinism in particular, been so little valued, so utterly misunderstood, and treated with such sovereign disdain, as in Berlin. Nay, Adolf Bastian, the most zealous of all the Berlin opponents of our doctrines, has insisted on these facts with peculiar satisfaction." (What a depth of infamy must he have reached, in Professor Haeckel's opinion.) He continues:—

"Of all conspicuous naturalists of Berlin *only one* accepted the doctrine of transmutation from the beginning with sincere warmth and full conviction (Freedom of Science, p. 115). This solitary instance to be found among Berlin naturalists accepting Evolution was, it is noticeable, not a zoologist but a botanist, Alexander Braun."

Carl Ernest Von Baer, whom Mr Haeckel speaks of in one place as "our greatest naturalist," as a "gifted and profound thinker and biologist," as soon as he came out distinctly as utterly denying the modern doctrine of Evolution, is quietly set aside as "no longer capable of mastering this difficult problem;" and we are told insultingly that this dualistic prating of the old man is quite incapable of shaking the monistic principles of the young and enterprising pioneers of science."

Very young and *very* enterprising some of them indeed are; and as to pioneering, I am afraid some have pioneered so far that they are likely to be lost themselves, and to find themselves in a strange country without a compass to help them back again. If, his enemies being judges, the greatest of German naturalists, a gifted and profound thinker and biologist, is incapable of mastering the difficult problem of the modern doctrine of Evolution, what chance have the ordinary run, even of educated men, of understanding, much less of intelligently believing it? We leave Mr Haeckel to reply. Abuse and depreciation of their opponents appear to be the weapons most relied upon by many Evolutionists.

Mr Darwin himself tells us, in the introduction to the edition of Descent of Man, 1879, that "at least a large number of naturalists must admit that species are the modified descendants of other species, and this especially holds good with the younger and rising naturalists. The greater number accept the agency of natural selection; though some urge—whether with justice the future must decide—that I have greatly overrated its importance. *Of the older and honoured chiefs in natural science many unfortunately are still opposed to Evolution in every form."*

Thomas Carlyle says:—"The short, simple, but sublime account of creation given in the first chapter of Genesis is in advance of all theories, for it is God's truth, and as such the only key to the mystery. It ought to satisfy the savans who in any case would never find out any other, although they might dream about it. I have no patience with these gorilla damnifications of humanity."

The celebrated Dr Wyville Thomson of the Challenger expedition states it as the result of an eight years' study of ocean fauna, that the discoveries "refuse to give the least support to the theory which refers the evolution of species to extreme variation guided by natural selection."

Professor J. Gwyn Jeffreys says that "he cannot understand how either natural or sexual selection can affect marine invertebrates, which have no occasion to struggle for their existence, and have no distinction of sex."

Enough, I think, has been said to satisfy candid persons that it is inadvisable to limit all knowledge, all intelligence, and even all culture to Evolutionists alone.

The fact of the presence of useless or rudimentary organs in certain creatures—as that of rudimentary mammæ in the males of the mammalia; teeth which never cut through the gums as in unborn calves—has been advanced as an argument in favour of Evolution, and has probably been considered by many one of its strongest points. As we have to-night a good many facts to deal with rather than fanciful speculations into the causes of things, it may be sufficient to dispose of the argument of rudimentary structure by the following quotation from Professor Huxley, who will not be suspected by Evolutionists of having a leaning the wrong way. In his article on Evolution in the 9th edition of the Eycl. Brit., p. 750, he says, speaking of these rudimentary and supposed useless structures:—"It is almost impossible to prove that any structure, however rudimentary, is useless—that is to say, that it plays no part whatever in the economy; and, if it is in the slightest degree useful, there is no reason why, on the hypothesis of direct creation, it should not have been created. Nevertheless, double-edged as is the argument from rudimentary organs, there is probably none which has produced a greater effect in promoting the general acceptance of the theory of Evolution."

I proceed now to consider the more specific difficulties which appear to me to lie against the doctrine of Evolution, and, in order to make my argument intelligible to those of my hearers who may be but imperfectly acquainted with geology, it will be necessary to refer to a few of the leading facts of that science.

The crust of the earth, as you are all aware, has been usually considered to be but of small comparative thickness to the great bulk of the globe, say from forty to one hundred miles thick. It is composed entirely, so far as explored, of four classes of rock:—the volcanic, including lava, scoria, basalt, &c.; the plutonic, including all granites, and certain porphyries. These two may be safely considered as of igneous origin, and they are unstratified. Immediately above the granite are found the metamorphic or stratified crystalline rocks, consisting of the crystalline schists, statuary marble, the fine kinds of roofing slates, &c.

These rocks are stratified, and are named metamorphic as they are usually supposed to have been originally deposited by aqueous agencies, and to have afterwards undergone a radical change, chemically considered, probably by the action of heat and pressure since their deposition.

All these three classes of rocks (with the exception of the Laurentian subdivision of the metamorphic) are destitute of fossils. Lastly, there are the stratified fossiliferous rocks, with which we have chiefly to-night to deal.

These stratified fossiliferous rocks are divided into three great classes—the primary, secondary, and tertiary, with certain recent deposits or strata, designated post-tertiary; the primary being again subdivided into Laurentian, Cambrian, Silurian, Devonian, Carboniferous, and Permian; the secondary into the Trias, Lias, Oolite, and the Cretacious or chalk formation; the tertiary into the eocene, miocene, pliocene, and recent formations. The proportionate thickness of these various formations is shown in diagram No. 1; whilst in diagram No. 2 the relative position of the various strata is shown, but the more recent are exaggerated in scale, and the periods at which the various kinds of plants and animals first came upon the scene are indicated in the

two left-hand columns.

The primary fossiliferous rocks are also called the palæozoic, from two Greek words, signifying ancient organic beings. The secondary are also named the mesozoic, signifying the middle organic beings; and the tertiary are also named cainozoic, or recent organic beings.

Lastly, the tertiary, or cainozoic strata—that is, all strata above the chalk—are further subdivided, as regards the age of their fossil remains, into eocene, miocene, and pliocene, which signify respectively the dawn of recent forms, the less recent forms, and the more recent forms.

The present usually accepted theories of geologists with regard to all the stratified rocks, excepting, perhaps, the actual coal beds, about which considerable diversity of opinion exists, is that all the stratified rocks have been deposited by aqueous agencies at the bottom of the ocean or of lakes, the term "sedimentary" being frequently applied to all the stratified rocks, the material forming such sedimentary or stratified rocks having been washed down by the action of rain, frost, ice, rivers, and the ocean from adjacent continents, during vast ages of time, by the operation of the laws now seen to be active in the world, and distributed over the sea-bottom by the action of ocean currents, &c.

I confess that, after study of the facts and theories of the most eminent living geologists, there appear to me to be a vast number of geologic phenomena which the theories at present advanced and accepted fail altogether to account for, particularly the deposition, for a long series of ages, of strata of a particular mineral, chemical, and even organic character, and then suddenly the change to strata of a totally different character, both, by accepted theories of geologists, formed below water; and also the formation of the coal beds, the origin of which, up to the present time, I have no hesitation in saying, has never been satisfactorily accounted for, each of the various theories advanced making calls upon our credulity of too gigantic a nature to be easily granted. Great masses of the primary and secondary rocks are supposed also to have been formed by the exuviæ of small marine animals, such as the Foraminiferæ, Trilobites, corals, &c.

There are two important points that must be borne in mind.—1st, That although the sedimentary rocks are shown in diagram No. 1 as superimposed one above the other in the order shown, and which may be taken as approximately exhibiting their relative age, yet in nature these rocks, which were originally deposited in a horizontal position, or very nearly so, under water, have been frequently raised by the action of subterranean forces, sometimes to the height of many thousands of feet above the sea level. No further stratified deposit can take place unless they are again, by a subsidence of the earth's crust, brought under water. On the contrary, such strata are liable to denudation and gradual destruction when above sea level, their material going to form new stratified rocks beneath the ocean. Again, whilst some of the strata, such as the old red sandstone and carboniferous formations, extend over very large tracts of the earth's surface, others are to be found in much smaller areas, and sometimes widely separated. It is clear that a continent above water will not show any strata corresponding in age with stratified rocks formed during the same period under adjacent oceans or lakes. It is these elevations of different parts of the earth's surface taking place at different periods of geologic history, which bring within our view the rocks formed at the various periods below the ocean or lakes, and which alone, on the theories of geologists, can perserve fossil forms of the flora and fauna of the corresponding age. You will therefore readily understand that our examination of the stratified rocks, lying on the sides of the various mountain ranges of the earth, enables the geologist to determine at what particular period of geologic time any particular mountain range was upheaved. It is impossible, in a lecture such as this, to do more than indicate, thus briefly, a few of the leading facts of geologic science, which I do, of course, only for the benefit of any of my hearers who may be ignorant of the subject, and to prevent misapprehension of the bearing of the difficulties I shall refer to further on.

Diagram No. 3 shows the position of certain of the stratified rocks after upheaval. All these strata above the crystalline rocks, and probably including the vast formation termed the Laurentian, abound with fossils of animals or plants, and are believed to constitute a record of contemporary animal and vegetable life. All theories, therefore, which deal with the "origin of organic forms" upon the earth, or with the methods or ways by which the immense variety of such forms which we now find upon the earth, or such forms as we have reason to believe existed in past ages, came first into existence, must, *inter alia*, and as a matter of prime necessity, be consistent with the testimony of the stone record.

When the present animal creation is examined, it is found that, notwithstanding the almost infinite variety of structure—so great that a person unlearned in such matters would be inclined to think that nearly all creatures were formed on separate and distinct plans—yet there is apparent in every organism a fundamental plan of structure, and that the whole of the animal creation, diverse as it appears to the ordinary onlooker, from the most simply constituted animalcule to the most complex mammal, including man himself, is constructed on one of four distinct fundamental plans of structure. Hence it is possible to divide the whole animal kingdom into four great subkingdoms—the radiates, the mollusks, the articulates, and the vertebrates.

Time will not permit of our going into any account of the marvellous character of these four plans of

structure, but I wish you to note and remember that they are each, as it were, poles asunder, and that, whilst the plan of structure of every creature can be shown to belong to one of these four classes, yet there is not the faintest indication, in all the world, of living or fossil creatures of a structure in any way intermediate between any two or more of these plans.

Professor Huxley tells us (Lay Sermons, p. 103):—"So definitely and precisely marked is the structure of each animal that in the present state of our knowledge there is not the least evidence to prove that a form in the slightest degree transitional between any of the two groups vertebrata, annulosa, mollusca, and cœlenterata, either exists or has existed during that period of the earth's history which is recorded by geologists."

Each of these sub-kingdoms, so diverse from each other, are again subdivided into classes, each of which whilst retaining the character or fundamental plan of structure of the sub-kingdom to which it belongs, manifests certain well marked differences in all its members from those of other classes of the same sub-kingdom. These classes are further divided into orders, families, genera, and species, each and all of which, retaining the special characters of the division above it, manifest distinct differences of structure and function with all the members of its own division. Lastly, the division termed species is divided again into varieties, and finally the variety into individuals. It is curious and interesting to note that the law of likeness and unlikeness, of similarity and dissimilarity, holds good even down to each individual, of even a variety, so that no two creatures or even plants, even of the same species and variety, but differ from each other. You will of course notice that all the points of difference increase with marvellous rapidity as we ascend in the scale of classification. The differences between two individuals of the same variety being very fine, and sometimes almost indistinguishable to the closest observer, whilst on the other hand the likenesses which they have in common may be counted by millions. On the other hand, if we compare two individuals of separate classes, orders, families, genera, and species, but of the same sub-kingdom, we may say their points of likeness are reduced to one, viz., their fundamental plan of structure; and their differences might be counted by millions. As we ascend, therefore, in the scale of comparison from two individuals of the same variety to the individuals of different classes, &c., but the same sub-kingdom, the likenesses diminish and the unlikenesses increase in something much greater than a geometric ratio.

Again, we find existing in nature, provision for carrying on the living creation of animals and plants from one period to another, notwithstanding the law of death which we see everywhere reigning. This provision is by natural generation. Leaving out of account the other methods of propagation by fission, &c., the male and female animal together combine to produce and leave behind another animal in all essential respects like themselves, and even inheriting individual as well as varietal specific and other likenesses. It is clear, therefore, from this law, that where individuals of *different* varieties are fertile together, definite varietal differences will tend to disappear, and that where individuals of different species are fertile, definite specific differences' will disappear, and if it were possible for members of different families, orders, and classes, to be fertile with each other, these higher differences would also vanish, and the whole animal kingdom be gradually reduced to a single series of individuals, each differing entirely from the other.

We find, however, that when a certain point of un-likeness between organisms has been attained, nature refuses to sanction the propagation of animals differing any further in structure and function from one another; hence the offspring of varieties only are fertile, whilst the offspring of different species are absolutely sterile. We have here an iron law which has kept separate, and will keep separate, the whole of past and present species for ever. Mr. Darwin clearly sees the absolute necessity of breaking down this barrier between different species, if his hypothesis of the "Origin of Species by Natural Selection" is to be received, and whilst compelled to admit (Origin of Species, 6th Ed. p. 19) that "hardly any cases have been ascertained with certainty of hybrids from two distinct species of animals being perfectly fertile," he a few pages further on apparently quite forgets this crucial fact, and tell us that (Orig. of Sp. 6 Ed., p. 47): "The amount of difference considered necessary to give to any two forms the rank of species cannot be defined." Again (p. 42): "If a variety were to flourish so as to exceed in numbers the parent species, it would then rank as the species, and the species as the variety, or it might come to supplant and exterminate the parent species or both might co-exist, and both rank as independent species."

"From these remarks it will be seen that I look at the term species as one arbitarily given for the sake of convenience to a set of individuals closely resembling each other, and that it docs not essentially differ from the term variety which is given to less distinct and more fluctuating "forms."

If Mr. Darwin should ever be really puzzled as to whether two forms are merely varieties of the same species, or individuals of different species, I invite him to test the question by the law of the sterility of hybrid offspring, and he will very soon have the matter settled in a manner that admits of no question or exception even according to his own words already quoted.

The sterility of hybrid offspring is the true standard of specific difference.

The universality of this law is not questioned by evolutionists generally, and although one or two instances

of exception have been alleged from time to time to have occurred, naturalists, as well as most people of common sense, will rather believe that the observer has failed to estimate aright the amount of unlikeness between the animals, and thus has mistaken a mere variety for a true species, rather than suppose a law established throughout the whole domain of animate nature, to have been inoperative in a single instance. Since writing the foregoing I have just received the work of that eminent geologist and Paleontologist, Proff. Dawson, entitled "The Origin of the World," published last year. He says: "There is also a physiological distinction between species, namely, that the individuals are sterile with one another, whereas this does not apply to varieties, and though Darwin has laboured to break down this distinction by insisting on rare exceptional cases, and suggesting many supposed ways by which varieties of the same species might possibly attain to this kind of distinctness, *the difference still remains as a fact in*

"*nature*, though one not readily available in practically distinguishing species." Proff. Dawson also informs us (Earth and Man, 5 Ed. p. 524) "Species of animals are only variable within certain limits and are not transmutable in so far as experience and experiment are concerned. They have their allotropic forms but cannot be changed into one another." This testimony, did time permit, might be multiplied indefinitely. The impossibility, therefore, of developing one species out of another by actual experiment and the absolute sterility of hybrid offspring, may, therefore, be stated as our first difficulty of Evolution, and not- withstanding all the efforts and sophistry of Evolutionary Naturalists, the great natural barrier remains as rigid and immovable at the present moment, as it has always been considered in former times by preceding generations of naturalists to have been.

The Darwinian theory of Evolution, you will remember, requires us to believe that the existing species of animals and plants have been derived by ordinary generation from pre-existing forms by the slow and gradual change of the different generations of creatures under the supposed laws of natural and sexual selection. If the ancestry of the now existing species can be traced back many thousands and millions of years, we shall, of course, find this slow modification in their forms. Now, what *do* we find. Agassiz, in his (Structures of Animal Life, p. 49), referring to the Egyptian mummies, says, "Some of these relics, which have come down to us are unquestionably nearly 5,000 years old. They form a very interesting basis by which to ascertain to what extent animals may change under the different circumstances in which they live. The most careful comparison which has been made between the skeletons of animals preserved in mummies and those recently killed in the Valley of the Nile has not shewn the *slightest difference* between them. We have here, therefore, direct and positive evidence that a period of 5,000 years does not change the appearance, structure, or character, of any living being." Agassiz also goes on to show that the coral reefs of which a large part of the Florida Peninsula is made, and which it would have taken hundreds of thousands of years for these little creatures to build, have been built by creatures of exactly the same species as those now living and going on with their work in the Florida waters.

Again, when we come to question the stone record as far back as the Pliocene strata, we find out of 436 species taken from the Norwich Crag, and the Red and Coraline crags, 89, 60, and 52 per cent, respectively were species identical with those now living. Whilst as far down as the Miocene beds at Antwerp, out of 152 species, 39 per cent, were identified as living species (Sir C. Lyell's Ele. of Geology, page 204 and 232). Not only, however, do we find existing species as low down as the Miocene beds, but we even find them penetrating to the Eocene and down into the great secondary rocks. (Prof. Huxley Am. Ad. p. 35) says "I have already stated that as we work our way through the Tertiary formation we find many species of animals identical with those which live at the present day, diminishing in numbers it is true, but still existing in a certain proportion, in the oldest of the Tertiary rocks. Furthermore, when we examine the rocks of the Cretaceous epoch, we find the remains of some animals which the closest scrutiny cannot show to be in any important respect different from those which live at the present time."

When we bear in mind the almost inconccivable slowness with which many of these tertiary beds have been formed (see Lyell El. Geo. p. 229) we get some idea of the tenacity with which species now living have adhered to their present form absolutely without change through vast ages of time, and this is the more astonishing when we bear in mind the vast geologic and climatic changes which have occurred during these vast periods.

Again, Professor Huxley (Am. Ad. p. 57) carries us back still further. He says, "I have already referred to the fact that the carboniferous formations in Europe and America contain the remains of scorpions in an admirable state of preservation, and that those scorpions are hardly distinguishable from such as now live," and again, at the bottom of the Silurian series in beds which are by some authorities referred to the Cambrian formation where the signs of life begin to fail us—even there, among the few and scanty animal remains which are discoverable, we find species of mulluscous animals which are so closely allied to existing forms that at one time they were grouped under the same generic name."

Again (page 38) referring to the mesozoic or secondary epoch he says, "There are groups of reptiles such as the ichthyosauria and the plesiosauria, which appear shortly after the commencement of this epoch, and they

occur in vast numbers. They disappear with the chalk, and throughout the whole of the great series of mesozoic rocks they present no such modifications as can safely be considered evidence of progressive modification."

Perhaps, however, the most astonishing instance of the persistence of species is to be found in the genus foraminifera Dr. W. B. Carpenter (Article foraminifera, 9th Ed. Cy. Brit., page, 586), says, "It is interesting, however, to find certain clay beds of the new red sand stone, palæozoic, yielding foraminifera, chiefly of the cristallarian type which can be identified, not only generically, but specifically, and *even varietally* with forms common in the Italian tertiaries, and still living in the Mediterranean." Therefore, whether we trace back existing species through geologic periods, or take up any extinct species and trace it through vast ages of geologic time, we get the same answer. From the time, the species first appear till the time it vanishes from the scene, it shows no sign of change or modification; it retains the same distinct specific character after the lapse of millions of years, which it did when it made its first appearance in the arena of our planet. This direct testimony of the rocks is absolutely fatal to the fanciful speculations of the Evolutionists.

Having considered now what the evidence of the stone record furnishes with regard to the period during which species continue to inhabit the earth, and that its answer to our question is invariably to tell us that species, when once introduced remain unmodified through vast ages of time, we come now to consider what the same record has to say about the first appearance of the various species which have from time to time inhabited the earth. From top to bottom the reply is clear, unhesitating, and conclusive. That reply is, that all species have at definite times made their appearance on earth *suddenly*, and in the full perfection of all their varied and remarkable powers and organs. I will quote a few facts in support of this statement.

We will take a few instances at various points of the earth's geologic history. First, as regards the primary, or palæzoic rocks, Professor Williamson (The succession of life on the earth, Manchr. Science Lectures, 1876, p. 77) says, But associated with this cephalaspis there also existed in the later silurian days another fish. And now comes one of the perplexing facts which geological investigation, has brought to light, and which appear unfavourable to the doctrines of development and Evolution. Murchison first showed that in the upper silurian beds there existed the remains of species of shark, and other observers have verified the statement. When we enquire what position the sharks occupy in the scale of fish organisation, we learn that they occupy its summit. There is every reason to suppose that the particular fossil found in the silurian beds is not only a shark, but that he belongs to one of the highest types of sharks. We have here a seriously awkward fact. Nature has apparently taken a step forward in advance of her time. Between these sharks and the lowest forms of fishes there exists a vast series of fishes such as we see in our markets, but which have apparently no representative in this ancient epoch." In this silurian shark we have therefore a member of the highest sub-kingdom, the vertibrates, and of the very highest order of the whole class of fishes, the shark, and again of all the sharks, the very highest type, in this old fossil of the paleozoic age, thousands of feet down in the primary rocks.

Mr. Herbert Spencer's definition of Evolution is as follows:—"Evolution is a change from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity, to a definite coherent heterogeneity through continuous differentiations and integrations." (First Principles, 1862,) and in the 3rd Ed. of the same book, concluding his observations on this topic, he says, "From the remotest past which science can fathom, up to the novelties of yesterday, an essential of Evolution has been the transformation of the homogeneous into the heterogeneous."

Now, whatever Evolution may have done for other things, she appears to have reached the absolute limit of her powers as regards fishes as long ago as the silurian period. Whether, therefore, we consider the astonishing earliness of the period at which so wonderfully high a type of animal as a shark came upon the scene, the apparent suddenness of its appearance, there being no ancestral forms at all nearly allied, from which it could have sprung, or the tact that Evolution has absolutely stood still from the silurian to the present age in regard to the great class of vertebrates, fishes, we are alike forced to the conclusion that the facts are altogether inconsistent with Evolutionary doctrines.

Professor Huxley (Am. Ad., p. 41), says, "The great group of lizards *which abound in the present world* extends through the whole series of formations as far back as the Permian or latest paleozoic epoch. These Permian lizards differ astonishingly little from the lizards which exist at the present day. Comparing the amount of the differences between them and modern lizards, with the prodigious lapse of time between the permian epoch and the present age, it may be said that the amount of change is insigni- ficant. *Now note*. But when we carry our researches further back, in time we find no trace of lizards, nor of any true reptile whatever in the whole mass of formations beneath the Permian."

Here, Professor Huxley takes refuge, like Mr. Darwin, when in similar straits, by urging the imperfection of the geological record. That is, we are to believe that although in the Permian and all subsequent rocks we can find hosts of lizards down to the present day, all trace of the immense number of ancestors of very similar form, which they must have had on the Evolution hypothesis through the age which immediately preceded the Permian, has been lost. The rocks refused to receive a single specimen of lizard although receiving myriads of other creatures. Lizards, or any other true reptile, they sternly refused to receive or record as existing then on

the earth. Similarly, when we pass from the Permian to the Triassic formation which lies immediately above it, we find sudden and very numerous new species, orders, and even a new class (birds) making their appearance. Professor Dawson describes the change in these words:—Physically, the transition from the Permian to the Trias is easy. *In the domxin of life*, a great gulf lies between. The geologist, whose mind is filled with the forms of the paleozoic period on rising into the next succeeding bed, feels himself a sort of Rip Van Winkle, who has slept a hundred years and awakes in a new world."

Professor Williamson says, (Succession of Life on the Earth, M. Science Lect., 76-77, page 67), "But we now cross a boundary line, beyond which we find evidence of a *great change*. I do not mean to say that all the genera we shall meet are wholly new, because such is not the case. On the contrary, there are large numbers of types and patterns that appeared upon the earth in the earliest portions of its history which never passed away again, and which are living to the present time; but whilst this is perfectly true, it is equally so, that at the boundary line we are now crossing, like passing from one hemisphere to another, we leave behind many things that we have become familiar with, and and are brought face to face with new forms of organic life." A vast number of new species genera and even a new class altogether, that of birds, comes upon the scene whilst in the strata which immediately underlies the trias, not a trace is to be found of any forms (although this Permian formation underlying the Trias is rich in fossil remains of its own fauna), which could be considered as, even in a remote degree, the ancestors of these new species, genera, and class. Immense numbers of gigantic monsters of the reptilian order suddenly appeared, as also gigantic birds. (Professor Williamson, *ibid*, page 71), says, "In Scotland, the remains of a huge crocodilian creature has been disinterred from beds which are now generally admitted to be of triassic age." In the United States he tells us the footsteps of at least thirty-two species of three-toed bipeds abound, "believed to be those of birds like the ostrich, but some of which must have been four times as large as the ostrich." Professor Dawson refers to the reptiles, birds, and mammals of the Trias, the greater number of which appear for the first time, as follows:—"Gigantic saurians come on the scene, some harmless brousers on plants; others terrible rendors of living flesh, but all remarkable for presenting a higher type of reptile organisation than any *now existing*, and approaching in some respects to the birds and in others to, the mammalia. (Earth and Man, p. 202.)

Referring to these triassic forms Huxley says (Crit. & ad. p. 213) "The supposition that the Dinosaurian Crocodilian Dicynodontian and Plesiosaurian types were suddenly created at the end of the Permian epoch may be dismissed without further consideration as a monstrous and unwarrantable assumption." Mark, how easily he gets rid of the idea of creation. He then goes on—"The supposition that all these types were rapidly differentiated out of Lacertilia in the time represented by the paleozoic to the Mesozoic formations, appears to me to be hardly more credible, to say nothing of the indications of the existence of Dinosaurian forms in the Permian rocks which have already been obtained." Mr. Huxley, rejecting both these hypotheses takes refuge in a curious and remarkable theory of his own, destitute of a shadow of evidence which may be adduced in support. He says, "For my part I entertain no sort of doubt that the reptiles, birds, and mammals of the trias, are the direct descendants of the reptiles, birds, and mammals which existed in the latter part of the paleozoic epoch, *but not in any area of the present dry land*, which has been explored by the geologist." Even Mr. Huxley is compelled to admit that this may seem a "bold assertion," and it is both curious and instructive to see that Mr. Huxley, who dismisses the idea that these forms were suddenly created "as a monstrous and unwarrantable assumption" is himself reduced to account for them by a hypothesis which makes, I submit, very much heavier demands upon our credulity, and that refusing to believe in the creation of anything whatever by a Divine being without direct evidence of the creative act, he is perfectly ready to "entertain no sort of doubt" about matters of which he has not even a shadow of evidence.

We have, therefore, in the triassic formation distinct evidence of the sudden introduction of new species, families, orders, and even of a distinct class, viz:—that of birds.

Hence, as Mr. Darwin tells us (Or. of Spec. 6 Ed. p 413), that natural selection acts, "*solely* by accumulating slight successive favourable variations; it can produce no great or sudden modification, it can act only by short and slow steps." It cannot, therefore, have produced the vast variety of new organisms which suddenly appear in the Triassic formation. Again, Professor Williamson tells us (Succession of Life on the Earth, page 68) that "in passing from the palaeozoic to the mesozoic strata, from the Permian to the Trias, the family of Encrinites is still represented. *All* the types of this group which are found so abundant in the palaeozoic beds have disappeared, every one of those numerous species have become extinct. In their place we find a new Encrinite, a true member of the Crinoidal family, and yet *altogether different* from those whose place it has taken. The question inevitably arises, how and whence has this new Encrinite come. It is very distinct from those of the carboniferous rocks, merely preserving the general plan and pattern according to which they are all constructed. We cannot so connect it with any of the extinct forms as to suggest a probability that it has descended directly from them; *it is the isolated known representative of the vast race whose place it has taken*."

Ascending to the strata immediately above the Trias, viz., the Lias, Sir C. Lyell (E. of Geol., p. 417) tells us, "The whole series has been divided by zones, characterised by *particular ammonites*, for while other families of shells pass from one division to another, in numbers varying from about 20 to 50 per cent., *these cephalopods* are almost always limited to single zones." We have here, throughout, the whole Liassic formation, the very curious phenomena of separate species of one family appearing constantly quite suddenly, then disappearing as suddenly, and being immediately replaced by totally different species in the zone immediately above, whilst the species of other genera continue to pass through the successive zones unchanged. Referring to this remarkable phenomena, he says, "As no actual unconformity is known from the bottom of the lower to the top of the upper Lias and as there is a marked uniformity in the mineral character of almost all the strata, it is somewhat difficult to account for such partial breaks as have been alluded to in the succession of species, if we reject the hypothesis that the old species were in each case destroyed at the close of the deposition of the rocks containing them, and replaced by the creation of new forms when the succeeding formation began." Still ascending and passing the Lias, we come to the Oolitic strata; what do we find here? Professor Williamson (Succession of Life on the Earth, page 74), says:—"Were I to describe all the forms of animals that occur in this Oolitic age, I should detain you longer than my time will admit, so I must select certain salient ones upon which to dwell. The various types of marine shells now multiply in a very increasing manner, compared with what we found to be the case in the rocks lower down in the geological scale. Not only so, but every individual species that we discover is new and in many cases the large groups of species which we call genera, are equally new."

At the end of the Mesozoic age you are aware that the cretaceous rocks were formed, commonly called chalk, and that immediately above the chalk we enter upon the Oainozoic age, the Tertiary strata. Here again we find an astonishing change takes place in the character of contemporary fossils. The magnitude of that difference you may have some idea of from the following quotation from Sir C. Lyell (El. Geol., page 310):—"The marked discordance in the fossils of the tertiary as compared with the cretaceous formation has long induced geologists to suspect that an indefinite series of ages elapsed between the respective periods of their origin. Measured, indeed, by such a standard, that is to say, by the amount of change in the fauna and flora of the earth, effected in the interval, the time between the Cretaceous and Eocene, may have been as great as that between the Eocene and recent periods." Some idea of the magnitude of the change may be obtained when we read the following extract from Professor Williamson's (Succession of Life in the Earth, page 86):—"In all probability, if we except some foraminiferous creatures of low organisation, no one species, either of plant or aminal that lived previous to the close of the chalk age, survived that period. Except one doubtful shell, all the species found in the Mesozoic strata became extinct.

Again, page 87, "On crossing from the cretaceous to the tertiary beds even the molluscan forms underwent a *sudden change*." Again, same page, "The Ichthyosaurus and its companions are now replaced by the crocodile and the serpent. We have numerous turtles." Mammals of new and strange structure appear, resembling closely tapirs and antelopes, as well as carnivorous creatures. We also find for the first time whales. Professor W. adds, "Thus you see that though the giant Ichthyosaurus and other allied acquatic reptiles have disappeared from the sea, other huge marine creatures have taken their place, *though of an entirely different class."* Professor Dawson thus refers to the change (Earth and Man, page 245):—"If the old Egyptian by quarrying numulitic limestone bore unconscious testimony to the recent origin of man (whose remains are wholly absent from the tertiary deposits); so did the ancient Britons and Gauls when they laid the first rude foundations of future capitals on the banks of the Thames and of the Seine. Both cities lie in basins of Eocene Tertiary, occupying hollows in the chalk." After describing the character of the fossils in these beds, he says, (page 246) "These remains must be drift carcasses from neighbouring shores, and they show, first, the elevation of the old deep sea bottom represented by the chalk, so that part of it became dry land; next, the peopling of that land by tribes of animals and plants unknown to the Mesozoic and lastly, that a warm climate must have existed, enabling England at this time to support many types of animals and plants proper to inter-tropical regions. They show that no sooner was the cretaceous sea dried from off the new land than there were abundance of animals and plants ready to occupy it, and these were *not the survivors of the flora and fauna of the Wealden, but a new creation*." Sir C. Lyell, who is disposed to adopt Mr. Darwin's theories, escapes from the pressure of the difficulties of the position by suggesting that the vast masses of missing strata, which he is compelled to suppose must have been formed, but which are nowhere to be found; accumulating, as he himself informs us, through ages as vast as are represented by the whole Cainozoic period, have somehow or other been washed away by ocean currents.

The "suspicions" of geologists are therefore supplemented by suggestions and explanations, of which there is no evidence whatever, and which are altogether incredible. Mr. Huxley tells us that the vast accumulation of strata which, on the Evolution hypothesis, must have been formed between the period of the Permian and the Trias are *somewhere*, but cannot be found, and Sir C. Lyell says that the similarly vast mass which on the same

hypothesis must have accumulated between the chalk and the lower Eocene, has been washed away.

One other instance of the sudden introduction of new forms of life, and I have done with this branch of my subject. Passing from the Eocene we reach the Miocene division of the tertiary strata. Here, as everywhere else, we find the same introduction of entirely new forms. Professor Williamson (Succession of Life on the Earth, page 90) writes as follows: "We must now cross another threshhold and enter upon the Miocene age in which we discover a marvellous outburst of that animal life, living forms of which now constitute so conspicuous a feature in the forests of India and Africa. We have now the mammoth and the mastadon, huge forms of elephants, hippopotamus, rhinocerus, bear, hyæna, monkey, giraffe, camel and deer of numerous forms. I have now said enough to show how marvellous and rapid has been the outburst of new forms of animal life contrasted with its slow development in previous ages. In dealing with the question of Evolution we have carefully to consider the facts which I am now briefly enumerating. Recollect how extremely insignificant the thickness of the deposits that we are speaking of is compared with those of earlier date. The entire series of tertiary beds is only represented by a very thin line in any large section of the stratified rocks drawn to one scale. Yet, as I have already shown, the thickness of a series of deposits constitutes our best standard, imperfect though it be, for measuring the time which these deposits occupied in the accumulation. Remember then that in the lowest part of the tertiary series we have scarcely any of these mammals. The few found in the beds of the Eocene period are but scanty representatives of the group, but when we turn a corner it appears as if some great magician had waved his wand and in response to the magic summons *life of the most varied character*, and in forms *most dissimilar from what immediately preceded*, flash into existence.

"The evolutionist has to explain these unprecedented phenomena, and to ascertain if he can how it is that this development of animal forms has proceeded so slowly through millions of years, and then at a very late period, as if in preparation for man's advent upon the earth, it should suddenly advance with such amazing rapidity."

It is true that Professor Huxley, in his lecture on Evolution at New York, delivered in 1876, has submitted a certain series of forms found throughout the post tertiary and the tertiary strata in America, in which he professes to see the pedigree of our modern horses.

It is the solitary instance in which an Evolutionist, even with a highly cultivated scientific imagination, has attempted to show from actual fossil remains with even a show of possibility, how any genus of animals has been on Evolutionistic principles actually derived. Mr. Huxley even goes the length of submitting these seven different orders of animals, all differing so largely from one another, that a vast multitude of different species, with fine gradations between, must have intervened between each of the series, and which fine gradations are nowhere to be found, as a specimen of what he means by "demonstrative evidence of Evolution."

To give you an idea of the enormous difference between these forms, I need only say that the oldest of the series, orohippus, has four complete toes on the front limb, whilst the form found nearest to it in likeness, the mesohippus has only three. In his drawings, exhibited at New York, as well as in the illustrations accompanying the published edition of his American addresses, the various specimens are shown as all of one size, and he does not tell us that the orohippus was not larger than a fox, nor would I suppose many persons have discovered this fact, had not Professor Dana fortunately enlightened us to that effect in his Manual of Geology, 1875, p. 505. (See J. Cook's Boston Lectures.)

As so much is made of this supposed demonstration of Evolution, I will quote one or two opinions of scientific experts upon it. (Professor Williamson's Suc. of Life on the Earth, p. 100), referring to Mr. Huxley's lectures:—"It will not be enough that the limbs and teeth of these creatures indicate transmutation, but such transmutation *must be evidenced by every part of the animal*. This demand is especially applicable to the stages which intervene between the hipparion and the horse. If the latter was evolved out of the former during long periods of time, it must have been evolved *as a whole*, not merely showing the gradual change progressing in some organs, but in every portion of its structure, myriads of individuals must have existed to effect this gradual shading of the one into the other in every part of its body. It is true that in the pliohippus (a form intermediate between the hipparion and the horse) of Professor Marsh, the two lateral metacarpals had not digits, but even between this form and the abortive splint bone of the horse there is yet a *wide gap*."

It is curious that whilst Mr. Huxley selected the few parts of the structure which he supposed furnished evidence of modification, he is perfectly silent with regard to the other parts of the series of animals he treats of, and it would appear from the foregoing quotation from Professor Williamson, that the other parts of the skeleton are not so convenient for Mr. Huxley's purpose.

As we have amongst us a scientific authority on morphology, I think it would be highly interesting and instructive if he were to take up the parts of these ancient tertiary fossils which Mr. Huxley has not thought it necessary to notice and enlighten us further on the subject.

Joseph Cook, in his Boston lectures, 2nd series, p. 120, referring to Mr. Huxley's lecture, speaks as follows:—"The New York lectures disagree in their conclusions with those of higher geological authorities,

equally well or better acquainted with the American facts, and notably with the conclusions of Dana and Verrill. According to these Professors of the University where the relics are preserved, the bones explain in part the variations of one style, but do not account for gaps between groups of animals, and least of all do they account for man." (Dana Manual of Geology, p. 75, 590, and 604.) Fossil links between different groups merely establish the fact that genera are more numerous than palaeontologists, with less information supposed, but are no proof whatever of that gradually shading off of one species into another which is the cardinal doctrine of the Evolutionists.

Professor Huxley's ideas of demonstrative evidence are not likely, I imagine, to commend themselves to thoughtful or cautious men.

Again, the discovery of fossil remains of such a creature for instance as the archæopteryx, supposed by some to be intermediary between the reptile and the bird, could only be supposed to have any bearing on Evolution by a person altogether ignorant of the subject, and that for several reasons—1st. Professor Owen, unquestionably the highest authority on the subject, is of opinion that it is a true bird, and not intermediate, as was at first imagined, between a bird and reptile. (Sir C. Lyell, Elemt. of Geology, 394.) 2nd. The strata in which the remains were found, viz., the Solenhofen slates lie in the upper oolitic series, which was deposited millions of years after fully developed and true birds, some four times as large as an ostrich, had inhabited the earth. These birds made their apearance in the triassic formation, at the very bottom of the secondary rocks. Professor Huxley, speaking of the creature, says, "Nor do I think it is likely that the transition from the reptile to the bird has been effected by such a form as the archæopteryx." He classes it as a merely "intercalary" type, not representing the actual passage from one group to the other, as distinguished from "linear" types. It is true that Professor Huxley professes to imagine that he can trace the parentage of the bird class through the group of extinct terrestrial reptiles, named orinthoscelida, but as he informs us that "The remains of these animals occur throughout the series of mesozoic formations from the trias to the chalk. (Am. Ad., p. 60) and, as during the whole of that time the earth teemed with fully-developed birds, it is somewhat difficult for ordinary mortals to understand how the bird has been derived on Evolutionist principles from these creatures. It is true that Mr. Huxley tells us that there are indications of their existence even in the later palaeozoic strata, but as again the same high authority in another place, says that, "He entertains no sort of doubt" that inter allii birds existed in the latter part of the palæozoic epoch, it would appear that forms vastly differing from birds, and from which birds are supposed to be derived, and fully developed birds themselves, have been as nearly cotemporary as we can well conceive. It certainly requires, I think, the reasoning and imaginative faculties apparently peculiar to Evolutionists to enable one to conceive the *modus operandi* of Evolution in this case.

3. In the last place links between *different classes* are no proof of that gradual shading off of one species into another, which is exactly the thing the Evolutionists allege has taken place, and which, if their doctrines are true, must have taken place, and been continually and everywhere taking place, yet, of which they have, as yet, furnished no evidence whatever as a thing having taken place in *nature*.

We have now travelled through the whole of the stratified rocks, from the palæozoic to the cainozoic, primary, secondary, and tertiary, and have found that they all, and at all stages, tell the same story. There is not a trace of species having been derived from one another, but every new species, and sometimes whole genera, families, and orders, suddenly make their appearance. Species once introduced remain unchanged through vast ages of geologic time, and this notwithstanding the tremenduous changes, physical and climatic, which their *habitat* has undergone during these periods. To bring their theory into accord with the facts disclosed by palæontology, we have seen that the Evolutionist is reduced to most severe straits, and is obliged to make the most "monstrous and unwarrantable assumptions" as to the imperfection of the geological record, such record from top to bottom having steadily refused to receive or preserve a single specimen of those forms intermediate between species, so many millions of which must have lived on the earth through vast ages of time, if that hypothesis be true. To bring the Stone Record into harmony with the doctrine of Evolution not only must we suppose enormous masses of strata to be missing between the great subdivisions of the primary, secondary, and tertiary rocks, but also between every subdivision of these great classes, and particularly is this the case with the tertiary formation, which is comparatively speaking a recent deposit. The difference between the fossils of the Eocene and the Miocene beds is described as you have heard by a celebrated naturalist as so startling that it is as if a magician had waved his wand and life of the most varied character, and in forms most dissimilar from what immediately preceded, flash into existence. Piles of strata are wanted here just as badly as elsewhere to account for the marvellous change. Alas, they are nowhere to be found.

To the objections or difficulties already advanced I will add other two, numerous illustrations of which will occur to you, but which time will not permit of our enlarging upon.

1. The incredible difference in the rate of differentiations in different branches of the lineal descendants of (on the Evolution hypothesis) a single form; whether looked upon from a morphological or physiological point of view, some existing genera remaining to this day but specks of animated jelly, and others, as the mammalia,

exhibiting the most astonishing complexity of structure and function.

2. A similar objection, considered as to relative size of the various forms now existing, different descendants of the same form differing from others in size and weight, in the ratio of at least 1,000,000,000,000,000,000 to 1, as say one of the smaller animalculæ to a whale.

Here I must draw my remarks to a close. I have thought it better to endeavour, though at considerable length, to lay before you a few of the most prominent difficulties which beset the path of the Evolutionist as we study the evidence furnished to us by palæontology, rather than to travel over a large area less exhaustively. If I have resisted the temptation to multiply the arguments, and to present many more objections than I have actually done, it is not because material did not lie ready to my hand, but rather that to do so would involve me in greater prolixity than I could expect your patience to bear. I do not think I can close this first division of my subject better than by quoting the opinions of two of the most eminent modern palæontologists. Pictet, in his introduction to his traite de palæontologie, says, "It seems to me impossible that we should admit as an explanation of the phenomena of successive faunas the passage of species into one another. The limits of such transitions of species, even supposing that the lapse of a vast period of time may have given them a character of reality much greater than that which the study of existing nature leads us to suppose are still infinitely within those differences which distinguish the two successive faunas. Lastly, we can least of all account by this theory for the appearance of new types, to explain the introduction of which, we must necessarily in the present state of science, recur to the idea of distinct creations posterior to the first." The latest work on the subject which has appeared from the pen of any man of eminence in the scientific world, is from that of Principal Dawson. From his work on "The Origin of the World," published last year, I quote the following passage:—"Are not all the creatures that inhabit the earth the lineal descendants of creatures of past periods, or may not the whole be parts of one continual succession under the operation of an eternal law of "development? No, answers geology, species are immutable, except within narrow limits, and do not pass into each other in tracing them towards their origin. On the contrary, they appear *at once in their most perfect state* (the italics are mine) and continue unchanged until they are forced off the stage of existence to give place to other creatures. *The origin of species is a mystery, and belongs to no natural law that has yet been established*. Thus then stands the case at present. Scripture asserts a beginning and a creation. Science admits these, as far as the objects with which it is conversant extend, and the notions of eternal succession and spontaneous development discountenanced both by theology and science, are obliged to take refuge in those misty regions, where modern philosophical scepticism consorts with the shades of departed heathenism."

In my next lecture I propose to consider difficulties arising from the truths of chemical, astronomical, and philological science, devoting a considerable part to the application of the theory to account for the origin of Man.

[N.B.—Throughout the foregoing lecture I have italicised those parts of the quotations I desire to direct particular attention to. The *italics* are, of course, my own.]

Vignette

Coulis & Calling, Printers, Bookbinders, &c., Rattray Street.

Are we to Stay Here? A Paper on the New Zealand Public Works Policy of 1870,
Considered Specially with Reference to the Question of the Settlement of the Crown Lands, and the Incidence of Taxation.
By a Colonist of 22 Years' Standing

Preface.

THE Title-page of this Pamphlet gives some idea of its general drift. It was originally written for, and read to the members of the Timaru Debating Society. The paper having attracted some attention in Timaru, as bearing upon a subject of great interest to every colonist of New Zealand, especially in view of the depression which at present prevails throughout the colony, I have been asked to publish it for general dissemination, After some hesitation I have been induced to adopt this course, believing as I do, that the people of New Zealand generally, and more particularly those dwelling in the large towns, have paid far less attention to the settlement of the land than the importance of that question to the welfare of the colony deserves. In the Paper, I have attempted to prove to my readers the following propositions, viz.—

1st.—That the Public Works Scheme of 1870, known as Sir Julius Vogel's Policy, contained in its original form all the elements of success, if only it had been carried out in its integrity.

2nd.—That in the original scheme, the *bond fide* settlement of the land by farmers on small blocks, was one of the essential features.

3rd.—That such settlement was frustrated, owing to the prior occupation of the country by the runholders,

and the great power possessed by them as a class.

4th.—That the comparative failure of the Public Works Policy, and the present stagnation of the colony, are due in a great measure to the monopoly of so much of the best land in large estates.

5th.—That no permanent improvement in the affairs of the colony can be looked for until the majority of the large estates are broken up and settled upon by a numerous population.

6th.—That in order to hasten the above process it is desirable to abolish the Property Tax, and impose in place of it, a Land Tax on a sliding scale, increasing the amount per acre in proportion to the extent of the estate.

7th.—That no reforms in the taxation or system of land tenure can be expected, unless the Hall Ministry, representing as they do the large landed proprietors, are supplanted in office by a Liberal Ministry, representing the interests of the people at large.

8th.—That unless reforms of the above nature are speedily carried out, the colony will retrograde by reason of large numbers of those who have immigrated here, having to leave again in consequence of being unable to obtain a live lihood—this process has already commenced, to the serious detriment both of the Customs Revenue, and of the Railway Traffic Returns. Hence the title I have chosen for this Pamphlet, "Are we to stay here?" Of course, I am fully aware that the discussion of these subjects is likely to excite some degree of indignation and opposition on the part of vested interests; but I believe, that a disinterested outsider calmly reviewing the position, could come to no other conclusion than that some radical change in the land system of the colony is absolutely necessary, and must be made, in the true interests of all classes of colonists alike, as it is impossible that one class can continue to prosper for any length of time in a country so heavily burdened with debt as this is, when all other classes of the community are in a condition the very reverse of prosperous.

H. J. Sealy.

TIMARU,

February, 1881.

Are we to Stay Here?

A Paper on the New Zealand Public Works Policy of 1870.

Written for, and read to the Members of the Timaru Debating Society, December 20th, 1880.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN—

I have been requested to read a paper to the members of our Society upon the "Immigration and Public Works Policy of 1870;" and I believe there is no subject of inquiry in which every member of our society, as a colonist of New Zealand, is more vitally interested; as it is upon the success or failure of that policy that the progress and prosperity of the colony have principally depended; in fact, I may go further, and affirm that the success or failure in life of every person here present depends more directly than he has probably ever thought to be the case, upon the success or failure of the policy of 1870, now known as Sir Julius Vogel's Public Works Policy. That the policy has been to a great extent a failure, and is now proving disastrous to the colony, most people are inclined to admit; but it will be my endeavour to prove to you this evening, that the failure of the scheme is not due to any radical want of judgment on the part of the original promoters, but to the fact of the scheme not having been carried out in its integrity, and that it is chiefly in consequence of one of the cardinal points of the policy—viz., the settlement of the people on the Crown lands—having been ignored, that we now have to deplore a state of stagnation and depression almost throughout the colony, instead of a continuance of progress and prosperity.

To go into the whole question of the way in which the Public Works Policy has been carried out would take far more time than is at my disposal to write or yours to listen to; for instance, there are engineering questions as to whether certain lines could not have been more cheaply constructed if other routes than those adopted had been taken; and there are disputed points on all sides as to the utility of certain lines of railway which have not proved of a paying character, and which have since become known as "political railways," which would give

rise to endless discussion, and into which I cannot now enter. Doubtless arguments could be found in favour of, and, on the other hand, objections urged against, nearly every section of railway that has been constructed in either island; but these questions would prove to be too wide for our society, and would involve too much loss of time in the discussion. I shall therefore confine my paper mainly to one single point—viz., "the settlement of the people on the lands of the colony," with which the system known as "squatting" is so inseparably bound up that I have found it impossible to go into one question without the other—in fact, "settlement" has so hinged upon "squatting" from the first history of New Zealand that I have had to treat it as one subject. This question of the settlement or non-settlement of the people on the lands is, I consider, the one of all others of the most vital importance to every colonist, of whatever rank or station in life; for it is obvious, that without the settlement of the lands, the present population of the towns cannot Jong be supported; and I maintain that it is owing to the fact of the country not having been actually and indeed 'settled" in the proper sense of the term, that we now see the anomalous spectacle of hundreds of thousands of acres of fine land remaining almost uninhabited, whilst industrious men are daily leaving the colony because they cannot find homes for themselves and their families here; and every winter, crowds of the unemployed wander hopelessly about the country looking in vain for work, until the distress becomes so apparent that the Government have to find work for them, whether such work is required in the interest of the colony or not. To the same circumstance of non-settlement we can trace in a great measure the present lack of prosperity in the towns, the constant complaint of "business being dull," the overcrowding of the professions, and the eager competition for any "billet" which may become vacant, however trifling the emoluments attached thereto may be. There is great reason to fear that the colony has at present not only ceased to progress, but that it has actually entered on a period of retrogression, which may prove disastrous to all classes of the community, unless it can be speedily arrested; and for this reason, an inquiry into the causes of the want of progress is, or ought to be, of equal interest to all, whether the newly arrived immigrant who seeks to found a home in the colony, the tradesman hoping to establish a prosperous business, the labourer looking for permanent employment at fair wages, or the professional man seeking clients; but more especially to those of us who have sons growing up for whom we shall presently have to seek openings in which they can make their own way in the world, or daughters, whom we hope to see in the future wives and mothers in happy homes of their own.

As it may seem somewhat presumptuous on my part, as a private individual, to go into these questions or to set forth any opinion I may have formed on the subject, I may explain to those of you with whom 1 am personally unacquainted that I have been resident in New Zealand for some twenty-two years, having arrived in January, 1859; that I spent four years in Hawkes Bay Province—viz., one year on a sheep run, in which I possessed an interest, and three years engaged on the Government Survey Department; that I was some months on the Otago diggings, during the palmy days of Gabriel's Gully (1861), and that I have resided in this district of South Canterbury since June, 1863, having been for twelve years engaged in surveying for the Provincial Government, and for the last five years farming and grain-growing on a somewhat extensive scale, so that I have had some insight into most phases of colonial life; and as a surveyor, have had special knowledge on the subject of the land laws and regulations, both here and in the North Island, and unusual opportunities of observing the tendencies of those laws and regulations with regard to their facilitating or obstructing the *boná fide* settlement of the country. But, to return to the Public Works Policy, I shall endeavour to prove to you that it ought to have been a success, whilst admitting that, as carried out, it has turned out a comparative failure. It is desirable, therefore, for every one of us to study the subject earnestly, and if we wish to render New Zealand a country for our children and their posterity to live prosperously in, to endeavour to arrive at a just perception of the causes which have led to the present unfortunate condition of our adopted country, and each to contribute his share in the effort to arouse public opinion on the subject, with a view to remedy the errors of the past, and to ameliorate the present position of affairs.

It has been the custom during the last year or two for the Conservative papers to anathematize Sir Julius Vogel as the author of all our disasters, so I shall be at some pains to show you, not only that his original scheme was never carried out in its entirety, but also that the .said scheme was warmly supported and strenuously advocated, not only by the public at large, but also by the great majority of the members of both Houses of the Legislature, including the most prominent members and supporters of the present Government, the division in the Lower House having recorded forty-five votes for, and only seven against the Bill; and in the Upper House twenty-five for, and only seven against it; whilst we find amongst the names of those supporting Sir Julius Vogel, the names of the Hon. John Hall, Messrs. Rolleston, Stevens, Studholme, M'Lean, Driver, Ormond, and Tancred, which facts prove conclusively that it is grossly unfair to turn round now and blame Sir Julius Vogel in the terms of unmeasured abuse which such papers as the Christchurch *Press* and the *Timaru Herald* delight to heap upon him.

Upon going carefully through the debates on the subject as given in the pages of *Hansard*, I find that the main point impressed upon members by many of the most able speakers was the paramount importance of

"settling the people upon the land." It was upon this point that the success or failure of the whole scheme turned, and the evil effects of introducing large numbers of immigrants into the colony, without securing their permanent settlement upon the land, was over and over again reiterated.

As I am firmly convinced that the principal cause of the failure of the scheme of 1870 has been the monopoly of the land of the colony by the holders of large estates, I must ask your forbearance whilst I quote somewhat largely from some of the speeches on the subject made during the lengthened debates which terminated in the inauguration of the Public Works Policy, all advocating the actual settlement of the country; and I shall then proceed to show you that the country was not actually settled in the way which had been intended, and to point out to you some of the causes which frustrated that essential part of the scheme, so that the blame of the failure of the policy may rest on the proper shoulders—viz., on the Conservative or squatting element in the colony, and not as some newspapers would falsely have you believe, on the progressive or Liberal party. I shall commence by giving you a few extracts from the speech of Sir Julius (then Mr.) Vogel, sketching out the salient points of his policy; these and other extracts being quoted literally from the pages of *Hansard;* but, before giving these, it would be well to explain, for the benefit of those who were not then in the colony, that for two or three years previous to this memorable session of 1870, the colony had been in a state of complete stagnation and depression; immigration had almost entirely ceased; the revenue had fallen off from £1,862,000 in 1866 to £1,287,000 in 1870; all enterprise was checked, and a spirit of doubt as to the future had fallen like a dark shadow over all classes of the community—in short, all the conditions existed under which we are now again suffering after eight or nine years of prosperity.

Well, then, Mr. VOGEL said:—

*"Last year we had in this Assembly many evidences that the colonising spirit was reawakening. During the recess, from all parts of the country those evidences have been repeated in the anxious desires expressed for a renewal of Immigration and Public Works. I now ask you to recognise that the time has arrived when we must set ourselves afresh to the task of actively promoting the settlement of the country. We recognise that the great wants of the colony are public works in the shape of roads, and railways, and immigration. I do not pretend to decide which is the more important, because the two are, or ought to be, inseparably united. * * *!Now, as to the mode of payment for these railways: it is essential, in order that we shall not proceed too fast and undertake more than our means will justify, that we should fix a very effectual limit to the liabilities to be incurred. Speaking broadly, I contend that during the next ten years the colony will run no risk if it commit itself to an expenditure (or a proportional liability for guarantee of interest) of ten millions for railways and other purposes comprised in these proposals. * * * * * * * But there is another source from which to anticipate a reduction in the money cost—the land should be made to bear a considerable portion of the burden. We propose that authority should be given to contract for the railways by borrowing money, by guaranteeing a minimum rate of profit or interest, by payments in land, by subsidies, or by a union of any two or more of these plans. The contractors may want some money, but they should he glad to receive some land to yield them a profit consequent upon the effects of the railway; and similarly, if the routes be judiciously selected, the contractors should be glad to keep the railways with the security of a minimum guarantee. * * * * * * * In some cases the Government might take as collateral security the results of a special tax, or a mortgage over particular properties, such as railways in course of progress, or over rents and tolls. * * * * * * * I want to trace aggregate results. I suppose that some 1,500 or 1,600 miles of railway will require to be constructed, and that this can be effected at a cost of £7,500,000, together with two and a half million acres of land, and that, in addition, about a million will be required to carry out the other proposals I am making. I leave on one side the cost of immigration, because, as I have before remarked, that expenditure will be essentially and immediately reproductive. Suppose that this money is expended at the rate of £850,000 a year for ten years. It matters not for the purpose of our inquiry whether the money is procured by direct borrowing, by the security of a guarantee, or by the aid of payments in land in excess of two and a half millions of acres, which I have assumed to be part of the construction money. So confident are we that a great deal of the work comprised in these proposals can be effected by guarantees or subsidies, and by land payments, that we seek authority to directly borrow only six millions to carry out our proposals, including immigration. For the first three years the payments will be so inconsiderable as to leave little room for apprehension of difficulty in finding the money. After three years, supposing that extraordinary sums are required, will it be a great hardship to increase the stamp duties, or to have a house tax, or an income tax, or some tax which will touch that lucky class, the absentees, who enjoy all the advantages, whilst they share not the burden of the hard colonising labours, without which the most favoured country on the globe's surface could not attain permanent prosperity? * * * * I might detain you for hours discussing the question of immigration in its various aspects. It is essentially one of the greatest questions of the day, a question of transferring to lands sparsely populated portions of the excessive populations of old countries. Prom whatever point of view you regard it, whether from the highest social, or the narrowest pecuniary view, immigration is a profit to the State, if the immigrants can settle down*

and support themselves. If many thousands of immigrants introduced at once could earn a livelihood in the colony, I would not hesitate to ask you to vote the money to pay for their passages. Long before the money would have to be paid, supposing it to be borrowed, the immigrants would recoup the amount by contributions to the revenue. But it would be cruel to bring out immigrants if you do not see the way to their finding the means of self-support. As every immigrant who becomes a settler will be a profit, so every immigrant who leaves the colony, or is unable to procure a livelihood in if, will be a loss. We therefore say, that we will introduce immigrants only to those parts of the colony which are prepared to receive them. What the nature of the preparation may be it would be impossible now to define. It might be land for settlement, it might be employment of an ordinary nature, or on public works, it might be that facilities for establishing manufactories or aiding special or co-operative settlements were offered. What cultivation is to the farmer, what sheep breeding to the runholder, what an increase of clients to the professional man, are immigrants, if they become settlers, to the State."

From these extracts from Mr. Vogel's speech you will see that, whilst expatiating on the value and advantages of immigration, he laid special stress on the absolute necessity of retaining those immigrants who were to be introduced permanently in the colony *by settling them on the land;* though, I must admit, he did not dwell nearly so strongly on this point as did subsequent speakers. You will also observe that the original scheme embraced the principle of paying in part for the railways by means of large grants of land, being an adoption of the plan so extensively resorted to in the United States of America, and which has been found to answer admirably there. This part of the programme was afterwards dropped altogether, owing no doubt to the fact of vested interests being powerful enough to prevent the granting of land to contractors or other outsiders, which was occupied under depasturing licenses, and *all land in the colony worth anything at all* came under that category. Of course these grants of land would only have been made to companies constructing the railways, whose interest it would then have been to sell the land at such a reasonable price to *bond fide* settlers as would have ensured villages and hamlets springing up alongside the lines, thus maintaining a paying amount of traffic; whereas, in too many cases, it has since been sold in large blocks to the runholders, whose object was to frustrate settlement instead of encouraging it, the railways consequently running for many miles at a stretch through rich land without any population upon it, and the passenger traffic consequently restricted principally to dwellers in the large towns.

I will now pass on to the speech of Mr. RICHMOND, who seems to have been impressed with the idea of the enormous possibilities of New Zealand under a proper system of settlement, thus speaking of the West Coast of the North Island, he says:—

"My conviction is, that the carrying capacity of the West Coast is enormous, I believe that the whole district from Manawatu to the White Cliffs, is capable of supporting a family for every 50 acres. There is a point of great importance that should be considered in our Immigration scheme, it is one thing to bring immigrants to a colony, but it is another thing to keep them there. I think that we shall fail if we neglect to provide that great attraction which all unaccustomed if rural life look forward to when coming to a strange land, I mean a footing on the soil. My belief is, that an essential condition of permanent settlement in this country is a liberal land law for immigrants."

Mr. Richmond appears to have had a dread that the whole scheme would be thwarted by the opposition of the runholders, and showed a desire to make concessions to them, not because he thought they were equitably entitled to any concessions, but simply in order to conciliate them, through fear of their great power in the Assembly. He says:—"For the present at all events I have not the boldness to propose that we in this House should undertake in any serious degree to modify the local land laws, *which are the abomination of the country*. I think it would be quite possible * * * * without bringing on my back the squatting interests of New Zealand, it appears to me that I could conceive of some regulations running parallel with the whole of the land regulations, with the single view to the settlement of immigrants. The men who have most certainly improved their condition in this country are the labourers *who have got on to their own land* and worked it for themselves. I would not throw any difficulties in the way of their occupying the land, but would facilitate it by every means."

Mr. Richmond, however, voted against the Policy, apparently fore-seeing what has actually happened, viz., that the immigrants would be introduced, and the Railways made, not for the benefit of the people at large, but for that of the runholders, who in the mean time would find means to secure nearly all the cream of the country for themselves.

Mr. TRAVERS (the next speaker) seems to have had similar misgivings, though according the Policy his support to some extent, he says:—

"He quite concurred in the spirit of the proposals which had been made, and that the Colony could not be raised from its present difficulties, otherwise than by increasing the population of the country, by devoting all its energies to opening up its resources, so as to make it more attractive and available to those who are in it, and more attractive to those whom they sought to bring to it, and he could not conceive any proposal which

*would commend itself more com- pletely to the sense of the people of the colony, than one which provided for an extensive and well considered system of Immigration and Public Works. He thought the Colonial Treasurer's proposals in the Financial Statement were based upon a general cry throughout the country for increasing the population by means of immigration. It was not an original proposition at all of the Honourable Members, but was forced upon them by the expressed opinion of the people of the Colony throughout its length and breadth, and it was to the fact of the Government seeing the necessity and knowing better than he (Mr. Travers) did, that it was impossible that the colony could be recovered from the state of depression into which circumstances had plunged it, without increasing its population, that they owed the propositions of the Colonial Treasurer—propositions which he was prepared to endorse to a certain extent * * * A well considered scheme of Immigration would be of enormous value to the country. It was patent to all that what was wanted was population, and that without it all the interests of the colony were seriously suffering."*

Mr. JOLLIE, then member for Gladstone (South Canterbury), was with the exception of Sir Cracroft Wilson, the most unhesitating and bitter of all the oponents of the Policy: he was one of the old school of sqatters, who appeared to think that New Zealand had been created expressly for pastoral purposes, and looked upon it as little better than sacrilege to talk of settling people on the land; yet, even he admitted that something in the way of immigration was required, and would consent to borrow even as large a sum as £2,000,000 as a sort of compromise with the popular outcry for a large loan. Mr. Jollie said:—"Certainly we want additional immigration not only for the prosecution of Public Works, but for increasing the population of the country. I should myself not be opposed to a reasonable sum of money being voted for Immigration and other public purposes. I should not be opposed to the borrowing of so large a sum as £ 1,500,000, I should perhaps be prepared, reluctantly prepared, to authorise under proper safe-guards the raising of £2,000,000, beyond that I would not

Sir Cracroft WILSON, whilst violently denouncing the scheme, yet admitted, like Mr. Jollie, that something might be done for the colony by Public Works and Immigration, he said:—"Sir, the Financial Statement of the present Finance Minister, is based upon two things, Immigration and Public Works, and we all know that by properly carrying out Immigration and Public Works, this colony would in a short time rise to a high pitch of eminence—that we all recognise."

Mr. ROLLESTON, as usual, advocated extreme caution, he said:—"The colony as a whole approves thoroughly the principle that is involved in a proposal of this kind, and recognises that our duty as colonists has in a great measure been neglected for some time past * * * * Do we think we are going to settle the country by initiating large works, and bringing people to carry them out? The object of the Government is not to put itself in the position of an employer of labour, nor to bring people here, and then have to find them work for a year or six months afterwards. So surely as we enter upon the work with that object, so surely will the scheme fail. We have had notable examples of that. We brought in some 3000 or 4000 people to Auckland, and we expended £100,000 or more in finding employment for these people, and I venture to say there is not a tithe of them in the country at the present time."

Mr. Rolleston, as you are aware, was then Superintendent of the Province of Canterbury, and in that capacity had the reputation of being the friend of the farmer, and was in consequence nicknamed by the squatters "The People's William." Many of the runholders had a violent antipathy against him for advocating more liberality in the Land Regulations, and also because he had proclaimed sundry reserves for Educational and other purposes on their runs, and it was in a great measure owing to the strong feeling they had against Mr. Rolleston, that the squatters of Canterbury as a class eagerly supported the movement for the Abolition of the Provinces, hoping no doubt to be able to carry things with a high hand in the Assembly, now that their privileges were getting somewhat curtailed by Mr. Rolleston and his adherents in the Provincial Council.

Now, when it is too late, even the most violent opponents of Provincialism in Canterbury admit that they made a great mistake in procuring the downfall of the Province, and have detrimentally affected their own interests, and those of all other Canterbury men in every way; whilst the squatters themselves find that they by no means have everything their own way in the Assembly, as they used to for so many years in the Provincial Councils. Bearing these facts in mind, I have been astonished at Mr. Rolleston's alliance, during the last year or two, with the very party of whom he was formerly the veritable *bête noir*, and am unable to account for it in my own mind, except on the supposition that his personal dislike to, and fear of Sir George Grey, may have induced him to cast all his former professions to the winds, if by so doing he could help to keep the Grey party out of office; or else, that having been disappointed in the expectation of getting a portfolio in Sir George Grey's Cabinet, he made sure of one as the price of joining the Conservative Ministry. You may remember that for several years he and Mr. Montgomery were in close alliance, and that their every act was warmly supported by the *Lyttelton Times*, and as violently opposed by the *Press*, whilst, now he finds himself ranged with the Hon. John Hall and the *Press*, and opposed by Mr. Montgomery and the *Lyttelton Times*, his conduct must appear inconsistent to nine-tenths of his former supporters, though he might attempt to explain away the

inconsistency.

Mr. Bunny and Mr. H. S. Harrison both supported the Government proposals.

I now come to one of the most important speeches of the whole debate, that of Mr. STAFFORD, who was at that time member for our own town of Timaru. He approved generally of the scheme, and he spoke strongly, fearlessly, and uncompromisingly of the dangers of the land monopoly, pointing out the evils of the system of large estates, and instancing those of Nelson and Marlborough Provinces, where nearly the whole country was occupied by freehold sheep runs in large blocks to the total exclusion of small settlers. The same state of things existed almost throughout the Provinces of Wellington and Hawkes Bay. I know, from personal experience, that so long ago as 1859, all the best land in Hawkes Bay had been bought up in large blocks at the price of live shillings per acre, and most of it has been locked up from settlement to this very day. So many obstacles were thrown by the land regulations and survey system in the way of farm settlement, that it was almost an impossibility for an outsider to get hold of any piece of land for farming at all; and if some newcomer persevered until he did manage to get a piece, he quickly found out that he had practically outlawed himself, and was considered more out of the pale of society than if he had been convicted of horse-stealing. The very same state of things existed here in South Canterbury until comparatively recent times, as any of those who have been long in the district could testify. And, whilst touching on this subject, I may mention that I was in this district when the first number of the *Timaru Herald* appeared, and from that time to this I cannot recollect a single article having ever appeared in that journal which has advocated the *bona fide* settlement of the country, or raised even the most feeble protest against the way in which the country was monopolised by the squatters, and practically, almost entirely closed (at least to the southward and westward of Timaru) against real settlement. This, though the *Herald* professed to represent an agricultural district, though its growth depended in a great measure upon the increase in the number of small farmers, and though Mr. Stafford, our late member, who is continually held up by the *Herald* as a model for our admiration, spoke so strongly as he did in 1870 against this *most pernicious system of land laws*, and even went so far as to suggest that *the Government should resume some portion of those large estates* in the interest of the community at large. Contrast the conduct of the *Herald* on this question of settlement with that of the *Lyttelton Times*, which journal has for the last fifteen years consistently and fearlessly written against the monopoly of the land, though by so doing it earned the hatred of the most powerful class in the country, who made every effort to crush it; but its present success, and the great circulation both of itself and its weekly edition, the *Canterbury Times*, prove the truth of the old adage, that right will in the end prevail over might. I have said fifteen years, but even longer ago than that, the *Times* was the advocate of the small farmers. I will read you some extracts from one of "The Canterbury Rhymes," composed so long ago as February, 1858, by the late Crosbie Ward, who was then Editor of that journal, showing that even then he foresaw the ill effects of, and protested against, the monopoly of the land by the squatters:—

* * * * * *

When he stopped, rose Jonniol-tok,
Shrewd and subtle Jonniol-tok!
He the double-barrelled justice
Ever brought to give opinions;
And at once he shoved his oar in
In his customary manuer:—
"I assent to these proposals
With a trilling reservation,
Ye will sweep away conditions
Which tie up the land so closely,
Only ye'll except the squatter—
Will not touch the rights of squatters,
Of the shepherds and the stockmen.
Ye shall take the rights of farmers,
Of the millers, bakers, butchers,
Tailors, drapers, clothiers, hatters,
Soldiers, doctors, undertakers,
Of storekeepers and bootmakers,
Of all trades and occupations,
Of all persons in the province,

But the shepherds, the runholders;
Them ye shall not touch nor injure."
Thus he spake and gave no reason,
Shrewd and subtle Jonniol-tok!
* * * * * *

Then spoke rugged Bobirodi,
The hard-headed one from Yorkshire;
He the prince of all the squatters,
Largest holder of runholders—
"Ye remember old Suellis,
Councillor with us of old time:
Crafty statesman, cunning prophet,
Who taught all of us our wisdom,
He arranged the matter for us,
And he said it should not alter,
Should remain as he had left it,
As he prophesied, so be it."

And the very big man, Stunnem,
Moving only eyes and shoulders,
Mutely making demonstrations;
Saying nought was most impressive;
Then the shepherds in a chorus,
Squatters and the friends of squatters,
Begged, implored, and prayed the Council
To consider all their hardships;

How their rents were so oppressive,
How their wool was sold for nothing,
How they could not sell their wethers
For the paltry price of mutton,
How the market rate of stations
Showed it was a loosing business,
And they begged and prayed the Council
To maintain the old conditions
That had tied the land so closely,
Only on behalf of squatters
Sweeping quite away the others.
* * * * * *

Few were bold enough to argue
In reply to Bobirodi
To the very big man Stunnem
To the subtle Jonniol-tok
And the few that stood their ground there—
Stood their ground, and asked for justice,

Simple justice to all classes—
They were bullied and brow-beaten,
Called to order, reprimanded
By the big men, the stock-owners,
Squatters, and the friends of squatters,
And the timid ones around them,
Who would fain be friends of squatters,
So the fluent Secretary,
Oloware, the rapid speaker,
With his colleague sitting by him,
Tomicas, the Chief Surveyor,
Trembled on the crimson cushions,
Gave them all that they demanded,
Granted all the boon they asked for,
Never dared to ask objections,
For they feared the mighty squatters.
* * * * * *

And they kicked the farmer backward
From the fertile spots of country
In the region of the Westward,—
Never thinking of hereafter.

Well, to return to Mr. Stafford, he said:—"Sir, this scheme to which our attention has been invited, proposed by the Government though it be, is one for which no Government, or no party within or without the wall of this House can claim the sole paternity. It is one to which the mind of the country generally has been for some time directed with an ever ripening conviction that it was necessary erelong to take some steps in the direction in which we are now invited to consider the propriety of moving. I should desire to see immigrants carefully selected from the agricultural counties, from the south and west of England, from the Lothians of Scotland, and from the north of Ireland, where the inhabitants are well skilled in every sort of agriculture. I would make provisions for settling these immigrants throughout the length and breadth of the country, especially upon the arterial lines of communication which it is proposed to construct, and in order to do so *I should be prepared to walk over the heads of the whole existing land laws* of New Zealand. Sir, there is a large part of the Middle island of New Zealand familiar to me, where at the present time it is almost impossible for working men to obtain a place tor the sole of their feet. *Where whole districts have been carved out into large estates by the operation of a most pernicious system of land laws*, a system adopted in 1853, and against which, at the time, I emphatically protested. Large estates have been allowed to accumulate, upon which nothing but sheep are allowed to run, while large portions of them are fit to maintain industrious settlers. It behoves us in connection with such a great scheme as that now initiated, to consider seriously *whether we should not take power to resume portions of those large estates*, giving, of course, a fair compensation for the lands taken back from those who are now for the most part in profitless occupation of them. I would settle along the line of arterial communication throughout the country, at intervals of not more than 8 or 10 miles, village communities, giving them, not a quarter or half-acre section, as may be sufficient for a village black-smith, or a village publican, but village lots of some three acres, and suburban lots of 8 or 10 acres each, upon certain conditions of proprietorship and residence. I would attach to these communities considerable commons, not for the purpose of establishing a pastoral proprietory, but for the purpose of giving to each inhabitant of the village community, the means of maintaining a few cows."

Mr. Stafford speaking at a later stage of the Debate, was still more emphatic in pointing out the absolute necessity of throwing open the lands for settlement, and foretold in most prophetic terms the occur-rence of our present difficulties, if that were neglected, he said:—"I have from the first believed that this scheme cannot work out eventually to a successful issue without an entire review of the existing land laws of the colony, and it was to me a very great source of pleasure that the suggestions I offered during the debate upon the resolutions (which appeared to me at the time to be treated if not with contempt at least with indifference by the House), viz., as to the *absolute necessity* now that we are going to largely increase the population of the colony by a

system of State Immigration, for *making some provision for settling the people on the land* of the colony, have at last seemed to honourable gentlemen, to have some weight, and to be worthy of serious consideration. I firmly believe that if we are going to land a large number of people upon the shores of this country without offering them facilities for settling in the interior, away from the sea-ports, we shall have nothing but a *hungry, discontented, semi-pauperised people* * * * * That instead of having a healthy stream of immigrants coming into the country to reclaim its waste lands, we shall have a *peripatetic, unsettled, and discontented population*, who instead of being a source of wealth, will be a great source of injury and injustice to those already in the country."

How truly this prediction has been verified we can all see for ourselves—but we cannot say it was for want of due warning.

With regard to payment for Railways being made in land, Mr. Stafford said :—"He confessed that if he thought the land was going to be alienated in large blocks, he should altogether object to it. It would prevent the settlement of a large population in the country, and the carrying out of a scheme of colonisation, which after all was the main object they had in view. One effect of this Bill would be to do away with all the existing Provincial Land Laws, and assimilate them into one system, and in that direction he should like to see Legislation going."

Speaking of the monopoly of the land, I must tell you that at that time (1870), comparatively little harm had been done in South Canterbury, only a few thousands of acres each having been bought by some of the more wealthy squatters; yet, no sooner was the money borrowed and the railways commenced, than they rushed in, and swept up nearly all the good agricultural land in enormous blocks; the Government in the meanwhile looking calmly on, without endeavouring to interpose to save the country for actual settlement. In deploring this state of things one is met by the argument, "the land was open to all, why did not the public buy it ?" In answer to this I shall have more to say presently. You will observe that Mr. Stafford advocated a system of village settlements, which has now, after 10 years fatal delay, and when too late to be of much practical use, been adopted, as explained in the last report of the Secretary for Crown Lands, extracts from which I shall read you presently.

Mr. MACANDREW in supporting the Government scheme, brought forward a new argument, in their favour, viz., that railways would cost very little more in the long run than metalled roads, which all admitted to be a necessity—Loan or no Loan.

Mr. MCGILLIWAY'S views were in entire accord with those of Mr. Stafford, as to the necessity of settling people on the land, he said :— "What was the use of railways or the development of any industry without population? Instead of asking the people to come out and labour on the Public Works, he would ask them to come out and settle upon the land at once, under such land regulations as would enable them to do so. He greatly doubted if the yeomanry and industrious tenantry would come out to work on the roads. The great summit of their ambition was *to be landowners* on easy and desirable terms. Instead of asking the immigrants £100 for 100 acres, it would be much better to acquire it at the rate of 2s. an acre, for 10 years. He admired very much what had fallen from Mr. Stafford, his scheme of colonisation appeared to him truly excellent. He would prefer seeing *men, women, and children upon the land, instead of sheep and cattle*."

Mr. GILLIES, in the course of a speech, strongly against the Government, expressed similar views as to settlement. He said:— " I believe in immigration that attaches men to the soil, and I believe in providing for them out of the soil—that is true colonisation, if we can introduce such colonists. I say if there is one legitimate object for which the colony should borrow money, this is the object; and I say if we are in a position to borrow at all, let us borrow for immigration purposes to settle the people upon the soil, and *make them owners of the soil."*

Mr. Fox, who was then Premier, spoke, of course, strongly in favour of the proposals, but time will only permit of a short extract. He said:—"What we want is roads, railways, and public works, and we must have as much money as will make them. My deep conviction is, that the time has come when we should again recommence the great work of colonising New Zealand; and the object of the Government proposals is, if possible, to re-illume that sacred fire. I may not live to see it fully done, but it will be my greatest happiness if I may be permitted still to wear my harness; and if in my latter days I shall not be able to take an active part in the work, still I shall be able to cheer on and to encourage that younger generation into whose hands the work will pass."

Mr. STEVENS, one of the members for Christchurch, also expressed himself in favour of settlement. He said:—"I believe the way to carry on immigration is to give people regular employment at a fair rate of wages—at a rate that will enable them to live through the whole of the year comfortably, and save some money, and to *give them abundant facilities for choosing Crown lands at a reasonable rate*. I may say, from my own experience, which among the farming class is very extensive, that there is no man who does so well in settling in the country as the man who has got a little money and buys his own land."

Mr. FITZHERBERT, of Wellington, who was even at that time a very old colonist, made a most forcible speech. He seems, like Mr. Richmond, to have foreseen the danger of the land being bought up before the immigrants could be settled on it, and in the strongest possible terms protested against such a catastrophe being permitted to happen; yet, that is precisely what has happened, and the disastrous results of which we cannot yet see the end of. As Mr. Fitzherbert's speech bears directly on the point I wish most strongly to bring out before you, I give you somewhat long extracts from it. He said:—

"It is well known that it has been a deep and growing conviction on my mind for the last two or three years that we were stagnating in this country, and that we were absolutely failing to perform our duty; that, from whatever cause, Provincial Governments and General Government alike seem to have got into a dreamy and dormant state; that they seemed to have become almost lifeless; that we had over-looked too much the great work of colonisation, which we ought to have considered as those who had to found a new country; that we had altogether forgotten our raison d'etre in this part of the world. I felt that we were false to our great interests, and that we were no longer the men who ought to parade the pretensions which we were constantly doing of being the great builders up of a country. With respect to this question of immigration, I do not hesitate to say that it is one of the greatest problems of the present day, than which there is no question of peace or war, starvation or plenty, civilisation or barbarism, of larger or more profound interest; and we form in New Zealand no small item in that problem, and, for this reason, that we are nearly about the last country within the Temperate Zone which remains yet uninhabited—I say uninhabited, for how else can it be regarded, seeing that we have only a population of a quarter of a million, including the infant born yesterday, to make up the number. To call this an inhabited country is simply trifling with terms. It is not enough to bring people out here and to drop them down anywhere in the country; they must be established and settled. If I thought that a system would be devised of a grand scheme of Public Works for the sake of finding employment for a number of strangers who would be brought here, I would oppose it. I say that the idea of bringing out people as immigrants with the view of obtaining employment upon Public Works in the colony is the most preposterous idea that was ever entertained. It would be a blot upon our administration if we permitted any such scheme to be carried out, which could have no other effect than that of utterly demoralising and corrupting the whole population. It would be monstrous that in a country like this, the immigrant should look to employment on Public Works for a permanent livelihood Panem et circenses. The pages of the past tell us that that was the ruin of one empire. But if such a system be a disease incidental to the mature age of nations, nothing could produce such a state of things in a young country but culpable incapacity of administration. What do we mean by settlement? I come here to a question of vital importance. The land question is the great theme. I admit the problem is not an easy one to solve. The problem in New Zealand has generally been complicated by many difficulties. It is no use to quarrel with that, but we must, by intelligence and discrimination, try to solve that problem. The land must be opened for the people."

Mr. M'INDOE, in speaking next, corroborated Mr. Macandrew as to the great cost of metalled roads in Otago.

M. PEACOCK, of Canterbury, supported the Government scheme.

Mr. BRANDON spoke in favour of settlement. He said:—

"He had hoped that a scheme would be put before the House for inland settlement, somewhat on the plan of the old original settlements. That would have been the means of introducing not only labour, but capital also at the same time. It would have formed a settled population, instead of (as now seemed to be the great idea) introducing people to carry on works without thinking what was to become of them when the works were finished. There was plenty of land both in the North and the Middle Island ready and available for such a purpose. Instead of borrowing for railways upon any such scheme as had been proposed, it would have been better to have said to Provinces which had land available for such a purpose, or for the construction of roads—'We will assist you by legislation in the Assembly to offer to contractors payment either in land or in the form of a guarantee, you taking care that when the contractors have such land they shall settle it or sell it for settlement within a specified time.'"

Mr. KELLY spoke strongly in favour of encouraging small settlers, and also in favour of establishing local industries, which, in my opinion, can never be successfully introduced in any town except where the country districts around it are thickly settled by a fixed population. Mr. Kelly said:—

*"The men they wanted, were small holders of land—men who came from parts of the old country where industry and frugality were habits of second nature. * * * * * * The class of men also which they required were those who in settling down relied upon their own exertions, and who would not, in times of temporary depression, go clamouring to the Government for work. The only way to secure such people was to insure them liberal land laws, by which they could obtain holdings at a cheap rate, to be paid for in a reasonable time, and make them accessible by good roads. There was one point which he had overlooked, and that was to impress upon the Government the necessity of encouraging new industries. It was a most important consideration, and*

one which could not fail to strike any one on looking over the customs returns, finding as they did there, articles of food, clothing, boots, shoes, cordage, leather, and other articles of manufacture, which might be just as well produced in this country. He found that the value of these necessaries imported into the colony, and which might be produced within its boundaries, amounted to two millions sterling."

Mr. HOWORTH reiterated Mr. Fitzherbert's views. He said:—

"It would not be wise to introduce immigrants to compete with the labour we have already here. The great inducement to the people in the old country (and in all countries, in fact) to come to the colony was, that they might become proprietors of the soil; that they might have land on which to settle and call their own. He did not think it would be any inducement to ask labouring men in England to come out to this country merely to accept employment on Public Works; they might be giving up a certainty for an uncertainty, and they might not like colonial life when they came here. The great inducement to persons leaving the home country was the prospect of making a new home for themselves and families, and releasing themselves from a position out of which they can have little hope of gaining an independence. He believed that if this colony were to take its place among the nations of the earth, it was the duty of its inhabitants to make themselves a nation, and to do that they must have population, which is the greatest source of wealth any country can have, and the means of developing large resources."

MR. MERVYN spoke in favour of altering the land regulations, and showed that even so long ago as 1867, suitable settlers had left Otago, owing to the difficulty of finding land to settle on. He said:—

*"The colony must ere-long take up the question of liberalising the land laws generally * * * He could speak with greater certainty with respect to the province of Otago (than Canterbury), and he could say that he had known hundreds of people compelled to leave Otago in consequence of land not having been thrown open to them on which they could settle. He had presented a petition to the House to that effect in 1867, and since he came to Wellington this session, he had met men who were on their way to California, for the simple reason that there were not facilities given them to enable them to settle in Otago. These men to whom he referred, he knew had £200 to £300 a-piece in their pockets, and it could not be denied they were a most desirable class of settlers, men who by frugal habits had saved what little they possessed, and so long as such a state of thing existed respecting the land laws, people might be brought into the country, but they would not settle."*

MR. POTTS (of Canterbury) advocated opening up the country by branch lines to encourage settlement.

MR. ORMOND, then Superintendant of Hawkes Bay, also supported the Government proposals. He was subsequently instrumental in starting the Scandinavian settlements in the Ninety Mile Bush, which have proved what patient industry can accomplish in the face of great difficulties. He said:—

"It must be apparent to all that the country is starving for want of population to develope its resources. I have not those fears which some honourable members appear to entertain, that we shall not be able to borrow this money to advantage. I think we may with safety incur expenditure on productive works to any amount that we may be able to get, and I firmly believe that those works will be eventually remunerative."

MR. CREIGHTON supported the scheme generally, but pointed out that *the land of the Colony should be made security for the loan*. He said:—

*"He believed * * * * that the resources of the colony fully warranted going into the market to borrow ten millions, but he also believed that what was called the Consolidated Revenue was not at present sufficiently elastic to justify such borrowing on the security of that revenue alone. Let the Government come down with a proposal to resume the landed estate of the colony, let them propose to pledge that estate to the Public Creditor, and then he would support the Government in borrowing ten millions. In Victoria the land was pledged to the Public Creditor, and the land fund was appropriated by a vote of the Legislature. In New South Wales the practice was the same, and so it was substantially in regard to Canada and California. If New Zealand was to go into the English market for a large loan, the English capitalist would require that the whole of the public estate of the colony should be pledged as his security. It would be unfair to New Zealand, to its credit, and to its good name generally, as well as to the capitalist, if the colony went into the market for such a loan, and offered any less satisfactory security."*

MR. W. H. HARRISON in the course of his speech corroborated Mr. Macandrew's and Mr. McIndoe's statements as to the great cost of metalled roads in New Zealand; this is a fact often lost sight of by those who declaim against the Railways, as having entailed so much expenditure, as in all fairness, from their cost ought to be deducted the cost of the metalled roads which would have been necessary if no Railways had been made.

MR. O'NEILL went pretty deeply into the land question, and spoke of the lands of the colony, as being the *birthright of the children born in the Colony*. He said, speaking of Railways:—

*"In 40 years England constructed about 14,000 miles of railways, at a cost of about £500,000,000 * * * At the commencement of the present year (1870), America had 48,869 miles of railways constructed, at a cost of 2,212,000,000 dollars. Speaking of land, he thought that in this country immigrants had been enticed to come out on representations that land was so easily obtainable, and that grants (free grants) could be got. Now 50 or*

100 acres sounded largo and comfortable in the old country, quite an estate, but little did the immigrant know that he might get almost barren rocks, or some wild secluded spot in the bush, far away from civilisation, on which he would have to make a livelihood for himself and his children. He believed that many immigrants were consequently disgusted with the country, and the representations which had gone home, had to a large extent stopped the tide of immigration. As there was plenty of land in the colony, he would give as a birthright forty acres of land to every child rocked for the first time in the colonial cradle, and he would have this arrangement in force until the end of the time estimated for completing the scheme proposed by the Government."

MR. CURTIS, then Superintendent of Nelson, supported the scheme.

Sir DONALD MCLEAN, Native Minister, also spoke, of course in support of the Government proposals. He said:—

"I will only add that, from the time the Government first took office, we felt that a policy for the country was wanted. We felt that firstly, the restoration of peace was necessary, and to that end we have worked constantly and earnestly, with what results the House and the country can judge. We also felt that when peace was restored, colonising operations were absolutely necessary for the progress of the country. We recognised that the country is one abounding in great auriferous wealth, rich in varied resources, but requiring a system of colonisation that should have continuity, that should not be spasmodic, or liable to break down suddenly—a system extending over a series of years, and which should be the means of bringing population, not only from Great Britain, but from Germany, Norway, Denmark, Switzerland, and other parts of the Continent, which population should be able to make for themselves a future, and comfortable homes, in a land which needs but labour to make it, in fact what it has long been regarded as certain to become, 'The Briton of the Southern Seas."'

Mr. WILLIAMSON, of Auckland, was also a strong supporter of the scheme, especially wishing to see the Maori lands settled. He said:—

"I ask myself, as I did in 1860—Are railways and great trunk roads required for opening up the country? and I cannot but see with more force than I ever did before, that such works are required, and should now be undertaken. But those works must go hand in hand with colonisation. Of what use will it be to open the country by roads unless we have traffic upon those roads? Sir, there is at the present time unoccupied land in the Province of Auckland to the extent of about 14,000,000 acres, and I ask, are we who are here now to retain the monopoly of those lands? The honourable member Tareha has told us to-night that the Natives are willing to dispose of their lands to the Government. I trust, sir, soon to see that land occupied and cultivated, and to see upon it the homes of our countrymen, and its 'wilderness made to blossom as a rose.'"

Mr. DRIVER, of Otago, spoke in support of the scheme, deploring the state of stagnation into which the colony had fallen at the time, thus, he said:—

"In fact, he thought the whole country was drifting into a state of utter stagnation and ruin. In every part of New Zealand, and amongst every class, the feeling was in favour of new blood and new capital. * * * * * * Unless some new life and new blood was introduced into the country, which could only be done by a reasonable and proper system of Public Works and immigration, he thought they would die an ignominious, and what might be termed a dried up sort of death."

Mr. EYES, of Nelson, in supporting the scheme, said:—

"On behalf of his constituents, he desired to return his sincere thanks to the Government for having initiated the only scheme of colonisation worthy of the name, which had been undertaken by any Government who had held office in the country."

Having now gone through the list of speakers, I next come to Mr. VOGEL'S speech in reply, in which he said:—

*"The ruling idea of the Government proposals is, that the few colonists of New Zealand have a great problem to solve—viz., how to improve the very magnificent estate which Providence has given into their hands; that it is the duty of those colonists not selfishly to endeavour to keep that estate for themselves alone * * * * * * but to set to work to open and improve it, and really to populate it." Speaking of the Land Laws, Mr. Vogel showed that he was afraid to have that subject ventilated, lest the squatters should combine to defeat his proposals altogether, thus he says—"The honourable member for Grey and Bell (Mr. Richmond) endeavoured once more to obtrude that irritating question, the alteration of the Land Laws. If the honourable member were sincere in desiring to see our measures passed, he would not endeavour to obstruct their passage by obtruding questions which he knows are of a nature likely to divert honourable members' minds from the consideration of those measures. He is sufficiently familiar with the interest which in this House centres in all questions relating to the Land Laws of the colony, to know, that if the question of a radical alteration in the Land Laws is raised, it will supersede the consideration of the Government proposals." Speaking of the Canterbury railways, he said—"The figures given by the honourable member (Mr. Rolleston) were very instructive. They showed us the astounding progress which Canterbury has made, and it seemed to me that it was in the mind of the honourable*

member to shut out the rest of the colony from the prospect of such improvement as has taken place in Canterbury, rather than to say to the other Provinces—'Go and do likewise.' We say only, we will construct such railways as may from time to time be found to be desirable and payable; but Canterbury entered upon railway construction with a population of some 12,000, and with that great tunnel difficulty before it. And what has been the result? One which the honourable member for Avon describes as eminently satisfactory." Speaking of the proposed railways, he said—"The Government shall understand it to be its duty, before the new House can be called together, to ascertain the opinions and wishes of the different Provinces, to enter with them just as is proposed by the Bill, into a discussion as to what railways they desire, what conditions they are willing to submit to in order to get such railways, what are the conditions of the country through which the proposed lines will pass, what will probably be the traffic, and to what extent the lines are likely to pay."

Mr. RICHMOND followed in a short speech, from which I take one extract:—

"We are providing means for bringing people here, but we are not providing attractions for the purpose of retaining them here. There is no attraction to the rural settler which will compare with the attraction of settlement upon the land; and there is nothing on the American Continent which presents so powerful an attraction to emigrants as the facilities which are afforded them of settling down upon their own land"

Mr. VOGEL, in winding up the debate, said:—

"During the last few days of this Parliament, let us think of the people, not of ourselves, not of parties. Let us forget all differences, and give to the country the future which this Bill promises."

Then came the division, which disclosed an overwhelming majority for the Government—viz., ayes 45, noes 7, the only members voting against the Public Works Policy being Colonel Haultain, Sir C. Wilson, Sir D. Munro, and Messrs. Jollie, Richmond, Reader Wood, and Collins; yet the organs of the present Government would have you believe that Sir Julius Vogel is responsible for the debt, and that they had nothing to do with it!"

I have now gone through the debate, and given you quotations from most of the speakers in order to prove to you that the great majority of the House of Representatives supported Sir Julius Vogel's policy; and further, that nearly all the most prominent men concurred as to the *absolute necessity of settling people on the lands* of the colony on favourable terms, if that policy was to turn out a success, and that in the absence of such settlement nothing but a disastrous failure of the whole scheme could be expected.

In going into committee on the Bill, on August 9th, Mr. FITZHERBERT said:—

"For the first time in our history I may say this colony as a colony is going in for Public Works, it is going to resume that great duty which has been so long neglected, that of colonisation. There is no doubt that in according the vote for that purpose there has been a unanimity such as has been rarely accorded upon any question in this. House. Having in view that which must be faced by the Government, the actual settlement of the people, he would gladly have seen the Government propose, instead of a wholesale indiscriminate and promiscuous kind of proposal for taking land, that it should be limited in the direction of granting alternate sections, limiting the depth from the frontage. Colonisation in the North Island henceforward had become almost impossible, unless some change was introduced. He meant colonisation upon any concerted or large scale. The very eyes of the country were being picked out every day, and it was impossible to form anything like systematic settlements."

Mr. RICHMOND in opposing the proposal to pay for some of the railways in land, said:—

"Land is not only bad coin because of the uncertainty of its value, it is not only subject to discount, but it is also bad because we want to settle a population upon it, not to sell it in lots to suit the convenience of contractors and speculators, but to settle every part of the country with a population that will remain upon it. We do not want large farms, but we want the smallest farms that men can settle down upon and cultivate profitably, because then we get population settled in the country, and with population we get revenue. Unless those who think with me exert themselves to the very utmost, and make up their minds to sit here for the next three months, if necessary, to perfect these Bills, we are about to launch measures which will bring shame upon every one of us, who have so grossly failed in our duty, to protect the interests of the people of this country."

Mr. CARLETON speaking of the proposed immigration, said:—

"Let me assure the House from the experience I have had among immigrants, that no man settling down upon a piece of ground in this country need expect a return under eighteen months or two years, and unless he has the means to sustain himself during that time, he sinks down at once into the position of a day labourer. I for one am not prepared to flood the country with mere day labourers, and to bring down the rate of wages to such as will not support a working man. I am one of those who ask a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, and I also ask a fair day's work for a fair day's wage. Some successes there have been, I know, and the greatest success has been in the importation of immigrants from Canada, and Nova Scotia. They are the best settlers I have seen, the hardest working, perfectly sober, and able to turn to in this country at a day's warning, without loitering about the town after disembarkation, and wasting what little means they have brought out with them. I

have said this much concerning immigration, not by the way of discouraging it, for I myself most heartly desire to see it entered on; but to show the necessity of caution, of beginning quietly and steadily, and of feeling our way, and not bringing out crowds at once, but by degrees."

Mr. DRIVES said with regard to the Land Laws:—

"There was another great element which ought properly to come on now for discussion, and that was in reference to the lands of the colony. This he considered the backbone of the whole undertaking, and unless coupled with this in a proper way, it was impossible to think that the scheme could be carried out properly. He believed, more particularly with regard to immigration, that it was impossible it could be carried on under the existing system of Land Laws"

Mr. ROLLESTON in his speech showed that he was quite aware of the evils of large holdings. He said:—

*"He was glad to hear what the honourable member for Timaru had just said, that he objected to the payment for these Public Works being made in land, because it showed that the honourable member was in earnest in bis views with respect to the settlement of the country by people instead of sheep; but at the same time he did not think any great good would be obtained by doing away with the existing Provincial Land Laws. In Canterbury the Government had the land to dispose of for the purpose of making roads and other public works; but the moment they dropped the price of land it would be bought up by large speculators, who did not care about opening up roads, and in fact would rather be without them. The settlement of the country would be obstructed by the land getting into the possession of large holders. No one, he felt assured, would accuse him of a desire to interfere with enabling people to settle on the land, or desiring to see large tracts of country occupied by sheep to the obstruction of colonisation * * * He would oppose the system of payment in land, because it would ultimately tend to prevent colonisation."*

Mr. WILLIAMSON, speaking as to land in Auckland Province, said "that there was plenty of land to the north of Auckland which might he rendered available for settlement if in the hands of the Government, but which would be quite useless for that purpose if allowed to pass into the possession of private individuals. It was well known that wherever lands were thus acquired they were left to remain as they were before—a perfect wilderness. Colonisation was wanted in the North Island."

Speaking with regard to the taking of private land for railway purposes, Mr. VOGEL said "it was the very bane of a new country, that greediness for compensation when any new work was to be carried out. The strong way in which it had been put down in America enabled important works to be carried out for the benefit of the public. There, private individuals were not allowed to interfere with the carrying out of great public undertakings. In this country we should also discountenance the organised greediness of persons who would prevent Public Works being carried out unless they could obtain extraordinary compensation from the Government."

Mr. GILLIES said, on the same subject:—

"The honourable member for the Hutt was right in saying that the speculator would be in advance of them. Orders had gone from, this city, since this Bill had been placed in the hands of honourable members, to purchase lands wherever the railway would pass through. He would suggest to the Colonial Treasurer, that unless some mode of valuing the land before and after occupation were adopted, it would be ruinous to attempt to make a railway under the provisions of that clause."

Mr. MOORHOUSE, speaking on this subject, said:—

"His experience was, that the sympathies of that part of the public who were called upon to judge in such matters as this, were not with the Government, but with the unfortunate people who acquired four, five, or even ten times as much for their land as it was worth. In the Province of Canterbury, twenty times the actual value of an estate had been given for it for this purpose."

With regard to this plundering of the Government under the form of demands for compensation, you may remember a charge of this kind was brought against the present Premier by the *Lyttelton Times*, on the occasion of his last candidature for Selwyn, at Leeston.

The Public Works Bill was read a third time, and passed on August 18th, 1870.

In the Legislative Council the debate was opened by Mr. GISBORNE, who said in the course of his speech:—

"Immigration is unquestionably a reproductive work. Every immigrant whom we can bring into the colony, looking at the question in its lowest light, represents so much of revenue-producing power. But when we think of the importance of increasing our population, we must consider that immigration is the most essential of our requirements."

Colonel WHITMORE, speaking in reference to the assumption that customs revenue would increase in proportion to the increase of population, said:—

"Neither the ordinary revenue nor the customs revenue shows any proportionate increase to the increase of population. There is nothing of the kind. I would further say, that a large immigration means a very

*considerable fall in wages, and it is the excess in wages which is spent in luxuries upon which our customs are levied; and if the wages of the people are reduced, the customs revenue of the country must, suffer fully to the extent of the larger number of people. * * * We shall be leaning on a rotten reed if we think that immigration will so increase the revenue as to keep down that taxation, and to meet it we must trust to our own industry alone."*

The Hon. MATTHEW HOLMES, a thoroughly practical colonist, made a long speech, from which I will read you some extracts bearing on the question of settlement by small farmers. He said:—

*"I think therefore that the time has arrived when we should entertain the question of the settlement of the country, and introduce as large a number of immigrants into it as our means will permit. And, sir, I cannot but pause to think how wanting in our duty we should be to our fellow-countrymen at home, who are, many of them, living in what we should consider abject poverty, and not a few in a state of complete destitution, were we not to make an effort to enable them to join us here, especially when we consider that there would be a double benefit to them, in placing within their reach liberal wages, plenty of good food, and the certainty of their becoming independent in a few years, as the result of sustained industry and sobriety. The profits of an ordinary labourer for one year would enable him to buy the fee simple of at least thirty acres of agricultural land, such as he never could have dreamt of possessing in the mother country; and to us there would be the great benefit of settling an industrious population on our waste lands, which only require a very moderate amount of labour expended upon them to make them productive. Sir, in thinking of these things, the mind is lost in the grandeur of the future of these islands, their insular position, fine temperate climate for Europeans, prolific soil, capable of growing all the productions of Britain, and most of those of the Continent, and mineral productions only waiting for a large population to develop them. Another argument in favour of immigration is, that so long as it continues, the prosperity of all classes is sustained, while a stoppage invariably produces depression amongst all the members of the community. For a colony to remain stationary means physical, mental, and moral decadence. America is a notable proof of this. There is no doubt that its continued extension and prosperity is promoted by the constant influx of people. All classes there (unlike the working classes of these colonies) welcome the new-comers as their best friends * * * * * * Another question of vital importance is, what class of persons are we to introduce? My own experience as an employer of labour would lead me to prefer the small farmers from the Lowlands of Scotland, the north of Ireland, and the best agricultural counties of England, farm labourers from the same districts, shepherds from both sides of the Borders, the Lothians, Perth, and Sterling shires. Other classes worthy of consideration for settling on the West Coast of the Middle and Stewart's Island are Norwegians, Nova Scotians, and people from the north of Scotland and the Orkney and Shetland Islands. There they would have fine harbours, splendid timber for shipbuilding, and the sea teeming with valuable fish for curing. But, before entering on their introduction, the question arises, how are they to be settled, and what attractions can we place before them to induce them to select this colony for their future home? The first requisite is constant employment at a fair rate of wages. This can be secured for them only by commencing Public Works, such as are proposed by this Bill, in different parts of the colony. But the greatest attraction is the certainty of their being able to purchase upon easy terms lands upon which to settle permanently. I never met with a man of any grade who did not desire to possess a piece of mother earth. It is the one dream of the life of agricultural labourers especially, which can never be realised in old countries. Hence the large number of the best of that class who emigrate. It will, therefore, be necessary to have a good supply of land in the market ready for settlement. Our land system in Otago is very defective in that respect. The regulations are so complex that only bush lawyers can understand and take advantage of them. The difficulties thrown in the way of purchasers would lead one to believe that the Government was conferring a special favour in allowing people to purchase, whereas the obligation is all on the other side."*

The Hon. Mr. SEWELL said, on the subject of immigration:—

"I now come to the question of immigration. I entirely agree with the honourable members who have spoken of that as the cardinal point in any plan of colonisation; because, to my mind, everything revolves around this central point—the bringing of people into the country. It is in the people of a country that its strength and its wealth resides."

The Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said, in relation to the same subject:—

"I am sure that all those who have been in the country for the last few years must recognise that the utter cessation of immigration which has taken place, has been the one thing more than anything else, which has produced the present stagnation of trade in the country. When I consider that the total amount to be expended is £1,000,000, only sufficient to bring out 70,000 people, I do not think the proposal is too large for the country to undertake. I believe that a healthy scheme of immigration to the extent of seven, eight, or ten thousand people a year would not be too much for the colony to absorb. Unless we have a large immigration into this country we shall never be able to undertake manufacturing industries, or to cultivate the country, and we shall not enable the colony to meet the burdens which will necessarily be imposed upon it by the present scheme."

Mr. Campbell was then the largest sheep-owner in New Zealand, and is now a very extensive holder of freehold land, so that he looked at the question entirely from the point of view of an employer of labour.

The Hon. Mr. ROBINSON spoke next. He was then, and is still, one of the largest freeholders in the colony, and one who has kept nearly a whole county locked up from settlement to this day. He expressed the most liberal and patriotic sentiments with regard to *other peoples runs*. He said:—

*"He had very little hesitation in saying that when the great resources of New Zealand—that is, her mines, those great storehouses of wealth, her native industries, flax, &c.—were developed, and her fertile plains and valleys occupied, as they are sure to be, it would be found that New Zealand was capable of keeping a larger population than the present Australian colonies combined. Indeed, he might say, that he believed that the capabilities of this country were far greater than even its most sanguine colonists imagined. * * * * * * He saw around him many honourable members who had possessions in the shape of leaseholds, who probably thought they ran no risk, but let them not think they would go scot free. The people—the power of this country—would sweep those leases away, and turn those lands to their proper legitimate account, by converting them into homesteads for families, and populating the country, instead of letting it remain a wilderness in the shape of a sheep-station. * * * * * Whilst money was being expended in conquering a peace and reclaiming land in the North Islsnd, the land in the South Island had been tied up in faster ratio. All the land in Nelson and Marlborough was leased for twenty-eight years, and was much more alienated from purposes of settlement than freehold land. * * * * * * Those leaseholders were like dogs in the manger; they could not put population on their land, and they would take care that nobody else did. * * * * In the Province of Otago * * * * * * they might call their land laws legion; and so complicated were those laws that any one arriving with, say £500, would find his money all gone before he could find out the land laws." I quote Mr. Robinson's peroration, which a Yankee would call "high falutin:"—"Upon the shape and form that Bill left the Council hung the question, shall this country, great in every sense of the word, take the lead amongst the civilized nations of the Southern Hemisphere? Shall this broad and sparsely populated land, with a climate for salubrity without a parallel, with its broad and verdant plains intersected by rivers, rivulets, and sparkling streams, its rich and fertile valleys, and its magnificent wooded slopes, become densely studded with millions of the happy and luxurious homes of prosperous and contented families, or shall the present and rising generations live a lifetime of poverty and misery?"*

The Hon. Mr. WIGLEY, speaking in favour of making payment for the railways in land, quoted the case of the Albury Estate, taken up in that way by the Hon. E. Richardson, he said:—

*"In Canterbury that principle had worked very successfully. In that province 20,000 acres of land had been taken up by the contractor for the railway, representing a sum of £40,000. The result of that system was, that the contractor had settled in the colony. Instead of taking the money out of the Government chest, the contractor had settled down, selecting his land in blocks of 8,000 or 10,000 acres, which formed nuclei for subsequent selections. * * * * * * He had no doubt that when the railways were completed the freehold land he had purchased would be settled on by small farmers; and, from the way in which he had acted, he (Mr. Wigley) was induced to believe that he would bring other persons out to the colony, and thus do it a good service."*

After Mr. Gisborne's reply, the division was called, and resulted as in the Lower House, in a large majority for the Government—viz., 25 *for the Bill, and only* 8 *against it*. Those who voted against it were Colonel Russell, the Hon. Ernest Grey, and Messrs. Kenny, Mantell, Nurse, Robinson, Taylor, and H. R. Russell.

Subsequently, in committee of the Lower House, Mr. WILLIAMSON said:—

*"They should open up the country and render it fit for the reception of people, unless they wanted it all to themselves. Robinson Crusoe occupied a territory and was able to say he was monarch of all he surveyed; but he trusted that the British mind with which they were endowed (his honourable friend, the member for Gladstone, Mr. Jollie, included) would feel that this great country was not given to the present inhabitants to hold for themselves; that it was not for their own particular benefit that the money proposed to be borrowed was to be expended, but for the good of the whole British Empire. They should not forget that there were many others anxious to participate in the benefits which they enjoy. The great resources of this country would never become known or developed if left in the hands of the few who were now in occupation of it, and it was the duty of that House to give the Government the means of bringing out people who would assist in the object of improving the country and developing the vast resources of it. * * * * * * He trusted that those narrow-minded legislators, who had so long monopolised public places would no longer be tolerated—men who held their seats, not to the advantage, but to the great disadvantage, of the colony."*

Mr. MERVYN said, by way of a last protest:—

"Under the Immigration Bill which the House had previously passed, no inducement was held out to intending immigrants to come to this country, in the hope that they might be enabled to settle upon the waste lands. He maintained that unless some such inducement were held out to the immigrants who were invited to our shores, the immigration scheme of the Government must prove a failure; because he believed that the

proposal to bring people into this country merely to execute public works was based upon a false principle, and could not fail to be productive of disastrous results."

Sir JULIUS VOGEL wound up with the following peroration:—

"The whole case for our measures may be summed up in a few words—Do we or do we not believe in the resources of New Zealand? If not, it is not wise that we should spend money in trying to develop the country. But, if we do believe in the resources of New Zealand, why should we not march with the time, and try to do rapidly that which would otherwise take a very long while to effect? Why should we not do for the country in ten years that which, if the work be not specially and energetically undertaken, will probably not be done in less than one hundred years? The Government believe that there are in this country vast and valuable forests, great and varied mineral wealth, teeming fisheries, pastoral lands, and enormous agricultural capabilities. Why should we not say to the overburdened population of the old country—Here is a land rich in all natural resources; we are willing to develop it to the largest extent if you will come and make it your home. That, Sir, is the policy of the present Government!"

The division followed—ayes 35, noes 6.

And so the great Immigration and Public Works Policy of 1870 was carried triumphantly through both Houses of the Legislature, amid high hopes for its success and for the future prosperity of the colony. I fancy most of you will concur with me in thinking, that if it had been carried out in its integrity, according to the ideas set forth in various speeches I have quoted from, it would indeed have been a success, and have led to great results; and probably, at this moment, all classes of the community would have been rejoicing in a fair measure of prosperity, instead of our being in a position to be held up by the home papers before the British public as a solemn warning and shocking example of spendthrift improvidence. I shall now, in accordance with the plan I sketched out in my opening remarks, proceed to show you that *the colony has not been actually settled*, or the inland district populated to anything like the extent it ought to have been, and which it is generally supposed by the dwellers in the large towns to be. In tact, that, with the exception of a few districts, such, for example, as the Christchurch district, extending, say, from South bridge to Amberley (which, I may remark, was mainly settled prior to the inauguration of the Public Works Policy), and in South Canterbury, the district extending from Temuka to the Waihi Bush (which was also settled prior to 1870), the greater part of Canterbury is held in large blocks to the exclusion of small settlers. And here, it would be as well to remark, that these districts I have alluded to as being properly settled, were so settled, not because there were no runs there, but because the land being all level and nearly all of good quality, the squatters found it impossible to "spot" it so as to prevent farmers buying it up, as was done in the Downs districts, and consequently the only effectual remedy against "cockatoos" would have been to buy up the whole run at one sweep, which few of the run-holders were in a position to do, at the Canterbury price of £2 per acre, though the process was easy in Nelson or Hawkes Bay at 5s. per acre. I shall now give you some statistics tending to show what the amount of settlement ought to have been, if the country had been settled on the American system, by small farmers, instead of being carved out into great estates on the Australian system. In order to give you a clear idea of the different results of the two systems, I will first give you a comparative statement of the increase of population during ten years in some of the Western States of the Union, and in some of the Australian Colonies, also some results of the American census of 1880, from the London *Times* of 13th August last.

Here you have four of the newer States of the Union compared with the three most densely populated of the Australian Colonies, and what do we find? that though the area of the four States is somewhat less than that of the three colonies, yet the population in 1870 was over six times as great, and the increase in ten years was nearly six times as great.

During the twelve months ending 30th June, 1880, 457,043 immigrants arrived in the United States, and 49,922 more during the month of July, and this rapid increase of population is reducing the weight of debt per head in a remarkable way. The figures given are:—

Contrast this diminishing scale with the increasing scale of the New Zealand debt, which was:—

Here is a table giving the increase of production and trade which has taken place in the United States in twenty years from 1860 to 1880:—

One remarkable fact disclosed by this table is that, whereas in 1860 the imports exceeded the exports by 20,000,000 dollars, in 1880 the exports exceeded the imports by no less than 165,000,000 dollars, showing an enormous balance of trade in favour of the States. Another still more remarkable fact is the astounding increase in the exports of wheat, and this is of most vital importance to us in New Zealand. I confess I was surprised to find that the exports of this grain amounted to only the trifling quantity of 4,155,000 bushels so recently as 1860, less than the present export from Lyttelton, and now it has risen to 175,000,000 bushels. What may it not be in another twenty years?

I will next give you a statement of receipts and expenditure in the United States for the years 1879 and 1880, so that their financial system may be compared in one or two particulars with ours:—

You will observe, first, that the expenditure is kept well within the receipts, the last year especially showing a very large surplus, and, secondly, that the revenue from land sales is so insignificant as to have no appreciable result on the state of the finances. In New Zealand, on the other hand, the land revenue has all along been a very large proportion of the whole revenue of the colony, so that its sudden cessation causes a violent disturbance in the financial position. The tables given for a few years past are:—

From this it will be seen that during the seven years 1873 to 1879 the territorial revenue amounted to more than one third of the total revenue of the colony, instead of being, as in the United States, only about the three-hundredth part of the whole. It is well known that in New Zealand, in spite of the large revenue, the expenditure has generally been in excess of the receipts, the deficiency being met out of fresh loans. However, there is one point in favour of New Zealand which ought, in justice to the colony, to be here pointed out, and that is, that here the entire cost of the railways appears as part of the public debt, which is not the case in the States, as there the railways have been constructed by private companies, with the aid of Government grants of land on an enormous scale. There were in the United States at the end of 1879 no less than 89,497 miles of completed railways. These lines cost 4,762,500,000 dollars, and earned during 1879, 529,000,000 dollars, gross receipts, of which, after paying expenses, 219,916,000 dollars remained as nett earnings, which would give a profit of 4.6 per cent on the capital. The figures I have given tend to show that much as we are accustomed to brag of the rapid progress of the colonies and of our colonial cities, their progress is slow compared with the wonderful rapidity of progress in the United States. Let us now inquire into the causes of this difference, and I believe one of the most potent will be found in the difference of the land systems. The more I have studied the subject, the more I feel convinced, that the secret of the unparalleled success of the United States lies in this fact—viz., that from the very first colonisation of America, *both, the Government and the people* have used every possible means to attract immigrants and to fix them as *permanent settlers on small freeholds* of their own, instead of, as in these colonies (owing to the occupation of the country under depasturing licenses), throwing every possible obstruction and difficulty in the way of the small farmers. There were in 1870, in the United States, no less than 407,735,000 acres occupied as farms, and the average size of the holdings was only 153 acres, which would give 2,665,000 farmers, most of whom are farming their own freeholds, and consequently have a conservative tendency and a patriotic interest in the welfare of their country. This was out of a population of 38,558,000, giving one farmer for every thirteen of the population. Since that time, the population has increased by thirteen millions; and, if the farmers are relatively as numerous, which there seems no reason to doubt, their number will now be about 3,660,000. It may be argued that 153 acres is too small a holding here; but I say, if it is a sufficiently large area to maintain a family in the States, it surely ought to be so here, with our superior climate and higher average yield of grain per acre. You will remember that Mr. Richmond maintained in a speech I have quoted from, that in parts of the North Island every fifty acres would support a family in comfort. But, to quote a local authority (Mr. John Grigg, of Longbeach), he, in an article in the September number of the *New Zealand Country Journal*, gives the gross product of a 200 acre farm at £743 10s, and the expenses at £250 13s. 4d. After deducting £1 an acre for rent, he leaves a profit of £292 16s. 8d. for the farmer. According to this estimate (which, however, I cannot by any means endorse), a farmer should clear £2 10s an acre, if his land was his own freehold, and he consequently had no rent to pay. The land in America is exceedingly cheap, being frequently *given away* to encourage *bonâ fide* settlement. I will read you an extract from a letter written to the *Times* by the Earl of Dunraven respecting the advantages at present offered by the Canadian Government in the new district known as Manitoba. He says—"A little more than a fortnight's journey from the shores of Ireland is Manitoba and the North West Territory, in the country drained by the Red River, the Assinebonie, and the Saskatchewan, are *hundreds of thousands of acres of most fertile land*. Of this land the Canadian Government will *grant to any emigrant* 160 *acres for nothing*, on the sole condition that in three years the man shall prove that he intends to dwell on and cultivate the soil. In addition, he has the right of pre-emption over the adjoining quarter section of 160 acres, *at the price of ten shillings per acre*, or £80 for the quarter section. The payment of this sum is spread over a period of ten years, interest being charged at the rate of six per cent, per annum, and *no instalments are required for the first three years*. Considering the fertility of the soil, the rapid development of the country, and the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway is in course of construction, and affords a good market for labour, there is no doubt that a fairly industrious man could support himself and family, and find himself in possession of the fee simple of a farm of 320 acres long before the limit of time assigned for payment of the land—viz., ten years—had been reached."

I will also read a short extract from a letter appearing in the *Times* of August 5th last, signed "J. Sampson, Iowa," expatiating on the inducements offered to immigrants in that region. He says:—"Having experience here in the States, and having travelled here a good deal, I would say * * * * * * first, confine your search for a home to the States of Illinois, Winsconsin, Iowa, and Minesota. In them can be found cheap lands, pure water, a healthy climate, good schools, good roads, good markets, &c. The four States just named are largely settled in many parts by Irish people or people of Irish descent. The time from Ireland out here to Iowa is only thirteen

days. Men sent out from Ireland to pioneer, as I suggest, would meet with a hearty welcome everywhere. People here are very friendly and cordial. The stranger and the foreigner are well treated by all classes."

When we consider the accessibility of the States from Europe, and the great advantages and inducements held out to immigrants of humble means, we need no longer be astonished at the vast proportions immigration into the States has assumed, so that last year 457,000 immigrants landed there, a number greater than the entire white population of New Zealand; nor need we be astonished at the correspondingly rapid growth of the cities, for instance, Chicago, a younger city than Melbourne, has now considerably more than double the population of that city.

Now, let us return to the question of the state of settlement in this colony. In New Zealand, according to published returns, there had beed sold, up to the 30th of June, 1879, 14,014,000 acres. *If this land had been settled on the American system of small farms*, it would have provided homes for 91,600 farmers, whose holdings would average in size the same as those of the States. This would have meant a rural population of about 733,000, and a correspondingly large increase in the town population, whereas we find from census returns that there were only 13,767 freeholds of over one acre in extent—say, a population of about 110,000 engaged in farming. I shall next read you two remarkable papers of statistics in support of my statement that there is comparatively *little real settlement* in this colony. One is an extract from a table prepared by the late Edward Jerningham Wakefield shortly before his death, containing a list of some of the great estates, and the other consists of portions of the report of Mr. James M'Kerrow, the Surveyor General and Secretary for Crown Lands. Mr. Wakefield's list is:—

From this list you will see that ninety-two estates (all but two of which are in this island) embrace between them no less than 2,398,100 acres of freehold land, or an average of 26,175 acres each. These ninety-two estates, if divided into farms of the average size of those of the United States, *would provide homes for nearly* 16,000 *farmers;* whilst, if we allow for each farmer a wife, an average of four children, a ploughman, and a servant girl, we should have no less than 128,000 people subsisting on these ninety-two estates alone, which probably do not now average more than 30 souls on each, or about 2700 in all. In contrast to these great estates, let us now turn to the village settlements and deferred payment blocks. You may remember that Mr. Stafford strenuously advocated the formation of village settlements with a system of commonages, in 1870, but many years were allowed to elapse before anything was done. Now, however, that all the good land has been swept up except in parts of the North Island, Mr. Stafford's suggestions are being tried, which is like the proverbial shutting the stable door after the horse is stolen.

Mr. MCKERROW, in his Report dated 24th July, 1880, says:—

*"Weight must also be given to the fact, that the easily accessible and most valuable Crown lands have been generally taken up. In the Canterbury District, for instance, there is very little Crown land remaining that anyone would care to purchase at £2 per acre * * * As we may not expect any great revenue from the sale of land in Canterbury, Otage, or Southland for the next two or three years, and the other land districts having mostly forest lands, are not likely to help very materially, it is evident that the Land Revenue from sales cannot be expected to rise very much above the £150,000 of the year ending 30th of June last.*

"Deferred Payments, Agricultural Lease, Homestead, Village and Small Farm Settlements.

"During the past twelvemonths, under these several clauses of the Land Acts, the great work of settling 718 *persons or families on* 95,000 *acres*, has been accomplished. This is a marked increase of 50 per cent., both in settlers and acreage, as compared with the twelve months ended 30th June, 1879. Among the causes contributing to this result may be mentioned the passing of the "Land Act, 1877, Amendment Act, 1879," which by reducing the minimum price at which deferred payment lands may be offered from £3 per acre to £1, set free several blocks, that have since been taken up at 25s., 30s., £2, and higher, per acre. Another cause is the necessity imposed on heads of families to look out for *something independent of employment on wages*, which has become in all branches, public and private, more precarious than formerly. Although the deferred payment system proper was only introduced in 1873, and for a year or two was kept within very narrow limits, it has now assumed very large dimensions. On the 30th of June last, 1862 persons held 238,534 acres on deferred payments, the annual payment of fees due on which, being instalments of price, amounted to £54,100. Up to that date 675 persons, representing 97,113 acres, originally taken up on deferred payments, had fulfilled all conditions and converted the land into freehold. Of this number 115 persons, representing 13,778 acres, have done so during the past twelve months, in the exercise of the option to the deferred payment settler of discharging in one payment the balance of half yearly payments, if he has held the land 3 years, and fulfilled the improvement conditions.

"THE HOMESTEAD SYSTEM is by the Land Act, 1877, made applicable to the land districts of Auckland and Westland only. In Auckland 50 applicants selected 8816 acres for the twelve months, and since the introduction of the system a total of 260 selectors have taken up 46,271, *or an average of* 178, *acres each*. But as no one, unless representing a family or household, may select more than 75 or 50 acres, according to quality of land,

(and if under 18, from 30 to 20 acres), it is evident that in the high average of 178 acres to each selection, *there is a family represented by each selector*. There is a set towards the system at present, several selectors having gone up lately from Canterbury.

"VILLAGE SETTLEMENTS.—This mode of acquiring Crown Lands only came into operation on the 1st January, 1880. It is essentially a system for the encouragement of thrifty settlers, who begin with a dwelling and gradually create comfort around them. The maximum of land attainable is 50 acres * * * Although, hardly time has been given to get the system fairly into operation, and the time of application for all the 601 sections advertised has not yet arrived, 46 selectors, in Canterbury and Hawkes Bay, have already taken up 249 acres in areas ranging from 1 to 15 acres each—31 of the selections were on deferred payments, and 15 on immediate payments. Agreeably to instructions, village sites of 150 to 300 acres each are now being selected every 3 or 4 miles along the main roads, at convenient well watered spots in the Waimate Plains, and it is worthy of consideration whether this should not be done in all the best blocks of Crown lands, as they are opened up by survey. It is a very small matter apparently, making such reservations when the land is all a wilderness of fern or forest, but the importance and wisdom of it appears as the country gets settled, and sites are wanted for schools, churches, and homesteads for village tradesmen, and others following in the wake of the settlers. The *main object* of all these modes of settlement is not revenue, but *the improvement and occupation of the country*. They are very expensive to work, and the question arises, Is the object fulfilled and the expense warranted? *The reply must be in the affirmative*. Summarising the results of all the settlement clauses, we had in New Zealand on the 30th June last, 3160 selectors, holding 374,425 acres, and liable for an annual payment of £65,000."

It is worthy of notice that these 3000 odd poor selectors are to pay £65,000 a year into the Colonial Exchequer, which is half as much as the rent paid to the Government for the use of all the 13 millions and a half of acres of land, held under Pastoral Leases by the squatters of the colony, viz., £113,000. From these figures you will see that *these selections only average* 112 *acres each* or 40 acres less than the average size of American farms, proving the truth of my contention, that 150 acres is sufficient to maintain a family in comfort. Now, with regard to the character of the land still open for selection under these various forms of settlement, I will read what Mr. McKerrow says, which goes to prove *how heavily New Zealand is handicapped in the contest with the States*, as to attractions for immigrants, he says:—"To the north of Auckland there stretches away to the north for 200 miles, a most interesting country of 3,000,000 acres, of which fully 1,000,000 or more than one-third are Crown lands. The soil on the open ridges is generally very clayey, and would require a great deal of pulverising to bring it into cultivation. The bottoms in the valleys are very fertile, as are also the limestone and volcanic ridges which are mostly under forest, and the areas covered with larva overflow * * * * It is proposed to explore a road line through it, and if funds are available, to open a bridle track. *Until this is done, no settlement can take place*, for in its present state, it will to the settler *for ever remain an impenetrable unknown land*. WELLINGTON COUNTRY DISTRICT.—This is 10,000 acres of hilly bush, country. It lies on the ridge west of Hutt Valley * * and slopes down to Pahautanui small farm settlements. This is rather a rough piece of country, but being in the heart of a settled district and opened up by these roads, it is likely to be well taken up when offered for application. OTAGO.—Crown Terrace—A dray road was very skilfully selected by Mr. Bews, for the Lake County Council, up the steep side of this Terrace to the flat above. It was formed, and then the land was opened for selection, *five or six families mostly Shetlanders have settled there*, and in February last, within ten months of the date of their applications, they had several fields of well grown oats in crop *at an elevation of* 2300 *feet above the sea*. This road is part of the lino Wakatipu to Cardrona and Wanaka. SOUTHLAND.—woodend to Seaward Moss.—This is an expanse of fully 40,000 acres of level land, stretching from near Woodend, a station five miles from Invercargill on the Invercargill Bluff railway, across between the forest and coast line to the Mataura river. It is a swampy, mossy country, with isolated pieces of dry land interspersed. 1044 acres along the road lino were surveyed into eleven sections, and offered for sale on deferred payments. It has all been taken up except three sections. By cutting drains to help the natural drainage, and pushing the road forward a mile or two each season, this extensive area, *which is literally a 'howling wilderness'* will eventually become an inhabited settled district."

From these extracts from Mr. McKerrow's report, you will be able to understand the undesirable character of the blocks of land still remaining in the hands of the Government of New Zealand, comprising as they do, only those blocks possessing such insuperable natural drawbacks, as to render them unworthy of the attention of capitalists or speculators, yet you see that in spite of these drawbacks, plenty of industrious thrifty men can be found to take them up under the deferred payment system, in the hope of making homes for themselves; and moreover, you see from the report, that numbers have succeeded in doing so, notwithstanding the great difficulties they have had to encounter. If, on lands of this character, 3160 selectors can be found to take up 374,425 acres (or 112 acres each on the average), what might not have been done with the land occupied by the 92 large estates before enumerated (with their area of 2,398,000 acres) under a judicious system of small farm settlement. Remember also *that these* 92 *estates are all picked properties* embracing some of the very best

agricultural and pastoral land in New Zealand, whilst the poor selectors have to content themselves with the choice between the heavy bush (inaccessible as it is) north of Auckland, the clay hills near Wellington, the "howling wilderness" of swamp near the Bluff, or the Crown Terrace at Cardrona, 2300 feet above the level of the sea! It is also necessary, in reference to these 92 estates, to point out that they bear a very different proportion to the extent of country available for settlement in New Zealand, to what they would do in the United States; there, a block of land of the extent given, would be only the 185th part of the occupied land, and only about the 1100th part of the whole land of the States; whereas, here it represents more than one-seventh of the whole purchased land in New Zealand, and more than one-thirtieth of the entire area of the colony. In reality, the importance of these 2,398,000 acres to New Zealand is relatively much greater than even the above figures indicate, as in the States there are thousands of square miles of fertile prairie land yet unbought, whereas, here the 14 odd million acres already alienated from the Crown represent almost *the whole of the land in the colony that is really fit for agricultural purposes*. This proves incontestably that *the colony cannot afford to have these large estates locked up from, settlement*, and consequently remaining almost entirely unproductive in respect of contributions to the colonial revenue, now that so large a proportion of that revenue has to be devoted to meeting the charges on the Government loans; and more especially as the expenditure of the loans on Public Works has been of such *great and direct benefit* to the owners of those large estates.

But, to come nearer home, I believe that since 1870, for every acre of good land bought in South Canterbury by small farmers, at least five acres have been added to the estates of the runholders. I will give you a rough list of some of the principal estates, with approximate acreages, so that you may judge how this district has been *settled*. They are:—

These sixteen estates contain about 437,000 acres *or an average of over* 27,000 *each*. This land, if cut up into farms of the average size of those in The States *would provide homes for* 2900 *farmers*, or with their families and dependents, say 23,200 souls, which is considerably more than the entire population of South Canterbury at the present time. Moreover, these 2,900 farmers would support a small village to, say every 100 farms, or 29 villages in all, each with its church, school, tradesmen's shops, &c. This of course would mean an immense development of the trade and commerce of Timaru, which is now in such a stagnant and depressed condition. Again, take the Oamaru district, there precisely the same state of things exists, and sufficiently accounts for the gloomy state of business affairs there. The Oamaru district is no doubt naturally very rich for its size, though its extent is much smaller than that of the Timaru district. The land is considered the very finest for wheat growing in all New Zealand, but it is principally held in large estates—viz., those of the New Zealand and Australian Land Company, the Hon. Matthew Holmes, the Hon. Robert Campbell, Messrs. John Reid, of Elderslie, Menlove, of Windsor Park, John M'Lean, and Borton and M'Master, which seven estates, I am told, *embrace three-fourths of the best land in the district*. In Otago, the price of land was lower than in Canterbury, and I believe the greater part of these Oamaru estates was purchased from the Provincial Government of Otago at £1 per acre. The land regulations had been frequently changed in that province, but the general system was to keep most of the land shut up from sale, but to throw open certain blocks from time to time in what were called hundreds. I find, in a debate on the Otago Hundreds Bill, in 1870, that Mr. Bradshaw said "he had listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of the honourable member with regard to the action taken by himself and the honourable member for Hampden, in 1806. He recollected very well that he and the honourable member for Hampden had opposed the proposal made at that time—that of free selection by purchase of land throughout the Province of Otago at the upset price of thirty shillings per acre. If that proposal had become law at that time he believed the agricultural land of Otago *would have fallen into the hands of a few people*, as well as the whole of the auriferous land of the country. They had condemned the system, and would do so again. The Colonial Treasurer (Mr. Vogel) would permit the whole territory of Otago, auriferous or otherwise, to fall into the hands of speculators—the whole of the land to fall into the hands of a few private individuals. It would be unwise when they were about to bring in a large number of people, to lock up the land or give one-fourth of the agricultural land in the Province of Otago to a very few people. Prom a return laid on the table he found that there were only 800,000 acres of agricultural land in the Province of Otago. The present Bill would give 300 squatters 640 acres each, or one-fourth of the whole of the land—that land which ought to be kept for the people coming into the country for settlement. As fast as they brought the people into the country, and as fast as they reduced the rate of wages, *they would go away from the colony*—they would go to the place where they would receive the best wages."

Mr. BRADSHAW, in speaking against the monopoly of the land by the squatters, quoted a remarkable article which had appeared in the London *Times*, in 1866, on the question of leases for terms of years being given to the Runholders in Victoria, the writer says:—"But it had a still worse collateral result, which nobody seems to have foreseen—it entirely altered the position of the tenant. He could not be dispossessed unless the land he occupied was bought over his head for at least £1 an acre, which in the case of inferior land gave a tenure equal to fee simple * * * * The tenants of the Crown or squatters had been the objects of oppression! A genuine

feeling of sympathy was excited on their behalf, and they employed the feeling with much dexterity, not only to protect themselves from the Government, but to strengthen their own tenure *at the expense of their fellow-colonists*. Like the Irish tenants-at-will they raised a cry for fixity of tenure, and compensation for improvements, and the Home Government interfered once more, and gave them leases of their lands, varying in duration according to the nearness or remoteness of the site. Thus did the Home Government by these three ill-advised measures, the compulsory raising of the minimum price of Crown land in obedience to what is now the thoroughly exploded theory of Wakefield; the attempt to raise a revenue by prerogative, *and the granting of leases to tenants who had no occasion for improvements*, and therefore no intention of making them, *raise up a most formidable interest*, and place the most serious obstacles in the way of good government in Australia. The mismanagement of the Colonial Office raised up in Australia *an Oligarchy of the most irritating and dangerous kind*, possessing neither the distinction of worth, of wealth, nor of public service, and yet endowed with public land, in many places valuable, well situated, and suitable for colonisation, and this *in a lavish profusion* which no conceivable public services could possibly merit. It is not too much to say that the democratic reaction, which has swept away everything before it, is mainly owing to the inexcusable error of calling into existence a body so peculiarly calculated to excite the envy, and irritate the passion for equality always so powerful in new communities. There is very little doubt that, had the Australian Colonies been independent Republics, instead of dependencies of England, *blood would have flowed* in a quarrel thus wantonly created * * * No country is safe unless its institutions are under the custody of men who have a permanent interest in its prosperity, of a class not living on wages, but bound to the soil by the ties of family and property. It is this essential condition of good government, which a mistaken policy has so long withheld from Australia."

But to return to Timaru. I firmly believe that at some future time, when our Breakwater and other Harbour Works are completed, and the large estates in the neighbourhood thrown open for settlement Timaru will be one of the largest and most prosperous cities in New Zealand, from the great extent of fine agricultural land of which it is the natural centre and outlet; but in the meantime its development is retarded by reason of so much of the land in its neighbourhood being monopolised in large blocks, which are now lying comparatively waste and uninhabited.

In my opening remarks I undertook to explain some of the causes which have prevented to a great extent the land of South Canterbury being settled by small farmers, which I will now endeavour to do. In the first place, owing to the remoteness of the district from Christchurch, and its difficulty of access on account of the dangerous rivers (Rakaia and Rangitata), which had to be crossed between it and that city, the land was granted under Depasturing Licenses in very much larger blocks than prevailed in other parts of New Zealand, though not so large as in some parts of Australia; thus, The Levels Run (Messrs. Rhodes) embraced 160,000 acres, the Pareora (Messrs. Harris and Innes) 90,000, the Otaio (Messrs. Thompson Bros.) 70,000, the "Waimate (Messrs. Studholme Bros.) 130,000, the Waiho (Messrs. Harris and Innes) 60,000, and Messrs. Parker Bros. 90,000; so that nearly the whole coast country from the Opihi to the Waitaki was occupied by six large stations, containing altogether about 530,000 acres. In the interior districts of Australia, country that will carry a sheep to 10 acres is considered very fair, but in the block contained between the above-mentioned rivers the country was capable of carrying on an average I sheep to every 2 acres in its native state; so that the original applicants, having taken up the runs at a merely nominal rent, found themselves in a few years possessors of very large flocks of sheep.

Prior to 1870 there were very few small farmers south of the River Selwyn, except around Temuka and Winchester, but about the year 1872 numbers came down from North Canterbury, looking for land, on which the runholders took the alarm, and at once began taking steps to secure their runs in every possible way. Seeing this, the Government ought (in accordance with the warnings of Mr. Stafford, Mr. Fitzherbert, and the other statesmen from whose speeches I have quoted) to have stepped in and reserved the land from sale to the runholders by such stringent regulations as would have secured *the actual settlement of the country by a farming population*; but unfortunately, the Government acted supinely, and took no steps whatever in that direction, beyond making a few Reserves for Educational purposes, and the consequence was, that within about three years nearly the whole of the 530,000 acres I have mentioned as contained in the six large Coast Runs, passed into private hands, in enormous blocks, and now constitute some of the 16 estates I have enumerated as being amongst the estates of South Canterbury.

This land was *virtually given to the runholders*, having been bought in a great measure out of the profits made during the previous tenancy at a nominal rent of the land itself, and consequently the holders of the Depasturing Licenses had a great advantage to begin with over any outside buyers. But they had other advantages, viz., that their intimate knowledge of the land and the quality of different parts of it, enabled them to spot it in such a way as to be useless to an outsider; and moreover, the system of Improvement Pre-emptive Eights (which I believe was originally devised by the present Premier *the Hon. John Hall, and no other)*, secured enormous areas of land on each run without the owner having to pay anything at all for it. Thus, for putting up each shepherd's hut (of one room), a 50 acre Pre-emptive Eight was granted, besides a 250 acre

Homestead Pre-emptive over the head Station; but worst of all was the system of giving Improvement Pre-emptive Rights over wire fences, as 50 acres of Pre-emptive was given over every 38¾ chains of wire fence, these Pre-emptives were 38¾ chains long each, and nearly 13 chains wide, so that by running subdivision fences up all the watered valleys, and across all the open flats nearly the whole of the run could be secured from purchase. In two oases in particular in this District, fences were run along the main roads and then Pre-emptives taken out over them in such a way as to secure all the frontage. These fencing Pre-emptives could be taken *parallel with the roads*, whereas a *bond fide* settler wishing to purchase land, *could only front on a road* and run 40 chains back; but more than this, he was not allowed to buy within 40 chains of a road unless he fronted on it; so that, by taking a string of Pre-emptives along parallel to a road, the runholder actually secured from purchase 320 *acres of land for every mile of fence* he erected, at a cost of say £60, whereas the farmer *would have to pay* £640 *in cash* for the same amount of land, and then fence it at his own cost. On the Levels Run, the whole frontage on the west side of the main road from the Levels up to Sutherlands, a distance of about 13 miles, was secured in this way, and again on Messrs. Buckley and McLean's Run the whole frontage on the west side of the Main South Road from the Waihou to the Waitaki, about 12 miles, was secured in the same fashion. On one run at least, huts and wire fences were shifted after Pre-emptives had been granted over them, to fresh sites, and then fresh Pre-emptives taken out for them. The total amount of Pre-emptives actually granted was very large, being over 55,000 acres in South Canterbury alone—8,000 odd acres being thus covered on the Levels Station alone, to say nothing of the much larger extent of country indirectly *secured* by the Pre-emptives as already explained. These 55,000 acres may be said to have been held unbought for 10 years on the average, thus saving the interest on £110,000 annnually to the runholders, and losing the same to the Government. *Gridironing* you have probably heard a good deal about, but this I consider to have been comparatively harmless; it consisted in buying a series of 20 acre sections fronting five chains on a road and running 40 chains back, leaving 19 acres between each section unbought, as by the regulations no one could buy less than 20 acres without going to auction; this, however, was not very extensively resorted to, as it required too much cash outlay in proportion to results. *Spotting* however did much more harm, and was resorted to as a matter of course upon every run: this consisted in buying numerous small sections varying from 20 acres to 100 acres or upwards, scattered in such way as to spoil as much as possible of the country for purchase by a farmer or any outsider; frequently these were taken in such a way as to cover all the small creeks in the valleys, thus leaving the adjacent downs and ridges secure from purchase, owing to the lack of water. Shepherds and other employees had ordere to watch strangers seen on the run, and report them at headquarters; and so, many an unfortunate farmer (or would-be farmer), after wasting days in picking out a suitable selection, has found on going to the Land Office that he was too late, and that the piece of land he had chosen had just been secured for the runholder. Altogether, a man wanting a bit of land on which to make his home, had to take as many precautions, and be as much on the alert, as he would in Scotland to stalk a stag in a well preserved deer-forest—so it is no wonder that many abandoned the pursuit in disgust, and left with their little capital for California or some other country, where laud was to be more easily obtained. With regard to young men of the higher classes at home coming out with small capitals, they were generally well received and hospitably treated, until they spoke of buying land, when they were quickly made to understand that they would lose caste if they did so; for, *incredible* as it might sound to American ears, or even in England, a public opinion had grown up, led by the runholders and their friends, that it was a mean action to buy land on a run; and, as the whole country was parcelled out into runs, it followed that a man could not buy land anywhere without offending the prejudices of the runholding class. I have said this may sound incredible, seeing that the colony was originally founded for the purpose of settling the land, yet it is not so when you come to consider how easily public opinion is warped, and guided in a wrong direction, to suit the interests of the leading class in any country, of which I might quote numerous examples. Thus, there are districts in England where snaring a hare is punished with greater severity than kicking a wife nearly to death, or where the shooting of a fox would be thought a worse crime than killing a man in a drunken row. Again, in the Southern States of America public opinion ran far stronger against a man who questioned the right to hold slaves than against one who flogged his slaves to death. Another example I might quote is, that in India, amongst the Thugs, a man is held in honour and estimation according to the number of unsuspecting and inoffensive victims he has murdered by garotting, and we are told that the Thugs actually offer up prayers (with all due formalities), for success before setting out on one of their murdering expeditions. In South Canterbury, as in Hawkes Bay, and doubtless in all other runholding districts of New Zealand and the colonies generally, public opinion had been so warped that the original *end and aim of colonisation—viz., the founding of homes for the people*, was lost sight of; and the runholders and their managers so far from being ashamed of the means which they resorted to to obstruct settlement, and circumvent the small farmer (the despised "cockatoo"), rather plumed themselves on the discomfiture of the un-fortunate men whose only crime consisted in attempting to get what had been the chief bait held out in inducing them to come to the colony—viz., a piece of land of their own on which they could live and bring up their family at peace with their neighbours; and where their own success

and advancement in comfort would contribute to the welfare of the colony they had settled in. I have no hesitation in saying that in New Zealand, as in other Australian colonies, hundreds, *aye*, thousands, of promising young men, who, if they had been encouraged to buy land with a view to farming, would have turned out prosperous and successful colonists, have had their whole lives wasted through the fear of being thought to have acted dishonourably in buying land on a run, and sunk at last out of sight as aimless wanderers or improvident "rouseabouts." Young men without professions and unaccustomed to, and often physically unfit for, hard manual labour, have come out to the colonies by hundreds, some without money, others with a few hundreds, or even a thousand or two; but, unless they had enough to buy a share in a run, there was actually no opening for them in these colonies, and they had either to go as cadets on stations, which seldom led to anything, or take a billet on the roads driving sheep or cattle, or even go a step lower, and ship as cook to a party of shearers or bushmen. Their refinement and self-respect was soon lost, and they often ended by becoming the roughest of the rough, and helping to fill our prisons or lunatic asylums. Who that has lived long in the colonies but has met scores of examples of this class, and many of them might have turned out very differently if they had had a little encouragement at first, and could have seen some prospect ahead of acquiring homes of their own, through facilities being given them for buying land. But, even the bullock-drivers and other men employed on the runs were looked upon with suspicion if they saved up their wages, for fear they should buy land on their employer's run or that of one of his friends. The men were encouraged to "knock down" their earnings periodically, for two reasons—first, to keep them in the condition of willing servants, and, secondly, to avoid any risk of their buying land. Men seen on the runs were contemptuously designated "land sharks" by the runholders; but the day will come when public opinion will acknowledge that the real "land sharks" were the runholders themselves, who bought up enormous blocks, not because they wanted to cultivate them themselves, but solely in order to prevent other men getting footing on the soil on which to make homes and rear their children.

On the great arid plains of Australia the squatting system appears to be the only way in which the country can be utilised; but here, in New Zealand, with its fine climate and abundance of water, there can be no doubt that the settlement of the country would have gone on much more rapidly, and on a sounder system, if Depasturing Licenses had never been granted, except on the mountainous parts which are too rugged for agriculture. I really believe that if none had ever been granted, this Colony would by this time have had at least six times its present population, and there would have been few estates much exceeding 1000 acres in extent: nay, more, I believe that there *would even have been more cattle and sheep* than there are now, as there would have been a rapid increase in the systematic cultivation, and consequently in the carrying capacity of the land from the very first. In America, there were always "squatters" beyond the very verge of settlement (indeed, it was there the word originated), but they were never allowed to obstruct actual settlement, and had always to move further back before the advancing wave of farmers, so that they were a benefit rather than otherwise to the country; besides, they squatted amongst dangers of all kinds at the daily risk of their lives, and formed a sort of fringe of protection against the Indians to the actual cultivators of the soil. I believe that the presence of wandering tribes of Avarlike and ferocious Indians in all parts of America at the time of the early settlements there has proved to be the root of the prosperity of the United States, inasmuch as it prevented the monopoly of the land in large estates, held for pastoral purposes, and compelled the settlers to advance steadily, wave by wave, cultivating the soil, and building towns and villages as they reclaimed the wilderness; thus building up a nation on the sure foundation of a numerous and prosperous body of small freeholders.

In this country, I believe it would have proved to the ultimate advantage of the State *to have made free grants of land* to *bonâ fide* farmers and farm labourers in blocks not exceeding 200 acres, with' stringent conditions as to residence and improvement, *rather than to have sold the land* to runholders at £2 per acre, to be locked up as sheep runs; in which state it is of very little more use to the community than when in the hands of the Maoris, it was merely a hunting ground for wild pigs. Latterly, the runholders themselves have admitted the desirability of settlement by farmers, as each one would have been glad to see all his neighbours' runs so settled, provided his own particular block was left intact, as each one is quite alive to the enhanced value given to his own land by the fact of settlement going on around him; in short, he would be only too glad to profit by the "unearned increment" in the value of his own land brought about by the labours of other people. Another point to be remembered is, that though in this Island there was no necessity for mutual protection against the Maoris, owing to the paucity of their numbers, yet the great estates are practically protected against absorption by some foreign Power, not by the expenditure of money or force by their owners, as in feudal times, but by the fact of the Colony having been founded by Great Britain on the assumption that it was to be settled by a numerous population, and therefore that it would be worth her while to take up arms for its protection if necessary. To explain my meaning more clearly, let us suppose that this Island had been sold to three great capitalists, at 1s. per acre, one taking Nelson and Marlborough, another Canterbury, and the third Otago and Southland, and that they used the territories so acquired as sheep runs only, it is obvious they would be quite

unable to protect themselves against a single privateer of any foreign Power which could land 100 armed men, and it is equally obvious that they could not expect the British taxpayers to send out a sufficient force to hold the Middle Island for their use and benefit. Bring this illustration down to the holder of 100,000 acres, and you must admit that it is unfair that his property should be protected by the State without receiving a very large contribution from his own resources. But to return to the system of Land Laws and Regulations here: you must remember, that in the early days the Provincial Councils in all the provinces, except Auckland and Taranaki, were composed mainly of runholders and of those merchants and others who depended chiefly on the runholders, and could not afford to quarrel with them; the farmers were mostly unable to spare the time and money required for attendance at the Council, whereas the squatters, with superior wealth and leisure, had no such difficulty, consequently the whole tendency of the Provincial Legislation naturally was still further to increase the privileges of the runholders and obstruct the advance of the small farmers. The Fencing Ordinances, the Impounding Ordinances, and other enactments were all devised with this end in view; take any of these and read them over carefully, and you will see they were framed entirely in the interest of the runholder as against the freeholder. Even the Road Boards were so constituted as to be potent engines for preventing the spread of settlement. The Boards were generally composed of runholders and those immediately under their influence, so the working of the Board tended in this direction. The money was all spent along the main roads where the land had been already secured for the run either by purchase or pre-emptive; care was taken not to open any new block or district, by making a road into it, until it had first been "secured" by the runholders interested. If a "cockatoo" bought fronting on a road which had been merely surveyed and not made, it might be years before he could get his applications attended to, and his land remained in the meantime almost useless to him; whereas, on the other hand, large sums were spent in making roads through the extensive blocks bought up by the runholders for their sheep to run on. I know that in South Canterbury alone there are hundreds of miles of roads formed, and in many cases also metalled, through uninhabited estates, where you may travel for 10, 15, or 20 miles at a stretch without seeing a soul or the least sign of human habitation; and in some cases where no traffic has ever gone over the road except the carts used in its construction, until it has been rendered quite useless by the action of the rain cutting into what had been a road, until it became converted into a small gully. The Lincolnshire Delegates, who travelled through this district in February 1880, were struck by nothing that they saw more than by the numerous and expensive roads which they found ramifying in all directions, and which they said were even better than they had been accustomed to see in some parts of England. You can travel here for hours together, without seeing a solitary human form, over infinitely better roads than those which in Wales or Devonshire would lead through a district of small farms, with good sized villages at intervals of every two or three miles. When you consider that these very roads were all made during the height of the good times, when pick and shovel men were getting 10s. to 12s. per day, it is easy to understand what large sums were lavished in their construction, and also that no system of rating will suffice to keep them all in efficient repair in the future unless the rural population should become much more numerous than it now is. Again, the system of rating adopted by the Road Boards told against settlement, as under it good land, if left unfenced and uncultivated, was let off at a very low valuation, whilst similar land under cultivation had to pay on an excessive valuation. The rates on the leaseholds (runs) were most trifling, being based on the rental paid by the runholders; thus leasehold land was charged 1s. in the £ on, say 2d. per acre rental, whilst the same land on being bought would be rated as being worth from 5s. to 11s. per acre. Another anomalous regulation was, that though the runholder's stock could graze with impunity on a man's freehold block until he had ring-fenced it, yet the freeholder's stock could be impounded the moment they trespassed on the leasehold of the runholder, though altogether unfenced.

The numerous Reserves made by the Provincial Government for Educational purposes, and, which from a farmer's point of view might be said to be "saved from the wreck," as giving a chance to outsiders to obtain farms, were frequently let to runholders on whose runs they were, for 14 years at a low rental, thus spoiling the last chance of "settlement" on the run. Again, in a good many cases where small farmers have succeeded in getting footing on the runs and making little homes for their families, the runholders by buying up the mortgages over the farms, or other means, have managed to dispossess them; thus, it is no uncommon sight in riding through the country to see a clump of trees and a ruined garden, marking what had once been the house of a cottager and his family, but which is now absorbed into the great sheep paddocks of his wealthy neighbour. Of course, no law can prevent any man from buying out his poorer neighbours, but it is, looking at it from the lowest point of view, short-sighted policy on the part of the capitalist, who overlooks the fact that in his greed for more land he is removing the very class of small freeholders who serve, so to speak, as buffers between the great freeholders and the democratic element in the large towns; and there can be no doubt that but for the mistaken support of the small freeholders (who had been deluded into the idea that their interests were identical with those of the great landed proprietors) the Hall Ministry would never have got into Office at all. Again, there can be no doubt that the monopoly of nearly all the land fit for farming in the hands of a few large

holders, at the time when, consequent on the influx of enormous sums of Loan Money, many people were both able and eager to buy land, led to the "land mania" or rush for land at fictitiously high prices, which has proved so disastrous to New Zealand generally, and more especially so. in this District of South Canterbury. If the land had been reserved by Government for *bonâ fide* settlement, and taken up by farmers at £2 per acre as they required it for actual use, the great majority of them would have been able to pull through the crisis in spite of low prices of grain; but having bought farms at from £10 to £15 per acre on deferred payments, the greater number have had to throw up their purchases, and sacrifice the instalments already paid. The drain on the resources of the colony by reason of the instalments falling due on such blocks as Kingsdown, Pareora, and The Totara, where sections sold from £15 up to £27 per acre, is now keenly felt, and will continue to be so for several years to come, as the money has to be found and remitted to England, to be distributed there instead of in the Colony.

In order to bring home to you practically the effects of the squatting system on individual interests, and, as a consequence, on the interests of the colony, let me suppose the case of three young men (whom we will call Smith, Brown, and Robinson) arriving in New Zealand, say twenty-five years ago, with equal capital (which we will put at £2000 each) and equal abilities and advantages of education, &c. Let Smith take up a run, Brown buy a farm, and Robinson go into the Government service, and let us sketch, by way of contrast, their subsequent careers. Well then, Smith, soon after his arrival, is advised to take up a run, and manages to secure a block of 50,000 acres of Crown land previously unapplied for, and consisting chiefly of low hills and undulating downs at a nominal rent. He lays out his money in the purchase of a small flock of ewes, a horse or two, and a couple of bullocks for draught purposes. He at once realises that, being a squatter, he is hedged round with privileges, and that the most able men in the Provincial Council, being also squatters, are constantly looking after his interests in common with their own. He puts up a hut, and fences in a small horse paddock, and immediately applies for a homestead pre-emptive right of 250 acres, which is at once granted to him without any payment whatever. As bis sheep increase he puts up two or three one-roomed out-huts on different parts of his run, and gets a fifty acre pre-emptive over each of them, also without payment. Next he erects a boundary fence of wire, and applies for a long string of pre-emptives over the same. These be also gets granted him without payment, at the rate of fifty acres for every 38¾ chains of fence. By degrees, as years go on, he erects division fences across his run in various directions, taking care to run the fences as much as possible up his best valleys and through his best flats, and over all these he is granted, still without payment, other strings of pre-emptives. By this time he has secured about 3,000 acres of his run directly by holding pre-emptive rights over that acreage, but indirectly these pre-emptives secure about another 6,000 acres of country from purchase, by spoiling the frontages, taking up the water rights, or in other ways taking advantage of the Land Regulations. His flocks have now be-come numerous, as his country is naturally splendidly grassed. There is no native population to contend against, and there are no wild animals to molest his sheep. The climate is one of the healthiest in the world, and he has actually no dangers to encounter except the risk of being drowned in some flooded river, and, as he has plenty of good horses, this risk is much less than that incurred by the poor "swagger" tramping wearily in search of employment. Well, at the end of fifteen years Smith's bales of wool are numbered by hundreds, and he begins to think of securing the run effectually against all comers. He accordingly spots it wherever it is likely that farmers would buy, and where it is not already spoiled by his pre-emptive rights. He takes care to buy small sections along all the water-courses on the run in such a way as to prevent any "cockatoo" getting a block with water on it for his cows and horses; and if some hardy farmer manages to get hold of a hundred acres or so on the run, he immediately buys all round him, so as to block him from making further purchases or inducing friends to come and settle beside him. But even while thus blocking the poor "cockey," as he contemptuously calls him, our astute friend is careful to leave a narrow strip of Crown land intervening between his land and the "cockatoo's," so as to shirk having to pay half the cost of the latter's fence, which he would have to do if he actually joined him. But, the railway having been by this time commenced under Sir Julius Vogel's scheme, Smith finds that, in spite of all his vigilance, two or three small farmers have managed to creep in and get hold of small sections on his run, so he thinks it best to make a clean sweep before the nuisance spreads (on the same principle that he makes strenuous efforts to exterminate rabbits, or eradicate Scotch thistles when first seen on the run), so he proceeds to raise a large loan, which he finds no difficulty in doing on the security of the land itself and his stock, and forthwith his run becomes transformed into a freehold estate, with the exception of the 3,000 *acres of pre-emptive* previously mentioned, which can still be *held unbought for a few years longer*. Smith has by this time been called to the Upper House as one of the landed aristocracy of the colony, and is accordingly entitled to affix the letters M.L.C. to his signature. He is also a J.P., Chairman of his local Road Board, Licensing Commissioner, &c., &c., &c., and he is held up to the admiring gaze of each newly-arrived "new chum" as an example of the success attending conspicuous merit in the Colonies, though he has never, in the course of the whole twenty-five years he has lived here, made the smallest sacrifice of either time or money for the benefit of his fellow-colonists; and though the service he has

rendered his adopted country during that time is confined to his having imported half a dozen Merino rams at £50 each—which, by the bye, turned out a most profitable spec' for him by his yearly sales of young stock from them—and in having succeeded in maintaining as a solitude for his flocks to ramble over, a block of land that, under a proper system of settlement, would have furnished homes and means of comfort and independence to some three hundred families of his fellow-countrymen.

So much for Smith, now lot us turn to the case of Brown, who o his arrival here 25 years ago was advised to go in for a freehold farm with his £2000, and who accordingly bought 500 acres of good land on the plains, which was then to be had at £2 per acre. After paying £1000 for this land, he found he would have to fence it substantially on account of the mobs of cattle belonging to the local runholder. As there were no roads, and timber was very scarce, his ring fence, and a few interior paddock fences, ran away with £500, so that by the time he had bought a team of horses, the necessary farm implements, and a few cows, and put up a small cottage and stable, his capital was exhausted, and he hod to trust to his first crop to keep things going; labour was expensive and difficult to obtain, a nor'-wester came and threshed out some of his grain before he could cut it, and he began to find that farming in the colony was rather a precarious pursuit. However, he succeeded in borrowing enough money (though at high interest) to keep him afloat, and by dint of thrifty industry and self denial, he has just managed to keep his head above water ever since; the great rise in the value of land, consequent on the increase of settlement around him, and the inauguration of the Railway Policy, having at length enabled him to sell 200 acres of his land at a price sufficient to clear the remainder from debt; he now finds himself the owner of a 300 acre farm, and the father of a large family, and wondering what on earth he is to do with his boys, who have all been brought up to practical farming, and who are steady and industrious, but for whom, after careful search and enquiries, he cannot find *any Government land worth having for farming purposes throughout the whole extent of the Middle Island*, and he is consequently beginning to think seriously—old as he is—of selling out, and moving with his whole family to the North Western States of America, where he hears there are vast tracts of good land to be sold at about a dollar an acre, and moreover where the farmer is welcomed as being in truth the very backbone of the country, and the mainstay of its prosperity; there he hopes his numerous sons will all be able to found new homes for themselves, though it is not without many a pang he tears himself away from this beautiful climate to face the cold of an American winter, or admits to himself the necessity he is under to exchange the Flag of Old England, for the "Stars and Stripes."

But, poor Robinson, who chose a career in the Government service has fared still worse in life. Twenty-five years ago he obtained a billet at £300 a year, being about twice what he would have had for the same work in England, and was thought by his friends very fortunate. He soon afterwards got married, spent his capital in building and furnishing a house, and then his troubles began. He found that the price of everything he had to buy (excepting meat) was much higher than in England, servants' wages more than double, and so on. He soon found he had some difficulty in making both ends meet. However, as his family increased, he also received a slight increase of salary, and managed to get along pretty well till the crisis of 1879, when, owing to a breach of faith' on the part of his banker, he will entail the finding of £640,000 annually in the shape of interest Still, beyond this, we have to take into consideration the large sums payable to the different Banks as discounts and interest on advances, which are chiefly distributed and spent in England in the form of dividends and bonuses. From a return I find that, on the the 30th June, 1879, the total advances by all the Banks in New Zealand reached the enormous sum of £14,017,000, the deposits at the same date standing at £7,904,000. As most of the Banks hare head offices in London, it is difficult to arrive at the balance against the public of New Zealand, as probably a large share of the deposits are made in the London offices, and the advances are made chiefly in the colony; but to be on the safe side we will assume that both deposits and advances are made in the Colony and, deducting the former from the latter, we arrive at a balance of £6,113,000 against the public; this sum at 8 per cent, would mean £489,000 payable to the Banks in the shape of interest. But there is yet another, and that a very heavy drain upon the resources of New Zealand, which we must not lose sight of, but of which there are no statistics available. I mean the large sums yearly remitted, in the form of wool or other produce, for the benefit of absentee proprietors. Take, for example, the 340,000 acres belonging to the New Zealand and Australian Land Company, the whole of the profits of these runs, after paying working expenses, are remitted Home and spent in England or Scotland by the individuals who form the proprietory—or rather, I should say, not the profits merely, but the whole produce of the land except what is distributed in the colony in the form of wages or on materials for improvements. Then, there are several other companies in Great Britain holding large properties in New Zealand, notably the Waimea Plains Company which holds no less than 170,000 acres of freehold agricultural land in the Mataura district of Southland, and to whose railway scheme the Hall Government lent their assistance at the very time they were railing against the Grey Government for their so-called reckless extravagance. Again, there are sundry wealthy individuals (such as Messrs Clifford and Weld) deriving large revenues from estates in New Zealand, and spending the money in England or elsewhere

outside the colony. However, leaving all these uncertain items out of the question, let us add together the sums which we know have to be provided, and I think we shall find it quite sufficiently alarming; they are—

Dividing this by 130,000 (the number of men between twenty and sixty) we arrive at the conclusion that each man has to find annually £30. Though New Zealand, we all admit, has large resources, I am very doubtful if it will prove to be possible to find so large a sum as £3,911,000 every year. The exports of wool for the year 1879 amounted to £3,126,000 for the whole Colony, and of grain to £688,000, so that together they would be about £100,000 short of the amount required. The total exports for 1879, including gold, Kauri gum, and all other items, amounted to £5,667,000, so that after paying the outgoings there would be only a surplus of some £1,750,000 left towards paying for our imports which amounted to £8,755,000 in 1878 and £8,373,000 in 1879, and this is supposing that public works were entirely stopped throughout the Colony, except to the extent of the surplus railway revenue. Let us put the case in another form; the capital sums due amount altogether, as we have shown, to £45,770,000. Assuming the white population to be now 450,000, this shows over £100 of indebtedness for every man, woman, and child in the Colony (roughly, two-thirds public debt and one-third private indebtedness). Contrast this with the United States, where the Government debt was only £15 10s. per head of population in 1866, after paying for the great Civil War, and it has since been reduced to £8 10s. per head, with every prospect of extinguishing it altogether within another twenty years, as the interest is diminishing every year whilst the population is rapidly increasing. No less than £13,000,000 of the debt was paid off during the twelve months ended 30th of June, 1880, and according to the special correspondent of the *Otago Witness* the Government is now paying off the debt at the rate of £3,000,000 a *month*. In a recent publication, there is given a table showing the public debts of different countries and colonies, and also the amount raised by taxation in each, and these tables will be found useful for enabling us to appreciate the real weight of the burden under which the colonists of New Zealand will in future have to stagger:—

The taxation is given as follows, viz.:—

It will be seen, therefore, that in both these lists this Colony holds an unenviable pre-eminence.

But in comparing our position with that of the United States, it must be borne in mind that the greater part of the American National Debt is now held by American capitalists, so that the interest is retained in the country; whereas, nearly the whole of our debt is due to English capitalists, consequently, the interest will have to be sent out of the colony every year, and no part of it will be spent here. The plain fact of the matter is, that the Government of New Zealand have attempted (in spite of the warnings of Mr. Stafford and the other speakers I have quoted from), to *perform an absolute impossibility*, viz., to spend £20,000,000 reproductively in a country with a population only sufficient to justify a fourth of that expenditure. We, or rather our Landowning Rulers have attempted to combine the advantages enjoyed by pastoral races of people—viz., extensive tracts of land for their flocks and herds to roam over undisturbed by the conflicting interests of a settled population—with the advantages of an old and densely peopled country, viz., good roads in all directions, and a system of railways, telegraphs, and other modern luxuries adapted for and only justified by a dense population. The two conditions are antagonistic, and cannot be made to harmonise, they never have done so yet, and never will in any country. It is a well-known fact, that the purely pastoral countries of the world (in Central Asia, for instance), have remained in the same condition with regard to roads and other concomitants of civilisation as they were in the days of Abraham! The really good land fit for grain growing within the colony is very limited in extent, and scattered in patches widely apart through both Islands, but the bulk of it being in the Provinces of Canterbury and Otago; so that to render a large scheme of Immigration and Public Works really successful, *every acre fit for cultivation ought to have been reserved by Government* from the very first promulgation of the policy, for actual settlement, in moderate-sized farms with numerous village centres; instead of which, I believe, that fully three-fourths of the good land is held in large estates, and consequently, those farmers who were too late to get a share of the other fourth, have had to content themselves with getting patches of inferior land, such as shingly plains, sandy river-beds, or steep hill-sides, or go without altogether. Upon this inferior land they now find to their cost that it is impossible to compete successfully as wheat-growers with the innumerable small holders of the good prairie lands of the United States; and, on the other hand, they find it equally impossible to compete as stock raisers with the holders of the large estates of picked land in this colony.

And here, I would say, that, under the existing order of things, it is, in my opinion, only a question of time for all the small holders of grazing land in New Zealand to be crushed out by the competition of the large holders. This process has been going on rapidly during the last two years, assisted by the arbitrary action of some of the Banks, who have suffered the small holders to succumb to the times by hundreds, whilst assisting the great holders, to the utmost of their resources, to tide over the financial crisis brought about by the failure of the Glasgow Bank; and this policy, all now admit, to have been suicidal on the part of the Banks in their own interest. It is obvious that the owner of 30,000 or 40,000 acres of good land bought from Government at £2 per acre (if in Canterbury, or at 10s. or £1 an acre in the other provinces), can afford to under-sell in the Stock Market either the farmer paying a rent of from 10s. to £1 an acre for good land, or the owner of a few hundred

acres of inferior land bought from Government at the same prices that the picked land was obtained for. Thus, if there had been no outside debt to disturb the course of affairs, in the course of a generation or two the rural population would have become divided into two classes only, as was truly pointed out by Sir George Grey—viz., an enormously wealthy class of large landed proprietors, few in number, but having unlimited power in the control of the affairs of State, and a class of agricultural labourers, numerous indeed, but possessing no political power, and in condition little if any better off than their brethren in England. In fact, I question whether the farm labourer in England is not better off in some respects even now than he is here. There, at least in the southern counties, he generally has a neat little cottage and garden, with enough ground to keep a cow or a pig or two. His children look healthy and happy in the green lanes; he has his allowance of beer or cider every day; should sickness occur, he and his family are generally well looked after by the ladies of the parish, and his medicine found by the parish doctor, and in old age, if worst comes to the worst, he has the Union or often a comfortable Almshouse to fall back on. Hero he has to tramp long distances from one station to another in search of employment, and when he gets it, he has either to camp in a tent or be crowded with ten or a dozen other men in a rough men's hut with no garden or trees to shelter it from the hot sun; he is often thrown out of employment altogether during the winter, when, let him be ever so careful, his summer earnings melt away long before the next busy season comes round; he is generally unable to marry because he can find no home up country for his wife; and no provision whatever is made by the State for his old age, when past work. No doubt some of my opponents will argue that the competition amongst the farmers would have been more severe if the land had been in small holdings. I believe, however, it would not really have been so, for in that case the mere numbers of the rural population would have caused the towns to grow to three or four times their present size, and industries and manufactories of all kinds would have started into existence, which are now not attempted, for the simple reason that the country population is not sufficiently numerous to render the chance of success certain or even probable. We should then have had good markets within the colony for the productions of our small farms, instead of having, as now, to rely almost exclusively on the precarious profits of an export trade. I have no hesitation in asserting that at the present time most of the *towns of New Zealand are altogether overgrown* in proportion to the numbers of the surrounding rural population. Three or four years ago, when the large land-holders in South Canterbury were in haste to get their best lands laid down in English grass, extensive areas were let for cropping, generally two crops being allowed, to practical men owning teams of their own. Grain was then realising fairly remunerative prices, and a great amount of temporary prosperity in the district was created by the operations of these men. Now, much of the land has been laid down in pasture, and cropping given up, the consequence being, that numbers of ploughmen and other labourers have been thrown out of employment, farm horses have been sold off in such numbers as to have depreciated enormously in value, and the grain traffic on the railways is also materially diminishing. A further result must be a falling off in the customs revenue in the grain-growing parts of the colony, caused partly by the diminution in the number of labourers employed, and partly by the diminution in the earnings of those still in employment, but at lower wages than those ruling a year or two ago. In a recent copy of the London *Times* it was mentioned that, owing to the acreage in wheat in the eastern counties of England having fallen off to the extent of nearly 1,000,000 acres during the last ten years, the rural population of those counties had diminished to the extent of nearly 500,000 souls during the same period; that is to say, the people having failed to find employment in their customary country avocations, had been forced into the manufacturing districts in large numbers. In this colony, unfortunately, the working classes have very little in the shape of factories to fall back upon if country labour fails them, and I assert that it is hopeless to expect that capitalists will start anything of the kind, so long as the bulk of the land is locked up in large estates, thereby precluding all hope of a local sale for the products of the factories—in short, *until the land is really settled by a permanent population* it is mere waste of time and money appointing commissions on local industries, and a farce offering bonuses as an inducement towards the establishment of factories of any kind. For instance, take the flour-mills in Timaru and Oamaru, which were built in the prosperous times on the assumption that the country districts around those towns were being actually settled, and that therefore population would rapidly increase, they are now either shut up altogether or hardly paying working expenses, and why? because settlement was frustrated by the squatters, and consequently business of all kinds instead of expanding, as was naturally expected by the enterprising firms who spent their capital in erecting those mills, has rather shown a contraction—in short, they were misled by the fictitious appearance of prosperity produced during the cropping era, and now find out, when it is too late, that they are years in advance of the present requirement of the districts. The same circumstance of course affects the railways, public buildings, and other works carried out by the Government, and which were calculated for the requirements of a country thickly settled by farmers, rather than for the solitudes of the large estates. Let us turn to the example of other countries. It is well known that France is now the most prosperous nation in Europe, and many writers attribute the fact to the possession of the soil of France by over 5,000,000 small freeholders, consequently the great bulk of the rural population is frugal, industrious, contented, and

ardently patriotic. So evident is this to statesmen that the Prussian Government is now doing all it possibly can to facilitate the subdivision of the soil of that country into small freeholds on the French plan; and, even in England, many able writers are now advocating the adoption of some similar system, seeing how more and more unequal becomes the competition with the American producers of grain and meat, and taking warning by the terrible example afforded by Ireland of the evil effects of large estates and absentee proprietors. Look at the history of the United States, which country has achieved its present greatness amongst nations, owing chiefly to the fact that from the very first nearly every man who went there did so with the fixed idea of founding a home for himself and his children, and not merely with the idea of making money, and then returning to spend it in England. Read the history of early settlement in America, and what do we find? That the people had literally to fight their way inch by inch in subduing the wilderness. Settling in dense forests, and with a long and severe winter to contend with, they lived hard and frugal lives, importing little or nothing, and subsisting almost entirely on the produce of their own small farms. They had to contend with wolves, bears, and other noxious animals inhabiting the woods; but, worse than all, they were surrounded by bands of savage Indians, ready at any time to attack them, so that they had literally to till their fields with their rifles beside them, and carve homes for their families out of the forest, with their lives in their hands. Yet, in spite of all the hardships they endured, they were ready at the call of patriotism to lay down their lives for their adopted country, and, with a population of only 3,000,000, they were able to resist successfully the whole power of England, and to found a nation which already has a larger white population than Great Britain and all her colonies combined. Contrast the progress of population in the United States with that in the Australian Colonies. These colonies owe their origin to the settlement of New South Wales in 1788, and by 1820 the population was about 30,000. In the fifty years which had elapsed between that date and 1870, the whole population of the entire group of colonies, including Tasmania and New Zealand, had not reached a total of 2,000,000; whereas, in the same fifty years, the single State of Illinois, with an area only half that of New Zealand, had increased in population from 55,000 to 2,539,000, and a similar wonderful increase had taken place in many of the other States, notably Ohio, Michigan, and Missouri, which three States together had increased from 45,000 to 5,570,000 in the same fifty years. Again, the small state of Iowa, only two-thirds of the size of New Zealand, possessed only 95,000 inhabitants when admitted to the Union in 1846, and had increased to 2,000,000 by 1880, being about four times the present population of this colony—after all the large sums we have lavished in promoting immigration. There can be no doubt whatever that this striking difference in the rate of increase is due in a great measure to the different systems of land regulations, those in the States holding out *every possible inducement for the settlement of the immigrants on the land*, and those in these colonies *obstructing such settlement* as far as possible *in the interests of the stockowners*. No other explanation of the difference is sufficient, for, you must remember, that practically those Western States were more remote and difficult of access forty years ago than these colonies are now, whilst here we have the advantage of a far more genial and healthy climate, owing to the absence of the long and severe American winter; and, moreover, we have had the advantage of the stimulating effects of rich gold discoveries in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, and New Zealand, whilst the five States quoted above have had nothing but their agriculture to depend on for their wealth and progress.

Now, let us consider the Land System of these colonies. Study the history of the Feudal System of Europe in the Middle Ages, and you will see so many points of resemblance between that system and the squatting system of the colonies, that squatting might be described as feudalism modified to suit peaceable times instead of warlike times. Thus, under the feudal system, the king, who was considered absolute owner of all the soil of his kingdom, granted large tracts to his different barons, in consideration of their rendering him assistance in time of war, or at other times contributing in money towards bis personal expenses; but the barons soon acquired such great power as to be able to claim their lands as freehold, and hand them down from father to son. In these colonies the land was granted by the Colonial Governments in large tracts to the squatters, subject to a merely nominal rent, and the privileges attached to the possession of the runs were so great as soon to enable them to be converted into freeholds.

The "Head Station," with its group of huts for the dependents, takes the place of the old Feudal "Castle" with its adjacent village, and the ancient hostility shown by the Lord of the Manor to poachers and other intruders on his domain, finds its equal in these colonies in the stern determination to exclude cockatoos from the run, and so preserve its solitude unbroken for the benefit of the flocks and herds of the runholder. But, there is one important particular in which the system in these colonies is worse than the old Feudal System ever was, and that is, in the absence of provision for the family life of dependents. Under the old Feudal system the retainers and dependents of the Lord of the Manor were allowed land to cultivate for their own use and that of their families; it is true, the men had to fight when required by their lord, but he on the other hand was held, bound to protect them and their families against all hostile comers; hence, in the course of a generation or two a strong mutual attachment sprang up, and the vassals were just as ready to lay down their lives in defence of

their lord, as they were to do so in defence of their country against any foreign invader. In the colonies, you find on an average station from 15 to 20 men, shepherds, bullock drivers, fencers, and others, but generally only one or two women, and family life is almost universally discouraged. The stereotyped advertisment, "Wanted for a Station, a married couple without encumbrance," sufficiently indicates the feelings shown. If one of the hands on a station is rash enough to marry, he generally has to betake himself to the towns or farming districts to look for work; or perhaps he settles in the suburbs of some small town, and goes away from home every summer for the shearing and harvesting, earning, it is true, good wages for sis months, on which he and his family have to subsist during the six months in which little or no work is obtainable. All thinking men must admit this to be an undesirable and unnatural system. Can we wonder that some of the wives take to drunkenness and other vices, during the long absence of their natural protectors, or that the children, being neglected and beyond the control of their mother as they grow up, develop into larrikinism? The other day the Government complained that Burnham, and the other Reformatories are already inconveniently full, and for this state of things I believe that the Colonial system of employing labour is in a great measure responsible. Another evil of the system is, that many of the men having to live for months together away from their wives and families, lose their natural home-loving instincts, and get educated, so to speak, up to the point of deserting them altogether—an evil now so commonly complained of in all parts of the colonies. There is still another evil brought about by the above state of things, which is a great lack of young men growing up in the country, fit to take a position as farm labourers, as the lads brought up on the streets of the cities are useless as ploughmen and ignorant as to the care of live stock; whilst there are very few girls growing up who are likely to turn out good dairy-maids or domestic servants on farms, the town bred girls aspiring to be shop-girls and barmaids. This evil is beginning to be complained of even in England at the present time, and is one which will be seriously felt here now that the immigration of farm labourers and country girls from Britain is almost at a stand-still.

However, there are of course stations and stations. As typical examples of squatting under its most beneficial aspect, I might mention Mount Peel and the Orari Gorge Stations. Here we see large tracts of rugged mountainous country, only a very small portion of which is fit for cultivation, held by the descendants of the old landed families of England, who have been trained up in the traditions of the duties and responsibilities of proprietorship, which have been thus defined by the celebrated Dr. Johnson, "a man of family and estate ought to consider himself as having charge of a district, over which he is to diffuse civility and happiness." You see scattered around the head stations little comfortable cottages, each with its neat garden, and upon enquiry you find that the married shepherds, ploughmen, gardeners, and others, live in these and bring up their families in comfort. At Mount Peel Station, there is a handsome little stone church built by the proprietor, in which every Sunday the men with their wives and children assemble for worship, service being held at intervals by a regular clergyman, and at other times by a lay-reader. On both of these stations the proprietors themselves reside permanently, having large families and households, so that the evils of absenteeism are avoided, and the children brought up in the country acquire a patriotic love for their native land.

It is only on stations managed on these principles that anything akin to village life in England is possible, where it is no uncommon thing to find servants who have been their whole lives in the service of one family, and perhaps their fathers before them; whilst, on stations generally in the Colonies, the hands are constantly being changed, and there is no sort of cohesion or kindly fellow-feeling between the different classes composing the rural population.

At the opposite extreme of station life in New Zealand I should place the stations held by the New Zealand and Australian Land Company and the other largo Absentee Companies holding properties in New Zealand. Here you have *enormous blocks of good agricultural land* held merely as a speculation by absentees belonging to the commercial classes, and consequently, without any of the traditional sense of their responsibilities which I have above alluded to. It is well-known that the large investments made in New Zealand land by the Company, under the auspices of Mr. Morton, was one of the principal causes of the disastrous failure of the notorious Glasgow Bank—an event which carried ruin and misery into thousands of previously happy homes; and which failure also indirectly brought on the Financial Crisis in this colony, which has caused such irretrievable disaster here also. Well, the lands of these Companies are held merely as a speculation, with a view to being ultimately cut up and sold to colonists at an enormous advance on the price originally paid to Government; but, in the meantime, the prosperity of the present population is undoubtedly injuriously affected by the locking up of these lands by absentee proprietors, who only seek for the largest possible return from the estates, in order to spend the proceeds in Scotland or England. Take the Levels Estate of 80,000 acres as an instance. I believe the progress of Timaru has been materially checked by reason of the way in which this fine block of land in its immediate neighbourhood is held closed against population; and in this and similar cases, it is open to argument whether Mr. Stafford's remedy of *the resumption of land by the State* on payment of compensation *would not be justifiable* in the interests of the community at large. Some few years ago there was apparently much progress in the Point District, owing to the cropping which was then going on on the Levels

Bun, preparatory to laying down the land in English grass; but, at the present time, you may get on to this estate, within a few miles of Timaru, and ride through great paddocks of English grass for 10 or 15 miles at a stretch, without seeing a human being, or anything more to remind you of human life than an occasional deserted sod hut falling to ruins. The township of Morton and other townships were laid off, and sections sold to the public on the undertanding that the surrounding land was about to be disposed of in moderate sized farms; but now, the purchasers finding the farms still unsold, and everything in a state of stagnation, naturally complain that they have been misled and seduced into purchasing under false pretences. A short time since we saw a paragraph in the papers, saying that the Committee of the Glasgow Bank had decided not to realise their New Zealand assets in the shape of land till the times became more favourable for selling. What meaning has this for the people of New Zealand? Why, sir, it means that every struggling "cockatoo" or small tradesman has to contribute so much annually in taxation to meet the deficiency in the colonial revenue, caused by the payment of interest on money expended on the construction of railways through, and for the benefit of, those estates; and he has to pay this extra amount in order that the company may be able to hold those estates uninhabited, till other parts of the districts surrounding them shall have become more densely peopled and highly improved, so as to give these estates enhanced value in the market. To put it more plainly: the New Zealand and Australian Land Company hold in Canterbury, Otago, and Southland some 340,000 acres of freehold land, whilst the whole of the land sold up to date in those provinces is only 6,600,000 acres, so that the above company actually owns about one-twentieth of the whole. There has been spent on railway construction in those three provinces, according to the latest returns, about £5,473,000, a twentieth part of which sum would amount to about £273,500, which latter sum has therefore, I maintain, been spent *practically for the benefit of the company's estates by the people of New Zealand, and* consequently the interest on that sum has to be found annually by the people of New Zealand, until such time as the company, by the sale of those estates, allow new contributors of the revenue to step in and relievo the present population of New Zealand of part of the burden. Or, to put it in another way, the company will have bought the Canterbury estates at £2 per acre, and the Otago and Southland ones at £1 per acre, say £500,000, the total purchase money; this land they expect to sell at an *average rate of about* £8 *per acre*, the enhanced value being due to the railways and other public works, and to immigration. If they succeed in selling at that price, then about £2,700,000 will be withdrawn from New Zealand and sent to Scotland for distribution amongst the proprietors; and to allow of their realising this great profit, all of us who remain in New Zealand will have to bear the burden of paying interest on the proportion of the Public Works Loan expended for the benefit of those estates. The same argument of course applies to all the other great freeholds, but the evil is not so glaring in the case of resident proprietors who spend their profits within the colony. I have instanced the holding of the Levels Run by the company as being specially detrimental to the interests of Timaru; but the evils of absentee proprietorship are felt and deplored just as much in other parts of the colony. "Atticus," the writer of "Pastoral Notes" in the *Otago Witness* of December 18th last, says—"Public companies stand convicted of having brought about the present unsatisfactory state of things. It does not require the pen of a ready-writer to expose their system of station management. On several of the company's stations one solitary shepherd is the sole resident employed to protect their interests in the elevated regions of the wilds. They pursue a policy of self-aggrandisement at home and abroad, and Heaven knows how they have carried out their adopted programme to the letter. After holding possession of miles of country for the past twenty years, and having no doubt heaped up treasures in abundance, they have reduced below zero the rate of wages of the few hands they presently employ, and have also adopted a system of amalgamation, with a view of ruling the labour market, or moulding it to suit their own pockets, and establishing a labour ring amongst themselves."

There can be no doubt, that if the New Zealand runholders had been content to live on in the isolated and semicivilised fashion in which the old feudal barons did, or in which the squatters of most parts of New South Wales and Queensland do still, they might have held their runs comparatively intact for many years to come. Had they confined their attention solely to producing wool and tallow, and steadily vetoed any attempts to borrow money, either for public works or for immigration, they would have been able to hold their ground permanently, and quietly crushed out all attempts to interfere with their privileges. Those professional men or tradesmen who dared to advocate liberal ideas, would have been quickly starved out of the colony, and in the course of a generation or two the population at large would have had to work at the improvement of the great estates on such terms as the proprietors chose to dictate, or to emigrate again to some country where the land was not all locked up, and where, consequently, the small farmer would stand some chance of rising to independence. This position was no doubt clearly seen at the time by Sir Cracroft Wilson, Mr. F. Jollie, and the other squatters who so bitterly opposed the Public Works Scheme. But, sir, I contend that, by giving in their adhesion to the borrowing policy, the majority of both Houses of the Legislature placed it *beyond the power of the large freeholders to escape for any length of time* the responsibilities of their position; and, I argue, that the money raised on loan *having been expended mainly for the benefit of the landowners*, they will have to provide

the greater portion of the interest on the loans, either directly or indirectly, in spite of all the combined efforts they can make to evade doing so. It is obvious, that it is only possible to tax the trading and labouring classes up to a certain point. If you further tax the tradesman, who is only just able to make a comfortable living by his trade, he must adopt one or other of two courses: he must charge his customers—*i.e.*, the squatters and farmers—more for his goods, or he must leave the country for one where taxes are lighter. Similarly, if you impose too heavy a tax on the labourers' necessaries, such as boots, clothing, and groceries, he will either expect higher wages or take the first opportunity of clearing out of the colony, Here, I may mention, that a case of this kind has actually recently occurred. In a recent article in the London *Times* was given an account of the causes which led to the late Civil War in the Argentine Confederation. It appears that that country borrowed £5,000,000 in England about the year 1865, for the purpose of constructing a railway leading from the capital (Buenos Ayres) into the interior, and at the same time held out great inducements to immigrants, which were taken advantage of by large numbers, chiefly of Italian, French, and Basque origin. Everything prospered for a time under the magic influence of the borrowed money, property rose rapidly in value, new settlements went en apace, and some of the old residents made large fortunes; but presently the money was all spent, and then there was a collapse. Taxes had to be imposed to pay the interest on the debt. The large landowners of the interior were in the ascendant in the Legislature, so the Government decided on raising the required amount in the form of a customs duty of 20 per cent., instead of in the form of a land tax. What was the result? The people became dissatisfied, and numbers of the small settlers and labourers left the country; the revenue fell off owing to the diminished spending power of the people; then the Conservative Government blindly aggravated the evil, and so the process went on acting and reacting on itself, until they had actually worked the customs duty up to 60 per cent, *ad valorem*. At this point the strain on the populace proved too great; an insurrection broke out in Buenos Ayres against the Government; the landowners of the interior raised forces to overawe the city, and a civil war ensued. If, then, by a system of over-taxation our Government should drive the trading and labouring classes to leave the colony in any numbers, they would also at once ruin the small farmers who supply the towns with. farm, dairy, and garden produce, and who even now find great difficulty in disposing of these goods at a price which will give them anything over the cost of production. The large farmers and graziers would then have to rely almost exclusively on an export trade, as the local market, both for grain and live stock, would be almost destroyed; and both the customs revenue and the railway traffic returns would show a large and constantly increasing deficiency. I see that the latter item is expected to fall short of the Colonial Treasurer's estimate for this year by no less than £164,000, and that, in spite of the fact that the last grain season (1880) the yield was nearly double what it had ever been before, and much larger than it is likely to be for many years again.

Taking into consideration the large amount that has to be provided annually to meet our liabilities, and the extreme sparsity of the population of the colony, I confess I can see no possible solution of the difficulty but by reverting to the land tax, and making each estate pay something in proportion to the amount it would contribute to the revenue if it were held by numbers of small farmers, instead of by one proprietor or by a company of absentees. To do this equitably, it would be necessary to have a sliding scale, (as has been adopted, after violent opposition by the monopolists, in the neighbouring colony of Victoria), according to the size of the estate, something after the following fashion, viz.:—

Two or more estates belonging to same owners or company to count as one, for the purpose of computing the rate per acre. Of course there would have to be modifications of the above scale according to the quality of the land, for instance, an estate like the Longbeach Estate, all first class land, could bear a higher rate, whilst estates on the shingly plains or in the Mackenzie Country would be very much less than the rate given. At any rate, the principle is perfectly just and fair, as the theory is, that people should contribute towards the expense of the State in exact proportion to the benefit they derive from the protection of the State; and if it suits a capitalist to hold a large tract of land to the exclusion of other people, it is quite fair that he should pay for his privilege. The average customs revenue of the colony is about £3 10s. per head of the population, let us take this as a basis for comparing the tax payable under this scale by the land in large estates, with the same land if held in small farms. Take for example an Estate of 40,000 acres, the land tax would amount (at one shilling per acre) to £2,000 per annum; but divide the estate into farms of an average size of 150 acres, and we should have 266 farms, allowing an average of eight persons to each farm and giving a population of 2128 souls; these, at the rate of £3 10s. per head, would contribute £7,418 to the Government annually in the form of customs revenue, to say nothing of what would be contributed by their dependent population of blacksmiths, wheelwrights, and other tradesmen. Again, let us take the estates of the New Zealand and Australian Land Company, which I find by an advertisement on the cover of Messrs. Grant and Foster's report holds 340,000 *acres of good land* in New Zealand. Well then, 340,000 acres at two shillings per acre would amount to a total tax of £34,000 per annum, but what would the same land give if divided into small farms? It would divide into 2,266 farms of 150 acres each; allowing as before eight souls to each farm, we should have 18,128 souls without reckoning dependent

tradesmen. This, at £3 10s. per head would mean a contribution to customs revenue alone of £63,448 per annum, to say nothing of stamps, post office, and other sources of revenue from the additional population, and the enormous increase of railway revenue which that population would ensure. Look at the subject in whatever light you may, whether as a matter of justice to the people who have been induced to come out here, expediency for the general welfare, or even absolute necessity in the interests of self preservation, I think most people studying the subject earnestly must admit, that some such *radical change in the incidence of taxation is necessary*; and not until it is made can we ever hope to escape from the depression and gloom which now overshadows and stifles the energies of the whole colony.

If the competition of the 3,000.000 small freeholders in America has been sufficient to shako to its foundation the whole system of land tenure in the United Kingdom, where it has been rooted for hundreds of years, and where the producers have the finest markets in the world at their own doors, I ask, sir, how is it possible that we, at a distance of 16,000 miles from those markets, can hold our own against that competition, except by adopting the American system of small holdings ourselves, or something as near akin to it as is now feasible? I believe that if our present system of largo estates continues, a very few years will see the increasing burden of taxation drive a large number of the industrial population out of the colony; and then the large freeholders, deprived of the assistance afforded by the presence of numbers of fellow-colonists to share the burden with them, will have to submit, with the best grace they can, to a much more heavy direct taxation than has yet been mooted by even the most radical section of the community, if they wish to maintain the credit of the colony and keep up the payment of interest on the Loans. In case of any failure to do so, the British Government would probably interfere in the interests of the capitalists who have found the money for those loans; since the land of the colony was virtually pledged as security for them, as pointed out by Mr. Creighton in 1870, in the speech from which I have before quoted; but since that time the Colonial Government has permitted nearly all the good land to pass into private hands, without laying by the proceeds of such sale towards the repayment of the Loans, thus leaving the British capitalist in a position in which he might reasonably complain that he had been unfairly dealt with. The number of acres sold in New Zealand up to the end of 1878 was 13,820,281, of which 11,478,300 were sold for cash, realising £10,208,282. The land remaining in the hands of the Government is 5,080,000 acres in the North Island, and 29,786,000 in the South Island, but this nearly all consists of rugged mountain ranges and other waste country, which would not in all probability sell if offered at an average of 5s. per acre all round. It is true that, if the land had been sold to numerous purchasers, in small farms, the extra population, by contributing a large increase to both the customs and railway revenue, would have made our creditors' position more secure; but now, the greater portion of our landed security has disappeared, without a corresponding increase in revenue to compensate for the loss of it. The forthcoming Census Returns will doubtless disclose a large increase in the total number of the population, owing to the extraordinary large proportion of births to the number of adults, as compared to other countries; but it must be remembered that it is only an increase in the number of adult males that can be depended on in calculating on an increase of revenue, the addition of a large infant population being an element of financial weakness rather than of strength to the colony.

It has been suggested that the large estate owners should lease their lands to tenants, in farms of moderate size, as recommended by Mr. John Grigg, of Longbeach, in a paper which appeared in the *New Zealand Country Journal*, but I fear this plan is not feasible, for several reasons: in the first place, the rent expected is far too high in comparison with what land can be obtained for in other new countries, and out of all proportion to the profits which may reasonably be expected from the land; in the second place, the owners of the large estates have generally neither the will nor the means to build the requisite houses and farm buildings on each holding, and mere tenants will not do so unless they get very long leases at low rents; and, in the third place, there are not farmers enough in New Zealand to take up a fourth of the area of the large estates even if they were willing, and as for farmers from England, of whom we have heard so much lately, I do not think many of them would care to exchange a lease in a country where unfailing markets exist at their own doors, for a lease in a country where they may find the markets most precarious and uncertain, even if the season should prove entirely favourable, as many farmers here have found to their cost during the last two years. Besides, as was pointed out by several of the speakers from whom I have quoted, men do not care to break up their homes, leave their native land, and travel 16,000 miles to find themselves in the same position as they held in the old country, viz., that of tenant farmers; *and no inducements, short of freeholds of their own*, would tempt them out here in any great numbers. In the London *Times*, of 1st October last, is to be found an account of the new "Colony," so-called, in the State of Tennessee, formed under the auspices of "The Aid to Land Ownership Society," of which Mr. Hughes, M. P., is president. They have 400,000 acres freehold, the site of the town being only seven miles from a main trunk line of railway, and eight hours, by rail, from Cincinnati, a city of 255,000 inhabitants. The climate is described as healthy and genial, the soil remarkably good, game in the neighbourhood plentiful, and the land is to be sold in small farms *at the price of* 1 *dollar* 70 *cents per acre (about* 7*s.*), of which only 25

per cent, is required in cash, and the balance in payments extending over a period of three years. This combination of advantages is to be found within a fortnight's easy travel from Loudon, and the particulars are set forth at length in the same English papers which contain letters from New Zealand describing this Colony as in an almost hopelessly bankrupt condition.

As another means of relieving the colony of a portion of the burden of debt, it has been suggested that the Railways should be sold to a company or series of companies. I fear, however, it would be found impossible to meet with capitalists willing to incur the risk of taking them over, except at an enormous reduction on the cost price. Owing to the sparsity of population, the traffic is even now not sufficient to pay two per cent on the cost of construction over the whole of the New Zealand Railways, and you must remember that some of the lines have now been in use 10 years or upwards; and as no money has been set aside for maintenance fund, the purchasers would have to prepare themselves to meet a heavy expenditure within a year or two for laying down new sleepers, repairs to bridges, and for maintenance generally, to say nothing of special risks from flood, land slips, and other accidents to which the New Zealand Railways are so specially liable. Moreover the would-be purchasers finding that most of the Railways run for miles at a stretch through large estates, *which are now in process of being rapidly laid down in permanent pasture*, instead of being devoted to grain growing, would argue that the traffic returns instead of showing a constant increase year by year, would probably show a tendency to decrease, or possibly fall away, until they were actually below the point at which they would cover mere working expenses. As bearing on this question, I may here point out that New Zealand has actually 1,254 miles of railway open, as against 1,124 in the Colony of Victoria, which colony has more than double our population. If you compare us with the countries of the Old World, the disadvantage under which our railways labour through lack of population becomes still more apparent; and further it must be borne in mind, that this disadvantage will become more aggravated as the average wealth of the population diminishes; thus, in the prosperous times, numbers of people travelled for pleasure who can no longer afford to do so, and as the working men get thrown out of employment, they have to forego the luxury of moving about from place to place by rail; thus, a recent return showed that in four weeks ending 11th December, 1880, the number of railway passengers was less by 10,612 persons than in the same four weeks of 1879, which itself was not a prosperous year, as the financial crisis occurred in April of that year.

We have heard a great deal during the last twelve months or so on the subject of retrenchment; the present Ministry have received a great deal of laudation, in the columns of the Conservative journals, on account of the vigour with which they have set about cutting down salaries and discharging Civil servants (some of whom had been long in the Government service); we have had it dinned into our cars how fortunate it was for the colony that they took office when they did, just in time to save it from bankruptcy; we were solemnly assured that the very money (out of the £5,000,000 loan) had been all squandered by the Grey Ministry, which, as it now turns out, the Hall Ministry have been lavishly expending in Taranaki and other favoured districts ever since they took office. Sir George Grey's Liberal teachings, and warm solicitude for the real welfare of the mass of the people of the colony, have been craftily and unscrupulously distorted in order to frighten a too credulous public with the idea that they were evidences of Communism or Red Republicanism, and he has been made use of as a sort of shocking example, enabling the venial supporters of the Hall Ministry to attack any expression of dissent from their doings, and to brand the dissenters as revolutionary demagogues. Moreover, the persistent and virulent abuse of Sir George Grey served to divert the attention of the bulk of the people, whilst the dominant class of wealthy landowners divided as much as possible of the remains of the public estate amongst themselves. We have been told, over and over again, that all that was necessary to ensure the return of our lost prosperity was the continuance in office of the Hall Ministry; this idea has been so persistently impressed upon us as to give rise to a suspicion, in many minds, that the terrible financial crisis which swept over the colony, with the suddenness of a tornado, in April, 1879, was brought on by a "ring" of capitalists and land speculators, with a view to paralyse Sir George Grey's watchful care for the interests of the working classes, by holding him up to them as the author of all their misfortunes. If this suspicion is correct, we must charitably conclude that, in the excitement of political hatred, *the irreparable mischief* which would accrue to the colony, in consequence of that crisis, was not thoroughly foreseen, for we cannot bring our minds to conceive of men *base enough to bring ruin to thousands of unoffending homes*, in order to gratify political spite, or even in the reckless effort to secure self-aggrandisement.

Sir, I believe that the public of New Zealand, more especially in the cities and towns, are now beginning to suspect that, in their blind terror of Sir George Grey's so-called Communism, they have been deluded into putting into power the very men who have really been at the root of the evils which have befallen the colony. Our present Premier is THE MAN, *above all others* in Canterbury, who, by his invention of the system of pre-emptive rights and other abuses, has done most to build up the gigantic land monopoly which has utterly destroyed, for the present, all chance of New Zealand becoming a populous, prosperous, or great colony; he is the exponent and champion of the wealthy "ring" who decreed that Sir George Grey must be ousted from

office, and the Land Tax abolished at all risks; and who proceeded to carry out that programme so recklessly, that they have completely played into the hands of the enemies of New Zealand, and caused the colony to be held up as a sad example and solemn warning to all other colonies, in many of the leading English newspapers. In proof that this is so, I will read an extract from the *Otago Witness*, of 25th December, 1880. Their home correspondent says: "Canada and the United States are reaping a splendid harvest of scared British farmers, and New Zealand would reap the best of all but for the indescribably dismal stories which are coming home from the colony. It is a thousand pities that it should be so, and especially that these stories should be so exaggerated as many of them plainly are. I can read between the lines two distinct sources of exaggeration. Some are political, and have their origin in a desire to exaggerate the difficulties of the colony *in order to make capital out of the blunders and faults' of the late Government*. Those who are guilty of this, little think how far-reaching is the harm they do, and how they are making a rod under which their own backs will smart, when they diminish the credit of the colony, and scare away the class which, just now, the colony most needs—capitalist farmers. It is exactly this class of statement which most surely finds its way home, and is made most of where not one in a thousand has colonial knowledge enough to discount it to its true value. * * * * The English Press still keeps up a shower of most damaging articles upon New Zealand affairs."

What is the character of the retrenchment we hear so much about? I fancy the public are beginning to find out that the Conservative Ministers are setting about it in a way to do much harm, and very little real good after all. They have the strictest sense of duty when dealing with the poor "Civil servant," who has perhaps been twenty years in the Government service, and who has a large family to provide for; by all means cut him down ten per cent, just when he has naturally been expecting a rise after his long years of service, and if he ventures to grumble, tell him he may think himself fortunate that he is not turned out altogether; by all means cut down the railway porters their ten per cent.; even the poor servant girl at the hospital, on £20 a-year, is not too humble to have her £2 deducted, or the country postmaster, at £5 per annum, to be reduced to £4 10s.; these are all necessary retrenchments, and must he submitted to with a good grace. But you must deal very gently with the Hon. John Merino, who has 100,000 acres of freehold land, with no house on it but his own, and who shears, each year, 80,000 sheep; his nerves are susceptible, and his feelings delicate, so it would never do to hurt them, by taxing his land, as that Communist, Sir George Grey, attempted to do; if you talk of such a thing he will withdraw (so you are told) his capital from the colony in disgust, and New Zealand can never get on without capital (as you are also told, in an awe-struck whisper). At the same time, the Hon. John, being in the Legislative Council, is careful to draw his honorarium to the utmost penny, though he earns it by taking a good deal of trouble to conserve his own interests at the expense of those of the people. You may, perhaps, remember, sir, that when, last session, the Hon. Mr. Peacock brought forward a motion in the Upper House, to forego the honorarium for that one year, on account of the urgent cry for retrenchment, he could not get one single member to vote with him—with shame be it spoken!

Let us briefly recapitulate the work which the Hall Ministry have achieved since they took office. First and foremost, they have abolished the Land Tax, which told heavily on their friends and supporters, the holders of the large estates, and comparatively lightly on the mass of small owners of property, whether in town or country, and they have substituted in lieu thereof the Property Tax, which fails comparatively lightly on the large holders of land, and heavily on the owners of buildings or of improved farms. Under the Property Tax every owner of a house or shop in town has to pay a penny in the pound on its capital value, though it may be unlet owing to the general depression and bad times, and the unfortunate tradesman has actually to pay a tax on goods which are lying useless, because he is unable to sell them owing to the depressed state of trade. On the other hand, the great estates owned by the Levels Company and other absentee owners, pay on only one-eighth part of their capital, though they bring in a very large income from wool and other sources. Next, the Ministry have altered the customs tariff by increasing the 10 per cent. *ad valorem* duties formerly paid to 15 per cent., and by taxing articles formerly exempt. They have also imposed a Beer Tax of 3d. per gallon, which would have been 6d. but for the strenuous opposition of a portion of the public. The Hall Ministry have, by their 10 per cent all-round reductions in the Civil Service, completely demoralised every department of that service, filling the mind of every man in it with dissatisfaction as to the present, and uncertainty as to the future. By arbitrarily cutting down the pay of the lower classes of officials, who were previously in receipt of salaries already less than their equals in skill could earn outside the Government service, they have destroyed all *esprit de corps* in each branch of the service, and paved the way to losing all their best men as soon as the affairs of the colony begin to show signs of returning prosperity. Further, the Hall Ministry have suspended indefinitely public works in both islands of the greatest importance to the producing communities, who alone render public works reproductive, and squandered large sums in, as far as we can yet judge, entirely unproductive expenditure at Taranaki and other favoured localities, apparently for the sole purpose of pleasing constituents of some of the members of the Ministry. They have, in spite of the earnest, emphatic, and, I may say, prophetic warnings given by Mr. Stafford and others, of the disastrous effects entailed on the colony by the system of

large landed estates in this Island, connived at the acquisition of enormous blocks of land in the North Island by speculators more or less connected with a prominent member of the Ministry, and who are said to form a ring having complete control of the land question in the Province of Auckland, and who expect to realise, by cutting up the land and selling in small blocks to settlers, *the profits which ought to have gone into the Government chest*, so as in some measure to reimburse the colony for the enormous sums spent in acquiring the land from the Maoris.

In short, the whole policy of the Hall Ministry has been *to play into the hands of large capitalists, and heap burdens upon the mass of the people of New Zealand*, to drive away men who have worked half a lifetime in the colony, in order to aggrandise the great absentee proprietors, forgetful of the fact that a day of reckoning must come, and that, by driving away the small farmers and industrious mechanics of the colony, the taxation rendered inevitable by means of our enormous debt *must eventually fall with tenfold force upon the large landed proprietors*. In the matter of railway management, the Ministry have increased the rate for goods to such an extent as to cause widespread dissatisfaction, and still further to reduce the chances of farmers at a distance from Christchurch growing grain with a reasonable margin of profit. I maintain, sir, that one-half the present rates, both for passengers and goods, would have been amply sufficient to pay interest on the cost of construction of the railways, if the country through which the lines pass had been occupied under a proper system of small farm settlement—which, I have shown, was an integral part of the original Public Works Scheme—instead of being occupied, as it now is, for the most part, by a series of large estates, carrying only an extremely scanty population. In the United States, from which country the crushing competition to our wheat growers originates, the railway companies are now carrying grain a distance of 900 miles for the same price which is here charged for carrying it 100 miles; and why are they able to do this? For the simple reason that they have what we lack, a dense population of small farmers and their dependents spread throughout the country, and furnishing a large passenger traffic to swell the receipts.

If the present Ministry remain in office over another session they will find it necessary to advocate further sweeping reductions in the Civil Service and Public Works votes, on account of the stationary character of the customs revenue and the large falling off in the railway receipts, which is now estimated to be £164,000 for the year below the Colonial Treasurer's estimate. They will also, doubtless, as shadowed forth in Mr. Wakefield's late speech at Geraldine, endeavour to sweep away the vote for education, towards which property now pays its share, and throw the whole weight upon the parents of children attending the schools—a section of the community who now contribute most heavily to the revenue of the colony through the *ad valorem* customs duty. And here, I must remark, that in the case of the schools having less than twenty-five scholars, and which are to be done away with to save expense, the reason why so few children are found in one neighbourhood is, that in consequence of the land having been bought up in great tracts by the runholders, the small farmers have had to settle on a few rough corners left unbought on account of their inferior quality, and thus, perhaps three or four poor families are found together, separated by ten or twelve miles of uninhabited land from the next small community; whereas, if the farmers had been allowed to spread wave by wave over the country, as in America, there would always have been numerous families within a school radius of three or four miles. Thus, in a map in my possession of Buena Vista County, in the State of Iowa, no less than seventy-nine schools are shown as existing in a block of country twenty-four miles square, and which was only first settled in 1860. For this reason, I consider it would be quite fair to compel the owners of the uninhabited blocks to subsidise the small schools, rather than that the children should go untaught.

The same fact of the scattered and isolated position of the small farmers tells against their interests in numerous other ways, as, for instance, in largely increasing the cost of hauling their grain to market, and an increased cost and difficulty in getting threshing machines and other machinery on to the farms when required. Again, their being so scattered is an insuperable obstacle to the establishment of co-operative cheese or butter factories, now so generally in use in the States, where the small farms are numerous and in close contiguity to each other. And, I believe, that the establishment of these cheese and butter factories here would be the only means of starting an export trade in those lines of produce with any hope of permanent success.

No doubt, also, the subsidies to County Councils, Road Boards, Municipalities, and other local bodies, will be abolished altogether, whilst, at the same time, the burden of maintaining the hospitals, and the payment of charitable aid, will be thrown upon those bodies, who will consequently be under the necessity of raising special rates for those purposes. Probably, also, should the Ministry consider their position sufficiently strong, they will re-impose the tea and sugar duties, as lately recommended by sundry speakers representing the interests of capitalists, and thus still further relieve the great land- owners at the expense of the struggling heads of large families, poor widows, whose sole luxury is their cup of tea, and others of the feeble order who can least bear additional burdens. It is all very well for the Hall Ministry and their organs to make a great parade of the large reductions effected in the Civil Service; but you must remember, sir, that the saving to the colony is more apparent than real; for instance, in discharging an official with, say £400 a year, you deprive the district in

which he was employed of the expenditure of that £400 amongst the tradesmen, small farmers, and other members of the community; for it is notorious that the Civil servants, like country clergymen at home, have mostly large families, and have to live fully up to their incomes; thus the money is still kept in circulation in the colony. On the other hand, if you relieve one of the leviathan estate owners of taxation to the amount of £400 a year, you simply increase the chances of his spending that amount in travelling abroad, or in sending members of his family to live in England. A word here with regard to the Land Tax, the great argument used against which was that it checked the flow of capital into the country for investment. I would remark that it was only deterrent in the case of capitalists seeking to buy large estates—*a class we are most undoubtedly better without;* whereas, the Property Tax deters the man of small capital, seeking a place to settle on with a view to farming, or a town property in which to start a new industry; and this is the very class we are admittedly *most urgently in need of at this tune*.

Sir, I think most people (at any rate in the towns) of New Zealand are beginning to ask each other what they have gained by entrusting the reins of power during the last two years to the nominees of the great landowning interest; they are beginning to see that the "good times" which were promised them seem just as far off as ever, and many of our most industrious and thrifty men, both in town and country, are beginning to say to each other, that unless some change soon occurs in the Policy of the Government, they will have to "clear out" of New Zealand before money gets so scarce as to prevent their leaving at all. During the last two years, many scores of industrious men in South Canterbury, as well as in nearly every other part of the colony, have seen the savings of years, (in some cases almost a lifetime), melt away from their grasp through no fault of their own, and they are beginning to conclude that there is, and has been, something radically wrong about the Government system of the Colony, which from good soil, fine climate, extensive sea-board, fine harbours, rich gold diggings, and other favourable circumstances, ought to have been, if properly governed, so flourishing. "What that something is, I have endeavoured to point out in this paper, viz., that the Government of the colony has never really honestly fostered a system of actual settlement, as is done in America. Yet, if any one is bold enough to say as much in public or to write to a newspaper expressing such views, as the Rev. John Foster of Oamaru recently did, he is at once abused, and hooted down on all sides as a maligner of his adopted country, and is, so to speak, socially outlawed for daring in this so called free country to express his real opinions. I have read the Rev. John Foster's letter carefully, and consider that, making due allowances for his hastiness of judgment on some points, as a new arrival in the colony, the statements in his letter came in many particulars remarkably near the truth. The lector bears internal evidence of having been conscientiously written as a warning to persons amongst his old associates, and who might be contemplating immigration to New Zealand, that their hopes and expectations might be grievously disappointed if they came. I have no doubt whatever that hundreds, aye thousands of other private letters from persons who have arrived in the colony during the last two or three years, have had much the same tenor, though they have not found their way into print. I say, sir, that immigrants can truly complain that they have been cruelly misled (whether by Sir Julius Vogel or his subordinate agents, who have written guide-books to New Zealand is immaterial), when they were told that there were millions of acres of good land in the colony only awaiting settlement, as thousands have been led to believe. The fact is, as I have shown from the Report of the Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands, there is no good Government Land left, and it is most reprehensible to induce men to come out here by making such false statements. It is also most unfair on the part of some of our journals to brand unfortunate "new chums" as loafers, because they find on arrival hero that it is impossible to get any Government Land upon which they can make a living, and almost equally impossible to get work at once of a kind to which they have been accustomed in the old country, if indeed they are fortunate to get work of any kind whatever.

What can be more significant than the fact that considerable numbers of steerage passengers are returning to England in the wool ships, no less than thirty having recently sailed in one vessel; surely this is a sign of there being something wrong in a young country with less than half a million inhabitants; for men would not encounter the discomforts of a steerage passage a second time, if they saw a reasonable hope of doing any good out here. All attempts made to conceal the real state of stagnation and depression under which the colony suffers, are futile, where returns and statistics are so frequently made public, and it would be far better for our writers, to face the difficulty, instead of glossing it over, and endeavour to discover to what causes we owe that state which we all deplore amongst ourselves. Have not the pages of the *Bankruptcy Gazette*, ever since March, 1879, shown that there have been more failures in New Zealand, in proportion to its population, than probably ever occurred in any civilised community before (except, perhaps, in Ireland, in 1847)? Have not the columns of our newspapers been filled, and are they not so still, with advertisements of the sale of freeholds, by order of the mortgagees, and of farmers' plant and live stock, under distraint for rent and under bills of sale? Is it not notorious that the only people who have thriven in business, during the past two years, are the lawyers and the auctioneers? Can it be denied that scores of farmers were compelled to take less for their grain last year, owing to the pressure of creditors, than would cover the bare expenses of growing it, leaving rent, interest, and their

own expenses of living, out of the question? Is it not true that thousands of men were out of work for weeks, aye, for months, last winter, whilst a portion of the last large loan was still unexpended? Can we ignore the fact of soup kitchens having been established in Christchurch, and other large towns, for the relief of the destitute? Why, even in December (the middle of summer) we read of 375 receiving relief in Wellington alone. In the newspapers, of December 1st, the fact was recorded that 290 of the unemployed were then working on the "relief works" of the Canterbury railways; and at Waimate thirty-five unemployed men, with their families, were put on by the County Council to deepen a creek, to keep them going till harvest should set in. Do we not hear from all directions, that "swaggers," looking for work, wore never so numerous before? In one case, no less than fifty came to a sheep station, on the Rangitata, on one evening—and all this in the height of what is called the "busy season." If this be the case now, what look-out is there for next winter, when most of the public works will be stopped for want of funds? The reserved funds of the County Councils and Road Boards are fast running out, owing to the stoppage of the subsidies, and then where will the married men in our small townships look for employment? You must bear in mind that, so far from the cultivation of the land increasing, it is actually diminishing, as many of the large landed proprietors, and some of the smaller owners, are laying down permanent pasture for grazing, and intend to crop no more, at least unless prices given for grain should improve materially.

There is no doubt that the Government will be compelled to find work of some kind or other for large bodies of men, during the coming winter, whether they have funds available or not, as the men have been induced to come to this country by the statement that work was always to be had; and it is certain that when men congregate in largo numbers, in a state of destitution, there is no possibility of resisting their demand to be fed and provided for, unless the Government are prepared to face riots and excesses of all kinds, for men will simply not starve quietly, whoever is to blame for their destitution. Yet you have the *Timaru Herald*, and other Conservative papers, laying the blame of the hard times on the ignorance or want of enterprise of the farmers, on the improvidence of the working men, on the alleged extravagance of the late Ministry of Sir George Grey; in short, on anything except what I believe to be the true cause, or at least one of the principal causes, viz., the *monopoly of nearly all of the best land of the colony* in the hands of comparatively few holders. Every San Francisco mail brings accounts of the increasing prosperity of the United States, so much so, that the new President set apart a day of general thanksgiving for the unexampled prosperity of the country; and we read that the national debt is being paid off at the rate of £3,000,000 a month, so that it will all be cleared off in ten years time. I am convinced, sir, that unless means can be devised shortly for throwing open, for actual settlement, the lands of the colony, both the remaining Government land, where of any use, and some of the large freehold estates, we shall witness numbers of our best men leaving our shores for the States, where, it is known, there are millions of acres of fertile prairie lands still open for settlement, on terms so easy as almost to amount to a gift of the soil to the hard-working small farmer. Then, when it is too late, we shall begin to acknowledge the realisation of Mr. Stafford's prophecy, that if we introduced immigrants, *without reserving land for them to settle on*, we should have "nothing but a *hungry, discontented, semipauperised people*, who, instead of being a source of wealth, will be a great source of injury and injustice to those already in the country."

We have been told, by the *Timaru Herald* and other papers of the Conservative party, that drawing attention to the plain truth, in the way I have done, is "sotting class against class," this, sir, is a cant phrase, which has been made the most of in abusing Sir George Grey, who has made bitter enemies by his fearless advocacy of the cause of the poor man; but disinterested people are beginning to see that those who would keep largo tracts of the land in the condition of unpeopled solitudes, for the pasturing of their flocks and herds, or who would raze to the ground all the cockatoos' cottages, rather than be annoyed by humble neighbours, are, in reality, the men who are setting "class against class," and raising up, in this new country, a feeling of bitterness and irritation which, unless allayed by wise legislation, *will assuredly lead, sooner or later, to all the evils under which Ireland is suffering at the present momemt*. Again, another charge brought against Sir George Grey was, that his Land Tax, and other measures, wore "class legislation," why, sir, the whole history of the colony, from the day on which the first depasturing licenses were issued, has been "class legislation" with a vengeance, legislation which has aimed steadily at the building up of great estates for those who were fortunate enough to be here during the first few years of the settlement of the colony, or who have arrived here, of late years, with largo capital; but, legislation which has *done its lest to obstruct and frustrate the settlement* of a large population, on the lands of the colony, in every possible way.

I feel convinced, sir, that when once this question of the settlement of the land is studied, and thoroughly understood by the people of the large towns of New Zealand, they will insist on a radical change being made in the incidence of taxation, they will see that *their own prosperity, and the future prospects of their children, have been wrecked*, through the eager greed and reckless ambition of a comparative handful of wealthy men; and they will, by excluding, as far as possible, from the House of Representatives, all men identified with those great proprietors, take the only means of insuring that the burdens which have been incurred, in creating public

works for the advantage of the few, shall be placed on the shoulders of those who derived the benefit, instead of on the shoulders of the many who have in no way participated in that benefit. *Then, and not till then*, shall we be able to look forward to fixing our homes permanently in this colony, and to teaching our children sentiments of patriotic love for the land in which they have been born.

I have had occasion to mention the name of Sir George Grey, a statesman who has been more misrepresented and vilified, both by the Conservative journals and by *the representatives of vested interests*, than any other in New Zealand. Sir, I will read you the opinion of Sir George Grey's character given recently in the columns of the *Sydney Mail*, which, though a Conservative paper, is not blinded by hatred or self-interest, and is therefore honest enough to give a fair criticism. It says—"From Sir George Grey's politics we are often compelled to dissent, *but the man's devotion to New Zealand is supreme and unquestionable*. History will rank him with *patriots*, not with adventurers. He may be grievously wrong in some of his views, but, in the eyes of posterity, the *love he bears to the colony* in which he has spent the strength of his life, *will cover a multitude of mistakes*." This is a generous criticism, vigorously expressed, and which I, for one, cordially endorse; though doubtless he has at times allowed his zeal for the welfare of the masses of the people to outrun his discretion; and he would probably have been able to achieve a greater measure of reform if he had attempted far less at once, and educated, so to speak, the people up to his level gradually. I believe that the time will come when the great bulk of the people of New Zealand will look back with feelings of love and reverence to the name of Sir George Grey, who in his old ago fought their battle almost single-handed, with an indomitable pluck and an earnest self-sacrifice worthy of all honour; abused and insulted though he has been, by those who would have, if possible, crushed out the liberties of the people of New Zealand for ever, and built up an oligarchy worse than the feudal system of old; inasmuch as it would have been based on the power of wealth alone, where consequently sordid meanness or grasping avarice would have usurped the leading positions in the State, instead of being based, as in feudal times, on the obligation of fighting side by side in defence of their country, under which system chivalry and patriotism were the characteristics of those who took the leading positions in the State.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I have to apologise for having detained you so long; but, having spent the best years of my life in Now Zealand, I have a heartfelt interest in the welfare and prosperity of our adopted country. I have taken some trouble to put my views at length before you, feeling that the subject is one which, unless gone into fully and exhaustively, had better be left alone altogether. Should any of our members be able to bring forward arguments in debate, tending to prove that the monopoly of the land is not so detrimental to the true interests of the colony as it appears to me to be, or that I have in this paper underrated the resources of the country, and that our burdens are not likely to prove so crushing to us all as I have been led believe, I shall be only too happy to be convinced by their arguments. In the meantime, I can only express a hope that we may all live to see the whole of the good land of the colony thickly settled upon by an industrious and contented population, *then, and not till then*, shall we be able to acknowledge the benefit derivable from our railways, roads, bridges, and other monuments of *Sir Julius Vogels Public Works Policy of* 1870.

May each one of us live to see that time, and the consequent prosperity of the land which has been hopefully, if somewhat ambitiously, called "the Britain of the South."

Vignette

Contents.

Local Self-Government,

By F J. Moss, Esq., M.H.R.

LOCAL Self-Government will probably, at no distant time, form the chief dividing line between parties. It underlies all our political questions, and no Ministry has been able altogether to avoid it since the destruction of the old provincial institutions in which its principles were embodied. The loan policy has enabled Ministries to dally with Local Government in the past. But that resort must cease when people have discovered that an unsystematic and reckless borrowing policy means permanent burdens for all, while the permanent gain is for comparatively few. Last session the sum appropriated from the Consolidated Revenue was three million three hundred and twenty-eight thousand pounds. Of this vast sum, only forty-seven thousand pounds were available for even the pretence of public works. Additions and repairs to buildings, furniture, and similar items absorbed nearly all of this small provision excepting a poor £10.000 for tracks on goldfields, and £3,000 for prospecting. The whole of the great balance was needed to pay interest on loans, departments, the working of the railways,

the cost of education (exclusive of school buildings), and the maintenance of hospitals and asylums.

There remain the land sales, a fluctuating and decreasing sum, but which were estimated to produce £330,000 for the current year. The Survey and Crown Lands Departments, extermination of rabbits and a few minor claims, absorb £154,000 of this amount. Two Reclamation Boards (New Plymouth and Lake Ellesmere) take £50,000, and certain local bodies get £35,000 for their share of the proceeds of deterred payment lands. The ordinary subsidies to local bodies will absorb probably £90,000 more. Here we have the only source, except loans, from which the smallest aid in opening up the country is to be expected.

Let us turn to the loans. From them we have now to look for roads and bridges, public buildings, water works, lighthouses and telegraphs, land purchase and immigration. These, with the departments connected with public works and railway construction, absorb nearly £700,000 during the year. The construction of railways takes nearly a million, and £184,000 was required for contingent defence. It will be seen from this brief sketch how unhealthily dependent we are becoming upon loans. If we do not take care, borrowing must become our normal state. The best and surest means of taking care is to bring down the enormous central expenditure, and to begin by reducing the number of members in our overgrown Legislature to at least one-half. This can only be accomplished by handing over local duties to well organised local bodies by whom they can be more efficiently and more economically performed.

In this light, local self-government is an important question of administration. Finance is dependent upon local government, and not local government upon finance. But I venture to say that it is of still graver moment if regarded from the ground of a higher policy; and that the fate of those who come after us must largely depend upon its satisfactory solution. Shall New Zealand continue its march as the well ordered and prosperous Democracy it has hitherto been? Or shall it, as wealth increases and society becomes more artificial, sink into an Oligarchy, with the social misery and political servitude from which an Oligarchy is always more or less inseparable? It is this consideration which gives dignity and weight to a question that might well be relegated to the background of politics if it concerned only the power of the people to control small local works, and to regulate small local affairs. Let us therefore first glance at

The Political Aspect.

The old New Zealand institutions were based upon the incontestible fact that its people were a Democracy. They had left behind them the well-established and varied political orders and social classes which time and circumstance have produced at home. The Provincial Governments were almost entirely democratic. There was a wide suffrage, with elected Legislatures and elected Executive Chiefs. The General Government was somewhat differently constituted. Prerogative was represented by a nominated Upper House and a nominated Executive Chief, The Governor of the Colony was supposed to exercise this prerogative as the representative of our gracious Queen. In reality it was exercised by the Colonial Ministry, uncontrolled by the constant regard for the good understanding between the Sovereign and the people, and by the ancient usages and traditions, which influence a Ministry at home. Nor did there rest upon our Upper House a shadow even of the personal and political responsibilities which press upon the House of Lords, whose place in our system it was designed to fill.

Unfortunately the Imperial Act which created our Government was passed at a time when democracy was regarded in England with a hatred and mistrust which have now happily passed away. That New Zealand was a Democracy, and that its physical formation precluded the country being governed from any one centre, could not be gainsaid. But it was resolved that democracy should be controlled. Hence the general Government, embodying the antagonistic element of nomineeism, was not only made supreme but was endowed with a concurrent jurisdiction against which Mr Gladstone and other eminent men in Parliament vainly protested at the time. They urged, in the strongest terms, that Democracy and hearty Loyalty had gone together in the best times in the old colonies of England's earlier days, and that they might well be trusted to go together in the new. But they urged in vain. A provision that the Upper House should be elected by the Provincial Councils was struck out and they were left defenceless in the hands of the General Legislature. Gradually the General Government developed the principle of antagonism on which it rested. In creasing wealth and population, and increasing diversity of interests and pursuits, gave to it ever increasing temptations and opportunities. In the conflict that ensued the Provincial Councils broke away from the control of the powerful party which aspired, in those days, "to curb democracy" by establishing the English system of a governing class in a country in which such a class had always been unknown, The General Government, on the contrary, unobserved and unregarded, fell into their hands. Skilfully taking advantage of their own power and of defects in the constitution of Provincial Governments, they reduced them, by constant aggression, to poverty, weakness and contempt. In 1876, the conflict culminated in the destruction of the provinces, and hundreds of trained men went forth from the provincial councils bent on making their principles prevail in the General Legislature which they had

previously been too well occupied to regard. The House of Representatives was overwhelmed by what those of the old school called "a wave of democracy," and its halls were filled with men determined, above all things, to guard against the ascendancy of particular classes or particular sets of men which they clearly saw that Centralism was sure to produce.

Provincial Institutions.

Excellent as were these institutions in principle, and admirably as they managed affairs in the early days when the Assembly was yet too weak to molest them, they had inherent defects. Their sphere of action was neither defined nor independent. Their finance was dependent on that of the General Government, and they suffered by its wasteful extravagance and needless wars. They were prohibited from passing laws that created a criminal offence and, being thus deprived of the power of compelling statutory declarations, they could only raise a revenue by the rudest and most inefficient means. Their laws had to receive the sanction of the General Government and their elected chief was made responsible to it and not to the people who elected him. The latter was a fatal defect. It forced the Councils to resort to a system of "responsible ministries" unsuited to Legislatures of their character. With an elected chief, the Executive and Legislature might easily have been kept distinct. A con- tinuous and steady control over the finances and over the administration, might have been found in the well-proved expedient of giving to the Councils power to override the veto of the Superintendent by a fixed majority of their members. Had they possessed this power, common in similarly constituted Legislatures, the work of the largest province could have been done by the Superintendent with a couple of secretaries (of his own selection and approved by the Council) instead of with the responsible advisers," by whom the Council was obliged to surround him. Had this been done we should have been saved the party intrigues and the mimic political struggles which so ably aided the General Government in combating institutions that it was bent upon destroying, but which a truer wisdom would have induced it to reform.

Finance.

The abolition of the old Local Governments brought no diminution in public expenditure and no aid to the Treasury. On the contrary, the expenditure has increased, and in such a form as to be much less under control. One hundred and forty legislators now do, at enormous cost, that which Provincial Councils did far more economically. A host of ministers, under-secretaries, private secretaries, royal commissions, nominee boards, chairmen of counties, county officers, and civil servants of all kinds, are now needed to do work which the Provincial Governments did more simply and cheaply. Local Self-Government cannot, therefore, be regarded as injuriously affecting colonial finance It would only be necessary to decide what sources of revenue should be retained by the General Government and what sources be handed over to such Local Governments as might be created. This would depend upon the work and responsibilities assigned to each, and must be considered by those who may have to undertake the re-establishment of Local Government. It would be their further duty to propose some equitable arrangement, in order that available funds may be so distributed as to balance the great disproportion in the assets that would be handed over to different portions of the colony. For example, the railway expenditure in the Middle Island has so much exceeded that in the North that, on the 31st March 1881, there were 845 miles open in the former and only 432 miles in the latter. The surplus of railway receipts over expenditure in the Midele Island for the year was consequently £265,000. In the North Island it was only £50,000. If the railways were handed over to one or more Local Governments in each Island, this great disparity, as well as the value of the Crown Lands and of other assets that might be divided among them, must be taken into account. A ready way of equalising these differences would be to issue General Government debentures to each Local Government, in such proportions as a careful investigation might prove to be just. The interest on these debentures would add to the local revenues until works—such as those of the Auckland-Taranaki Railway—could be advantageously begun. It would be a useful safeguard to require that no Appropriations or Loan Acts of Local Legislatures should be legal unless passed by an absolute majority of two-thirds of the members. This provision has been found an admirable check on hasty extravagance wherever it has been tried, and would have been of great use in the old Provincial Governments.

In the meantime it may be useful to see how the present expenditure can be roughly divided by analysis of the Appropriation Act of last session into General and Local charges respectively,

General Charges.

Here we see how large is the proportion of the General Government Expenditure which has to be met without annual appropriation, and is practically above control.

Local Charges.

If we suppose that the remaining services of the country would be performed under Local Legislatures, we should have them dealing with an expenditure of £1,188,649 To analyse this expenditure accurately, it would be necessary to have House in the General Assembly of the Colony. They must be started fairly on their new career by such an equitable provision as will atone for inequalities produced by the past expenditure of loans and land fund in particular localities. Beyond this provision, they must raise their own revenue and ought assuredly to do it better than the General Assembly can do it for them. The Railway Revenue, the Property Tax and other direct taxes might be handed over to them. To the General Government would remain the Customs and other indirect taxes and the fees earned in the administration of the Departments left to it. The public debt, the Natives, the Supreme Court, and all work affecting the colony as a whole, would remain with the Assembly. The Crown .Lands could be better dealt with provincially in a country in which uniformity of price and of administration has already been found impracticable. Whether there should be two provinces or four, or what other number, ought to depend on the area that can be conveniently administered from a common centre, and yet be sufficiently large to enable its Government to raise an adequate revenue. Administration in the provinces, as well as in the General Government, should be decentralised so as to secure the distribution of power and patronage. As many local bodies as possible should be elected at one and the same time, so as to impose the least burden on the electors in accordance with the custom in all democratic countries. Still further following that custom, it might be well in cases like Road Boards, for example, to vest the administration in a lesser number of members. It is a question whether we should not have a keener sense of responsibility and a more faithful performance of duty if the work were left, in many cases, to a single, annually elected overseer, than when left to a Board which too often serves to shield from responsibility the one or two active members under whose control it may fall, These are important points in order that Local Self-Government may be conducted with the least possible burden to the people, but they are details which it is unnecessary now to consider. I have endeavoured rather to show in broad outline the grounds on which Local Self-Government is to be regarded as a paramount question, and the means by which, in my humble opinion, it can be best secured. Attempts were made by the late Ministry to replace by nominated "Roads Construction Boards" and other composite and fancifully constructed bodies, the provincial institutions which some of their number took the most active part in destroying. It is useless now to discuss proposals that were condemned as soon as heard. Ministries, by plunging the country into deeper debt, may avoid a settlement of the troublesome subject a little longer. The field is still a blank, but they cannot leave it a blank without imperilling the highest interests of our descendants even more than those which immediately concern ourselves. We leave to those descendants a great public debt. Let us also leave to them the priceless blessing of full and perfect self-government, without which we may build up a rich and powerful country, but assuredly neither a prosperous nor a contented people.

Vignette

H. Brett, General Steam Printer, Wyndham-street, Auckland.

Wednesday, February 1, 1882.

The LORD MAYOR presided on Wednesday at the Mansion House over a large, influential, and enthusiastic meeting, convened "to express public opinion upon the outrages inflicted upon the Jews in various parts of Russia and Russian Poland." The Egyptian Hall was crowded in every available part, and the reserved seats on the platform were altogether inadequate to accommodate those who were invited to take part in the proceedings. Lady Burdett-Coutts-Bartlett sat on the right of the Lord Mayor, and amongst those present were: The Earl of Shaftsbury; The Lord Bishop of London; The Lord Bishop of Oxford; Canon Farrar; Rev. Newman Hall; Canon Spence; Sir Julian Goldsmid; Edward Clarke, Esq., M.P.; Lord Reay; Lord A. Russell, M.P.; Lord Stanley of Alderley; Mr. Alfred Goldsmid; Sir George Bowyer; the Honourable Saul Samuel; Mr. Alderman Cotton; Mr. Phillip Callan, M.P.; Lord Elcho; Dr. Munro; Dean Plumptre; The Dean of Wells; Rev. John Wilkinson; Dean Bagot; Alderman Breffit; Rev. Edward Henry Bickersteth; Rev. Charles Voysey; Rev. Henry Landsdell; Rev. Dr. Martineau; Professor Rogers, M.P.; Mr. H. Brinsley Sheridan, M.P.; Dr. Gladstone; Mr. C. McLaren, M.P.; Rev. Canon Jenkyns; Mr. A. Cohen, Q.C., M.P.; Sir W. Rose Robinson; Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, Bart., M.P.; Hon. Rollo Russell; Rev. Dr. H. Adler; Rev. A. L. Green; Sir Alex. Galt; Mr. F. W. Buxton, M.P.; Mr. Cyril Flower, M.P.; Rev. Dr. Mensor; Rev. Horrocks Cocks; Rev. Alex. J. D. D'Orsey; Dr. Henry Behrend; Rev. G. C. Bellewes; Mr. Montague Guest, M.P.; Mr. Magniac, M.P.; Archdeacon Blunt; Rev. J. Wilkinson; Lady Winford and Hon. Miss Mostyn; Sir A. Otway, M.P.; Rev. Dr. Gordon; Rev. W. Cadman; Archdeacon Brooks; Mr. T. Rogers, M.P.; Right Rev. Monsignor Capel; D. Grant, Esq., M.P.; Sir J. Vogel; Sergt. Simon, M.P.; Professor Bryce, M.P.: Mr. W. T. Merriott, Q.C., M.P.; Mr. J. B. Montefiore; Mr. Edward M. Leon; Mr. Pugh; Lord Haldan Malcolm; Mr. Leopold Schloss; Rev. H. Jephson; Mr. I. Seligman; Mr. H. L. Beddington; Mr. J. Bergtheil; Rev. W. R. Rowe; Alderman Lawrence, M.P.; Sir T. Lawrence; Mr. Robert

Browning; Louisa Lady Goldsmid, Dr. A. Asher; Countess D'Avigdor; Mr. Israel Hart, High Bailiff of Leicester; Alderman Emanuel, of Southsea; M. Léon Jolivard, &c.

The LORD MAYOR, in opening the proceedings, said: My lords, ladies, and gentlemen—At the request and in compliance with the memorial which has been presented to me, and which has been most influentially signed by men whose names are foremost in the world for their philanthropy, for their political knowledge, and for their political courage, but no less also for their unswerving determination to advance only the interests of humanity—(cheers)—and the interests of their country I have called this meeting. (Hear, hear). If this memorial had been presented to me by any one section of society, I need hardly say, that placed as I am in this responsible position, I should hardly have dared to fill this hall with such an audience as I have here at present. But if you will look at the memorial, with the roll of names attached to it, you will see that every creed in religion is represented—(great cheering)—that the great Christian world, severed and divided as it is, has combined in this memorial to request me to call this meeting. If you take the political creeds of our country, you will find that on all sides men, whatever their views in political matters be, combined to request me to call this meeting today. (Hear, hear). I feel, therefore, that I shall have the sympathy not only of those who are here present, but that the country is with us on this platform, and with those gentlemen whom I shall have the honour presently to call upon to propose some resolutions. I need perhaps hardly add—but perhaps I should be wanting in my duty if I did not say—that the sympathies of the women of England has been invoked on this great occasion, and that lady whose name stands beyond all others for philanthropy, for works of charity, for works of beneficence, and for works which stand in the old defence of interests of the religions instruction of poorer classes, is on the platform on my right—(great cheering)—willing to aid in another sympathy which I believe will add even lustre to the name of the Baroness Burdett Coutts. (Renewed cheering). I need not detain you with any further observations, because there are several gentlemen here who I have no doubt will address you in most eloquent strains, but I have been asked by the Committee, and by those gentlemen who have been associated with me in calling this meeting, to read to you some of the letters which I have received, because they come from men of so high and pronounced opinions, and of so varied opinions also, that it is well perhaps in their absence their sentiments should be made known to the meeting. The first letter that I have to read to you is from the Archbishop of Canterbury. It is as follows:—

MY DEAR LORD,—It is a distress to me that I am forbidden by my medical attendant to take part in the meeting your lordship has undertaken to call together to enter an emphatic protest against the recent outrages to which the Jewish people have been exposed. Unable to attend myself, I have asked Canon Farrar to be present and express the horror with which I contemplate the disgrace brought on the Christian name by these shameful persecutions.

Yours sincerely,

A. C. Cantuar.

The Duke of Westminster has written. He says:—

I am unable to attend the meeting to-morrow. I cannot, however, repress my feeling of horror and of indignation at the barbarities and ruin worked upon the defenceless Jews in Russia. I am afraid there can be no doubt as to an enormous amount of great and hideous wrong-doing; but we want more information—to obtain which every effort should be made, and for acquiring which, I believe, the Russian Government are willing to give facilities. Meanwhile, I can well understand, and can sympathise with the feeling that prompts thousands of our follow-countrymen to givent vent to their indignation against the perpetrators of these barbarities, and of sympathy with those who have suffered and are suffering under these enormities.

Again, I have a letter from the Bishop of Exeter. He says:—

I should have greatly desired to join my voice to those that will be uplifted in protest against such cruelties. No language can well be thought too strong to declare our abhorrence of such conduct, and our appeal to the Russian authorities to use every effort to punish it and prevent its repetition.

Then I have a very interesting letter from the Bishop of Manchester. He says:—

As I signed the requisition to the Lord Mayor, begging him to call a public meeting at the Mansion House, at which an opportunity might be given for the expression of the feeling that, I imagine, is strong in the hearts of all Englishmen with regard to the outrages to which the Jews appear to have been subjected in Russia, I regret that it is out of my power to attend that meeting in person; but the Mayor has called a similar meeting at Manchester, on 3rd February, at which I hope to be present, and when I shall have an opportunity of saying what I feel. I will merely say now that these outrages, as they have been reported in England, have aroused in my breast the liveliest feelings of pity and indignation. I cannot for a moment believe that any civilized Government could either encourage or connive at them, and it seems to me that the Government of Russia owes it to the place it occupies in Christian Europe to extend the strong arm of its protection to the weak and

helpless, and to repress, with all the force at its command, acts of pillage and violence which one would have thought were only possible in some byegone age of barbarism.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol writes:—

I particularly regret that diocesan business of importance prevents me attending and raising my poor voice against the horrors and barbarities that have taken place. Pray express publicly, if you think fit, my deep regret that I am prevented attending the meeting, and that I thus lose this opportunity of joining with others in expressing abhorrence at the atrocities perpetrated in a Christian country against God's ancient people—the Jews.

Mr. Alfred Tennyson writes:—

I am unable to be present at the Mansion House on 1st February. Not the less am I dismayed by the reports of this madness of hatred against the Jews (whatever the possible provocation), and of the unspeakable barbarities consequent. If they are not universally denounced, it can only be that they are so alien to the spirit of the age as to be almost unbelievable. The stronger the national protest the better. Our Government, however, may have reason to fear that they may do more harm than good in official intervention.

The Master of Balliol, Professor Dyer, writes:—

The cruelties which have been inflicted on the Jews in Russia are detestable, and should be denounced by the unanimous opinion of civilized nations.

Lord Kinnaird writes:—

Feeling deeply how scandalous are the outrages inflicted upon the Jews in Russia, and I may add, elsewhere, I should have wished by my presence at your meeting to manifest my sympathy, and to testify my abhorrence of the wrongs to which they have been subjected.

The Dean of Ripon writes:—

I hope the meeting will be very largely attended, and that the protest against the cruel and cowardly persecution of the Jews in Russia will be strong enough to check the continuance of barbarities which are a disgrace to the Christian name. I hope that every Mayor in England will follow your good example in convening a public meeting on the subject.

Mr. Karl Blind says:—

Strongly sympathising as I do with the praiseworthy object in view, I can only say that every person with a human heart, every one able to influence public opinion, every statesman worthy of the name, ought to join in condemning this mediæ valish madness which is passing over large parts of Europe, and which, if not speedily stopped, by united efforts, will dishonour a so-called age of progress and make it a byword for the future historian.

Mr. W. Fowler, M.P. for Wolverhampton, writes:—

It is the duty of Englishmen, irrespective of creed or party, to utter their strongest protest against this brutal and barbarous persecution. If the Russian Government have sanctioned, connived at, or condoned these fiendish cruelties, no considerations of a political or dynastic character should be allowed to stifle the voice of England.

The Venerable Dr. Adler, the Chief Rabbi, writes:—

MY DEAR LORD MAYOR,—I regret more deeply than I can express that the state of my health renders it impossible to me to be present at the public meeting to be hold at the Mansion House to-morrow, under your Lordship's presidency.

I need hardly assure your Lordship how keen is the grief which I share with every member of my community at the pitiable calamities suffered by my coreligionists in Russia.

But in the midst of the darkness which overshadows my oppressed brethren there is, happily, a gleam of light. For there appears to me no small probability that deliverance may arise through the influence of the public opinion of free and enlightened England, and through the noble and spontaneous outburst of sympathy from our Christian fellow-countrymen. Grateful, indeed, do I feel, in common with every Israelite in this land, for the enthusiastic and practical sympathy which has just found utterence; and the grief which oppresses my heart at the dire woes of my brethren is not a little assuaged by the consoling thought that I have lived to witness in the people of England the noblest development of religious toleration—the union of all creeds on the broad platform of common humanity.

May God, our common Father, bless your philanthropic efforts, and crown them with success.

Believe me, my Dear Lord Mayor,

Yours very faithfully, The Bight

N. Adler, Dr.

Hon. John Whitaker Ellis,
Lord Mayor.
Brighton,

31st January.

I will read a characteristic letter from the Rev. C. H. Spurgeon. He says:—

I am sorry that I am quite prevented by prior engagements from being at the Mansion House to speak against the outrages committed upon the Jews. I am, however, relieved by the belief that the heart of England is one in a strong feeling of indignation at the inhuman conduct of certain savages in Russia. Every man and woman amongst us feels eloquently on behalf of our fellow men who are subjected to plunder and death, and still more for our sisters, to whom even worse treatment has been meted out. Hence you have the less need of speeches and orations. As a Christian, I feel that the name of our Redeemer is dishonoured by such conduct on the part of his professed followers. As a Nonconformist and a Liberal, believing in the equal rights of all men to dwell in freedom and safety, I must protest against a state of things in which the Jew is made an outlaw. Lastly, as a man, I would mourn in my inmost soul that any beings in human form should be capable of crimes such as those which have made Russia red with Israelitish blood. But what need even of these few sentences? The oppressed are sure of advocates wherever Englishmen assemble.

Letters were also read from the Earl of Roseberry (which was received with loud cheers), Sir Benjamin Philips, Baron Henry De Worms, M.P., and the Hon. George Russell.

(The reading of all these letters was received with loud applause.)

And now my lords, ladies, and gentlemen, I have to inform you that, in addition to the numerous distinguished men you see on the platform, the Bishop of Oxford has just honoured us with his presence. (Great cheering.) I will now ask the Earl of Shaftesbury to propose the first resolution. (Cheers.)

The EARL OF SHAFTESBURY, who was received with loud and long continued applause, then moved the first resolution, "That in the opinion of this meeting, the persecutions and outrages which the Jews in many parts of the Russian dominions have for several months past suffered are an offence on Christian civilisation, and to be deeply deplored." His Lordship said,—My Lord Mayor, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—The Lord Mayor has very rightly described the great intelligence of this meeting; it is special and peculiar in its character. There may be or there may not be a precedent for such a meeting as this, but I hold that in these days of what is called the solidarity of nations, enlarged responsibilities and great forces of distinguished men, if there is not a precedent it ought to be established on this very day—(cheers)—and I am glad the people of England have come forward to make a solemn declaration that in their belief there are moral and material views of it. There is a moral view which may become the more permanent, and it is our duty to resort to those moral views, when for the use of the material we have neither the right nor the power. But I dare say it may be asked what is the use of the representations and your memorials when they are thrust aside and thrown into the waste paper basket? My lord, we have a very strong feeling and opinion upon the power of an open and constantly repeated affirmation of a great principle founded upon justice and humanity. It carries with it prodigious weight. Have we not seen in time past and in the present day the marvellous influence produced by a good public opinion upon such states of tilings as existed in Turkey upon the Sultan of Turkey and the Shah of Persia? They succumbed to the influence of that opinion, because if they did not it would endanger their reputation with all the world around them. In the time of that stern and powerful emperor, the Emperor Nicholas, was he indifferent to public opinion, especially the opinion of England? I know well, from a conversation held with him by one of my most intimate friends, who reported to me what had passed, that the Emperor of Russia of that day (the Emperor Nicholas) felt deeply and acutely the opinion of England. And shall we not, my lord, hope that the humane and civilized prince, his successor, who now sits upon the throne of all the Russias—shall we not hope and believe that he will feel the influence of such a public voice as this? I believe it will be so. I believe it is far beyond any power to disregard it. I believe in the words of Richard Hooker long ago, who writing about the Law Divine, said:—"The very meanest bow to its influence, and the very greatest are not exempt from its power." (Cheers.) It is not necessary to dwell in detail upon all the horrible circumstances of these events of which we are speaking, enforced as they are by murder, lust, rapine, and destruction; they are set before the world in the columns of the *Times* and other papers. (Hear, hear.) They have been supported by testimony which cannot possibly be surpassed, and especially by the wise, touching, and unanswerable memorial presented by the Jewish community. (Cheers.) My lord, we are filled with horror and disgust, and we are come here for the purpose of expressing our opinions, and of praying God that a stop may be put to those atrocities that have afflicted, and that are a disgrace to the generation, and the age in which we live. (Great cheering.) To all statesmen denials are made, and the denials come in from official authority. Of course it was

to be expected that that should be so—(hear, hear)—but I maintain from all that I have heard that the evidence in favour of the truth of our statements is so great, so overwhelming, and so powerful, as to take away all hesitation whatever as to the acceptance of that evidence. And if they say it is exaggeration, I give them the benefit of the doubt, for if there is a tenth part true of all that has been stated, it is quite sufficient to merit our condemnation. But they are not content with denials in the sense of refutation; they proceed further, and in these quasi-official docu- ments—though they are as official as any that ever came out of the Russian Chancellerie—they proceed to imputation. And what do they say of the movements of the people of England, and what do they say of the gathering here? They say that the object of this movement is one of a party spirit to disturb the peace and happiness of Mr. Gladstone. (Great laughter.) Why, my lord, of all the wild assertions that ever were made this is the very wildest. (Loud cheers.) Look to the signatures to the requisition. I doubt whether you can see one Conservative upon it. Let me take a few names—Mr. Matthew Arnold, Sir John Lubbock, and others. Are they full of rancour and jealousy against the Prime Minister? I can only say, if this case was not so appalling, such an assertion would be childish and contemptible. They know that—if they feel it, they know that this is a free meeting, of free citizens; that we are come here to express our deep regard for the rights of the human race. It is not simply because those who are persecuted are Jews; it is not simply for that we are brought here. An Englishman would feel the same for any one, whether he were Hindoo, Mahomedan, or Pagan. (Cheers.) I know that many have a deep and special feeling towards the Hebrew race. I have myself, I confess it, most deeply and most strongly; but I say we are met here on one great universal principle. If there is one thing that an Englishman loves better than another, it is freedom—(loud cheers)—that every living soul should be as free and as happy as he is himself. (Hear, hear.) But we must not look at it in that light alone. We must clear the ground; we must look at another charge. They say that all this movement arises out of hatred to Russia. (Cheers.) My lords and gentlemen, I do not believe it. (Hear, hear.) I cannot answer for what may be the feelings of private individuals, but I will boldly take upon myself to say that the feeling of the great mass of the people of England is neither of hate nor of fear of the Russian people. (Loud and long continued cheering.) Honoured as I have been to-day in having the post assigned to me to move the first resolution—I may speak for myself—hatred of Russia there is none. (Hear, hear.) Let me recall this to your recollection. When a movement was made, and a committee was formed for the purpose of protesting against the outrages committed on the wretched Bulgarians, I was there; and I was your president at the meeting. At that time I said—and I never regretted what I said—"the charge of hatred to Russia in this case does not apply to me." (Cheers.) I did not regret it then, I have not regretted it, and I am not going to regret it now. (Hear, hear.) I do not fear to see, nay, I almost wish to see the Russians upon the shores of the Bosphorus. (Cheers.) So far from this being their feeling towards Russia, I believe amongst the mass of our people it is slightly the reverse. (Cheers.) I will boldly maintain that there is nothing in the shape or form of malignant hatred; on the contrary, I am satisfied that in these three kingdoms there is at the present moment a deep sympathy with the people of Russia, and with their ruler, in the terrible calamities that have fallen upon the Imperial family. (Hear, hear.) When the late Emperor fell by the hands of those demoniacal assassins, our country was filled with horror and dismay; they rose and spoke as one man, not only because they were appalled by the frightful crime, but because they remem- bered that the father—and I trust that they will remember it in the son—was the great and glorious emancipator of two millions of slaves—(cheers)—and if we are to approach the Emperor, I am disposed to put it to his Imperial Majesty, what are we asking after all? Are we asking anything to prohibit his dignity or lower his power? Nay! on the contrary, are we not asking him to do that which shall conduce very much to his honor? Are we not asking him to do judgment and justice to a large body of his loyal and suffering people? Are we not asking him to restrain violence, murder, outrage, spoliation? Are we not asking him to be of service to the Jews of Russia? Are we not asking him to enter upon the greatest and noblest exercise of power, "to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free!" My lord, this is the purpose and object of our meeting; this will be the prayer of our memorial, and may God in His mercy prosper the removal of these horrors unto the comfort of the Jewish people, on whose behalf we now appeal. His Lordship concluded by reading the resolution.

The BISHOP OF LONDON: One circumstance, my Lord Mayor, and one circumstance alone, justifies me to rise at your request to second this resolution, because such a meeting as this I am not fitted to address, and in the presence of those I see around me on the platform; and that one circumstance is the necessary absence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. I quite admit—indeed I deeply feel—that the Church of England ought not, and I am sure will not be backward in joining in the expression of feelings of indignant sorrow—for it is indignant sorrow—in the statements that have come before us lately in regard to the treatment of the Jews in Russia; and in the absence of the Archbishop it may not be presumptuous in me, the Bishop of the most populous and most prominent diocese in England, if I venture, in the absence of any one more fitted for the office, to second the resolution which has been proposed. Happily for me and you no words are needed. The case has been stated to you by the noble Earl with a vigor which shows that age has not diminished his power of speech any more than it has enfeebled, and never can enfeeble, his sympathy with the suffering and his sense of indignation at

injustice and crime. (Cheers). The facts can scarcely be denied. If they could have been denied—thoroughly denied—what need for all these reasons that have been assigned why the English should be so moved at reading these atrocities? (Cheers). If the Russian Government could be able to say the statements are false and can be proved to be false, they need not have said that the English have a hatred of Russia, or that we are unfavourable to, or in favour of, this or that ministry. (Hear, hear). We have seen the papers: we have seen an attempt, hardly to deny the facts, but certainly to palliate them, and palliate them by excuses, not only improbable but utterly inadequate, and set before us, I must say, with the cynical indifference which we would be very thankful to believe, had not been placed in the paper by the hands of a foreigner. (Hear, hear). There is one circumstance, my Lord Mayor, and it is the only one I dwell upon, there is one circumstance in these atrocities which must make every member of the Church—indeed every Christian—feel together with his indignation, a certain feeling of shame. A few years back our country was horrified with the accounts of atrocities committed in what were then certain provinces of the Turkish Empire. The country was moved: but we had the consolation of knowing that though the sufferers were Christians the perpetrators were men of another creed. Now, alas, the case is reversed, and they who perpetrate these atrocities are men who bear the name of Christians. So that the persecution of the middle ages, on which history has long set the stamp of reprobation, are being reproduced in this latter part of the nineteenth century, and the dark stain of rapine and lust and murder is let fall again upon the fair fame of Christianity. We do feel this, my Lord Mayor, and I will venture to say that not in this crowded assembly alone, not in this metropolis merely, but in the cities and large towns of England is the sympathy and horror felt which has been expressed before you to-day, and which has called us together; but in the most quiet parsonage, and the most retired village throughout England there is the same feeling of mingled horror, and grief, and shame, when they are told that now again, in days of civilization, in the days when we think ourselves, and with reason, better than our fathers in some respects, that again a Christain nation is persecuting the Jews—(cheers)—and knowing this, my Lord Mayor, I venture to assume that in speaking here upon this platform I may, without presumption—or if it is presumption it will very easily be pardoned—I may not in my name, but in the name of every member of the Church of England, second the resolution which Lord Shaftsbury has now proposed. (Loud cheers).

CARDINAL MANNING, who was received with great cheering, said: My Lord Mayor, my Lord Shaftsbury, Ladies and Gentlemen, it has often fallen to my lot to move a resolution in meetings such as this; but never in my memory have I moved a resolution with more perfect conviction, or with more reason, or with more entire concurrence with the feelings of my heart than I do on this occasion. (Hear, hear). My lord, before using any further words, it will, perhaps, be proper to read the resolution I have to propose. It is to this effect:—"That this meeting, while disclaiming any right or desire to interfere in the internal affairs of another country, and desiring that the most amicable relations between England and Russia should be preserved, feels it a duty to express its opinion that the laws of Russia relating to Jews tend to degrade them in the eyes of the Christian population, and to expose Russian Jewish subjects to the outbreaks of fanatical ignorance." (Cheers). I need not disclaim, for I accept the eloquent disclaimer of the noble Earl, that we are not met here for a political purpose. If there was a suspicion of any party politics I should not be standing here (hear, hear); but it is because I believe we are high above all the turmoils and all the conflicts of party politics, and in the serene region of human sympathy and human justice, that I am here to-day. I can only declare that nothing can be further from my intention—as I am confident nothing is further from yours—than to do that which I believe would be a violation of the laws of mutual peace, order, and respect which bind nations together, viz., that we should attempt here to interfere in the domestic legislation of Russia. (Hear, hear). And I am also bound to say, I share heartily in the words of veneration used by the noble Earl towards the Imperial family of Russia. No man can have watched the last years of that Imperial family, no man can know the condition in which His Imperial Majesty now stands, without a profound sympathy, which would at once control any disposition on our part to use a single expression which could convey the wound of the mind to its heart. Therefore, I disclaim absolutely and altogether that nothing which passes from my lips, at least, and I think I may speak in the name of everyone in this meeting, assumes a character inconsistent with the veneration I hold for the Emperor of Russia. Further, I may say that, while I do not pretend to touch upon any internal question in the legislation of Russia, there are laws larger than any Russian legislation, there are laws which are not one in London and another in St. Petersburg, and another in Moscow, they are the same in every place—I speak of the laws of human nature—the laws of God are the foundation of every law of man. (Cheers). Well, now, I must touch upon one point which I acknowledge has been painful to me. We have all watched during the last twelve months, the Antisemitic movement in Germany. I look upon that movement, first of all, in great abhorrence, as tending to disintegrate the foundations of social life, and I look upon the movement with great fear as the first lighting up of an animosity which has already taken flame in Russia, and may spread we know not where. (Hear, hear). I have read, with great regret, an elaborate article full, no doubt, of minute observations on the spot, written from Russia, in the "Nineteenth Century" of last year. In that article were given an account and an explanation of

those class animosities, and those class conflicts, which at this moment are so sharp in that country. I acknowledge that when I read that article my first feeling was "I am profoundly sorry that the power and the energy of the Old Testament should be so much greater than the power and energy of the New Testament; I am sorry to see that the spirit which has penetrated, that Rationalism has not sufficient Christian energy, and Christian power, and Christian virtue to render it impossible that those cultivated and refined and industrious, and energetic people, as they are, should endanger society in that great kingdom." I have also read, with pain, accounts of the condition of the Russian Jews, bringing against them accusations which, if I touch upon them, I must ask all my Jewish friends who hear me to believe that I reject them with incredulity and horror; I have read that the cause of what has happened in Russia now has been that they have been the pliers of infamous trade, usurers, and I know not what. When I read these accusations I ask, first, "And is outrage the remedy? Will this be cured by outrage, violence, crime, murder, and abominations of every sort?" Again, "Why is it, if it be true," which I do not believe—(hear, hear)—"Why is it that the Jews are in that condition?" "Are they not under penal laws; is there anything that can degrade a man more than to close against his intelligence and energy and industry all the honorable careers of public life? (Cheers). Can anything tend to debase and irritate the soul of man more than to be told you may not pass beyond the boundary; you may not go beyond or within a certain number of miles of the frontier; you may not dwell in that town or that province? One other thought occurred to me, and it was this: Why do not the people who bring these accusations against the Jews of Russia, bring them also against the Jews of Germany? Why do they not bring the same accusations against the Jews of France? If the charge be brought against the Jews of Russia, who will bring it against the Jews of England? (Hear, hear). For uprightness, refinement, generosity, for charity, for all that adorns man, for all the natural graces and virtues, where, I ask, will be found examples brighter or more full of true human excellences than in those of the Hebrew race in England? ("Thank you," and cheers). Well, now we are told that these accounts are not to be trusted. I will ask your lordship if there were to appear in the newspapers of the Continent, a long and minute narrative, that about the Egyption Hall—in Old Jewry, in Houndsditch, Shoreditch—there were murders, rapines, and oppression, and that the Lord Mayor of London was looking on; that the Metropolitan police did nothing; that the guards at the Tower were sent to mingle in the mob; whether you would not thank any man who gave you the opportunity of exposing and contradicting the accounts? We are, then, rendering a public service to the departments and ministry of Russia, and I believe our movement will bring consolation to the heart of the great prince who reigns over that vast empire. Let me suppose, for a moment, that these things have occurred, and I don't found my belief of the truth of them upon either the *Times* newspaper or the *Pall Mall Gazette*; I hold the proofs here in my hand—(cheers)—and from whom do they come? From an official document, from the report of the Minister of the Interior, General Ignatiew. These horrible atrocities had continued through May, June, and July, and in the month of August this document was issued. The first point in it is that he laments and deplores—what? The atrocities on the Jewish subjects of the Czar? By no means; but "the sad condition of the Christain inhabitants of the southern provinces." (A laugh). The next point is "that the main cause of those movements and riots—to which the Russians, as a nation, are strangers—was but a commercial one." The third point was this, that "the conduct of the Jews has called for the protests on the part of the people, as manifested in acts of violence and robbery." Fourthly, we are told by the Minister of the Interior, that the country is subject to malpractices, "which were, as is known, the cause of the agitation," To say nothing of the logic of the document, its tone and insinuations are most inflammatory, and I can readily see why, with the rescript in their hands, the Russian people should be encouraged to violence. The document then goes on to say that a commission has been appointed to enquire into what? First of all, "What are the trades of the Jews which are injurious to the inhabitants of the place?" Secondly, "What makes it impracticable to put into force the former laws limiting the rights of the Jews in the matter of buying and farming land, the trade in intoxicants and usury?" Thirdly, "How can those laws be altered so that they shall no longer be enabled to evade them, or what new laws are required to stop their pernicious conduct in business?" and lastly, "give (besides the answers to the foregoing questions) the following additional information; on the usury practised by the Jews in their dealings with Christians, in cities, towns, and villages; the number of public-houses kept by Jews in their own name, or in that of a Chris- tian; the number of persons in service with Jews, or under their control: the extent (acreage) of the land in their possession, by buying or farming; the number of Jewish agriculturalists." We have in our hands the Russian laws affecting the Jewish subjects of the Emperor. I would ask what is the remedy for a population in this state; is it more penal laws; is it to disqualify them from holding land; is it to forbid them to send their children to the higher places of education? No, my lord, I believe that the remedy of these things is twofold. I believe it is by putting in force, in a proper manner, the real Christian law. It was not by laws like those enacted against the Jews in Russia, that Christianity won the world, and won the Imperial power to execute justice among men. It will not be by laws other than these that the great Imperial power of the Russias, will blend with the wishes and feelings of the Jewish subjects of the Russian empire. The other remedy I believe to be is this, a stern and merciful execution of justice upon evil

doers—(cheers)—coupled with an equally stern and rigorous concession to all that is right in the law of nature and of God. (Cheers). All that is necessary for the protection of life and limb and liberty and property, all that constitutes human freedom—this, and nothing else than this, I believe, will be a remedy of the condition of things in the Russian empire at the present time. The Earl of Shaftsbury spoke very hopefully of what will be the effect of this meeting. Don't let us overrate it. If we think that this meeting will have done its work, and that we may cease to speak, I am afraid that its effect will not be all we ask. Neither let us underrate it. I believe that all through England, I will even say through the United Kingdom, there will be a response to this meeting in every place. Wheresoever the English tongue is spoken throughout the world, that which your Lordship has said, so eloquently and powerfully, will be known. I believe that at the very moment we are meeting here that a meeting of a similar kind is assembled in New York, and what passes here will he translated into every language of Europe, and it will pass even the frontiers of Russia. (Cheers). Like the light in the air, it cannot be excluded, and wheresoever there is human sympathy on earth, the declarations of our meeting here and the meetings held elsewhere will meet with response, and will tend to terminate these horrible atrocities. I have spoken on this question in the sense of natural and even political justice. There is a book which is common to the race of Israel and to us Christians. That book is the bond between us, and in that book I read that the people of Israel are the oldest people upon earth—the Russias, and the Austrias, and the Englands are but of yesterday, compared with that imperishable people, which with an inextinguishable light and immutable traditions and faith in the law of God, centred, as it is, all over the world, passed through the fires unscathed, trampled in the dust, yet never combining with the dust in which it is trampled—the people lives still, and we are in bonds of brotherhood with it. The New Testment rests upon the Old, they believe one-half of that for which we would give our lives. Let us, then, acknowledge that we are united in a common sympathy. My lord, I only hope this, that not one man in England, who calls himself civilised or Christian will have it in his heart to add, by a single word, to the sufferings of this great and ancient and noble people, but that we shall do all we can by labour, by speech, and by prayer, to lessen, if possible, these atrocious deeds. (Loud cheers).

Canon FARRAR, in seconding the resolution, said: "I think it is a good rule when you have a good cause to read not what those say who agree with you, but the opinions of those who disagree with you; and acting on that principle, I have read what has been said by the Russian papers on this question, and what has been said has been already referred to by the noble Earl. They call this agitation malicious, anti-Russian, and anti-philanthropic, and they say that we are founding our indignation on a mass of falsehood and exaggeration; that we are desirous of setting English and Russian society altogether by the ears, and that this was an opportunity which had been seized by Her Majesty's Opposition to weaken and embarrass the Government of Mr. Gladstone. Now, on the first point, some falsehood and some exaggeration doubtlessly there may have been, and we are, indeed, but too glad to believe it; but it is certain that we have not been listening to entirely unfounded and malicious charges, for the events of which we complain have been recorded in every European newspaper, and the facts authenticated by names, and dates, and places, which have come to us not only from Jewish sources, but also from other sources and correspondents, like the correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, who has gathered information on the very spot. Secondly, it is said that this is an agitation got up to damage Her Majesty's Government, but certainly the Duke of Westminster and the Earl of Rosebery are not the men to embarrass Mr. Gladstone's Government. The requisition for this meeting has been signed by a large number. I always have been a Liberal, and not a single Opposition leader has raised his voice against this meeting. And I am sure there is not one of us who would not abhor the notion of dragging the name of charity into the noisy arena of party-politics. There are none of us who would not be utterly ashamed to make a feeling of humanity an engine of political warfare. (Cheers.) The third charge is that of fostering enmity against Russia; but the noble Earl who has just addressed you is one who has devoted his whole life to promoting the peace and happiness of his fellow men. The Archbishop of Canterbury and Cardinal Manning, whose voice has never been wanting in the cause of the oppressed; the Bishops of Oxford and London, and the numerous ministers of all denominations who have signed the requisition, would think it a sin to violate the first principle of their religion which teaches them the universal fatherhood of God, and the universal brotherhood of man. (Applause.) The fact that Prince Lebanoff would not transmit to the Emperor of Russia the memorial of the Jews of England does indeed betray the fact that there is a certain amount of irritation against the Jews existing. All that I can say is, that nothing is further from our intentions than to foster or to deepen the irritation: we only want to raise a friendly remonstrance. We claim the right to remonstrate against those men of high rank who have by their words and actions fostered this deplorable hatred between race and race. Between the Russian and the Bulgarian atrocities there is no parallel. The crimes are, in many instances, analogous, but the position of the Turkish and Russian Governments were wholly different. We thought it right to interfere in the Bulgarian atrocities, and why should we not in the present instance? If not, is it because in the former the offenders were Mahomedans, and now they are Christians? Is it because in the former instance the government was the weak Government of Turkey, and in this the mighty Government of Russia? England has ever interfered in the cause

of freedom, and what we wish to do now is to approach Russia in the most respectful and friendly spirit and to ask her to do exactly for the Jews in Russia what we have done for them in England, namely, give them equal rights and equal privileges. (Cheers.)

Professor BRYCE, M.P., moved the next resolution. He said: My Lord Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, I feel highly honoured to have been asked to address this meeting to-day, and I ascribe the honour to the fact that some few years ago I took a part in making an active protest against the Bulgarian atrocities, which were then sending a thrill of horror throughout the civilised world. Having taken a part in the agitation on that subject, I am, to some extent, the better able to bear witness to and confirm what has been already said by a previous speaker as to the horror which was then felt at the atrocities committed by Mahomedans against Christians being reproduced now, and the suffering victims are Jews. I do not attempt to draw any parallel between the case of the Bulgarian massacres and those which are now taking place in Russia; but we cannot but charge the Russian Government with great remissness and neglect in not suppressing outrage and violence with a strong hand. (Hear, hear.) I do not draw a parallel between the two cases on other grounds, because we find that the acts of revolting brutality which accompanied the Bulgarian outrages are absent, or nearly absent, from the case of the Russian massacres. But when all deduction is made, when every allowance is made for exaggeration, there is enough left to justify the holding of a meeting like this, and to make it a necessity and a duty of every Christian inhabitant to enter his protest. We are bound to express our opinion of the conduct of those who have been guilty of these horrors in Russia, more openly than any other country is bound, because it is England which was the first to admit the Jew to the privileges of full political and civil equality—(cheers)—because we have admitted him to our learned professions, and because we have seen that, wherever we have found him, whether on the bench or the bar, we have found that none rank higher than he; and we therefore, speaking from experience, say that the only true way to do justice and to make the Jews the good citizens which they are capable of becoming, is to grant them the fullest equality in civil and political life. (Renewed cheers.) My Lord Mayor, I will not say more on this subject, as it has been dwelt upon by many of the speakers who have preceded me, and I will content myself with saying a few words on the resolution which has been placed in my hands. The resolution is:—"That the Lord Mayor be requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone and the Right Hon. Earl Granville, in the hope that Her Majesty's Government may he able, when an opportunity arises, to exercise a friendly influence with the Russian Government in accordance with the spirit of the preceding resolutions." Now, I think that that resolution does not and could not suggest to the right hon. gentlemen to whom it is addressed more than what is commonly called diplomatic action." It would, in my opinion, be a great mistake to call on any Government to take more than diplomatic action in a matter of this kind, for we know how very sensitive Governments are with any interference in their internal affairs by any other country. It was only yesterday that I heard that the King of Italy had made a speech, in which, referring to the report that Prince Bismarck was going to interfere on behalf of the Pope, he took the opportunity of most emphatically disclaiming the right of any foreign Government to interfere in matters of church and state in Italy. And the position of the King of Italy is the position in this respect of all the other potentates in Europe. We might not, perhaps, have expected the King to have taken this tone, for if there is one country in Europe in which another power might have interfered in matters of religion, one would suppose it to be Italy, for Rome is the home of the supreme head of a church which has an enormous number of adherents in every other country. But if the Government of Italy held that tone with regard to any other country, suggesting more than diplomatic interference, in what manner do you suppose so autocratic a Government as that of the Czar would resent anything that took the form of diplomatic action? It is because we know that diplomatic action is impossible, and we think the meeting here to-day to be of infinite value. (Hear, hear.) A meeting of this kind is a far better representative of feeling in England than diplomatic action. We can only estimate its value when we consider its spontaneity, and that every religious feeling and creed is represented on this platform. Not a voice has been raised throughout the country against holding this meeting, although a fortnight has passed since it was convened, and that is the best evidence that we can have that the heart of England is really stirred. (Applause.) If a representation is to be made, and the voice of England is to go forward, it is not to Russia alone that representation should be made. Brutalities such as you have heard of are not peculiar to Russia, they are common in the whole of south-eastern Europe. I myself have seen Jews flying for their lives in Moldavia before an enraged crowd, who had been incited against the Jews by a report spread in a district in which cholera had broken out, that they had poisoned the wells. This burst of brutality is a phenomenon in south-eastern Europe, and it is a phenomenon which is not confined to uncivilized people, for it has found expression, not, indeed, in so terrible a form, but it has found expression in the Jewish persecutions which have been going on in Germany. It is enough to make people blush that a nation like Germany, which has rendered such great services to learning and science, should have given way to a rage of persecution upon the old lives of race hatred. (Renewed applause.) I will now tell you what I take this resolution to mean. It is addressed to the English Government, and we say we are confident in you. I do not speak as a political partisan,

I should say the resolution meant confidence in the Government if another Government were in power, because to everyone who believes in the principles of truth and justice and humanity, this question is lifted out of the region of party politics. And, not speaking politically, I unhesitatingly say that there is no man who has earned his title to be believed in to take warmer interest in this matter than Mr. Gladstone. What then, I say, this resolution means is, that we recognise the difficulty of diplomatic action; but we believe and hope that it will not be far distant when English influence will be used not only with Russia in the cause of humanity. When the Government speaks it will speak in the voice of united England, where, above all things, the principles of religious toleration and civil equality are recognised, which she was the first to accord, and to which she believes she owes her own greatness and happiness to be inseparably united. (Applause.)

The Hon. LYULPH STANLEY, M.P.—My Lord Mayor, it gives me great pleasure to rise and second this resolution, and it gives me the more pleasure because by its terms it calls the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the two resolutions which have already been passed unanimously to-day. The first resolution is one in which you express detestation for the outrages which the Jews in parts of the Russian dominions have for several months past suffered, since they are an offence to civilization. The second resolution is, however, the more important perhaps, because it touches not only the evil but the remedy. When the outbreaks of race-hatred take place, we cannot, I think, but feel that the only safety which we have from their recurrence is to put all the inhabitants of a country upon the same footing of citizenship, and so wipe out all those distinctions which result in so much cruelty. And now I come to the resolution in my hand. It is to bring the question before Mr. Gladstone and Earl Granville, with the hope that they will be able so to exercise their kindly offices, as to secure a better treatment of the Jews in Russia. I, myself, strongly feel the force of the remark of Professor Bryce, that it is a delicate thing so to interfere in the internal affairs of another nation as to secure good results from intervention. Your object to day is to secure remedial measures for the unhappy objects of persecution in Russia, and I hope that the condition of the Russian Jews in the future will be put on so sound a basis that no fresh call for remedial measures will be necessary. For myself, I do not believe that the Russian people, if properly approached, have any desire for brutaility and out-rage in their midst, or that the Russian Government has any wish but for the progress of humanity. We know that in that country there is a government penetrated with desires for western civilization, but that their environments are not of such a character as to enable them to carry out their design in that direction, and so when we make suggestions we must take care that we do not make them in such a way as to pique the national sentiment, and so injure the very cause which we have most at heart. We should before all things, if we would be successful, approach the Russian Government in a spirit of fairness. As I have said, it has been a great pleasure for me to come here today, because I think if ever in England there has been a public recognition of civil and religious unity, that recognition has been to-day. (Applause). What we have asserted is the principle that no man should suffer civil disability on account of his religion—(renewed applause)—and we may be assured that, if that principle is fully recognized, we shall not have recurrences of such outbreaks amongst ignorant people as have but too lately disgraced Russia. This is not a party question, nor are we actuated by party feeling; and it is our custom in England when our sympathies are touched, as to-day, to break the bonds of party, and give them free expression. (Applause).

The LORD MAYOR: I have just received the following telegram from New York, "That at a meeting of the New York, United States, Evangelical alliance, resolutions were passed protesting against the persecution of the Jews in Russia, and it was decided to memorialise the Russian Government thereon." (Loud cheers).

The third resolution was then carried by acclamation.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD, M.P., moved the next resolution, which was that a fund be opened in order to assist the Jewish inhabitants in Russia, and that a committee be formed to see that it is properly administered. He said: This meeting is not held as a threat to Russia, or as a hostile demonstration, but I do think that the best influences may be expected as its result. I feel that despite all obstacles the voice of this great meeting will reach the ears of the Czar, and that it will not be without its effect on the policy of Russia.

Mr. W. FOWLER, M.P., in seconding the motion, said:—"We are assured that the Russian Government is not responsible for the outrages to the Jews, and I hope sincerely that that is so; but it cannot be denied that there are officials in Russia who are not so active as they ought to have been, and they ought to hear some very plain speaking on the subject. We certainly should not hold our tongues for fear that Russia might be displeased, for we gave entire freedom to the Jews, and we are entitled to ask that they should be free also in Russia. (Cheers.) I should be the last to counsel interference in the internal affairs of Russia, but when we hear of events such as these outrages, it is impossible to be silent.

This resolution was also carried unanimously.

Sir NATHANIEL DE ROTHSCHILD, M.P., proposed, and Serjeant SIMON, M.P., seconded a vote of thanks to the Lord Mayor, which his LORD-SHIP formally acknowledged, and the meeting was brought to a close with the announcement that a Mansion House Fund for the relief of the Jews in Russia had already been opened, and that a list was open for subscriptions.

The following donations have been already promised to the Mansion House Relief Fund:—Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild gave £10,000—£5,000 on behalf of the London house, Messrs. Rothschild and Sons, and £5,000 on behalf of the Paris house. Donations of £1,000 each were contributed by Messrs. Louis Cohen and Sons (whose praiseworthy exertions in collecting a fund before the Mansion House meeting was organised will be remembered), by Mr. Samuel Montagu, Beddington and Seligmann Brothers. Baron Henry de Worms, M.P., gave £300; Baron G. de Worms, £100; Mr. Louis Goldberg, £210; Mr. David Goldberg, £100; Mr. Nathan S. Joseph, £100.

[The above Report has been extracted from the columns of the *Jewish Chronicle* of February 3rd, 1882.]

Lyon and Blair, Printers, Lambton Quay, Wellington, N.Z.

REPORT OF THE ORKNEY AND ZETLAND ASSOCIATION
For 1881.
Edinburgh: Printed by Crawford & M'Cabe, 15 Queen Street. 1882.

OFFICE-BEARERS.

Patrons. The Right Hon, the EARL of ZETLAND. The Hon. Lord GIFFORD. DAVID BALFOUR, Esq. of Balfour and Trenabie, Convener of Orkney. Major CAMERON of Garth and Annsbrae, Convener of Shetland. ROBERT BAIKIE, Esq. of Tankerness, Vice-Lieutenant of Orkney. JOHN PENDER, Esq. of Minard, M.P. SAMUEL LAING, Esq. of Crook, M.P.
President. The Hon. JOHN CHARLES DUNDAS of Papdale, M.P., Lord Lieutenant.
Vice-Presidents. JAMES D. MARWICK, Esq., LL.D., Town-Clerk of Glasgow. ROBERT BROTCHIE, Esq. of Swannay. MAJOR-GENERAL F. W. TRAILL BURROUGHS of Veira, C.B. ARTHUR JAMES HAY, Esq., Lerwick.
Council. THOMAS DISHINGTON, Merchant, Leith. DAVID PETRIE, 4 London Street THOMAS S. CLOUSTON, M.D., F.R.C.P., Edinburgh. P. SIEVWRIGHT, Actuary, Edinburgh. NATHANIEL LEASK, M.A., Edinburgh. JOHN A. TRAIL, M.A., LL.B., W.S., Edinburgh. GILBERT GOUDIE, National Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh. The PRESIDENT of the ORKNEY and SHETLAND EDINBURGH ASSOCIATION.
Secretary. JOHN DAVIE, 13 Rankeillor Street, Edinburgh.
Treasurer. JAMES SHAND, Union Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh,
Auditor. PETER PEACE, Union Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
District Secretaries. *Kirkwall*—R. G. W. IRVINE, Banker. *Stromness*—JAMES SPENCE, Banker. *Lerwick*—JAMES M. GOUDIE.

Twelfth Annual Report of The Council of the Orkney and Zetland Association.

THE OBJECTS OF THE ASSOCIATION ARE—

- THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF FRIENDLY INTERCOURSE AMONGST THE MEMBERS; AND
- THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE COUNTY BY THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES, BURSARIES, OR OTHERWISE.

EXTRACT RULE VIII.—'*Every Ordinary Member shall, on admission, pay the sum of Five Shillings for the year in which he is admitted, and thereafter an Annual Subscription of Five Shillings during the Membership. Every Honorary Member shall contribute Ten Shillings Annually to the Funds of the Association, or in lieu thereof a single payment of Three Guineas. A single Payment of One Guinea shall constitute a Lady an Honorary Contributor. The Annual Subscriptions shall be payable on st January in each year. Donations will be received from all who are interested in promoting the objects of the Association.*'

THE COUNCIL beg to submit their TWELFTH ANNUAL REPORT for the year to December 1881.

The number of Members on the Roll at the close of last year (1880) was 126. Of these eleven have resigned, one has left the country, and one has been removed by death, while there has been an addition of five new members, making the total number now on the roll 118,—consisting of twenty-one honorary life members, twenty-two honorary members, and seventy-five ordinary members.

Note.—The Life Subscription received from one Honorary Life Member being in addition to his ordinary subscription for the year, does not appear in this Account, but will be shown in next year's Statement.

The ordinary income has been £52, os. 7d., and the expenditure has been £38, 17s. 3d., leaving a credit balance on the year of £13, 3s. 4d. The Funds now amount to £286, 13s., being £13 3s. 4d. more than was reported last year—consisting of Capital Fund £200, 11s. 7d., including £69, 9s. raised specially for the School

Bursaries, and Ordinary Fund £86, 1s. 5d.

The Book Prize Examinations for 1881 were held in the month of April. The number of competitors was 149, against 79 last year, and prizes of the value of £7, 4s. 4d. were awarded to pupils of 14 schools. The Council regret that Kirkwall is not among the schools sending pupils this year. Mr Leask's Report, with the names of the prize-takers, and numbers of marks that they obtained, is appended.

Suggestions were received from the Secretary of the Orkney Teachers' Association, objecting to the Council reverting to the old syllabus, and these were submitted to Mr Leask, but he expressed his opinion that the action of the Council was correct, and this was amply borne out by the number of pupils who attended the Examination.

Further suggestions have since been received from the Orkney Branch of the Educational Institute of Scotland, as to the Examinations which will be considered by the Council and the Examiner for the ensuing year.

The Council are under great obligation to Mr Leask for the care and trouble which he has taken in the examination of the various papers; the increase in the number of pupils competing, likewise affords them much satisfaction. Mr Leask has, at the request of the Council, now that he has removed to Edinburgh, kindly consented to join in their ordinary labours, in which his practical experience will be of the greatest value.

The Secretary Mr Trail, regrets to find that, from various reasons, it is impossible for him to continue in office, and has therefore given in his resignation. He has pleasure in reporting that Mr John Davie of the Standard Assurance Company, has consented to take the post

Mr Arthur Laurenson, Local Secretary at Lerwick, has also been compelled to intimate his resignation, but the Society have been fortunate in securing as his successor Mr James M. Goudie, Montfield.

The School Bursaries for Orkney and Shetland respectively, which are presently held by Mr Andrew Eunson and Mr James Rose, will be open for competition this year, which will be held on a day to be afterwards fixed.

They recommend that the Office-Bearers be as follows:—(*See list prefixed*.)

- The Twelfth Annual General Meeting of the Association was held in No. 5 St Andrew Square, Edinburgh, on Friday, 31st March 1882, Mr Brotchie of Swannay, in the chair.
- Mr Robertson, for the Secretary, having read the Report by the Council, on the motion of the Chairman, seconded by Mr Goudie, it was approved of.
- The Chairman moved the election of office-bearers, as recommended in the Report, and a vote of thanks to the Secretary, Mr Trail, on retiring, and to the Treasurer, Mr Shand.
- Mr Goudie moved a vote of thanks to Mr Laurenson, Local Secretary in Shetland, on his retirement, for his long services, which was unanimously adopted.
- The meeting terminated with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

Report on the District Prize Examinations of the ORKNEY and ZETLAND ASSOCIATION, by NATHANIEL LEASK, Esq., M.A., Headmaster of Abbey Park School, St Andrew's.

I have now the pleasure to report to you in general terms the results of the recent District Prize Examinations. There were 149 Candidates, compared with 79 last year—the increase, no doubt, being due to the return on the part of the Association to the former programme of Examination, in which History was ranked among the Special Subjects, instead of among the Common Subjects, as last year. It is evident a large proportion of the Candidates, who at present take History alone as a Special Subject, would be excluded from Competition if this branch were classed with the Common Subjects. In the special Subjects 141 Candidates took History, 23 Latin, 21 Mathematics, and 14 French. The total number of marks assigned to the Common Subjects was 214, and to the Special Subjects 200—making a grand total for both Common and Special Subjects of 414 marks. The highest Candidate obtained 329 marks, and there were 23 Candidates who obtained upwards of 60 per cent, of the total marks. As the age of the Candidates varies from 11 to 16 years, there are necessarily great inequalities in the papers, and I have no doubt the Council of the Association well consider the age in awarding the Prizes. Some of the papers done by the younger boys are of great merit, and indicate skilful and careful training on the part of the teachers, as well as diligent application on the part of the pupils. As a rule, the papers were neatly written and well arranged.

I hope in future years to see an increase in the number of Candidates taking Latin, French, and Mathematics, as Special Subjects.

NATHANIEL LEASK.
JOHN A. TRAIL, Esq., W.S.,
Secretary of the Orkney and Zetland Association.

Proceeding on the Report of the Examiner, the Council awarded prizes as follows:—

First Class Prizes.

Prizes.

General Abstract of the Accounts of the Association for the Year 1881.

CHARGE. To Funds on hand at 31st December 1880, ... £273 9 8 " Annual Subscription of The Earl of Zetland, £2 2 0 " Annual Subscription of Colonel Balfour, . . 1 0 0 " Subscriptions of Honorary Life Members . . 6 6 0 " Annual Subscriptions of Honorary Members, 10 10 0 " Do. do. of Ordinary Members, 19 5 0 " Interest on Bank Account, ... 0 7 7 " Do. on Deposit with National Bank of India, 5 0 0 " Do. on Deposit with National Bank of New Zealand, ... 7 10 0 52 0 7 Total Charge, £325 10 3 DISCHARGE. By Account for Book Prizes, ... £7 4 4 " Bursaries awarded to Andrew Eunson and James Rose, . 20 0 0 " Account for Printing—Annual Report, Examination Papers, Notices, etc., and Paper, ... 6 14 6 " Sundry Expenses—Postages, etc., of Secretary. Treasurer, and Local Secretaries, ... 4 8 5 " Rent of Room for Meetings, ... 0 10 0 £38 17 3 " Funds on hand, viz.:— Deposit with National Bank of India, Ld., as per Receipt, ... £100 0 0 Do. with National Bank of New Zealand, Ld., do., ... 150 0 0 Balance on Account current with Union Bank of Scotland, ... 36 13 0 286 13 0 Total Discharge, £325 10 3 JAMES SHAND, Treasurer.

EDINBURGH, *10th February 1882.—I* have examined the foregoing Accounts for the year ended 31st December 1880, and have found the same correctly stated and vouched; the balance due on the Capital Account being £200, 11s. 7d., and that on the Ordinary Fund, £86, 1s. 5d., of which sums £100 is lodged on Deposit Receipt with the National Bank of India (Limited), *£150 on* Deposit Receipt with the National Bank of New Zealand (Limited), and the balance, £36, 11s., at the credit of the Association's Account current with the Union Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.

P. Place,
Auditor.

List of Members at 31st December 1881.

I.—Honorary Life Members.

- The Right Hon. the Karl of Zetland.
- The Hon. John Charles Dundas of Papdale, Lord-Lieutenant of Orkney and Zetland.
- Colonel David Balfour of Balfour and Trenabie.
- Major-General F. W. T. Burroughs of Veira, C.B.
- D. Deuchar, Harlaw, Hope Terrace, Edinburgh.
- The Hon. Lord Gilford, Granton House, Edinburgh.
- William Hawley, Frederick St., Edinburgh.
- Samuel Laing of Crook. M.P.
- Nathaniel Leask, M.A., Abbey Park, St Andrews.
- Rev. William Leask, D.D., 34 Sandringham Road, Kingsland Road, London.

- James D. Marwick, LL.D., City Clerk, Glasgow.
- John Pender, M.P., Mount Street, Manchester.
- William Peterson, Highland Road, Upper Norwood, London.
- John S. Peterson, Merchant, 6 Queen Street, Melbourne.
- Basil Sievwright, Solicitor, Dunedin, N.Z.
- Robert Stout, Solicitor, Dunedin, N.Z.
- George Hunter Thoms, Sheriff of Caithness, Orkney, and Zetland, 52 Great King Street, Edinburgh.
- John A. Trail, M.A., LL.B., W.S., Edinburgh.
- J. W. H. Trail, Professor of Botany, Aberdeen University.

II.—Honorary Members.

- Robert Baikie, M.D., of Tankerness, 55 Melville Street, Edinburgh.
- Rev. Alex. Bayne, Tingwall.
- Roben Bell of Lunna, Sheriff-Substitute, Falkirk.
- Robert Brotchie of Swannay, 5 John's Place, Leith.
- Major T. M. Cameron of Garth, Lerwick.
- Harry Cheyne, W.S., Edinburgh.
- John Cheyne, Sheriff-Substitute. Dundee.
- T S. Clouston, M.D., Royal Edinburgh Asylum.
- David Flett, S.S.C., 57 Castle Street, Edinburgh.
- L. F. U. Garriock, Gibliston House, Scalloway.
- Andrew Gold, Chamberlain to the Earl of Zetland, Kirkwall.
- Captain John Harrison, 3 Bowater Place, Blackheath, Kent.
- Arthur J. Hay, Merchant, Lerwick.
- G. H. B. Hay of Hayfield, Lerwick.
- R. G. W. Irvine, Banker, Kirkwall.
- Joseph Leask of Sand, Lerwick.
- Samuel Reid of Braebuster, Kirkwall.
- R. M. Smith, Bellevue Cres., Edinburgh.
- John Spence, Riverside, Walton-on-Thames.
- George Stewart. Merchant. Bath St., Leith.
- John Walls, S.S.C., 33 Heriot Row, Edinburgh.
- Rev. John M. Webster, M.A., Row.

III.—Ordinary Members.

- John Allardice, Teacher. Lerwick.
- William Brodie, 9 Picardy Pl., Edinburgh.
- James Brotchie, Merchant, Leith.
- J. G. C. Cheyne, Secretary, Scottish Widows' Fund, Glasgow.
- James Copland, H.M. Register House, Edinburgh.
- James Cromarty, Bankburn, South Ronaldsay.
- Wm. Cromarty, Berridale. So. Ronaldsay.
- John Cursiter, Merchant, Kirkwall.
- John Davie, Standard Life Assurance Company, Edinburgh.
- Thomas Dishington, 5 Laverock Bank Terrace, Trinity.
- Tames Donald, Banker, Kirkwall.
- James Drever, Factor. Harris.
- George Elgin, 12 North St Andrew Street, Edinburgh.
- T. Fun son, Merchant, Quality St., Leith.
- William Firth, Secretary. North British Rubber Company, Edinburgh.
- Robert Flett, Ship Agent, Kirkwall.
- J. K Galloway, Solicitor, Lerwick.
- P. Garriock, Commission Agent, Lerwick.
- Thomas Gifford, Busta, Shetland.

- Gilbert Goudie, 39 Northumberland Street, Edinburgh.
- James M. Goudie, Montfield, Lerwick.
- James T. Goudie,Manufacturer, Glasgow.
- A. M. Sutherland Græme, yr. of Græmes-hall, Holm.
- Rev. William Harens, M.A., London.
- A. Cunningham Hay, Merchant, Lerwick.
- B. H. Hossack.
- Captain Robt. Hossack, Bonnington, Leith.
- T. B. Howrie. 28 Glassford St., Glasgow.
- Rev. J. S. W. Irvine, St Margaret's Hope.
- P. W. Jamieson, P. and O. Navigation Company, London.
- Arthur Laurenson, Leog House, Lerwick.
- Gilbert Laurenson, Inland Revenue, Ler-wick.
- J. B. Leask, 1 Union Street, Leith.
- Henry Leask of Swartland, Boardhouse, Stromness.
- D. F. Leith, Teacher, Stromness.
- W. C. Liddle, Writer, Kirkwall.
- George Linklater, Teacher, Bressay.
- Rev. Jacob Linklater, M.A., New Deer, Aberdeenshire
- J. S. Linklater, Merchant, 14 Summerside Street, Bonnington, Leith.
- James C. Logic, M.D., Ward House, Morpeth.
- James S. S. Logic, M.D., Kirkwall.
- Alexander Macgregor,. Solicitor, Lerwick.
- W. K. Mackay, National Bank of Scotland, Leith.
- Arthur Morison, Scottish Provident Institution, Edinburgh.
- Samuel Mullay, Edinburgh Gas Company, Waterloo Place, Edinburgh.
- W. T. Norquay, Union Bank of Scotland, St Margaret's Hope.
- Peter Peace, Union Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
- John Rae, Stationer, Stromness.
- A. Macbeth Robertson, Zetland Villa, Dumfries.
- George Robertson, Merchant, Leith.
- John Robertson, Merchant, Lerwick.
- John Robertson, Jun., Merchant, Lerwick.
- Thomas Robertson, Inland Revenue Office, Edinburgh.
- J. B. Rosey, Merchant, Stromness.
- Arthur Sandison, Town Clerk, Lerwick.
- C. Sandison, Publisher, Lerwick.
- Peter Sievwright, Actuary, 12 Danube St., Edinburgh.
- William Sievwright, Solicitor, Wellington, N. Z.
- James Shand, Union Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh.
- J. A. Shearer, Grocer, Stromness.
- Major A. V. Smith Sligo of Inzievar, Drummond Place, Edinburgh.
- Rev. W. Spark, Kirkwall.
- James Spence, Banker, Stromness.
- John D. Spence, Scottish Widows' Fund, Edinburgh.
- Robert Spence, M.B., Burntisland.
- T. W. L. Spence, General Board of Lunacy, Edinburgh.
- John Stewart, Merchant, Bath Street, Leith.
- Robert Stout, Postmaster, Lerwick.
- Thomas Stout, Writer, Glasgow.
- R. C. Traill, Merchant, Warriston Crescent, Edinburgh.
- William Traill, M.D., of Woodwick, St Andrews.
- Rev. R. Walker, Parsonage, Lerwick.
- D. F. Wishart, 14 Greenhill Terrace, Edinburgh.
- Rev. T. D. Wingate, The Manse, Stromness.
- W. A. Young, Leith Engine Works, Leith.

Honorary Lady Contributor.

- Mrs Edmondston of Buness, Shetland.

Report of the SHETLAND RELIEF COMMITTEE.
Price Sixpence.
Printed at the "Shetland Times" Office, Lerwick,

The Shetland Fishermen's Widows' Relief Fund.

Instituted, 7th December, 1881.
PATRON: The Right Hon. The Earl of Zetland.
Directors, *Ex Officio:*— CHARLES RAMPINI, Sheriff-Substitute of Caithness, Orkney, and Zetland. Major THOMAS MOUAT CAMERON, Convener of the County, and Chief Magistrate of the Burgh of Lerwick.
Directors: WILLIAM IRVINE. JOHN ROBERTSON, Sen. ARTHUR LAURENSON. ARTHUR JAMES HAY. JOHN LEISK. JAMES B. LAURENCE. ARTHUR SANDISON. JOHN BRUCE, Jun. CHARLES ROBERTSON.
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Sheriff Rampini.
SECRETARY AND TREASURER: Mr. Alexander Mitchell.

Report of the Shetland Relief Committee,

THE boats engaged in the prosecution of the "haaf" or deep-sea home fishing in Shetland, and locally known as "sixerns," are of a build peculiar to the Islands, and closely resemble the Norwegian yawls. Slimly built, about six and a half feet broad, and three feet deep, and with from twenty to twenty-one feet of keel, they are manned by six men, and carry a large lug sail containing about sixty yards of canvas. Although from their frail appearance they are not used by south-country fishermen, the Shetlanders, accustomed to them from infancy, manage them with consummate skill, and make marvellous voyages in them on the dangerous and boiling seas which surround their coasts.

On the night of Wednesday the 20th July, 1881, the whole of the haaf fleet belonging to the North Isles was at sea. The day had been fine and the air warm. Some heavy showers had fallen towards evening, but except for a heavy swell on the sen, supposed to have been caused by the rain, there were no indications of an approaching storm. Between ten and eleven most of the boats were from forty to sixty miles out at sea. Some of the smaller ones had hauled their lines, and were making for the land with their fish; others were setting their lines, when all at once, and without any warning—"like the shot of a pistol," as it was described by an eye-witness—a violent storm from the north-north-west broke upon them. Between midnight and one o'clock A.M. on Thursday, the gale was at its height. About the latter hour it commenced gradually to moderate. So suddenly had wind and sea arisen that some of the crews had not time to reef their sails, and had to set them for land just as they were. Thus over-rigged, they staggered and plunged onward. In some cases they reached the shore in safety. One, however, sweeping on before the gale in this perilous trim, became unmanageable. Her rudder was lifted out of the water; she broached round, and a gust of wind taking her sail aback, she was instantly swamped, and her crew left struggling in the sea. Many of the boats which reached the shore owed their safety to being ballasted with fish. The fish floated the boats while they were being emptied of water. The crews of others broke the livers of the fish they had caught, and cast them into the sea to calm in the waves.

The total loss of lives and boats was as follows:—

- *Boat* I., belonging to Gloup, North Yell—Alexander Henry, skipper; Thomas Henry, Sandwick; William Williamson, Gutcher; Thomas Henry, Houlland; Arthur Moar, Mursetter; and Robert Williamson, Colvester.
- *Boat* II., belonging to Gloup—William Spence. skipper; Laurence Williamson, Colvester; Alexander Danielson, Kirkhoull; George Moar; Andrew Robertson; and Thomas Tulloch.
- *Boat* III., belonging to Gloup—Laurence Danielson, skipper; Laurence Williamson, Westafirth; Basil Hay, Mursetter; James Nicolson, Sellafirth; William J. Williamson, Gloup; and Daniel Moar, Gutcher.
- *Boat* IV., belonging to North Yell—Alexander Robertson, skipper; Alexander Moar, Cullivoe; Basil Anderson, Houll; William G, Anderson, Houll; James W. Spence, Cullivoe; and Alexander Moar,

Breckon.

- *Boat* V., belonging to North Yell—Andrew Anderson, skipper, Gutcher; Andrew Moar, Gutcher; Peter J, Williamson, Houlland; Thomas Hay, Burrabrake; Andrew Moar, Huefield; and Thomas Bain, Midbrake.
- *Boat* VI., belonging to East Yell—William Henry, skipper; Peter Williamson, Neepoback: James Jamieson, East Yell; Basil Gardner, East Yell; James Sinclair, Cullivoe; Andrew Nisbet, Sandwick, (boy).
- *Boat* VII., belonging to Mossbank, at Fethaland—Isaac Gifford, skipper; James Blance, Mossbank; Robert Williamson, Innhouse; James Robertson, Firth; Alexander Beattie, Firth; John Nicolson, Swinister; and Gilbert Cooper, Firth.
- *Boat* VIII., belonging to Ollaberry, at Heylor—Andrew Copland, skipper; John Tulloch, Ollaberry; Magnus Sandison, Ollaberry; Laurence Inkster, Ollaberry; Thomas Anderson, Queyfirth; and Gideon Anderson, his son.
- *Boat* IX., belonging to Haroldswick—James Thomson, skipper; Magnus Thomson, Haroldswick; David Johnson, Haroldswick; James Jamieson, Haroldswick: William Anderson, Haroldswick; and Laurence Priest, Norwick.
- *Boat* X., belonging to Havera (inshore fishing)—Walter Jamieson, skipper; Walter Jamieson, junior; and James Smith.

The total number of widows, children, and persons dependent upon the deceased fishermen is as follows:—Widows, 34; Children, 85; Dependents, 14.

On Friday, the 22d July, the news of the disaster reached Lerwick. A meeting of the inhabitants was held in the Masons' Hall the same day, at which it was resolved to form a Relief Fund, and to appoint a large and representative Committee to administer the same. The following is a complete list of the Committee as ultimately constituted:—

Charles Rampini, Sheriff-Substitute; Major T. M. Cameron of Garth, Convener of the County of Zetland; G. H. B;. Hay of Hayfield; Commander LeCocq, R.N., Fort Charlotte; John Robertson, senior, merchant; Arthur J. Hay, merchant; William Irvine, merchant; F. D. A. Skae, M.D.; Alexander Pole, M.D.; The Rev. Robert Walker; The Rev. A. R. Saunders; Alexander Mitchell, Union Bank; J. Scott Smith, Sheriff-Clerk; J. Kirkland Galloway, Procurator-Fiscal; Alexander Macgregor, Solicitor; Arthur Laurenson, merchant; Charles Robertson, merchant; Arthur Sandison, Town-Clerk; J. B. Laurence, merchant; John Leisk, merchant; Robert Sinclair, merchant; Alexander Sandison, merchant; Andrew Sandison, publisher; Andrew Smith, merchant; Joseph L. Pole, merchant.

- *Convener of Committee—Sheriff Rampini.*
- *Treasurer—Alexander Mitchell, Union Bank of Scotland, Lerwick.*
- *Secretary—J. Scott Smith, Sheriff-Clerk.*

The Committee commenced its meetings on the 28th July. Subscriptions were invited on the condition that, if a larger sum was collected than was necessary thoroughly and efficiently to relieve the distress occasioned by the present calamity, the surplus should be appropriated to the formation of the nucleus of a permanent fund to be available in cases of similar disaster in the future. The following gentlemen were appointed local Treasurers:—

London.—Thomas Edmondston, Esq. Edinburgh and Leith.—James Shand, Esq. Glasgow.—Thomas Stout, Esq. Aberdeen.—Charles Merrylees, Esq. Liverpool.—R. P. J. Simpson, Esq.

From the first the response to the Committee's appeal exceeded their most sanguine expectations. The generous example of Mr Samuel Fielden, of Manchester, to whom the most grateful thanks of the Committee are due—who, on hearing of the disaster, at once sent the magnificent donation of £500 to be applied to the immediate relief of the sufferers by the calamity—was promptly and liberally followed. Special collections were made in every Church throughout Shetland. An appeal to the Primus and Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church was generously and readily acceded to, and collections instituted in the various places of worship throughout their respective dioceses. The clergy of the various other denominations throughout Scotland, unasked, imitated their example. Subscription lists were also opened by the Corporations of Edinburgh and Glasgow, the Town Councils of Greenock, Paisley, Stornoway, &c., the Commissioners of Supply of Orkney, and the Town Council of Kirkwall.

NOTE.—No remittances have been received from the latter twe bodies.

An important addition to the Fund was made through the kind exertions of Sir Robert Anstruther, Bart., of Balcaskie, Pittenweem. In many places subscription lists were voluntarily started by private individuals interested in the Islands. Messrs J. & G. Stewart, Leith, and Mr John B. Leask, Leith, the Rev. J. W. Macwilliam, Letherhead, and many others, were instrumental in adding large sums to the Committee's Fund. A party of tourists visiting Shetland in Messrs Langlands' s.s. "Princess Royal" contributed £22 10s. Collections were also made on board the steamships belonging to the North of Scotland and Orkney and Shetland Steam Navigation Company, running between Leith and Lerwick, and the s.s. Earl of Zetland, trading to the North

Isles. From the Press throughout the kingdom the utmost assistance was obtained. Subscription lists were, opened at the offices of the *Dundee Advertiser*, the *Aberdeen, Free Press*, the *North British Daily Mail*, the *Stirling Journal*, the *Greenock Advertiser*, the *Christian*, and others.

In England sympathy took a no less practical shape. The Ship-wrecked Fishermen and Mariners' Society immediately opened a special fund, heading the list with a subscription of £100. To this fund Her Majesty the Queen subscribed £25, and the Prince of Wales, and the Duke of Edinburgh also contributed, while the Corporation of London subscribed £100. The total sum collected by the exertions of this Society amounted to £766 4s 9d.

A London Committee was formed of the following gentlemen:—

Samuel Ling, Esq., M.P.; John Pender, Esq., M.P.; R. G. C. Hamilton, Esq.; Alexander Ludovick Irvine, Esq.; Rev. Alexander Sandison; and Thomas Edmondston, Esq.

Presided over by Mr Samuel Laing, M.P., the member for the County, while Mr Edmondaton acted as Honoray Treasurer, they were enabled by their exertions to add a very considerable sum to the Shetland Relief Committee's Funds. A large sum was also received from members of the "Baltic Coffee House," London.

Much substantial aid also came to them from the Colonies. A Shetland Relief Fund was established in Melbourne. The Caledonian Society of Adelaide, South Australia, exerted themselves to collect subscriptions; and remittances were also forwarded from Tasmania and New Zealand. Messrs W. & J. Irvine, of Launcesten, New Zealand, forwarded two tons of oatmeal to distribute among the bereaved families, while the National Bible Society of Scotland presented each widow with a large type, and each son or daughter with a small type, Bible.

In addition to the sums obtained from the Committee the bereaved families were supplied with clothing and bedding by the Yorkshire members of the Society of Friends, and assistance also was given them from other quarters.

To aid in the formation of a Permanent Fund the sum of £107, being the balance of the Shetland Destitution Fund of 1817—51, was handed over to the Committee by W. F. Skene, Esq., W.S., LL.D., the Secretary.

To all these various bodies and persons the Relief Committee tender their sincere and grateful thanks.

On the 7th December, 1881, when the Relief Committee was dissolved, and the Shetland Fishermen's Widows' Relief Fund was established, the total amount of subscriptions received by the former body amounted to £11,683 14s 5d.

The sum received up to date (5th January, 1882) amounts to £12,497 12s. The Edinburgh collections are not yet to hand.

In order to obtain information as to the particulars of the calamity, and the extent of the destitution caused thereby, as well as to collect subscriptions in the country districts, the following Local Agents were appointed:—

FOR UNST.—Mr John Spence, Haroldswick; and Mr Alexander Sandison, Uyeasound.

FOR NORTH YELL.—Mr P. M. Sandison, Cullivoe.

FOR MID YELL.—The Rev James Barclay, and Mr Thomas M. C. Pole, Gardiesting.

FOR SOUTH YELL.—The Rev. John Watson.

FOR DELTIN'G.—Messrs Polo Hoseason & Co., Mossbank; Messrs Thomas M. Adie & Sons, Voe; Mr James Inkster, Brae; and Mr Thomas Gifford, Busta.

FOR NORTHMAVINE.—Mr John Anderson, Hillswick; Mr Gideon Nicolson, North Roe; Mr George Sinclair, and the Rev. P. H. Russell, Ollaberry; and the Rev. James Fraser, Sullom.

These gentlemen were at a subsequent period, along with the local Treasurers in London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Dundee, and their respective local Committees, appointed *ex officio* members of the Committee.

In addition to these sources of information one of the members of the Committee—Mr J. Kirkland Galloway, Procurator Fiscal—visited the bereaved families, and made a report to a meeting on the 4th August No portion of the expense of this visit was borne by the Committee.

The first care of the Committee was to provide for the immediate necessities of the distressed families, and that was done under the personal superintendence of the Local Agents. All sums specially contributed for immediate relief, or for the inhabitants of specified districts, were expended in accordance with the wishes of the donors. A sum of £533 8s was expended on mournings for 255 persons.

Questions having arisen, and claims having been made upon the Committee to discharge or buy up the debts of the deceased fisher-men, the Committee on the 14th September resolved as follows:—"(1) That they would not hold themselves responsible for the debts of the deceased fishermen: (2) That in their grants of alimentary relief they would not take into consideration the fact that the deceased men were, or were not, members of the Shipwrecked Fishermen and Mariners' Society: and (3) that they would not entertain any claim made against the representatives of the deceased fishermen on account of the loss of the boats"—many of

which were, in accordance with the custom of the country, hired out to them for the fishing season.

In order to ensure the bereaved families in the occupation of their houses, till they were able to decide as to their future movements, the Committee on the 21st October resolved: "(1) That the rents of the bereaved families should be paid for this year only, either in whole or in part, according to the recommendation of the Local Agents in the Schedules laid before the meeting: (2) That where the rent is paid in full an assignation of the landlord's right of hypothec should be taken from the landlord: (3) That the rent, or proportion of rent, should be paid by the Agent to the landlord direct, and a receipt taken from him for the same: and (4) that in cases where the rent exceeded £2, the Committee reserved the right to themselves to make such deductions from the annual grants to be made to the widows or other dependents of the deceased fishermen, for the purpose of equalising the payments to each family, as they might subsequently think fit."

The Committee having determined to grant pensions to all the widows, to all children under fourteen, and to certain persons directly dependent upon the deceased fishermen, and whose age or circumstances seemed to justify this expenditure, Mr P. Sievwright, Assistant Actuary to the Standard Life; Assurance Company, was requested to prepare a Scheme showing the amount required for this purpose—the pensions to be granted on the following conditions:—(1) that the pensions to widows, fixed at 2s 6d per week, should be for life, or to cease on second marriage; (2) that those to children, fixed at 1s 6d per week, should be conditional on their being sent regularly to school, and living in family with their mother; and (3) that those to dependents, fixed at from 2s 6d to 1s 6d, according to circumstances, should be for life also.

The Actuary's Scheme, a copy of which is hereunto annexed (Appendix I.), having shown that a sum of about £6000 would be needed for this purpose, the Committee, in order to have an ample margin, appropriated £7000 to thin end.

The total amount collected being larger than was necessary thoroughly and efficiently to relieve the existing distress, the Committee felt themselves warranted in appropriating the balance—after setting aside the above sum of £7000, and deducting all disbursements up to date—to the formation of a Permanent Fund, in accordance with their intentions set forth in their Subscription Lists. A sub-committee was accordingly appointed to prepare the Rules and Regulations of the Shetland Fishermen's Widows' Relief Fund, and at a Special Meeting called for the purpose on the 29th November, these Rules, carefully framed to avoid trenching on the ground occupied by the Shipwrecked Mariners' Society, were finally adjusted and approved. A copy of these is attached to this Report (Appendix, II.).

It was also resolved that the Shetland Fishermen's Widows' Relief Fund should be registered under the "Friendly Societies Act" of 1875.

On the 7th December, 1881, at a Meeting specially called by circular and advertisement for the purpose, the Agreement between the Shetland Relief Committee and the Shetland Fishermen's Widows' Relief Fund was signed, and the office-bearers of the latter Fund appointed as follows:—

DIRECTORS, ex officio.—Charles Rampini, Sheriff-Substitute of the County; Major Thomas Mount Cameron, Convener of the County and Chief Magistrate of the Burgh of Lerwick.

DIRECTORS.—William Irvine, John Robertson, sen., Arthur Laurenson, Arthur James Hay, John Leisk, James Burgess Laurence, Arthur Sandison, John Bruce, Jun., Charles Robertson.

Sheriff Rampini was subsequently appointed Chairman of the Board of Directors, and Mr Alexander Mitchell, Secretary and Treasurer. The Right Hon. the Earl of Zetland was also elected Patron.

By the establishment of the Shetland Fishermen's Widows' Belief Fund, the Shetland Relief Committee ceased to exist.

An abstract, showing the receipts and the disbursements of the Committee during its existence, is appended. (Appendix III.)

Charles Rampini, CONVENER.

Appendix I.

Actuary's Report.

The Committee of Management of the Shetland "Relief Fund" having requested me to estimate the sums required to meet the allowances to widows and families of fishermen lost in the gale of 20th July last, the Convener of the Committee has furnished me with a schedule of particulars of the ages of the persons to whom they have decided to give relief. These persons are (1) widows, 34 in number, who will be allowed 2s 6d per week for life, the grant to cease if they marry again; (2) certain dependents, 16 in number, whose circumstances justify the expenditure, seven of whom are to be allowed 2s 6d per week, and nine 1s 6d per week for life

without any condition annexed; (3) children under 14 years of age, 42 sons and 43 daughters, who are to be pensioners at the rate of 1s 6d per week until they attain that age; two who are imbecile are to be pensioners for life. To this grant are annexed the conditions that they shall attend school regularly, and that they shall reside in family with their mothers.

The Committee desire to be informed—"(1) the total amount of the sum required to be set apart, and (2) the amount of the annual expenditure." I append a list showing in detail the annual amount and the calculated present value of the weekly allowances to each family and each member of it.

It is necessary that I explain to the Committee on what assumptions of mortality and interest the estimate of present values proceeds. First, *As regards the rate of mortality*—After careful consideration and comparison of various recognised mortality tables, I resolved to adopt, as most suitable in the circumstances, the tables for males and females of the Registrar General based on the national statistics (known as the English Life Tables, No. 3) as those according to which the lives will die off. I am aware that Dr Cowie, in his work on Shetland, claims for the Islands a rate of mortality lower than for other parts of the kingdom, but had he extended his observations over a series of years instead of taking the Registrar's figures for one year only, I think it probable he would have modified his views on that point. Bearing in mind the unfortunate position in which the poor widows are placed, I do not think that they can be said to have any greater expectation than the female population of the country generally; and it is very probable that the dependents are under, rather than over, the average of lives. I do not, therefore, think it necessary to use a table requiring larger sums to be set against engagements. I do not know of any table that better measures the value of life of young persons of thè class to which these, children belong than the English table. Second—*As regards the rate of interest*—I have assumed 3 per cent, as the rate at which the funds will be improved. I am aware that considerable sums will have to be kept in Bank on deposit, and also on current account, so as to be easily available for the purposes of the Fund, and therefore earning a small return. Keeping that in view, and looking to the present prospects of the money market, I do not think that a higher return can be safely calculated upon; but I think that that rate can be obtained. It will be understood that if any portion of the Fund is earning a lower rate other portions must be invested so as to yield a sufficient surplus above 3 per cent, to make up an average of at least 3 per cent, upon the entire funds.

I am at a loss to know what deduction to make from the value of the allowances to the widows on account of the possible forfeiture by re-marriage. It will depend on circumstances, the force of which I am not in a position to measure, how far relief to the Fund is to be looked for from that cause. As a question of mere probabilities, the likelihood of any relief is very small. Of the 34 widows, nine only can be said to be within the marrying age. I have deducted £100, which the Committee may consider sufficient. I imagine that the Committee do not contemplate continuing the allowances to the widows throughout life, should the circumstances not refluire. There may be some relief in this way.

The annual amount and present value of the allowances are—

The annual expenditure at present will be £633 2s, and I am of opinion that a capital sum of £6000, invested as stated, will suffice to provide the allowances proposed. I have included in the estimate a sum to cover possible liability on account of children yet to be born to three of the widows. I have also made allowance in the calculation for the payment of weekly instalments.

I assume that the ages have been correctly given. If the widows or dependents have overstated their ages, the amount required to meet the allowance is under estimated, but the Committee will know if care was taken to arrive at the correct ages.

In this estimate I have made no provision for the expense of managing the fund, as I have no instruction on the point. For every £10 of annual charges there would have to be added to the above £200, being the capitalised amount of 20 years' purchase which I would consider a fair valuation. The Committee, however, may be of opinion that the expenses might be left to form a charge on the surplus interest above 3 per cent, realised on the investments. If it is resolved to provide for them in that manner ½ per cent, of margin will give £30, and 1 per cent. £60 per annum on the present amount of the Fund; but of course it will be understood that the expenses must decrease concurrently with the decrease in the Fund.

I believe that the scheme will be worked to a successful termination on the basis of calculation adopted.

(Signed) P. Sievwright.

Edinburgh,

29th November, 1881.

Appendix II.

Rules and Regulations of the Shetland Fishermen's Widows' Relief Fund.

1. That this Fund shall be called THE SHETLAND FISHERMEN'S WIDOWS' RELIEF FUND, and its registered office shall be in Lerwick, in the County of Zetland.

2. That the object of this Fund shall be to assist and relieve the Widows, Children, and other Dependents of Shetland Fishermen, left destitute by disasters at sea.

3. That the Fund shall consist of (1) the balance remaining over of the Fund raised for the relief of the families of the Fishermen lost in the gale of 20th July 1881. after providing for the distress occasioned by the calamity; (2) contributions, donations, or bequests; (3) subscriptions of life and annual Contributories; and (4) interest or income accruing on said Fund, and unexhausted or unappropriated during the year.

4. That it shall be administered by a Board of Directors, consisting of nine members, to be elected by the Contributories, and three *ex officio* members, and that at all the meetings of the Board three shall be a quorum. That vacancies occurring in the Board during its tenure of office shall be filled up by the remanent members thereof. That no Contributor shall have, by reason of his contribution, any right or claim to any benefit or participation in the Fund, which is hereby declared to be purely charitable; but the control and administration of the income and capital thereof shall be and subsist in the said Board of Directora, who shall alone have the power to deal with applications for relief.

5. That the *ex officio* members of the Board shall be the Sheriff-Substitute of the County, the Convener of the County, and the Chief Magistrate of the Burgh of Lerwick.

6. That three of the elected members of the Board shall retire annually, but shall be eligible for immediate re-election. The first annual meeting for election of Directors shall be held at Lerwick on the Seventh day of December, 1881, at which meeting nine Directors shall be elected by ballot, and the order in which these Directors shall annually retire from office shall be determined by the number of votes given to each—the three lowest in number retiring first, and so on in this order; and in case of equality of votes, the Directors shall, at their first meeting thereafter, determine the order in which such Directors shall retire. That the Board of Directors shall, in all cases, remain in office till their successors are appointed.

7. That the Board of Directors shall annually elect from among themselves a permanent Chairman and Deputy-Chairman, who shall preside at all meetings of the Board, and at the annual meeting of the Contributories to the Fund. In the absence of the Chairman and Deputy-Chairman, the Directors or Contributories present respectively may elect a Chairman. At all meetings of the Board of Directors or Contributories, the Chairman shall have a casting vote.

8. That the Board of Directors shall annually appoint, upon such terms as to remuneration, or otherwise, as they may think fit and proper, a Secretary and Treasurer, who may be one and the same person. The Treasurer shall annually, on or before 1st December in each year, make up a general state of the Fund, showing the capital and revenue accounts as at 11th November previously.

9. That the Board of Directors for the time being shall have power to elect a Patron or Patrons, and to fill up vacancies in that office as the same may arise.

10. That the capital sum of the Fund, which, it is declared shall in no case be encroached upon,—except in so far as it may be necessary to do so to meet any deficiency in the sum appropriated to the relief of the families left destitute by the disaster of 20th July, 1881—shall be invested in the names of three Trustees, who shall in all cases be elected from the members of the Board of Directors, and who shall be appointed at the first annual meeting of the Contributories to the Fund, and vacancies shall be filled up at any subsequent annual or special meeting thereof. The foresaid Secretary shall have powers to sue implied by or conferred on Trustees or other officers of Friendly Societies by the Act 38 and 39 Vic., cap. 60.

11. That the Board of Directors shall have power to enter into an agreement with the Shetland Relief Committee to take over and administer the fund raised for the relief of the dependents of those lost in the gale of 20th July, 1881, on such conditions as may be agreed on by parties.

12. That the monies of the Fund shall be invested only in the Government Funds, or in unexceptionable Heritable Securities in Scotland; but until or while any portion of the Capital is uninvested, it shall be competent to deposit the same in any Bank of issue in Scotland.

13. That all persons shall be considered Contributories to this Fund, and shall be entitled to attend and vote as such at the meetings of the said Contributories, who shall either (1) contribute the sum of Five pounds sterling as a single and Life Payment to the Fund; or (2) subscribe Five Shillings or upwards annually towards

it. Annual members shall be entitled to vote at any meeting prior to and inclusive of the first Annual Meeting subsequent to the payment of their subscriptions.

14. That there shall be an Annual Meeting of the Contributories to the Fund as soon as practicable after 1st January in each year after the year 1882. on a day to be named by the Board of Directors, of which due notice shall be given by advertisement in the local papers or otherwise, as may be determined upon by the Board, and at which meeting the vacancies in the Board of Directors shall be filled up: the Directors shall produce a Report of their proceedings during the preceding year, and the Treasurer his annual account, duly audited, as hereinafter provided.

15. That the Treasurer's Accounts shall be duly audited once a year by one of the public auditors appointed under the Friendly Societies Act, 1875.

16. Special Meetings of the Contributories shall be called by the Chairman of the Board of Directors either *ex proprio motu*, or on a requisition in writing signed by ten Contributories, setting forth the business to be disposed of.

17. The Board of Directors shall have power to frame such Bye-Laws as they may think proper for the better carrying out of the objects and intentions of the Fund; but no such Bye-Laws shall come into effect until the same have been approved of at an annual special meeting of the Contributories to the Fund.

18. No alteration, amendment, or rescission of the rules and regulations of the Fund shall be made except with the consent of four-fifths in number of the Contributories present at a special meeting called for the purpose, after due notice given by advertisement for four successive weeks in a newspaper published or circulating within the County, provided always that no alteration, amendment, or rescission shall be competent which shall in any way defeat or subvert the objects of the Fund, as herein provided.

19. In the event of the Fund lapsing from any cause, or being dissolved or wound up, the same shall be handed over to the Commissioners of Supply for the County, and the Corporation of the Burgh of Lerwick for the time being, in trust for the foundation, endowment, or maintenance of a Public Hospital, or of such other charitable or benevolent institution, for the behoof of the inhabitants of Shetland, as they may determine upon.

Appendix III.

ABSTRACT ACCOUNT OF THE TREASURER'S INTROMISSIONS UP TO 7TH DECEMBER, 1881.

Charge.

Discharge.

Expense of Management—

Funds on Hand—

LERWICK, 6th January, 1882.—We have examined the foregoing Account, compared the same with the vouchers, and find it correct.

(Signed) Thos. M. Cameron.
(Signed) William Irvine.

The Fifth Annual Report of the Educational Institute of Otago, 1881-2.

Office-Bearers of the Institute:
President: John B. Park. ESQ.
Vice-Presidents: James Reid, ESQ., Milton. James Orr, ESQ, Invercargill. Robert Peattie, ESQ., M.A., Oamaru.
Secretary: Mr. D. White.
Treasurer: Mr. W. J. Moore.
Librarian: Mr. R. S. Gardner.
Representatibes of Branch Associations: DUNEDIN MR. D. A. McNicoll. TOKOMAIRIRO MR. Jas. Reid, BALCLUTHA MR. Alex. Grigor, LAWRENCE MR. Robert Neill, WAITAKI MR. Alex. Stewart, INVERCARGILL MR. William Duncan
Representatibes of the Institute: Mr. W. S. Fitzgerald Mr. Alex. Montgomery Mr. W. Milne, M.A. Mr. Jno. Stenhouse Dr. McDonald.

Report of the Educational institute of Stage, 1881-2.

THE Committee of Management of the Institute present the following report of the transactions of the past year.

The various recommendations of the Annual Conference were fully considered, and such measures taken as were considered necessary to give effect to the views of the Institute.

Interim Report on the Standards.

The Interim Report of the Conference was adopted by your Committee. The report, a copy of which was sent to the Inspector-General, contained the following representations:—(1.) That whilst some of the appended notes were worthy of approval, others were opposed to the spirit of the original paragraphs of the Syllabus. (2.) That the Regulations stated that serious failure in two subjects shall be considered a failure in the Standard, whereas the Notes, Section 8, limited the number to serious failure in one subject. (3.) The hope was again expressed that, in the event of there being any modification of the existing Regulations, the suggestions of the Instituto would receive favourable consideration.

Resolution defining "Fair Attendance."

This resolution referred to the instructions issued by the Inspectors, and represented that these should be amended so as to allow teachers to withhold from the Standard examination all pupils who had not made a fixed number of attendances during the school year. It was considered by your Committee that, as the Regulations were issued by the Education Board, application should be made to that body asking for a more precise definition of "fair attendance." The resolution was forwarded to the Education Board. The reply stated that the Board had not the power to make the alteration suggested.

Resolution regarding Standard Questions.

A communication was sent to the Minister of Education concerning specimen questions of the various Standards. In reply your Committee were informed—"It was deemed better to issue Notes on the Standards than to prepare specimen questions. Such Notes were published, and the first paragraph of the Note on page 18 indicates in part the reasons for not sending out specimen questions."

Affiliation with Canterbury.

Your Committee gave considerable attention to the matter of affiliation with the Canterbury teachers. The result is so far very successful and encouraging. The Teachers in the neighbouring Province have formed Institutes at Timaru, Ashburton, Leeston, and Christchurch. Lengthy correspondence ensued between your Committee and the above Associations relative to a permanent basis of union between the two Provinces. It was thought expedient to postpone further negotiations until the annual Conference. A deputation of Canterbury teachers has been nominated to attend the annual meeting for the purpose of fully discussing the whole subject. In connection with this matter your Committee have to state that inquiries have been received from all parts of the Colony in regard to the working of the Institute, with the view of establishing similar organisations.

Branch Associations.

Your Committee have had under review during the year suggestions from the Branch Associations. By far the most important was a communication from the Southland Branch bearing on the method of payment of Teachers throughout the Colony. This and the report of your Committee thereon will be laid before the Conference.

Your Committee are pleased to slate that the Southland Branch has determined to remain in connection with the Institute. Letters have been received respecting the formation of a branch at Tapanui, which give promise, that ere long an association will be established in that district. The branch reports show that there has been more work done in this than in any previous year. Your Committee hope that measures will be taken to maintain the interest thus evinced, as the success of the Institute depends largely upon the support given by the Branch Associations.

Finance.

The following is the Treasurer's Report, showing a balance in hand of £30 19s.:—

Balance Sheet.

RECEIPTS. 1881. June 18.—To Balance ... ... £12 5 8 " Lawrence Branch, two-thirds subscription ... ... 1 14 4 " Balclutha Branch, additional subscription ... ... 0 14 0 July 9. "Oamaru Branch, two-thirds subscription ... ... 7 6 0 1882. April 24. "Balclutha Branch, two-thirds subscription ... ... 2 16 0 May 18. "Dunedin Branch, two-thirds subscription ... ... 5 5 0 " Lawrence Branch, two-thirds subscription ... ... 2 13 4 " Milton Branch, two-thirds subscription ... ... 4 3 0 19. "Invercargill Branch, two-thirds subscription ... ... 3 18 0 £40 15 4 EXPENDITURE. 1881. June 18. By Secretary's account for Stationery £3 17 0 Aug. 1. "Coulls & Culling, printing ... 1 9 1 Otago Daily Times, printing ... 1 3 0 Dec. 18. "Star, printing ... ... 0 18 6 1882. May 19. "Secretary—Stationery, Postages, &c. 2 8 9 27. "Balance in hand 30 19 0 £40 15 4

Your Committee propose a reduction and a re-adjustment of the annual subscription as follows:—That rules 6 and 8 be amended; that 5s. per annum per member be paid to the Institute by the Branches, and that pupil-teachers and Normal School students be admitted to membership on the annual payment of 2s. 6d. Further, that Branches be permitted to fix any additional sum above the amount transmitted to the Institute, for local expenses.

Programme of Proceedings of Conference.

Copies of the programme of proceedings will be sent to members and teachers. In addition to the ordinary business thus provided for, members are invited to bring up for discussion such other matters as may appear to them worthy of consideration. Similar privileges to those of last year will be conceded to Teachers in the matter of railway passes. Your Committee have to thank the Education Board for sending out circulars to School Committees suggesting that the schools be closed in order that Teachers may attend the Conference. The thanks of the Institute are due to Mr. Pryde for the interest he has manifested in the success of the Annual Meeting.

D. White, *Secretary*.
W. J. Moore, *Treasurer*.

Dunedin,

May 27, 1882.

Vignette

Annual Report of the Southland Branch.

OFFICE-BEARERS, 1881-2.
PRESIDENT, Mr. John Hardie.
SECRETARY AND TREASURER, Mr. E. W. Gurr.

We have the honour to submit to you the Annual Report for the year ending 31st March, 1882. During the year, ten meetings have been held, which have been latterly very fairly attended, and great interest seemed to have been taken in the meetings by those present. At the first meeting the election of the officers for the year took place. Mr. John Gurr was chosen to read a paper on behalf of the Branch at the Annual Conference, and Mr. Duncan, of Green Island, the Branch's Representative on the General Committee. The following members gave papers on the subjects connected with their names:—Mr. John Gurr, on "The Standards and how to meet them;" Mr. Hardie, on "The Teaching of Geography;" Mr. Orr, on "Composition related to Grammar;" Mr. Neill, on "A Country Teacher's Difficulties, and how to meet them;" Mr. Bennett, on "The Teacher's Aim;" Mr Southwick, on "The Teaching of Elementary Science;" Mr. Von Tonzulman, on "Notes on Dr. Trench's English, past and present."

Several other matters of importance engaged the attention of the Branch during the year. Abbott's "How to Parse," was pronounced a most unsuitable text book for pupil-teachers on the subject. It was considered that "bonuses on classification" should be distributed from the Central Department, and not from the several Boards, as at present. Early in the year a desire to separate from the Institute was manifested on the part of some of the members, but after the Conference, which many of the Teachers attended, it was considered best to maintain the connection already existing.

E. W. Gurr,
Secretary.

Annual Report of the Balclutha Branch.

OFFICE-BEARERS:
PRESIDENT, Mr Alex. Grigor.
SECRETARY AND TREASURER, Mr. Jas. McNeur.

In submitting the Fifth Annual Report of this Branch of the Institute, your Committee have to state that we began the year with nineteen members, four of whom were of other professions. Three of our members, who were regular in their attendance at our meetings, have removed to other districts; but their places have been filled by others, who are likely to take an active part in the affairs of the Institute. Seven meetings have been held during the year; but these have not been quite so well attended as those of last year. Four papers of great interest have been read, viz., on "The Phonic system of teaching beginners to read," by Mr. Grigor; "The reading of the Bible in Schools," by Mr. McColl; "The choice of a Profession by the Young, and our duties as Teachers in this matter," by Mr. Wad-dell; "School Prizes," by Mr. McEwen.

James McNeur,
Secretary.

Annual Report of the Waitaki Branch.

OFFICE-BEARERS:
PRESIDENT, Mr. J. H. Rice.
SECRETARY AND TREASURER, Mr. R. Peattie, M.A.
LIBRARIAN, Mr. W. Fidler, B.A.

On the 12th March, 1881, the Waitaki Branch of the Educational Institute was constituted for the year. Mr. Alex. Stewart, Union street school, Dunedin, was appointed Representative on the General Committee of Management, and Mr. Neil Fleming, Representative Essayist to Annual Meeting. Nine meetings were held—eight monthly and one extraordinary. This last was held for the purpose of considering the subjects to be recommended to the Oamaru Caledonian Society for its bursary competitions. At one of the monthly meetings the address of the retiring President, on "Our Schoolmasters," was criticised. The Secretary suggested that the Members should ballot for the order in which they should give papers. The ballot was taken and no member has failed to provide a paper since. The following is the list of subjects and essayists: "Difficulties of Inspection," Mr. Peattie; "Half-time Schools," Mr. Sinclair; "School Government," Mr. Lindsay; "Teaching of History," Mr. Rice; "Geography of the Standards," Mr. Wallace; "Critique on Possible Culture," Mr. Darley; "School Hygiene," Mr. Piper; "Teaching from Objects," Mr. Wood. The membership has slightly decreased, but the members have been more enthusiastic and more regular in attendance, and, as regards the work accomplished, this branch has never before been in so flourishing a condition. The above was adopted at the Annual Meeting on 4th March, 1882.

Robert Peattie,
Secretary.

Annual Report of the Tuapeka Branch.

OFFICE-BEARERS, 1881-2:
PRESIDENT, Mr. L. Pope, Wetberstones.
SECRETARY AND TREASURER, Mr. R. Neill, Blue Spur.

Our membership roll contains 13 names, but as some of our members reside from 5 to 16 miles from Lawrence—our place of meeting—our attendance is not what it might be were they more conveniently situated. The following papers have been contributed during the year, viz., "The Standards," by Mr. Bryant, Beaumont; "Method," by Mr. Macandrew, Waitahuna; "Geology," by Mr. Closs, Tuapeka West; "The Application of some of the Principles of Mental Science to the art of Teaching," by Mr. Macandrew. We have held 8 meetings during the year, but, as the time at our disposal is limited to about an hour and a halt, owing to the arrival and

departure of the trains, we usually take the reading of the papers on one day, and the discussion on the following. In the matter of interchange of ideas, and experience, and as a medium of instruction, our meetings have been productive of much and lasting good.

R. Neill,
Secretary.

Annual Report of the Milton Branch.

OFFICE-BEARERS:
PRESIDENT, Mr. J. YOUNGSON.
SECRETARY AND TREASURER, Mr. JOHN LYTTLE.

I have the honour to submit to you the Annual Report of the Milton Branch, for the year ending 28th April, 1882. During the year, three new members were enrolled, and one left the district. There is now a roll number of twenty members, including pupil-teachers. There were eight meetings of the Association, with an average attendance of nine members of the Institute. At these meetings the following papers were read, viz., (1.) "The Study of the English Language," Mr Lyttle; (2.) "Dialects of Old English," Mr. Reid; (3.) "The Physical Geography of the fifth and sixth standards," Mr. Mahoney; (4.) "Examinations," Mr. Joseph; (5.) "Aptitude," Mr. Morgan. It is a matter for congratulation that a revival of interest has taken place in educational matters in this district. It is to be hoped that a still greater interest will be taken in the welfare of the Institute in 1882. Those who are employed in the cause of education should show, by their diligence and earnestness, that they fully realize the importance of an Institution which is calculated to effect so much good.

JOHN LYTTLE,
Secretary.

Annual Report of the Dunedin Branch.

OFFICE-BEARERS, 1881-2:
PRESIDENT, Mr. Wm. Duncan.
TREASURER, Mr. D. Mclauchlan.
SECRETARY, Mr. Ay. J. Moore.
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE BRANCH ON THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT, Mr. D. A. MCNICOLL.

MEETINGS—Eleven meeting were held during the year, at which the following papers were read:—

- May 7th, 1881, "On the present working of the Education Act in Scotland." Mr. Pollock.
- June 4th, 1881, "The Education of Teachers in Otago," Mr. Duncan.
- August 6th, "The Classification of names in Grammar," Mr. A. Montgomery.
- September 3rd. "The use of the Pantograph for Map Drawing," Mr. AY. J. Moore.
- October 1st, "Teaching Composition," continuation of a previous paper on the same subject, Mr. J. B. Park.
- November 5th, "Bishop Butler's Ethical System," Mr. Duncan.
- February 4th, 1882, "Teaching of English in Primary School," Mr. T. C. Farnie.
- March 4th, "Home Lessons," Mr. W. Hislop.
- April 1st, "Accuracy," Mr. Jas. Hendry.
- May 6th, "School Appliances," Mr. Jas. Mahoney.

From the above it will be seen that the Branch has been extremely fortunate in obtaining papers for all but one meeting. To this circumstance, and doubtless to the merits of many of the papers, may be attributed the improved attendance of our meetings.

Early last year the Branch resolved to publish Mr Park's book on Composition for the benefit of the profession. The success attending the venture may be gathered from the rapid sale of the book. About 500 copies were published, all of which have been disposed of with a slight profit to the Branch.

It was deemed advisable to alter the time of the annual meeting of the Branch from March to June, in order to suit the annual meeting of the Institute held in the latter month.

The President was chosen to read a paper on behalf of the Branch at the annual Conference.

In conclusion, your Committee have to congratulate members on the prosperous condition of the Branch, and would strongly advise their successors to exert their influence in keeping up a lively interest in its affairs.

W. J. Moore, *Secretary*.
Vignette
COULLS & CULLING Printers and Stationers. Rattray street.

Education Board Management in Westland,

The sub-committee appointed by the Hokitika Local School Committee, to reply to the Board's circular letter asking the Committee to state the duties of teachers, and to make recommendations for curtailing the Board's expenditure, have brought up the appended report, which is to be transmitted to the Central Board. The Committee consisted of Messrs H. R. Rae (chairman) Hudson, Jack, and the Rev. W. Douglas. The following is the

Report of the Committee.

We have the honor to report that we have considered the letter from the Central Board, referred to us for report, asking the Hokitika Local Committee (1) to inform the Board what the duties performed by teachers were, and (2) to make recommendations for curtailing the Boards expenditure.

In reference to the first request, we recommend that the Board be informed that the duties of teachers of schools are those prescribed by the Board's regulations, and consist, mainly, in instructing the pupils committed to their care. Should the Board require more detailed information on the subject, application, we think, might be made to the Inspector.

The invitation to the Committee to make recommendations for curtailing the Board's expenditure is one not so easily responded to. Such serious reductions in the staffs of schools, in the payments to teachers, and in the grants to Committees for school purposes, have already been made by the Westland Board, and such difficulty has been experienced, of late, in getting the most trifling repairs executed in school buildings, that we have taken some pains to endeavor to ascertain whether Westland is exceptionally treated by the Government in the matter of grants for Educational purposes, and whether the same financial difficulty and parsimony in the administration of the Education Act is common to the whole, or any other part of, this Colony. Your Committee find that the Government do not treat Westland illiberally in the matter of Education, and that no such financial difficulty as our schools now labor under, is experienced in any other part of New Zealand, or indeed in any colony to whose reports we have access.

The Report of the Minister of Education for last year shows that the Westland Board received, for that financial year from Government, the sum of £15,879 7s 1d, of which sum, £9,675 7s 1d, was for the maintenance of schools, and £6,200 for school buildings. There were 3,143 scholars on the Westland rolls for that year, so that this maintenance vote of £9,679, 7s 1d, amounted to £3 1s 7d per scholar, on the roll. The following table shows that, as compared with other districts, Westland has received its due proportion of this maintenance vote:—

Distribution of Maintenance Vote.

The proportion allotted to Westland, of the vote for school buildings was absolutely greater than that allotted to any other district except four, and was relatively greater than the proportion allotted to any district whatever. The Government has treated Westland with more liberality than any other part of New Zealand with regard to the vote for school buildings, as is shown by the table appended:

Distribution of Building Vote.

Putting both of these votes together and adding receipts of the Board not derived from Government, we find that Westland, with 3,143 scholars, received £18,329 for educational purposes during the year, while South Canterbury with 3,506 scholars received only £15,800, Wanganui with 4994 scholars, received only £19,403, and Southland, with 4000 scholars received but £22,012. The Government cannot, therefore, fairly be blamed for the present deplorable condition of Educational finances in Westland.

Coming to the teaching staff in the Hokitika schools, we find that so far from there being any lavish extravagance in the number, or salaries of, teachers, the staff is less than that of any other State School of similar size in Victoria or Now Zealand, while the teachers are no better paid than they would be if employed elsewhere in the colony, and are not so well paid as they would be if employed in many of the other school

districts of either of these Islands. Omitting pupil teachers (who are not employed in some of the school districts in New Zealand, who are employed, but not paid in others, and half of whom are paid and the remaining half unpaid, in Victoria, and who in all cases everywhere receive but a very small remuneration for their services) the following are found to constitute the staffs of adult teachers in schools similar in size to the Hokitika School, in Victoria and New Zealand respectively:—

Staffs of Head and Assistant Teachers.

Head Teacher: Male. Head; Teacher: Female Male Assist. Teachers Female Assist. Teachers Total. Scholars in average attendance. Victoria: Emerald Hill ... 1 1 1 2 5 398 Footscray ... 1—2 2 5 368 Maryborough ... 1 1 2 2 6 390 Hawthorne ... 1—2 2 8 367 Beechworth ... 1 1 3 3 409 Ballarat No. 720 1 1 1 2 396 New Zealand: Ponsonby ... 1 1 1 8 11 389 Newton ... 1 1 1 8 11 371 Kanaeranga ... 1 1 3 7 12 379 Thorodon ... 1—2 3 6 380 Invercargill ... 1—2 2 5 384 Hokitika ... 1—1 2 4 384

We observe that, while the Board asks our advice as to possible reduction of expense in the schools under cur charge, a sub-committee of the Board has prepared a report on the same subject, recommending still more sweeping reductions in the payments and staffs of schools, than those which have already been effected, in order to reduce a deficiency of £1793 in the Board's finances. This they propose partly to effect by the wholesale dismissal of the trained assistant teachers now employed, and the substitution of what are called "junior as istants"—or in other words, of pupil teachers whose term has lately expired. As an example of the operation of this scheme, we find, from the schedule of the staffs and salaries as now proposed to be engaged and paid, that the Hokitika School, having a present average attendance of 375 is to be officered by two adult teachers (the head teacher and another) with four of these so called juniors, or elder pupil teachers, and four younger pupil teachers. The proposal therefore amounts to this—that one sixth (namely 375 scholars attending the Hokitika school) of all the scholars under the Hoard, are to be taught by two adults, with the help of eight young people who very recently were scholars themselves, and whose average age is not 16 years.

The two trained teachers who are to be thus dismissed are to be generously offered the refusal of the posts of junior assistants, at an average salary of £75 per annum, instead of their present pay of £130. These ladies were both invited from Victoria, years ago, with a stipulated salary of £140

The Hokitika School is now earning for the Board, from the Government, (at £3 15s for every scholar in average attendance) the sum of £1398; of this sum the Board propose to pay back, in salaries to the teachers, only £834

The present total daily average attendance in Westland is 2007 scholars. These will each earn for the Board, from the Government, £3 15s; or a total of £7526. The amount proposed to be paid out of this in salaries, for the teaching of these 2007 scholars is only £5722. The difference is the considerable sum of £1804. Where is this £1804 to go to? Why is it to be taken from the schools and teachers who have earned the money?

We compared also, this schedule of proposed staffs of teachers, with that actually in force in North Canterbury at the present timo, The North Canterbury Board state that they have adopted the very lowest possible staffs, consistent with efficiency.

This reduced and lowest possible scale is as follows:—

But the Westland Board propose *to* give the Hokitika School two adult teachers for 373 scholars.

We find it difficult, without using undesirable expressions, to convey our opinion of these propositions. The scheme in one aspect, seems like the boyish effort of some junior clerk employed in the Board's office. In another aspect it looks still worse. Such proposals cannot be seriously discussed. To assent to them would be a betrayal of the trust reposed in us. As trustees for the public we believe we should better consult their interests by closing the schools altogether. If the exigencies of the Board require such sacrifices, it is clear that the Westland scheme of education has collapsed, through the shameful misuse of public funds which has taken place.

Coming next to the grants paid by the Board to School Committees, we have to state that the amount paid is far less than the amount paid to Committees in any other part of New Zealand, and is less by more than one half, in several cases. It is proposed to give the School Committees in Westland, with 3143 scholars, the total sum, amongst them, of £537 10s. The following table shows the sums the other Education Board's distributed amongst their School Committees during the year:—

Grants by Boards to School Committees.

It is evident from these statistics, that the ample revenue of the Board is in no way wasted, either in the salaries of teachers, the maintenance of schools, or in the grants made to the School Committees. On the contrary, the figures demonstrate that in all these particulars the Westland Board treat their teachers and the

Committees with the most wretched parsimony and niggardliness as compared with any other educational district whatever, and not only curtail and reduce the staffs of schools, and the payments of teachers, but give the Committees funds totally insufficient to enable them to decently provide for absolute wants of the schools under their charge. In what direction then, does the mismanagement of the Board's income take place? We do not profess to be able here to thoroughly answer that question. We will however, endeavor to indicate, so far as facts are-available, the direction in which the misuse of the Board's funds takes place. We find the following figures in the reports already referred to, and we quote them for the information of the Board and the public.

The "office management" of the Education Department in Victoria, coats 8¼d per scholar. In Auckland the cost is 3s 9d per scholar. The cost of the Board per scholar in some other districts, is as follows:—

And if to this 7s 4d per scholar be added the amount spent in the purchase of buildings at Greymouth and trips, to Wellington, it then becomes clear that recent Board management in Westland has cost the Country at the rate of 14s 10d per scholar.

Inspection, and the office expenses of the Board, together, cost Westland 8s 11d per scholar. Auckland does better, and more perfect work, of the same kind, for 4s 11 1/3 per scholar; Wellington, for 3s 7d per scholar; Hawke's Bay, for 7s 2d per scholar; Nelson, for 5s 10d per scholar, North Canterbury, for 3s 3½d; per scholar, Otago, for 8s 1d per scholar; and Southland, for 4s 9d. Inspection and office work cost more in Westland than in any other district in the whole colony. A very considerable sum misspent in maintaining a book depot, causes a very heavy annual loss to the Board's funds, It is illegally a source of profit to the present Chairman of the Board, and the son of the Chairman has been employed in connection with this stock, in addition to the Secretary, the Inspector, and the son of the inspector, all of whom have spent considerable time in the care and custody of these goods. All of these same persons appear from time to time to be employed in office work, and it would appear that the Inspector spends most of his working hours, in doing the work of the Secretary. For many months past, the correspondence, circulars, vouchers, cheques &c., of the Board coming to this committee, have been all in the handwriting of the Inspector, or of some boy, or boys employed in the office. As almost the whole work of the Board consists in circulars, correspondence, and payments, we think the boys should he discharged immediately, and the office of Inspector and Secretary amalgamated. In 1880 (when the work was more cheaply and more satisfactorily performed than it is now) these two offices cost £1410; their cost at present is considerably more. In Nelson, with 1000 more scholars, the same work costs only £953. In Wellington with twice the number of scholars, the inspection and office work costs only £1100. No reason whatever exists why the plan followed at Nelson should not be adopted here, and the two offices combined. If these suggestions were acted on, and the book depot abolished, a waste and perversion of a very considerable sum of money could be effected. In connection with the book depot, a single illustration will show the desirability of sweeping it away. Dr Richardson's Text Book on Temperance is being now retailed, through the Board for 3s 6d per copy. The same book exactly can be had though the Post for 1s 9d per copy. Very numerous other matters in connection with this business might be mentioned to show the urgency of at once doing away with this book depot.

"Sundries," in the management of the Board is an item which appears to be capable of great reduction, It consists of miscellaneous expenditure, such as the travelling expenses from Greymouth to Paroa of a daugter of the Chairman of the Board, who is a pupil teacher at the Paroa School, but lives in Greymouth. In Westland these "sundries" cost £184. Auckland with nearly five times as many scholars, spends £57 in "sundries," Taranaki, £2; Wanganui, £5; and many other districts *nil*. Your Committee hare good reason to know that—surprising as these figures of the Board's cost are—the expenditure in Board management and "sundries" in Westland will be found to be still greater when the correct figures for the following year are available.

We are not able under any circumstances, to suggest any reduction in the staff, (already too small and too badly paid) of the Hokitika School district. With the foregoing figures before us, we are firmly of opinion that, with judicious Board management the additional assistant teacher to which the Hokitika School is entitled, could readily be paid. As for reducing the grant of the Hokitika School Committee, it is futile to imagine that the Committee can carry on its functions with the present ridiculous grant of £50 per year. With the most rigid and strict economy, it takes at least £175 per annum to defray the bare necessaries of the schools. We would gladly recommend an appeal to the public to subscribe funds to maintain the schools in our district in a creditable state, and there is no doubt that the public would come to the aid of the Board, if they thought for a moment that the Board's distress was deserving of relief. But there are two insuperable objections to an appeal to the public for aid to carry on the schools. In the first place, the Government provide the Board with ample funds for Education in Westland, and no real necessity exists, or ever did exist, for the deplorable state into which education finances in Westland have drifted—a condition utterly unknown or unheard of in any other part of this prosperous and wealthy colony. Secondly, as the Government liberally maintain a system of free education from the taxation of the people, the people cannot, with any show of right or reason, be asked to subsidise that free system by subscriptions or donations.

RICHARDSON RAE,
Chairman.

Hokitika, L. S. C.,

May 5, 1882.

Vignette

BY this Act the Creator of All is virtually shut out of the School-room. HIS name is not permitted to be mentioned,—the whole catalogue of heathen gods *may* be!

The most interesting of all interesting histories, the history of God's own ancient people, by order of this our N.Z. Parliament, must not be listened to by the children,—is forbidden; and it is further declared that this being a sacred history, there is no guarantee that the school teachers as a body are fit to have it trusted into their hands. (?) This paltry excuse is in truth nothing short of a libel.

Again, while the teaching of some kind of morality in the schools cannot by any possibility be avoided, yet this wisdom?) of our Parliament decides (by a bare majority, thanks!) that the youth of this land shall not even listen in the common schools to the bare reading of *the book* upon which the morality of the whole civilized world hangs; but they shall take the chance of receiving their flimsy morals, second-hand and diluted, in place of at the fountain itself.

Once more,—the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and any of the words which came from His lips, may be heard anywhere else, but shall not be mentioned inside the doorways of our schools, except by an infringement of the education laws of the 19th century!

Truly mad legislation all this, legislation which *must* bring its national blight and curse upon the land. Can any Education Act with such a blank as this prove a blessing?—Never! Its tendency will be but to produce clever rogues, schemers or villains. It will bear its deadly fruit, it has *already* done so in some states of America, and is now working the same end in Australia. Bitter, bitter fruit, in an increase of more clever and genteeler crime! That is indeed a hateful system of education in a professed Christian country, which cannot admit even the ten commandments—upon which the British constitution itself is based—into its common schools! Shame upon such statesmen. Will any wise Government persist in shutting out from the minds of her public youth the very *name* of the Creator? and also the bare *words* of the divine Book,

NOTE.—In a school where it so happened a majority of children belonged to Roman Catholic parents, let the Douay version be read, the other scholars absenting themselves, as *vice versa*. In any and every case the public reading could be undertaken (if preferred) by an elder class in place of the teacher. The reading *(only)* of the Bible in schools is a *national* question, a question purely between the Government and the *people*, and which the clergy of any church in their public capacity have nothing whatever necessarily to do. Let these take their position as private citizens on this matter, as we truly believe the very large majority are perfectly willing to do. The divine Book is national property, therefore unsectarian; and whether the authorised or the more corrupt version is used in any particular school, may be safely left with majorities.

which is the light of the whole world, and without which secular instruction is but darkness! If such continues in N.Z. it will cause many to blush and to tremble for this new colony—to be truly ashamed of the land of our adoption, and pre-eminently so of its Parliament of 1877!
Patriot.

The *New Zealand Parliament Mistake: Namely The Education Act of 1877!*

No. 2.

By this Act the Creator of ALL is virtually shut out of the School-room. His name is not permitted to be mentioned,—the whole catalogue of the heathen gods *may* be! *(Viae No. I.)*

That truly great and noble man, who was the instrument of shedding light in the minds and hearts of millions in Europe in the 16th century—Luther—and who also was the reformer indirectly of governments and empires, spoke the following notable and never to be forgotten words, *viz:*—

"I am much afraid that the universities will prove to be the great gates of hell, unless they diligently labour in explaining the Holy Scriptures, and engraving them in the hearts of youth. I advise no one to place his child where the Scriptures do not reign paramount. Every institution in which men are not unceasingly occupied with the Word of God must become corrupt."

Weightly words these, and fit to command the most serious attention of the governing power in every civilised country. The blind infatuation however, of a small majority of the New Zealand Parliament of 1877, has acted the exact reverse, they have deliberately withdrawn from the young of the Colony in their daily schools the light of God's revelation to man,—every child's *birthright!* They have deprived (*robbed*) the children of that which is their *only* safeguard for becoming trustworthy citizens of a new colony. They have so voted, that our Public Schools by having the Book of Books excluded, are in truth nothing else than heathen educational establishments, or indeed *worse,* for some of the heathen nations have *not* acted thus blindly! What a lasting curse upon the country, and on the memory of the godless legislators, will follow in the fruits yet to be reaped! Who, who in our N.Z. Parliament will awake to the dreadful consequences that the present condition of *blight* in our Public Schools must end in. The *common* foundation of all desirable moral and social life is forcibly removed from hearing! What remains? What? Who will say!

Let the whole Colony of New Zealand remember well the Word of God which says:—Them (Nations?) that Honour Me, I Will Honour, but they that Despise Me Shall be Lightly Esteemed!

PATRIOT.

Public Instruction in Cookery.
Teacher—Mrs. Macpherson,
(Late of Edinburgh School of Cookery.)
SYDNEY AND PARRAMATTA: C. E Fuller, Printer, George Street.

Public Instruction in Cookery.

MRS. MACPHERSON, who has recently arrived in the colonies has been for four years a most successful teacher in the Edinburgh School of Cookery. She holds a first-class diploma from the National Training School of Cookery, South Kensington, London, is well known in most of the principal towns in the United Kingdom, and has frequently been engaged as teacher by members of various school boards, as well as by the managers of public institutions.

As the British public had long experienced the need of wider-spread information on the subject of Cookery, and as such lectures as Mrs. Macpherson's were so obviously the means of diffusing useful knowledge throughout the country, the movement has been attended by immense and unvarying success.

Mrs. Macpherson, therefore, has every confidence in resolving to offer her instructions to the people of the colonies, and has much pleasure in announcing that she is about to deliver a course of twelve lectures, with practical demonstrations. Her stove (a present from the Edinburgh School) is of the most modern description, being fitted with Bunsen burners, etc.

Mrs. Macpherson has received public testimonials from many of the towns where her lectures have been most highly appreciated. She subjoins a few of the opinions of the Press, and of the names of those who have taken part in, and allowed their names to appear in connection with, the movement. She would call attention to the amount of support she has received from the Medical Faculty, who have rightly deemed a proper knowledge of cooking to be an essential part of every woman's education, and highly conducive to the health of the community.

- THE DUKE OF WESTMINSTER.
- LORD AND LADY ROSEBERRY.
- SIR WATKIN AND LADY WILLIAMS WYNNE, Wynnstay, North Wales.
- THE DOWAGER LADY RUTHVEN.
- LADY FRANCES LLOYD.
- LADY GRANT MACPHERSON.
- HON. MRS. STAPLETON COTTON.
- ALEXANDER STEPHENSON, Esq., M.P., Tynemouth.
- STANLEY LEIGHTON, Esq., M.P. Oswestry.
- DONALD MACGREGOR, Esq., (late M.P.), Leith.
- ARCHBISHOP STRAIN, Edinburgh.
- THE BISHOP OF PERTH AND DUNKELD.
- THE DEAN OF CHESTER.
- THE LORD PROVOST OF EDINBURGH, AND LADY FALSHAW.

- LORD GIFFORD.
- LORD SHAND.
- PROFESSOR ARCHER, Museum of Science and Art, Edinburgh.
- THE MAYOR OF NEWCASTLE.
- THE SHERIFF OF NEWCASTLE.
- THE VICAR OF NEWCASTLE.
- THE MAYOR OF CHESTER.
- THE MAYOR OF TYNEMOUTH.
- THE MAYOR OF SOUTH SHIELDS.
- THE SHERIFF OF DUMFRIES.
- THE SHERIFF OF FIFE.
- THE PROVOSTS OF DUMFRIES, DUNFERMLINE, LEITH, PORTOBELLO, MONTROSE, QUEENSFERRY, etc.
- DR. BRUCE, Newcastle.
- DR. MERTZ, Newcastle.
- R. SPENCE WATSON, Esq.
- J. B. DALE, ESQ., Westo, South Shields.
- J. FOSTER SPENCER, ESQ., North Shields.
- G. BOSWELL, ESQ., Garallan, Ayrshire.
- THE VICAR OF OSWESTRY, and many Clergymen of all Denominations.
- MR. ALMOND, Loretto Public School, Musselburgh.
- DR. SCIENNES, Edinburgh University.
- DR. STEPHENSON MACADAM, Edinburgh.
- DR. LEGAT, North Shields.
- DR. BALFOUR, Portobello.
- DR. LAWRENCE, Cumnock.
- DR. M'CULLOCH, Dumpfries.
- DR. HUGH CUNNINGHAM, Dumfries.
- DR. JOHN CUNNINGHAM, Dumfries.
- DR. EWEN MURRAY, Dumfries.
- DR. BRUCE, Castledykes.
- DR. LEWIS, Dalbeattie.
- DR. WATSON, Montrose.
- DR. ROBSON, North Shields.
- DR. TURNBULL, North Shields.
- DR. DALZIEL, North Shields.
- DR. DOW, Dunfermline.
- DR. T, A. SCOTT, Musselburgh.
- DR. STEPHENS North Shields.
- DR. DAVIES COLLEY, Chester.
- DR. JEPTHCOTE, Chester.
- DR. CALDWELL, Shotts.
- DR. GRANGE, Moffat.
- DR. FORBES, Moffat, Hydropathic Establishment.
- MR. ORMISTON, Shotts Iron Works.
- THE MEMBERS OF THE FOLLOWING SCHOOL Boards:—Ddin, burgh, Leith, Portobello, Newcastle, Chester, Oswestry, Dunfermline, Shotts, Queensferry, Corstorphine, Dumfries, Troqueer, etc., etc.
- THE MANAGERS OF THE FREE CHURCH TRAINING SCHOOL, Moray House, Edinburgh.
- THE MANAGERS OF THE MAGDALENE ASYLUM, Edinburgh.
- THE MANAGERS OF THE MERCHANT COMPANY'S SCHOOLS, Edinburgh.

"THE success of the Edinburgh School of Cookery is largely due to the hearty co-operation of the teachers of the School. As the result of these classes, Local Committees have reported not only great general improvement in the cookery and economy of the district, but many individual instances of increased comfort in the homes of the working classes. At an early date in the existence of the School of Cookery, your Committee considered by what means they could most efficiently disseminate the principles of good and economical Cookery over the country. After much deliberation they formed the opinion that this could be best achieved by sending carefully-selected teachers, who could give lessons or lectures on Cookery, with practical demonstrations, in halls that the public were accustomed to frequent. The success that has hitherto attended this scheme has surpassed their most sanguine expectations."—*Report of Executive Committee of Edinburgh School*

of Cookery.

"BY means of hard work, method, thrift, and careful attention to financial details, the Edinburgh School of Cookery finds itself, at the end of two years, with more than £1000 of actual earnings. These canny Scotch ladies have charged the smallest sum possible for admissions to their lessons. The ladies of Edinburgh have formed a very high ideal of the training required for teachers, and their only fear is that, owing to the interest felt all over the country on the subject of Cookery, inferior and half-trained persons may be sent out who will bring the movement into disrepute."—*Saturday Review*.

Opinions of the Press.

"ONE of the important points enforced by Mrs. Macpherson was, that good cookery meant economy. A number of useful hints were given; the lectures being delivered in a simple, effective way.
"—Argus, 28th October.

"MRS. MACPHERSON takes care that her pupils shall really benefit by her teaching, answering all questions fully, passing round the dishes, when finished, for inspection, and repeating her instructions in a concise form, so that they may be transferred to note-books. The course includes every variety of dish for breakfast, dinner, and supper.
"—Argus, 13th November.

"MRS. MACPHERSON continues most deservedly popular with all her pupils."
—Argus, 27th November.

"MRS. MACPHERSON comes to the colony with an excellent reputation as a teacher of cookery. The impression she created yesterday was a most pleasant one, and there can be little doubt that her lectures here will be the means of diffusing useful knowledge on the subject of cookery. She has a happy style of expressing herself, and at once demonstrates the fact that she has carefully studied, and has been well educated in the art she professes."
—The Age, 28th October.

"THIS lady has a most pleasing method of instructing her class in the practical as well as the theoretical mysteries of her art. The lecture was listened to with the utmost attention and interest, which Mrs. Macpherson's quick-witted sallies and anecdotes never for a moment allowed to flag."
—Daily Telegraph, 28th October.

"MRS. MACPHERSON has a very pleasing style, and speaks distinctly, pausing between the sentences to give her audience time to take notes. On concluding, she was loudly applauded by her fair audience."
—Daily Telegraph, 24th November.

"THE mission which Mrs. Macpherson has set herself to carry out ought to be heartily taken up, and raised into a propaganda by the ladies of Victoria. Cookery should be made as essential a part of every girl's education as needlework and genteel deportment. Mrs. Macpherson's energetic labours are to be heartily commended."
—Daily Telegraph, 25th November.

"WHAT pleased me most was, that the cooking done was within the power of the most moderate means of housekeepers to copy. In some cases the lecturess used materials that otherwise would go to waste. I hope the science of cooking will become so popular that Mrs. Macpherson will be tempted to prolong her stay amongst us."
—Evening Herald, 12th November.

"MRS. MACPHERSON delivered the last of her series of lectures on cookery at the Athenaeum, yesterday afternoon, to a full audience. At the conclusion of the lecture, Dr. Macmillan, on behalf of the ladies who had attended the course, presented the following address:—'Melbourne Athenæum, 12th December, 1879.—To Mrs. Macpherson,—Dear Madam,—We have felt so much genuine pleasure in being present at your admirable course of lectures on cookery that we cannot refrain from indulging in the further pleasure of expressing our thanks to you for coming forward to instruct in a branch of female education that is too frequently neglected. We hope it will be some satisfaction for you to be assured by us that we have profited by your instructions, and have acquired an additional help to make our present and future homes happy. In saying au revoir, we hope you will soon allow us the privilege of gaining a wider experience of the culinary art under your intelligent guidance.' The Hon. T. T. A'Beckett testified to the pleasure and advantage that had been derived from the admirable course of lectures.
—Argus, 13th December.

"MRS. MACPHERSON'S knowledge of her subject is so wide and accurate, and her manner and method of imparting her knowledge are so successful, that the best results must accrue from her tuition. As a lecturer the

lady is very popular; she succeeds in giving a sense of her thorough competency as a cook and an instructor to her listeners; and each and all who visit the courses of her lectures cannot but profit by her admirable instruction."

—Australasian Sketcher, December 20th.

"MRS. MACPHERSON'S credentials are of the highest order, and her exhibition convinced her audience that her reputation was fully sustained. She has an attractive, cheerful manner, and expresses herself clearly and distinctly. There can be no doubt that a vast amount of comfort would be experienced in many homes, were housewives only initiated into the mysteries of the art of which Mrs. Macpherson is so clever an exponent."

—Sydney Morning Herald, April 2nd.

"MRS. MACPHERSON has a most pleasing delivery, her words are well chosen and to the point, and convey their exact meaning clearly to her audience. Her method of imparting practical teachings is such that a thorough knowledge of the preparation of any dish may be obtained by attention. Every ingredient she uses is not only useful as a component part of the dish being prepared, but is also employed as a means of imparting a store of thoroughly useful information to her pupils, the method of testing the quality, measuring quantities, and proper treatment of each ingredient being carefully and lucidly explained."

—Sydney Daily Telegraph, April 2nd.

"MRS. MACPHERSON explained the why and wherefore of everything connected with the cooking of the good things she described, showing her audience very clearly both how to cook them well and make them nice and appetisable for the table."

—Sydney Evening News, April 2nd.

"ONE great feature in Mrs. Macpherson's lectures is the great stress she lays upon economy in cooking, and for using up cold meat, bread, fruit, etc. She has an infinite variety of dainty dishes."

—Sydney Town and Country Journal, April 17th.

"ONE great advantage of Mrs. Macpherson's instructions is that the dishes prepared by her are of simple ingredients, within the reach of every one; and she teaches how to make the most of the homely materials within reach."

—Town and Country Journal, April 10th.

"WE have among us a highly competent professor of this most useful art in Mrs. Macpherson, of the Edinburgh School of Cookery. It is impossible to listen to her lucid explanations of matters so homely—to witness her delicate manipulations, combined with quickness of movement, and readiness of re-source, and not feel how intelligence and culture may ennoble the commonest acts of life."

—Geelong Advertiser, January 7th.

"WHEN, quick as thought, she produces as by the touch of a magic wand, wondrous little invalid delicacies, and her clear voice, attuned to the most melodious of accents, tells you in what way they are designed to give strength to the weak, and health to the ailing—you see before you the exact type of woman, that in the person of Florence Nightingale, has established, for all time, an abiding place in the hearts of our countrymen. She has so much to impart that it is to the interest of everyone to know that, upon sanitary grounds alone, her advent here may be regarded as of much social importance."

—Geelong Advertiser, January 24th.

"MRS. MACPHERSON has a most pleasing method of delivering her lectures. Speaking slowly and distinctly, she proceeds to show how everything is made, and pauses sufficiently long to enable her pupils to jot down in their note-books her remarks and hints in connection with cookery."

—Geelong Times, January 6th.

"MRS. MACPHERSON has a singularly happy method of teaching, and her pupils seem to watch the operations with engrossing interest."

—Scotsman.

"MRS. MACPHERSON has proved herself to be a capital instructress, her explanation on the manipulation of each dish being made in an exceedingly clear, intelligent, and interesting manner. All speak in terms of the highest praise of the cheerful and excellent manner in which she has imparted information to her interested audiences."

—Dundee Advertiser.

"THE classes which are being held at the Lecture Hall, Nelson-street, are a great success. The Newcastle ladies are learning: to cook, and to cook well. They could not have a more capable teacher than the Edinburgh lady who is now initiating them into the most useful of mysteries. Mrs. Macpherson is a first-class lecturer and a first-class cook, and the thanks of the whole town are certainly merited for what is one of the most useful educational movements ever started in Newcastle. Mrs. Macpherson has performed her work so well and obligingly that she has gained for herself the commendation of all who have attended her lectures."

—Newcastle Daily Chronicle.

"MRS. MACPHERSON'S explanatory remarks showed that, in the system of cooking, which she so ably illustrated, economy and cleanliness were not overlooked. She is eminently fitted for the office she fills. She has been well educated in the art she professes, and clearly explains her methods of compounding every dish brought under her notice."

—Newcastle Daily Journal.

"THE Committee have procured the services of Mrs. Macpherson, who holds a first-class diploma from South Kensington, and who, in a simple, concise, and practical manner, explains the modus operandi of her cooking. She is a bishop among cooks.'"

—Chester Chronicle and North Wales Advertiser.

"MRS. MACPHERSON, who is the accredited agent and teacher of the Edinburgh School of Cookery in Chester, is a thoroughly practical teacher of the culinary art. From the acquirement of cooking potatoes properly to that of turning out an elegant and appetising dish, she expresses all she desires in good, honest, Saxon language, and illustrates her preaching by conscientious practice."

—Chester Gazette.

"THE Cookery Classes which are being taught in the Mechanics' Hall, Dumfries, are proving completely successful. Apart from the interesting and useful character of the subject, its treatment by Mrs. Macpherson makes the lectures of that lady a source of real enjoyment to both sexes. She is a perfect adept in the theoretical and practical mysteries of plain and fancy cooking; a sensible example of a deft and cherry housewife, who executes her work with amazing celerity and un-soiled cleanliness; a clear-minded, quick-witted, fluent woman, whose explanations of the several processes of cooking are as graphic, plain, and popular as her practical execution is free, unencumbered by any awkwardness, and uninterrupted by any hitch."

—Dumfries Weekly Standard.

"MRS. MACPHERSON is a lady of great intelligence, and evidently mistrsss of her subject, which she illustrates in a very homely and pleasant manner."

—Dumfries and Galloway Herald and Gazette.

"MRS. MACPHERSON practically illustrates that which is theoretically advanced. She explains the various dishes with great lucidity, relieving the faintest sign of tediousness by a witty sally or anecdote. She holds a first-class diploma from South Kensington, and, from the manner in which she goes about the various processes, shows that she has undergone a thorough training, and is mistress of the art. She possesses a pleasant appearance, and sustains, by the clearness of her explanations and the rapidity of her movements, the fixed attention of her audience for two hours."

—Dumfries and Galloway Standard.

"THE attendance at the cookery classes continues to be as large as ever, and Mrs. Macpherson's popularity is undiminished. Her instructions, as well as her manner of teaching, seem to be highly appreciated by her numerous pupils, and the succession of novelties produced sustains the interest in the proceedings."

—Dumfries Courier.

"THE teacher is well qualified for the task she undertakes, as she so handles and explains the different arrangements and combinations, that even the most unskilled might easily understand. Mrs. Macpherson's audience followed her with much interest, and were as much astounded at her deftness as they were pleased with her clear explanations."

—Leith Burghs Pilot.

"THE Executive Committee have been unfortunate in having so excellent a lady as Mrs. Macpherson to conduct the lessons She is admirably fitted for the purpose, and as she cooks she carefully explains the dishes for the benefit of her audience The Cookery Classes at South Shields are an unqualified success."

—South Shields Daily News.

"THE Cookery Classes established in South Shields by Mrs. Macpherson, from the Edinburgh School of Cookery, are proving a complete success, both afternoon and evening classes being crowded every day. The limitation of the lectures to a course of twelve seems far from adequate to the demand of the Shields public."

—South Shields Gazette.

"IT is exceedingly satisfactory to note the gratifying success which is attending the Cookery Classes in the Albion Assembly Booms, North Shields, and the great interest which is evinced by the numerous students in the practical instructions given by Mrs. Macpherson. During the past fortnight that lady has gained many friends and admirers by her kindness and courtesy while giving her lectures, and her departure for Edinburgh, which takes place on Monday, will be looked forward to by many with regret."

—North Shields Daily News.

"MRS. MACPHERSON fully maintains her reputation as a highly efficient teacher. Not only is she thoroughly interested in her work, but she spares herself no trouble to make the subject interesting, also to her pupils, and, besides showing them how to prepare dainty dishes, has a happy knack of conveying much information and

many useful hints in domestic matters generally."
—Oswestry Advertiser.

"MRS. MACPHERSON is an able teacher, and well qualified in every respect for her work. To the very last she managed to keep up the interest of her pupils in the work of the classes."
—Hamilton and Airdrie Advertiser.

"MRS. MACPHERSON explains and illustrates her subject in a singularly clear and lucid manner; supplies many axioms well worth remembering; whilst, in the handling of the materials, she shows herself an adept."
—Kirkcudbrightshire Advertiser.

"MRS. MACPHERSON gained the confidence of the whole of her audiences by the clear way in which she demonstrated her lessons by word and deed. She possesses great natural gifts, her power of demonstration and handiwork being the envy of all."
—Montrose, Arbroath, and Brechin Review.

"IN the hands of Mrs. Macpherson what appears in genera only food for the body becomes, at the same time, food for the mind. Unusually apt in handling the requisites which she calls into use; thoroughly economical in the use of them; quick and active in the disposition of the morceaux required, she is, at the same time, a fluent instructor in the modus operandi of her work; possessed of a thorough knowledge of the nutritious or other qualities of everything which she puts through her hands; careful in her explanations; and so plain in the character of her instructions that none could possibly be misunderstood."
—Ayvshire and Cummock Express.