

Olympian Thunderbolts.

Rev. Messrs. Hardy and Wilson.

THE sixteenth preacher from Victoria—The Rev. Mr. Hardy, of Kilmore—appeared in the pulpit of the First Church, on the forenoon of Sabbath, 17th May, 1874. He is a young man of middle stature, spare build, dark-brown hair, with whiskers and moustachios, and of a florid complexion. He read a portion of psalm 118, verse 24, beginning : "This is the clay God made," etc., which the congregation sang. Prayer was then offered up by the minister. His voice is somewhat squeaking, and his attitude comparatively sedate; albeit there is a tremulous waving of the head. After devotion, he read Isaiah, 52nd chapter (the former half) with a running commentary thereon, by way of a flourish of trumpets, with outstretched hands and a shrieking voice. Again, he read the latter half of chapter I. of the first epistle to the Corinthians. Then, he read a portion of Psalm 25, beginning, "To thee I lift my soul," &c. Then we had another prayer—but not the usual *parrot* prayer. He has the genuine Puritanic devotional tone of voice. The rev. gentlemen selected his text from Romans, chap. 16 : "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." There is no text in Scripture so hackneyed as this. It is the stock-in-trade of all would-be imitators of Paul. It is no disparagement to Mr. Hardie, to say that nothing original was said on that topic. Originality here is impossible. However, the usual platitudes on the Roman Empire in its social, political, intellectual, moral and religious condition at that time, were commendably and laconically set forth. Paul's conduct under those circumstances was, of course, eulogised, and quotations from his writings freely indulged in. His obligations to Greek and Jew and Roman, were specified, and a parade of his sufferings in his missionary labors was set before the congregation, almost in his own words, and by way of an exordium. Then the sermon—properly so-called—was judiciously, if not learnedly, distributed under two orthodox heads.

I. Paul's glorying in the Gospel of Christ. This Gospel is the ground of sinful man's justification, by faith before God. It was miraculously revealed to the great Apostle by the Saviour himself. Its fundamental principles, the redemption of the soul, the Divine substitution, the duty of Faith, and the inspiration of Hope, were amply set forth and proved by texts, embodying the salient events of the Gospel, from the Incarnation to the final ascension of the Redeemer of mankind; and also the consequent personal salvation of both soul and body, re-united and crowned with glory, honor, and immortality in the spotless Paradise of God. Unconsciously, he pointed out how Paul would have been heartily *ashamed* of the hateful tenets of Antinomianism. By the way, there are two congregations in Dunedin strongly tinged with these odious tenets of grace superseding personal holiness. It is, as a dogma, as disparaging to Christ, as Arminianism, taught in Methodist and certain Presbyterian Churches, is derogatory from the omniscience of the Deity. Paul, too, would have been cordially ashamed of the moderatism of our Episcopal Churches, and also of that Church which travesties the memory and doctrines of the Scottish Reformer. So much for this digression.

II. We come now to Paul's Reasons for *not* being ashamed of the Gospel. It is the Power of God, divinely revealed to man for his soul's salvation. It is God's peculiar instrument for human regeneration. It is the omnipotent panacea for all ills. Paul prepared and seasoned the soil for the reception of this Divine seed. He broke up the fallow ground of the human heart. The Gospel is pre-eminently fitted for all classes—Jews and Gentiles. It exercises, like the sun in the firmament, its beneficent influences upon all shades of sinners. It is calculated to make them new creatures, fellow-citizens of the City of God—as Augustine phrases it. The preacher closed his excellent sermon with a rousing practical application to the consciences of his hearers. He energetically asked, "What is your attitude to this glorious Gospel? What is your personal relation to it? How do you look upon Him, whom your sins have nailed to the cross? Have you washed away your sins in this divine fountain? Are you ashamed of the Gospel? Do you set your affections on the things that are above?" The baseness of being ashamed of the Cross was depicted in rhetorical figures of speech, accompanied with appropriate bodily gestures. The hands were elevated aloft while the preacher importuned the people *not* to be ashamed of the glorious Gospel of Christ. A portion of the 30th psalm, beginning "Lord, I will thee extol," &c., was then read by the minister, and by the congregation. Then the preacher prayed fervently. Again, a portion of Paraphrase 54 was sung : "I'm not ashamed to own my Lord," &c. Finally, in the *Whitfieldian attitude* of uplifted hands, the minister pronounced the benediction.

The day was intensely cold. Many seats were empty. The preacher's shrieking voice died often away in an unintelligible monotone amid the echoes of the building. He is, however, a promising young man. Originally a cooper to trade, socially, but not *financially*, he raised himself to the ministry, and was assistant pastor to the

Cowgate congregation, Edinburgh. Paul himself was a tent-maker, and in these colonies would have realised handsome wages—and even affluence at such a lucrative and thriving trade. A deafness in one of his ears prevents him from modulating his voice according to the capacity of the church. At present, he is located in the picturesque town of Kilmore—37 miles north of Melbourne, on the Sydney road. His present church is not so large as the hall in the rear of the First Church; but he has another little charge at Broadford, a few miles further forward on the Sydney road. Twelve years ago, we sojourned for three months in Kilmore. The town has not increased since that time; indeed, it has decreased. But yet there are, for a population of about 1200 souls, *six churches*, of which two are Presbyterian. But Kilmore is the centre of a splendid agricultural district, so that the farmers and their families worship in the town. There are, also, ten public houses. We believe the Rev. Mr. Hardie has received a call to one of the Presbyterian churches of Emerald Hill—one of the fourteen populous suburbs of Melbourne.

Presbyterianism flourishes well everywhere but in Otago—where, however, it ought to fill the land. There is ample room in Dunedin for other two large churches, with earnest and intelligent ministers. The First Church should take action, and apply to the Established Church of Scotland for a good pastor, and guarantee him £1000 a-year by way of stipend.

THE seventeenth preacher from Victoria—the Rev. F. W. M. Wilson from Camperdown—delivered his inaugural sermon in the First Church, Dunedin, on Sabbath, 14th June, 1874. He is a tall, dark-haired, whiskered and moustachioed, and dignified looking man. He gracefully ascended the glorious pulpit, sat down a few moments, and then rose reverentially, and read the First Psalm: "That man hath perfect blessedness who walketh not astray in counsel of ungodly men," &c. Thereafter he read the 3rd chapter of Malachi, and also the 16th chapter of Matthew's Gospel—thus bringing the close of the Old Dispensation into juxtaposition with the beginning of the New.

In prayer he has a dignified and even judicial deportment. His articulation is clear, without being loud, and very intelligible. In devotion, his posture is erect and solemn, and sedate. The hands are firmly clasped over the Sacred Oracles, and there is no motion of the head. His attitude resembles that of the presiding Judge at the Titchborne trial. Each petition is weighty in expression and fraught with wisdom. His phraseology is exceedingly appropriate. After prayer the congregation sang a portion of Paraphrase 26, beginning thus—

Ho! ye that thirst, approach the spring,
where living waters flow; &c.

Again, he recited, with a beautiful introduction, the Lord's prayer. The rev. gentleman selected his text from Matthew's Gospel, chap. xvi., v. 26: "For what is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" With a sermon on this text, the Rev. Dr. Begg opened the First Church. Like Dr. Begg, Mr Wilson sets the highest value upon the soul. The question propounded in the text is most important and practical. In the eyes of the world, it would appear that men place small value upon their souls. They throw it away, like the prodigal, on the pleasures and vanities of life. They prefer the temporal to the spiritual—the present to the future; God and religion are disregarded in their pursuit of wealth, fame, esteem, honour and pleasure. They look on religion as casting a gloom over life. They hope, however, to attend to its concerns at a future and convenient season, before death. But how differently God regards the soul, may be learned from the fact of his Eternal Son having left the throne of his glory, descended to this sinful world, and made atonement for the guilt incurred by the sinful sons of men. Compared to the value of the soul, the world is only as a mite floating in the sun-beam. The redemption of men is eternal proof of God's appreciation of the immortal soul. It is, therefore, possible for a man to lose his soul. This the sinner feels, and therefore, for his own peace's sake he studies to forget God, Judgment, and Eternity, or ignores the Gospel, or takes refuge in scepticism for a while—being immersed in the perishing things and pursuits of life. But let him do his best, still his efforts are unavailing; for he cannot shake off the fears of a guilty and awakened conscience. It is possible for a man to gain his soul; for it is already lost, by reason of the Fall. Our case is very different from that of Adam. He was created in a state of innocence, holiness and happiness. But we are plunged into a condition of sin, misery and infelicity. By Divine grace, however, we may be redeemed; there is hope of recovery, and Eternal life is freely offered to us in the Gospel. If we will not accept of the overtures of grace, we shall be finally, eternally, and irretrievably ruined.

This solemn truth was grandly illustrated by means of parables, anecdotes, and stories collected from the gibbet, the sinking and burning ship, the besieged city, the Pilgrim's Progress, from the history of Dives and Lazarus, and from Esau's conduct in relation to his birthright. The minister contracted the unseen with the seen world, and showed the folly of sacrificing the former for the evanescent pleasures, riches, positions, and fleeting honors of the latter. The deplorable and defenceless state of the worldling before the Great White

Throne at the final Judgment was eloquently painted in graphic language. The world and all its treasures, when weighed in the balance of Heaven, are light as air compared with the salvation of the soul. The recollection of the vanities of life, so far from giving the condemned soul any sense of pleasure, will be gall and wormwood to it. Worldly wisdom and nobility avail not then. The gifts of the world and of Fortune will then be seen in their true colors. The preacher urged his hearers not to allow the world to come into competition with the salvation of their souls from sin, misery, and eternal death. It is a great delusion to invert the Order of Grace—aye, and of Nature, too to seek first this world, which is as unstable as "rainbow's lovely form, evanishing amid the storm." It is dangerous to postpone, even for a day, the business connected with the soul's salvation. It is foolish to postpone spiritual for worldly good. What begins in worldliness cannot end in heavenliness. Why not reform now? Future reformation will be far more difficult, even should life be prolonged. Hut can reformation blot out the past? Sin must be punished, justice must be executed upon the sinner. Oh! but "God is merciful!" Such a plea in the mouth of the wicked is very fallacious. It is fraught with false notions of God. All sinners are condemned already. They are in prison waiting the day of execution. God is only merciful to such as fear, love, and obey him, and approach him through the great Mediator. Out of Christ, he is a consuming fire. You refuse to repent now, and God will most justly despise your prayer for mercy when it is too late to seek it. Suppose you gained the whole world, and neglected the great concerns of eternity; what then? If the soul is lost, all is gone; therefore, if your possessions distract your thoughts from religion, sell them at once, and accept the terms of grace freely offered to you in the ever glorious Gospel.

At the close of his sermon, the preacher offered up a grand prayer, and then read another portion of the 26th Paraphrase, which was sung by the great congregation,—

Seek ye the Lord, while yet His ear
Is open to your call;
While offered mercy still is near,
Before His footstool fall.

Let sinners quit their evil ways.
Their evil thoughts forego;
And God, when they to Him return,
Returning grace will show," &c.

After this sacred service of praise, the preacher made sundry congregational announcements, and finally pronounced the benediction.

As Admiral Duncan, on June 11, 1797, when he first came in sight of the Dutch fleet off Camperdown, gallantly and bravely bore down upon them, and totally defeated, the enemies of his country, and was accordingly elevated to the peerage with the title of Viscount Duncan of Camperdown, and rewarded with an annual pension of £3000 by the Parliament of England : even so, on the 11th of June, 1874, when the minister of Camperdown first surveyed the Dunedin congregation from his lofty pedestal, he eloquently directed a steady shower of Gospel fire at the heads of the subjects of Mammon, and the apostate rebels of the King of Heaven. Accordingly, let the congregation elevate the minister of Camperdown to the pulpit of the First Church, and bestow upon him an annual stipend of £1000. Verily, they cannot do better for their own spiritual interests, and for the salvation of their souls from the all-devouring jaws of materialism and death.

Olympian Thunderbolts.

I. The public meetings, held in Dunedin, for the ventilation of opinions respecting the water question, have not been altogether barren of results. Both the quasi-Rector of the High School, and the quasi-Professor of the so-called University, by their idiotic utterances and undignified gestures, gave emphatic demonstration of the truth of every word which I had written concerning them.

II. On the evening of the 4th of May, 1874, the Otago Night School opened its winter session. The Hall was not half filled. Dr. Donald McNaughton Stuart introduced, in a few rambling words, Captain Hutton, the newly-appointed professor of Geology and Zoology, who gave a rambling and idiotic address, like a schoolboy. Behind the lecturer, there were about nine local mountebanks, representing every phase of faith,—spiritualism, materialism, and nihilism. On the left-hand of the platform, there was a fair proportion of the members of the

Provincial Council. On the right-hand were seated a group of clerical invalids of the Otago Hospital. Immediately in front of the stage, sat a coterie of women, anxiously trying to look scientific. In the body of the Hall was scattered a motley collection of the general public. Cart loads of chairs had been procured for the occasion, but not many were occupied, while the forms presented a dreary picture of desolation. The night was cold and damp, and the atmosphere of the Hall was still more so. Captain Hutton is a spectacled and motionless man and a drawling reader. His address was a piece of patchwork from books on science. There is not an original notion in his head. His MSS.—consisting of printed slips of the next morning's 'Times'—he held in his hands and before his weasel eyes, like a child holding an alphabetical chart. He is a barbarous pronouncer—nearly as bad as the quasi-vice-chancellor. He labored hard to impress on his audience that he was sound in the faith. Another Quasi-Professor served as a beacon of warning to keep him off the materialistic rock. During the reading of his reviews, I was nearly frost-bitten. Altogether, the proceedings presented a most ludicrous burlesque on education, and a most contemptible caricature of a university.

III. Otago's revenue for the year ending March 31, 1874, was £451,425, and the expenditure was £376,007. Besides, Otago contributed towards the General Government the sum of £436,147—of which £55,580 have been refunded to the Province. We have a fine revenue, but it is frittered away on worthless officialism which, owing to our complicated system of Government, covers the land, like Egyptian locusts, lice, frogs and caterpillars.

In Otago, besides private schools, there are about 140 State institutions, in which about 220 teachers of both sexes instruct 11,000 children. While we sell land to the extent of about 260,000 acres annually, and lease about 30,000 acres, and receive large revenues from the pastoral tenants of the Crown, we can afford to lavish annually large sums—between L30,000 and L40,000—upon education of a very spurious character; but the day of taxation is looming in the horizon, and then economy of expenditure and efficiency in tuition will be demanded by the taxpaying public. As a community, we have done next to nothing towards the promotion of education—all our blatant boasting notwithstanding. To examine annually these alphabetical schools, we keep up two peripatetic inspectors.

V. Professor Pillans opened the Humanity Class in the Edinburgh University with a prayer for the whole session. A member of the Otago Council "wanted prayers to be read only at the beginning of the session." The Otago member probably never heard of the "paltry Pillans of Lord Byron"—the "Pillans who traduced his friend." Pillans, also, in his inaugural address, always impressed upon his class the Apostolic precepts: "Let every man be *swift to hear, slow to speak, slow to wrath,*" &c. It would be well if flippant and ignorant quacks would "lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive with meekness the engrafted word, which is able to save their souls." We want "doers, and not hearers of the word;" and *praters* all wise men will studiously eschew.

VI. On the 30th April, 1874, quasi-Professor McGregor delivered an ebullition in his usual style before the Knox Church Young Men's Christian Association. The attendance was very meagre. The pastor eulogised the lecturer, who, to our thinking, showed a strongly Materialistic bias. To his inaugural lecture in 1871 we took violent exception, and gave much offence to the Pharisees, who "were offended." But let the lecturer speak for himself: "At the age of 40, a man's brain is a stereotype of his past life, and it is then a difficult matter to leave on it the impression of a new idea. Men's brains seldom grow after they reach, the age of 40. The *cells* in the brain grow and increase in number until they reach 40, when the growth stops." Combined with the *inherent laziness of our nature*, we allow our minds—if minds we have—"to grow as a vegetable does." Hence, "at 40, a man's brain is stereotyped," and he can have no new ideas! The lecture would appear to be a formal apology for "the young men of the present day, who find so little sympathy in their yearning after truth," in grave-yards, seance-chambers, and the coarse sties of Materialism. McGregor's lecture is not worthy of much serious notice; for the whole successive history of the Human Mind, from Heraclitus to Professor Blackie, Carlyle, and Emerson, gives the lie to his stupid reveries. Life is short, art long, opportunity fleeting, experiment slippery, judgment difficult, according to Hippocrates. According to Aristotle, the Mind does not reach its prime vigor till 49. Herodotus did not begin to write his great history until he was seventy years of age. Isocrates wrote his grand remonstrance at the age of 100, and after the fall of Greece on the fatal field of Chæroneia, he in grief committed suicide. How vigorous at 90 was Brougham! and Brewster the day before his death was in his study. But why multiply cases: for some men's brains are stereotyped from the womb. The cells of their brains expand only like mushrooms; they have no sculs capable of development; their intellect is simply a keen sense of appetite; their mind is lodged in the pit of their stomach. To such men, Metaphysics and Morals are *meaningless* sounds. The soul of man, we hold, is perpetually growing, expanding and renewing its youth, like a strong eagle that loves to soar higher and nearer to Empyrean spheres, where for ever dwell the Platonic ideas of the *Good*, the *True*, and the *Beautiful*.

VII. In the course of my speech, at the public meeting of the citizens of Dunedin, on the question of deepening the Harbour, I accidentally taunted some of the promoters of that work with the glaring

inconsistency of calling on the Provincial Council to borrow large sums of money, while they themselves had neglected to pay their creditors. The remark operated like a shell cast into the assembly. Disorder and confusion compelled me to sit down. "Do you not see," said the chairman, "you have offended these men?" Precisely so. As Professor Blackie well writes on Moral Culture,— "There is no more offensive thing than truth, when it runs counter to certain great social interests, associations and passions. *Moral courage* is unquestionably, if the most manly, certainly the rarest of the social virtues." As of old, so to-day, men will come up to a fearless reformer and censor, and say, like the timid Disciples, "Master! knowest thou not that the Pharisees were offended?"

VIII. During my speech at the official declaration of the state of the Poll, I gave much offence to certain Jews because I spoke sarcastically of Vogel's loans from the Cockney usurers. Three Israelites next day assured me that they would do all in their power against me whenever I presented myself before the public. I replied that they were descendants of men who opposed, even to death, a better man than myself. "O yes! such another fellow as yourself," was the prompt rejoinder. Among Jews, Christians, Turks, and Gentiles generally, it is needless to say, there are good as well as bad specimens of humanity. No man of reflection and education can despise the Jewish, any more than the Scottish Nation. Were I to make a voyage to the extreme ends of the Globe, I should find both *a Jew and a Scot bestriding the Poles*.

IX. Can anything be more despicable than what is ludicrously called a Provincial Political Crisis? Our Council met on the 29th April, when the Executive resigned, and on the 7th May, a new team of bullocks had been fitted for the yoke. What an illiterate parcel of creatures they are! Yet there is something commendable in their composition. A pioneer bullock-driver takes the lead. A spiritualist is always ready to give supernatural information as to the character of results. A storekeeper regulates the books. A shepherd will give advice as to the price-currents of mutton and wool. And a watchmaker is ever ready to regulate the political chronometer. But, the whole affair is beneath a wise man's serious notice or animadversion.

X. When Andrew Mercer retires from the Mayoral chair of Dunedin, he should inscribe, in golden letters, over his door, this inscription,— "Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit." As a public speaker or a chairman of a meeting, he had few equals, and certainly no superiors. He is racy of the soil.

XI. Ex-Mayor Fish has been angling for two offices, and in the desire to secure one, he has lost both. He should recede to the shade, and engrave over his shop a gilded inscription to this effect:—"Trust not in princes nor man's son, in whom there is no stay."

XII. The old First Church is now turned into a clothes and boot factory. To what base uses may not the noblest things be transformed in these mercantile communities?

XIII. If, said a West Tareri gentleman, who drives his carriage and pair, side by side with his pastor, "if we could only worry away our minister, we would all gladly and unanimously call Mr Johnstone of Caversham. He preached in our church, and our minister hung down his head for very shame during the service. Contrary to use and wont, he could not pluck up the courage to say something at the close." Johnstone—like Forsaith—is not eligible for a call in a Presbyterian church.

XIV. Who edits the 'Otago Daily Times?' *Nobody*. The New Zealand editors—as frequently we have written in the pages of the *Saturday Review*—are men clothed in ignorance as with a garment. To have a few shares in a newspaper company; to have a cigar in one's mouth and a staff in the hand; to be a member of a free and easy club of creatures who glory in denying their religion, desecrating the Sabbath, and holding up to scorn all that is true, honest, just, virtuous, lovely and reputable, these are pre-eminently the qualifications of a so-called leading journal in this degraded colony. As for so-called leaders, they emanate from the teeming maggots that float in the brains of out-side penny-a-liners who wish to earn a guinea, and gratify a personal spleen.

XV. The *Timaru Herald* is naturally indignant at the idea of "emptying the Reformatories and Workhouses of the United Kingdom into our emigrant ships." We have, however, one consolation in the reflection that, however bad may be *the quality* of our immigrants, they cannot possibly be more *worthless* than the men who are instrumental in importing them to our virgin shores.

XVI. Taieri boor and the Shetland pony have, at last, succeeded in making *both a political*, if not a grammatical *conjunction*—a conjunction of a very queer description indeed.

XVII. The 'Otago Daily Times' has erased Vogel's motto. It should now get an engraving of the following emblematic device, to wit—*a weathercock*. This is the emblem of its politics and general creed.

XVIII. Auckland is obtaining an unenviable notoriety for its periodical conflagrations. Indeed, almost all the fires that burst out in these provinces are the works of incendiarism. What diabolical dispositions must those men have who destroy the earth's precious fruits when safely gathered into the farm-yard and granaries!

XIX. Divine Providence always employs the vilest instruments to scourge the wicked. The New Zealand reptiles are being fattened for the worms on borrowed capital, negotiated by a lineal descendant of the impenitent thief on the Cross.

XX. In 1865-6, I tried, in my place, in the Otago Council, to bring thieves and rogues to justice. Hence

Dunedin refused to re-elect me.

XXI. Sydney Smith said that Great Britain is "the only country in which poverty is a crime." Had he lived in these degraded Colonies what would he have said? Colonial communities seem to be totally ignorant of what Professor Blackie calls "the fundamental principle of all moral philosophy, that the real dignity of a man lies not in what he *has* but in what he *is*. *The Kingdom of Heaven is within you*—not without." Dunedin, for example, is so far given over to the worship of Mammon, that it hath ostracised altogether Moral Philosophy; and the Church of Otago endows the public teaching of the coarsest forms of Materialism. As Professor Blackie says—"Laws of Nature, invariable sequence, natural selection, favourable conditions, happy combination of external circumstances," why, such expressions are simply *reasonless phrases*, which can never suffice "to explain the frame of the universe apart from mind." Morals divorced from Religion are simply abnormal and monstrous materialism. As Blackie nobly says, "The fountain of all the nobler morality is moral inspiration from within; and the feeder of this fountain is God. Atheists are crotchet-mongers, and puzzle-brains; fellows who spin silken ropes in which to strangle themselves; and who *can fasten their coarse feelers upon nothing but what they can finger and classify, and tabulate, and dissect.*" What a portrait of the Materialism of the Otago Night School! But, continues Blackie, "there is something that stands above all fingering, all microscopes, and all curious diagnosis, and that is simply *Life*; and life is simply energising Reason, and energising Reason is only another name for God." Professor Blackie reasons as a disciple of Plato and Aristotle. Our Otago professional pensioners shriek out the coarse utterances of Bentham, Bain, and such like materialists. In Dunedin *particularly*, how needful is Blackie's caution to young men to "beware of being infected by *the moral contagion* which more or less taints the atmosphere of every rich trading and manufacturing community,—the contagion which breeds a habit of estimating the value of men by *the external apparatus of life* rather than by its *internal nobility.*"

XXII. I have spent many thousands of pounds in the dissemination of knowledge in New Zealand. Mammon-worshippers doubtless esteem me as a fool. But Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Paul and a host of others testify, or as Professor Blackie says, "all agree in stating with serious emphasis, that money-making is not an ennobling occupation, and that he who values money most values himself least. There are few things in social life *more contemptible* than a rich man who stands upon his riches." And what else can the so-called men of *social position* stand upon? They are simply dwarfs "perched upon a lofty platform, looking over the heads of the multitudes, but, take the creatures down from their *artificial* elevation, and look them fairly in the face, and soon you will find that they are figures too insignificant to measure swords with." Away, therefore, with those who eternally bore me with their sage advices to this effect, "If you had feeling, and did not hit so hard, or write so forcibly, &c., you might be the highest man in New Zealand" and such like ghostly admonitions. *Such men want me to be a hypocrite.* Nay, verily I will, with the grace and help of God, "stand strictly on my moral and intellectual excellence, and I will stand in the long run, where the true value of things comes out. There is not a millionaire in the land who can boast himself my superior."

XXIII. Ten years ago, in an obituary notice of Thackeray, in the *Saturday Review*, I held up to scorn his miserable caricatures of humanity, and was roundly brought to task on that account by several journals, notably the *Melbourne Argus*. Feeling confident in my position I did not reply. In his book on *Self Culture*, just published, the Professor of Greek in the Edinburgh University writes of Thackeray thus, "for myself, I honestly confess, that I never could learn anything from Thackeray; there is *a certain feeble amiability even about his best characters*, which, if it is free from *the depressing influence of his bad ones*, is certainly *anything but bracing.*" Both Thackeray and Dickens are now no more; their works, like their bones, will rot away in inglorious oblivion. The river of Lethe will roll its oblivious waves over their worthless memories.

XXIV. At a trial for libel, an Otago lawyer is reported to have said that, whatever the Bench might do, he, "at all events, would assert the independence, decorum, and dignity of the Bar." This is a labor, we fear, more hopeless than that of the daughters of Danaus. To maintain the dignity of a Colonial Bar, is as vain an undertaking as to milk a he-goat in a sieve. As the English sage well writes: "Nothing can make that great which the decree of Nature hath ordained to be little." Why did not the judge commit to custody such a flippant contemner of the Bench?

XXV. What a great number of lame people strut about the streets of Dunedin on crutches. Plenty of scope here for a Syrian Thaumaturgus!

XXVI. Colonists ought to feel ashamed to look a sheep or an ox in the face. They eat so much animal food that their features assume a brutish hue. In Otago, with its 80,000 souls, we have 3,300,000 sheep.

XXVII. According to official statistics, the passengers, for the past financial year, ending March 31, 1874, by the Dunedin and Port Chalmers Railway numbered 84,746, and the receipts amounted to L7,992. 8,988 persons paid L1,123 for Sunday excursions. The total amount realised for goods, passengers, and rent of refreshment rooms was L21,553. The profit realised amounted to L7,929. The Press—even the 'Tablet' included—sneers at Sunday trains. According to the 'Tablet,' Presbyterians converse and associate with

Catholics, and 'evil communications corrupt good manners.' A low state of morals among Presbyterians but too surely implies a low state of morals among Catholics, too." Will Sunday excursions improve the tone of public morals? Are not the Sabbath and the pulpit the bulwarks of morality? It is all very well to speak about the baneful effects of the Reformation as a "foul revolt." But Luther—who translated the Bible in his lonely citadel—laid the foundation, not only of German, but of even European greatness. It may be that Archbishop Manning's "Lutheran heresy has developed into simple rationalism in the educated, and into materialism among the millions of the people." Nevertheless, the Reformation gave an immense impulse to human reason in the divine progress of mental illumination. It enabled the soul to rise from the thralldom of spiritual slavery, and to emerge from the Cimmerian darkness of ignorance, bigotry and misery.

XXVIII. Dr. Beke has discovered the real Mount Sinai, and also, on its summit, the remains of sacrificed animals, and on its slopes some Sinaitic inscriptions. Language cannot express our contempt for such buffooneries and superstitious impositions. Away with your lies!

XXIX. The United Kingdom, with its 31,000,000 souls, boasts of 1585 newspapers. Of these, London owns 314; Provinces, 915; Wales, 58; Scotland, 149; Ireland, 131; British Isles, 18. In England there are 95 dailies, in Wales, 2, in Scotland, 14, in Ireland, 17, in the British Isles, 2. The number of Magazines and Reviews is 639, of which 242 are decidedly religious. New Zealand, with its 300,000 souls, has about 100 newspapers—or rather private journals of illiterate and worthless proprietors. They talk about freedom of the Press—whenever their pockets are concerned—but there really is no paper in this colony that dares to utter a word of truth, if it runs counter to the political crotchets and the interests, of the coterie it servilely adulates for bread and butter. Freedom of the Press! a fool's word in the degraded colony of New Zealand. Here the soul of man is fast ensconced in the capacious pit of his stomach.

XXX. David Chadwick, the M.P. for Macclesfield, is building a free library, at a cost of £5000 for the town he represents. He, also, puts 10,000 volumes on its shelves. Mr Greenall, member for Warrington has given £1000 towards building a new hospital and dispensary. In four years, the golden city of Dunedin cannot raise £600 for a Scott Scholarship to perpetuate the memory of Scott" in the Otago Night School. Besides, the blatant followers of the New Zealand Gorilla have not yet raised their boasted £500 for a memorial to the meanest—but most representative man of the colony.

XXXI. The *Daily Times*—like the vane of a steeple veering with the varying wind—treats its readers with a contemptible portrait of the Colonial Gorilla. Like draws to like. Both the editor and his idol were once representatives of Waikouaiti, and hobbled about Dunedin like a Damon and Pythias, a Pylades and Orestes, or a David and Jonathan of an unspeakably lower type of humanity.

XXXII. According to the Inverness 'Courier,' Glenurquhart, starting off from Loch Ness, in its profusion of wood, and rock, and water, and its mild western climate, is the Tempe of Scotland. This lovely parish is the patrimony of the heir apparent to the earldom of Seafield. By the way, Lord Macduff has been elected, in preference to the Hon. James Grant, of Grant, as member for Nairn and Moray. Macduff Was hooted and hissed at Gran town, for his audacity to seek the suffrages of the Strathspey tenantry of the family of Grant. Time was, when none but a Grant could show face on such a mission in the picturesque regions of Castle Grant. Albeit the tenants feared to support Macduff, yet as his lordship "drove in his carriage and four horses, ridden by postillions in scarlet jackets," through Grantown, he was loudly cheered. Strathspey is a stronghold of Toryism, an I, on the whole, it is better than mock liberalism. If Gladstone has gained the support of the member for Nairn and Moray, he has lost the patronage of Perthshire; for Sir William Stirling Maxwell—a host in himself, a scholar and an aristocrat—has been re-elected. Poor old Roebuck has been re-elected for Sheffield. He has been banquetted in the Cutler's Hall. He, too, will be a bitter thorn in Gladstone's side. But—as Carlyle says—Gladstone is a *hagsman*, and Disraeli a contemptible *pedlar*. And, between the two, Old England is losing her time-honored prestige among the European nations. England wants another Milton and another Cromwell to put her right.

XXXIII. According to the Inverness 'Courier,' in the year ended the 31st of March, 1874, there were 14 detections of illicit distillation in England, 10 in Scotland, and 1,033 in Ireland. Why may rut a farmer extract spirit from his grain? We should make free trade in spirits, and then there would be an end to intoxication. Revenue derived from licenses is spent in the prosecution and punishment of crime that follows in the train of drunkenness. Abolish licensed pot-houses and distilleries, and let every man manufacture or sell the water of life as pleases. Pure mountain dew is a real boon to humanity. Like Homer's Nepenthe, it soothes all our cares and banishes all our woes. Templars and teetotallers we heartily abominate. A drunken man, lying in the gutter, is a more powerful temperance lecturer than a Gough or a Jago. When will the children of men return to common sense?

XXXIV. Carlyle often says that England is going to wind and tongue. Well, the sage is right: for there are 2148 male, and 255 female authors, editors, journalists or writers. In this idiotic century, literature is diffused: in the seventeenth century it was terribly concentrated, and therefore it was original, powerful, and learned.

XXXV. So, Shirley Brooks, the editor of 'Punch' is dead; Its last editor, Mark Lemon, died in 1870. The editors of this Idiotic Journal of buffoonery had, according to the 'Inverness Courier,' "but a brief meteor-like public existence. Only one of the number—the late Mark Lemon—has yet attained the age of sixty. Albert Smith, Gilbert à Becket, Douglas Jerrold, Thackeray, Leech and Brooks, have all sunk down without reaching three score years." We read that the wicked shall not live half their days. Such coarse caricaturists of Humanity would have been treated with contempt in Ancient Athens, while in old Rome, they could not have been tolerated by the grave and austere senate. Thanks be unto God, there is no such *thing* as a 'Punch' in good old Caledonia. Human nature is too sacred to be burlesqued by buffoons.

XXXVI. Greg's *Creed of Christendom* is a formidable but pedantic book. His pre-conceived thesis—according to Professor Newman—is "the miraculous perfection of *One* most imperfectly known to us, of whom we have only miserably garbled accounts, reaching over a very short period of time. Unitarians desire a purified Gospel. Why, then, is not such a thing published? Nearly every sentence has to be either cut out or re-written." Precisely so. There is the Gospel, either accept or reject it: for to modify it to square with your notions is to surrender the citadel of Faith to the enemy, as Greg did to Newman, and as Pillans of Sydney did to Grant of Dunedin.

XXXVII. Professor Blackie has been lecturing on Classics before the Edinburgh School of Arts. He spoke contemptuously of "the narrowness and exclusiveness of the champions of Physical Science. He knew no more narrow minded people than *the fellows* who were working with knives and scalpels. They had all a tendency to believe only what they could finger and see with the eye, which was called *Materialism*—a tendency to despise life, colour, imagination, philosophy and religion."

XXXVIII. In my book on Classical Education, I stated that no branch of knowledge could be intelligently studied without an acquaintance with the classics. Blackie has arrived at precisely the same conclusion, after a long life of professional devotion to the Greek and Latin tongues. "Nine-tenths of French, Spanish, and Italian, and one-half of the English were only Latin under a slight disguise; and a thorough drill in Latin, besides its mere value as a drill, stood in the same relation to English and those other languages which I have mentioned, as a thorough course of Anatomy did to Physiology and Medicine—it gave a solid, bony framework to all linguistic study. Nineteen twentieths of the technical terminology of the Physical Sciences were mere Greek and Latin, and nothing more powerfully assisted the memory and gave a *more marked distinctness to great ideas* than an accurately understood phraseology." Such ideas cannot be appreciated in these Colonies for a century at least. Colonists have no *great ideas*. Their thoughts are always fastened on what they shall eat, drink, and wherewithal they shall be clothed. They are Epicureans, *minus* its ancient delicacy of taste, and refinement and culture. Classics are pre-eminently calculated to *inspire a taste for literature*: but then, as Blackie well said, they must be "taught by really accomplished men and not by merely hired grammarians," and idiotic materialists, such as pollute the mind, in embryo, in these outlandish Provinces of New Zealand, and Colonies of Australia. An ignorant teacher is a moral nuisance.

XXXIX. The Wapping Pork Butcher, the would-be English baronet, the companion for six years of "members of Parliament, the chosen of fashionable clubs, the idol of the populace," the blackest impostor of modern times, has now at last found suitable quarters—"He is now in his right place, the occupant of a cell in Newgate—a convict branded with every mark of infamy, and consigned to a felon's cell." This extraordinary trial, the gain and disgrace of the English bar, has cost altogether about £200,000. The execration of mankind follows him to his lonely and accursed cell. He has been convicted of "crimes as black and foul as Justice ever raised her hand to strike," to use the words of his own Counsel. Only fanatics and fools can feel for such an abandoned brute.

XL. The right thing at last! Death on Normal Schools : for they are scholastic nuisances. A chair of education is to be founded in the University of Edinburgh. The other Universities will follow suit, and we shall have properly trained students, such as always were selected in the counties of Aberdeen, Banff, and Moray—the best educated shires of Great Britain. "This chair," says the 'Inverness Courier,' "is the first recognition by a University in the British dominions, and in English speaking lands, of the wisdom and necessity of educating our teachers professionally within college walls, amidst the influences of culture, learning, and University prestige, already enjoyed by other professions." Away, therefore, for ever with the coarse grained dominies of Normal Schools. They are beneath contempt.

XLI. Threw millions of souls in India are starving. At Durbungob, 15,000 persons are employee' on the relief works at the semi-starvation wages of three half-pence daily." Glasgow has subscribed L5,000, and London L50,000 for the sufferers. "Three half-pence daily," for a working man! Think of that, ye men of Otago, who get from 8s. to 20s. per day. But your turn is drawing nigh. The day is coming when you will call, and call in vain, on the man, whom you have ungratefully insulted, for aid in the time of trial and privation. Ingratitude is a sin of the blackest dye. Neither God nor man can forgive it. Men who enjoy the privileges of the eight hours' system of labor, and for whom I spent years of labor in advocating their rights and in procuring

them labor, vote against me at elections, and pass and repass me and never invest a shilling in any of my Books! However, let that pass.

XLII. Dr. Niel Arnott has died in London at the age of 86. He was an eminent man of science, and inventor of the Arnott Stove, &c. To each of the Scottish Universities he bequeathed L1,000 to encourage the study of science; and L2,000 to the London University. He was a native of Arbroath, and author of the Elements of Physics, &c. His brain did not become *stereotyped* at 40. Neither was the brain of Mrs. Somerville stereotyped at 40, nor even at 92 : for in 1872 she was "able to read books in the higher algebra for four or five hours in the morning, and even to solve problems." She also, according to her autobiographical confessions, "enjoyed reading about all the new discoveries and theories in the scientific world, and in all branches of science" But there are creatures pensioned in Otago whose brains never expanded to the conception of one living idea, and whose souls never get out of the sleep of Materialism. They have copious stomachs, but minds Nature stingily denied them. Their brains are a stagnant pool, covered over with loathsome maggots.

XLIII. According to the 'Inverness Courier' of March 5, during February, "no less than 95 Englishmen arrived at Caprera to pay their respects to Garibaldi, who is in poor health. Garibaldi is honorary citizen of 90 towns, villages and districts, and honorary president of 120 societies; he has twenty-one swords of honour, eleven of which have been sent him from abroad, and since 1871 he has received upwards of 5000 addresses of sympathy from various quarters. The Island of Caprera brings in to the General a net income of about 3000 lire. There are 25 lire to the pound sterling. Universal Fame with *otium cum dignitate*, on an income of £120. This is less than the wages of a Colonial mechanic. But great men despise money, and the worshippers of mammon. Like the brave Apostle, having food and raiment and lodging they are satisfied. In all circumstances in which they are placed by Providence, they are contented. But there is a very dark side to this picture. The illustrious Kossuth, according to a German Newspaper, is living in Turin, "where he supports himself by giving lessons in German, English, and Hungarian, earning less than Fifty Pounds a-year." As the 'Inverness Courier' says : "he is very old, his hair entirely white, his cheeks wan and hollow, and his eyes utterly dimmed. His wife and children are dead, and he is left alone in his old age." According to the German newspaper above specified, "Against the rear wall stood a narrow, plain bed. On the walls hung portraits of Mazzini and Louis Napoleon. On the book-shelf I noticed Hugo's Armée Terrible, Kinglake's Crimea, and ten or twelve well-worn grammars. On a table, close to the bed, lay a loaf of bread and a plate of dried meat." Flippant sciolists deny the depravity—the total depravity of man; but reflective minds are constrained to accept the Calvinistic theory as alone sufficient to account for the social anomalies of this world. The history of great men is a lamentable demonstration of the utter worthlessness of the great mass of mankind. Socrates was poisoned and Jesus crucified, and every great man has had to drink to the dregs the cup of affliction, and to eat the bread of sorrow and of suffering. As Emerson says—"When the gods come among men they are *not known*."

Mills, Dick and Co Printers, Stafford Street. Dunedin.

Evolution.

I. This hateful doctrine—so repugnant to reason, religion, and common sense—saps all sense of manliness and self-respect. It sets its votaries adrift upon the ocean—the charterless and illimitable ocean of scepticism. It inverts the order of nature, and presents a perfect caricature of physical science. It, in short, inculcates the abominable doctrine that man is only a developed baboon.

But we have no desire to misrepresent it in our words. We shall, therefore, tell our readers what a powerful thinker, and even admirer, of Darwin says regarding it: "Those who believe in the Darwinian theory of Evolution, measure the distance which man has travelled, according to that grand hypothesis, from the monad to the saint and the philosopher."

In these degenerate days, one hears it constantly reiterated that "the soul cannot exist without the body." This odious tenet is a logical deduction of Evolution—which is only a very coarse reproduction of the old school of Epicurus. Evolution is arrant Materialism. Now, what is the teaching of the Materialistic school "of science, falsely so called?"

Let Greg respond : "Mind, thought may be merely a state or operation of the physical brain—the soul has no existence whatever—it is only a finer function or development of the reason." Accordingly, the disciples of Darwin, Huxley and Bain are perfectly consistent in caricaturing well-meaning men of the stamp and colossal proportions of Sir William Hamilton, who had the audacity to put this little motto on the title page of his edition of Dr. Reid's Philosophy:—

On earth there is nothing great but Man,
In man there is nothing great but mind.

II. Evolution has a peculiar fascination to rude, ignorant, and degenerate communities. The earliest sciolists of Greek science luxuriated in this crude sort of speculation. The Pre-Socratic School of Philosophy started, like these infant schools—shall we call them schools?—of Australasia, with Materialism; but the Greek mind did not rest there. Dissertations on the properties of matter, and ingenious manipulation of the primordial elements, to wit, fire, air, earth, and water, failed to satisfy the ardent curiosity, and the yearning thirst after knowledge, of the speculative Greeks of that pre-historic period. Even before the advent of Socrates upon the theatre of Greece, all sane men had discovered for themselves that Materialism and its complex Evolutions began and ended in blank Atheism of the coarsest sort, and without even one redeeming feature to console the drooping souls of its infatuated votaries.

III. Victor Cousin—a Peer of France, and a philosopher who laboured for the prolonged period of fifty years to stem the tide of Materialism in France—has abundantly proved in his admirable lectures the baneful influences of Evolution. Sir William Hamilton—the ripest scholar that Great Britain has produced in this century—out of a generous impulse of gratitude dedicated his erudite edition of Scottish Philosophy to that veteran and illustrious French Philosopher. If we go back to that learned seventeenth century, we shall find the celebrated Primate of England—the eloquent and great Dr. Tillotson—solemnly declaring that the votaries of Materialism "degenerate into beasts and devils, wallowing in abominable and filthy lust."

As are men's ideals, so are their aims. In Scripture phraseology, "If we sow to the flesh, of the flesh we shall reap corruption."

Again, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God. Men do not gather grapes from thorns, nor figs from thistles. A corrupt tree cannot produce good fruit." A man who regards himself in the light of a developed ape, and who can trace, or fondly loves to trace, his ancestry back to the fetid, reeking and seething dunghill of Epicurus and Lucretius, is not likely to be transported out of himself in the heroic enterprises of gods and God-like men. The journey from a monad to a man may be a large one, but it is surely a dirty, inglorious, irrational, and singularly irreligious career.

The doctrine that inculcates that, at first, the worm, the lion and man sprung from the tepid womb of the earth, is surely atheistic, essentially degrading, decidedly anti-Christian, and even subversive of every form of natural religion, and laughs to scorn the being of God, the immortality of the soul, and future rewards and punishments in another and eternal state of existence.

IV. The most curious feature in the history of Evolution is the fact of ministers of religion gravely attempting to reconcile its hideous deformities with the beauties of the Christian faith. The fall of man, taught alike in Pagan and Christian religion, has no place in the creed of the Evolutionist. The preacher feels this anachronism, and sets about to evade this difficulty by having recourse to a very disreputable and gratuitous assumption which has not one grain of reason, religion, or authority—human or divine—to support it.

To deny the fall of man is to ignore the plan of redemption, and to fly in the face of the doctrine of the Christian scheme of substitution and reconciliation. The preacher cannot do this and remain in his pulpit, and eat the loaves and fishes of office. Hence, he flies to a disingenuous quibble. He will say that man ascended from a monad to a responsible being, according to the law of Evolution, and thereafter fell from the lofty pinnacle of evolutionary splendour; Alas! in religion,

What damned error, but some sober brow
Will bless it, and approve it with a text,
Hiding the grossness with fair ornament?
There is no vice so simple, but assumes
Some mark of virtue on its outward parts.
How many *cowards*, whose hearts are all as false
As stairs of sand, wear yet upon their chins
The beards of Hercules, and frowning Mars;
Who, inward searched, have livers white as milk?
And these assume but Valour's excrement,
To render them redoubted.

V. The relation of the soul to God is altogether beyond the proper sphere of science. Science deals with

material objects and proceeds on the basis of observation and experience. It collects materials and draws deductions therefrom. It analyses and then synthesises its own notions. It proceeds by the inductive law and attains to certain generalisations. From a vast aggregation of analogous particulars, it rises to the conception of species, and it classifies these into generic conceptions. But all along, its speculations are purely physical; it must not, and indeed cannot, be allowed to transcend its own peculiar sphere, and launch into the regions of metaphysical ideas. For lack of understanding this cardinal distinction between science and metaphysics, many writers have fallen into the vortex of Materialism. Hence Evolutionists not only come into direct antagonism to Christianity, but they fall into sheer Atheism. Evolution can never lead us into Theism. Even vulgarised Christians and spurious apologists of Christianity confound Theism with Atheism. "Christians in general," says Professor F. W. Newman, have been absurdly apt to confound Deists or Theists with Atheists. "The problem of discovering or discerning that a Divine Mind exists is one thing; the problem of judging what are the qualities of that Mind is another. We argue from what we know within ourselves, to what we are to believe concerning the Most High. This is the metaphysical argument. By mere material observation you cannot discover a Divine Mind—nay, you cannot in this way discover a human mind. This is the materialistic argument. External nature treated as alone the men of science choose to treat it, does not reveal a holy and perfect God. In speculating on the moral qualities of the Divine Mind, we reason primarily from the qualities of our own mind; *not* from external nature. The most decisive proof of the existence of a Divine Mind with Socrates and Cicero is derived directly from contemplating the human mind itself. Anatomy will not reveal that a brain can think, nor that the brain of a man is nobler than that of an ape; but knowing beforehand the superiority of the man to the ape, we are taught what structure and what convolutions belong to the nobler brain." Had our amateur lecturers on Evolution and Christianity been able to read with intelligence the dialogues of Plato in Greek, and the philosophical disquisitions of Cicero in Latin, we should have been spared the infliction of their crude notions and imperfectly digested speculations. Such men are incapable of seeing that science and theology revolve in altogether different, but not contradictory spheres of operation. Physics and metaphysics are essentially distinct the one from the other. But vulgar and unphilosophical minds cannot draw the line of complete demarcation.

VI. The Baconian philosophy, applied to religion, is the pregnant mother of Atheism. As a guide to scientific pursuits, it has been prolific of singularly beneficent results in every department of external nature. The present century is very remarkable for our progress in material civilization. As Greg truly says: "More has been done, richer and more prolific discoveries have been made, grander achievements have been realised, in the course of the seventy years of our own life-time than in all the previous life-time of the race." Gas, railways, steamers, telegraphs, newspapers, manufactures, and inventions generally. "All those contrivances which oil the wheels and promote the comfort of daily life, have been concentrated into the present century."

Mammon is the god of the nineteenth century; Minerva has been discrowned and disrobed and cast out of our utilitarian shrine. Everything is measured in the balance of the bank.

We live too fast and cannot afford to think. Men of severe reflection are constrained to admit that in real mental greatness, we have not exceeded, if even we have equalled, the men who flourished upwards of 2,000 years ago, in the age of Pericles. This is allowed to have been "the culminating point of human intelligence." Where can we find sages, seers, and great men generally, like Homer, Sophocles, Æschylus, Euripides, Plato, Aristotle, &c.? In sculpture and painting even, where are our Phidias or Praxiteles? Again, look at the Roman era—notably the Augustan age. Where is our Cicero, Virgil, Horace, &c.? Yet these were simply imitators of Greece. The seventeenth century did certainly produce a great crop of mind. None of them, however, equalled the Greek sages. But has this century a Shakespeare, Bacon, Milton, Barrow, Taylor, Hooker, or Tillotson to boast of? Clearly not.

Even the cold-hearted Deists, but elegant scholars of the eighteenth century, are not equalled by the Materialists of the nineteenth century. In one respect, however, our Evolutionists imitate the men of the eighteenth century, just as those followed in the footsteps of the Epicurean philosophers. Both profess to believe in a God; at least they do not openly and offensively deny the possible existence of the Divine Nature. But they give the Deity almost next to nothing to do. Like the supreme God of Greece and Rome, he is bound fast in the iron grasp of fate, or his own inexorable and unbending laws. Epicurus, to escape the charge of Atheism, and consequent prosecution for impiety, asserted, indeed, the existence of the popular gods, but held that they were too happy in the enjoyment of their own felicity to trouble themselves, or even to ruffle their divine *tranquility*, by exercising any providence over the affairs of men.

That I am not misrepresenting the Greek Sage of Pleasure, any one conversant with Cicero's treatise on *The Nature of the Gods*, will easily admit. Our modern Epicureans, our coarse-grained and illiterate Evolutionists—who cannot produce even one great man in their camp—adopt precisely the same attitude towards Christianity, and even towards Theism or Deism, that Epicurus held in respect to the pagan deities of his own age and times.

VII. The conflict between religion and science is as old as the hills. And it will endure so long as man is a

depraved and corrupt creature. All truly great men are essentially religious; for religion is ingrained in the very essence of all great souls. The fool, says the royal bard, has said in his heart, that there is no God. He does not really think so, but he wishes there was no Higher Power.

All Evolutionists are Atheists, practically and theoretically; they blaspheme and insult the Majesty on High. The celebrated Archbishop Tillotson says, "The Atheists, who will not believe that there is a God who made the world, can yet swallow things ten times harder to be believed; as that either the world was eternal of itself, or the matter of it, and that the parts of this matter being in perpetual motion, did, after infinite trials and attempts, at last happen to settle in this order in which we now are; that is, that this admirable frame of the world, which hath all the characters upon it of deep wisdom and contrivance, was made merely by chance, and without direction and design of any intelligent author." This is the vague doctrine of Democritus, and notably of Epicurus, and the whole servile and ignoble brood of Evolutionists downwards.

But what is more contemptible than Atheism? "It wants," as Tillotson says, "a stable foundation; it centres nowhere but in the denial of God and religion, and yet substitutes no principle, no tenable and constituent scheme of things in the place of them." It is a doctrine of negation, of feebleness, and of irresolution. It levels man beneath the brute creation.

VIII. Know thyself, reverence thyself, were cardinal precepts of Greek philosophy. Fear God is the foundation of religion. All these principles are trampled under foot by the idiotic gabblers and scribblers of Evolution. To trace our ancestry back to the ape, and even to the primordial, potential and pregnant germ of the dung-hill is degrading, God-blaspheming, and man-dishonouring. Evolutionists know nothing of the depths of the riches of the human mind, of the mysteries of the human soul, of the relation of man to God, and of the awful reverence with which we ought to approach, in conscious converse, the Almighty Creator, Preserver and Governor of the Universe. All manner of sin, said Christ, shall be forgiven to men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven. And what is this blasphemy? Is it not quenching the intuitions of the soul, the monitions of the conscience, the voice of God in man? Man is, as Young said, a terrestrial god. To degrade him to the position of an ape is a foul libel upon the Deity. "Human nature," said the great and eloquent Tillotson, "is conscious to itself of its own weakness and insufficiency, and of its necessary dependence upon something without itself for happiness, and therefore in great extremity and distress, the Atheist himself hath naturally recourse to Him; and he who denied and rejected Him in prosperity clings to Him in adversity, as his only support and present help in time of trouble. And this is a sure indication that these men, after all their endeavours to impose upon themselves, have not been able wholly to extinguish in their minds the belief of God and His goodness; nay it is a sign, that at the bottom of their hearts they have a firm persuasion of His goodness, when, after all their insolent defiance of Him, they have the confidence to apply themselves to Him for mercy and help in time of need; and, therefore, our hearts ought to rise with indignation against those who go about to persuade the belief of a thing so prejudicial to our interest, and to take away the light of our eyes and the breath of our nostrils, and to rob us of all the comfort and support which the belief of an Infinite Power, conducted by Infinite Wisdom and Goodness, is apt to offer to mankind."

IX. How fearfully the human mind has degenerated since the days of Socrates! To rise from the study of Greek philosophy and peruse the coarse and crude treatises of modern Evolutionists, is like abandoning milk and honey for gall and wormwood. The ancient theories of natural and moral philosophy were beautiful, elevating, and replete with mental nourishment. Their dissertations on the Chief Good, the *summum bonum*, and their disquisitions on the nature of the soul, were characterised "with great sharpness of wit, and reasoning, and set off with art and eloquence. They were great searchers after wisdom and knowledge." Varro, according to Budgell, "reckons up no less than two hundred and eighty-eight different opinions upon this subject; and another, called Lucian, after having given us a long catalogue of the notions of several philosophers, endeavours to show the absurdity of all of them, without establishing any theory of his own. As nothing is more natural than for every one to desire to be happy, it is not to be wondered at that the wisest men in all ages have spent so much time to discover what happiness is, and wherein it chiefly consists." Strabo asserts that they had no less than eight hundred different opinions, or rather *shades of opinion*, regarding the chief good. All their deliverances savoured of ripe thought and dialectical subtlety. They sharpened the intellect, purified the affections, and calmed the passions, and administered food for the ever-craving soul of man.

Can the same be said of the stupid reveries, fantastic dreams, and idiotic visions, and senseless crotchets of modern Evolutionists. Do we not close our ears to their odious tenets? Do we not, in fact, close their books with a feeling of sensitive abhorrence?

X. The Hebrew Bible and the Greek philosophy teach us that we are descended from God. The Fall of man finds its exact counterpart in the Age of Gold. Each successive generation fondly clings to the idea of a primeval innocence and glory. All great men, from Plato to Carlyle, are, more or less, *laudatores temporis acti*. A man conscious of a great ancestry and fortified with a becoming sense of his own native worth, and looking forward to a glorious destiny, can be recognised by his very gait. As Lavater says, "Actions, looks, words,

steps, form the alphabet by which you may spell character."

But a man, conscious that he is only a single step removed from the African gorilla, moves along, oppressed with a recumbent feeling of conscious baseness. His optic nerves, like those of a pig, are so constructed that he cannot elevate his admiring eyes to the heavens. Science, as our contention is, deals exclusively with material objects, more or less subtle. But even philosophy itself, as a great writer has elegantly phrased it, "Can in only one way become truly popular—that which Socrates tried, and which centuries afterwards was perfected in the Gospels,—that which tells men of their divine origin and destiny, of their heavenly duties and calling. This comes home to men's hearts and bosoms, and, instead of puffing them up, humbles them. But to be efficient, this should flow down straight from a higher sphere. Even in its Socratic form, it was supported by those higher principles, which we find set forth with such power and beauty by Plato. In Christian philosophy, on the other hand, the ladder has come down from heaven, and the angels are continually descending and ascending along it." In the mouth of an Evolutionist, God, virtue, truth, falsehood, energy and determination are the jargon of the veriest fool. He is a beast buried in self, and cannot comprehend the nature of piety, charity and disinterestedness. Without lofty ideals and noble aspirations men degenerate even beneath the beasts of the field. Well, truly, and philosophically, does Jacobi ask, "What is there in man so worthy of honor and reverence as this,—that he is capable of contemplating something higher than his own reason, more sublime than the whole universe: that Spirit which alone is self-subsistent, from which all truth proceeds, without which is no truth?"

Who descant the most glibly on the vagaries of Evolution? Who indulge so shamelessly in the cant of science? Who scoff at religion, sneer at virtue, and deny immortality so barefacedly and so flippantly? Certainly not men of genius; for, as Tully tells us, these ideas "take the deepest" root, and are most discoverable in the greatest geniuses and "most exalted souls."

Only the vicious, the vile, the shallow and the foolish insult humanity with such blasphemous, illiterate, unphilosophical and irreligious lucubrations.

XI. This stupendous universe, this glorious system of things, we never can fully comprehend. It is high as heaven,—what can we know? and deeper than hell,—what can we do? The oriental and royal sage, who turned his attention to the study of this gigantic problem, and who wrote upon multifarious topics, from the hysop on the wall to the cedar of Lebanon, declared that it was insoluble, and even a wise man, though he laboured to find it out, yet could not be able to discover it. Nature, however, forces upon us the stern conviction that there is a God. This is axiomatic. Hear what Cicero says,—"*Omnibus enim innatum est et quasi insculptum in animo esse deos.*" And again, still more pointedly, he declares, "*Esse igitur deos est ita perspicuum ut, qui neget id, viz existimem eum sanae mentis.*"

So patent was this to the Pagan mind that Epicurus himself durst not openly profess Atheism. Tully says of him, "*Video Epicurum videri nonnudllis, ne caderet in offensionem Athenisium, reliquisse deos verbis, sustulisse re.*" Precisely so. What else do the Evolutionists do? They own that there is a God in words, but they have demolished Him in actual fact. Nominal Theists, but practical Atheists, are all the upholder's of the ape theory Well wrote Ennius of such men—if men they can be called—"*Simla turpissima bestia quam similis nobis!*"

Such beastly doctrine undermines reverence, the foundation of morality, and every religion. It takes away, effectually, the providence of God towards men. Who can respect, or revere, or adore, the lazy and indolent deities of Epicurus? Who can feel the pulsation of love, and gratitude, and devotion to the God of the Evolutionists?

Of the votaries of this ignoble science, we are prepared to say what the Roman orator affirmed of Epicurus, "*Epicurus vero extraxit religionem radicitus ex animis hominum quum sustulit et opem et gratiam diis iwmortalibus.*"

The dance of atoms is a fool's word. The primordial germ of the Evolutionist is a madman's dream. Even the very origin and conception of motion arise internally, not externally. It is purely a mental idea. Plato himself, the god of philosophers, affirms this most explicitly. "*Hunc autem motum,*" says Cicero, "*ponit esse in solis animis, ab iisque putat principium motus esse, ductum.*"

The materialistic Evolutionist has not even a peg to hang a rational argument upon in favour of his grotesque and impious doctrine. Stupid worm! try to raise your eyes to the blue vault of heaven on a clear winter night, and then reflect on what you have beheld, and own your own profound ignorance and impiety, and break forth into Young's ejaculation,—

What involution! what extent! what swarms
Of worlds that laugh at earth ' immensely great!

Immensely distant from each other's spheres;
What, then, the wondrous space through which they roll,
At once it quite engulphs all human thought;
'Tis comprehension's absolute defeat.

Say, does not such a stupendous scene strike awe into your soul? Do you not feel your own littleness, and greatness at the same time? Do you not seem to hear a voice calling upon you to "wait the great teacher death, and God "adore?" The rolling ocean, the spangled heavens, and the pictured earth all aloud pronounce that there is a God. As the great Bard of Melancholy says:—

This prospect vast, what is it?—weigh'd aright,
'Tis nature's system of divinity,
And every student of the night inspires.
'Tis elder Scripture, writ by God's own hand :
Scripture authentic! uncorrupt by man.
One sun by day, by night ten thousand shine,
And light us deep into the Deity;
How boundless in magnificence and might!
O what a confluence of ethereal fires,
From urns unnumbered, down the steep of heaven,
Streams to a point, and centres in my sight!
Nor tarries there; I feel it at my heart;
My heart, at once it humbles and exalts;
Lays it in dust, and calls it to the skies.

XII. The Miltonic primeval man—based, as it unquestionably is, on Biblical tradition—is immeasurably superior to the quasi-scientific man. The one is divine, the other is brutish; the one fills the soul with rapture, the other with loathing. The primeval pair of Paradise partake of the lustrous resplendence, and superhuman graces of the golden age.

For contemplation he, and valour formed!
For sweetness she, and soft attractive grace.

The man of Evolution is of the earth, earthy : the man of philosophy and of religion is verily a God incarnate. When we survey his divine proportions, do we not burst forth in Young's song?

How poor, how rich, how abject, how august,
How complicate, how wonderful is man.

He has, indeed, the frailty of a man, but he has, also, the security of a God.

The woman of Evolution is loathsome to look upon : but of the Eve of Paradise, as of the Venus of Paphos, we involuntarily and passionately say:—

Grace was in all her steps, heaven in her eye,
In every gesture dignity and love

Do we not turn away from an Australian savage, or American squaw with disgust? And yet, though terribly degraded, we recognise there the human traces of fallen glory. But a beautiful woman, *a perfect model nobly planned*, is, indeed, as the American philosopher says, a picture that drives the beholder nobly mad. Behold a Demosthenes, calmly and eloquently addressing the Athenians, or a Paul, on Mars Hill, or a Tully gracefully stretching forth his hand when about to deliver an oration, and tell me whether such a spectacle does not kindle your soul into a divine flame of devotion, that shall consume away the dross and dregs of your sensuous

speculations of Evolution?

There is, indeed, a sort of Evolution, moral and material, in which we, too, heartily believe. Divine Providence evolves good out of evil, virtue from vice, and order out of confusion. Light is evolved out of darkness, day from night, minutes from moments, hours from minutes, days from hours, weeks from days, months from weeks, and the crowning year from the months. The eternal God is for ever bringing to pass such beautiful, beneficent and rational evolutions, throughout His infinite domain. But that a baboon has ever yet developed into a man of reason and resolve, no sane mind will ever grant.

XIII. It cannot be too frequently and urgently pressed upon the acceptance of men, that science deals exclusively with external nature in its ever varying phenomena. Whence substance itself originated we cannot ontologically demonstrate. Here we are truly in the nebulous region of hypotheses. Again, metaphysics deals exclusively with mind and its ideas. Consciousness is the Bible of the metaphysician and of the Theist also. Ontologically, we can no more determine the real nature of the mind, any more than we can apprehend the essence of the Deity. We feel the existence of both and accept them as apodictical, and reason from the manifestations—the conscious manifestations of the one to those of the other.

Intellectually, morally, and spiritually we are created in the image of God, and not anthropologically. By the ladder of knowledge—virtue and devotion—we emerge from the sensible and approximate to the supersensible. By faith, hope, and love we rise, as on eagle's wings to the True, the Good, and the Fair. Well does Shelley say, "Ask him who" loves what is life? Ask him who adores what is God?" Such intuitions and emotions are too sacred and too great for utterance. So true is it,—

Devotion wafts the mind above,
But heaven itself descends in love;
A feeling from the Godhead caught,
To wean from self each sordid thought;
A ray of Him who formed the whole;
A glory circling round the soul.

To seek God in the sensible regions of science, in the sties of the Epicurean, and in the fantastic schemes of the Evolutionists is verily to seek the living among the dead. This is the high road to scepticism, and finally to Atheism; for materialism leads to scepticism, and plunges its votary in the stygian gloom, and Cimmerian darkness of absolute Atheism. The gulph between the lowest type of man, and the highest type of animal is so deep that it cannot be filled, and so wide that it cannot be spanned. The great Puritan fully felt this, and hence Milton's singularly significant utterance,—

In loving thou dost well, in passion not,
Wherein true love consists; love refines
The thoughts, and heart enlarges, hath its seat
In reason, and is judicious, is the scale
By which to heavenly love thou may' st ascend,
Not sunk in carnal pleasure, for which cause
Among the beasts no mate for thee was found.

Perpetual intercourse with sensual men—men whose god is gold—has a tendency to degrade man and to demoralise his noble nature. Even his leisure hour speculations are turbid emanations of the worldly spring from which they flow. As Colton says,—"A Newton or a Shakespeare, deprived of kindred minds, and born amongst savages—savages had died." Hence the great attractions which the materialistic speculations in the regions of Evolution have for the ignorant, the selfish, the ignoble, and the profane. Bad men do not like to retain God in their thoughts. As the sublime Hebrew poet-king sang some three thousand years ago:—

The wicked through his pride of face,
On God he doth not call;
And in the counsels of his heart,
The Lord is not at all.

To the grovelling praters on Evolution we would earnestly address the cutting and well-merited, the

sarcastic and characteristic couplet of Persius:—

O souls in whom no heavenly fire is found,
Fat minds, and ever grovelling on the ground.

An assembly of magpies, chattering upon politics or Evolution, is one of the most detestable spectacles under God's earnest sky. The true philosopher—the man worthy of honour and reverence—as Jacobi says, is he, who "capable of contemplating something higher than his own reason, more sublime than the universe: that Spirit which alone is self-subsistent, from which all truth proceeds, without which is no truth."

Such contemplations swell the bosom with delight, en-large the heart, expand the mind, ennoble the conscience, inspire devotion, and elevate the soul on the Platonic wings of philosophy in the quest of man's supreme and self-satisfy- ing bliss, and perennial felicity. The philosophy which fails of this *summum bonum* is emphatically vain as vanity.

XIV. The eminent scholar of Tarsus—the disciple of Gamaliel, the learned persecutor of Christianity, the brave apostle of the Gentiles, the philosopher who had imbibed copiously from the Stoic well of Tarsus—became, after his conversion to the religion of Christ, such a devoted propagator of the new Faith, and such an enemy to the diluted tenets of the Greek philosophy—notably the Epicurean and Stoic—that he earnestly exhorted his beloved Timothy to divert his attention from the schools of philosophy, and, above all, "O, Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called : which some professing have erred concerning the faith."

This is a glorious example for all the accredited ministers of Christendom. If Paul dissuaded the earliest teachers of Christianity from dabbling in the wranglings of the schools of Greek thought, what, think ye, would he have said to the Christian teachers of the 19th century who turn their pulpits into platforms for the propagation of an entirely new gospel—a gospel at variance with reason, religion, and even philosophy. The ancient schools of philosophy inculcated maxims respectable indeed, when compared with the ineffably silly, coarse, and illiterate jargon of modern evolutionists. We would earnestly recommend to the pastors of Christendom the attitude assumed by the Father of Philosophy towards the sophists of his day. And, by the way, those same sophists were great men as contrasted with the teachers of Evolution. Socrates brought philosophy from the clouds—from the nebulous regions of negation and mysticism down to the plain paths of common sense and everyday life. Let Christian ministers do the same, and let them turn away with loathing from the profane and vain babbling of men of corrupt hearts and uncultivated minds, and graceless souls. Their business is, as Wesley said, to save souls, and to uphold the Faith once delivered to the saints. As Socrates practically told each of the sophists, so every minister should, by his living example and doctrine, tell every captious babbler of the tenets of Evolution :—

On life, on morals, be thy thoughts employed,
Leave to the schools their atoms and their void.

Such idiotic wrangling and vain jangling, and foolish gabbling, and illiterate scribbling, do not tend towards moral purification, mental refinement, and rational devotion, and sublime adoration of Almighty God.

XV. Why the Darwinian theory has such attractive fascinations for the masses of mankind—more particularly in these primitive settlements of the South Pacific—requires no great depth of penetration to discover. Troubled and polluted streams cannot, as the bard said, a hallowed spring afford. Men of low aims and selfish propensities find a kindred pleasure in the sties of Epicurus. In colonial societies notably, "material objects and interests must predominate over those intellectual and moral ones which dignify man as motives to action." Indeed, in this materialistic age of superficial aims and terrestrial motives, education, as a practical writer says, "of an ordinary kind may be widely diffused—reading, writing, and useful acquirements may be imparted to all the population,—and yet education may be very defective and uninfluential, and may lose in *depth* what it gains in *breadth*." This is the characteristic, *par excellence*, of the 19th, as contrasted with the 17th century. As the English sage said of Scotland, we may now predicate of all countries: "Every" man has a mouthful, but no man has a bellyful." The *argumentum ad ventrem* is the potent spring of human activity. The *argumentum ad intellectum* is practically ignored, and almost driven into the shade of deep forgetfulness. Religion itself is degraded into the office of the policeman. The priest has lost his sacred character, and his utterances carry neither respect nor reverence. The teacher at the altar must pander to his flock, and fling an occasional sop to Cerberus if he means to retain his office, and maintain the means of subsistence. But, after all, the masses can never, even under the most favored conditions of outward circumstances, be able to follow the

reasonings of philosophy, and the sublime ratiocinations of theology. Abstract notions of virtue, of duty, and of religion are not sufficiently substantial for the common sense apprehensions of humanity. Hence, periodical incarnations of virtue and of religion are the powerful level's to elevate human nature to a higher and holier platform of life and action. Cato and Christ were magnets of influence to their respective ages, and country. Plato and Cicero reasoned magniloquently on virtue, but exercised little influence upon practical conduct. No man discoursed more beautifully and sublimely on the nature of virtue than Tully, and yet no man acted in adversity more ignominiously and cowardly than the self-styled Father of his country. No great teacher ever conformed his life so faithfully to his precepts as Jesus did. Hence the spell of his example, and the magical influence of his name over mankind. Virtue and religion in him shone forth in resplendent glory and power. Christianity silenced the schools and abashed the speculations of philosophers. It came forth, like the sun, from the darkness of night, and dissipated the cobwebs of speculation regarding duty and the chief good, and caused vice to hide its diminished head, and, by the practice of hypocrisy, at least, to do outward homage to virtue. The powerful influence of Christianity in its first crusade against a world lying in iniquity, and carried away with the unsubstantial illusions of speculation, has been eloquently depicted by Lord Macaulay in the following singularly remarkable passage:—"God, the uncreated, the incomprehensible, the invisible, attracted few worshippers. A philosopher might admire so noble a conception, but the crowd turned away in disgust from words which presented no image to their minds. It was before the Deity embodied in a human form, walking among men, partaking of their infirmities, leaning on their bosoms, weeping over their graves, slumbering in the manger, bleeding on the cross,—that the prejudices of the Synagogue, and the doubts of the Academy, and the pride of the Portico, and the fasces of the Lictor, and the swords of thirty Legions, were humbled in the dust." This is not only philosophical, but it is also strictly historical. Hence, we see that what Carlyle has so quaintly, and even grotesquely, preached to the world in his books—notably in his lectures on Hero Worship—is substantially correct in almost every particular. Hero Worship can never grow old, and can never die. Erasmus was a greater scholar than Luther. But Erasmus could never have precipitated the Reformation of the 16th century. Luther, on the other hand, came forth from his cell, and thundered forth, as from the mouth of Behemoth, the convictions which he had elaborated for himself in his study, and backed them up with his own living example, and thus appealed to the more generous instincts of humanity, and, in due time, truth prevailed over error.

COULLS & CULLING, Printers, Rattray-street, Dunedin.

The Sabbath: its Divine Origin and Perpetual Obligation.

IN my Book—entitled 'Firebrands'—I published the Christian theory of the Sabbath. In that book I endeavoured to brush away the captious cobwebs that had been woven around the question by an ignorant Press, and an abandoned class of immoral characters in our midst. My views were regarded as extreme, and my language deemed much too severe. I have not met with any adequate expression of the question in dispute, since the publication of that work. But, I rejoice to find that, on the 8th of September last, in the capital of New South Wales, there was delivered a remarkable Lecture "by the Rev. J. B. Laughton, B.A., in connection with the Association for the Promotion of Morality." That Lecture, both in respect of scholarship and of argument, so entirely coincides with my own printed views on the Sabbath, that I have resolved to publish it for the benefit of the citizens of Dunedin and the colonists of New Zealand. After an elegant exordium, the Lecturer proceeds to prove the eternal obligation of the Sabbath, by means of four well-reasoned propositions. Having successively disposed of these propositions under the first division of his Lecture, the Rev. Gentleman goes on to demonstrate, under the second branch of his discourse, the inseparable "connection between Sabbath Observance and Public Morality;" and this he effectually does by appealing to Reason, Revelation, and World-wide Testimony and Experience.

As a scholarly and consistent Divine, the Lecturer is "unwilling to plead for the observance of the Sabbath on the low grounds of expediency, or even of outward morality." He takes far higher ground, and stands upon a more adamant platform. His contention is that "the Sabbath is neither of Jewish nor of Christian origin," but that it is coeval with the Creation, and like Marriage, was instituted in Paradise. What the one ordinance is in the social, that precisely the other is in the spiritual sphere. Both ordinances had been "instituted before man fell from that holy and happy state in which God created him." The Sabbath and Marriage, as Divine ordinances, remain still in force and are essential to the very existence of society. Without them, man would relapse into barbarism, immorality, and atheism. Virtue, as ashamed, would hide her sacred head, and Vice would reign triumphant, and finally decimate her devotees.

Albeit Dunedin has not, like Sydney, an Association for the Promotion of Morality, yet it boasts of its possession of a Society for the Investigation of Spiritualism, or, more correctly speaking, for the promotion of Immorality, and the propagation of obscene notions respecting all forms of Religion, natural or revealed. Under the cloak of zeal for the testing of Spiritualistic phenomena, this association pursues its base and covert machinations against everything, civil as well as sacred, that good men love and revere. It is a sort of seriocomic Tammany Ring, based upon, and upheld by the vilest and most atheistic principles and practices. The Being of God, the Immortality of the Soul, Human Responsibility, a Final Judgment, Eternal Rewards and Punishments—these are, *par excellence*, the standing jokes of the professed investigators of spirit-rapping. Zeal for the discovery of truth is, indeed, laudable; but any man who goes to a Seance chamber to obtain any manifestations of anything but folly, credulity and imposture, has actually bidden adieu to his reason and common-sense—let alone Religion. Pretended mediums I regard as either fanatics or impostors. Who but a madman would pass a Sabbath evening in a partially darkened seance chamber, in the impious expectation of getting a message from the world of spirits? Is this the outcome of our spurious system of modern materialism? Is this the result of the teaching of modern Epicureanism, after the low type of Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Bain, &c.? What is Spiritualism, but a *tertium quid* between Atheism and Epicureanism? Is it not Necromancy revived? Are we to fling Christianity overboard to make room for this loathsome and old superstition? Froude well and truly describes Spiritualism thus :—"Necromancy has been revived in spirit-rapping. Latterly the spirits, or whatever they are, have shown a special fancy for three-legged tables. They make them run round the room, pirouette on a single claw, hop, skip, dance to airs produced by invisible musicians. Finally, they use them as the channel through which they communicate the secrets of the other world. Probably the entire history of mankind contains no record of a more hopelessly base and contemptible superstition. Mumbo-jumbo and the African rain-makers appear to me to be respectable in comparison. Yet every one of us must have heard circumstantial accounts of such performances, time and place minutely given, a cloud of witnesses, and the utmost precaution said to have been taken to make deception impossible. It is the story of the witch processes over again. Once possess people with a belief, and never fear that they will find facts enough to confirm it. Never fear that they will so tell their stories that the commonest thing shall be made to appear marvellous; that unusual features shall be preserved and exaggerated, and everything which would suggest a rational explanation shall be dropped out of sight and hearing. The spirits do not like sceptics, and object to showing off before them. Mr Hume cannot float in the air when there is light enough to see what is going on. All precautions are taken, we are assured, by the initiated to expose fraud or prevent illusion—all but one—the presence of cool-headed, scientifically-trained observers."

The Dunedin Association for the promotion of Immorality always dwells on the analogy between Spiritualistic and Biblical phenomena. Some of their stoutest adherents, or investigators—save the mark—stoutly challenged the clergy to a public discussion on this analogy question. Hut the Rev. Gentleman so pointedly challenged by the Spiritualistic Elisha declined to degrade himself by appearing on the same platform with a man who has been for years investigating the question, and, according to his own confession at a public meeting of the fraternity, convened for the purpose of bidding farewell to the first President of the Association, has not yet arrived at any definite conclusions, He is one of those spoken of by Paul, men who are ever learning but never able to come to a knowledge of the truth. For the benefit of such stout investigators of spirit-rapping, I can certify that nowhere in "King James' version of the English Bible," can they find a single instance of any *sneaking spirit* cringing and bullying beneath a table, on a Sabbath evening, in a partially darkened seance chamber.

To the everlasting disgrace of the Dunedin clergy of all denominations, the people are fearfully ignorant of Scripture; and hence the willingness with which they can swallow the coarse ribaldries of Spiritualists, and the wretched parody of Christianity, periodically foisted upon them by the Press, when advocating the secularization of the Sabbath-Day. The Press—as well as the Spirit-rappers—labour to bring Christianity and the Sabbath into utter contempt. Secularists and Spiritualists make use of their respective shibboleths as mouth-pieces of their own crude and ignorant ravings against a Faith which they have not the courage to forsake openly, nor the ability to overthrow in a legitimate way. Flippant, shallow and uncultivated minds that cannot grasp any truth, nor give a reason for their vague opinions, are driven about by every wind of doctrine, deceiving and being deceived. There are illiterate wretches in our community, who labour, night and day, to sap the very foundations of Morality and Religion in our infant colony. Let us strangle such filthy snakes at the very outset of their pernicious and poisonous operations. They are charlatans, professional, venal and immoral.

The Sabbath is systematically desecrated in Dunedin. On Sabbath evening the streets are literally crowded with the sons and daughters of Belial. The language that strikes the ear is profane and coarse in the extreme. The doors are closed, but the bars of the pot-houses are lighted, and drunkards freely go in and out at back-doors. The Sabbath-breakers parade the streets, smoking and poisoning the air with their noxious vapours—but less noxious than the fumes of blasphemy that issue out of their unhallowed mouths. Even those

who go to church manage to combine, happily, rest, recreation and devotion during the Sabbath. The trains and carriages carry away their loads of pleasure-seekers to the secluded haunts of infamy, during one portion of the day, and some of these resort, either before or after their excursions, to the Sanctuary, under the pretence of worshipping God—who is not in all their evil thoughts. The man who thus combines pleasure and piety on the Sabbath is either a hypocrite, or his intellect is disordered. God will not accept his impious oblation. The Law of the Sabbath was promulgated at the creation. It is the key-stone of the Decalogue. The man who desecrates it is not a Christian. The Bible declares solemnly that whosoever wilfully and habitually offends in any one point is guilty of the breach of the whole law. The desecration of the fourth commandment is chargable with the violation of all the rest. Indeed, the ten commandments are foully violated in these degraded villages, provinces and colonies. Mammon is preferred before God; Bacchus supplants Christ; Venus supersedes Minerva. Idolatry is rampant. Because of profane adjurations in our Courts of Law, the land groaneth. The parental authority is flatly disregarded. Calumny kills its thousands. Moral purity is defiled. Stealing is the order of the day, in various legalised ways. Covetousness, envy and perjury pollute these Southern virgin lands. Colonial muck-worms grudge one day out of seven for the elevation of their souls from the sties of Epicureanism. They experience no pleasure in the contemplation of God, religion and virtue. They seek not an opportunity of soaring aloft, on the wings of meditation, into the Empyrean regions of life, light and immortality. I hold such men, whatever may be their material possessions, to be poor and mean wretches, damnably degraded outcasts from God and happiness.

Is the Sabbath of Divine origin? Every Christian must answer this question affirmatively, along with the Rev. Mr. Laughton, of Sydney. It was promulgated in Paradise, and God wrote the Decalogue on two tables of stone, and handed them to Moses afterwards. If not, Moses was an impostor and the Bible is an impudent fable. The witty, vigorous and eloquent Dr. South asserts that "the Decalogue of Moses was hut a transcript, not an original." Surely, South is a far higher authority than such visionary and hazy writers as the Rev. F. W. Robertson—the great authority of the Dunedin Sabbath-breakers. Abrogate the Law of the Sabbath! As well try to abrogate the existence of God. Christianity cannot subsist without the Sabbath. Indeed, they both must stand or fall together. They are now convertible terms. The Sabbath-breaker is a violator of all the moral law. I repeat, he who offendeth in one point is guilty of all. This is not only a Christian, but also a Stoic doctrine. Such is the nature of sin, that it contaminates the whole moral nature, and renders the sinner amenable to the heaviest punishment and retribution.

I quite agree with the Rev. Gentleman, whose lecture I now recommend to the careful perusal of my readers, that in these colonies there is a sad misconception and misapprehension prevailing "even among those who might be expected to be better informed," in the public mind, respecting the origin and perpetual obligation of the Sabbath. The ancient Jews primarily kept holy the Sabbath in commemoration of the great work of creation. Secondly, out of gratitude for having been miraculously rescued out of Egyptian bondage. Christians, *a fortiori*, are bound to hallow it in perpetual remembrance of the Resurrection of their Lord and Redeemer and Advocate, and from gratitude to God for having been delivered out of darkness and bondage of more than Cimmerian gloom and severity. If the Jew, in his quiet pastoral and primitive village life required one day out of seven for refreshment to his soul, how much more need have Christians in this excessively busy and materialistic age, to draw living water out of the wells of Baca on the glorious Sabbath day? The Sabbath question I have compressed into a nutshell. I have nothing to do with secondary considerations involving personal feelings, statements, prejudices and utilitarian principles of the necessity of rest and recreation at stated periods. Such questions I relegate to spiritualists, quasi-freethinkers, materialists and idiotic newspaper editors and parsons of free-and-easy churches. In the absence of a Divine command and eternal obligation, every man is quite capable of judging for himself whether he shall rest and enjoy himself once or twice, or even seven times, a week. The question to be solved is this: Whether the fourth commandment came from God as part of the Decalogue? If so, then it is now morally binding on all Christians. They cannot violate it without imperiling their own salvation. Christians are bound, under peril of eternal damnation, to observe the Sabbath religiously. If God has not spoken on the question at all, then there is an end of the matter. Let every man do as he pleases; let him laugh, dance, trade, eat and drink on every day alike. It is impertinent presumption in any man, or body of men, to say unto him "What doest thou?" Open all places of business and amusement. Follow your callings as well on Sunday as on Monday. Do as you will, and abide the consequences.

Without any further comment, preface, introduction or prologue, I hereby spread before my readers the Rev. Mr. Laughton's admirable lecture on the Sabbath.

Given under my hand, at Dunedin, on the

12th day of October, 1874.

J. G. S. GRANT

Sabbath Observance and its Connection with Morality.

MR CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

The extent to which the holy Day of Rest is desecrated in this and other professedly Christian lands cannot but be a cause of regret to all that reverence the law of God, and believe that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. In endeavouring, therefore, by all lawful means to promote a better observance of the Sabbath as an important part of social ethics, we, as professing Christians, are not only obeying our moral and religious instincts, but are fulfilling a sacred duty. The greatest of all Moral Teachers has declared that "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments (of God), and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt, v., 19).

There, is, however, considerable difficulty in bringing any influence to bear directly upon the Sabbath-breakers themselves. They are not usually to be found in the house of prayer; and they will not trouble themselves to read what wise and good men have written on the subject. It is chiefly by the consistent example of those who do "remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy," that any permanent impression will be produced, humanly speaking, on the careless sons and daughters of this careless world. I can hardly persuade myself that any habitual Sabbath-breakers are among this assembly. I believe I may take it for granted that you who now hear me not only keep God's Sabbaths yourselves, but are also convinced that the observance of the Day of Rest has an important bearing on the morality of the whole community. It is through you, accordingly, and others like-minded with you, that we hope to reach some of those who have not yet learned to fear God and keep His commandments. And I will venture to say that, if those professing Christians who regard the Sabbath as indeed "holy of the Lord and honourable," were more alive to their responsibilities, and more faithful in the discharge of them, a most beneficial influence would be exerted upon the whole body of the people, which would speedily cause iniquity as ashamed to hide its face among us

Entertaining these views, ladies and gentlemen, I have most willingly complied with the request of the committee of the Association for the Promotion of Morality, under whose auspices we are now assembled; and I shall accordingly do my best to interest you in the important subject which has been entrusted to me, namely, "Sabbath Observance, and its connection with Public Morals."

I propose to speak first, of the Obligation of the Sabbath; and secondly, of the Connection between Sabbath Observance and Public Morality

I. First, then, I shall speak of the Obligation of the Sabbath. There is reason to believe that on this question great misapprehension prevails, even among those who might be expected to be better informed. There is an impression among many that the Lord's Day is, in point of obligation, essentially a different thing from the Jewish Sabbath, or the Sabbath of the Decalogue; that the Lord Jesus Christ Himself has relaxed the obligation of the fourth commandment; and that the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh, is itself a proof that the Christian Church accepts the fourth commandment only in a modified sense. If these opinions were correct, the "shreds and patches" of Sabbath that would be left us, would scarcely have any value, and would certainly have no appreciable effect on public morals. In opposition to these views I shall endeavour to show you that the obligation to observe the Sabbath is perpetual; that it is of a moral, and not of a ceremonial character, and consequently that it is universal; that the change of the day has made no change in the nature of the obligation; and that the teaching of Christ has not in any way relaxed the obligation.

1. My first proposition is that the obligation to observe the Sabbath is perpetual.

The Sabbath, as an institution, is neither of Jewish nor of Christian origin. It was instituted before man fell from that holy and happy state in which God created him. Two ordinances of God were instituted before the Fall, and both of them remain to this day—namely, the ordinance of the Sabbath, and the ordinance of Marriage. Man was intended from the beginning to be both a religious and a social being. He was accordingly made in the image of God—he was also made male and female. The Fall materially changed man's relations to God, and wholly corrupted him, both morally and physically; but it did not change his constitution. I mean that, notwithstanding the Fall, man remained, as God had made him, both a religious and a social being. The necessities of his intellectual, moral, and physical nature impelled him to seek companionship; and for this social necessity God provided by the institution of marriage, which is the basis of all human society and of all human government. The Creator thus indelibly stamped upon man's constitution the fundamental principle of all social law, that man is dependent on man. Marriage was a provision not only for the continuance of human society, but also for its moral purity, its good government, and its consequent safety and happiness. Precisely as

marriage is held sacred, so human society becomes prosperous, elevated, and refined; while, without its benignant, genial, and restraining influences, the higher conditions of civilization are impossible.

But it will not be questioned that man's religious necessities are of infinitely greater importance than his social necessities. If, therefore, the Creator saw fit to provide, by a permanent and irrevocable ordinance, for those necessities of man, which extend not beyond this life—for in the Resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage—much more was it needful for Him to provide for those higher necessities which relate not only to this life, but also to that which is to come; and accordingly we find that such provision was actually made by the institution of the Sabbath. For it is not a mere arbitrary arrangement, but a necessity of man's being, that he must worship somewhat; and, apart altogether from the testimony of Revelation, reason and conscience are sufficient to teach that the worship of the creature ought to be given to the Creator. If then, man is to worship God, he must have time for it. Common sense tells us that if anything is to be done effectually, some specific time must be set apart for doing it. And God himself has indelibly stamped upon the constitution of man the fundamental principle of all religion—namely, that man, whether as an individual or in societies, is dependent on God, and accountable to Him—by making periodical rest necessary to healthful existence. For it is a simple physiological truth, that neither the body of man, nor his intellect, nor his affections, are capable of incessant exertion—they must have intervals of rest. This necessity is to some extent supplied by sleep; but besides the taking of rest in sleep, numerous experiments have demonstrated that some additional period of absolute cessation from labour is essential to the preservation of a sound mind in a sound body. God has accordingly ordained that a certain proportion of time—namely, one-seventh, or one entire day out of seven—shall be devoted to rest. And, inasmuch as the rest of an intelligent moral agent cannot be mere idleness, God has, by interdicting all ordinary labour on every seventh day, restricted man on that day to the duties of piety, necessity, and mercy—a restriction which He has confirmed by many stringent precepts.

The Sabbath is, therefore, an institution of perpetual obligation, equally with marriage. He who saw that it was not good for a man to be alone, and made him a helpmeet for him, saw also that it was not good for him to labour incessantly, even when he had no other labour than the dressing and keeping of the Garden of Eden, and therefore "the Sabbath was made for man." It is a statute and an ordinance unto all generations, so long as sun and moon endure—so long as man's constitution continues what it is—so long as it is necessary to rest from toil and to prepare for a future life. Men have, in the pride of their own hearts, made frequent and violent attempts to change or abolish this law, just as they have attempted to do away with the law of marriage—as, for example, in the days of the old French Revolution; but all such attempts have brought their own punishment, and can never be successful unless the constitution of man be changed. If it be impossible, on the one hand, for human society to continue safe, pure, and happy without marriage, so also, on the other hand, it is impossible for man to discharge the duties of his allotted station vigorously and efficiently, and still more impossible for him to have due regard to his interests as an immortal being, without the rest of the weekly Sabbath

2. My second proposition is, that the law of the Sabbath is of a moral, and not of a positive or ceremonial character, and, consequently, that it is universal, or obligatory upon all mankind. Many of God's laws are not of this universal character, but have been given to certain classes of mankind, under peculiar circumstances, and for peculiar purposes. The ordinances of the Mosaic ceremonial law were for the children of Israel alone; and were of necessity abrogated when that better thing which they foreshadowed had come. So, the sacraments of the Christian Church are for professing Christians only. And if the law of the Sabbath were found only among the ceremonial laws of the Levitical code, it could have no force beyond the Jewish nation, any more than the law of the Passover, or of the year of Jubilee. But the commandment to rest one day out of seven, though it had always been in force from the creation of man, was declared to be a part of the moral law, and was solemnly re-enacted and proclaimed amidst the thunders and lightnings of Sinai. It was one of those Ten Commandments which God wrote with His own finger on two tables of stone two several times. The two tables of the moral law have respect to the obligations of man as a religious and social being. They teach us our duty to God, and our duty to our neighbour, and they are therefore, for all men, for all lands, and for all time. And it must be evident that one part of the moral law is just as obligatory as any other part. There is no conceivable reason for supposing that the fourth commandment is one whit less binding than the other nine.

Consider for a moment the scope and design of the Sabbath. It was intended, first, to be a perpetual commemoration of the completion of the work of creation; secondly, to provide for the constitutional necessity of man, which requires rest, both for the body and the mind; and thirdly, it was intended to afford to man due opportunity for the worship of God, to the end that he might be better fitted to glorify Him here, and to enjoy Him for ever here after. Such objects are of importance to every human being. Best from labour; meditation on God's works of creation and Providence; the direct worship of God; the seeking after fuller knowledge of Him, and closer communion with Him; these are things in which all men, of whatever name or nation, age or race, are always concerned. Therefore the obligation to keep holy the day appointed by God for these purposes is absolute and universal, extending to every land, and claiming the recognition of every human government. Like

the other commandments of the moral law, it has in many cases, been forgotten or abused; many nations have been entirely ignorant of it; and even those who profess to acknowledge its obligation have neglected and evaded it; but notwithstanding all this, the law still stands unrepealed, and no man is able to repeal it, for it is the law of God. The moral obligation to remember the Sabbath Day and to keep it holy, is to this hour precisely the same that it has been from the beginning.

3. My third proposition is That the change of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week has in no way changed the nature of the obligation, but has rather strengthened it.

The moral, universal, and perpetual obligation of the law of the Sabbath does not in anywise depend upon the particular day out of the seven that may be set apart for its observance. It was the Sabbath Day, and not necessarily the last day of the week, that the Lord blessed and commanded to be kept holy. So far as the moral principle is concerned, any one of the seven days might be kept holy. It is indeed physically impossible that the same identical period of twenty-four hours can be observed in different longitudes; as, for example, when the Sabbath commences in Sydney, 151° east from Greenwich, it is only two o'clock on Saturday afternoon in London. I am speaking, you will observe, only with reference to the moral principle involved. I do not by any means imagine that men are at liberty to choose a day to suit themselves; for in that case, there would be no uniformity. It was most wise and expedient that the day should be fixed by God himself; and accordingly we find that He did at first appoint for the weekly Sabbath the seventh or last day of the week, because on that day He rested from His work of creation.

A change in the day, however, became reasonable and necessary when an event had occurred vastly transcending in importance the creation of the world. I mean the completion of that work to which creation itself was only preparatory and introductory—the work of Redemption, which was consummated by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead on the first day of the week. No Christian man can doubt that the work of Redemption infinitely transcends in importance the work of Creation. Redemption is the one grand eternal purpose of God, for the accomplishment of which the world was created. When that glorious purpose shall have been altogether fulfilled, and the time of the end shall have fully come, then the heavens and the earth, as we now see them, shall pass away. But the work of Redemption shall not pass away: "we look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," and for an eternal Sabbath-keeping which remaineth for the people of God. It was therefore highly reasonable that the first day of the week, the day on which the Lord Jesus rose from the dead, and became the first fruits of them that slept, should thenceforward be the weekly day of rest and religious worship for God's people.

That this day has in fact been so observed from the time of the resurrection of Christ is a simple matter of history. Jesus showed Himself alive to His disciples, after His passion and resurrection, by many infallible proofs, on the first day of the week; and on that day He instructed them in things pertaining to the kingdom of God. The Apostles were wont to meet for religious worship on the first day of the week; and on that day the Apostolic Churches stately met for prayer and hearing the word, and for the breaking of bread according to Christ's appointment. From the Apostolic age downwards, the whole visible Church has observed Greek the Lord's Day (so called by St. John), as the Christian Sabbath. But the moral obligation of the Sabbath remains the same, though the day is changed. If there be any difference, the obligation should be greater; for not only are the resurrection of Christ and the doctrines involved in it of infinitely higher moment than the fact of creation, to which the seventh-day Sabbath had respect, but, under a spiritual dispensation, the call to exercises of devotion, and to the exclusion of worldly concerns, should be more imperative than it was in former ages, under a dispensation of types and shadows. It follows, therefore, that whatever it was wrong to do on the Sabbath of the old law, it is equally wrong to do on the Sabbath of the new. And whatever was right then is right now. I repeat, that I speak only with respect to moral obligation. I do not mean that the penalties imposed by the ceremonial law are binding upon Christians. From the yoke of the ceremonial law Christ hath made us free. But the moral law abides. Christ came not to destroy the moral law, but to fulfil it. "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail" (Luke xvi. 17).

4. And this brings me to my fourth proposition, namely—That the teaching of Christ has not in any way relaxed the obligation.

It has been asserted, both frequently and loudly, by those who are unfavourable to the keeping holy of the Lord's Day, and who would have our Christian Sabbath made a day for doing their own pleasure, that the Sabbath of the Christian dispensation is altogether a different thing from that of the Jews. And in support of this assertion, they have not scrupled to wrest the words of Our Blessed Lord Himself. They have alleged that the strict sanctification of the Sabbath under the Mosaic law was merely ceremonial, and that the same strictness is not required of Christians; and this they attempt to prove by referring to the teaching and example of Christ. I believe that such an assertion has no foundation in truth.

Let me beg you to bear in mind that the Christian Sabbath, as distinguished from the Jewish, had no existence until after our Lord's Resurrection, it was the Sabbath of the Mosaic law that our Lord kept; and it

was to that Sabbath alone that all His teaching referred. And there is not one word in all His discourses, or one action of His whole life on earth, that can be shown to authorize any relaxation of the commandment to keep holy the Sabbath Day. Our Lord did indeed condemn, and that with just indignation and severity, the unwarrantable additions imposed by the Scribes, who, by a variety of childish and superstitious traditions, had made the Sabbath a burden instead of a delight, as though man had been made for the Sabbath, and not the Sabbath for man. The most ordinary and necessary actions of domestic life, and even works of common charity, such as ministering to the sick, were by those blind guides prohibited as unlawful. Our Lord, as One that had authority, rebuked them for thus making the Commandments of God void by their traditions; and, by performing some of His most notable miracles of healing on the Sabbath, He showed that it was lawful to do good on that day. From the circumstance of the disciples eating the ears of corn, He also took occasion to show that it is lawful to minister to the necessities of the body on the Sabbath, as well as on any other day. In thus teaching our Lord gave no hint whatever of any relaxation of the moral obligation of the Sabbath. He merely declared what was the true intention of the Sabbath from the beginning in opposition to the corruptions of those who so unworthily sate in Moses's seat.

What sanction, then, do our Lord's teaching and example lend to the sort of Sabbath advocated by our modern secularists and others? It is not for works of piety and charity, necessity and mercy, that they plead. These, we cheerfully admit, are as lawful on the Lord's Day as they were on the Jewish Sabbath. But what the secularists clamour for are works of amusement—the opening of public exhibitions, such as the Crystal Palace—public musical performances—many of them would even go so far as to open the theatres, as is done in France—and all contend for excursions by rail or steamboat, for the gratification of the giddy and godless multitude. If this style of Sabbath prevailed, thousands of industrious persons must either consent to deprive themselves of the rest of the weekly Sabbath, and of the benefits of public worship, or else lose their daily bread. Now, the principle for which in the interests of morality, I think, we ought to contend is that, since the Sabbath was made for man, every man has a right to enjoy its rest, and that no man ought to be compelled or induced to forego it, except for such works as are sanctioned by the law of Christ. The Sabbath was made for man, not that he might desecrate it or abuse it for his own gain or glorification, but that, while resting his body, he should care likewise for his immortal soul. The Sabbath was made for man, not that the rich man might enjoy himself by making his servants work, harder perhaps than on other days, but that his manservant and his maidservant, and even his cattle, should rest as well as himself. The Sabbath was specially enjoined upon the children of Israel, in remembrance of their having been bondsmen in the land of Egypt. (Deut. v. 15.) Surely we Christians, who have suffered under the more grievous bondage of sin, and to whom a far greater deliverance has been proclaimed, have still stronger reasons for keeping holy the Sabbath day.

II. If I have devoted too large a portion of my lecture to the consideration of the moral obligation of the Sabbath, the importance of the subject must be my apology. It is obvious that the observance of the Sabbath can have no legitimate or beneficial influence on the morals of the community at large, unless that observance be regarded as a matter of moral obligation. That it ought to be so regarded, I have been attempting to prove; and now it remains for me to consider the connection between Sabbath observance and public morality. I shall endeavour to show, that the Sabbath is a standing witness for God concerning righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come; and that its testimony has a beneficial effect, as may be inferred from the low state of morals in those countries wherein the Sabbath is habitually neglected, and the much higher moral condition of those wherein it is duly observed.

Let us suppose for a moment, that the whole population of a country had their hearts inclined by the Lord of the Sabbath to keep this law, and that they were enabled to experience something of what the beloved disciple felt when he said, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day." I do not mean that professing Christians should expect extraordinary raptures, visions, or revelations, such as were vouchsafed to the prophets and apostles of old; but let us suppose that there were among the people of this land a general disposition to withdraw themselves on the Lord's Day from all worldly and fleshly cares, and occupations, and to employ the sacred hours in the public and private exercises of religion, in a manner suited to the capacities of individuals of different ages and attainments. Suppose that such a spiritual observance of the Sabbath were actually realized among us, might we not safely affirm that the morality of the whole community on the other six days of the week would be greatly the better for it? It is altogether inconceivable—it would do violence to common sense—to suppose that a community which had with sincerity of heart so occupied itself on the Lord's Day, could on the Monday turn greedily to the sins from which they had prayed to be delivered, or forget the commandment of God to which they had besought Him to dispose their hearts. It would assuredly be felt, that, having thus distinctly and publicly borne witness for God's law, every one was bound to walk consistently during the remainder of the week; and that the full benefit of the rest and devotions of the Sabbath would not be reaped, if the worshippers were not thereby better fitted for the active duties of life, and brought more fully under the influence of that Divine love, which is emphatically the fulfilling of the Law.

Unhappily, such an observance of the Sabbath as I have supposed has never yet been perfectly realized, and probably will not be so, until the Kingdom of Christ shall be set up in the earth, for which glorious consummation the people of God pray and wait. There have been times, in various ages and in various parts of the world, when there has been some approximation to it; but I fear that, even in professedly Christian countries, it may be said with truth of too large a proportion of the people, that, so far from being "in the Spirit on the Lord's Day," they are on that day more unequivocally in the body than on any other day. When the sacred day dawns, and they are not summoned, as on other days, to go forth to their accustomed labour; when the beasts of burden are turned out into the pasture; when the fires are extinguished in the forge; when the hammer and the axe are silent; and the weights and measures, and the pens of the ready writers, are laid aside in the halls of commerce; then, on that very day, which was given to man that he might not forget that he had an immortal soul, too many may begin to remember that they have a body, and make it the business of the day to indulge its appetites, each one in the direction of his own particular taste, so far as his means and opportunities will permit. Even among those who do recognize the Sabbath, and partially and outwardly observe it, there is very generally a more luxurious provision for the body on that day than on other days, which necessitates the employment of the household, and keeps its members, more or less, from the public and private exercises of God's worship. Need I remark upon the inconsistency of those who thus employ their own servants, and yet exclaim against the poor working man, who sends his Sunday dinner to a public oven! "Thou hypocrite! first cast the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye!"

But, notwithstanding these evils, which to a great extent make the Sabbath a mere name and outward form, instead of what it was intended to be, a fountain of both temporal and spiritual blessings; notwithstanding all that the enemy of God and man has done to desecrate and destroy it, the Sabbath is still an estimable benefit, and exerts, wherever it is recognized, a powerful influence for good. I am, indeed, unwilling to plead for the observance of the Sabbath on the low grounds of expediency, or even of outward morality. It would be far more congenial to my feelings to expatiate upon the immense value of the Sabbath as a means of grace; and to show that in the keeping of this, as of all God's commandments, there is great reward. The humble and sincere believer in Jesus needs no argument to induce him to observe the Sabbath: he does it cheerfully, because, to him, it is a delight. His soul longs, yea even faints for the courts of the Lord; and, therefore, he loves the Sabbath, because on that day the tribes of the Lord go up to the gates of the Sanctuary, to give thanks to the name of the Lord, and to pray for the peace of Jerusalem. We love our Sabbaths, and cannot consent to sacrifice them, for none of us have so many years of life before us that we can afford to waste any of our opportunities, or make light of any of our privileges. We love our Sabbaths, because the Sabbath is a type of the Saints' everlasting rest. Heaven itself is a perpetual Sabbath-keeping; and the right employment of our Sabbaths on earth is the best preparation for the eternal Sabbath above.

I cannot but feel that to any man who has such views of the Sabbath as these, arguments of morality or expediency are quite unnecessary; but for those who are content to take a lower view I may observe that the return of the weekly day of rest, with the suspension of worldly business, and the Sabbath-bell proclaiming that the house of prayer is open for all people, is of itself a witness for virtue and a protest against vice which cannot be wholly unheeded. It is no light thing that, once a week at least, there is a lull in the din and bustle of the world, and a solemn call to the toilers and schemers, as well as to the butterflies and butterfly-hunters, of this world, reminding them that there is something more to be desired than gold, and sweeter than the dropping of honeycombs. And I may also remind you that in almost every case where we have been able to trace the career of a prodigal, who has left the house of his godly parents and wasted his substance in riotous living, it has been found that his downward course began with the neglect of the Sabbath. It is a fact, well-known to all that have had any experience in dealing with the consciences of their fellow-men, that Sabbath desecration is a fruitful parent of vice, and not unfrequently leads to crime. It is indeed too true that there are sanctimonious hypocrites, who can assume a long face and for a pretence make long prayers on the Sabbath, whose cup on the other days of the week is full of extortion and excess. I will not venture to say that all that outwardly keep the Sabbath are to be held up as types of a high and pure morality; but this I will say, that I have never known a man who habitually dishonoured the Sabbath and was at the same time scrupulously observant of the other commandments of God. Sure I am that in no community wherein the Sabbath is systematically desecrated do we find a high standard of morality prevail.

In proof of this it is only necessary to refer to the moral condition of the Continental nations of Europe. Among these, and more especially among those which are subject to the ecclesiastical domination of the Papacy, the Sabbath is notoriously a day of pleasure. Theatres and other places of entertainment are open, and, instead of the day of rest serving to remind men of their responsibility to the Judge of all the earth, every device of the Devil and his angels seems to be employed to banish all thoughts of death, judgment, and eternity from their breasts. Travellers who have visited that interesting and picturesque part of Europe called Switzerland have observed the remarkable difference between the Protestant cantons, in which the Sabbath is generally well

kept, and the Roman Catholic cantons in which it is habitually desecrated. In the former the inhabitants are cleanly, orderly, and happy, and crime is of rare occurrence; in the latter, squalid misery and vice are painfully prominent. I do not say that these evils are to be attributed to Sabbath desecration alone: that is but one development of the gigantic system of iniquity and immorality under which many nations of Europe have long groaned; but the fact admits of no dispute that in those parts of Europe where the Sabbath is neglected, misery, vice, and crime of the lowest and darkest types abound.

Contrast the moral condition of these countries with that of Great Britain, the United States of America, and the other Anglo-Saxon communities where the Sabbath is more or less reverently observed. I am indeed very far from thinking that the moral condition of these communities is all that can be desired. Not only have we a large vicious and criminal class in our population, presenting a social problem of most formidable difficulty, but we have also to deal with a numerous class of propagandists who, under the specious names of "broad views," "advanced thought," and "liberal principles," busily diffuse sentiments the direct tendency of which is to destroy the foundations of the Christian faith, and to leave us without hope and without God in the world. With such adversaries this platform is not the proper place for controversy; but I may be permitted to remind you that one of the fortresses against which these self-styled Rationalists have directed their most subtle and malignant efforts, is the Sabbath. The enemies of divine truth are not ignorant of the restraining influence exerted by the Lord's Day upon the public morals, and nothing would be more gratifying to them than to see our holy Sabbath turned into a French Sunday. There is profanity enough, drunkenness enough, licentiousness enough among us, and to spare, God knoweth; it is not the language of boasting, but that of shame and confusion of face, that becomes us. But the Sabbath we still have; and let us beware how we surrender it. Let us beware how we permit this great bulwark against the rising flood of infidelity and immorality to be thrown down. Let us not be afraid of being reproached as Puritans, or Sabbatarians, or as "righteous overmuch." That decade of our history when Great Britain was under a Puritan Government, the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, presents nothing to bring a blush to the cheek of any Christian patriot. With all his faults, Cromwell made the name of our beloved country respected in the world; while the Stuarts, before and after him, made it contemptible. It was that high-souled man, Puritan and Sabbatarian as he was, who laid the foundation of those civil and religious liberties which we now enjoy. And it cannot be doubted, that one great means of producing the high moral tone that pervaded British society during the Protectorate was the strict observance of the Sabbath, which was not only enjoined by statute, but commended by the consistent example of those in the highest places of the land

Let all, then, who desire to see this our adopted country distinguished for that righteousness which exalteth a nation—let all who would see this goodly south land, so highly enriched with physical advantages, still more largely adorned by the virtues of her sons and daughters—"Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy.

MATTHEWS, BAXTER & Co., Printers, Princes Street, Dunedin

Our Land Laws: what Should be their Basis?

By Charles W. Purnell.

Printed at the Evening Star Office Dunedin Bond Street. 1876

Our Land Laws: what Should be their Basis?

I.

THE Abolition of Provinces Act is not likely to be a measure standing alone on the Statute Book. Its advocates have set the ball of change a-rolling, and none can do more than guess what direction it will take, or when it will stop. The constitution of the Legislative Council, which has hitherto been a theme for mere speculation, now presents itself as a problem requiring early, if not immediate solution. Then the land question, over which we have fought for years and years amid conflicts as apparently interminable and indecisive as those which long ages ago took place around the walls of Troy, suddenly assumes an aspect which betokens that the final battle is at hand. That event, however, has only been hastened. Men have reached deeper social and political principles than they had attained when these Colonies were founded, and are getting impatient at the desultory fighting which has been going on between the mass of the community and the large landholders. They want something more effective. They have begun to see—in a glass darkly, as it were, yet still with a strong apprehension of the lineaments of the truth—what are the real rights of the State to the possession and control of its lands; and it is these feelings and perceptions which have made so many persons look favorably upon the State leasing system. The arguments used in support of that scheme have familiarised the public with

one aspect of the relations between a State and its lands; but those relations may be contemplated in several lights. For the purposes of this treatise, four points of view will be sufficient. First, a State, through its governing body, may let out its lands on terms of military service—that is the feudal system; secondly, it may lease them to tenants paying a money rental—that is, the "leasing" system; thirdly, it may sell the perpetual freehold to any person who chooses to buy the land for money, without limiting the area purchaseable by a single individual, which is the system prevailing in New Zealand; and fourthly, it may sell the perpetual freehold to the first comer who is willing to pay the price asked for it, under the restriction that any individual or his family shall not possess beyond a certain acreage of land. The latter plan was advocated by me in a pamphlet published eighteen months since, entitled "An Agrarian Law for New Zealand." The proposal provoked sharp criticism. Novel views in politics generally do, especially when they relate to fundamental questions; besides which, in this instance, a great many persons' toes were trodden upon, while a still larger number fancied themselves to be threatened with personal injury. Some one put it that I was attacking all the leading men of the country. The supposition was baseless. I attacked immorality, and tyranny, and greed of gain wherever exhibited, and careless whether my words touched high or low; but my sole object was to show how the future welfare of the entire community was endangered by the presence of certain evils in its midst. Still my proposal was capable of being contorted from its natural shape, and those who deemed their craft was imperilled did not scruple to so twist it with little regard to fair play. Two or three critics discussed it as though my avowed purpose was to advocate the abolition of manufactures : a preposterous notion, which no word of what I wrote could reasonably be construed to mean. On the contrary, I had argued that by the greater independence of the workman, which would result from the adoption of correct agrarian principles, his intelligence would expand, he would become an artist instead of a mechanical drudge, and manufactures would attain higher excellence than is possible under a system which reduces him to a state of complete dependence upon his employer, and thus degrades his faculties. The question I propounded, and, so far as I know, it was the first time it had been propounded in the Colony, was—Are we not establishing in New Zealand a counterpart of that state of society which in England has produced pauperism and kindred evils, and will it not produce the same results here, and that, too, before very long? My remedy may be good or bad, but who will undertake to deny the importance of the question? It goes to the root of all we are doing politically; and if the proposition I have laid down be right and sound, no pooh-poohing will get rid of it, nor will a foolish shutting of the eyes to the approach of the enemy prevent him seizing us with a strong grasp when his day comes. My argument is the old one—"You cannot sow thistles and reap figs." If you scatter the seeds of pauperism broadcast over the land in due season you will reap pauperism; and if the efficacy of the antidote which I suggest should be used against the latent poison in our political frame is disputed, those who object to its use are bound in duty to propose a better. Happily the public mind is becoming educated on this subject. When these views were first enunciated the idea that pauperism or aught in its shape could ever overtake New Zealand was ridiculed as being absurd; yet I have since had the pleasure of finding certain of the newspapers wherein these hostile criticisms appeared either arguing in a similar strain or taking the fact as proved, and the still greater pleasure of seeing so eminent a man as Sir George Grey vigorously warning the people of New Zealand that a state of society containing evils as bad as those which contaminate society in Great Britain impends over the Colony, and summoning them to use their utmost efforts to prevent its descent. The danger being admitted, there is hope that the safeguard will be erected.

In the pamphlet referred to I directed my arguments chiefly to these points (1), to prove that our present land system would result in the overcrowding of towns, and the deprivation of the poorer classes of their social independence, ultimately accompanied by pauperism; (2), that the best safeguard against the occurrence of these evils was a strict limitation of the size of freeholds; and (3), that such a restriction would in the end produce the effect of raising the moral and intellectual tone of the entire community. As a minor point, it was also urged that the comparatively small quantity of arable land in New Zealand rendered the limitation expedient. A different train of reasoning will now be pursued, and it will be contended that the practice of permitting individuals to acquire the fee simple of the soil, without limit as to area, by money purchase, is a contravention of the fundamental principles of the land laws of Great Britain and of the leading States of the Continent. The very spacious field of inquiry here opened up would require a bulky volume for its full treatment, and the only method to follow in a popular sketch like the present is to indicate the salient features of those laws, leaving the assertions made to be tested in the usual manner by reference to standard works. The argument will not, however, be confined to that point, but will support the enactment of an agrarian law for the reason, likewise, that the productivity of the soil would thereby be increased, and the territory of the State made to furnish subsistence for a far denser population than it can maintain where the size of private domains is only limited by the bounds of the owner's purse.

First, as to

England.—When searching for the key to the Anglo-Saxon tenures, which are the oldest we can deal with,

the circumstances of the country must be kept in mind. The population of England was very small then compared with what it is now, and there was consequently no lack of land. Forest and morass overspread much of the country, and the open land was, as it were, cultivated in patches. Its full produce was not required for the support of the home population, and an export trade in farm commodities scarcely existed. Nor was there any prospect of a lack of territory. Hence, if individuals had accumulated large freehold estates, it could not have exposed them to the charge that by so doing they were likely to injure their poorer neighbors. Their greed or land could scarcely result in driving hundreds of thousands of human beings into cities, there, at the best, to lose their independence, and, at the worst, to sink into the depths of pauperism. It might have been contended, and justly, that no one man was entitled to monopolise a large area of that Earth which was given by its Maker for the use and enjoyment of all His creatures; but that would have been an abstract idea, too refined to emanate from so rude an age. Had our Anglo-Saxon ancestors only regarded the rule that might is right (whether the might of the sword or the might of gold) in the possession of land, and admitted the principle that, because the earl was rich and powerful, he was justified in appropriating to himself as much land as he pleased; and that, because the ceorl was poor and weak, he must go without any, or take whatever his lord might please to leave him; still, that fact would not be available as an argument for the adoption of the same or a kindred system now. The world since that period has rolled through many centuries; its people have gathered together vast stores of knowledge; they have mounted, with much toil and struggling, from one lofty principle to another; and are nearing the summit whence they will discern a new and glorious region of intelligence and beauty. They will never go back. Nor will they ever look back save for warning, and to rejoice over those few bright stars of morality and genius, scarce heeded in their day, but now shining immortally through the darkness around the mountain's base. If I say the Anglo-Saxons, just emerging from barbarism, had acknowledged to the full, the right of individuals to monopolise extensive tracts of land, it could not have been urged as a plea to justify such a practice at the present day; but when on the contrary the Anglo-Saxon laws did not recognise any such right, but created tenures founded on principles entirely adverse to monopoly, it becomes an argument of enormous weight against a British Colony, governed on essentially democratic principles, in the nineteenth century, with all its subtle refinements of human rights, permitting individuals to engross scores of thousands of acres of land to their private use, without being required to render any special service to the State for the privilege.

The notion lying at the bottom of the various Saxon tenures was that the land belongs to the entire community. That is the original, and I submit the just idea which man forms to himself of his claim to the soil. A nation holds a certain territory—in the savage state, because it is strong enough to do so by force of arms; in the civilized, because one nation recognises right of another to live as well as itself. The Saxons brought with them from Germany to England that custom of the Village Community which Sir Henry Maine has shown to have been widely distributed over Asia and Europe; and which exists in full vigor in India, and to a less degree in Russia, Servia, Croatia, and Austrian Slavonia at the present day. A large portion of the soil of England was thus held under folcland tenure—that is to say, it was the property of the people—of Communities, who dealt with it in their folkmotes according to their own will, save that they could not alienate it in perpetuity. They could and often did grant leases of it to individuals for the lifetime of the parties, for convenience of cultivation, but at the death of the lessees it reverted to the community, which thus never lost its inheritance. Neither the Crown nor the nobles could touch it, and what in modern days would be termed "public opinion" was too strong to permit of the display of such acts of rapacious tyranny as were subsequently committed by the Norman kings and barons; nor were the people able to divest themselves of their birthright. They held the land, not by charter nor by deed, but by custom dating to the remotest antiquity. Mr Allen, indeed, in his learned work entitled, "An Inquiry into the Rise and Growth of the Royal Prerogative," expresses the opinion that folcland was assignable to thanes on military tenure, which is an apparent contradiction of what I have just stated; but military tenure in those days always ended with the life of the holder, and it may well be imagined that in disturbed times a folkmote might deem it necessary for the safety of the community to offer a portion of its land to a thane for life in order to gain his protection. Some land was, however, private property, held by virtue of written documents, and hence called bocland. This tenure seems to me have been derived from the Romans. The Roman legions stationed in Britain, like those posted in other outlying parts of the empire, held land upon military tenure, that is to say, they occupied it on condition of defending it, but without thereby gaining the fee simple of the soil; and when, in course of time, the legions were withdrawn from the country, the Romanised Britons accepted the same tenure, and deemed all lands to be held of the Sovereign as paramount lord, to whom they would revert in case of the tenant failing to fulfil the military conditions upon which he held it. Mr Finlason ascribes the introduction of the manorial system to the Romans. Tracts of public land were granted to private individuals, not, as in New Zealand now-a-days, to do what they liked with, but to allot amongst actual cultivators of the soil; the grantee possessing superior privileges to his dependents, but not being permitted to expel them from his domain in order to substitute sheep or cattle in their place; and being, moreover, responsible for the safety of his manor against the onslaughts of the public enemy. It may be

presumed, however, that during the 470 years over which the Roman rule, more or less effective, lasted in Britain, a population of Roman descent grew up, who, with chance settlers, would form a resident population looking to peaceful pursuits for its support. We know, at any rate, that London attained a considerable size under Roman dominion. A population of this kind would not break up entirely on the departure of the legions, and it is to these peaceful settlers we must look for the origin of deeds of grant in England.

Bocland was devisable and alienable at the will of the proprietor, but the Crown retained control by subjecting the land to forfeiture in the event of certain delinquencies on the part of the owner; and the overgrowth of estates was effectually checked by the Saxon law of succession, by which landed property was divided amongst the children. This rule kept down the size of estates to such a degree as to become a matter of complaint.

While it is needful for the husbandman to till the ground in order to provide the means of subsistence for himself and his family, it is equally necessary that, while so employed, he should be protected from hostile attack, and that his crops, when garnered, should not be liable to be swept off in a raid of the enemy. It is difficult for us to realise such a danger. Now-a-days the farmer ploughs, and sows, and reaps; and the thought of how his life and property are to be protected never enters his head. That he regards as the business of the Government, and his anxieties are confined to the state of the weather and the likelihood of getting a good price for his crops. But in ancient times, if a man did not guide the plough with one hand and carry the spear in the other, he had, at all events, to ascertain beforehand that his field work was not likely to be interrupted by a descent of the foe; still more, that a fair prospect existed of his reaping the [unclear: crop] which he had sown. Hence arose the military tenures under which a portion of the land of England was held in the latter days of the Saxons. An earl undertook to defend a certain tract of territory, and it was placed under his dominion for the purpose; the thane did the same thing for a similar reward, holding sometimes of the earl, sometimes of the king. But it was not the fee simple of the land that was given to them; it was theirs to guard and protect; they became entitled to certain dues from its inhabitants; but they could not sell it or do what they pleased with it, and when the lord died, he could not appoint an heir to reign over his possession. The lord himself, too, was compelled to perform certain services to his superior for the privilege of exercising this dominion; and the same principle descended from the highest to the lowest, the inferior order of thanes, who were either deemed unworthy of, or were exempt from, performing knight's service, being required to pay rent or render other dues for the land which they held. It is true that holdings in fee simple or "allods" did exist, corresponding to a certain extent with "hocland," and originating probably, as Freeman suggests, from the invaders of the country being permitted to appropriate portions of land for their personal use, as prizes of war, in which case it is obvious that the noble, being a leader, would take more than the ceorl who had followed in his train; but although these allods have since developed until they have covered the entire country, it is pretty clear that they embraced but a small area of it in Anglo Saxon times, or at all events in the early and middle periods of Anglo Saxon domination. Moreover, even allods were subject by the common law to certain burthens. They were not private estates of vast magnitude, whose lucky owners, having bought the fee simple, sometimes for a fraction of its value, can escape special taxation, and even, occasionally, much of the taxation of Road Boards, and who argue as if it were a treason against natural justice to hint that their domains are not in their absolute possession, as so many bales of wool might be. Upon these allods, as upon every inch of soil in England, lay the *trinoda necessitas*—the liability of the occupier to serve in the field, and to contribute towards the repairs of fortresses and bridges. These three burthens were inseparably connected with the land, and so continued for centuries.

The subject of Saxon tenures, although explored by many learned men, and illuminated by much fresh light gained of late years, still remains rather obscure, but their leading principles are known and have just been described. At their bottom lay the Village Community, with its absolute repudiation of the private ownership of the soil. "In the time of Cæsar," says Mr Freeman, in his 'Norman Conquest,' "it would seem that the whole territory of a Teutonic community was folcland—individuals could obtain no right in it beyond that of a yearly tenancy." This great and fundamental principle had been broken into before the Saxon invasion of England. The republicanism of barbarism had begun to yield, and the chiefs to snatch bits of land for their private use; but the innovation was not material, while such as it was, it was a violation of Custom, which in those days stood in place of law. It was the outrage of Might upon Right. The position of the invaders after establishing themselves in England tended to destroy the principle still further. The Romans, during their occupation of the country, had established their own tenures there, and the large number of Teutons and other foreigners serving in the legions, by importing their own notions about land, would serve to complicate the nature of the tenures of the country.

William the Norman came and established the feudal system in its harshest form. Its elements were in England before; but William developed and confirmed the system in its entirety, and without the graces of chivalry which afterwards surrounded it with the glory of romance. His reign was the very age of blood and iron. It is conspicuously worthy of note in regard to the changes made in the land tenures of England. Immediately after Domesday Book was compiled, a Great Council was held at Sarum, in 1086, at which all the

principal landholders of the kingdom submitted their lands to military tenure, became the King's vassals, and did homage of fealty to his person. Two decrees, having the force of laws, were afterwards promulgated by William, which effectually rivetted Feudalism upon the country. Freeholds thus vanished, and the whole of the land was brought within the power of the Crown. It was dealt with as State property, placed in the temporary charge of individuals who were forced to render numerous contributions to the Crown in the shape of aids, relief, primer seisin, fines, and other feudal incidents familiar to all readers of history, while the soil itself remained subject to the *trinoda necessitas*, to which it was liable in the days of the Saxons.

France.—The land system of France, like that of England, originated in a variety of customs, arising from the intermingling of different races. The earliest period to which we need refer is the time of the irruption of the Goths and Burgundians into Gaul, the whole of which then lay under the dominion of the Romans, who had planted colonies and granted lands there upon the usual conditions of military service. These colonies contained numbers of barbarians, who would naturally import their peculiar notions of property in land, which ideas would, when the Empire was breaking up, and the Roman law began to be enforced with less strictness than before, influence the character of the land tenures; while behind lay the mass of the aborigines, with their notions of common proprietorship. The Goths and Burgundians descended upon the country, and the Roman Governors, making a virtue of necessity, gave them locations, the invaders receiving two-thirds of the whole occupied territory, and thus foreign modes of tenure were introduced into the complex system already prevailing. But the occurrence which revolutionised the agrarian system of Gaul was the advent of the Franks, who in this respect did for Gaul what the Normans did for England. The Franks came as conquerors, used the conquerors' rights, took what land they pleased, and impressed their own laws and customs upon the country. Their land tenures present two distinguishing features—the allodial holdings and the benefices. The former approached the nature of holdings in fee simple, with the important difference that the allodialist was compelled to perform military service for his land; in other words, he was bound to protect it against foreign enemies, which principle will be found to lie at the bottom of most, if not all, European tenures, except those of Russia, which rest upon a more primitive basis. The notion of a man possessing land as something peculiarly his own property, which he can do as he likes with, and without being forced to render special public services for it to the supreme authority of the State, is entirely unknown to these tenures. It is an idea of very modern times, and, indeed, has only reached its full development in the United States and the British Colonies. The allodialist, so far as military service was concerned stood on the same footing as the feudalist, only whereas the latter followed the banner of his feudal lord, the former was led to battle by a count—that is to say, in France, with which we are dealing. The benefices—the other conspicuous feature of the Frankish tenures—may be designated embryo feuds. A great deal of learned discussion has been spent upon the nature of these benefices, and historians and antiquarians still dissent from each other's views on the subject. This much, however, is conceded: that they were military holdings, and at first of limited duration. Some writers contend that they were originally revocable at pleasure; others, that they were granted for life. The first seems the better opinion; but it is of little consequence for the purposes of our inquiry. It suffices to know that the land did not actually belong to the beneficiary, but to the King, as representing the State, nor did the holder enjoy any absolute property in it whatever. The honor of exercising dominion over the benefice, for its protection, was the gift conferred upon him, together with the right to cultivate a liberal portion of it for his own use, and to exact certain services from its humbler occupants, whom he led in his train when called upon by his King to perform military service in the field. The utmost personal freedom prevailed amongst the Franks at the period when they invaded Gaul, and amongst themselves they would never have tolerated individual landed possessions of great magnitude; or that the holder of a benefice should obtain excessive privileges. The vanquished tillers of the soil, however, furnished a ready means of aggrandising the power of the nobles; while the dispersion of the Franks over a wide space of territory rendered it difficult for the King to strengthen his influence sufficiently to preserve the temporary nature of the benefices, which gradually lapsed into regular fiefs. This, with other causes, ultimately made them hereditary, which consummation was attained under the rule of the Mayors of the Palace. The lords of the fiefs grew strong; the vassals became weak; while the allodial holdings were swallowed up one by one until they all became merged in the feuds. This was effected by the small allodialist finding himself practically defenceless in the presence of the feuds, and a kind of outcast, while at the same time special inducements were offered to him to place his land under feudal tenure, by surrendering it to a lord and receiving it back on terms of homage. Thus the whole of France was, little by little, brought under feudal tenure, and a very hard tenure it became for all save the territorial aristocracy. It would be out of place in a rough sketch like the present to discuss the causes which rendered feudal service so very oppressive in France. Harsh servitudes began at an earlier and lasted until a later date there than in any other country of Europe. They existed until the great Revolution, when they vanished in the moral hurricane which swept over society. Nevertheless, in the primary stages there seems to have been no attempt at monopolising vast tracts of land for the exclusive use of individuals, albeit the enormous areas of territory then lying waste might have supplied an

excuse for such a proceeding, if any valid excuse could be made for it. The spirit of the feudal system forbade a monopoly of this kind. It was when tyranny got full swing that monopoly of the soil came into play; yet even just before the Revolution, when the whole country groaned in sympathy with the peasant's sufferings, the extent of land monopolised by the nobles was not a prominent subject of complaint. His plot of ground was still left to the peasant, but he was grievously oppressed by servitudes which he was forced to render to his feudal superior. The *gabelle*, or tax on salt, and the *corvée* were his peculiar burdens; but at every turn dues and payments on account of manorial rights hampered his exertions and made his life one incessant round of toil for the benefit of another, who idled away his time in luxurious splendour. The deluge came; the feudal obligations and laws disappeared for ever; and when the flood subsided the country was divided into a multitude of small freeholds, in which state it still remains. According to the Hon. G. E. Broderick, writing on primogeniture in the Cobden Club Essays, 1871, there are 7,500,000 landed proprietors in France, about 5,000,000 of whom own plots averaging six acres a-piece, while only 50,000 of the holdings average 600 acres each. The size of the holdings is kept down by the laws of inheritance, as defined in the Code Napoléon, under which a testator with a family is permitted to dispose of but a part of his property, varying in proportion to the number of his children, who take the remainder in equal shares. This system of inheritance has, it is well known, caused the soil to become subdivided to such a degree as, while increasing its productivity, to keep the husbandman in needless poverty, while the frequent political changes in the country, and the mischief resulting from a severely centralized form of government, have seriously retarded the progress of agriculture and prevented the full benefits being obtained which would otherwise have accrued from this distribution of the ownership of the soil—although, it may be observed, I am not advocating peasant proprietorship. Nevertheless, in spite of all drawbacks, the net result is satisfactory. Mr Sackville West, Secretary to the Paris Legation, reporting upon the tenure of land in France to the British Government, says,—“The prevalent public opinion as to the advantages or disadvantages of the tenure of land by small proprietors is decidedly that it has been advantageous to the production of the soil, and has tended to the improvement of the material condition of the agricultural population.” [Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives respecting the Tenure of Land in the several Counties of Europe, 1869, part I., p. 66.] Other responsible witnesses concur in affirming that the French peasant is better off materially, and a man of a higher grade of mental cultivation than the English farm laborer. His personal independence is secured, and that is the first step in all human progress.

Germany.—Logically, I ought to have dealt with Germany first, since from it issued those races of men which have impressed a deeper stamp upon the land systems of England and France than any other; but, for various reasons, it seemed convenient to begin in reverse order. The earliest form of German land tenure known is that subsisting in the days of Julius Cæsar, at which period the ancient Germans, composed of many tribes, but all following similar usages, resided in villages and held the land in common—each individual, or rather head of a family, however, being allotted a piece of land for cultivation, which he retained for a year only, an annual redistribution of such plots being made. The Germans were, at that time, barbarians and unsettled in their habits; but as civilisation began to touch them, and the tribes to take up permanent locations, individual ownership of the soil, to a limited degree, intruded itself into their communities. Each family then acquired the permanent ownership of the piece of ground upon which its dwelling and the usual surroundings stood in the village; while a certain portion of the arable land was allotted to it, occasionally in perpetuity, but generally for a term of years; and, in tilling its allotment, it was obliged to follow the method of cultivation prescribed by the community. The leading features of a Village Community, at this stage, are clearly and boldly sketched out by Professor Maine in his work on “Village Communities” in these words :—“The ancient Teutonic cultivating community, as it existed in Germany itself, appears to have been thus organised. It consisted of a number of families standing in a proprietary relation to a district divided into three parts. These three portions were the Mark of the township or village, the common Mark or waste, and the arable Mark or cultivated area. The community inhabited the village, held the common Mark in mixed ownership, and cultivated the arable Mark in lots appropriated to the several families.” This principle of general ownership possessed vitality enough to live for 1,800 years, and, favored by locality, even now retains its primitive form in some places. In proof of that assertion let me quote from Mr Harris-Gastrell, of the Berlin Embassy, who, in his admirable official report on the land tenures of Prussia [See Reports on the Land Tenures of Europe, already quoted] says :—“In many of these districts, as in Saarhölzbach so recently as 1863, the only private right of property was to the house and any small garden belonging to and adjoining it.”

The ancient Germans, like most barbarians, were essentially republicans. Equality and fraternity were the principles on which the members of a tribe held the soil. The more complex tenures of the Saxons and Franks, as exhibited in England and France respectively, were fruits of later growth, when these peoples had become partially civilised, and doubtless the succession of conquests made by the German nations tended much to the rapid development of their system of tenure. The division of conquered territory, if it was proposed to settle upon it (and the object of the Germans in their military excursions generally was to obtain a fresh place of

residence) would be the first proceeding after victory; and the mode of distribution is probably correctly described by Menzel, who says that, whenever the ancient Germans acquired territory, the land was equally divided amongst all the freeborn. That, however, was in the early stage. A military system grew up; the power of the chieftains, at first temporary and dependent upon the will of the people, became fixed and permanent; they learnt to arrogate the right of allotting the conquered territory amongst their followers in such proportions as they deemed fit and on terms of military service, the gift, moreover, being revocable at the will of the donor, while the vast tracts of waste land, which were then to be found in all parts of Europe, save Italy and Greece, naturally fell under the control of the principal ruler, and were used by him as a means to supply the wherewithal to support his dignity and the expenses of Government. In France and Germany the kings and princes long looked to the public domain as the prime source of the royal income, taxation being unknown, or rather unavailable; and while this was a legitimate use to which to apply the land it enabled the Crown to grant large estates to its principal subjects, and so infringe upon the territorial equality, or almost-equality, which originally prevailed. These estates were, it is true, bestowed as temporary fiefs only, but since the very gift helped to deprive the Crown of the power of enforcing the observance of the conditions upon which it was made the nobles speedily converted their fiefs into estates hereditary in all but the name. The quantity of waste land formerly existing in Germany was immense. The population of the country was comparatively small, and when the Village Communities had taken as much land as they desired there still remained vast tracts of territory, mostly covered with forest, ready to be seized by the kingly and aristocratic powers as soon as they came into existence. A certain number of small freeholds were likewise carved out of the forests and moors by squatters from time to time.

It may perhaps be asked, "Why rake among the dust of a distant Past in order to discover the roots of a pernicious land system? Why not rest content with proving that the abolition of that system would result in glorious consequences to the country in the future? Thrown amid the surging flood of men which now overspreads the earth, we cannot afford to spend our days in gazing on the past, admiring its triumphs, or regretting its errors; we must needs look at the Present and towards the Future alone." To which I reply—All that is required to justify the enactment of an Agrarian Law is proof that it would be beneficial in its operations; but those who desire to maintain the existing state of things, presuming upon the popular dislike to historical researches, assiduously promulgate the theory that the present land system possesses a kind of sanctity from long usage, having its roots intertwined amid the foundations of society, and that the most terrible effects would result from its subversion, whereas in truth it is but the offspring of yesterday. If that fact be proved the supporters of land monopoly will be driven from their strongest logical position.

The feudal system rose up through the ancient tenures of Germany, intermingling with and greatly modifying, but not utterly destroying them. The lords of the fiefs were incessantly trying to encroach upon the rights of the poorer occupants of the soil and did ultimately succeed in reducing the bulk of them to a state of personal serfdom, and even when the peasants, in course of time, escaped from that abject condition, it was only to find themselves surrounded with feudal dues and taxes. The lords were, however, much less fortunate in their attacks upon the landed possessions of the peasants, because they had then to encounter the united strength of the Communes, and although they managed to convert very considerable tracts of common, originally belonging to themselves and the peasantry as joint owners, into their own private estates, the confiscations thus effected were, compared with the size of the country, far smaller than those of which the lords of the manors in England were guilty. The latter forged a powerful instrument for accomplishing their purpose by getting the commonage of the manor recognised as property legally belonging to themselves, but to which the people resident in the manor had a usufructuary right; in Germany, however, the Communes in most cases successfully resisted this encroachment, and upheld the original principle that the waste of the manor was the common property of the lord and the peasant. The feudal lords of Germany, too, in their contests with the Crown, were unable to secure for themselves such large powers of alienation as fell into the hands of their English brethren. In many districts, up to the present century, the consent of the Crown had to be obtained before the lord could sell his land; while, since the beginning of the 18th century, if, from any cause, a peasant's holding became vacant, the lord could not annex the land, but was bound to find another peasant cultivator for it. Then, also, it was the duty of the lord to keep the roads and bridges within his manor in repair; to provide churches, and perform similar public services; in fact, while the lord oppressed the peasant with dues and taxes, the oppressor himself was greatly embarrassed by the heavy services which the State exacted from him, and his lack of liberty to dispose of his land.

About sixty years ago agrarian legislation of the most radical character was entered upon in the different German States for the purpose of liberating the peasants (in which term nearly the entire agricultural population is included) from the yoke of the feudal obligations and converting them into small freeholders, and at the same time releasing the lands of the nobles from their bonds and obligations, so as to make them freeholds likewise. Although the land tenures of Germany sprang from common sources, the division of the country into a number

of separate States had naturally engendered diversities in the manner in which the soil was held: the Commune having departed from its primitive form to a less extent in some districts than in others, while the power of the lords over the soil of their manors was proportionately great or small. The general tenor of the requisite legislation was, however, much the same everywhere, and its result has been to educe a multitude of small freeholders, the production and preservation of which class is sedulously fostered by the laws relating to inheritance and the transfer of land. The parcelling out of the soil is, nevertheless, very unequal. The Rhineland province of Prussia, for instance, measuring 6,127,216 acres in area, is held by 824,611 persons, in 1,181,858 parcels, while in Silesia and Posen many large properties exist, some of them being 50,000 or 60,000 acres in extent. In Bavaria, according to Mr Fenton, Secretary to her Majesty's Legation at Munich, the total number of landowners is about 500,000, of whom only 100 are proprietors of estates, or of an aggregate of land, exceeding 1,000 Bavarian acres [a Bavarian acre is equal to a fraction more than five-sixths of an English acre] in extent. Wurtemberg has 280,000 proprietors of plots of less than five acres in area, and some 160,000 owners of larger estates. Two-thirds of the cultivated land in the Grand Duchy of Hesse belongs to the peasants, leaving moderately-sized farms out of account; the rest of the soil being in the possession of the Crown and large proprietors.

The Empire of Austria is a congeries of different peoples, and the character of its land tenures varies accordingly. They all derive their origin, however, from the Commune and the Feudal system. The latter subsisted until 1848. In the lowland districts of Styria and Oarniola the land belongs chiefly to small proprietors; but in some of the Alpine districts the peasants own as much as from 1,500 to 2,000 acres a piece, a considerable area of such properties usually consisting of forest. Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia seem to be the especial heritage of great proprietors, who own estates varying in size from 10,000 to 60,000 acres. The Hungarian nobles likewise possess immense estates. On the other hand, the Commune exists in its primitive form in Sclavonia.

Feudalism was abolished so recently in Austria that there has not been time to loosen the grip which it enabled large landowners to place upon certain parts of the country, but it may be inferred that the agrarian legislation of Germany will produce its effect upon Austria in due course. The results of that legislation have been distinctly felt in Germany, and it seems to be agreed on all sides there that the true policy to be pursued is to break up the large holdings. The reports made by Her Majesty's Representatives at the German Courts [see Reports from Her Majesty's Representatives respecting the Tenure of Land in the several Countries of Europe, 1869-70] supply remarkable testimony to the wisdom of creating a multitude of small proprietors, and prove indubitably that it betters the social condition of the poor agriculturist, increases the productiveness of the soil, and augments the resources of the State. The doubts which agitate the minds of English writers on the subject find no place among writers resident on the spot. It must, however, be admitted that, in some districts, the subdivision of the soil has been carried to a mischievous extent; but that is an evil which will right itself by-and-bye, as it has already done in certain localities. Taking the worst view of the case—conceding all that has been urged against the peasant proprietor—that he toils early and late, that his food is coarse, that in bad seasons he suffers want—surely he is far better off than the agricultural laborer of Wiltshire, who likewise toils early and late, lives on the plainest fare, and often suffers want, and in addition exists in the lowest state of dependence on his employer, has neither house nor land to call his own, and no prospect of rising from his condition of demi-serfdom. His circumstances are more fortunate than those of the poor laborer or artizan in a city, trembling all his life on the verge of the gulf of pauperism, working from six o'clock in the morning until six or eight at night in some crowded factory; dwelling in some unhealthy hovel in a dirty alley; plunged in misery when lacking employment, and when he finds work to do not daring to call his soul his own lest his master should be offended and dismiss him—nominally a free man, practically a slave. The peasant proprietor works hard, but for himself; he labors in the pure air of Heaven, and is his own master. He is free, not a serf, and that is worth untold treasures. And if he occupies a superior position to the English country or city laborer, how exalted is his state compared with that of the hereditary pauper in a workhouse, born of a pauper, and whose children will be paupers after him! There are a million of paupers in England—the offspring of Manufacturing Civilization.

Russia.—The Village Community, or Commune, lies at the base of the agrarian organisation of Russia, and never having been complicated, as in Germany, by feudal customs, has retained its pristine vigor until the present day. The Russian Village Community differs in some important respects from the German, but its animating principle is the same. It furnishes a conspicuous example of the acknowledgment of the right of the nation, in its collective capacity, to the land, and gives an equally conspicuous denial to the justice of that system—the progeny of mercantile ideas of the worst kind—which permits any individual to purchase as much land as he pleases, and to deal with it when obtained as though it were a bale of goods. To comprehend how firmly welded the Commune is in the Russian Constitution we must carry our thoughts back to the period antecedent to the year 1861. Prior to that date nearly all the Russian peasantry, and many of the townspeople,

were serfs, occupying different grades of servitude indeed, but all veritably slaves, inasmuch as they were deprived of personal freedom. Altogether 48,000,000 persons belonged to the fettered class, and were divided into Crown, appanage, and private serfs, the first being, as might be guessed, the best off. Some of the serfs on the nobles' estates, and they counted two and twenty millions, were slaves of the lowest and most degraded order, their lot reminding one of that of the negroes on certain of the Mississippi and Louisiana plantations before the American Civil War. Yet, while exercising despotic power over the peasants, the nobles were never able to deprive them of their title to the Commune lands. The noble heaped personal services upon the villager and made his wretched life more wretched, but did not dare to break through the ancient custom and tear him from the soil altogether. Nor did the Crown attempt to do so. The condition of the Crown peasants, indeed, was much easier than that of the private serfs; but it is a striking proof of the deeprootedness of this custom of the Commune, that the Crown never offered to disturb it. The sway of a Sovereign could not be more despotic than was that of the Czar before the accession of Alexander II. to the Throne of Russia. Nicholas was regarded almost as a god by the mass of his subjects, and if when Jupiter nodded, *nutu, totum tremefecit Olympum*, the nod of Nicholas was hardly less awful to the Russians. He knouted, and slew, and banished whom he pleased, but in his most irritable and savage moods he let the commune lands alone. In truth, the custom existed before serfdom began. Grant Duff, in his "Studies on European Politics," says :—"The communal institutions of Russia are far older than its serfdom. They saw that evil begin, as they have seen it end." Russian serfdom arose in comparatively modern times.

An excellent account of the agrarian organisation of Russia is given by Dr. J. Eckardt, in his "Modern Russia." One third of the land in a manor, whether belonging to the Crown or to a private individual, fell, according to custom, to the direct use of the lord, the rest belonged to the Village Community, and was left to its undivided possession. Nominally and legally the land was owned by the lord, just as the serfs were owned by him, but practically it belonged to the latter, who regarded their share of the domain as the private property of the Commune, exempt from the lord's control. So strong was this feeling that most of the Communes, since the emancipation, have refused to avail themselves of the right accorded them by the Act of Emancipation to purchase the proprietary right of the lord, on the plea that the land is, and always has been their own. All the occupiers of the estate stood in equal, and almost unlimited dependence on their master; and were bound, amongst other things, to cultivate the part of the domain allotted to his use. The equitable ownership of the soil of the village was vested in the villagers as a body, and the land was periodically allotted, usually about every ninth year, in equal parcels amongst all the families in the place. Every member of the community had an equal claim to the use of a share of the village territory; and if a peasant, with the permission of his lord, took up his abode in a city for a time in order to work as an artisan or engage in commerce, he could, on any day, return to his village and obtain a share of the land at the next allotment, even though he had become wealthy during his absence. At the allotment, the arable land was divided into narrow strips, 100 to 500 fathoms long, and from three to six broad; the wood, pasture land, fisheries, etc., being left to the undivided possession of the whole community. This plan of cutting up the arable land of the village into narrow strips, for temporary occupation, was adopted by the Teutonic village communities of Germany, and its traces were likewise visible in some parts of England until a recent date.

The framers of the Emancipation Laws, recognizing facts, strove to convert the Communes into legal owners of the soil, but otherwise the principles on which the Communes existed were left untouched. "In the management of the estate; in the relation of each member to the entire community; in the periodical allotments; in the manner and style of taxation; and in the division of the land, absolutely nothing was altered. The right was indeed secured to the communities of dividing their district, after they had acquired it as property, and to subdivide the separate portions, but no use was ever made of this right and the land was retained as common possession." The Commune did not exist in the Baltic Province, inhabited chiefly by a population of German descent, in the Provinces which formerly made part of Poland, nor in a portion of Russia Minor. Even in Russia Proper there were a few small freeholds, but they were looked upon as abnormal, and throughout a territory where fifty millions of serfs, besides free men, dwelt, the Village Community was supreme, "a system which," says Professor Maine, "is known to be of immense antiquity. In whatever direction research has been pushed in Indian history, general or local, it has always found the community in existence at the farthest point of its progress." The vast extent of territory over which this mode of occupying land has, at one period or another, prevailed, was unknown, even to scholars, until within the last few years, and still lacks full recognition. There is, of course, a community of living intertwined with this community of land tenure, and in Russia the social communism became remarkably developed, each village commune being subdivided into families, consisting of a number of persons residing together, and yielding obedience to a patriarch, who kept the common purse, and exercised very large social powers over the members of the family, of which he was the representative so far as the outside world was concerned. The emancipation laws have resulted in a considerable disintegration of the communal system in this respect, but to the decided benefit of the people; otherwise, the commune holds its

ground, and is regarded by the Russian Socialists, whose ranks contain the bulk of the intellectual classes of Russia and "Young Russia" almost to a man, as the basis upon which a new and better national organisation can be built, and all the Slavonic races of Europe raised to a higher grade of civilisation.

II.

I HAD intended to treat of the land systems of other European countries than those mentioned, but I find it would occupy too much space to do so, and it is unnecessary for the purposes of the argument. The Commune, the Saxon and Frankish modes of holding land, and the feudal system, are the keys to the principal land tenures prevailing in Europe, and with them in his hands, the student can gather for himself a competent knowledge of the subject, and learn how it has come to pass that in England and elsewhere, one man is lord of a vast tract of country, while another has not an inch of land to call his own, and is only permitted to dwell on God's free earth by sufferance, as it were.

Let us sum up and frame a general conclusion. Leaving Russia aside, the characteristics of the seed from which the present land organisations of the principal countries of Europe, with their several branchings, have grown, may be described as the recognition of the principle that the land possessed by a community belongs to that community as a body, and it, for the sake of convenience, portions of it are given to individuals, the gift is made on condition that they shall guard it from invasion and render peculiar services to the State, which, if left unfulfilled, will entail forfeiture of their domain. The military protection of the soil was the central spring of the feudal system but the power which the system, with its compact machinery, vested in the gentry gradually reduced all rural residents of a lower grade of society to a state of dependence, more or less servile, upon their social superiors; while the latter, step by step, converted their military tenures into freeholds, and got rid of the peculiar burdens imposed upon the land. By the days of the Commonwealth the large landholders in England had reduced their feudal burdens to a mere remnant, and taking advantage of the times, cleverly contrived to shift their money dues on to the shoulders of the mercantile class, then just springing into life, but too weak, and perhaps not sagacious enough, to repel the imposition. The latter, indeed, have since amply revenged themselves; but as for the poor in means, they may truly say that, if the old knights and barons chastised them with whips, their commercial masters have chastised them with scorpions. In the days of William the Norman, Brute Force trod upon the necks of the poor; now, it is Brute Wealth. The feudal dues having been shunted off, the landholders got military tenures formally abolished in the reign of Charles II., when they found themselves, instead of being military tenants, hereditary masters of the soil.

In Russia, the right of the entire community to the use and possession of the soil exists in its naked form; and it has been left for New Zealand and other British Colonies to start on their career with the motto emblazoned on their shields, that any man with sufficient money in his purse, however basely he may have got it, shall be entitled to buy the absolute dominion of as much land as he pleases, unshackled by legal burdens, whose æsthetic glories he may rigidly prohibit all other human beings from enjoying, and whose material benefits he may permit to lie wholly undeveloped, even though thousands of his fellow-creatures be starving. One can understand a man who distinguished himself at Cressy or Agincourt—a Marlborough or a Wellington—receiving an absolute grant of land as a gift from the nation in acknowledgment of his public services. A Nelson, preserving his country's liberties—perhaps her national existence—and surrounding her with a corona of naval glory, might well be rewarded with a portion of the soil which he had defended at the risk of his own life to keep for himself and his heirs for ever. If an eminent statesman, or any man who performs great services to the State, be endowed in this manner, a cogent reason for the distinction is apparent, although, even in such cases, the utmost care ought to be taken not to infringe too far upon the integrity of the public domain. But why should Mr John Jones, who would laugh at the idea of any man sacrificing himself for the public welfare as ridiculous, and only credible to unsophisticated youths, whose life has been one long devotion to the acquisition of money, be permitted to appropriate to himself forty or fifty, or one hundred thousand acres of land, or any greater area which he has means to buy, more especially when there are thousands of men in the country he inhabits far better, morally and intellectually, than himself, and who, for that very reason, have failed to heap up as large a pile of wealth as he has done? What has been the career of three-fourths of the rich men of the Colony? Is it not because they are hard-hearted, careless of right and wrong, willing to seize every occasion to add to their golden store, however much their fellows may suffer thereby, it all being in the way of business," that they grow rich? Had they been better men, they would have remained poor. Why then should the State reward them for their selfishness?

Doubtless in other countries than New Zealand rich, men of this character frequently exercise a highly pernicious influence; but not satisfied with enduring the evils which prevail elsewhere, we are heaping up fresh troubles for ourselves by bestowing all the honor and power of the country upon these bad productions of modern society. Not content with letting them have a large share, we must needs give them pretty nigh the

whole. Money, no matter how got, is becoming the sole passport to the principal public offices—to all the public offices, indeed, which carry any political influence with them. The Upper House of Assembly has been openly surrendered to the rich class, on the plea that it should represent "property." The Constitution Act does not say that it should represent "property." The disease, too, is getting worse. The character of our rulers, great and small, has sadly deteriorated of late, and the body politic has been driven along the high road of moral degradation with accelerated speed during the last three or four years by the reckless loan expenditure of the General Government, originally devised by unscrupulous land and mercantile speculators for their personal benefit, and since continued amid their frantic shouts and abuse of all who objected to their proceedings. The lower-most stratum, morally and intellectually speaking, is being elevated to the top. That will tell in time. The Colony sustains a direct loss by allowing its affairs to be managed by those least capable of administering them, and an indirect but perhaps greater one by the crushing of the energies of its best citizens.

It is sometimes urged, in response to regrets at our lack of culture and the undue honor paid to vulgar and base minded men because they are rich, that "we have no leisured class in the Colony." That, however, is begging the question. A leisured class does not exist simply because there is such an insatiable grasping after wealth, and so much honor is paid to it that men never think of retiring from business until *pallida Mors*, who _____æque pulsat pede pauperum tabernas _____Regumque turrets _____imperatively commands them to do so. There are plenty of men in the Colony richer than three-fourths of the leisured class at Home and in the prime of life who would form a leisured class under the influence of a healthy public opinion, but they see that the only path to distinction lies through the golden gate, and they consequently seek no other. Their sons are brought up on the same principle. How many Colonial-born young men, whose parents are in easy circumstances, are devoting themselves to any nobler pursuit than that of making money—and to that alone? Has the reader, being himself an old colonist and capable of judging, met with *one*? Nevertheless, I do not know a country on the face of the globe which offers more facilities for the development of the higher faculties of the mind and the rearing up of a truly distinguished community than New Zealand. Socially, it is unhampered by the ties which are woven through long ages; politically, its people enjoy the utmost freedom; æsthetically, it contains untrodden fields of research in the brightest regions. Who that has seen the lofty and rugged mountains of the Southern Alps, with their snowy tops melting in the sky, trending away into the illimitable distance; or penetrated their deep and forest-clad gorges, with roaring torrents weltering down from the everlasting glaciers; or visited the sounds on the West Coast, with their rocky walls shooting up into the heavens, and their deep pellucid water lying still, close sheltered from the storm which rages on the wide Pacific but a few miles off; or sailed along the southern shores of Cook's Strait, gazing on the picturesque hills, wooded to the water's edge, and casting their shadows upon the quiet bays and the charming islets that lie scattered everywhere about the water; or has roamed through the dense forests of the North Island, with their glorious pine trees and fern and palm groves, and clear streams gurgling amongst the boulders, and sweet retreats fit for fairies; or has looked from the heights of the Coromandel peninsula upon those wonderful amphitheatres of rock and hill and grove which there lie exposed to view, and the ocean, in the far distance, with dark green islands resting like gems upon its purple bosom—who that has witnessed these scenes, or many, many others in New Zealand, but must recognise that this country is endowed with charms enough to kindle the imagination to its liveliest mood, and to produce poets and painters and followers in every walk of art of the highest excellence!

My theory is supported by the census returns, which disclose the fact that already the population of the towns is augmenting in a vastly greater ratio than that of the country. This is seen by comparing the tables of the census taken in 1871, with the returns of that taken in 1874. To appreciate their meaning we must keep in mind the circumstances of New Zealand: that it is a country where manufactures are only budding into life, and where millions and millions of acres of land are lying waste and still belonging to the Crown. During the period of three years under notice, considerable efforts were made to increase the agricultural population, not, indeed, by the General Government, which contented itself with shooting the human sweepings of Europe into our ports in order to supply the demand for cheap labor; but by the Provincial Governments, which, urged on by the popular cry, secured powers from the General Assembly to throw open blocks of land for sale on deferred payments, and to reserve tracts for special settlement. All such efforts, though excellent in their way, must, however, fail of their end while the root of the cancer is left untouched. The sufferings of the patient may be mollified, but unless the source of the malady be reached, he will succumb at last. So here. Freehold estates of undue magnitude derange the entire system of the body politic. There may be Crown land unoccupied, but that is not to the purpose. Great freeholds and the immoderate growth of towns are correlatives, and the two swell as the alienation of the soil from the Crown goes on. A large freehold seems to absorb the little ones by a species of attractive force. So the bigger a town gets the more rapidly it distances its rivals. Let us observe now the change which occurred in the distribution of the population during the three years between 1871 and 1874. When the census of 1871 was taken, there were 256,393 Europeans settled in the Colony, of whom 103,785

resided in towns—an astonishing proportion, truly. The census of 1874 was made in March of that year, and gave a total European population of 299,514; while the inhabitants of the towns (allowing 5,000 for the suburbs of Dunedin) numbered 139,223. Otherwise, out of a total increase of 43,121 souls, 35,438 was due to the augmented urban population! That is a fact which cannot be gainsaid; nor is there anything exceptional in the period to account for it. It is the natural and inevitable consequence of our blindly repeating here the follies which have placed a heavy and painful burden upon the shoulders of the Mother Country. Look at the condition of Victoria! Its urban population is 424,993, and its rural 355,369. Will any political economist assert that such a state of affairs is a healthy one? If these things occur in the green tree, what will happen in the dry?



THE question which the large landowners are bound to answer satisfactorily is this—Upon what plea do you claim to monopolise to your personal use these enormous tracts of territory? It has been proved that the monopoly is injurious to the public weal, since its ultimate tendency is to force masses of people into cities, thereby stripping them of their independence, and reducing many to pauperism, and a larger number to semi-pauperism; that it violates the original principles upon which the land belonging to a community was parcelled out and placed under the care of individuals; that the lords of these estates cannot base their titles upon eminent public services; and the only argument left is the profitable utilisation of the soil. Every inhabitant of New Zealand is able to judge for himself as to the tenability of that plea. He need not pore over musty books, or grope amongst columns of bristling figures, to ascertain whether the proprietor of 10,000 acres or the proprietor of 200 tills the soil most carefully. The fact is notorious that the returns from the large estates are proportionately far smaller than from those of limited area. Did no other impediment exist, the enormous amount of capital that would be required to put one of these vast domains under close cultivation would be an effective bar to their being used in that manner. They are managed on quite a different system. The object kept in view is to reduce the quantity of human labor employed to a minimum, and to produce the greatest possible return from the capital at the owner's command. Hence, a rough and ready style of farming, if farming it can be called, is adopted, and since the rearing of sheep and cattle meets these requirements best, it is chosen in preference to agriculture, even though the soil be of arable quality. The small cultivator, on the contrary, is obliged to make the most of his plot; he applies infinitely more hand labor to his fields than the lord of many acres does; while he bestows upon his little domain an affectionate care which seems ridiculous to the wealthy runholder, who regards his huge estate as a mere money-making machine, and "works" it accordingly. The waste of the resources of the soil en- by comparing the yield of produce per acre attained by the market gardener with the results achieved by the proprietor of a 50,000-acre freehold. The official report of the proceedings taken under the Victorian Land Act during the year 1874 likewise illustrates, but less forcibly, the want of economy which these vast estates engender. It states that "the withdrawal from pastoral occupation of 3,500,000 acres of the best land remaining in the Colony has had little influence in decreasing the number of stock held by the pastoral licensees, and therefore has not materially injured that interest, but has increased the stock held by farmers to the value of £3,000,000." Thus, by the transference of 3,500,000 acres of land from the bands of squatters to those of small farmers an immediate net gain of nearly £3,000,000 has resulted to the State. If the land had been placed under tillage, the gain would probably have been much larger. These figures, however, only prove what every candid and practical breeder would acknowledge, that, where the land is of fair quality, the small farmer will rear a larger number of stock to the acre than the runholder is accustomed to raise. Of course, there is poor and rugged country unfit to be cut up into small farms and considerable areas of which must needs be occupied by the shepherd, but that must be dealt with separately. We want shepherds, but not Shepherd Kings, in the Colony.

The argument of impracticability must be met. Persons, who admit the desirability of an Agrarian Law, nevertheless shake their heads and say, "Oh, it is impracticable." Now, when a new political idea which, if put into practice, would produce important and useful consequences, is propounded to the British public, the public usually responds, "It is impracticable." That objection disposed of, a second is urged, "It would be mischievous if carried into effect;" which likewise disappearing before the blows of reason the dangerous novelty is tried, and no more is heard of the objectors. The sole argument that has been urged in support of the plea that the proposal for an Agrarian Law is impracticable is, that it would be impossible to overcome the power of the great landowners, who would resist the passage of such a law to the uttermost. That is a singularly cogent argument on my side. If a small body of men has acquired such empire in the country that it is able to stifle a measure calculated to produce beneficial consequences to the community at large, it is time that its influence was reduced to reasonable proportions. Let it be remembered, too, that the possessors of this influence are not the Aristocracy of the country, but a Plutocracy. It is not intellect, nor learning, nor patriotism, which rules, but Brute Wealth. I acknowledge that among the large landholders educated gentlemen may be found, to whom the

latter remarks will not apply, although the main argument is just as cogent in their case as in that of their social inferiors; but they are gradually being supplanted by that objectionable class of rich *parvenus* already described. But however bold a front they might show, I apprehend that, when it came to the push, these gentlemen would give way, if only to save themselves from worse evils. It is part of their policy to cast the stigma of impracticability upon every proposal which threatens their dominion over the public estate; and their command of the Press enables them to do so with effect. Not half a dozen journals in the Colony are free to discuss the land question with a single eye to the public interest. Still in this, as in other matters, the truth will ultimately prevail.

The day is rapidly approaching when, throughout the civilised world, Wealth will be summoned by public opinion to show cause why it should exist at all, unaccompanied by merit. It would long since have been brought to that trial in European countries, but for the interposition of a class which, possessing riches, is likewise endowed with higher attributes. In New Zealand that class has no place, while the poorer ranks of society in the Colony are permeated with an intellectual leaven which will make them far more impatient of injustice, and far readier to resent it, than the corresponding classes of society in Europe have been. Hence it is to the immediate interest of the rich to guard against the creation in the Colony of a large body of landless poor, and of huge cities inhabited by festering masses of discontented people. To them such a state of things means critical danger. It is extreme folly to ignore the existence of new ideas on these matters. They are waves of reflection, coming no one knows whence, but passing through the minds of millions. People are asking themselves—Why should a man who is in every respect detestable, whose sole virtue is the demi-animal instinct of acquiring money, be permitted to dwell in luxury, while the honorable man, whose talents, were he given a field in which to use them, might be of great service to the State, is condemned to perpetual poverty, simply because his own sense of what is right and becoming will not permit him to employ those contemptible means of accumulating riches at which the base spirit of his rival has never blinked? The old answer, diligently propagated by those interested, that it is one of the inevitable evils of civilisation, has lost its force. People will not believe it. It is, indeed, a monstrous lie. Modern civilisation, whether in the form which it assumes in Great Britain, or in the worse shape in which it presents itself in New Zealand, is an artificial product, and the same hands which built it up can pull it down again. If it has defects they can be amended; if good features, they can be preserved. Turning back to the principal topic, however, it must be granted that the enactment of an Agrarian Law, so as to accomplish the object in view and at the same time avoid doing injustice to individuals, would be a difficult work. It would require statesmanship, but not a tithe part so much now as twenty years hence, when probably almost every available acre of land will be alienated from the Crown.

It is absolutely certain that if Australia had husbanded her waste lands, three-fourths, perhaps the whole, of the revenue required for the machinery of Government could have been raised from the State domain. These things were done in the olden time by the Romans, and they could be done now. Australia is already beginning to suffer the chastisement of retributive justice. Like New Zealand, she has scandalously squandered her estate, and is commencing to reap the fruits of her folly. The waste of their public lands will be a black mark upon the history of these Colonies. The free bestowal of the absolute title to all the soil within their borders was a munificent gift on the part of England to her Australian Colonies—next to the right of self-government, the noblest gift a parent State ever made to its dependencies. The gift, however, implied the corresponding obligation to use it properly. In the hands of wise and patriotic statesmen what noble results might have been achieved by means of the waste lands of Australia and New Zealand! What social problems could have been solved; what relief given to the oppressed millions of England; what happy reputations would have rested upon the authors of these successes! Yet, with their course unimpeded, not a single effectual step has been taken in Australia or New Zealand either to permanently utilise the public estate for revenue purposes, or to guard against the recurrence of those social evils which are the curse and dread of England, and which are already making their appearance in the large cities of Australia.

The only real barrier against these social evils is a law imperatively forbidding the holding, by an individual or family, of more than a certain acreage of land, under pain of forfeiture. Such an enactment is the basis upon which all our land laws should be founded. It would rest, itself, upon natural justice, and could be put into force without any unfairness towards private persons. If, as I originally suggested, an individual were restricted to 640 acres, and a family to 1,000 acres of freehold (the principle of restriction is the point, however, not the precise area, which is a matter of detail), it would, of course, become necessary for the State to resume a considerable quantity of land now in private possession, paying the money value of it in the usual manner. It would do so on precisely the same ground as that on which it takes land for railway purposes—because it is wanted for the benefit of the entire community. It would be merely a difference in degree. There is no wrong done to the individual; the State takes back what it has lent, and gives the person affected a sum of money as compensation for the loss he would otherwise sustain. If a railway line becomes necessary, whoever heard the rights of the landed proprietors through whose estates it must pass pleaded as a reason for abandoning the

project, even though the proposed line be a commercial speculation? The rights and privileges of individuals are not permitted to stand in the way in cases when a considerable section only of the community is to be benefited; how then can they be suffered to obstruct the path when the interests of the whole of the people are in question?

Opinion as to the proper mode of dealing with the public estate has made immense progress in the Australian Colonies lately. Few persons, if any, now dare to contend that freeholds of excessive size are useful to the State. On the contrary, their mischievousness is admitted; but those who are interested in their maintenance argue that, while it might be desirable to abolish such holdings, insuperable difficulties stand in the way of doing so. This change of opinion is manifested by the different treatment now accorded to the "State leasing" theory in Victoria to what it received when first propounded in that Colony three or four years ago. Its pioneer advocates were scoffed at as dreamy philanthropists and ignorant radicals, but the idea has grown and grown in public favor until it has at length been embraced by many of the leading men of the Colony, and when an amending Land Bill came before the Legislative Assembly last June or July, the principle, modified so as to make it applicable to those lands only which still remained the property of the State, was fairly put to issue before the Assembly, and while it did not meet with sufficient acceptance to enable it to be carried into law, it nevertheless found a respectable following. In our own House of Representatives likewise the matter has been mooted, and the State leasing theory is undoubtedly gaining adherents in New Zealand. Every man, indeed, who desires to see the land applied to its proper use and fairly distributed amongst the community must sympathise with these efforts, even if he fears they are not capable of effecting their end. In my first treatise I urged certain objections to the project, nor have I since read or heard anything calculated to refute the views there expressed. Certainly, however, I could only wish "God speed" to those who, by a different road, are seeking the same goal as myself; but let me observe that none of the essential objections to the nationalisation of the land would touch an Agrarian Law. The latter would not, as it is alleged the system of State leasing would do, organise an army of officials and lodge a dangerous weight of power in the hands of the Government; it would not create a State tenantry which might bring political pressure to bear upon the Legislature to release it from its just obligations; nor would it thwart that love of landed proprietorship for which our race has displayed so strong a predilection. Under an Agrarian Law, the Government would have no more to do with the ownership of the soil than it has now, nor would the tenure of the farmer become insecure or of less duration. Whatever political difficulties it might present would be in the effectuation of the change; that accomplished, the ensuing social reforms would work themselves out noiselessly and imperceptibly. The project of nationalising the land is deficient in this respect: it leaves wealth just as powerful as before. The possession of vast tracts of land gives the owner social and political influence, even though he be unfitted to wield either. Now, one part of the problem is—how to strip wealth, pure and simple, of this usurped power, in order that it may be placed in abler and more patriotic hands. Unless the land reformers of Victoria and New Zealand can show that the problem will be solved by means of the nationalisation of the land, they fail in their purpose. Would not the leaseholder of 50 or 100,000 acres of land exercise practically as much influence over the government of the country as if he were a freeholder, and would a mere change of tenure lead him to use that influence unselfishly? It is folly to suppose so. These men would be placed in circumstances of such enormous temptation to use their position for their personal aggrandisement at the expense of the State, that they would require the virtue of angels to resist it. This was the vice which underlaid the agrarian laws of Rome and kept the State in turmoil for centuries, until finally the wealthy converted their State leaseholds into freeholds, a seething mass of pauperism gathered in the city of Rome, and the Empire fell through its own corruption. The one cogent argument which the land leasers can adduce is that, under their proposed system, the Government might derive a large direct revenue from the land in perpetuity; whereas, if the soil be alienated in fee simple, it will get none. That, however, does not embrace all the conditions required.

It might nevertheless be wise for the state to retain possession of the pastoral lands of the country. Much of the land now occupied by runholders is of arable quality; another portion could be made suitable for tillage by scientific preparation when the growth of population rendered such a course necessary; but, even then, a large residuum would be left, amounting to millions of acres, which could only be used for the de-pasturing of sheep. That residuum, if cut up into blocks of moderate size, could be let on short leases to private individuals, and the proceeds applied towards defraying the expenses of Government. A considerable and permanent revenue would, by this means, be obtained and without risk of creating a dangerous State tenantry, or rendering individuals too powerful by their occupancy of unduly-large areas of land. With the tenure of the cultivable land regulated by a strict Agrarian Law, and the pastoral country divided into moderately sized blocks and let on leases of short duration, it would hardly be possible for the Public Estate to be converted into an instrument for the aggrandisement of wealth at the cost of the poorer classes of the community.

The results of the agrarian legislation of France and Germany show that large estates may be broken up by other methods than defining the acreage possessible by individuals. In those countries, however, the legislator

had ancient land tenures and national customs to work upon which do not exist here. New Zealand suffers from a peculiar disease, which requires a peculiar remedy. The remedy, too, must be quick and thorough in its operation. One advantage of an Agrarian Law is that it would be a strictly Conservative measure. Small freeholders are the most Conservative of men. Radicalism is born in great towns. It is engendered from poverty and suffering and ignorance by the oppression of misused wealth, and should find no place in a young country. The political mind of New Zealand, unfortunately, lacks the tonic of that frequent grappling with great questions of foreign policy by which the mother country is invigorated, and is become debilitated and corrupt by Mammon worship. The day will doubtless arrive when the Colony, having acquired strength enough to bear her share of the national burthens, will likewise be able to participate in the national councils. In the meanwhile, she is not chained to the most ignoble of pursuits. Self-condemned thereto she may be, but glorious social works lie before her people's hands, which if performed zealously and aright, might ultimately make New Zealand the brightest star in the constellation of the British Empire.

The foregoing treatise is republished from the (Dunedin) EVENING STAR.

Printed at the Evening Star Office, Bond Street, Dunedin,

A Letter to the Right Rev. H. L. Jenner, D.D.,

In Reply to his Pamphlet, Entitled "The See of Dunedin, N.Z., The Title of the Right Rev. H. L. Jenner, D.D., to be accounted the First Bishop, briefly vindicated."

With an Answer to the Letter of the Right Rev. Bishop Abraham, *In the "Guardian" of June 7th, 1871.*

By the Very Rev. Henry Jacobs, M.A., Dean of Christchurch, N.Z., Formerly Michel Fellow of Queen'S College, Oxford.

Epigraph in Greek by Aristotle Printed by the "Press" Company (Limited) at their Offices Christchurch Cashel Street. 1874

Contents.

Letter.

TO THE EIGHT REV. H. L. JENNER D.D.

MY LORD,—

A sense of duty, amounting to a necessity, which I have endeavoured from time to time to put aside, but which has returned again and again impels me to address to you the following letter. On several occasions during the last five or six years I have felt a desire to write to the editor of the *Guardian*, in whose pages the controversy with respect to your Lordship's claim to be Bishop of Dunedin has been chiefly carried on; but two considerations have withheld me from doing so. In the first place, I have felt a great unwillingness to throw blame, directly or by implication, upon one whom I have so many reasons to revere and love, as the late Primate of New Zealand; and, secondly, I have on each occasion indulged the hope that, before my letter could reach England, this very painful and unedifying controversy would have altogether ceased. The impulse, which was scarcely more than a passing inclination on former occasions, has become, as I have said, a sense of duty, pressing more and more urgently, since I first read, less than six months ago, your Lordship's published pamphlet, entitled, "The See of Dunedin, N.Z.: the Title of the Eight Rev. H. L. Jenner, D.D., to be accounted the First Bishop, briefly vindicated." This pamphlet was placed in my hands by a clergyman, who had not very long returned to this diocese from England, who informed me at the same time that the statements therein contained, being generally accepted by Churchmen in England, had produced in many quarters, to his certain know, ledge, an impression exceedingly unfavourable to the Church in New Zealand. When I had read a few pages of the pamphlet, I could not wonder at this; and, before I had come to the end, I could not but acknowledge that, if its statements were only based on fact, the Church in New Zealand would not only have no ground to stand upon at all, but would richly deserve the very strong terms of condemnation in which your Lordship speaks of her conduct.

I must confess to have been perfectly astounded—a sensation from which I have not yet recovered—at the statements made by your Lordship in that pamphlet, not on your own authority, but on the authority of the Lord Bishop of Lichfield. I feel the strongest possible reluctance to impugn statements made on such authority, but I feel yet more strongly that to pass them over unnoticed and unanswered would be a positive sin. It is most deeply to be deplored that his Lordship should have fallen into such extraordinary and unaccountable mistakes, which have misled not only yourself, but the Archbishops and Bishops of England, and have been most prejudicial to that Church, which, on other grounds, owes to Bishop Selwyn so deep a debt of gratitude.

Before proceeding further, allow me to state distinctly that I am wholly and solely responsible both for the design of writing the present letter, and for its contents. I write unsolicited and unassisted. I have no claim to represent the Church of New Zealand, beyond the fact that I have been a member of the General Synods of 1865, 1868, 1871, and 1874, have been present at every sitting of those Synods, have voted, I believe, on every division, and, in particular, must own to a full share of responsibility for every act of the General Synod in the matter of the Bishopric of Dunedin.

In the following remarks, I shall deal, first and chiefly, with the extract from Bishop Selwyn's letter to your Lordship, of April, 1866, which is to be found on page 21 of your pamphlet, and upon which you chiefly, and, I must say, reasonably rely. Afterwards, I propose to notice briefly some other points in your pamphlet, and some of the statements also contained in Bishop Abraham's letter to the *Guardian* of June 7, 1871, of which your Lordship says that it "remains unanswered and unanswerable." I have only further to premise, that it forms no part of my purpose to defend the conduct or language of individuals; whether defensible or not, I am not concerned with it; I express no opinion about it; the Church of New Zealand is responsible only for her own acts, and I have only to do with the questions at issue between your Lordship and that Church in her corporate capacity.

1. EXTRACT FROM BISHOP SELWYN'S LETTER.

In order to bring this matter fairly before the readers of this letter, and that they may see the full importance of its bearing on the controversy, it will be necessary for me to quote somewhat largely from your Lordship's pamphlet. On page 20, you write thus :—"Bishop Hadfield includes among those positions which he says are 'absolutely without any foundation whatever'—a formula which he employs more than once—my statement that 'the Primate of New Zealand, acting in the name and by the authority of the General Synod, empowered Archbishop Longley to select and consecrate a Bishop for Dunedin.' Well, I can only repeat for the twentieth time, and with the full conviction that it may be necessary to repeat it twenty times more, that the assertion is made on the distinct authority of the late Primate of New Zealand. It is not my statement, but his; and, in affirming that 'it is absolutely without any foundation whatever,' Bishop Hadfield contradicts not me, but Bishop Selwyn whose words, in answer to a doubt expressed by me, whether I need have accepted the Constitution at so early a period, are as follows—the date is April, 1866, four months before my consecration : 'You seem to have been told that your subscription to the New Zealand Church Constitution was premature, if not unnecessary. On the contrary, the *General Synod expressly requested* the Archbishop of Canterbury to place our Constitution in the hands of *any clergyman whom he might select*, and obtain his written assent to it, before he *recognised* him as Bishop Designate.'"

The italics in the above extract are your Lordship's, or Bishop Selwyn's, I cannot say which; but, if your own, you have very justly emphasised the words; for, if the statements contained in them were only correct, the Church of New Zealand would have absolutely no case at all, and in continuing to reject your claim to have been First Bishop of Dunedin, would more than justify the charges you bring against her, of "recklessness," "perverseness," "falsehood," and "wrong." But, painful as it is to say it, the words must be spoken; the statements contained in that extract from Bishop Selwyn's letter are, to use the words of Bishop Hadfield, "absolutely without any foundation whatever." I write under a full sense of responsibility, and I say again most distinctly, that the statement that "*the General Synod expressly requested* the Archbishop of Canterbury to place our Constitution in the hands of *any clergyman whom he might select*"—*i.e.*, for the See of Dunedin—"and obtain his written assent to it, before he *recognised* him as Bishop Designate" of Dunedin—is "absolutely without any foundation whatever." Am I then imputing conscious untruthfulness, downright deliberate falsehood, to the late Primate of New Zealand? By no means; but I am bound to affirm that, in writing the words of that extract, his Lordship fell into a most extraordinary and inconceivable mistake. There is just enough, as I shall presently show, in the proceedings of the General Synod of 1865, to account for such a mistake having been made, through confusion of memory; but what, I confess, is most unaccountable, is the fact that such a mistake, having been made so long ago as 1866, should not since have been corrected, but should have been allowed to remain and fester, and be the cause of deep-seated and spreading mischief. I can only suppose that the words which his Lordship had written escaped his memory afterwards, in the multiplicity of his engagements, and that they have never fairly come under his consideration since. If the case were not a very clear one, it may well be conceived that I should not presume, nay, that I should not dare, to bring such a charge against such a man; if I cannot show it to be a clear one, then I am content to bear all the odium and all the disgrace that such a charge against such a man, if proved to be unfounded, would entail. That the course I am taking, and the risk I am encountering, is disagreeable to myself, needs hardly to be said; nothing short of the strongest possible sense of obligation would induce me to pursue the one, and to brave the other.

Before I proceed to the proof, that the statements contained in the extract from Bishop Selwyn's letter are

"absolutely without any foundation whatever," suffer me to point out the extreme importance which attaches to this extract—not for your Lordship's sake, but for the sake of those who may read this letter without having previously read your pamphlet. It may be truly said that the whole case between the Church of New Zealand and yourself hinges on the correctness or incorrectness of this extract.

After quoting it, you proceed to comment upon it as follows, on page 21:—"If language has any meaning at all, the above extract proves that the Archbishop was authorised by the General Synod to do three things :—1. To select a clergyman; 2. To obtain his written assent to the Constitution; 3. To recognise him as Bishop Designate. And all these several stops did Archbishop Longley take in regard to myself." Again, on page 23, you say, with, if possible, still greater clearness and emphasis :—"What I have said, and what I now repeat, is this: that Archbishop Longley, being 'expressly requested by the General Synod to place the Constitution in the hands of any clergyman whom he might select, and obtain his written assent to it, before he recognised him as Bishop Designate,' did select *me*, did place the Constitution in *my* hands, did obtain *my* written assent to it, and did recognise *me* as Bishop Designate." If then your Lordship has rightly understood the extract (and this can hardly be doubted—your interpretation of it, so far as I am aware, has not been corrected), it follows that it is, so to say, the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae Novae Zelandiae*. If the General Synod did make this request to the Archbishop of Canterbury with reference to the Bishopric of Dunedin, there is not another word to be said on its behalf; I, for one, throw up my brief at once.

To come then to the point. The letter from which the extract is taken, was written in April 1866, and refers therefore to the General Synod of 1865, the only one indeed, to which it could possibly refer. Now I have a very clear recollection of all matters of importance dealt with by that Synod, having been a member of it, and absent from none of its sittings. Moreover, I have now before me the printed Report of its proceedings, and have just carefully gone through it once more, having done so several times previously, in order to be quite sure that I am not mistaken in what I am about to assert. The result is, that I feel bound to state once more, most distinctly, in the words of Bishop Hadfield, that there is "absolutely no foundation whatever" for the statements contained in the extract. Two resolutions were adopted by that Synod, which may have left some traces of themselves on the memory of the writer, who presided over that Synod, and which may possibly have given rise to his mistake; but it will be seen, when I quote them, that neither of them supplies the least shadow of foundation for the statements in question. The first, which was adopted on the Eleventh Sitting Day, 11th May, 1865, (see page 55 of the Report) runs as follows :—Moved by Mr. Dutton, seconded by Dr. Donald,—"That the Nelson Diocesan Synod having deputed to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London the nomination of a successor to the present Bishop of Nelson; and the Bishop of London having notified that he is prepared to exercise such right of nomination, this Synod do forward to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury a copy of Clause 23 of the Constitution Deed, and request his Grace will be pleased to act on behalf of the General Synod in sanctioning, at his discretion, the nomination of a clergyman by the Bishop of London, and to take the necessary steps for giving effect to the nomination." *Carried*. It is obvious that this Resolution has no more to do with the Bishopric of Dunedin than it has with the Bishopric of Cape-town, or any other Bishopric. Neither is there any general principle involved in it, such as might in the remotest degree lend any countenance to the statements of the extract. It is the delegation of a particular power to a particular person in a particular case. And it has nothing whatever to do with the *selection* of a clergyman, but only with the *sanctioning of a selection* made by another person. It may be as well, perhaps, for the sake of perfect clearness, that I should recite Clause 23 of the Constitution Deed, referred to in the above resolution. It runs thus :—"The nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the Diocesan Synod, and if such nomination be sanctioned by the General Synod, or, if the General Synod be not in session, by the majority of the Standing Committees of the several Dioceses, the senior Bishop shall take the necessary steps for giving effect to the nomination. *Provided* that every such nomination shall be made upon condition that the person so nominated shall, before accepting the nomination, declare in writing his assent to this Constitution." The General Synod, accordingly, by the above Resolution, delegated to the Archbishop of Canterbury its right of sanctioning the nomination which should be made to the Bishopric of *Nelson*, just as the Diocesan Synod of *Nelson* had previously delegated the right of nomination itself to the Bishop of London. Before the Synod broke up, news was received from England of the exercise of the delegated right of nomination by the Bishop of London, and, accordingly, we read on page 63 of the Report, that on Monday, 15th May, "the President announced that the Rev. Andrew Burn Suter, Incumbent of All Saints Stepney, had been nominated as successor to the Bishop of Nelson." 2. If the Resolution just referred to affords no countenance to the statements of the extract, still less, if possible, does the other, to which I have alluded. So wide is it indeed of the mark, that I should not cite it at all, but for the fact that when, at the recent meeting of the Sixth General Synod at Wellington, I was comparing in a speech the statements in question with the Report of the Proceedings of the Third General Synod, as I have just been doing in the above paragraphs, it was doubtfully suggested by a leading lay member of the Synod, that it was just possible the Bishop of Lichfield might have been referring to the Resolution on page 59, adopted two days after the former

one, and which I now quote :—Moved by the Bishop of Christchurch, seconded by the Rev. Dr. Maunsell,—“That this Synod instruct the Bishops of this Ecclesiastical Province to memorialise the authorities of the State in England for the purpose of obtaining their consent to the regulation of the General Synod as expressed in Clause 23 of the Deed of Constitution, viz : ‘That the nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the Diocesan Synod and be sanctioned by the General Synod,’ or, pending their decision on this matter, that they appoint no Bishop to any vacant See in this Ecclesiastical Province, unless he shall be willing to declare his assent to this Constitution.” *Carried*. It will be seen that this Resolution, though it refers to the requirement of assent to the Constitution, makes no mention of the Archbishop of Canterbury at all, much less to the selection by him of a clergyman for the See of Dunedin; the memorial was to be addressed to “the authorities of the *State* in England.” In point of fact, no memorial of the sort was ever sent, as the Bishop of Lichfield is aware; for, immediately after the breaking up of the Session of the General Synod in 1865, news arrived of the delivery of the Judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon the petition of Bishop Colenso, known as the Westbury Judgment, delivered on the 20th March, 1865, the effect of which was to declare, that the Crown had no power to create Dioceses, or appoint Bishops as corporations sole, by letters patent, in Colonies possessing an independent legislature. By this Judgment the whole aspect of the relations between the Church in the Colonies, and the authorities of the State in England, was completely changed. So much was this felt to be the case by the Primate of New Zealand and his Comprovincials, that they took the decided step of offering to surrender their letters patent, and felt that they would be indemnified by the succeeding Synod for not sending homo any such Memorial as that which was contemplated by the Resolution above cited.

The two resolutions then, which I have thus referred to at length, are manifestly wide of the mark; they do not touch the question; and there is absolutely nothing besides in the Report of the Proceedings of the Synod of 1865, which could by any possibility be construed into an authority given by the Synod to the Archbishop of Canterbury to select a clergyman for the See of Dunedin. It is true that the Synod adopted, on the 13th May, the resolution referred to by Bishop Abraham in his letter to the *Guardian*, with respect to the next place of meeting; but let us see what that amounts to. It certainly could not have been in the mind of the Bishop of Lichfield, when he penned the words of the extract which is under consideration. It is as follows (page 58) :—Moved by Mr. Quick, seconded by the Bishop of Christchurch—“That the next Session of the General Synod be held in Dunedin, if by the time of meeting there be a Bishopric of Dunedin constituted, and the Bishop shall have entered upon the duties of his office. If there be no Bishop, the next Session shall be held at Auckland.” *Carried*. “If language has any meaning at all,” to use your Lordship’s words, neither this resolution, nor either of the two foregoing, can by any possibility be said to bear out the positive assertion that “*the General Synod expressly requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to place our constitution in the hands of any clergyman whom he might select, and obtain his written assent to it, before he recognised him as Bishop Designate.*” I must therefore sadly, but emphatically, conclude this part of my letter with the re-iterated declaration, that the positive assertion just quoted is “absolutely without any foundation whatever.”

2. IS THE CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND IN ANY WAY COMPROMISED BY THE ACT OF THE LATE PRIMATE?

Your Lordship, in the “Statement” presented by you to the Fourth General Synod, which met in Auckland in 1868, wrote as follows—and you invite special attention to the passage on page 12 of the pamphlet to which I am replying:—“An engagement of more than ordinary solemnity has been entered into; the two contracting parties being the Church in New Zealand, speaking and acting by her Metropolitan, and Bishop Jenner. The question to be decided by the Synod is simply this : Do the interests of the New Zealand Church demand, and will justice and honesty admit of the repudiation of that engagement by either of the parties, without the concurrence of the other? Such a question may safely be left to the judgment of any assembly of fair-dealing Englishmen; and the Bishop leaves it with perfect confidence in the hands of the General Synod of the New Zealand Church.” Tour Lordship must forgive me for saying that it is a perfectly groundless assumption that any engagement, either expressed or implied, has ever been entered into between the Church in New Zealand and yourself. Herein lies the *fons et origo mali*. Tour words are, “the Church in New Zealand *speaking and acting by her Metropolitan.*” Now if it can be proved that the New Zealand Church did really speak and act by her Metropolitan or, in other words, authorise her Metropolitan to speak and act for her, in the matter of the appointment of a Bishop of Dunedin, I have not a word more to say, except to express the deepest contrition for having had any share in the repudiation of a solemn engagement. But I must boldly and unflinchingly say that no such proof can be given. It is just this point, as I need not remind your Lordship, which Bishop Abraham essays to prove in his letter, in the Supplement of the *Guardian* of June 7th, 1871, and of which you say that it “remains unanswered and unanswerable.” As the Bishop has said in that letter all, and more than all, that can be said on the side of the question which he has espoused, it will be convenient perhaps if I put what I have to say

on the other side, in the shape of a reply to that letter. I hope it is unnecessary for me to say that, in applying myself to this task, I do so with feelings of the deepest respect, and most sincere regard, for one from whom I have received many kindnesses, and with whom, when he was in New Zealand, I enjoyed the privilege of frequent and friendly correspondence.

3. BISHOP ABRAHAM'S LETTER TO THE "GUARDIAN."

In the first place, let me say generally, that all the arguments, which Bishop Abraham and others bring forward in support of the assertion that the late Primate of New Zealand was either authorised or encouraged by the General Synod to take steps for the selection of a clergyman for the See of Dunedin, are *afterthoughts*. "When the fact became known in New Zealand that the appointment had been offered to your Lordship by Archbishop Longley, and that the Archbishop had been led to take this step by a communication from Bishop Selwyn, there was, I venture to say, but one feeling among Churchmen throughout the length and breadth of the Colony, a feeling of silent, regretful astonishment. If it had been any other man but Bishop Selwyn, the feeling would have been one of undisguised indignation. No one was more taken aback, if I may use the expression, than Bishop Selwyn himself, as I know from what he said to myself, when he called at Christchurch on his way to Dunedin in March, 1866. As Bishop Abraham says, when he "wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, requesting to him be on the look-out for a suitable man, he did not expect so immediate an answer as he received, that Dr. Jenner had accepted the bishopric." In writing that letter to the Archbishop, Bishop Selwyn probably intended and expected nothing more than that the Archbishop should select a clergyman, whom he (Bishop Selwyn) might recommend to the Churchmen of Otago for their Bishop, as he had before recommended the present Primate of New Zealand (Bishop Harper) to the Churchmen of Canterbury.

But, be this as it may, the great question is this—"Was the Church of New Zealand, through her General Synod, in any way a party to the step taken by Bishop Selwyn in writing to the Archbishop? In no way at all, I answer, and am prepared to prove. At the risk of being tedious, I will, for the sake of the completeness of the proof, take Bishop Abraham's letter, clause by clause.

"When the Bishop of Christchurch was appointed to that See," he writes, "there was no Church Constitution at all in New Zealand. The Bishop of New Zealand, after conference with the clergy and laity of the Canterbury Colony, offered the See to Dr. Harper, and on his acceptance of it presented his name to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and he was duly consecrated to the See." This is substantially correct; but let it be clearly perceived what the precedent amounted to; the Bishop of New Zealand acted as a trusted mediator, but the nomination proceeded, according to ancient Catholic principle, from *the clergy and laity over whom the new Bishop was to preside*.

"In the year 1857," Bishop Abraham proceeds to say, "those two Bishops, a body of representative clergy and of representative laity, met at Auckland, and drew up and signed the Church Constitution, in which provision was made for the election of a Bishop to a *vacant* See, but none for the formation of a *new* diocese, or the appointment of a Bishop for a non-existent diocese." It is quite true that no *literal* provision was made for the appointment of a Bishop to a new diocese; but clause 25 of the original Constitution, and clause 23 of the amended Constitution, agree in laying down the broad principles, that the nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the clergy and representatives of the laity over whom he is to preside, but that the nomination shall not take effect, unless it shall have been sanctioned by the Bishops, and the representatives of the clergy and laity of the Ecclesiastical Province. The original clause (No. 25) stood as follows :—"Saving any rights of the Church and of the Crown, the nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the Diocesan Synod, and, if sanctioned by the General Synod, shall be submitted by the General Synod to the authorities in Church and State in England for their favourable consideration." And the amended clause does not materially differ from this with reference to the principles of nomination and confirmation, but only in the omission of all reference to the rights of the Crown, and to the authorities in Church and State. Now I may say that, to my certain knowledge, it was always understood by many others besides myself—I think I might truly say, by the majority of Churchmen in New Zealand—that the *spirit* of these provisions would be adhered to in the appointment of Bishops to new dioceses, as we have seen that it actually was in the case of the appointment of Bishop Harper,—that is to say, that the nomination would proceed from the clergy and the representatives of the laity of the new diocese, and be confirmed by the General Synod, as representing the Church of the Province.

But, apart from this, there is the express provision of the 13th Clause of the Constitution, to which Bishop Hadfield has called attention, and which, as he justly says, is "absolutely decisive of the whole question." Clause 13 lays down expressly that "the General Synod shall have power to determine *how and by whom all patronage shall be exercised*." Your Lordship's answer to this is:—"Very well: then the General Synod was acting strictly within its defined limits, when it authorised Archbishop Longley to 'select a clergyman' for the See of Dunedin." But I have clearly proved, I think, that the General Synod never did authorise the Archbishop

to take this step.

I proceed to quote the next paragraphs of the Bishop's letter:—"Accordingly, in 1858, the Bishop of New Zealand proceeded, as before, to confer with the clergy and laity of several (political) Provinces of New Zealand, and having learnt from them that there were funds available for the purpose, and having mentioned the names of the clergymen he intended to propose to the Archbishop, he laid those names before the Archbishop and the Secretary of the State for the Colonies, and Bishop Hobhouse and myself were duly accepted by those authorities, and consecrated in 1858 by Archbishop Sumner. And the Bishop of New Zealand, having further conferred with the Church Missionary Society, presented the name of Bishop Williams to the same authorities, and he was duly consecrated at Wellington." Now the conclusion, which his Lordship draws from the facts here stated, is given by him further on, in the summing up of his letter, thus:—"I hold that Bishop Jenner was as duly elected and nominated for the See of Dunedin as Bishops Hobhouse, Williams, and myself were for our several Sees." It is strange that the Bishop should overlook the fact, that the circumstances of the Church of New Zealand were completely changed at the time when the appointment was made to the See of Dunedin, from what they were at the time of his own nomination, and those of Bishops Hobhouse and Williams. When these Bishops were nominated, there were *no Diocesan Synods, nor Rural Deanery Boards*, in existence; in other words, there was no regular organisation of the clergy and laity of any (political) Province or District; and, as the General Synod was not yet constituted, when these appointments were made, there was no authority to determine, "how and by whom Patronage should be exercised." Under these circumstances, Bishop Selwyn could do no otherwise than he did; he conferred, in the best manner he could, with the clergy and laity of the Provinces of Wellington and Nelson, and they gladly concurred in his recommendation; in the case of Bishop Williams, who was to preside over a Missionary Diocese, he conferred with the Church Missionary Society. But when, in 1865, seven years later Bishop Selwyn requested Archbishop Longley to be on the look-out for a clergyman for the See of Dunedin, circumstances were completely altered; the Synodical System had been in full operation for several years; three sessions of the General Synod had been held; the several Diocesan Synods had met annually; so had, in particular, the Rural Deanery Board of Otago and Southland. Clergy and laity had been roused to a sense of their responsibilities; distinct rights and privileges had been assigned to them; and they had learnt to take an active, intelligent, and regular part in Church legislation, and in the general management of the affairs of the Church.

But, over and above these general changes, there was another essential point of difference between the course which Bishop Selwyn pursued in the appointment of the three Bishops in 1858, and the unfortunate step which he took in writing to Archbishop Longley in 1865. It is a point which I do not remember to have seen noticed before in the course of this controversy, and to which I beg to invite special attention. When Bishop Selwyn, with his accustomed energy, pushed forward the formation of the new dioceses of Nelson, Wellington, and Waiapu, in 1858, and procured the appointment of Bishops Hobhouse, Abraham, and Williams to preside over them, he was carving out new dioceses *out of his own diocese*; he was selecting men to preside over portions of the wide-extended territory, which up to that time had owned allegiance to himself. But when he wrote to Archbishop Longley in 1865 to select a clergyman for the Diocese of Dunedin, the Provinces of Otago and Southland, which together constitute that diocese, had *for nearly nine years formed part of the Diocese of Christchurch*, had been annually visited by Bishop Harper, and all their Church affairs administered by him; he had appointed all their clergy, and had presided in person over their Rural Deanery Board. Here, then, is a marked difference between this case and those preceding ones, with which Bishop Abraham classes it as exactly parallel. Surely, if any *individual* was entitled to exercise a special influence in the appointment of the First Bishop of Dunedin, it was the Bishop of Christchurch. But, in truth, no such right belonged to any individual whatever, however exalted his position, from the time that the Synods of the Church, Diocesan and General, were in full operation.

But, in flat opposition to the assertion just made, the next paragraph in Bishop Abraham's letter contains the strange assumption—strange indeed to the great majority of churchmen in New Zealand—that the General Synod never dreamt of interfering with the first nominations to new Sees, until the claim to do so was devised, as an unauthorised novelty, by those who wished to defeat your Lordship's appointment. Strange indeed, if this assumption were correct, that, when the motion was made in the Synod that met in Auckland in 1868, "that the appointment of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin be not confirmed by the Synod,"

See Appendix.

neither Bishop Selwyn who presided, nor Bishop Abraham who was present, nor anybody else, thought of disputing the Synod's right to pass such a resolution. But let me proceed to examine what the Bishop actually says:—"The first General Synod was sitting at Wellington in March, 1859, when Bishop Hobhouse and I arrived, and had passed the first three statutes organising the General and Diocesan Synods and Rural Deanery Boards, before Bishop Williams was consecrated, but *no one ever proposed any reference to the General Synod to confirm our appointments, it being so clearly felt that the Church Constitution had made no provision for the*

first appointments, and that therefore the General Synod had nothing to do with them, until it should pass a statute remedying the defect, (which has only just been done in 1871)." I have emphasised by italics the latter portion of this extract, because it is extremely important in its bearing on the main question; for, if the reason here given for the non-interference of the Synod in the appointments of Bishops Hobhouse, Abraham, and "Williams were the true one, then I say again, the controversy would be at an end; the General Synod would have no case. But I must repeat, that this distinction, of which so much has been made in England, is altogether *an afterthought*, and has scarcely been heard of in New Zealand. I was not a member of the Synod of 1859, and cannot therefore bear personal testimony to what took place there; in the Synod of 1862, of which also I was not a member, no occasion arose, so far as I am aware, for any mention of the subject. But in the Synod of 1865, in which I took part, there was a very full and earnest discussion, as Bishop Abraham will doubtless remember, on the subject of the nomination and confirmation of Bishops, and the clause of the Constitution relating to the matter was materially amended; and I confidently state that during that whole discussion no distinction was drawn by any speaker between first and subsequent appointments. Had the question arisen, I doubt not that it would have been held that *the principle*, on which the clause was grounded, was wide enough to cover both, and that the clause was *intended* to govern both. This, however, may be regarded as a *petitio principii*: I therefore beg to confine myself to the assertion, of which I challenge contradiction, that, in all the discussions of the subject in the Synod of 1865, the distinction was never drawn. And, as I have stated above, when the very question itself was brought up in the most naked form, in the Synod of 1868, by the motion before-mentioned, "that the appointment of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin be not confirmed by the Synod," *neither Bishop Selwyn who presided, nor Bishop Abraham who was present, nor anybody else, took exception to the right of the Synod to give or withhold confirmation in the case of a first appointment.* This fact is an indisputable proof that the distinction between first and subsequent appointments, of which so much has been made, is an *afterthought*, which had its origin, not in New Zealand, but in England.

What reason, then, it may be asked, can be given why the First Synod of 1859 did not claim the exercise of the same right with regard to the appointments of Bishops Hobhouse, Abraham, and Williams? A very good and sufficient reason indeed, I must take leave to say. The original clause of the Constitution relating to the appointment of Bishops, which was then in force, ran thus:—"25. Saving any rights of the Church and of the Crown, the nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the Diocesan Synod, and, *if sanctioned by the General Synod, shall be submitted by the General Synod to the authorities in Church and State in England for their favourable consideration.*" But the names of those three Bishops had been already "submitted to the authorities in Church and State in England," and had been accepted by them, and two out of the three had been actually consecrated, not only before the First General Synod had met, but *before the Synodical system had been brought into operation at all.* How could the First General Synod have any voice whatever in what it found to have been an accomplished fact before it came into existence at all?

At the close of the paragraph last quoted, the Bishop states that the Synod passed a Statute in 1871, "*remedying the*" (supposed) "*defect.*" But how, let me ask, could a *Statute* remedy a defect in the *Constitution*? As well might we speak of one of the XXXIX Articles remedying a defect in the Scriptures. If there be a defect in the Constitution, it must be supplied in the Constitution; no Statute can supply it. In point of fact, the Statute of 1871—the draft of which, I may remind Bishop Abraham, was before a Select Committee (of which he was himself a member) of the Synod of 1868—is only *a development in detail* of the principle of the clause of the Constitution, which relates to the appointment of Bishops.

It is an exceedingly unpleasant duty to be compelled, for the truth's sake, to contradict a person for whom one feels a sincere and deep respect, more especially if that person be a Bishop. Such, however, is the obligation, under which I find myself placed with regard to the first half of the next paragraph of the Bishop's letter, which runs thus:—"When the General Synod met at Nelson in 1862, they pressed upon the Metropolitan (the Bishop of New Zealand) the desirableness of his taking steps to find a Bishop for Dunedin. In 1865, when the General Synod met at Christchurch, the matter was taken up again, and a resolution passed to the effect that the Synod should meet at Dunedin in 1868, if there was a Bishop there by that time; and I made the remark that if no more interest was shown in the matter during the next three years than in the three preceding, we had better name another place where the General Synod should meet, in case there was no Bishop, and Auckland was named accordingly. (General Synod Report, 1865, p. 104). I mention this to show that pressure was brought to bear upon the Metropolitan by the General Synod, to make him try and move the churchmen of Dunedin to endow a Bishopric."

Now I have searched the Report of the Proceedings of the Second General Synod, which met at Nelson in 1862, through and through with the greatest care, and fail to find the slightest vestige of proof of the Bishop's statement, that that Synod "pressed upon the Metropolitan the desirableness of his taking steps to find a Bishop for Dunedin." It is a pity that his Lordship does not give any reference here, as he does in the next sentence with regard to the Third General Synod. He must have been thinking of something which passed in private, or

of something, at any rate, which is not recorded. However that may be, there is absolutely no ground whatever for saying that the *General Synod* pressed the matter, or took it up oven; for the General Synod does nothing, except by formal, official, and published act. The only reported mention of the subject at all, at that Synod, occurs in the President's Address. After speaking of the organisation of the several Diocesan Synods, he adds, "To complete the system, a Rural Deanery Board has been organised at Otago, which, under the present circumstances of that Province, we hope will soon expand itself into the Synod of a new Diocese."

See Appendix, p. iii.

With regard to what transpired in the General Synod which met at Christchurch in 1865, I must refer to what I have said at length in the former part of this letter. I have a recollection that reference was often made by individual members of that Synod to that which was the desire of all, namely, that steps should be taken *to provide an endowment* for the proposed Bishopric of Dunedin as soon as possible. But that is one thing; the selection of a clergyman to fill the office is quite another.

I may pass over the next few lines of the Bishop's letter, in as-much as they have reference to facts which no one disputes, and which have no bearing on the merits of the controversy. The next passage I have to notice is this :—"I should add, that at the General Synod in 1865, a resolution was passed requiring any clergyman before his consecration to a See in New Zealand under the Church Constitution to sign a Declaration of Submission to the General Synod. This Declaration was duly accepted and signed by Bishop Jenner, and laid before the Standing Commission of the said General Synod." I refer to this passage chiefly, my Lord, because in your own pamphlet you lay stress upon the fact of your declaration of adherence to the Constitution having been laid before the Standing Commission, and accepted by that body, as though it were presumptive evidence of the legitimacy of your appointment. Your Lordship writes as follows (p. 23) :—"And I have argued also, that the fact of my assent having been required and given 'in consideration of being appointed Bishop of Dunedin,' and the statutable declaration to that effect having been accepted by the Standing Commission (the authorised representative of the General Synod when not in Session), and recorded on their minutes without demur or hesitation, is presumptive evidence that no violence had been done to the Constitution, and that my recognition as Bishop Designate was regarded as a matter of course." I will put as briefly as possible what I have to say on this branch of the subject. 1. The Standing Commission is, truly enough, "the authorised representative of the General Synod when not in Session," but *only within certain prescribed and clearly defined limits, laid down by statute*. This is a point, about which the General Synod has always been very jealous. Therefore, if the Standing Commission should at any time exceed its powers, it would be alone responsible; it could not bind the General Synod. 2. But, in point of fact, the act of the Standing Commission, in the case referred to, was simply an act of registration; nay, it was not even that; it amounted to no more than the listening to the reading of a document. It so happens that I am in a position to give the best possible proof of the correctness of this statement; for I am writing with the *original minute-book* of the Standing Commission before me. I will transcribe the minutes referring to the subject, premising that the meeting was held at the Cathedral Library, Auckland, on Wednesday, January 10th 1866, and that there were present, the Bishop of New Zealand in the chair, and only two besides, namely, Sir William Martin, and the Hon. William Swainson:—

"Read letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury reporting the recommendation of the Reverend Henry Lascelles Jenner as Bishop of the new See of Dunedin.

"Read declaration of adherence of the Reverend Henry Lascelles Jenner to the Constitution of the Church in New Zealand."

This is absolutely all that appears on the minute-book of the Standing Commission on the subject of the Bishopric of Dunedin until the 22nd May, 1871, when I find this minute:—"The Chairman informed the Commission that the Reverend Samuel Tarratt Nevill, Rector of Shelton, in the County of Stafford, England, had been nominated to the Bishopric of Dunedin by the Synod of the Diocese of Dunedin, and that the nomination had been confirmed by the majority of the Standing Committees of the Ecclesiastical Province. The Chairman further informed the Commission that it is proposed by the Primate to consecrate the Reverend Samuel Tarratt Nevill at Dunedin on Whit-Tuesday next." Then follows the minute of a resolution adopted by the Commission, the preamble of which recites at length the provisions of Statute No. 12 of the Fourth General Synod, 1868, (Statute to provide for the division of the Diocese of Christchurch into two separate Dioceses—certified, by the way, by Bishop Selwyn)—one of which provisions was that "until a day to be fixed in that behalf by the Standing Commission, the said Bishop of Christchurch shall continue to have charge of the said Diocese Dunedin, and, for the purpose of the Statute for the organisation of Diocesan Synods, shall be deemed and taken to be the Bishop of such Diocese." The Resolution, accordingly, of the Standing Commission, omitting the Preamble, is as follows:—"It is Resolved and Declared by the Standing Commission that, on the day on which the said Samuel Tarratt Nevill shall be consecrated to the office of Bishop, the said Bishop of Christchurch shall cease to have charge of the said Diocese of Dunedin, and shall cease to be deemed to be the Bishop of such Diocese for the purposes of the Statute for the Organisation of Diocesan Synods."

See Appendix, p. x.

So that, if the testimony of the Standing Commission goes for anything, it is manifestly to this effect, namely, that the Bishop of Christchurch did not cease to have charge of the Diocese of Dunedin, though constituted a separate Diocese, until the consecration of Bishop Nevill, and that therefore Bishop Nevill is to be regarded as the First Bishop of Dunedin. I have only to add, with regard to this point, that the members present at this meeting of the Standing Commission were the following, the Eight Rev. the Bishop of Auckland in the chair, his Honor Sir George A. Arney, Chief Justice, Sir William Martin, D.C.L., William Swainson Esquire, Frederick Whitaker Esquire.

This letter is extending to a far greater length than I had foreseen, but I am under the necessity of referring to yet another paragraph in the letter of Bishop Abraham. He proceeds to say:—"This point"—*i.e.*, your Lordship's acceptance of the Church Constitution—"has had great stress laid on it by the opponents of Bishop Jenner, and they charge him with having promised to submit to the General Synod, and then, on their expressing a desire that he should resign, refusing to do so. But it should be remembered that one leading principle of the legislation of the General Synod from the beginning was, that It should not exercise its authority over any of its members in the way of removal or suspension from any office except through the intervention of a judicial tribunal, or voluntary court of arbitrators. And to no such tribunal or arbitrator was Bishop Jenner's case ever submitted.

I cannot help thinking that the Bishop is confounding two documents entirely different. There are *two* distinct Declarations referred to in the Constitution, namely, one in Clause 23, which is a declaration of *assent to the Constitution*, and has to do only with the nomination of Bishops; and the other in Clause 28, which is a declaration of *submission to the authority of the General Synod*, and is to be signed by persons on their admission to any office under the General Synod. I may add that, if it was the first of these that your Lordship signed, it is an acknowledgement that your nomination was made under the said Clause 23, *which makes Confirmation by the General Synod indispensable to the validity of an appointment*: but, if it was the second, then the act was altogether a premature and irregular one, and therefore null and void.

This point," his Lordship adds, "I strove to impress upon the General Synod of 1868, but to no purpose."

And no wonder, since the argument is based on an entirely false assumption. It is based on the assumption that you, my Lord, were ever a member of the General Synod, or an acknowledged officer of the Church of New Zealand, which is the very point that the General Synod has, from first to last, in the Sessions of 1868, 1871, and 1874, felt itself bound most firmly and constantly to deny. The opponents of your Lordship's appointment, on this side of the world, have laid no stress, so far as I am aware, on the point referred to by the Bishop. The General Synod, at any rate—and I am not concerned to defend anything but the acts of that body—has never been guilty of such inconsistency. And I must here take the liberty of saying that the Bishop is wholly mistaken when he speaks of the General Synod "expressing a desire" that you, my Lord, "should resign." It cannot be too distinctly stated and affirmed that the Synod never did anything of the sort. On the contrary, it carefully guarded itself against doing so. Upon the motion being made, which I have referred to before, in the Synod of 1868, "That the appointment of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin be not confirmed by the Synod," an amendment was moved to the effect that the Synod "is unable to find any sufficient ground for withholding its recognition of the appointment of Bishop Jenner; but, while acknowledging the appointment, and declaring that it shall be competent for Dr. Jenner to enter upon the duties of his office, the Synod *would urge upon Bishop Jenner the expediency of his resigning the Bishopric*, on the ground of the difficulties experienced in obtaining an adequate endowment." *This amendment was negatived without a division*; and, after another amendment had been lost on division, and an adjournment of half-an-hour had taken place to allow of free conference among the members, the following amendment, moved by Archdeacon Harper, and seconded by myself, was ultimately Adopted Without a Division:—"That, whereas the General Synod is of opinion that it is better for the peace of the Church that Bishop Jenner should not take charge of the Bishopric of Dunedin, this Synod hereby requests him *to withdraw his claim to that position*."

See Appendix, p. vi.

It is obviously unnecessary to dwell on the importance of the distinction thus emphasised by the Synod, between *resigning* a position to which one has an acknowledged right, and *withdrawing a claim* which has never been acknowledged at all.

4. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION AT ISSUE.

I have now done with Bishop Abraham's letter, the remainder of which consists of a summary of its foregone mistakes. And now, my Lord, I would fain believe that, on the fuller information which I have endeavoured to lay before you, and which will be found, on examination, to be unquestionable as to accuracy, your Lordship will be induced to withdraw your claim to "the *historical* position of first Bishop of Dunedin."

This, if I may presume to say so, your Lordship may do with honour, whereas it is obvious that the General Synod could not *allow* that claim without the deepest dishonour. It is natural for those who have not considered the question, and are ignorant of the facts, to say, what actually was said by *one* member of the General Synod which recently sat at Wellington, "Why stand upon the point at all? If Bishop Jenner is willing to acknowledge Bishop Nevill as Bishop *de facto*, why should not the General Synod acknowledge Bishop Jenner as *First* Bishop?" The simple answer to this is, that the General Synod *cannot do so without telling a lie*. The General Synod cannot declare that to be the case which it knows not to be the case. To many, no doubt, the whole controversy in its present stage appears effete and futile. But any one who has read your Lordship's pamphlet, and especially any one who is aware of the impression produced by it in many quarters in England, will recognise the necessity which exists for clearing away, if possible, the grave misapprehensions which have arisen. For the character of the Church in New Zealand is at stake, her character, not only for adherence to ecclesiastical right and order, but for very truth and honesty itself. The motto from St. Augustine, which your Lordship has prefixed to your pamphlet, accuses us by implication of Cœcitas, Furor, Dolus, Tumultus; but the pamphlet itself accuses us, no longer by implication, but in very plain and direct terms, of "grievous injustice" and "inconceivable perversity." You say that our conduct "has already fatally discredited a much vaunted Synodical system in the estimation of all who prefer Truth and Justice to Falsehood and Wrong." You call Bishop Nevill "the schismatical intruder into my as yet unvacated See," and you say that, while "the Diocese of Dunedin remains in charge of an intruder, the whole Ecclesiastical Province of New Zealand is implicated in the scandal of a permitted and encouraged violation of ecclesiastical right and order." This language and these charges must be my apology to you, my Lord, for thus addressing you, and to the Church for the publication of my Letter. And these charges assume a grave importance indeed, when we find it asserted by your Lordship that you "are supported "in your claim" by the deliberate opinion of the whole Episcopate of England and Wales at least, and by a large majority of Churchmen, clerical and lay, including the best authorities on questions relating to episcopal mission and jurisdiction." If anything can add to their importance, it is the anticipation, which appears to be growing more and more into a certainty, of the assembling, within a very few years, of another Lambeth Conference, before which august tribunal the Church of New Zealand will be arraigned by your Lordship on these charges, if you still insist on maintaining them. It is manifestly therefore the duty of any one who believes that these charges are wholly founded on a series of misapprehensions, and who thinks that he is able to clear these away, to endeavour to do so.

5. BISHOP PATTESON.

A few words, before I conclude, with regard to the part taken in this unhappy business by him, whom you speak of as "the holy martyr of Melanesia." You say (page 19), "It is an unspeakable satisfaction to know that he vigorously strove against the counsel and deed of those who sought to ignore my *status*, as Bishop of Dunedin." It is no pleasure to me, my Lord, to rob you of this satisfaction, but truth compels me to affirm that whoever gave you the information upon which you base this statement was grievously mistaken. Bishop Patteson was a member of the Select Committee, elected by ballot by the General Synod of 1868 to consider the question of the Bishopric of Dunedin. I was also a member, and acted as secretary to that Select Committee. I am able therefore to affirm, on personal knowledge, what I do affirm, which is this :—1. The Report of the Select Committee, consisting of several Resolutions, terminating in this decisive and practical one, which was recommended for adoption by the Synod, "That the appointment of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin be not confirmed by the Synod"—was adopted by the Select Committee without a dissentient voice, Bishop Patteson being present. 2. One, if not more, of the Resolutions, adopted by the Select Committee, and leading up to this final one, was drafted by Bishop Patteson himself. I have somewhere among my papers, though, owing to a removal from one house to another, I cannot at present lay my hand upon them, the original memoranda of that Select Committee, and amongst them, as I distinctly remember, the draft of one or more of those Resolutions in pencil, in the handwriting of the martyred Bishop. 3. The Resolution which the Synod finally adopted, after prolonged discussion—"That whereas the General Synod is of opinion that it is better *for the peace of the Church* that Bishop Jenner should not take charge of the Bishopric of Dunedin, this Synod hereby *requests him to withdraw his claim to that position*—though moved by Archdeacon Harper, and seconded by myself, was in reality suggested and recommended to the Synod by a speech from the lips of Bishop Patteson, who urged, in very loving and gentle language, that, if the wish of the Synod were expressed in such terms as these, it could hardly fail to have effect. I may add that Sir William Martin, who was also a member of that Select Committee, is now in England, and will be willing, I have no doubt, to bear testimony to the correctness of my statements, as to these and other particulars.

6. CONCLUSION.

It is, however, with the conduct of the General Synod, and the position taken up by that body, that I have mainly to do. And, upon a consideration of the whole matter, I conceive that the following points are clearly established:—1. That the Constitution of the Church in New Zealand contains a provision for the appointment of Bishops, which has always been held in this country to apply to appointments as well to new, as to old, Sees. 2. That this provision makes the sanction, or confirmation, of the General Synod, or of the majority of the Standing Committees of the several Dioceses of the Province, essential to the validity of every such appointment. 3. That the General Synod never requested, or authorised the Bishop of New Zealand, or any one else, to take any step towards the selection of a clergyman to fill the See of Dunedin. 4. That the General Synod has consistently held, in three successive triennial Sessions, that the fact of your Lordship having by some means attained *per saltum*, though without fault of your own, to the final act of consecration, cannot possibly deprive the General Synod of its constitutional right of confirmation. 5. That the General Synod having, in the exercise of its judgment and discretion, determined to withhold this confirmation in your Lordship's case, and having deliberately placed the administration of the Diocese of Dunedin in charge of the Bishop of Christchurch until a day to be named by the Standing Commission on that behalf, and the Standing Commission having, accordingly, named the day on which Bishop Nevill was consecrated to that See, it follows that your Lordship was never rightfully Bishop of Dunedin.

If, my Lord, it were possible for you to see your way to an acknowledgement of the truth of these conclusions, a sad and mischievous controversy would be closed for ever; the peace of the Church, which "the holy martyr of Melanesia" had so much at heart, would be restored; and we in New Zealand would gladly forget the hard words that have been spoken of us, and the hard thoughts that have been entertained of us, owing to the mistakes of some of our best friends. If on the contrary, I have failed to make these points clear to you, I can only say, I have done my best; I have spoken as a sense of necessity compelled me to speak; I have perhaps made some points clear to others which were obscure before; it may be, I shall have succeeded in convincing others, if not yourself; at any rate, at the very least, I shall have the satisfaction of feeling, *Liberavisse me animam meant*.

I am, my Lord, with sincere respect,

Your Lordship's faithful servant in Christ, Henry Jacobs.

The Deanery, Christchurch,
New Zealand,

Sept, 7th, 1874

Postscript.

Since placing the foregoing Letter in the printer's hands, I have received the printed Report of the Proceedings of the Sixth General Synod, which recently sat in Wellington. It contains the text of a Resolution adopted by the Synod with reference to your Lordship's claims, and the Report of the Select Committee appointed to draw up a statement of the grounds upon which the General Synod acted in reference to the Bishopric of Dunedin. These documents, which may be regarded as the *ultimatum* of the Church of New Zealand in reference to this painful controversy, will be found to be in exact accordance with the statements made, and the position taken up, in the foregoing Letter. I take the opportunity of printing them as an Appendix.

Christchurch, New Zealand,

September 15th, 1874.

Appendix.

I. The following Resolution was adopted by the General Synod, with-out division, on the 1st of June, 1874:—

"That, it having been brought to the notice of this Synod that the Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain Bishops of England, have formally recognised Dr. Jenner as the first Bishop of the See of Dunedin, apparently

in disregard of the judgment of this Synod formally pronounced on Dr. Jenner's claims—This Synod, in exercise of its undoubted authority, having carefully examined the circumstances under which Dr. Jenner claims to be regarded as having been the first Bishop of the See of Dunedin, declares that Dr. Jenner, not having been appointed to the See of Dunedin in accordance with the laws of the Church in New Zealand, ought not to be recognised as having been such first Bishop; and this Synod doth recognise the Right Rev. Samuel Tarratt Nevill, D.D., as the present and first Bishop of the See of Dunedin."—(Report of Proceedings, pp. 49, 50.)

II. The above resolution was grounded on the following Report, which, carefully abstaining from comment, gives a full and detailed narrative of the steps taken by the General Synod from first to last in the matter of the Bishopric of Dunedin.

Report of the Committee

Appointed by the General Synod (May 19th. 1874) to draw up a Statement of the Grounds upon which the General Synod has acted in reference to the Bishopric of Dunedin.

decorative feature

YOUR Committee have to Report—

That the Constitution was framed in the year 1857, and came into operation at the first session of the General Synod, which was held at Wellington in the year 1859. Before that date the Bishops in New Zealand had been appointed by the Queen's Letters Patent.

The provisions of the Constitution for the appointment of Bishops aforesaid were set forth in the 25th clause thereof, and were as follows, that is to say : "Saving any rights of the Church and of the Crown, the nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the Diocesan Synod, and, if sanctioned by the General Synod, shall be submitted by the General Synod to the authorities in Church and State in England for their favourable consideration." In the year 1865 the Constitution was revised, and the provisions relating to the appointment of Bishops were set forth in the 23rd clause thereof, which is as follows :—

"The nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the Diocesan Synod, and if such nomination be sanctioned by the General Synod, or if the General Synod be not in session, by the majority of the Standing Committees of the several Dioceses, the senior Bishop shall take the necessary steps for giving effect to the nomination. Provided that every such nomination shall be made upon condition that the person so nominated shall, before accepting the nomination, declare in writing his assent to this Constitution."

These provisions have been acted upon, and the first Bishop appointed thereunder was the present Bishop of Nelson, a motion having been made and carried at the session of the General Synod at Christchurch in the year 1865 as follows, that is to say :—"That the Nelson Diocesan Synod having deputed to the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of London the nomination of a successor to the present Bishop of Nelson, and the Bishop of London having notified that he is prepared to exercise such right of nomination, this Synod do forward to His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury a copy of clause 23 of the Constitution Deed, and request his Grace will be pleased to act on behalf of the General Synod in sanctioning, at his discretion, the nomination of a Clergyman by the Bishop of London, and to take the necessary steps for giving effect to the nomination.

The present Bishop of Auckland has also been appointed in conformity with the provisions before-mentioned.

That the first reference on the records of the General Synod to the Bishopric of Dunedin is to be found in the opening address of the Metropolitan (the present Bishop of Lichfield) to the second General Synod held at Nelson in the year 1862, when he spoke as follows :—"To complete the system a Rural Deanery Board has been organised at Otago, which under the present circumstances of that Province we hope will soon expand itself into the Synod of a new Diocese."

That at the session of the third General Synod held at Christchurch in the year 1865, a resolution was passed in the words following :—"That the next session of the General Synod be held in Dunedin, if by the time of meeting there be a Bishopric of Dunedin constituted, and the Bishop shall have entered upon the duties of his office. If there be no Bishop the next session shall be held at Auckland." No other reference was made to the Diocese or Bishopric of Dunedin during that session.

The before-named Metropolitan in his opening address to the fourth General Synod at its session held at Auckland in the year 1868, said :—"The first question which will require your attention is an Act to validate the election of members chosen to represent the two portions of the present Diocese of Christchurch. This necessity has arisen from the unforeseen delay in the Constitution of the Diocese of Dunedin. It seemed to me to be expedient that a full representation of the Clergy and Laity in the Rural Deanery of Otago and Southland should assist in deciding the important questions affecting the new Diocese, which will be brought before us. On this subject I have only further to recommend that any matters involving personal considerations be referred, as in

former instances, to a Select Committee to be chosen by ballot."

At that session a statement from Bishop Jenner was read to the Synod, the conclusion of which statement was as follows :—

"In conclusion the Bishop respectfully submits that it is as a matter of good faith and common justice that the New Zealand Church is bound to recognise his claim to the See of Dunedin, to confirm his election, and to assign him spiritual jurisdiction over the territory to be separated from the Diocese of Christchurch. An engagement of more than ordinary solemnity has been entered into, the two contracting parties being the Church in New Zealand, speaking and acting by her Metropolitan, and Bishop Jenner. The question to be decided by the Synod is simply this : Do the interests of the New Zealand Church demand, and will justice and honesty admit of the repudiation of that engagement by either of the parties without the concurrence of the other? Such a question may safely be left to the judgment of any assembly of fair dealing Englishmen, and the Bishop leaves it with perfect confidence in the hands of the General Synod of the New Zealand Church, only praying that, in this and all its deliberations, God the Holy Ghost will guide it into all truth, and that wherever the influence of its counsels may extend, God's name may be glorified and the Church of His dear Son edified."

On the fifth day of the session the following resolution was moved and carried:—

"That a Committee be appointed to consider and report upon the expediency of bringing to a completion the Ecclesiastical arrangements proposed for that part of the Diocese of Christchurch which is included within the Rural Deanery of Otago and Southland."

The resolution was carried, and a Committee was balloted for, which consisted of—The Bishop of Christchurch, the Bishop of Waiapu, Bishop Patteson (of Melanesia), the Dean of Christchurch, Venerable Archdeacon Govett, Venerable Archdeacon Hadfield, Venerable Archdeacon Williams, the Rev. Dr. Maunsell, the Hon. J. B. A. Acland, C. Hunter Brown, Esq., F. D. Fenton, Esq., Sir Wm. Martin, and William Swainson, Esq.

Note added by the Printing Committee.

NOTE.—See General Synod Report.

"On October 9th, 1868, the Bishop of Wellington (Abraham), and not Bishop Patteson, was elected.

"On October 12th, 1868, 'At the request of the Bishop of Wellington Standing Order No. 14 was suspended, to enable him to move—1. For leave to retire from the Committee appointed to consider and report upon the expediency of completing the Ecclesiastical arrangements proposed for the Rural Deanery of Otago and Southland, and 2, That another Bishop be balloted for in his place. *Leave granted*, and the ballot took place accordingly, when the President declared that Bishop Patteson had been elected to the place of the Bishop of Wellington.' "

On the 9th day of the session the Committee brought up their report in the words following, that is to say—

"Report of Committee appointed to consider the expediency of completing the Ecclesiastical arrangements proposed for that part of the Diocese of Christchurch which is included in the Provinces of Otago and Southland.

"Your Committee, having carefully considered the subject submitted to them, and having taken such evidence and examined such documents bearing thereupon as were within their reach, including a statement by Dr. Jenner, beg to report as follows :—

"They have ascertained that the endowment fund for the proposed Diocese is, in its present state, insufficient for the support of a Bishop.

"They have further ascertained that the objection entertained in the contemplated Diocese to the alleged opinions and practices of Bishop Jenner preclude the probability of the speedy completion of this fund.

"At the same time they are led to believe that the pecuniary circumstances of Bishop Jenner, so far as they are able to form an opinion upon them, are such as would cause him to be wholly dependent upon that fund.

"In coming to a decision they have not thought themselves called upon to take into consideration the alleged ritualistic practices of Bishop Jenner, but they consider that the state and prospect of the Endowment Fund and the circumstances above referred to, constitute sufficient reasons for the following decision, namely:—

That they are not prepared to recommend the Synod to confirm the appointment of Bishop Jenner.

"They recommend that, so soon as the necessary endowment be completed, the proper steps be taken for the nomination, confirmation, and consecration of a Bishop for the proposed See.

"And in accordance with Standing Order No. 22, the Committee beg to submit the following resolutions for adoption by the Synod:

"1. That the appointment of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin be not confirmed by the Synod.

"2. That the foregoing resolution be communicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Christchurch, and Bishop Jenner, and the Rural Deanery Board of Otago and Southland.

"3. That it is expedient that, so soon as the necessary endowment shall be completed, the proper steps be

taken for the nomination, confirmation, and consecration of a Bishop for the proposed See.

"(Signed) H. J. C. CHRISTCHURCH.

"October 15th, 1868."

And on the same day of the session the Synod proceeded to consider the resolutions founded on the report.

On the following day the resolutions were further considered, and a resolution was moved "That the appointment of Bishop Jenner be not confirmed by the Synod."

An amendment thereto was proposed, "That, inasmuch as the sum raised towards the Endowment Fund of the proposed Diocese of Dunedin is totally inadequate to the support of a Bishop,

"*Resolved*—1. That the Synod does not see the way open at present to the completion of the Ecclesiastical arrangements in connection with the proposed Diocese of Dunedin.

"2. That the Rural Deanery of Otago and Southland be formed into a Diocese to be administered provisionally by the Bishop of Christchurch."

After a prolonged discussion the following amendment on the original motion was moved:—

"That this Synod having carefully taken into consideration all the circumstances in connexion with the See of Dunedin is unable, in the present state of the question, to find any sufficient ground for withholding its recognition of the appointment of Bishop Jenner, but while acknowledging the appointment, and declaring that it shall be competent for Dr. Jenner to enter upon the duties of his office, the Synod would urge upon Bishop Jenner the expediency of his resigning the Bishopric on the ground of the difficulties experienced in obtaining an adequate endowment."

After some discussion, the amendment was put and negatived, as was also subsequently the previous amendment.

The Synod adjourned for half an hour, and on its resuming the following amendment on the original motion, that is to say—

"That whereas the General Synod is of opinion that it is better for the peace of the Church that Bishop Jenner should not take charge of the Bishopric of Dunedin:

"This Synod hereby requests him to withdraw his claim to that position," was moved and carried without a division.

At the same session of the General Synod the following Statute was made and passed, that is to say—

"STATUTE to Provide for the Division of the Diocese of Christchurch into two separate Dioceses.

"WHEREAS it is desirable that the Diocese of Christchurch should be divided into two separate Dioceses, and to that end the Bishop of Christchurch is desirous of resigning so much of the said Diocese as is comprised within the Provinces of Otago and Southland : *Be it resolved* by the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand in General Synod assembled as follows :

"1. From and after the first day of January 1869 the said Provinces of Otago and Southland shall cease to form a part of the Diocese of Christchurch, and shall thenceforward form a separate and independent Diocese to be called the Diocese of Dunedin.

"2. Until a day to be fixed in that behalf by the Standing Commission the said Bishop of Christchurch shall continue to have charge of the said Diocese of Dunedin and for the purposes of the Statute for the organisation of Diocesan Synods shall be deemed and taken to be the Bishop of such Diocese."

The Primate (the present Bishop of Christchurch) in his opening address to the fifth General Synod at its session in Dunedin in the year 1871, said:—

"I have received by the last mail from Bishop Jenner the judgment or opinion of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury respecting Bishop Jenner's claims to the See of Dunedin.

"There is a letter also from the Bishop addressed to myself which I consider it expedient to lay before you, because it questions my right, as Bishop of Christchurch, to administer the See of Dunedin. My right to do so, or as I would rather say my duty, may be regarded as resting on two grounds, either on the fact of my consecration under Royal Letters Patent to the See of Christchurch, which at that time included the Provinces of Canterbury, Otago, and of Southland, and which as yet I have never formally resigned, or on the authority of the General Synod, which in its Statute No. 12 has declared that 'until a day, to be fixed in that behalf by the Standing Commission, the Bishop of Christchurch shall continue to have charge of the Diocese of Dunedin, and for the purpose of the Statute for the organisation of Diocesan Synods shall be deemed and taken to be the Bishop of that Diocese,' Whichever of these grounds are taken, my spiritual oversight of the Diocese of Dunedin is founded, I conceive, on very sufficient authority. But I am quite content to leave the whole matter in the hands of the Synod, in the full assurance that due deference will be paid to the opinions expressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the claims of Bishop Jenner be impartially considered, and with much sympathy with him for the position in which he has been placed. I will only add that I am persuaded that it is for the interests of the Church that this Diocese of Dunedin should be speedily entrusted to the charge of a Bishop who may be able to reside in it, and I shall be very thankful if arrangements can be made for that purpose, though

quite ready to continue in the charge of it if such arrangements at this time be thought impracticable."

The letter to the Primate from Bishop Jenner and a printed copy of the judgment of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, were laid on the table and read.

In order that the General Synod might be in possession of all information on the subject, a motion was made and carried—

"That the following papers be laid on the table:—Bishop Jenner's reply to the resolution of the General Synod asking him to withdraw his claims, and the reply of the Standing Commission, and any other correspondence that may have passed between Bishop Jenner and the Standing Commission or the Primate of New Zealand."

On the sixth day of the Session a motion was made and carried without division—

"That whereas the last General Synod of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand took into consideration all the circumstances of the nomination and consecration of Bishop Jenner, and did thereupon formally request that he should withdraw his claim to the position of Bishop of Dunedin for the sake of the peace of the Church, to which request Bishop Jenner has declined to accede; and whereas the law of the Church requires the sanction of the General Synod to the nomination of a Bishop to any See in New Zealand—Resolved that this Synod does hereby refuse to sanction the nomination of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin, whether that nomination were in due form or otherwise. But at the same time this Synod begs to express its sympathy with Bishop Jenner in the painful position in which he has been placed."

On the seventh day of the Session the following question was put to the Primate (as President)—

"1. By whom and in what form a specific request has been made to this present Synod to give the formal sanction of the Synod to the nomination of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin?" And

"2. If no such request has been laid before this Synod, whether any motion can be considered in order or entertained which proposes that this Synod shall refuse to give the said sanction?"

The President gave a written reply as follows:—

"In answer to the first question I have to state that I am not aware that any request has been made to the present Synod to give the formal sanction of the Synod to the nomination of Bishop Jenner to the See of Dunedin." To the second question—"If no such request has been laid before this Synod, whether any motion can be considered in order or entertained which proposes that this Synod shall refuse to give the said sanction?" My answer is—"That, looking at the terms of the Constitution, I do not think that this Synod now sitting at Dunedin is a different body from that which met at Auckland in 1868, although it does not consist of precisely the same body of men. It was and is the representative governing body of the Branch of the Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand. To this body the matter in question was referred at its last meeting for settlement, and a certain resolution was passed which has not been accepted, but which is known to have been formally if not officially declined by one of the parties most interested. This being the case, it appears to me in order that the matter should be again brought before the Synod for a further expression of its opinions."

On the ninth day of the Session a resolution was moved and carried—

"That the President be requested to forward to Bishop Jenner the resolution of the Synod having reference to the Bishopric of Dunedin."

By "The Bishoprics Statute, 1871," passed at the same Session of the General Synod, it was resolved that—

"Except as hereinafter provided the nomination of the first Bishop of a new Diocese shall proceed from a convention of the licensed Clergy resident within the boundaries of such new Diocese, and representatives of the Laity of the same, the said representatives to be elected for such districts in such number and such manner as shall be determined by the Primate or by a Commissary specially appointed by him for that purpose. And the Primate, or his Commissary aforesaid, shall convene and preside over such convention. Provided that the President of the convention aforesaid shall have no vote in the election of the Bishop, unless being a Commissary he shall be a Clergyman of the new Diocese, in which case he shall vote as one of his own Order. Provided further, that the nomination of the first Bishop of Dunedin shall be made by the Diocesan Synod."

At a meeting of the Standing Commission held on the 22nd day of May, 1871, the following resolution was passed:—

"Whereas by the Statute of the General Synod to provide for the division of the Diocese of Christchurch into two separate Dioceses, it was resolved that the Provinces of Otago and Southland should cease to form a part of the Diocese of Christchurch, and should thenceforward form a separate and independent Diocese to be called the Diocese of Dunedin, but that until a day to be fixed in that behalf by the Standing Commission the Bishop of Christchurch should continue to have charge of the Diocese of Dunedin, and for the purpose of the 'Statute for the Organization of Diocesan Synods,' should be deemed and taken to be the Bishop of such Diocese.

"And whereas the Reverend Samuel Tarratt Nevill, Rector of Shelton, in the county of Stafford, has been nominated by the Diocesan Synod of Dunedin to the Bishopric of the said Diocese of Dunedin, and the said

nomination has been confirmed by a majority of the Standing Committees of this Ecclesiastical Province, it is resolved and declared by the Standing Commission that, on the day on which the said Samuel Tarratt Nevill shall be consecrated to the office of Bishop, the said Bishop of Christchurch shall cease to have charge of the Diocese of Dunedin, and shall cease to be deemed to be the Bishop of such Diocese for the purposes of the 'Statute for the Organization of Diocesan Synods'."

Bishop Nevill aforesaid was duly consecrated on the 4th day of June, 1871, at St. Paul's Church in Dunedin, and on the same day the Primate formally resigned the administration of the Diocese of Dunedin.

In his opening address to this General Synod, the Primate said—

"The interval which has passed since the last meeting of the General Synod in 1871 has not been without events of interest to the Church of New Zealand. On the 4th of June in that year a Bishop, who had been duly nominated by the Synod of the Diocese, and whose nomination in accordance with our regulations had been confirmed by a majority of the Standing Committees, was consecrated at St. Paul's Church, in the city of Dunedin, by myself and three other Bishops of this Ecclesiastical Province, and on the same day I formally resigned the administration of that Diocese."

WILLIAM WAIAPU,
Chairman.

Observations Respecting the Proposed Railway

Down the Side of the Harbor Extending from its Junction with the Ocean Beach Railway to Portobello.

By Simon Frederick Every. Anderson's Bay, June 17th, 1876.

Mills, Dick and Co., Steam Printers Dunedin Stafford Street. 1876

Harbor-Side Railway.

"CAPITAL is as free as air!" says one; "You must not interfere with private enterprise!" says another. Thus an open course is left to all sorts of schemes. Now, I quite agree with the above remarks; but not without some reservation, or safeguard.

Let private enterprise flourish, the more the better; but let *public rights and properties be respected*. Let also *public life and limb be regarded*.

I am free to assert such consideration has not been shown by the parties proposing to construct a Railway down the side of the Harbor along the Peninsula.

First, as regards *public rights*, I hold that neither the Government nor the Harbor Board can consistently sanction such a line; it would be in direct violation of their duty as *conservators of the, public interest vested in them*. How can it be shown to be just and fair to give a *private* company the power of taking into their own hands the frontage to the Harbor for *nine* miles, with limits of deviation 100 yards wide, giving them a right over no less than 334 acres of the Harbor, including eight acres out of Anderson's Bay?

Again, how can it be shown that due care is taken of *public property* if a Railway is sanctioned, not merely running along the side of a road which is about twenty feet wide, but crossing it at curves and in cuttings, the road being bounded on one side by a high bank or perpendicular rock? Oh, say the promoters, horses become accustomed to a train!

But Low stands the case with a person quietly fishing from the bridge at Anderson's Bay? Will not horses become accustomed to him? On the contrary, it is deemed permanently dangerous, and must not be done, therefore it has been forbidden by authority in the 'Provincial Gazette,' and transgressors are told they will be prosecuted.

Speaking of the danger connected with level crossings, what answer did one of the company give? "Oh, you old gentlemen are more tenacious of life than young ones!" Another, being remonstrated with respecting the danger attached to the sudden appearance of a train round a curve in front of a horse, being such as would be sure to kill somebody very soon, coolly answered, "Never mind!" But I do mind; not for myself, it is entirely on public grounds that this is written. After inspecting the plan, I feel in duty bound, to sound a note of warning, otherwise, should the line be made, and a fatal accident happen, I should seem to have connived at manslaughter.

It is not my intention to notice the objections to the proposed line, merely in a general way. To make the matter plain, it is necessary to enter into particulars, and go through in a practical manner, examining step by step, as it were, the effect of such a line. And here it is right to state that the information about to be given is compiled chiefly from the plan of the Railway deposited in the office of the Registrar at the Supreme Court.

Let us commence at the junction with that part of the scheme known as the Ocean Beach Railway; but before doing so, there is another point to be noticed, showing the animus of the company. Not long before the

plan of the proposed Railway to Portobello was deposited with the Registrar, viz.. the 20th April, 1866, a petition was taken throughout the Peninsula, and signatures obtained thereto, under the representation that the course to be adopted was quite an open question at present; thus many names were obtained under false pretences.

Starting from the Junction, and going close by the road across Anderson's Bay, and touching the side of the road, which is bounded by a high, perpendicular rock as far as Grant's Braes, there it crosses a little bay; and then across the public road, entering a cutting 20 feet deep and 66 yards long, where there is a curve of 6 chains radius.

Be it remembered, the road was formed by prison labor, representing public money; a bridge at the Bay erected at public expense; and the portion merely crossing Anderson's Bay had cost £1,900 long before completion, having to be raised and improved afterwards at considerable cost. A heavy additional expense was also incurred at Grant's Braes: a large gang of prisoners being employed there for some time.

Particular attention should be directed to the above cutting and curve—it is a perfect trap! A rock 20 feet high on the inside of a curve 6 chains radius,—the cutting 66 yards long,—no chance of seeing ahead. A carriage, it might be, just at the entrance, or even entering, as a train came rumbling through.

Passing on, the road is rendered dangerous all the way by the line being close to it, and in some places crossed by the Railway.

There are also other curves of the same radius, interfering more or less with the road. It may also be remarked, that the *whole line of public road*, now formed down that district, is included within the limits of deviation, and at the mercy of a company, if successful in their application.

In favor of this scheme of Railway, it has been stated, that it would be a vast boon to merchants and others now resident in Dunedin, by enabling them to erect villas all over that side of the hill. This is a fallacy; as very few people would be inclined to climb up the slope to the height of seven or eight hundred feet. Whereas if a line were taken, something like two-thirds of the way up, it would give facility for building, either above or below, thus being of far more advantage to all property along the slope, than down at the bottom.

As regards a line to open up the Peninsula, it is evident there is great difference of opinion respecting the proper course to be taken;—some say down the harbor-side; others think it would be less expensive to take the line down the centre;—but these hasty conclusions, in the absence of necessary data, savor of self-interest, rather than mature deliberation.

No one can form a correct idea of what course should be taken throughout, or the traffic to be expected, or the probable cost, without first obtaining some definite data to go upon, to gain which, as an early writer said, "Various borings should be made, for the purpose of obtaining geological knowledge of the substratum; flying levels should be taken of three or four lines; traffic takers employed, and every possible information collected, as a preliminary measure, then all should be open for examination by the land owners and the public before more expensive measures are adopted, always remembering that publicity gives confidence."—(Peter Lecount, R.N., C.E., F.R.S., late of the London and Birmingham Railway). What is a Railway intended for? Surely to give the greatest possible amount of accommodation to the public. Again, how can this object be so well effected as by the adoption of a course, in a central position, giving facility for traffic from *either side* throughout the greater portion of its length?

The known resources of the Peninsula are various and due examination will bring more to light. The great question at present seems that of practicability. Some people look at the high range of hills, and at once conclude it is impossible to take a Railway near them; nevertheless, lines have been taken through as rugged a country, and this is no case for despair. Steeper gradients are now adopted than in the early days of Railways.

Two or three courses present themselves for examination. First, let a line diverge from the Ocean Beach Railway, about 30 chains south from the Bay Horse Hotel, pass round the abrupt rock, then go in nearly a straight line for some distance, rising about 1 in 50, then making a slight curve, and passing under the main road above the Presbyterian Church; (N.B.—The step of the Church is 122 feet above high-water in Anderson's Bay, and the ridge of the roof 30 feet more, or 152 feet, giving good data to guide both ways;) on again, just below Shiel Hill, curving across that property, and again passing under the Portobello Road, and going behind Shiel Hill Hotel, it would then proceed without difficulty to the hollow of the main road, South of Captain Stewart's residence, again passing under the road and getting on the Harbor side of it; there is thence no obstacle for some distance; but without data to guide it would be unsafe to venture any decided opinion beyond that point.

Those who have been down the road towards Portobello, and witnessed the beautiful and varied scenery on the Peninsula, can form some idea of what a Railway would effect by traversing the main portion of its length, in an elevated position, opening up the country, which at present is only thinly peopled, in consequence of its isolation from the main land.

Steam-boats on the Harbor are unavailable to an extensive district; they only serve those who reside near its

border; those located high up the slope find it more convenient to take the road, and all persons living on the ocean side of the range of hills are quite excluded from availing themselves of any boats that may be on the Harbor. This remark implies with *equal force to a Railway down, by the side of the Harbor*, which would only be of service to those who already enjoy the convenience of water communication. If a central course be adopted, and stations placed in convenient positions, then villas will be erected on *either side* of the line, and townships laid out, boarding-houses built for invalids or visitors to Otago. Passenger and general traffic will increase.

Although all the advantages or disadvantages of different lines cannot be enumerated with accuracy in the absence of definite information, still some of them may be stated, so as to give a tolerably correct idea of their comparative merits and demerits; and should it prove, after due examination, that a Railway crossing to the ocean side of the ridge, opening up all the beautiful country in the Sandfly Bay District and the Maori Reserve, before descending to Portobello; should this be found calculated to entail more extra expense than would be sanctioned by the increased returns that might be expected from the varied local resources of the district under improved circumstances, then let the line descend gradually, and keep on the Harbor side of the range, giving a station some-where in the neighbourhood of the residence of Mr. John Mathieson, which, with a good road to it from the present main road, would be a great boon to the whole neighbourhood.

There is one item I omitted in its right place, viz., the limits of deviation at the side of Anderson's Bay include a portion of the Government Reserve 454 links wide, and 1000 links long, of high rock, containing four acres and a half of fine building stone, *public property*.

I must state, distinctly, that I am not in any way personally interested as to what course may be pursued; but have felt strongly that it was my duty to the public to give such information as I could collect, and having done so, I now take leave of the subject, feeling quite aware that if there are any persons who are only influenced by *interested motives*, they will visit me with condemnation; but that is a secondary consideration, or rather no consideration—quite immaterial.

New Zealand Association.

Introductory Address, Read May 11, 1876.

Introductory Address.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

In the absence of your President, and at his request, I have somewhat reluctantly consented to address to you, at this first meeting of the Society after its formation, a few introductory remarks. These, I regret to say, are necessarily very sketchy and imperfect, the time at my disposal being quite insufficient for the purpose. But such as they are I will read them.

Eclecticism, as you are aware, is the act of choosing from amongst various forms of thought or opinion on any given subject, that form which one considers good, or the best. An Eclectic Society, therefore, is a society which binds itself to no creed, but is at all times open to new light, and prepared to adopt that form of thought, be it either on religious or secular topics, which most commends itself to the reason and the understanding. It will thus be clear to us all at the outset that the members of this Society are not, or at least need not be, of one mind on any one subject—except it may be in this, that no opinion is necessarily final and incapable of change—possibly even of entire reversal.

Of course in a Society so constituted no one will feel aggrieved should others differ from him in the statements he may advance or the views he may utter. Indeed, as discussion is the life and the mainspring of progress, it is to be expected, and even hoped, that there will often be a difference of opinion; but it is also to be hoped that we shall not fail to give expression to our thoughts under the idea that they may not be those of the majority.

It need scarcely be said that an Eclectic Society cannot admit of any Pope, or of any infallible guide. Everything must be submitted to the crucial test of reason and all-searching argument; and should these upon any matter fail us, we must of necessity relegate that matter, for the present at least, to the regions of the unknowable, or at all events of the unknown. As human reason is finite, and of very limited grasp, it need not be to us any cause for discouragement that there are many things we cannot understand. Life, for example. We all have an idea what life is, but we should, I think, find considerable difficulty in explaining why we live, and what it is that supplies to otherwise inert matter that occult something which we call Life. It may therefore be that this is one of the matters that is beyond human comprehension and unknowable. But because this and many

other subjects are beyond our grasp, we need not therefore blindly give ourselves up to the dicta of any would-be teachers who may claim to be able, on infallible authority, to explain these subjects for us; much less should we submit to be thus dictated to upon matters that come within the scope of human comprehension, *E.g.*: First, as to those matters which we are competent to demonstrate on evidence. Should one come to us with the assertion that he has learned from infallible authority that the sun revolves around the earth, and is only a subsidiary attendant upon our planet, we should have no difficulty whatever in telling him that his authority, notwithstanding its infallibility, was certainly in error. There can be no possibility of dispute here, the matter under consideration being evidently within our reach, and capable of demonstration by those who make astronomical science their study. It is impossible to accept as valid the absurd explanation offered for the misstatement of fact here referred to, that it is merely the current idea of the day that is given, and not the real opinion of the writer. Would any theologian or philosopher of our day, if discoursing to a congregation of ignorant persons, accommodate his speech to their current ideas when bringing out of his various stores of knowledge illustrations of his subject, and by so doing lend the sanction of his authority to their ignorant and mistaken views? Most certainly he would not. No more, it is to be imagined, would any Divinely-inspired messenger, speaking as an infallible instructor, do anything so grotesque and irrational.

Then as to the class of subjects beyond our knowledge. A theologian of a not uncommon school, with a triumphant air exclaims, "You admit that you cannot explain such familiar facts even as that of your existence, and, more wonderful still, why a simple blade of grass grows. You admit these are facts nevertheless; and yet you will not admit because you cannot understand the far deeper mysteries of revelation." Ah! so you say, we may reply; but what are the mysteries of which you speak? Here is one of them: let us dissect it, and see what it is made of. God is said to be a Being most wise, most good, most merciful, most beneficent, and yet it is asserted of him that He is so monstrously malignant, unjust, unmerciful, as to consign untold millions of human souls to the miseries of an eternal hell—not, be it remembered, so much for any wrong they may have done, as because they have not given their assent to a certain dogma which the large proportion of those lost souls have not even heard propounded for their acceptance. Shall we blindly give our assent to the statement of such theologians that their infallible authority asserts this, and therefore it must be true, whether we understand it or not, in the same way as we admit the facts of our own existence and that a blade of grass grows, though we cannot explain how? Shall we not rather reply, that the two statements are contradictory, and one or the other must be false? Either God is not most wise, most just, most merciful, or he does not, on the ground alleged, or on any ground, consign those millions indiscriminately—whether life-long criminals or comparatively sinless youths—to an eternal hell of woe and misery; and further, that the so-called infallible guide does not say on this subject what is asserted respecting it, or it is not infallible. All which will and must lead to the inevitable conclusion that this so-called mystery of revelation is not a mystery at all, but so far as appears from attainable evidence, is, as in the preceding case, a mere misstatement of fact.

So I might go on to criticise a number of topics of a like nature. They are familiar to you all, and will readily suggest themselves; but these examples may suffice as illustrations of the kind of stock arguments that are current in our day, and have for many years been allowed to pass almost unquestioned, because, being advanced with an air of authority, they were presumed to be unanswerable. These examples of false reasoning will also show the need there is for the most rigid eclecticism on such subjects, and the service that may be rendered by a society such as ours, should its aims and objects come to be properly understood and appreciated.

For is it not a fact that in consequence of the almost universality of a suspicion that not a few of the current ideas on religious, or perhaps more properly, theological matters, are untenable, Christianity has become emasculated and powerless to stem the torrent of all-pervading vice and sensuous pursuits, and there is reason to apprehend, is slowly it may be, but surely losing its control over the lives and consciences of even its pronounced adherents? What more needful under such circumstances of mental change—possibly even revolution—than that we should do what we can to aid in evolving out of the disintegrating elements of the old, a new and potent religious and moral sentiment which will bear the test of modern thought and criticism?

But our attention need not by any means be confined to the discussion of topics such as the above. There is a wide field open before us in the realms of mental philosophy, art, science, history, &c. Indeed, we might adopt with propriety the maxim of the Latin philosopher, "*Nihil humanum à me alienum puto.*" We might even improve upon that idea, and say that nothing which can come under human cognizance is foreign to us. With this wide, it may be said, illimitable range we can be at no loss for subjects. It remains for us to cultivate those extensive fields to the best of our knowledge and ability. We may not be able to bring to bear upon their elucidation the learning and skill of College Professors; but we have this advantage which such Professors have not: we are not necessarily trained into any special groove of thought, and have not assumed as it were the position of paid advocates for any school. We are free to look all around every subject, and view it in all lights without any fear that if we should be too inquisitive we might cut the ground from under our feet, and see our Professorship or our conscience in imminent peril. No such danger awaits us, and although it may be sometimes

trying and mayhap discouraging to find ourselves out of sympathy with many whose good opinion we value, still that is a small matter compared with the gratification we may experience in being free to gaze upon the light with unveiled vision, and to see the truth opening out before us in all directions.

Allow me, in conclusion, to express a hope that the members of this Society will not be discouraged because they may find their *protégé* at first not very demonstrative. Such is the usual fate of almost all efforts of this class. Men of standing and eminence do not as a general rule attach themselves to a new undertaking. When it has worked its way into popular favour and appreciation, then numbers may be found willing to lay their shoulders to the work. But all in good time. A gradual, slow, and quiet growth is in the end the surest and the best.

With these few very inadequate and cursory remarks, I commend our new-fledged Society to the care and protection of its members.

Mills, Dick and Co., Steam Printers, Stafford street, Dunedin.

The Finances of New Zealand,

By Master Humphrey, Price-One Shilling.

Mills Dick and Co., Printers and Publishers Dunedin, N. Z. Stafford Street. 1872

Several friends having asked me to republish my letters referring to the finances of New Zealand, I have much pleasure in acceding to the request The following pages will be found to contain the substance of my observations in a condensed form.

MASTER HUMPHREY.

The Finances of New Zealand.

FOR years past our ordinary expenditure has exceeded income, and of late the annual deficit has increased so rapidly that it now amounts to hundreds of thousands of pounds. The causes of this are so apparent, that hardly anyone who is not wilfully blind can fail to recognise them. With a total population not exceeding that of some of the principal towns in England, we have been cursed with the most complicated and costly series of Governments in the whole world. To gain an approximate idea of the extravagance we have been supporting let any unprejudiced man pay a visit to our Provincial Council of Otago; let him run over in his mind the list of officers and salaries that institution implies, with its Superintendent, Executive, Speaker, Clerks, Messengers, Sergeant-at-arms, and the whole paraphernalia. Let him reflect that the same deplorable exhibition of incapacity, and the same outrageous waste, go on in half-a-dozen similar assemblies; let him pass in review the limitless series of jobs that have been perpetrated here; let him look at the Post Office, costing from £35,000 to £40,000, when a building as well suited for that or any other purpose could have been erected for a tenth part of the money; let him look at the Exhibition Buildings costing £20,000 or more, and presenting the ridiculous spectacle of a permanent building put up for a temporary purpose; let him then cast his eye to the South and observe a railway constructed at a cost of £367,168, for the ordinary requirements of which a few donkey-carts might suffice; let him remark the jetty costing £40,000 at which the only ship that ever discharged was the one conveying the timber to make the approaches to it. When he has thus, perhaps, in some measure realised the folly displayed by our own Provincial Governments, let him imagine the same sort of thing going in the other Provincial Councils, whilst over all there has been a General Government outstripping every one of its subordinates in the dignified magnitude of its extravagance. When he has done this, it will cease to be a matter of surprise that our debt, as compared with population, exceeds that of every nation under heaven, and that our current expenditure should exceed income by nearly 50 per cent.

Why the people of this Colony should have allowed so pernicious a system to grow up, why they should acquiesce in a state of things so fraught with destruction, may prove hereafter an interesting question to the student of political philosophy. And it will probably be found that the true cause of this strange apathy is, that instead of additional taxes being imposed to supply the amounts wasted by Government, the annual deficits have been made good out of borrowed money. When bad or wasteful Government is brought home to the people, as it eventually must be in the shape of grinding taxation, an outcry is raised and measures adopted for enforcing economy. But in our case, instead of extravagance being associated with a vision of the stern tax collector, the systematic borrowing enables Government to present itself for a time in the shape of a beneficent fairy, with work for the unemployed, billets for the obedient, and lucrative contracts for those who may best deserve them. The strongest incentive to exercise a vigilant supervision over its proceedings is removed, and so long as the people can be persuaded that the pleasant system of artificial prosperity can be maintained, it is vain to expect them to interest themselves; for the majority of mankind care little about abstract ideas, and rarely resent bad government until it manifests itself in some tangible present grievance.

It is related of Hudson, the great railway king, that when elected chairman of directors of the Eastern Counties Railway, he issued instructions to the head of the financial department to "make things pleasant." This making things pleasant consisted simply in paying dividends out of capital, and for a time, no doubt, answered its purpose. Indeed the only objection to such a system was that it would not last for ever—otherwise it would have been perfect. But a time inexorably came, when the process, pleasant as it was, could no longer be continued, when the unlucky shareholders deprived of the customary dividend, were forced to recognise the existence of an enormous deficit.

The system adopted by the great railway king, is much the same as our Colonial politicians seem bent on following. Year after year things are made pleasant to the supporters of the Government, to our huge army of officials, to constituencies returning pliant members of Assembly, and the deficit is replaced by borrowing. Public works are started involving the expenditure of thousands, or tens of thousands, not on the ground of their being legitimately wanted, or likely to remunerate, but simply for the advantage to local traders of the expenditure of money in their immediate neighbourhood. The entire community with one voice cries out to the Government "Give, give, give. Spend money amongst us, no matter how, or for what purpose. Distribute billets, silence remonstrance, and buy off opposition as you will. All we ask is—*spend*, but do not tax us."

The results of adopting this system may be readily conceived. It gives possession of power to those who will use it with the least scruple. Instead of the Government being held accountable for enforcing economy or proper administration, its very tenure of office is made to depend upon the extent of its extravagance. Our practice of supplying deficits in revenue out of borrowed capital, and of incurring further debt for the reckless construction of public works, reverses the proper condition of things, and makes a government that is dragging the country to ruin, seem to the ignorant to be conducting it along the very path to prosperity.

When persons engaged in commercial avocations find themselves in a position of unexpected difficulty, when trade falls off and there is a simultaneous decline in the rate of profit, there are generally two alternatives, and the style of man may be fairly estimated by that which he selects. The one is to countermand orders, cease adding to his liabilities; and, above all, cut down expenses to the lowest possible figure. The other is to put on a bold face, launch out, order freely, and affect the appearance of doing well by disregarding every suggestion of prudence or economy. The results of the latter course are not difficult to foresee; and this is the policy to which in the crisis of our fate the Government has committed us.

The most alarming feature of the case is that the evil tends so rapidly to intensify itself. The bubble can only be kept from bursting by blowing it larger. Accustomed as our population has become to revel in false prosperity, any Government that awakened them to a sense of their true position might be reproached as the cause of misfortunes to which it only drew attention. And so we find that to grasp the nettle boldly, to inquire into, and avow, our real financial situation, requires more courage than any Colonial politician apparently possesses.

As illustrative of this we may refer to the action taken by the Stafford party during their recent but brief tenure of power. In making his ministerial statement Mr Stafford said—"The Government would strenuously endeavor to bring the ordinary expenditure within the ordinary revenue of the Colony, and thus avoid increasing the floating debt"—thereby admitting that expenditure exceeded income, and that great efforts would be requisite to establish an equilibrium. The Stafford party, however, were soon driven from office, and assuming that there was any real intention to carry out the programme laid down by their chief, few can be surprised at their speedy expulsion. But whilst giving them credit for a wish to do something towards reducing our preposterous expenditure, it is deeply to be regretted that a more determined stand was not made two years ago when the Financial Scheme was laid before the Assembly. By that means a fatal impulse was given alike to the reckless expenditure on public works and to the policy of supplementing deficits out of borrowed capital. Looking at the constitution of Assembly, at the pressure put on members by their constituencies, and on the ministry by members, it was a foregone conclusion that the money borrowed would be misapplied, and that no one could long retain the post of power without yielding to demands for which there was no justification. One or two individual members of the Opposition, it is true, spoke out boldly and nobly, and their conduct in doing so, when unsupported by the strength of their party, entitles them to the gratitude of every true friend of New Zealand.

It was at this meeting of the Assembly that the practice of defraying military and other expenses out of borrowed money was adopted as portion of our avowed policy. In the Financial Statement of that year the Colonial Treasurer remarked,—

"It is useless for us to attempt to disguise from ourselves that when in 1863 we incurred an enormous loan for war purposes—which loan has been from time to time increased by other expenditure of the same nature—we did that which put it utterly beyond the power of the Colony in the present generation to continue to pay interest upon those loans, and yet defray out of its revenue large war expenditure."

"You will not be surprised, therefore, after what I have already stated upon the subject of Defence

expenditure, to hear that the Government consider that the Colony is not justified, even if it were able to do so, in regarding the item of Defence Expenditure as one to be defrayed out of the ordinary revenue."

"We therefore propose to do that which we believe a large section of the public men of the Colony regret was not done four years ago—we intend to ask for a Permanent Appropriation for Defence Purposes of £180,000 for the first year, £160,000 for the second year, and £150,000 for the three succeeding years, the money to be borrowed from time to time, if required, and as required."

This recommendation was adopted, and one of the largest items of our permanent expenditure is thus transferred from the accounts of the Consolidated Fund and charged against one maintained out of borrowed money.

In the accounts for the year ending June, 1870, the revenue appears as £1,018,360; but the expenditure, including liabilities of the preceding year amounted to over a million and a-half. The actual figures were, £1,593,182; but from this it may perhaps be fair to deduct something on account of the Reserve Account and Incidental Receipts not included in the £1,018,360 of revenue. Still the deficit was very large, necessitating the issue of £365,000 worth of Treasury Bills, as against, £53,650 redeemed, besides a sum as £132,456, entered as accruing from transfers;—that is presumably, transfers from funds arising from borrowed money.

The accounts of the next year disclosed a state of things still worse. The revenue had fallen off whilst expenditure increased; and these alterations for the worse were observable in almost every item. The subjoined table shows the respective amounts of revenue for the two years :—

With the apparent exception of the Telegraph, therefore, we see that every individual item showed a diminution, and the entire discrepancy between the two years amounted to no less than £111,986 14s 9d. As regards the telegraph to which it will be necessary to refer more particularly by and bye, it may be here mentioned that like the Post Office it is a losing department, and that the enhanced receipts of this particular year are more than counterbalanced by increased expenses.

After the £936,188 which is the real amount of revenue for the period we are considering, come a variety of entries by means of which the public income is apparently raised from that sum to £1,201,832, full particulars of which will be found in the detailed statement annexed hereto. I do not expect my readers to understand all these items, but some of them, I think, they will understand very clearly. For instance, they will see that £50,000 worth of Treasury Bills are put down in the same way as if that amount was derived from actual revenue. And then they may remark £53,098 18s 4d entered as transferred from Special Fund. Now this Special Fund is the proceeds of loans, so here are two instances of borrowed money being treated like permanent income.

In regard to the other entries by means of which the receipts are swollen from £936,188 to £1,201,832, it is obvious that being mixed up with the Treasury Bills and transfers from the Special Fund we find them in very suspicious company, but if it is possible for the Government to manufacture so large an amount of money without having recourse either to borrowing or taxation, it is a pity they do not enlarge their machinery and supply the whole revenue by the same means.

The study of figures and statistics is proverbially so dry that it is hardly to be wondered the general reader should regard them with aversion; but, in dealing with these subjects, one occasionally meets with an amusing incident, or a mouthful of humbug of such exceptionally good quality as to afford an agreeable relief after the dreary monotony of statistical facts. Such a one is to be found in the preamble of the Appropriation Act, under which the £50,000 worth of Treasury Bills were issued, and £53,098 transferred from the fund of borrowed money to the accounts of the Consolidated Fund. The object of this Bill was to provide for the payment of large amounts of ordinary expenditure out of borrowed capital, and generally make ourselves comfortable at the expense of other people. Considering these circumstances, I think it will be admitted that the subject was led up to in a very elaborate and diplomatic manner, for the preamble ran as follows :—

"Most Gracious Sovereign—

"We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects in the House of Representatives in New Zealand in Parliament assembled, towards making good the supply which we have cheerfully granted to your Majesty in this Session of Parliament, have resolved to grant unto your Majesty the sums hereinafter mentioned, and do therefore most humbly beseech your Majesty that it may be enacted, and be enacted, by the General Assembly of New Zealand in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same as follows."

Bearing in mind the real object of the Bill, I think we cannot but admire the versatility and grasp of mind that could conceive the idea of so happily blending loyalty and disinterested liberality towards our beloved sovereign with the more practical notion of making things pleasant to ourselves. And I have no doubt that when Hudson adopted a similar course in like circumstances, he coupled his instructions with a few moral remarks of a highly edifying character.

Further down in the list of receipts we have an entry of £66,295 6s 6d for an "Advance from Special Fund, London," and partially balanced by a similar entry on the other side of £46,000 repaid. This still leaves a

balance of £20,295 6s 6d to be added to the other amounts of borrowed money tacked on to the actual revenue, and applied to purposes of general expenditure.

Then we come to Deficiency Bill £60,000, balanced by an entry on the other side of the same amount for overdraft repaid Bank of New Zealand. This apparently represents a temporary accommodation converted into a deficit. Next comes Treasury Bills renewed, £200,000, with a corresponding entry on the other side of Treasury Bills redeemed. This would appear to represent an old debt staved off for a time, indicating that when the time came to pay we found it more convenient to take an extension of credit. It seems our creditors did not object, but as these transactions, such as renewing bills and the like are rarely effected without some expense in the way of discount, commission, &c., it would be interesting to see what these amounted to in the present instance.

Passing now the accounts of disbursements we find (with the most trivial exception) that every item shows an increase, some to the extent of fifty or sixty per cent. This is a more serious affair even than the diminished revenue, for whilst that might possibly be attributed to misfortune, the increased expenditure indicates something worse. Passing by one or two accounts in which the increase has not been so great, we come to that of Public Domains and Buildings, for which we paid £2797 in 1870, and £9,300 in 1871, the increase being principally attributable to the erection of a new Government House. This figures for the sum of £4605, though that probably only represents a part of the entire cost. In this department, too, we find the salary of Colonial Architect, £700, and a sum of £43 7s 3d also paid to that gentleman for commission. Whether he gets a commission on *all* works he superintends, besides the £700, is not stated, but might perhaps be inferred from the entry above quoted; and here I wonder whether the Colonial Architect enjoys the same privilege as private architects—that of taking commissions from contractors? Should such be the case, what with his fixed salary of £700 a-year, commissions from the Government and commissions from the contractors, we must admit that the Colonial architect has a really good time of it. Further on, when we come to Miscellaneous Expenditure, we shall find £125 4s, or about £2 10s a week, set down as "paid to labourer engaged by Colonial Architect," though what work may be performed in return does not appear. And under Miscellaneous we also find £1568 expended in the purchase of furniture for the Government House.

Lower down we come to Public Departments costing £45,282 in 1870 as against £53,301 in 1871, an increase of £8,019.

Then there is Law and Justice, for which we paid £54,926 in 1870, and £63,753 in 1871—an increase of £8,827. Taxpayers, however, will hardly be disposed to grumble at this extra charge, bearing in mind that it is partly attributable to expenses incurred in the Barton prosecution—that is, provided they adopt the supposition of the quality of justice dispensed amongst us having been improved by that infusion.

Next on the list stand the Post Office and Telegraph Departments, costing £145,712 in 1870 and £147,765 in 1871. The revenue obtained from these combined sources for the year under consideration was only £65,632, the loss occasioned by them is £82,133 in 1871 as contrasted with £80,355 in 1870. And here it may not be out of place to remark that whilst the accounts of Post Office and Telegraph appear as separate entries in the receipts, they are muddled together in the expenditure, so that one cannot apportion with absolute accuracy the amount of loss occasioned by each.

Next we find the Customs' Department, which figures for £37,835 in 1869-70, and £45,557 for 1870-71. Now this increase is a very remarkable one, because the amount of revenue raised was smaller. In 1870, £813,025 was collected at an expense of £37,835, whilst in 1871 it appears to have cost £45,557 to collect £745,473, so that one year 4½ per cent, defrayed the cost of collection, and the next year it jumped up to 6 per cent., or in the ratio of 33 per cent, increase.

Then comes the Miscellaneous Expenditure, which here figures for £93,270 as compared with £63,823 for the previous year, showing an increase of £29,447, or nearly 50 per cent. The entries appearing under the heading of "Miscellaneous" certainly justify the selection of that name. I cannot attempt to give them in full detail, but have picked out a few, which are as follow :—

When I first made out a comparative table of expenditure for the years 1869-70, and 1870-71, I could not help being struck by the uniform increase of almost every item. But on coming to the account of money paid as interest on loans, it startled me to observe that it showed an apparent diminution, the figures being £411,711 for 1870, and £361,315 for 1871. Now, that I could not but regard as most remarkable. It is sufficiently notorious that our debt is growing larger, and it did appear strange that with an increasing debt, the interest should diminish. I therefore thought it worth while to investigate the matter, and on looking up corresponding entries for each year, I came across the following details :

These figures speak for themselves. It will be observed that in the former year there were four quarterly payments for interest of about £52,000 each; but in the latter we find only three quarterly payments—the one due on the 15th July being excluded, so that the total amount set down for interest was £52,000 less than really had to be paid. In excuse for this omission, it may perhaps be pleaded that the money was not absolutely due till

15th July, 1871, whereas the financial year terminated on 30th June. But if we admitted this reasoning, we should expect to find the account commencing with the payment on 15th July 1870, because that would then fall within the financial year. We know very well there are four quarters in every year, and that if money is to be paid by quarterly instalments, there must be four of them.

In estimating, therefore, the amount of interest really chargeable to the year under consideration, we must add £52,000 to the sum put down in the published account. When this is done, the seeming saving is converted into a loss, and the interest account for 1871 like the rest turns out to exceed that of 1870.

To complete our review of disbursements we have still to consider the items of Native and Military Expenditure.

The former shows an increase of £13,282, being only £21,490 in 1870, as contrasted with £34,778 in 1871; but, as this enhanced expenditure might possibly have been occasioned by the adoption of the so-called "Sugar and Blanket Policy," I was willing to suspend my judgment as to whether it was excusable until I had ascertained the amount of Military Expenditure, which, as a matter of course, we should expect to see reduced in a corresponding proportion.

On referring to the account of disbursements from the Consolidated Fund, I found that, in 1869-70, we spent on defence £244,615, whilst in the succeeding year only £83,993 was put down under that head, giving an apparent saving of £100,622.

It can hardly be necessary to dilate upon the favourable comparison ostensibly shown by these figures. Notwithstanding every other department showing an increased expenditure, the saving here indicated would more than counterbalance them all, and although the deficit for 1871 would still exceed that of 1870, yet seeing that part of it was occasioned by falling off in revenue (which might be attributed to misfortune), it would only be fair cordially to recognise the fact of a considerable saving in expenditure. In this seeming reduction, therefore, I thought we had legitimate ground for congratulation. It was the single bright spot in the dreary prospect of our affairs, the one green oasis in the desert of deficits. But when I reflected on the matter, and remembered that every other item of expense had increased—some of them enormously—when I recalled to mind the very significant omission of £52,000 from one account, my mind rather misgave me, and I resolved to investigate a little further before accepting the apparent saving as an actual fact. It happened that something caused me just then to look into what is called the Special Fund Account. This fund is maintained exclusively by loans. Nothing goes into it from the general revenue. It is supplied entirely by borrowing. The expenditure from it during the same period was of the most heterogeneous character, but we are at present concerned with one item alone. It is that of Military Expenditure, which is set down here as £171,134, in addition to the £83,993 charged against the Consolidated Fund. The entire Military Expenditure, therefore, instead of being £83,993, as anyone would infer from looking at the tabular statement of disbursements from the Consolidated Fund, is in reality £255,127, or £10,512 more than it amounted to in the year before.

When these entries have been rectified, we find, with one insignificant exception, that the table of disbursements is very brother to that of receipts—that as every source of revenue diminished, so every individual item of expenditure increased during the year under consideration.

I subjoin a comparative statement of the expenditure for the two years, indicating by a * the insertions necessary to correct the account.

Having thus reviewed the accounts of the Consolidated Fund, we have now to consider those of the Special Fund. The entries we find on the receipt side are those of sums raised by sale of Debentures, Hypothecation of debentures, Proceeds of Treasury Bills, Loans, &c. The amount of money so raised for the year under consideration was £602,587. There is £20,000 put down for Treasury Bills renewed. £15,000 as raised by Sale of Debentures, and then again another sum of £14,600 raised by Sale of Debentures. There is £214,900 put down for "Debentures issued in Conversion and Consolidation of Loans" and £273,500 as raised by "Hypothecation of Debentures."

The entries in this account are somewhat confusing for we find the same amount figuring on both sides. Thus, in addition to the above, we have £204,000 set down as "raised to defray amount advanced under Temporary Loan Act" and we have it again appearing on the credit side as applied in "part" repayment. Such items, however, we will pass over, merely remarking that they appear to indicate that the accumulating floating debt when it had assumed sufficient dimensions had to be consolidated or converted into a portion of the permanent indebtedness of the colony.

There is however one item of peculiar interest appearing on both sides of the account. Among the receipts we have £1,709 as Proceeds of Confiscated Lands, and on the other side, to set against this, we have £6,122 put down as paid for "Management and Survey of Confiscated Lands," or rather more than three times what the lands realised. Going to make up this sum we have £2,839 for salaries, £688 for extra clerical assistance, £1074 for surveys, £566 for purchase and compensation, £238 for office rent, and £131 for the inevitable travelling expenses.

Then we have a solid lump of £118,572 applied to purposes of a miscellaneous character as particularised below :—

As regards the £19,898 paid to Mr Busby, why was it paid? What did the Colony get in exchange for it? It is possible that this is in settlement of some antiquated land claim, but even if good value were got for the money in the shape of broad acres, it does not follow that they should be paid for with borrowed money. When a Province sells its land it deals with the proceeds as permanent income like that arising from rents or pastoral assessments, and if such receipts are credited to the current revenue it would be natural to expect payments for the purchase of land to be similarly debited against ordinary expenditure.

Then in regard to the £27,873 put down among the disbursements as "Balance due by the Province of Auckland," we can only suppose that it represents a bad debt owing by Auckland to the General Government, and instead of being defrayed out of income was met out of capital. A similar remark may perhaps apply to Taranaki and Wellington, but in the latter instance it would seem that at the very time it was necessary to write off £1180 as a bad debt, we made our bankrupt debtor a fresh advance of £15,000. Finally we have £48,823 to represent a part of what we have had to pay for the misdeeds of Southland.

Here then is £118,572 devoted to miscellaneous purposes out of borrowed money, besides the £171,134 applied to military expenditure. If, therefore, we wish to obtain an approximate idea of the real deficit for the year under consideration, it will be requisite to commence with £122,000, which is the deficiency admitted by the Colonial Treasurer, and add on to it the £52,000 for interest omitted, the £171,134 of military expenditure, and the £118,572 applied to miscellaneous purposes, thus :—

The next items claiming attention are £255,392 for Provincial Loans taken over by the General Governments, £810 for interest accrued on them, and £2,760 for charges and expenses attending their conversion. Then there is £6,000 handed over to Wellington to extinguish a loan raised under the "Harbour Reserves Amendment Act" and £250 to redeem debentures of the everlasting Wanganui Bridge.

Then we came to the expenses of negotiating the Loan of 1870, which stand as follows :—

£500 of the above is charged to the Consolidated Fund, £2895 to Immigration and Public Works; but with the exception of £500 every penny is defrayed out of the loan itself.

The reader will observe that a good many of the items appearing in the disbursements of the Special Fund, we have not included in the £463,706, representing the probable deficit for the year. The omission, however, is of little consequence, for when the annual deficiency gets well into six figures a few thousand pounds more or less are not of much consequence. I mean that whatever course of action might be proper with a deficit of £500,000, would be equally advisable with a deficit of only £450,000. If it behoves us to bestir ourselves in the one case it does in the other, and if we make up our minds to look on with lazy acquiescence whatever may be our plight, we might as well spare ourselves the trouble of inquiring into the exact circumstances of our position.

The complete accounts for the succeeding year—that ending 30th June, 1872—have not yet been published, for, as a rule, it occupies fourteen or fifteen months from the termination of each financial year before the full particulars are made public. The reader will no doubt remember that, in speaking of the transactions of this year, one of our Colonial Treasurers fixed the deficit at only £33,345, whilst the other declared there was a surplus of £10,500. Until the detailed accounts make their appearance, it is of course impossible to determine by what process our enormous real deficit has in appearance been explained away; but it is obvious that neither of these gentlemen can have considered military expenditure, provided for by loan, as affecting the deficiency. Here is one item of £186,813 paid out of borrowed money—

But this sum, large as it is, will not adequately represent the real deficit. We may not be able at present to estimate it with perfect accuracy, but we can get a very good general idea. Attached to the Financial Statements of each year are a series of tables, and the first of these is devoted to showing the amount of our indebtedness as it grows progressively larger. On the 30th June, 1871, its nett amount was £8,304,020, and by the following year it had risen to £9,406,492, giving an increase of £1,102,472. Now, in the recent Financial Statement, all that was claimed by the Colonial Treasurer as having been spent on Public Works and Immigration £711,611, and even of that £93,118 was made up of items partaking of the nature of current expenses; thus—

It follows, therefore, that only £618,493 was really applied to Public Works and Immigration, and if we deduct that sum from the £1,102,472 which was added to the debt, we get £483,979 to represent the increase of debt *for other purposes*, and that amount may very probably stand for the actual deficiency for the year just terminated. The detail are shown below.

There are two circumstances by which the public is liable to be deceived in regard to the financial operations of the Colony. One is the term Consolidated Fund, and the other is the occasional reference to the operations of the Sinking Fund. The name of the first seems to suggest all revenue converge to it, and that it is the source from which that all expenditure is defrayed, excepting that upon reproductive works. Consequently, when the Colonial Treasurer for the time being proclaims a surplus on the transactions of the Consolidated

Fund a number of people accept the assurance with thankful surprise, and comfort themselves with the belief that it is all right—that we have at last established a balance between income and expenditure—and that the Sinking Fund will gradually eat away into the principal of our loans, and in process of time, rid us of them entirely. But the seeming surplus on the Consolidated Fund as we have seen is only created by charging large items of miscellaneous expenditure against borrowed money, and, until quite recently, it has been part of our avowed policy to defray the bulk of interest and other expenses on the Public Works Loan out of the capital of the loan itself.

As regards the Sinking Fund, under the system we are pursuing, its very existence amounts to no more than a pleasant fiction. A Sinking Fund is the apparatus by which a debt is gradually paid off; and, in cases where the debt is *not* being paid off, but, on the contrary, goes on increasing at a enormous rate, the institution of a Sinking Fund becomes a patent absurdity. To illustrate its operation I subjoin a table, showing the relative growths of Debt and Sinking Fund for the last two years.

In this instance the increase of Debt was about seven times that of the Sinking Fund. In the next year we shall find the discrepancy still greater:—

Here the increase of Debt is more than ten times that of the Sinking Fund. What more solemn farce can therefore be imagined than keeping up a pretence of paying off our debt, when that debt is advancing with such gigantic strides? But it is not a mere question of silliness, nor even of uselessly complicating the public accounts. These operations cost money. There are "Commissioners" of the Sinking Fund, who, we may presume, draw salaries. At all events they make voluminous reports, and occasionally suggest the advisability of special legislation for the better performance of their duties. When, therefore, our debt is not being paid off, but on the contrary is rapidly accumulating, the operations of the Sinking Fund have and can have no other effect than to deceive the public, whilst putting the country to very considerable expense.

Whenever an attempt is made to draw attention to the enormous amount of our debt and the rapidity with which it accumulates, two arguments are used with the view of reassuring. One is, that debt incurred for reproductive purposes is not a burden but a benefit—that if borrowed money be only judiciously applied to public Works it will yield a return equal to the annual charge for interest, thus imposing no burden on the community whilst affording increased facilities to trade and general production.

As an abstract proposition this is of course undeniable, but upon the case in hand it has not the remotest bearing. The additions to our debt are not contracted for reproductive purposes only. About half of it, or £5,000,000, has been incurred for the wretched Northern War, and so far from that expenditure having settled the question it still costs us about a quarter of a million annually to maintain what I suppose we must call "peace." As shown above, the annual deficit amounts to nearly half a million a year, which regularly goes to augment the debt. Then, as regards the sums borrowed for public works can any one in his senses imagine that we get value for them, or anything like it? What is the real worth of all the Public Works in this Province as compared with the sums expended on them? Not long ago I was conversing with an engineer of high standing and solicited his opinion on the matter. Were they worth a half—a third—a quarter of what they had cost? After consideration he replied it was impossible to place so high a valuation as a quarter on them. They might perhaps be worth a fifth, but if swept away to-morrow could entirely be replaced for that fraction of their cost. Look at the Public Works of whose working we are furnished with accounts, such as the Post Office and Telegraph. The buildings and plant required for them are we may presume what would be deemed fitting objects on which to expend sums borrowed for reproductive works. And yet in what sense are these works reproductive except so far as debt tends to reproduce itself? Instead of making a profit for the Government—instead of paying interest of the capital invested in them or doing anything towards it—they involve a direct loss of about £80,000 a year. And it must be remembered there is nothing in the nature of a Post Office or Telegraph that makes it unreasonable to expect them to yield a profit, or at least pay their way. In America a vast number of letters are conveyed by private parties as a commercial undertaking. Most efficiently is the service conducted, and it shows every appearance of well remunerating the enterprising proprietors. When, therefore, we find the Government enterprises distinguished by such tremendous loss in cases where it is possible to keep track, what must we suppose it to be in cases where we have not the means of checking it?

Sometimes we hear people admit that the money intrusted to the Government for investment in public works is certain to result in direct loss, and yet it is urged that the indirect advantages resulting therefrom will more than counterbalance it. The very term "indirect advantages" is one of that vague illusive character that do so much to confuse and mislead the unthinking. Strictly speaking there can be no such thing as an indirect advantage, for whenever a real benefit exists, it must be to the profit of some individual or individuals of whom the public is composed. And in such cases, seeing that private parties have generally a pretty keen eye to their own interests, the community at large might safely trust them to adopt measures most conducive to it.

If, however, it should be imagined that an increase to the revenue is to be included among the indirect advantages that are expected to result from our lavish expenditure, the idea may be banished at once, for it will

not stand the test of experience. In 1867 our revenue culminated, and from that time to the latest period of which we possess complete and reliable accounts, it has steadily diminished. The following table shows the decrease :—

The receipts for the financial year ending June 1871, were £936,188, still showing a falling off.

If the above should not be deemed conclusive, we have the experience of other countries to guide us. In August last, a petition was presented to the House of Commons bearing the signatures of 4878 landed proprietors of Bengal and the Central Provinces of India, which represented that the proceedings of the Government had tended to worsen the condition of the country; that a loss of £2,000,000 a year on railways had to be made up by taxation; that the traffic in many places was reverting to the rivers, yet the Government designed to spend £28,000,000 on new lines of railway, and £39,000,000 on canals; that a large deficit was found almost every year in the Indian Exchequer, to meet which local taxes and cesses had been imposed in vain; and finally praying for the appointment of a commission to inquire into these grievances.

The other argument put forward in reply to the suggestions of prudence is the population theory. We are told to reassure ourselves, for immigration, by affording a wider base on which to levy taxes, will enable us to provide for the increased interest and other expenses of government.

If there were any probability of population increasing in the same ratio as our indebtedness, there might be some show of plausibility in the argument, though other countries will not tolerate the idea of allowing debt to increase at all. As compared with population, the national debt of Great Britain has largely diminished within the last fifty years. That of the United States, since the close of the war, has been enormously reduced, not merely in proportion to the population, but in actual amount. Whilst Northern Germany has practically no debt at all.

If, then, we made up our minds to look on contentedly, whilst debt and population advanced with equal strides, we should still be adopting a course which the foremost nations of the world repudiate. But even these conditions do not apply to us. Our population does not grow at the same rate as debt, for the latter increases in a ratio three or four times as fast—indeed, of late it has increased five times as rapidly, as may be seen from the following table :—

From 1857 to 1862 the debt had increased rather more than fifty percent., but the population had simultaneously increased a hundred and fifty per cent., and thus the debt, though actually greater, had relatively diminished. Here, therefore, was room for congratulation, and if our finances had subsequently been as wisely administered, we should have little reason to complain.

But whilst up to 1862 population went on increasing at a greater rate than the debt, since then the conditions have been reversed. Population has not doubled, nor nearly doubled, but the debt has increased eight fold. In 1862 the percentage chargeable to every man, woman, and child, was little over six pounds; now it is more than thirty-six. In view of these facts it is nonsense to plead the increase of population as a set off against the accumulation of debt. Such an argument can only be put forward by those who are ignorant of the truth, or who, for purposes of their own, wish to conceal it.

But the advocates of our wasteful policy endeavour to impose upon the public by another assumption equally at variance with facts. They talk as if an increase of population necessarily implied increased revenue; and if one accepted their representations, it would only be requisite to double the population in order to get double the amount of taxes; but this assumption is no less opposed to common sense than to ascertained facts, as shown below :—

Thus we see that for four consecutive years the population increased, whilst the revenue with equal regularity fell off. If there existed such an exact correspondence between population and revenue as is assumed, the revenue for 1870 would have been £400,000 higher than it was. It is true enough that additions to the population have a *tendency* to raise the revenue, but that tendency may be neutralised by many causes—as, for instance, bad government, or the perversion of the public funds from their legitimate objects; and if we admit that, other things being equal, the revenue for the last four years would have advanced in proportion to the population, it stands to reason that adverse influences of a very prejudicial character must have been at work to counteract this tendency to such a fatal degree.

Besides, is it likely that population will be attracted to a country so deeply steeped in debt, and that tolerates its reckless increase with such indifference as we manifest? Our very reason for desiring population is enough of itself to drive it away. Whenever, it becomes known, as eventually it must, that we are sunk in a debt of such magnitude as to be unable to defray its interest, what use will it be to go to the labour market of Europe and ask people to come out and help us to pay it? A man notoriously insolvent might as well advertise for a partner with £10,000 capital.

There are people who affirm that the resources of New Zealand are such as will enable us to defray the interest of our debt even when increased to the dimensions shadowed forth in the programme of the Colonial Treasurer; but it is remarkable that those very people shrink from the idea of imposing taxes even to defray the

interest on the present debt. But if we cannot pay interest on £10,000,000, how can we be expected to pay interest on £14,000,000 or £15,000,000?

The system we have been and are pursuing, cannot, in its nature, go on for ever. Some time or other our real position will become known, and then the bubble will burst. By the operation of some extraordinary delusion, English capitalists have been induced to advance millions to the New Zealand Government. Perhaps they may be under the impression that this money is only applied to reproductive works, and that we are honestly defraying current expenses out of revenue. Such infatuation can hardly be accounted for on any other hypothesis. They probably have not the means of knowing how enormously our expenditure exceeds income, and what large amounts of borrowed capital are annually applied to conceal the deficiency. The fact of such a Government as ours having carried on so long, can only be attributed to its creditors being in ignorance of our position, and the question of how long it may succeed in keeping up the game, is dependent on the success it may achieve in concealing the truth. Our financial position is like a barrel full of holes, into which people are pouring water, expecting to find it there when wanted. So long as they keep pouring in at a rate equal to the leakage, the water will maintain its level, and they may perhaps delude themselves into the belief that it is all there and available when wanted; but the moment the supply slackens the waste betrays itself. So it is with us. For years past our Government has been spending money at a rate absolutely furious, and the only reason that the increasing deficits have not forced themselves on public attention is, that capitalists in England have enabled it to proceed unchecked in its career of extravagance. At present even, it is doubtful if the country could support the weight of its burdens; but if any further additions to them are made, there will be but the alternative of repudiation, or such ruinous taxation as will dissipate for ever our dream of prosperity.

The evil is of such long standing, and seems to have worked itself so deeply into our whole system, that nothing but a united and energetic effort can suffice to throw it off. Our disease is so bad that only the most violent remedy will have any effect, and the very first step in the direction of retrenchment will necessarily be attended with disagreeable consequences. It is idle to think of accomplishing any real reform without first recognising our true position. To do that implies facing a long and severe period of adversity. The seeming prosperity that at present surrounds us is but the temporary effect of our infatuated policy of wasteful, reckless expenditure. Some time it must come to an end, and the practical question for the people of New Zealand is this—Will they put an immediate stop to the vicious system of bolstering up a rotten fabric, and resolutely face the worst that can befall them, or, for the sake of a short period of fictitious prosperity, will they consent to the ruin of their adopted country and the tenfold aggravation of the evil day when it comes?

Dunedin: Mills, Dick & Co, General Printers, Stafford Street. 1872.

The probability of Christianity: A Sermon

By the Rev. James Hill.

Published by request of the General Assembly.

Reed & Brett, Steam Printers Auckland "Evening Star Office. MDCCCLXXV

The Probability of Christianity.

"He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him".—Hebrews xi. c., 6 v.

ACCORDING to the teaching of Paul, whatever may be in our creed, there must be in it these two doctrines—God's existence, and God's favour to those who seek it. We must believe not only that there is a Supreme Being, but that there may be a relationship between Him and us — seeking on our part, rewarding on His. The dis severance of these two essentials was not peculiar to Paul's time. Few have denied the existence of a God, but many, while admitting this, have denied the possibility of any communion between the infinite and the finite; the divine and the human. They have believed that God is, but not that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

Now, as it appears to us, the belief of the one, if permitted to have its right influence, must lead to that of the other. There is no resting-place for the mind till this result is reached. In the thought of a God there are elements whose legitimate conclusion is that He must sustain to us, and that we must sustain to Him the relationship which is implied in the word—religion. And, if this is the case, the farther conclusion is forced upon us that Christianity is that religion. In the Bible there are many evidences of the divinity of Christianity; but, by inference, the same result may be reached, through the knowledge obtainable in God's works. There is a logical connection between the existence of a God and the truth of Christianity. It amounts, it is true, to only a probability; but this is so strong that, when associated with the evidences in the Bible, it greatly confirms our belief.

The statement, then, which we shall consider, as suggested by the words of Paul here, has two parts : If

there is a God it is probable that there is such a thing as religion : And if there is such a thing as religion it is probable that Christianity is true.

The material for this discussion is found in the knowledge of God and of man, as these are obtained in the works of nature, and the history of the human race. Does this knowledge then warrant the first conclusion—that there must be the relationship between God and man which religion implies?

On looking at creation, the first thought about God that arises in the mind is that of *Greatness*. There is such a combination of the stupendous and the minute that the conviction is inevitable that the Supreme Being is infinite. Now, to the minds of some, the relationship between God and His creatures implied in religion is inconsistent with this greatness. A gulf not only immense but without limits prevents belief. But to our mind the reverse is the fair conclusion. The very greatness of God leads us to believe that He thinks of men, controls their affairs, and communes with their hearts. This implies far more than our minds can comprehend; but for this very reason it harmonizes with His greatness, increases our idea of it, and leads to the belief that it is true of Him.

Another thought about God, at once awakened in the mind on looking at the works of nature, is that of *Goodness*. This is implied in the idea of greatness, but it is so stamped on the face of all creation that it possesses a prominence peculiarly its own. By first implanting wants in His creatures, and then furnishing in profusion the supplies requisite for them, the Supreme Being has so diffused happiness throughout our world that we are led to the conclusion that His goodness must be infinite. But if so good as to minister to physical wants, can He be indifferent to wants of a deeper and more important kind? Assuming for the present that there are desires, aspirations in man's spiritual being—that being which brings him to think of the unseen, and to be influenced by the thought—is it to be believed that these will be uncared for by a God so good as to provide for the most trivial wants of the tiniest insect? No. The more connected with happiness wants are, the more certain must be the provision from His hand. It would be an inexplicable anomaly if there were necessities in any of His creatures without what would meet them existing. He who cares for beauty for the eye, and music for the ear, and bounty for the sustenance of life cannot be indifferent to the emotions of the heart. In speaking of an imperfect being, reasoning from the greater to the less may be the only process; but from the less to the greater is what harmonizes with the character of the infinite God. If his goodness supplies the one, much more we infer will it supply the other.

Another important fact in regard to God, awakened in the mind by the works of creation, is that *He carries on His operations by laws*. Results in nature are not brought about by the special interference of power. An established order between cause and effect is everywhere discoverable, and any attempt on the part of the creature to break the connection is followed by penalty. But our mind reasons that if God has such regard for law in the physical world, He must have equal, yea greater regard for law in the moral world; that if He has attached penalties to the breach of laws which regulate dead matter, equally, yea more must He have attached penalties to the violation of those higher laws in which, as a Being perfect in justice and holiness, He must delight. This regard for the laws of rectitude, holiness, and truth implies a claim on the creatures placed under those laws. It is justice that He who gives and sustains life should have the services of those whom He so blesses, and hence the latter must have corresponding responsibility. To withhold such service is a violation of moral duty, and this cannot be a matter of indifference to a Being who has such regard for law, as the works of nature prove God to have.

Here then are three facts in regard to God which may fairly lead us to infer that there is such a thing as religion. He is infinitely great, and must take knowledge of His creatures; and infinitely good, and must supply the highest wants of His creatures; and He has established universal physical laws, and must have regard to the moral duties which the law of rectitude demands of His creatures. These three facts constitute a foundation on which the superstructure of religion may rest.

We shall now consider some points in our knowledge of man. Here we find such a harmony between the human constitution and the known character of God that we are brought again to the conclusion that religion is probable. On looking at man the first thought is that of *rationality*. He can think, gather facts, reason regarding them, possess knowledge. What could be the purpose of the Supreme Being in endowing man with this great power? Is it said, to ascertain the facts and trace out the laws which are in God's works? We must go farther, and say, to discover the features which are in the character of God Himself. Reason is the consummation—the glory of creation; and it cannot but be that it was given to the creature to rise to the contemplation of the highest object—the Supreme Being. Important is it to gather facts, generalise them, and infer principles in the works of God; but higher is it to discover the features in the Great Worker Himself, which these facts and principles disclose, group them together, and hold before the mind the glorious character which He must possess. And this power in man, let it be observed, corresponds with the greatness of God, of which we spoke; and by the harmony, moreover, is formed the first essential element in religion. God must be thought of; His greatness makes Him worthy of it, and by reason or intelligence man is fitted to discover it.

Another prominent fact respecting the human constitution is *Dependence*. Than this, there is no feeling deeper in our nature, or earlier manifested in our life. It is seen in the helplessness of childhood, the vigor of manhood, the weakness of old age. But it stretches beyond the sphere of surrounding objects. Nothing is truer of the human race than that there is a deep consciousness of the existence of a Superior Being or beings, and that with this there are corresponding feelings of hope and trust. The universal worshipping of gods demonstrates that the human heart seeks the Unknown, "if haply it may feel after and find Him." The few who furnish an opposite experience are but as drops in the great stream of humanity as it rolls on from age to age. And the feeling is as indestructible as it is universal. Not ignorance however gross, nor degradation however vile, can cause this throbbing of the human heart to cease. And this feeling of dependence in the constitution of man corresponds, it will be marked, with the goodness in the character of God, to which we referred. If the thought of goodness were completely dissociated from the thought of a God there could not possibly be any seeking after Him. Even when men have clothed their gods with human passions there has always been underlying the worship the idea of sufficient goodness to give succour, or protection in certain circumstances. Separate the two—the dependence and the goodness—and there is an inexplicable mystery; unite the two, and there is beautiful harmony. Bring the goodness of God down to the human heart, and let the dependence of the human heart find its object in God, and there is corresponding fitness between the character of the Creator and the nature of the creature; even that corresponding fitness which constitutes another essential element in religion.

In the human constitution we see yet another prominent and important feature, namely—a *sense of moral obligation*. The feeling of dependence, of which we have spoken, is everywhere associated with fear. Trust and distrust are found side by side; and but for the indestructibility of the former, the latter would completely prevail. It is this fact that has given to the seeking after the Unknown, which is true of humanity, a peculiar form, namely—that of sacrifice, or satisfaction. There is a consciousness of failure in duty, of exposure to displeasure and danger; and hence the prevailing attempt to atone for, or satisfy. And this element of moral responsibility, it will be noticed, corresponds with the regard for law which is true of God. Were God indifferent to moral duty how could man have this sense of moral obligation—a sense, let it be marked, which is not bounded by creature relationships. It would be a feature in the constitution of man without a corresponding feature in the character of God; and, therefore, a feature purposeless—meaningless. Thus the respect for moral law, which we inferred to be true of God from His operations in the physical world, harmonizes with the sense of right and wrong, and of responsibility arising out of it, of which men everywhere are conscious; and this harmony supplies a third essential element in religion.

Thus then, what we learn of God and of man, apart from the Bible, warrants the belief of the relationship between God and man which religion implies: greatness, goodness, regard for law on the one hand; reason, dependence, moral obligation on the other. If the relationship is denied, what we discover presents a disagreement between the crowning work of God in this world and His own character—a disagreement which we discover nowhere else, and which we cannot comprehend. Is it to be supposed that the wonderful adaptation which runs through all creation should fail only in regard to man, and to man too in the powers and requirements of his higher nature? Assuredly not. There is a manward side in the divine, and a Godward side in the human; and there must be development of both. Religion is this development. Deny it, and there is perplexity and darkness; admit it, and there is light and satisfaction.

But, if the existence of such a thing as religion is probable, we infer that the truth of Christianity is probable. This is the second part of the statement which we have to consider.

In reasoning from the probability of religion to the probability of the truth of Christianity a difficulty is met with at the outset, namely—the existence of moral evil in the world. Though the character of the Creator and the constitution of the creature must have harmonized as the latter came from the hand of the former, securing the relationship which religion implies, it does not follow that that harmony has survived the effects of moral evil in the creature. May not holiness, justice, and consequent anger on the part of God now prevent it? May not the yearnings after the Unseen, that still linger in man, be doomed to remain unsatisfied? May not the sense of moral obligation, which perplexes men, be but the precursor of deeper sorrow in the future? Have we, then, any ground for concluding that God may have interfered to counteract the effects of the change that has taken place in the human race, so that the relationship of religion between Him and His creatures may still exist?

To our mind there is reason for such a supposition. Look, first of all, at the world in which we live. Has it the appearance of being only a prison-house? Does it bear the marks of the rule of holiness and justice only? Are its voices nothing else than the utterances of condemnation? Nay. Do the sunshine and the bounty not hint at peace? Has the goodness originally stamped on creation not gained a new aspect, even that of forbearance? If holiness and justice are elements in the character of the Supreme—and to this a moment's reflection must lead us—it is difficult, yea, impossible to imagine the absence of displeasure from His heart; yet are not men at once removed from the earth, nor treated altogether as criminals. The beauty and comfort, then, of this world-home,

and the continued life of men in it, we cannot understand without the belief that there is a hidden purpose in the heart of God—a purpose which nothing else but the continuance of the relationship implied in religion can possibly explain.

Then look at the condition of man in the world. There is the strange and significant fact that there is discipline in it. All the surroundings are corrective in their influence. There is reward or punishment in everything. That, we venture to say, cannot be satisfactorily accounted for but on the supposition of the continued possibility of religion.

Then how is that seeking after the Unseen, of which we have spoken, to be explained but on the ground of the same belief? What has kept alive through the ages of the past the aspirations and the dependence of the human heart? Is it said that this is the result of a conservative principle in human nature? It is to be remembered that the tendency of human nature in that sphere is not conservative but destructive; and the belief is inevitable that, but for some other power than that of man, the destructive process would have been short and complete. Nothing can account for the continuance of those glimmering rays of light that shoot across man's path, and stir man's heart in the midst of his darkness but the restraining hand of God; nor for the preservation of the dilapidated walls and broken columns of the ruined temple of man's soul but the purpose of God still to be worshipped there.

Thus even in the presence of the difficulty of the existence of moral evil, the condition of the world and of men in it awaken the belief, that it is the purpose of God that the relationship implied in religion should still remain.

But if so, Christianity alone can lay claim to the possession of the requisite characteristics. No other religion can satisfy man's reason and man's heart, and have real power in man's life. Of all the false systems of religion Deism alone is worthy of notice here. Its belief is that unassisted the mind can adore, and the heart commune with the Glorious Being whose character is mirrored in creation. But if there is a new element in man's constitution the voice of nature cannot meet the change. There was nothing in nature anticipatory of it, and therefore there can be nothing counteractive of the results. Religion is possible now only on the supposition of a new revelation. What is the mind of God in regard to sin? The answer to that question is the essence of Christianity—its real worth to man. Thus the problem of our nature, as now existing, finds a solution in, and only in the Christian religion.

But it may be asked—does not Christianity, in solving the problem of moral evil in humanity, completely destroy the probability for which we are contending? The mode of solution is the suffering of the Son of the Supreme; and is it not a most improbable thing that a Being infinite and self-existent should give Himself to death in human nature for guilty creatures? Now, viewed in the light of the character of man, the improbability of such an event is indeed great; but viewed in the light of the character of God, instead of there being improbability there is probability. If left to solve the problem of guilt no created mind could ever have thought of such a plan; but when made known, and viewed in the light of the character of the Supreme, we can readily believe it. The sacrifice indicated was indeed tremendous; but does not this fact harmonize with, and find an explanation in the infinite perfections of His character? The more unlikely the event is on account of man's guilt, just the more likely is it on account of God's glory.

Then is there not probability in the peculiar attributes displayed? Was the tender, pleading voice of mercy never to be heard in the Universe? Was the sweet forgiveness of God never to be experienced in the heart of a creature? These are the brightest features in any character. Is it to be thought that the character of the great God could be for ever without that peculiar lustre? The features of his character would have been perfect, but incomplete would have been the manifestation; and will it be asserted that this was likely?

Thus the very greatness of the event harmonizes with the greatness of God; while the attributes displayed must be his delight as they are his peculiar glory. The solution of the problem of moral evil which Christianity reveals, detracts not from, but adds to the probability of Christianity. It stands therefore a thought which should command belief, that if it is the purpose of God that religion should still be in man's heart, Christianity alone possessing the requisite characteristics must be true; a belief which is not destroyed but confirmed by the stupendous—the Godlike means by which it has been accomplished.

The value of the probability of the truth of Christianity we have now traced is not to be under-estimated. It shows that there are difficulties apart from the Bible to be solved; it shows that a system like Christianity can alone solve them; it shows that if there is a God we must believe that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and that, now, as the Christian religion describes.

This subject has some bearing on the present attitude of science towards religion in some quarters. The tendency of science in the present day in subjecting all things, and that for millions of years to nothing but inexorable laws, is undoubtedly atheistical; yet is not the actual depth of atheism always, or even often reached by those following out these branches of knowledge. To whatever distance the mind may go back, it seems to demand the exercise of some original power, or force. Hence the existence of a Supreme Being if not broadly

admitted, is not bluntly denied. And this concession on the part of scientific men to the prevailing belief is hailed with gratitude and gladness as if forsooth their dictum, had they uttered it, would have banished the Almighty from His universe. But what, after all, is the worth of the belief of a God if the theory of inexorably fixed laws for many millions of years, without any possible interference on the part of God, is true? What signifies it to us that there is a God, if that complicated machinery of laws is between him and our souls, if he takes no cognizance of us and hears not our cry? We are but units in the human race, come into the world to be controlled for a little by the laws around us, and then to pass away for ever and be as if we had never been. If this satisfies the mind in regard to God's works, it assuredly cannot satisfy the heart in regard to God Himself. Thus the admission that is so praised, and that the world pauses breathlessly to hear, practically amounts to nothing. It cuts at the foundation of all reward; it makes all seeking after God a delusion, and brands Christianity, which gives shape and form to the seeking, as a mockery and a fraud.

To scientific men we readily concede the right of entering the domain of religious belief, taking with them their discoveries as a standard of truth. The religious dogmas, that either by their own nature or the mode of their revelation, come within the sphere which scientific investigation occupies, must stand the test of ascertained fact. But we ask that this be done on two conditions, the first of which is that all the branches of science be taken into account before a decision is arrived at. Mental and moral science furnish facts as certain and as important as is done by any of the physical sciences. Truths are to be learned from the history of the human race as well as from the history of the rocks. If a fossil, or a bone, or a feather leads to certain conclusions, no less do the desires and aspirations which for ages have controlled the human race; and it is as much the demand of reason and justice that the one be taken into account as well as the other in every enquiry into religious truth.

The other condition is that in every department of science that is examined, facts, not theories, be employed in determining the questions at issue. This distinction is often overlooked. Facts and the opinions founded on them, results and the inferences drawn from them, may be so associated and mixed up that those who are dealing with them may be deceived or misled.

Now in the attacks on the Christian religion which are being made from the side of science these two conditions are not fulfilled. Though the phenomena observable in rocks, plants, and animals receive due weight, the phenomena in human nature are altogether overlooked. The adaptation of surrounding circumstances to every object is firmly asserted; but what is to meet the wants and longings of the human heart receives no enquiry whatever. Every wonder is set down to law, but the consciousness of right and wrong, and of moral accountability—which is not an accident, but a part of our very constitution—is set down to nothing. Thus the results attained in the physical world have so absorbed attention that the principles in the mental and moral nature of man are altogether overlooked.

Then in the branches of science that are examined, not facts but theories, not results but inferences are put forward as shaking religious beliefs. Through the ramifications of their researches scientific men can be authoritatively followed by few, but when they come to reason about their facts they are as other men. And we find that in regard to man physically, there are assumptions from which our reason recoils; and that in regard to man mentally, there are conjectures to which credulity, in its highest flights, cannot yield assent. Yea, we find that the very points from which the attacks on religion are made are *beyond* ascertained phenomena and the sphere of human experience.

If, then, some branches of science are not taken into account at all; and if in those which are examined fictions instead of facts are presented, the theory of the operation of laws to the complete exclusion of a presiding God is not established, and the claim of entering the domain of religious belief so boastfully made, and so readily granted ends in—nothing. While acceding to scientific men the right to enter the domain of religion, we claim for the friends of religion the right to enter the domain of science, and to demand that science shall be true to itself, and not employ conjecture for reality as the means of assailing what is held as supremely sacred and momentarily precious by multitudes.

Not thus is the common consent of mankind to be set aside; not thus are the utterances of the burdened heart of humanity to be hushed; not thus is the indestructible instinct, the deep longing in our natures, which has immortality as its object, to be crushed and quieted. Poor in value is all conjecture about the past if it enshrouds the future in gloom and darkness; and every theory of the origin of life if it opens up before us nothing but the yawning gulf of annihilation. The progress which the necessities of our nature demand is not that of the race with the passing away of the individual for ever, but that of the race with the perfecting of the individual in a higher, holier, happier kind of existence. Tell us of the changes which have been going on for millions of years, yet our minds leap over them all to the Being that must have existed for ever and that never changes and there we find a bosom whose love and sympathy can be our solace and succour in all the vicissitudes and sorrows of life, and through all the untried experiences of death. These are the natural dictates of our hearts, and they are met by Christianity, and not from them shall we be driven by theories gratuitously framed, and shifting as are

the sands of the ocean. The thunder dies away, the lightning's flash is quenched, and the steady shining of the sun goes on. God is, and He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

In these remarks we have said nothing of the ordinary evidences of Christianity. These are a tower of strength, and moreover present facts demanding explanation as imperatively as any of the discoveries of science. Our object has been to give expression to a deep conviction in our mind that if there is a God He must have something to do with us, and that we must have something to do with Him, and that, if so, Christianity alone can now furnish the means of communication. The probability thus arrived at gives weight to the ordinary evidences of Christianity; but not only so, it explains the force of that kind of evidence which is the highest and most certain of all, namely — that of experience. Why is it that the advanced Christian has such unwavering confidence in the truth of his religion? Not merely because he believes in the possibility of miracle and the fulfilment of prophecy; not merely because he appreciates the beauty of the language, the purity of the morals, and the sublimity of the life of Jesus presented in the Bible, but because he feels that the blessings of Christianity fully meet the wants of his nature of which he is deeply conscious. With him the probabilities have risen to certainties. For his guilty, burdened heart he feels he has pardon, and he has peace. Once he was blind, but now he sees. He has sought, and he has found. He knows sweetly that God is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.

decorative feature

What Is Education?

By Ambrose Caston Cuddon, *Leigh Terrace, Chaucer Road, London.*

EDUCATION is any process by which the inherent and pre-existent qualities or powers in the human being can be elicited or brought out into practice.

This is a general description of education; and although brief, it is quite correct, yet, like all generalisations, it gives no particular information, and is, therefore, not a full answer to the question : proceed we then to particulars.

The word is from the Latin *Educo*, to educe, to bring out; not to put in, but to draw forth from within; not filling the mind with crotchets or opinions, as a cistern is filled with water brought in buckets from external sources; but opening up its own fountain, to draw out from its own resources the immortal spirit that is there—to develop our consciousness and bring into action the intellectual conceptions, the instincts and intuitions of our outward and inward selves, the pure and unperverted tastes, inclinations, propensities and powers of human nature, the germs and seeds of the virtues which God and nature have planted within us, to be nurtured, cultivated and matured by us in the manner best suited to ourselves, in order that every one of us may work out his or her own individual character, each respectively, in his or her own proper position and vocation in society, according to the natural constitution with which we are endowed, and which it is the great object and purpose of Education to bring out into light action.

The following original words or first principles are Divine Revelations in the human language. They point and lead to this right action;—they are the finger of Divine Providence.

Equity—First Principles are the laws of God and Nature;—our rule of Faith and Practice.

They comprehend the elements and substance of all the natural and true virtues, useful endowments and gifts of God and Nature, which we have to educate; they are of divine origin, antiquity and wisdom. We may enumerate them without attempting to decide which are first, which secondary; or which are virtues, which gifts. They may indeed be all esteemed, and should be venerated as the bounteous gifts of God and Nature. They are our rights and duties; they all tend to the well-being and well-doing of mankind. They belong to us as forming our political and social order—our pure and holy religion; they are of all languages, and evidently intended for our practice—for our use and benefit—our government, our rule and guidance. They therefore should be ever scrupulously attended to and manifested and illustrated in all our conduct through life.

FIRST PRINCIPLES, AS VIRTUES.—Truth, justice, freedom, love, diligence, faith, hope, charity, generosity, peace, patience, mercy, friendship, prudence, fortitude, temperance, morality, benevolence, pity, chastity, love of God above all things, and our neighbor as ourselves.

FIRST PRINCIPLES AS ENDOWMENTS.—Seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling, feeling, eating, drinking, sleeping, walking, talking, thinking, marriage, memory, wit, understanding, reason, instinct, intuition, individuality, and diversity of man, and his sovereignty over his own person, his own time, his own property, and everything that properly pertains to him.

FIRST PRINCIPLES, AS THE GIFTS OF GOD AND NATURE.—The whole earth, from centre to circumference, the soil, the land, the woods, the trees, the animals, vegetables, wild fruit and flowers, the waters, the rivers, the seas, rains, the flowers of the earth, the birds of the air, the fishes, the light of the sun, the moon, the stars, all

spontaneous productions, and the capabilities of further production by man's labor and the knowledge of agriculture and machinery.

Observe 1st. In the gifts of God and Nature, we have all the necessary materials wherewith, whereon and wherein to do the work of humanity.

Observe 2nd. In the endowments, we have the powers, the capabilities of doing the good work voluntarily given to us.

Observe 3rd. In the virtues we have the result—the reward of our efforts—in the universal harmony, peace and happiness of the whole human race; or such would be the result of these virtues, if not perverted by bad laws and bad men.

Each one of these virtues, endowments, and gifts has its own laws, suggests its own method of application and use; their efficiency, fitness and goodness are implanted within us, as part of ourselves, a part of our nature, and are recognised as such by every unperverted, rational human being. They are simple, plain, and easy to understand; delightful and improving in practice. They are profound, eternal, and infinitely comprehensive : therefore not of human invention or party spirit. They bear the impress of divine wisdom and beneficence, for they are suited to each other—suited to all times, to all persons, to all places, to all cases, for universal practice. They are principles and laws of God and Nature : therefore infallibly true. They are our unerring statute book, our tribunal of justice, our court of equity, our universal laws, our politics, our rule of faith, our true and sure religion. They associate us together in love, harmony and peace, with plenty of all the good things, good thoughts, and good deeds we can rationally enjoy, and a refined happiness and pleasure in the enjoyment of them.

First principles will expel vice and establish virtue; their proper application will lead us on in true wisdom's path, in the true and wisest policy, true morality, true philosophy, true science, and true religion.

First principles are our highest and infallible authority—should be our guide and rule of action in all the affairs of life. They should be the standard laws of all civilised nations and peoples;—indeed if the people be not guided by first principles, they are not educated or civilised. The present unhappy defection from first principles arose from the love of money, the domination of priests, and those combinations of interested, money-loving men, called government, whose principles and laws are based on war, falsehood, force, frauds, thereby establishing odious systems of rents, rates, taxes, money, interest on money, and other fraudulent imposts, which can be eradicated only by first principles, the laws of God and nature being put into practice by education, and the practice thereof is heaven on earth, conscience without reproof, for truly it is written, "The kingdom of God is within you."

Education is also a work of scrutiny and diligent observation, in order to discover the natural tastes, talents, capacities and powers in each individual, and to ascertain for what occupation in life he or she may be best fitted, so that they may in the best manner fill their proper places in society.

Instructed, not educated as man has hitherto been in the depths of enlightened and unenlightened error, false policy and the pride of life, little does he know at present what may be his capacities, his attainments and enjoyments when justice shall have been done to him, and he shall have done justice to himself; when all his faculties and powers shall be developed, and in their free and proper action shall manifest the majesty of human nature in the exercise of first principles. Then tyranny and oppression must hide their diminished heads, when war must cease, and peace reign triumphant in its stead. The sovereign dominion of mankind over all nature's terrestrial productions, properly directed, will work all for good,—man and woman, promoting the happiness of each other, will contribute also to the happiness of their neighbours, "learn to make others happy." Thus we might establish and secure in perpetuity the diversified peace, harmony, and happiness of the whole human family, whereby, without toilsome effort, but, as it were, incidentally, we advance ourselves in a state of preparedness for whatever of higher destiny may be in reserve for us hereafter.

And this beautiful, harmonious, and progressive enjoyment of humankind is anticipated in society—yea, even exists—in the physical structure, physiological functions, and propensities of man,—yea it resides in the very depths of man's physical organization; and from the wider range of his mental, intellectual, and spiritual constitution, they flow in streams, magnificent and glorious. It is conceivable that from the first to the last moment of his rational existence he might drink of them to the full extent of his capacity. Why does he not? What must happen before this be possible? The attainment of clear and just conceptions of things of which the knowledge hitherto acquired by the most enlightened men is imperfect. Physical nature, every department of it, capable of securing to every individual, and to the whole community, the maximum of happiness with the minimum of suffering; this must be known.

But first principles—the principles of humanity which are the basis, and lead directly on to this knowledge—have not been cared for, were and are not recognised or taught in our schools; our schools were not instituted for true and real education, but for false and artificial instruction, and for inculcating the will, the superstitions, the idolatrous notions and dictations of high priests and rulers.

The universities and colleges were instituted in the middle ages, in the greatest height and lowest depth of religious idolatry, superstition, and ecclesiastical arrogance, and instituted for the avowed purposes of teaching Greek and Latin, and exclusively inculcating the faith and doctrine and discipline of the Church and State authorities of Rome, the then prevailing creed, statues, sacrificial rites, superstitions, mortifications, idolatries, humiliations, ceremonial and useless observances called Loyalty and Religion. To all these absurdities such implicit obedience was insisted on, and with such rigor by the assumed Roman Catholic Church and State authorities, and with such dictatorial coercive injunctions as were deemed expedient to maintain Church and State dominion, and fit the scholars for the priesthood of that church.

Since the Reformation in England, the universities and colleges have been and are still continued in the essentially same superstitions and idolatries called religion, and in like manner appropriated, though not exclusively, to the teaching articles of faith, false and idolatrous doctrine, discipline for giving their scholars such instructions, dictations, and inculcations of obedience to the assumed authority in Church and State, as may fit them for parsons or ministers, for carrying out the purposes of the high priests and rulers of the Church and State of England—which purposes are chiefly the acquisition of money, wealth, and dominion over the people.

This required obedience and submission to all this coercive and unreasoning assumed authority is more like slavery than freedom—this dictatorial teaching is not Education; at best, it is but instruction, putting into the mind erroneous notions or crotchets which interested men or parties of men in assumed and unjust authority may wish to prevail for their own party purposes and views, that they may live in ease and affluence out of the labor of the industrious millions without themselves laboring at all.

The difference between Education and instruction is very clear and distinct. Education is to draw out from within; instruction is to put in from without. Yet the difference is never pointed out by our legalised teachers,—the two words are commonly confounded or mixed up together, as if it was not intended that they should be distinguished; yet the difference is wide as the poles are asunder, although, like the poles, they are connected with and necessary to each other. Education is to draw out from within, the first principles and laws there implanted by God and Nature, and to nurture the divine virtues as best suited to man's prosperity and happiness. Instruction is to receive from without the errors of the world, the false teachings, the superstitions and idolatries and doctrines of the high priests and rulers.

The high priests and rulers of the church dictate to and rule over the state, and the state dictates to and rules over the church; they quietly endure each other's rule, that church and state may both of them be able the more completely to rule over the people. True education is for man's advancement in knowledge, wisdom and virtue, health and happiness. But instead of true and real education, the more he has been taught of mere man-made laws, old usages, superstitious, and idolatrous teachings, ritual observances, ceremonies, forms of church and state policies, the classics and classical languages—the more a man has been crammed with this sort of useless learning, the better is he said to be educated. "O, he has received the very best of education," because, perhaps, he has been to college or university, while the real fact is that he has only been instructed and taught much error with very little truth, and not properly or really educated at all. Education is to learn to practise the virtues of all the virtues or first principles : this is never thought of. He may have been a good boy at school—learnt his lessons and catechism, and done as he was told. The word school means, the dictionary tells us, "a rule of government; a state of subjection and chastisement." Of course discipline and instruction is for inculcating and preserving, in strict rigour and full vigour, the present corrupt church and state order of things. Therefore we have lots of schools—day schools, evening schools, Sunday schools, boarding schools, grammar schools, collegiate schools, commercial schools, charity schools, and ragged schools—till the word school becomes vulgar; then we have academies, genteel establishments, seminaries, institutions, working men's colleges, university colleges for ladies, penitentiaries, reformatories for both sexes, etc.;—all for discipline, subjection and chastisement, in order to keep things as they are, or to prevent their being as they ought to be and as they would be by proper education.

But proper education would teach them to inculcate and practise only justice and truth, restrain them from evil and error, and lead them on in the path of virtue; onward to wisdom and virtue, first principles always point. But governments are generally fixed in error, injustice and wrong doing; they cannot go on in virtue, justice, and truth; they require to be supplied with food for their wrong doing and delusions, which means wealth, money and dominion over others. Hence, in order that Jesus of Nazareth may be taken for God, we have the Anno Domini dodge, its idolatries and superstitions; and other errors preached in the old churches called by the names of the Roman Catholic saints, who were the support and upholders of the Anno Domini church, and state doctrines and dogmatisms. Then we have the Jewish Bible dodge, the missionary dodge—to send men to preach idolatry and superstition to foreign nations; the church building dodge, the street preaching dodge—calling upon us "miserable sinners" to come to Jesus, etc. Then for supporting all these teachings, preachings, doctrines, dodges, and dodgers, we have armies of soldiers, armies of priests, armies of lawyers,

armies of policemen, armies of officials, and supernumeraries, at a cost of hundreds of millions of money every year extorted out of the industrious wealth-producers. As a natural consequence of all these abominations, we have large lunatic asylums, prisons, hospitals, pest and poor houses all over the kingdom.

But as for a house, college or school expressly for and appropriated to what can be properly called the true and real education of the people, I know not one in Europe. I should be glad to see England set an example of such an institution,—which in fact would only be to follow nature's laws, with reason and common sense, as Cod has written them everywhere in everything, especially in the conscience and heart and soul of every human being.

Dunedin: Mills, Dick and Co., Steam Printers, Stafford Street.

What is a Miracle?

To the Editor of the North Wilts Herald.

[Reprinted from "The Medium and Daybreak" June 24, 1870.]

"SIR,—Will you permit one greatly interested in your able article upon Dr. Newton's visit to Swindon, to say a few words, which irresistibly suggest themselves, upon the gifts usually considered miraculous? I suppose most of us were taught in our youth that miracles were things of the past—of a past that had for us not only a historical, but a religious interest, but still of a past that was dead and gone. We were also taught that a miracle was a 'wonder' out of the natural order of things, above and beyond the laws of nature, and, in fact, a breach of those laws. It must, therefore, we were told, be a *super-natural* event. It seems to me important, in these days when healing powers are claimed and discussed amongst us, to ascertain if such teaching be true, historically and philosophically; and, lastly, if it be calculated to increase or to diminish our faith in the power and presence of God as a living God in the earth.

"I rejoice to see that you have given many well chosen instances of the frequent appearance of the healing power through the Christian centuries, if I take up my Bible, I find that our Saviour distinctly promised that power, together with such other gifts, not only to His disciples, but to the Church of the Future, without limitation of time or country, faith being the condition of their reception. He even assured them that when He should be gone to His Father, when He should have vanquished death and ascended on High to 'receive gifts for men,' that He would so pour upon them His spirit and influence, that they should be able to do 'greater things' than those they had seen Him do. So, that though that time has not yet come, it is scriptural to hope that an age may arise when the earth may so be filled with an enlightened faith, when the knowledge of God may so 'cover it' that Christ, exalted as He is to the Highest Heaven, may be able to pour down upon men, and they be able to receive such a fulness of His power that marvels of love and mercy may be accomplished, superior even to those He was able to perform while in the flesh in the condition of the world's faith in that period. The Apostles not only exercised the gifts of healing and other powers called miraculous themselves, but they evidently considered them the heritage of the Christian Church. They exhorted their converts to desire and pray for 'spiritual gifts,' preparing them to expect them to be various in different individuals, subject to the sovereign will of God. St. Paul distinctly enumerates, these desirable gifts: prophecy, healing, speaking with tongues, discerning of spirits. It never seems to have occurred to him to suppose that these gifts would cease with the Apostles or their century, It would be as reasonable to say that the Apostles believed that all their teaching applied only to their own time, as to say that the possession of these powers was limited to it by them.

"The early history of the church proves that they existed, and were believed in by the Fathers. Indeed, whoever will take the pains to study the subject, will find an unbroken succession of persons so gifted, from the days of the Apostles till our own. There may have been seasons of darkness and eclipse of faith; times when materialism was so rampant that the spirit was quenched, and when, as of old in Israel, the 'word of the Lord was precious (or rare), and there was no open vision'. But, nevertheless, now and again, in spite of the world, the flesh, and the devil, there arose a prophet, or a healer, as a witness to the truth that spirit is greater than matter, and kindred with Him who 'is a spirit.' The legends of the saints of the Roman Church, though they may contain exaggerations and in some cases impositions, are yet most often those of the lives of persons of high aspirations and great holiness, possessing frequently those spiritual gifts mentioned by St. Paul as objects of desire and prayer. Since the Reformation, and amongst Protestants, there have been the French prophets, the Irvingites, and others too numerous to specify; and, in the Roman Church of our own day, the celebrated priest, Prince Hohenloe. Such is a very cursory view of the question from its religious and historical side Allow me to glance, though briefly and very imperfectly, at its philosophical view.

"The teaching that healing power or any similar endowment is contrary to natural law, and a breach of it—the speaking of such events as *miracles* and *supernatural*—has done much to raise doubts, often most painful and agonizing doubts, in minds of the highest intellect and earnestness.

"Doubt is not a moral crime. It is the most terrible of trials. If there be a sin at all in the matter, it too often rests with those who check investigation, and insist upon the arbitrary reception of that against which reason and conscience revolt. To a person to whose mind God has been revealed as 'not a man, that he should repent,' but as one 'without variableness or shadow of turning,' the idea of a breach of law is contrary to his highest conceptions of God. The God in whom he believes is incapable of suspending or breaking, as a mere exhibition of power and caprice, laws which, as the outcome of His nature, must be perfect.

"Moreover, physical study shews him that as a fact law is unalterable and inviolable. So that when required to hold a theological opinion at variance with his best perceptions of God, and with his scientific knowledge, he naturally and rightly refuses it. He would rather disbelieve in miracles, than disbelieve in God's perfection. And so he gets called an infidel. And though, because faithful to the reason and conscience through which God has revealed Himself to his being, he is far from deserving that opprobrious name; he yet loses much, by rejecting, together with the unreasonable form in which the dogma has been presented, its inner meaning or soul. He rejects not only all idea of breach of law; but in refusing to accept the facts and truths contained in the doctrine of miracles, denies the occurrence from time to time of events indicating the possession of powers by the human soul which link it with the unseen; and fails to realise the grand harmonious working of the laws of a personal God—some higher, some lower—but all His, and all natural and orderly; some physical, some spiritual, but all in their course, and all pulsing with His presence in 'whom we live and move and have our being,' and 'who is not far from any one of us.'

"The only solution of the difficulty appears to be the recognition of a gradually ascending scale in the realm of law, rising from the most palpable and demonstrable form of physical law to a more subtle and ethereal but equally inviolable form. The higher naturally subjects the lower. Miracles, or apparent deviations from the ordinary, tangible, and visible forms in which law manifests itself, can only be referred to the operation of a higher law, or rather to a higher form of the one great principle of universal law. One of the most earnest as well as popular writers of the day has explained clearly that one law, or one phase of law, holds good, and is infallible, until crossed and contradicted by another. He says something to this effect: By the law of gravitation an apple having fallen from the tree will inevitably reach the ground. But how if I put out my hand and prevent it falling? Has law been broken or destroyed? Not at all. But another and a superior form of it has intervened. The law of my will has interrupted, it is true, the ordinary course of nature, but my will acts through the agency of physical law, and not independently of it, or in opposition to it. With all reverence the same may be said of the Divine Will. The law of what the Apostle calls 'spiritual gifts' appears to be a law so subtle and so ethereal as to be 'border land, so to speak, between the domains of matter and mind—linking them together, harmonising them so completely that it is hard to say where the one ends and the other begins, and throwing floods of light upon the old battle grounds of the philosophers. For want of a better name, we call this law *magnetic*. Magnetism is an all-pervading, *world* principle, a *finer* and higher form of electricity. Some substances and some beings are more susceptible to its influence than others. Some absorb and some impart it. Some persons are as it were, enveloped and clothed in it, and can emit its efficacy to others. It is life-giving, and therefore it can heal, soothe, and restore. It is the atmosphere, rarer and purer than the heavier gaseous air about us, in which alone spirits out of the flesh and clothed in an ethereal and magnetic body can communicate with us, be they our kindred and brethren within the veil or higher angels sent on missions to earth. Through it they can influence us in dreams, by inspiration, and, under certain conditions, make themselves visible to us. We see as yet 'through a glass darkly,' and know but little of these conditions. The knowledge of magnetic law, its circumstances and extent, is yet in its veriest infancy. Firmly, however, and rejoicingly do we believe that we dimly see the principle of the physical or *semi*-physical law through whose agency it has pleased God to act in the region called 'miraculous,' but which in reality is as little so as any other manifestation of the creative mind. In one sense, everything is a miracle. In another, nothing is miraculous. Everything is *supernatural* in one sense, for all comes from the Great Divine Mind which guides nature. Yet in another sense, there is no supernatural, for all his workings are harmonious, gradual, orderly, and natural. There is nothing sensational or magical in his laws.

"The difficulty in receiving the miracles of the Bible has been to many very great, because they supposed themselves required to believe that mind and spirit had subdued matter without the action of physical law. And this in a region of physical facts they considered impossible. This appears, from his celebrated 'Essay,' to have been Professor Baden Powell's view of the case. Does not magnetism, which is a force physical, though so refined as to be impalpable, throw a ray of light upon these difficulties? Ignorant as we are of the wondrous workings of this mighty force, one thing is certain, that the possession of it and the capability of using it has *nothing whatever to do with goodness*, either as cause or effect. This should be distinctly remembered. It is easy to understand this, if we bear in mind that it is a force of a physical character, although of a rare and refined quality. History, sacred and secular, sustains this fact. In all ages there have been prophets, healers, and seers; but they have not always been good men. We read of Balaam, of false prophets, of men who sold their powers

for reward, and of those who communicated with devils or evil spirits.

"The powers called miraculous have been from the beginning. Christ did not give these gifts for the first time. But He, as the restorer and the great healer of soul and body, taught men their highest aim and object—the restoration of men, spiritually and physically, the individual and the race, so as to establish the kingdom of God on earth.

"That these powers exist now, in some degree, as they have always done, is to my mind clear as daylight. That they would increase in quantity and quality, were there more "faith in the earth," I also earnestly believe. Faith, or imagination (if that name be preferred), the faculty which makes distant things present, and which realises the ideal, may be (how know we not?) the law that augments that magnetic atmosphere in which and through whose agency these things happen. Some deep thinker has said that "spirits make substance." If that be so, may not faith act upon and increase magnetism? But ours, alas, are not "days of faith." They are, for the most part, days of the sheerest and grossest materialism. Love of the outward, the transient, the unreal, stamp and characterise them. Nevertheless, the gift of healing, and the power of communicating with the unseen, lives yet in our midst, and is, or ought to be, a witness to the truth of the sacred records, and another proof that God is not dead, or asleep like Baal; neither is "His arm shortened that he cannot save" now in the nineteenth century, as of old in Israel. I grant fully that, in an age such as this, great caution should be used in exercising such powers. We know so little about the conditions under which they may effect good, and so much harm may be done by failure, that to boast loudly of their possession is to exhibit a zeal untempered with discretion. Every opportunity for fair investigation should be given. Admitting the possibility and probability of these facts, there always remains the necessity for testimony and proof. Whether the cures attempted by Dr. Newton in your town will abide strict scrutiny, it is not in my power to decide. Except in the case of Mr. Young, their permanency, at least, has not been proved. Neither do you mention any other instance of such marked success. This may be the result of causes comprehensible to those who have studied the law of magnetism so far as it is known with its attractions and repulsions, though it may not be easy to explain to the less versed in these subjects.

"It must have been a strange sight in these unbelieving days—in this matter-of-fact age, where hearts are often 'dry as summer's dust' and the gentle dew of faith and imagination has passed away—that eager, expectant throng of half curious, half hopeful sufferers, the blind, the halt, the lame—crowding to a man who had come from beyond the sea on a mission of healing. Crowding to him as of yore men crowded round St. Paul, at Ephesus, to touch him, or be touched by him, and even to imbibe his influence through garments which had received his contact.

"Knowing nothing personally of Dr. Newton, and having small sympathy with what I have read of his views and opinions, I do not write to support him individually. But being fully persuaded of God's power and presence yesterday, to-day, and for ever, and believing that what we call the miraculous is as simple and naturally in the order of His government, as the commonest circumstance of every day life, I would appeal to your readers not to turn contemptuously from these statements, but to receive them with the same wise and reverend patience which one of old time displayed, when he quieted the excitement of the assembly with the remarkable words, 'If this work be of men it will come to naught, but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.'—I remain, Sir, yours obediently,
A SPIRITUALIST, BUT AN ANGLICAN."

LONDON: J. Burns, 15, SOUTHAMPTON ROW, W.C.

The Education of the Country, with some Suggestions on the Subject.

By the Rev. Andrew Robertson, West Melbourne.

Published by George Robertson Melbourne Elizabeth Street.

Mason, Firth, and M'Cutcheon, Printers, Flinders Lane, Melbourne.

Education of the Country.

I DO not deem it necessary to offer an apology for coming forward at this particular crisis with some thoughts and suggestions on the subject of Public Education. Besides being a minister of the gospel, deeply interested in whatever concerns the mental, moral, and religious well-being of the community, I am the citizen of a free country, and have the right as well as the privilege to express my sentiments on any topic which may occupy the public mind, and all the more when it is one upon which it is so needful that the community at large should be fully and correctly informed.

It is now thirty years ago since I began to turn my attention to this question; and from that period to the present I have been more or less engaged in its active agitation. I mention this simply to show that the question is not new to me, and that whatever may be the views which I advance, or the strictures which I offer, they are not the result of hasty or superficial consideration, but the fruits of matured thought and study.

Arriving in Victoria at the close of 1862, I had the pleasing satisfaction of congratulating the late lamented Mr. Heales on his having succeeded in carrying that Act of public instruction which is associated with his honoured name, stating to him how happy I felt in finding myself in a colony which had made such marked and gratifying progress towards solving not a few of those educational problems which were still perplexing and dividing our statesmen and our ecclesiastics at home.

That Act, which is designated the "Common Schools Act," and which is the one at present in force, has never, I have frequently said, received from the people of this country that praise to which it is entitled; nor has it, I conceive, been thoroughly appreciated in regard to its real aims and objects by any who have since attempted to improve on it. It has its defects and omissions, and time has demonstrated that additional legislative provisions must be enacted in order to facilitate the ultimate ends which it contemplates; and it will be my object to show how this, our Common Schools Act, can be perfected so as to meet all the exigencies and requirements of the case.

This Act, when framed, had to deal with schools established prior to its introduction, so that the field was not then clear for an entirely new system. In these circumstances, our Common Schools Act contemplated a twofold object. The first was to provide a good secular education for the children of the colony, and the second, to initiate and encourage a class of public schools which might gradually lead to the absorption of all our denominational schools into national ones; and thus place the whole public educational system of the country where it should be—not in the hands of the sects, but of the citizens. The policy which it embodies is virtually the same as that which is now being pursued by our ablest and most enlightened British statesmen. At this moment they are utilising the denominational schools that exist, and which cannot all at once be suppressed; and yet at the same time making provisions for the ultimate adoption of a completely national system, whereby the denominational schools will be superseded by schools not in any way bound up or connected with churches, but based on the suffrages, support, and management of the people themselves.

As I have observed, Mr. Heales' Act is not free from imperfections, which have impeded its full and successful operation. Of late, however, since the attention of the Board of Education has been turned to these, they have to some extent been rectified; not, however, by an Act of Parliament—which I consider was the only true constitutional course that should have been followed—but by what is called a special educational vote of the Legislative Assembly. For example, the Common Schools Act, as it stands at present, does not admit of any grants of public money being given to schools which have not an average attendance of twenty scholars; but by this special educational vote of the Legislative Assembly, the Board of Education is now supplied with certain sums whereby it has been enabled to plant what are termed Rural and Half-time Schools in the more thinly-populated districts of the colony, and which, as might have been expected, have proved an immense boon to the settlers.

There is still, however, a great defect felt on the part of the Board of Education, and that is power to amalgamate on equitable conditions schools where amalgamation is imperatively demanded, such as at Brunswick and elsewhere, there being about 300 schools throughout the colony which could with advantage be amalgamated into 150. To obtain this power, a draft Bill has been prepared by the Board, which for the last three years has been waiting the adoption of Parliament, which has as yet done nothing in the matter.

Such being the case, it is not at all surprising that the Board has been growing in favour, and that there are many who have no desire whatever to see it interfered with, but merely assisted in its work. Among those inclined, or lately inclined to this course, are the leaders of the Wesleyan body, and those belonging to the Church of England, whom Bishop Perry represents; together with the Board of Education itself, which in the Report of 1870, as well as that of 1871, submitted to His Excellency the Governor, gives it as its unanimous conviction that if the draft Bill drawn up by the Board for the approval of Parliament were passed, including in it a compulsory, tentative clause in regard to education, "the wants (that is, the educational wants) of the country would be adequately met." The members of the Board of Education who gave this as their conviction in 1870, were the Hon. George Harker, the Hon. Michael O'Grady, the Hon. Angus Mackay, and Henry Henty, Esq. Since that period, Mr. Harker has resigned, and Mr. Richardson has been gazetted in his room, while Dr. Cutts has succeeded the late excellent Dr. Corrigan, whose death proved so great a loss to the cause of public education in this colony; but whilst the Board has undergone these changes, the newly-issued Report of 1871 unanimously reasserts its previously-recorded conviction, that if the recommendations submitted by the Board in its Report were adopted by Parliament, "the educational wants of the country would be adequately met."

Now, here I must express my sympathy with the Board of Education, in the extremely difficult and delicate circumstances in which it has all along been placed. It is, from the very nature of the system it administers, a mixed denominational Board, consisting of representatives of the various religious bodies of the colony; and in carrying on its operations it has been hampered and restrained by its own inherent weakness, as well as by the outside denominational interests and feelings which it has had to consult and to contend with. No one, therefore, acquainted with what that Board, constituted as it is, has had to do, but must render it that meed of

commendation which it has, especially of late, so justly merited; but with all the regard which I have for the members of that Board, and with every confidence in its secretary, Mr. Kane, whom I have found to an able, liberal, and advanced educationalist, I cannot concur in the let-alone policy which some would recommend.

The Board itself even, to deal impartially and successfully with new matters of internal denominational contention that have recently arisen, must be emancipated from the fetters with which its action is cramped; and, now that the Ministry of the day has taken up the subject, the country ought to insist on a thorough investigation and settlement of the whole question. Had the Ministry now raised to office let it alone, it probably would have been in vain to hope for the formation of such a public opinion as would have enabled us to settle this question at once and for ever; but now it is different, the question is stirred and should not be allowed to rest until it is put on a fair and permanent footing. "There is a tide," says the great dramatist, "in the affairs of men, which taken at the flood leads on to fortune." Such a tide is now beginning to set in on this question, and if we can but seize it at the flood the friends of an enlightened and unobjectionable system of public instruction will be borne on to victory. This is not indeed, as I hold, a question of party, to be taken up for party purposes. On the contrary, it is a subject for the calm consideration of the citizen, the Christian, and the senator; but while this is the case, experience shows that it is only through the conflicts of parties that the community can be awakened from its lethargy, and led into a full knowledge and just appreciation of the real merits of those public social questions which it is called upon to decide. I look very little, or rather I do not look at all, to mere parties for the adjustment and settlement of this Educational question. Party is a passing and too often a one-sided, biassed, prejudiced thing; principle, however, is permanent and true, and must ever triumph in the long run, so that no party, political or ecclesiastical, need hope to have it in its power to settle this question irrespective of the views and interests of the community as a whole. This is a people's, not a party's question—a parents', not a priests'—and as such must be discussed and determined.

What, then, it may be asked, is the vital point at issue, or what is it in our present educational system that requires immediate eradication or reform? It may be summed up in one word—Denominationalism. Destroy it, remove the denominational element from our system of public instruction, and place the education of the people in the hands, not of the sects, but of the citizens; do this, and you will take away the cause of all the evils and complications that exist, and go far to make this colony, in the matter of public instruction, the first and foremost in the world. In spite of adverse circumstances, some progress has been made in this direction already; but it is slow, and does not promise to be more rapid in the future. The number of public schools, or schools vested in the Board of Education, has increased since 1862 from 193 to 457. I take my facts from the Report of 1870; but there are still 434 denominational schools, including a few private schools which also receive State aid. These denominational schools have diminished, it is true, from 513 to 434, but this is by far too large a number to have upon the list at this advanced period in the history of the Common Schools Act; while from various causes, which I need not particularise, the number is not likely in future to be very largely or speedily reduced. It cannot be so with Roman Catholic schools, which are still slightly on the increase, and which will, of course, multiply with the growth of their denomination; and if the other bodies do not add to the number of their denominational schools, it is simply because it is not deemed wise or expedient at present to do so. The Presbyterians, indeed, have all along from the first displayed a willingness to merge their schools into national ones, but of late they have been refusing to do so, except in a few exceptional cases not worth retaining; the reason for this change of policy on the part of the Presbyterians being the avowed tendency of some of our leading politicians towards a pure and exclusive secularism.

Denominationalism, therefore, if not dealt with now and vigorously, instead of growing weaker will become stronger; and the country, if not roused to energetic action on the subject, will have for many a long day to regret its supineness.

But how can denominationalism, it may be asked, be rooted out, and our public system of instruction purged from this permeating element? Did not Mr. Higinbotham first of all attempt it, and signally fail? He did; but do you know the reasons why? Mr. Higinbotham—than whom one more capable of grappling with this question is not to be found in this colony—did not receive from his colleagues in the Ministry that support to which he was entitled, while his Bill itself was liable to the most grave objections. Not to speak of his insisting by legislative enactment on the kind of religious instruction to be allowed by the local committees in the schools—an error for which I blame, not so much Mr. Higinbotham, as the members of the Royal Commission, of which he happened to be the chairman, Mr. Higinbotham committed two other fatal mistakes. In the provisions of his Bill for the elimination of the denominational element, he required, first, that all schools aided in future by the State should be vested in the Minister of Public Instruction—to many a very doubtful, and, in my opinion, a most dangerous proposition. This was to be done within five years after the passing of his Bill, and then if not complied with—which it would not have been, at least by the Roman Catholics—Mr. Higinbotham gave the country to understand that it would then be an open question for Parliament to consider whether, in such a case, the denomination that did not go into this arrangement might not, after all, have their

State aid continued to their schools, although not vested in the Minister of Public Instruction. The Protestant denominations were not to be caught—they foresaw the danger, and were resolved to keep their own schools in their own power, rather than permit the Roman Catholics to become masters of the situation, after their own Protestant schools had slipped through their fingers. Hence the failure of Mr. Higinbotham's well-meant and, in many respects, admirably-conceived measure. But he has acquired experience from the failure, and when the proper time comes, I have no doubt he will head the movement that is now looming in the horizon.

Next after Mr. Higinbotham's failure came the attempt of the M'Culloch Administration. The draft Bill which they drew up with the same view—namely, the destruction of denominationalism—was, if possible, still more objectionable. It contained propositions which one could perceive at a glance to be utterly impracticable, such as no Minister of Public Instruction that might have been appointed could have carried into execution, while it would have involved an amount of expenditure which the country never would have sanctioned.

So much for the past, now for the present. A new Ministry, pledged to make the Education question a Cabinet one, has just been invested with office, and the Attorney-General is employed in framing a measure by which they intend to stand or fall. This is at least manly on their part, while to me and others, to whom it is a matter of comparative indifference what party is in power, provided the best interests of the country are advanced, the resolution of the present Ministry is a subject of unfeigned satisfaction. What, then, is their scheme? From what fell from the lips of the Chief Secretary, their measure will resemble neither that of Mr. Higinbotham nor that of Sir James M'Culloch's Administration. It will not, in fact, attempt to grapple with denominationalism at all, so far as the immediate destruction of it is concerned, but will allow things to continue in this respect as they are, or rather, more correctly speaking, to develop themselves in the way in which they have been so slowly doing under the administration of the Board of Education; the only difference, and it is slight, between the policy of the Board of Education, as set forth in its reports, and that of the Ministry, as announced by them, being simply this, that they, the Ministry, besides making education free without fees, will stop the further increase of what they call sectarian schools. The Board of Education, after all that has been said against it, may congratulate itself upon having its policy thus endorsed by the Ministry; but will this scheme satisfy the country? So far as the Wesleyans, the Church of England, and even the Presbyterians are concerned, it will not trouble them much, having already got all the denominational schools they care to have in the meantime. The only denomination it will touch will be the Roman Catholic one, who will receive no State aid to whatever new schools they may erect. But is this a vigorous, comprehensive, or far-seeing policy? The stoppage of aid put to the very slight increase of Roman Catholic schools may be deemed by many a masterstroke of policy, both for what it smites and what it spares; but I doubt if it will prove so in the end. With education free, and a compulsory law brought to bear on the community at large, we shall have the Roman Catholics placed in this singular position, either they must send their children to the public schools, or they must send them to those which they themselves establish. If they send them to their own they must pay for them, but if they send them elsewhere they will get their education for nothing, so that the Roman Catholics when this measure comes into play will be dealt with after this fashion—namely, they will be compelled like us Protestants to educate their children, but, unlike us, they will not get education free, not even the secular branches, if they prefer to receive this secular education in their own schools, rather than in those which the Government alone will assist. This, unquestionably, will mark a new era in our colonial history, and introduce an order of things for which it will be impossible in the wide world to find a precedent.

I can hardly believe that the Government seriously intend to agitate the country for such a paltry object as this; and am therefore led to conclude that they are but feeling their way after a wider, more worthy, and statesman-like scheme than that which has been indicated. Indeed, one would be apt to imagine that if this were really the scheme they seriously contemplated, it was nothing more nor less than an artful device, under the pretext of terminating denominationalism at some indefinite period, to rivet it more closely round our necks, by giving the denominationalism that at present exists full time to strike its roots so deeply into the virgin soil of this young and rising colony, as to make it next to impossible for our coming statesmen to eradicate it.

Denominationalism is doomed, but its existence may be needlessly prolonged; and certainly if such a scheme should be adopted by Parliament, denominationalism will hold up its head in this colony for many more years than this generation will witness. I am for its immediate extinction. Our politicians indeed may probably point to England and Scotland, where they are not so much abolishing as utilising denominationalism; but no one who is aware of the complications and difficulties which are experienced in the old countries from the long-standing denominationalism that cannot now be suppressed, would ever counsel a young colony like this, with its mixed and increasing population from all lands, to retain denominationalism in any shape or to any extent in their system of public instruction, for a single instant beyond the time it is in our power to eradicate it.

But is it in our power to eradicate it at present? I maintain that it is, that the present is the most favourable period for doing it; that it can not only be done, but done at once without delay, without involving any additional expenditure to the country; and what is better still, without prejudice or disadvantage to any

denomination, but the reverse, including our Roman Catholics among the number. But before unfolding my plan, I shall first brush away some of the fog into which not a few of our public men have got, who cannot see any way of escape out of denominationalism except by the ultimate introduction of a universal, exclusive, and purely secular system.

This call for secularism proceeds in most cases from not understanding properly what our Common Schools Act is. So far as the Government is concerned, it is as pure a secular system as can possibly be had. Nothing could be more out-and-out secular than our present system of public instruction. There are four hours for secular education prescribed by the Act, and for secular education alone, and there are no hours whatever prescribed in the Act for religious instruction. The religious instruction may or may not be given outside the four hours for secular education; this is for the local committees and parents of the children to decide, and in which the Government is in no way concerned. Government takes no cognisance of it, and gives no pay for it. Accordingly, the Board of Education, which administers the Common Schools Act, wholly ignores it. The instructions given by the Board to inspectors of schools are very explicit. They are enjoined "to bear in mind, in performance of their duty as inspectors of Common Schools, that the Board's superintendence extends only to the temporal regulations and secular efficiency of the schools, and that they are therefore carefully to avoid all interference or expressions of opinion either to the teacher or local committee, respecting their arrangements, if they have any, for imparting religious instruction."

No procedure on the part of the Board could be more in harmony with the spirit and letter of Mr. Heales' Act, which leaves the committees at full liberty—no matter whether of vested or denominational schools—not only to say whether or not religious instruction should be imparted, but to determine, likewise, both the kind and amount of it that should be given.

Surely our secular friends do not mean that this discretionary power should be withdrawn by Act of Parliament, so that no religious instruction can be taught by any one, or at any time, within the walls of our public schools. This is not, I should hope, what the Ministry mean when they speak of an ultimate system of secular instruction.

First of all, such a system exists nowhere, and secondly, it receives no countenance whatever from the firmest friends of civil and religious liberty. The Dissenters of Scotland have ever stood foremost in the ranks of this noble army, and what are their views on this subject? In a declaration issued in 1839, by the Scottish Central Board of Dissenters, and which has been faithfully adhered to ever since, the following resolutions are set forth:—"Any system (says that manifesto) of universal education, which is based on the Legislature giving its sanction to a particular system of religious doctrine and worship, and which is carried into effect by grants of public money for the religious education of the community, is irreconcilable with the rights of conscience and the principles of religious liberty.

"On the other hand (it continues) no system of education can be considered as complete or even safe, which does not contemplate the religious and moral, as well as the intellectual improvement of its subjects. To exclude religious instruction from a system of universal education, if practicable, would be very undesirable; and even if desirable would, in the state of the public mind, be impracticable. The only means (adds this manifesto) of gaining the end (uniting the two kinds of instruction in our national schools) seems to be to provide for the appointment of a local committee in every district where a school is established, consisting of persons chosen by the heads of families, to whom it shall belong to say what kind and measure of religious instruction shall be in the school, and to settle what additional fee should be payable for such instruction. Provision also should be made that where there is a minority who object to this course of religious instruction, their children shall not be subjected to it, nor liable for the additional fee."

Now, this declaration, with the exception of the additional fee for religious instruction which is not insisted on in this colony, proposes substantially the very system in operation amongst us, and I trust there is no intention to depart from it.

No objections in Scotland would be raised against the principles embodied in our Common Schools Act. As to England, the Nonconformists, arising from circumstances into which I do not enter, have lost ground in the educational controversy that is being now waged in England, and some of them seem disposed to fall back upon secularism; yet no one who is at all familiar with the facts, but knows that pure and unalloyed secularism has not the ghost of a chance in England, any more than in Scotland, neither with the people nor the Parliament.

A third, and still weightier reason against secularism is that it would fail in effecting one of the main objects for which a national education is called for.

As Christians we ought not to ignore our own Christianity in our own schools. But not to speak of ourselves as Christians, what is it, which, as citizens, we ask from the State? Is it not security? among other things, security for character, property, and life. For this purpose we have our courts of justice, civil and criminal. But of what use would these courts of justice be in the way of protection, if these courts had no means of securing us against false witnessing? It is by means of the solemnities of an oath that this object is attained.

Now, what is an oath? The oath which we citizens swear is not a heathen but a Christian oath, and embodies some of the most vital truths of our holy religion. It implies for example, a knowledge and belief in God, in a future state, in a universal judgment, and in a final adjudication of rewards and punishment—while he who takes an oath solemnly avows that, as he shall have to answer at the last unto God, he shall tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Now secularism would exclude from the teaching of our public schools all the truths which go to the construction of an oath—the very security which, as citizens, we require for the proper administration of law and justice between man and man. Occasionally we hear or read in newspapers of persons so ignorant that they have no idea either of the nature or meaning of an oath, and whenever a case of this kind occurs there is sure to be a cry for more education—and especially for compulsory education; and yet these secularists who probably are the loudest in the cry, could not on their principles allow a child to be taught in our public schools the truths implied in an oath, or if they did they would contradict themselves by permitting that very religious instruction to be given to which they so inconsiderately object.

Another point to which I would briefly refer is the intention, if I have interpreted the Chief Secretary's remarks aright, to release the teachers of our public schools from the giving of such supplementary religious instruction as the parents may desire their children to receive. I contend that no teacher should be eligible to a school, whose moral character and habits are not unexceptionable, and who is not qualified to impart a knowledge of the simple, primary, elementary truths of morality and religion.

It is well known to those who are conversant with the facts that in not a few of our schools there is no religious instruction at all, partly from the indifference of local committees, who bestow comparatively little attention to the affairs of the schools entrusted to their charge; and partly, and in some instances chiefly, to the indisposition, aversion, or moral unfitness of the teachers to the work. In the report of one of the inspectors of schools, dated Castlemaine, 17th January, 1870, the following statements are made in regard to an extensive and important district, with which I myself have had connection:—"The good schools," says this inspector in his report, "are 35 in number, 65 schools are entitled to be called 'moderate.' The thoroughly bad schools are 15 in number. Of these, it may be said, they are generally placed in low neighbourhoods, taught by low teachers, and often controlled by committees even worse than the teachers. The work of regenerating these schools is hard, especially where the committees are themselves averse to the process, apparently valuing a teacher in proportion to his capacity for perjury and strong drink."

Will such statements be believed, and yet I am quoting from a public document which has actually been presented by the Board of Education to his Excellency the Governor, giving an account of the state of educational matters in the colony? It is time that a system which permits of such committees and teachers being tolerated ought to be reformed, and that no teachers should have committed to them the training of youth whose characters are of the description given in the Board of Education report.

So far from doing anything to lower the moral and religious character of our teachers, we should take care to have our system of public instruction, so framed and administered that our teachers should be men who will find it to be, not their aversion, but their delight to have the opportunity of imparting to their scholars the elementary truths of morality and religion.

Besides, the idea which the Chief Secretary seems to entertain of handing over the religious instruction to the ministers of the various denominations, is not only unworkable except in rare and exceptional cases, but would introduce in its worst and most objectionable form the very sectarianism he is so anxious to extinguish. After the four school hours, the secular teacher, according to the Chief Secretary, is to take his departure, and the ministers of religion are to step into the field. Of course the scholars must be arranged under their different ecclesiastical banners, and either in separate rooms or on different days, the work of supplementary religious instruction will have to be carried on. Thus, the first lesson the children are to receive at school is a lesson in denominationalism, and no doubt they will soon come to know each other in these professedly non-sectarian schools by the distinctive appellations of the sects to which they respectively belong. Happy device, ingenious mode of banishing denominationalism from our public schools!—a mode which I trust, if ever seriously contemplated, will be departed from by those who have undertaken to grapple with this all-important question.

Having cleared the way by these preliminary remarks for the consideration of my scheme for the entire and immediate elimination of that denominationalism which is clogging and impeding the full and successful operation of our present public system of instruction, and which I believe the proposed measure of the Government will tend rather to perpetuate than annihilate, to aggravate than subdue, I now submit my plan.

My first intention was to present it in the shape of an Amended Common Schools Act, but as this would have thrown it into too technical and legal a shape for popular apprehension, I shall content myself with stating it in a few easily-understood propositions.

There are, then, three prominent things in the system, as now existing, from which the denominational element should be extracted.

The first is, the Board of Education; the second, the local committees; and the third, the inequalities made

in the distribution of aid between the two classes of Common Schools, the vested and the non-vested ones.

As to the first—the Board of Education—it is a mixed denominational one, consisting of five laymen; no two of whom, according to the Act, can belong to one and the same religious denomination. As might have been expected, it has had a difficult and delicate task to perform, having had internal denominational contentions to struggle with, as well as outside feelings of the same class to consult and contend with. This Board, which administers the system of public instruction, demands to be speedily reconstructed, and to have its members taken from the citizens, and not as at present from the sects. It should, therefore, when the amended Act comes into force, say a year hence, be dissolved, and a new Board substituted in its stead—to be called the "Education Department," having likewise, as the present Board, a Secretary and a President.

The President should be a member of Parliament, and should be styled "The Minister of Public Instruction," whose duty it should be to preside at the meetings of the Education Department, to give in its yearly reports to Parliament, and to answer in his place such questions as may be put to him. I may simply add that the new Act "for public elementary education in England and Wales" designates the ruling authority by the title I propose, namely, the "Education Department."

As to the local committees, the second thing I mentioned, the sooner we get quit of them, the better for public education in this colony. All along one round of complaint has been heard from the Inspectors of schools, and even now, although somewhat improved by the recent action of the Board, they are still spoken of hopelessly as mere makeshifts for want of something better to put in their place. I would terminate them at once, substituting for them district boards, having, instead of only one school, several schools under their charge. Besides the present local committees proving in general a failure, they are practically denominational in all the non-vested schools; and to the extent to which any denomination may succeed in establishing schools, to the same extent it has in its hands the educational patronage of the colony. All teachers may be legally entitled to apply for vacant schools, but does the country imagine that these vacancies are filled up irrespective of denominational preferences and connections? Give to the district boards the powers of the local committees in the selection and appointment of teachers, and you put an extinguisher on this peculiar species of patronage at once, by placing all teachers on the same level, and giving to each and all of them a fair and equal chance.

Now, this idea of district boards is one which has often been thought of by educationalists; it has been taken advantage of by Mr. Forster, in his measure for England, while it has been unanimously approved of by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, which adopted the following resolution:—"That school districts should be formed, and that the board for each district should have the supervision of all the schools in its district;" and that the members of these boards "should be elected by the ratepayers and parents for a specified period, and that a certain proportion of them should retire annually, parents being ratepayers having a double vote."

Such district boards would, as the Rev. Mr. Nish, of Sandhurst, remarked to Sir James M'Culloch, "work well in this colony, and would have a dignity and responsibility which local committees do not possess."

In these district boards you would have men who would really advance the cause of education, while a seat in these boards would be coveted by the best portion of our citizens as much, if not more than a seat in Parliament itself, both for the honour and usefulness it would bring.

The third, and not the least important amendment I would submit is the placing of all schools that receive Government support on precisely the same footing, whether vested in the Education Department or not. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church suggests that all vested schools should be the property of the district in which they are situated; but whether the property of the districts or vested in denominational bodies, these ought, I conceive, to be treated alike in regard to grants for repairs, &c. The vested schools are privileged in this respect, and it was done purposely to induce the denominations to merge their schools into national ones, and in several instances this has succeeded, but it will not succeed now. The fact is that the denominations are beginning to feel that the possession of their schools is making them the actual masters of the situation, and hence the extreme tenderness with which it is proposed to deal with them in the present proposed measure of Mr. Francis' Cabinet, in which the Church of England schools and those of the other denominations are to be continued with this proviso, that no more sectarian schools are to be permitted to go upon the public exchequer—by which it is well known the Roman Catholic schools are chiefly aimed at, although the increase of such schools can be but small. Such an attempt to abolish denominationalism is not deserving of the name of an attempt, it is rather a confession of impotence; an acknowledgment that they are afraid to touch denominationalism, except in the infinitesimal way they have indicated, marvellously harmless to the Protestant sects, but somewhat needlessly provoking to the Roman Catholics, giving them, however, just that sufficient amount of fighting ground, which they will no doubt turn to profitable account in that earnest struggle which the ministerial proposals will originate, but cannot possibly terminate. The programme of the ministry as shadowed forth by them, may be policy as practised by politicians in this colony, but it is unstatesman-like and short-sighted. Boldly face the question, and deal with it, not on the passing prejudices and party expediencies of

the hour, but on the broad and enduring principles of equity and truth. Applying this maxim to the case before us, abolish the Board of Education as now denominationally constructed, and establish a non-sectarian Education Department; sweep away the local committees as being hindrances, not helps, in the way of a progressive and well-conducted system of public instruction, and substitute district boards in their place; and then, having freed the system from the noxious element of denominationalism, put all your schools, vested and non-vested, on the same level, treating them alike as to building, repairs, &c.; and not only as to this, but likewise in regard to their right of standing on the same platform—the vested schools having no greater claims on the Education Department than the non-vested—a thing which is not done, for reasons already stated, under the present system, but which will now, after what has transpired, lead in future, if persevered in, to serious complication and most bitter sectarian animosities. If vested schools are to have a preference over non-vested in the giving or withdrawing of aid, it requires little penetration to perceive how this can be brought to bear, not only on the future schools that may be established, but on those that already exist; not only those of the Church of Rome, but of the Church of England as well. The result of the whole in this case would be that all our non-vested schools will by-and-bye be turned into private ones, and with a higher course of instruction and with a superior class of teachers, the public schools will be driven to the wall, or converted into mere charity schools for the children of the poorer portion of the community.

But it may be said, if you give grants for repairs, &c., to the non-vested schools, the owners of these may withdraw from the control of the Education Department, and a great deal of money lost to the country. I would insert a clause in the amended Act to prevent this, to the effect that in the case of any common school, not vested in the Education Department, desiring to withdraw from it, due notice should be given of this intention, and a valuation made of what ought to be refunded to the Education Department for the grants for repairs, &c., that have been allowed to the school.

Now, such a power of withdrawal is essential, I contend, to the efficient working of a system of public instruction. The late Dr. Chalmers used to say that an Established Church required a body of Dissenters to keep it right and active; so unless there be freedom of educational action there will be no sufficient security against inertness, and it may be departmental wrongheadedness, or it may be improper Ministerial influence and abuse.

Having made these suggestions as to the Board of Education, the local committees, and the vested and non-vested schools, I do not intend to complicate the matter by any further suggestions, except to submit for consideration the propriety of doing away entirely with all the limiting clauses of the Common Schools Act, as to the average number of scholars required, the distances between schools, &c., all which restrictions are not only fettering the freedom, expansion, and flexibility of our public system of instruction, in a country which, above all others, is subject to constant changes and fluctuations in population, and towns, &c., but which limiting clauses are not needed, especially when the Education Department will have to meet the wants of the country in regard to schools, not on denominational grounds, but on the simple merits of each case; and when this department, directly responsible to Parliament, will have to satisfy the country, through its representatives, as to the equity and necessity of its procedure.

In conclusion, an amended Act, embodying the propositions I have stated, would require to give immediate power to the Board of Education to prepare the way for the new Act coming into force, by mapping the country and towns into school districts, and taking steps for the coming election of the district boards.

Thus, in the course of a single year, we might enter on a new era of educational progress and improvement, freeing this young and rising colony from the curse of national animosities and of sectarian strifes, keeping our rulers to the task which properly falls to them, and which involves the most sacred trust that any order of men can have committed to them in a free and democratic country, that is, to protect us in our civil and religious rights, and to deal out justice between man and man, and between all of us alike, on the safe, enduring, and unassailable ground of an equal and a common citizenship.

Mason, Firth, and M'Cutcheon, Printers, Flinders Lane West, Melbourne.

Papers Relative to Mr. E. Brandon's Case.

[FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION.]

Printed at the "New Zealand Times" Office Wellington Willis Street. MDCCCLXXV

I HAVE been induced to publish the following papers on account of the conduct of the Government throughout the affair;—I was suspended from my duties at a moment's notice, and all papers in my office (both public and private) taken possession of, on the 17th August last. Although frequent application was made I could not get particulars of the charges against me until the 10th September following—a lapse of twenty-four days. The inquiry commenced on the 17th September, and closed on the 22nd, yet I was not furnished with a copy of the Report until the 28th October following—a period of seventy-two days from the date of suspension.

During this time rumours of a nature very seriously affecting me were rife, and although I was acquitted of all the grave charges, and blamed for mere irregularities, the Government, neither directly nor indirectly published such acquittal; refused me a copy of the evidence taken on the enquiry, and when they did make

known through the *Gazette* the decision of the Commissioners, it was done in a most unfair way, and by a notice so garbling the Report of the Commissioners that doubts were left in the minds of many persons as to the true result of the enquiry, and inferences were left to be drawn very prejudicial to my character.

Serious charges affecting my integrity, and others of irregularity and habitual negligence had been made. The Commissioners had entirely acquitted me of the grave charges, and reported that those of habitual negligence and inefficiency could not be supported; yet, in the public notification of my removal from the Stamp Department no allusion is made to my acquittal of the grave charges, or that "the certain charges proved, and in fact admitted," were those which the Commissioner's decided were irregularities only, leaving, as I have before stated, much to be inferred.

E. Brandon.

Wellington,

2nd August, 1875.

Papers Relative to Mr. E. Brandon's Case.

[FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION.]

Stamp Office, Wellington,

18th August, 1874.

SIR,

I am directed by the Acting the Hon. the Commissioner of Stamps to request that you will *at once* present yourself at the office of the Auditor-General.

I have, &c.,
W. H. WARREN.

H. E. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Wellington,

21st August, 1864.

SIR,

As four days have now elapsed since I received your letter intimating my suspension from office, pending an enquiry to be made in reference to the issue of certain stamps, I have the honor to request that I may be informed of the nature of the charge against me, and of the time and place, when and where the gentlemen to whom the enquiry has been entrusted will sit, and that I may be allowed to be present when the enquiry is conducted and any evidence taken.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon. the Commissioner of Stamps
Wellington.

Wellington,

24th August, 1874.

SIR,

Referring again to your letter of the 17th instant, intimating my suspension from office, I have the honor to request a reply to my letter of the 21st instant, in which I asked to be informed of the specific charges which are made against me. Permit me to urge that it is unfair to me that charges should be made and investigated without any intimation to me of the character of those charges. The fact of my suspension has naturally become public, and rumours of a serious character have arisen from it, which would at once be set at rest by a disclosure of the specific charges against me.

Under these circumstances, I beg that you will be good enough to communicate the charge to me without further delay.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon. the Commissioner of Stamps,
Wellington.

Wellington,

10th September, 1874.

SIR,

Referring to previous communications addressed by you to the Commissioner of Stamps requesting to be informed as to the specific charges made against you, I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of charges preferred against you in your capacity as Chief Clerk and Accountant of the Stamp Department at Wellington.

If you deny the truth of the charges, you will please inform me in writing without delay, so that an enquiry may be held in accordance with the Civil Service Acts.

I have, &c.,
Mr. H. E. de B. Brandon,
WILLIAM H. REYNOLDS,

Wellington.
Acting Commissioner of Stamp Duties.

Copy of Charges

Against Mr. Henry Eustace de Bathe Brandon, Chief Clerk and Accountant in the Stomp Department at Wellington, preferred by and on behalf of the said Department:—

- That he has on divers days between the dates hereafter particularly set forth, and while acting as such Chief Clerk and Accountant, received from the persons hereinafter mentioned various sums of money covering requisitions for duty stumps intended to be supplied to the persons applying for the same, which stamps have been supplied but the moneys received for the same by the said Henry Eustace de Bathe Brandon have not been paid into the public account or otherwise accounted for according to law, that is to say:—
 - ¶ That on a day between the 3rd day of April, 1871, and the 30th day of April in the same year, he received the proceeds of a Post-office Order for £9 11s. 2d, which had been sent to the department by one H. I. Jones, of Wanganui.
 - ¶ That on a day between the 31st day of March last and the 8th day of April last he received the sum of £5 11s. 7d. from one Walter Hislop, of Featherston.
 - ¶ That on a day between the 18th day of June and the 24th June last, he received from one J. W. Gannaway, postmaster at Foxton, a sum of £5.
 - ¶ That on a day between the 5th day of June last and the 24th June last, he received from one—Roberts,

Postmaster at Alevandra, the sum of £4 17s. 6d.

- That he has at divers times, and particularly in the cases before mentioned, supplied stumps to stamp distributor's and other's contrary to the rules of the Stamp Department.
- That he has at various times, and particularly during the months of April, May, and June last, unlawfully been engaged in dealing in buying and selling duty stamps.
- That he unlawfully has, or lately had, in his possession duty stamps, the property of the Government, and particularly certain promissory note stumps.
- That he has acted as agent for various persons in passing legacy and succession duty accounts, and in procuring deeds to be stomped and registered, and otherwise acting in such matters contrary to his duty.
- That he has been habitually negligent in the discharge of his official duties, and has discharged his said duties in an inefficient manner, and has been guilty of such offences, breaches of duty, and other misconduct as to render it unfit that he should remain in the Civil Service of the Colony.

Wellington,

9th September, 1874.

Wellington,

12th September, 1874.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., covering certain charges preferred against me by and on behalf of the Stamp Department, and in reply thereto I have to inform you that I deny the charges made against me in so far as they impute misconduct on my part, and I am quite prepared to submit to an enquiry.

I trust that in appointing a Board to investigate the charges in question, the selection may fall upon officers who may fairly be considered impartial enquirers.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon the Commissioner of Stamps,
Wellington.

Wellington,

16th September, 1874.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 15th instant, intimating that an enquiry will be held respecting the charges preferred against me on Thursday, the 17th instant, and I have to request that you will kindly inform me whether I will be permitted the assistance of Counsel to attend and watch on my behalf.

I am, &c.,

E. BRANDON.

J. S. Williams, Esq.,
Wellington.

Wellington,

16th September, 1874.

SIR,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this day's date, in which you ask whether you will be permitted the assistance of Counsel to attend and watch the case in your behalf. In reply I have to inform you, that taking into consideration the nature of the accusations made against you, it has been decided to allow you the assistance of Counsel to attend and watch the case in your behalf.

I am, &c.,

J. S. WILLIAMS.

E. de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

The examination of witnesses on either side having terminated, Mr. Brandon, in addressing the Commissioners, said :—

I understand that the charges of improper conduct with reference to the stamps and money received by me (as far as any imputation of fraud or dishonesty is concerned) have been withdrawn. The enquiry, therefore, has been confined to an attempt to prove neglect and inefficiency on my part in the discharge of my duties in connection with the Stamp Department, and the transaction for certain professional gentlemen of some business unconnected with the Stamp Department. On the general charge of neglect and inefficiency, the chief evidence was tendered by the late Deputy-Commissioner and Secretary for Stamps, who repudiated all responsibility in connection with the accounts of the office.

Mr. Batkin was charged with the initiation of the Act in 1866, and the construction and procedure of the head and principal offices, and all regulations connected with the inauguration of the department. He was for five years connected with the department as its head, and acquainted, as he must have been, with the large and increasing work and pecuniary responsibility of the office, and of the nature of the work required at the hands of the officers employed in it, I submit that it is inconsistent and unjust that he should now appear as a witness on a charge of general misconduct and inefficiency of the chief officer of the department under him, particularly after he has ceased to be connected with the department since December, 1872.

While acting as Deputy-Commissioner for the Province of Wellington, and Secretary of Stamps for the whole Colony, it was clearly his duty to see that the officers employed by him were not only efficient, but were regular in their attendance; and, if inefficiency or neglect on the part of any officer were discovered, to point out the error, reprimand the officer, or take such other steps as he might deem necessary to ensure the proper working of the department.

It has been allowed in evidence that the officers of the Stamp Department have had to contend with great difficulties : Pressure of work, consequent upon the change in the stamp laws, has entailed upon them very considerable additions to their ordinary duties; and when it is remembered that in almost every transaction of the office either cash or revenue of the Government is involved, I need scarcely point out the absolute necessity for the exercise of the greatest care and correctness in every entry.

Throughout the whole evidence but one thing seems apparent, and that is, that I have been held individually responsible for every action (and of each officer) of the department. Remittances of cash or stamps not having been brought on charge; invoices not being prepared in proper form (these are all printed); requisitions not being made out; audit queries not being answered; audit memoranda not being attended to, and even to the record of all registered letters or parcels leaving the department, I have been held responsible for; Mr. Batkin, although my immediate superior officer repudiating all responsibility.

Not only having my own duties as Chief Clerk and Accountant to perform, I have had to instruct all other officer's of the department in their several duties, and, in every instance where error has occurred, to assume the responsibility.

If Mr. Batkin is correct in his theory, that he, as head, is not responsible, why am I held so?

I do not deny my responsibility for any errors in the accounts of the office since 1872 (the date of Mr. Batkin's retirement), although the compilation of those accounts form a portion of the work of Mr. Withers, the third clerk in the department.

Mr. Batkin acknowledges that I have endeavoured to do too much; that I have taken, in fact, on my shoulders more work than, in his opinion, I was able to perform; that I have not had the usual leave accorded to

other officers of the service; and that I might have been irregular in my attendance in the morning, but I have more than compensated for that by my constant attendance after the usual hours.

These points tend to show, not an habitual neglect or indifference on my part, but, on the contrary, an over zealous desire to fulfil the requirements of the department; and whatever laches there may have been I was not, I submit, alone responsible.

Subsequently to the retirement of Mr. Batkin (and I submit that by far the largest portion, if not all the alleged irregularities are stated to have occurred while he was connected with the department), I have had the entire management and control of the department; and especially during the present year both the Auditor-General and his officers have acknowledged not only that the accounts of the Stamp Department have been more promptly rendered, but that the general working of the department has been more satisfactory.

Taking into consideration the rapid progress of the Stamp Office throughout the Colony, and the difficulty of officers in other Provinces becoming immediately acquainted with the requirements of the original and four (4) amending Acts, it cannot but be expected that in some of the details of the departmental work errors and discrepancies should arise.

Referring now to detail, and more especially to the "Deposit Cash Book," it appeared that the entries were not made, or the book balanced in accordance with the Treasury Regulations; but the book was one seldom used, as was proved by the fact that the last two entries were made in December, 1872, and in February, 1874. The feet of the "nil" returns not having been forwarded during that period is one which will, I think, be considered of little importance, inasmuch as had moneys been paid in, or the account operated upon in any way, the Treasury would have been apprised of the fact by the officer whose duty it was to make the copies of the cash books.

The practice with regard to the receipt, custody, and accounting of stamps received from the clerks of the various Courts throughout the Colony (as detailed by me in my examination in chief, and the written statement appended thereto) has been borne out to the fullest extent by the subsequent evidence of Mr. Batkin; and I need scarcely remind the Commission that the stamps in my possession, received on this account, amounting to nearly one hundred pounds in value, were proved by subsequent examination to be perfectly correct. These stamps were handed over by me immediately on my suspension.

Referring now to the numerous Audit memoranda and queries, I need scarcely point out that not only in investigating the query, or searching for the information required, does it take time and require uninterrupted attention, but necessitates also a thorough knowledge of the accounts of the office. This duty I have in no instance been able to delegate to another officer of the department, consequently, when other work of a more pressing nature, or the daily routine work of the office required my immediate attention, these audit queries have of necessity had to remain over until time and opportunity offered. I would also remark that all information required by any queries on the accounts of the Stamp Department might have been obtained at once by the personal attendance of the Audit officer, whose duty it was to obtain the information had he chosen to do so—all accounts and books of the office being at his command. I cannot, therefore, see that when under pressure of other work I was unable immediately to give that information which was obtainable within two hundred (200) yards of the Audit Office, that circumstance should have prevented the auditing of any relative accounts. I mention this to show that when information was required it might have been obtained from the original account books of the office, and by personal examination.

The anomalous position in which I have for nearly two years been placed—I allude to having the entire responsibility of the head office, but the status of "Chief Clerk" only (representations of the latter not receiving that attention which would be accorded to the former) has rendered it exceedingly difficult for me at times to carry on the department. The occasional absence from Wellington of the Minister of the department has at times caused considerable delay and inconvenience. I allude more especially to the fact that all Audit memorandum and queries had to be signed by the Minister before return to Audit.

While practically responsible for the general conduct of the department throughout the Colony—for the instructions given to, and the correspondence with the Deputy-Commissioner of each Province, and for the proper collection of duties under the different Schedules of the Acts by each officer of the department, I have yet remained in the same position I was six (6) years since.

The revenue and general work of the office have considerably augmented. From time to time work has increased, necessitating on my part constant attendance at night-time at the office, yet there has never been hesitation on my part. I have never hesitated to sacrifice my own time or convenience whenever I thought it my duty to attend to the interest of the Government, trusting that at some time or other my endeavours would be appreciated.

In speaking of the work of the office, I may mention that during the past financial year over two million (2,000,000) cheque forms alone were counted, stamped, re-examined and issued, besides all the usual supplies to the various sub-officers and others throughout the Colony. And the value of the stamps received and issued

(and for the value of which I was accountable) last year amounted to £93,320 13s. 10d.

With every agency of each Bank in the Colony I keep a current account, and the balance held by these Banks is over £35,000. Besides these, there are nearly one hundred depositaries whose returns are rendered quarterly, and have each to be examined, recorded, and filed. The bonds of these depositaries vary from £10 to £200, while the total stamps at present out represents in value something like £6,000.

Legacy, succession, and residuary accounts of every estate in the Colony are, since January 1st, 1873, registered in this office. The estates for the last year are about the total value of £38,000.

If, as I understand Mr. Batkin, it is my duty to make up or assist in the making up succession and other accounts for all persons, professional or otherwise, I should require a staff of competent clerks for the special purpose, as such accounts are complained of as being complicated in the extreme, and very difficult to understand.

The duties I have had to perform, and the responsibility in connection therewith, cannot, I think, be viewed as light or insignificant. I have had many difficulties to contend with, and situated as I have before stated, practically acting as, and with the responsibility of Secretary for Stamps, but with the status of Chief Clerk only, my actions and even expressions of opinion have been fettered, from not being able to take such action as my nominal position of "Chief Clerk" did not warrant.

I would submit the letter books of the office, and the many minutes, &c., on subjects connected with the department to show whether in my higher capacity as Acting-Secretary inefficiency can be substantiated; and I would remark that there is not a single charge or complaint as to the higher and more responsible duty of conducting the correspondence or general conduct of the department throughout the Colony.

Referring to the charge of having acted as agent occasionally for Mr. Borlase and others, any work I may have done has not in any way affected the Government, or interfered with the working of the department. Granted that some deeds may have been registered in office hours, yet every officer is allowed half-an-hour every day for his own purposes, and I submit there is nothing in the Civil Service Regulations against my having acted as I have done. Regulation No. 5 is explicit, and the rule is that where a regulation is express against officers holding certain specified situations, the inference is that there is no objection to their holding others not specified, so long as there is no interference with their duties to the Government.

In conclusion, I would say that I have devoted much time and hard study to the working, and in the interest of the office, and have become acquainted with the requirements of the Acts and the decisions of various authorities. I have taken up this office, *con amore*, as I would a profession, and have studied hard to master the intricacies of residuary, succession, and other accounts; as also the requirements of the Act generally.

I have endeavoured in all cases to do my duty to the best of my ability; and when it is considered the large pecuniary responsibility that for years past I have had, and, after a months' strict investigation into my books and accounts, not the value of one single farthing, either in cash or stamps, is found wanting. I would sincerely trust that the Board will not arrive at the conclusion that, even if they deemed any of the irregularities complained of proved, they are such as will in any way justify the deprivation of an office I have for so many years filled.

23rd September, 1874.

E. BRANDON.

Memorandum.

JOINED the Stamp Department at the commencement, in September, 1866, as Junior Clerk @ £175 per annum. Appointed Chief Clerk and Accountant (on retirement of Mr. Parsons) early in 1868 and salary increased to (I think) £250. In July, 1869, salary raised to £300, and has since remained at that.

Revenue of the Stamp office last year was £95,000, and my estimate, accepted by Cabinet, for next year is £100,000, at a cost of about £3,080. The Department is worked cheaper now than it has been for some years, and yet mostly officers (except myself) have received increases. Additions to salary to every officer in my office are given each year.

E. BRANDON.

Telegram from G. M. O'Rorke, Esq.

Joshua Williams, Auckland.

Regt. Gen. Lands, Wellington.

WHEN I took charge of Stamp Department I was much annoyed at incessant queries from Audit office about Mr. Brandon's accounts, but in nearly all cases Mr. Brandon was able to give satisfactory explanations, and the Audit complaints ceased entirely in a month or two and I had no further trouble on that score. There were a few cases of insubordination on the part of officers of the Department, but I think Mr. Brandon was in all these cases in the right. I found Mr. Brandon a painstaking and obedient officer and have repeatedly expressed my opinion that the prejudice which I heard existed against him was an unjust one. I am sorry to hear of his official conduct being the subject of an enquiry, but can express no opinion on the subject as it has arisen since my retirement from Ministry.

G. M. O'RORKE.

NOTE.—It should be here remembered that the accounts referred to were not individual accounts but related to the various Stamp Offices of the Colony.

E. BRANDON.

I would like to have referred to the evidence here, but as will be seen by Mr. Cooper's letter of 12th December, a copy was refused me.

Report of the Commissioners.

To His Excellency the Right Honorable Sir James Fergusson, Bart., Governor of New Zealand, &c.

MAY it please your Excellency—We the undersigned, having been appointed by your Excellency to enquire into the truth of certain charges preferred against Mr. H. E. de B. Brandon, Chief Clerk and Accountant in the Stamp Department at Wellington, beg respectfully to submit the following report for your Excellency's consideration :—

As soon as the charges and Mr. Brandon's reply were laid before us, we gave notice of the time and place of the intended enquiry to Mr. Brandon, and thereupon received a letter from him in which he asked that he might have the assistance of counsel to conduct his case.

It appeared to us that although in an ordinary enquiry respecting the conduct of a civil servant, it would be highly inexpedient to allow counsel to appear, yet as the charges against Mr. Brandon seemed to implicate him in accusation which might render him liable to a criminal prosecution, it was not unreasonable to grant his request.

During the first two days of the enquiry, Mr. Travers appeared as counsel for Mr. Brandon, and during the whole investigation, which occupied five days, Mr. Reid, the assistant law officer, attended on behalf of the Crown.

The first specific case mentioned in charge No. 1 was withdrawn. We find that the other allegations set forth in charge No. 1 have been proved, and the truth of them is in fact admitted by Mr. Brandon.

We find that in two other instances, in addition to those mentioned in charge No. 1 that Mr. Brandon as chief clerk and accountant, has received money for stamps, has supplied the stamps and has not paid the money received for them to the Public Account. About the 20th May last, stamps to the value of £8 were thus supplied to the Postmaster at Bulls, Rangitikei. About the 8th of March last, stamps to the value of £2 17s were thus supplied to the Postmaster at Castle Point.

It does not appear that in any other cases Mr. Brandon has in his official capacity received money for stamps and has not accounted for it.

The question arises, whether, in the above cases, Mr. Brandon was guilty of fraud, or grave irregularity only. To establish a case of fraud against Mr. Brandon, it would be necessary to show that the stamps supplied by him were the property of the Government.

Of this there is no evidence nor any reasonable presumption. There are but two possible ways in which Mr. Brandon could have possessed himself of stamps wrongfully.

When stock of stamps on hand was taken by the Audit Department in 1870, it appeared that the stock was in excess of what should have been on hand according to the requisitions for stamping. This discrepancy has never been satisfactorily explained, and it might be suggested that the excess was greater even than appeared, and that stamps were then withdrawn from stock by Mr. Brandon, and concealed from the Audit Office.

Mr. Brandon kept the keys of the stamping-room—of the stamping-machines, of the boxes in which the dies are kept, and the safe. It would have been possible for Mr. Brandon to act in collusion with the stamper, or to impress stamps by himself at night.

We could not find any reasonable grounds to suspect that Mr. Brandon had obtained stamps by either of the modes above stated.

There do not appear to have been any other means by which Sir. Brandon would have become possessed of the stamps the property of the Government.

In the cases above stated to have been established against Mr. Brandon, the requisitions and the cash were forwarded to him in error, and should have been addressed to the Deputy-Commissioner at the local office. Mr. Brandon's duty was, not to supply the stamps required, but to have handed the requisitions and cash to the Deputy-Commissioners, who would then have forwarded the stamps to the parties.

As to charge No. 3. This charge appears to point to a breach of the Stamp Act by Mr. Brandon, in acting as a stamp distributor without a license. Mr. Brandon has by his own admission frequently sold and exchanged stamps, but it is doubtful whether he has "professed or held himself to be a distributor or vendor of stamps" so as to render himself liable to the penalties imposed by the 18th section of the Stamp Act of 1867.

On Mr. Brandon's suspension there were found in his private drawer seven 2s promisory note stamps, certain adhesive stamps attached to a private letter of Mr. Brandon's and 563 twopenny and 43 fourpenny adhesive stamps in an envelope.

No stock of either impressed or adhesive stamps, the property of the Government, is kept in Mr. Brandon's office : and therefore there is no *prima facie* reason why these stamps should be Government property. Mr. Brandon claims the impressed stamps, and the stamps attached to his letter as his own; but states that the adhesive stamps are the property of the Government, having been returned to the office some years ago by some person or persons unknown.

We find there is no evidence to rebut Mr. Brandon's claim of property in the impressed stamps and in the stamps attached to the letter, but his conduct in not bringing the other adhesive stamps to charge and keeping them in a drawer used by him for his private papers is highly reprehensible.

It appears that Mr. Brandon assisted divers persons in passing legacy and succession duty accounts; so long as this was done gratuitously it was very much for the benefit of the department and part of Mr. Brandon's duty that he should assist in unravelling these intricate matters.

We find by Mr. Brandon's own admission, on two occasions he received fees from persons for making out these accounts. Mr. Brandon conceives that he had Mr. Batkin's permission to adopt this course, if the work for which the fees were received were done out of office hour's. This Mr. Batkin denies, and it is impossible to believe that he would have given such permission.

We think that Mr. Brandon has committed a grave offence in thus allowing himself to become agent for the tax-payer, while he was himself the officer appointed to collect the tax.

Mr. Brandon is further charged with procuring deeds to be stamped and registered and other matters. There seems to be no regulation about work of this kind being done after office hours, and the charge resolves into one of occupying in private business, time which should have been devoted to his official duties.

It is admitted on all hands that Mr. Brandon has given to his duties time considerably beyond the usual office hours. The total amount of agency business done by Mr. Brandon does not appear large, and Mr. Brandon's explanation that the work was done so as not to interfere with the business of the office may be accepted.

There is no doubt that some time ago irregularities of various kinds took place in the Stamp Department; some of these were inexcusable, others may be accounted for by the pressure of business in the office.

These irregularities were known at the time to Mr. Brandon's superior, and if they seriously affected his character as an officer, it is as fair to assume that he would not have been left as the only permanent head of so important a department when Mr. Batkin gave up the office of Secretary for Stamps at the end of 1872.

During the year 1873 one serious instance of breach of duty occurred on Mr. Brandon's part, but in other respects few matters arising since the beginning of that year appeared to have called for the censure of the Commissioners of Audit.

Of late, according to the testimony of the Auditor-General the business of the office has been conducted in a more satisfactory manner.

At the time of Mr. Brandon's suspension there appears to have been arrears of work in the office, certain papers which ought to have been filed as records were not so filed, and these papers are stated to have been in confusion. The confusion may possibly be in part accounted for by Mr. Brandon's sudden suspension and the consequent absence of an opportunity to arrange his papers prior to handing over charge of the office to Mr. Warren.

On the whole, while it is certain that Mr. Brandon's conduct has been irregular, we do not think that the irregularities proved are sufficient, apart from the specific charges, to support a charge of habitual negligence and inefficiency. The specific charges hardly point to negligence and inefficiency, but to offences of a distinct character.

Mr. Brandon complains, and to a certain extent justly, that he has been placed in a false position, and that he in fact had to perform the duties of Secretary for Stamps as well as those of Chief Clerk and Accountant.

It appeal's from the evidence that a large amount of work and heavy responsibilities were imposed on Mr. Brandon—that he was not subject to any effective supervision, and that the staff of the office was inadequate. We respectfully submit that in dealing with his case his peculiar position should be taken into consideration.

We think that Mr. Brandon should receive some punishment for the grave irregularities he has been guilty of, but we respectfully submit to your Excellency that dismissal from the Civil Service of the colony would be an unnecessarily severe sentence.

We would respectfully call your Excellency's attention to the necessity of some changes in the organisation of the Stamp Department, as shown by the evidence that came before us, and especially of some more satisfactory check than exists at present in the use of the machine for impressing stamps.

JOSHUA STRANGE WILLIAMS,
T. S. WESTON.

Dated at Wellington this 25 day of September, 1874.

I may here mention that I had repeatedly brought under notice the absolute necessity for some more satisfactory check in the stamping machinery, and in July last, on my earnest recommendation, a sum of £300 was placed on the Estimates for new machinery.—E. B.

THE enquiry commenced on the 17th September, 1874, and for the first two days Mr. Travel's attended on my behalf, being however, very busy with a case in the Admiralty Court, which was then sitting, he requested me to release him from further attendance, at the same time informing me that the graver charges had either broken down or been withdrawn. A report subsequently obtained currency that other reasons had induced Mr. Travel's to "abandon" the case. Appended is a letter from that gentleman :—

Wellington,

17th March, 1875.

MY DEAR SIR,

It is quite untrue that I discontinued to act before the Commissioners on your behalf in consequence of any belief that you would not come out with clean hands. I was very busy at the time, and it being quite clear that the graver charges against you had broken down and that you could only be found to have committed breaches of discipline, I requested you to relieve me from further attendance as you were quite competent to meet these charges yourself.

Yours truly,

WM. THOS. LOCKE TRAVERS.

E. de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Colonial Secretary's Office, Wellington,

28th October, 1874.

SIR,

With reference to the series of charges preferred against you as Chief Clerk and Accountant in the Stamp Department at Wellington, copy of which was furnished to you on the 10th September ultimo, and with reference to your letter of date September 12 th, in which you "deny the charges made in so far as they impute misconduct on your part," I have now, in accordance with the request made in your letter of the 16th instant, to forward for your information copy of the Report made to His Excellency the Governor by the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the truth of those charges.

His Excellency has been pleased to direct that the action of the Government in this case shall be guided by the opinion expressed by the Commissioners, viz., "that you should receive some punishment for the grave irregularities of which you have been guilty, but that dismissal from the Civil Service would be an

unnecessarily severe sentence."

Accordingly it has been determined that you shall not be reinstated in your position in the Stamp Department, but that employment shall be found for you in some other office; that your salary shall be reduced to two hundred pounds per annum, at which rate you will be paid from the date of your suspension from office, and that you should be directed to hold yourself in readiness to proceed at short notice to any part of the Colony at which your services may be required.

I have, &c.,
DANIEL POLLEN.

H. E. de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Wellington,

October 30th, 1874.

SIR,

I have the honor to enclose a Memorial praying for a reconsideration of the decision lately given in the matter of the recent enquiry (under the Civil Service Acts) affecting me, and respectfully request that you will be good enough to lay the same before His Excellency the Governor in Council.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Wellington.

To His Excellency Sir James Fergusson, Bart., Governor of New Zealand, &c., &c.,

The Memorial of Henry Eustace de Bathe Brandon, an officer of the Civil Service of New Zealand, resident in Wellington, sheweth,—

Your memorialist has received with pain and regret the decision arrived at by the Government in the matter of the recent enquiry into the truth of certain charges preferred against him as Chief Clerk and Accountant of the Stamp Department at Wellington, namely:—

"Accordingly it has been determined that you shall not be reinstated in your position in the Stamp Department, but that employment shall be found for you in some other office. That your salary shall be reduced to two hundred pounds per Annum, at which rate you will be paid from the date of your suspension from office, and that you should be directed to hold yourself in readiness to proceed at short notice to any part of the Colony at which your services may be required."

And your memorialist respectfully prays that your Excellency will be pleased to recommend a reconsideration of the above decision on the following grounds:—

Your memorialist conceives that the omission in the Report of the Commissioners to show in what manner the stamps dealt with by him came into his possession may have prejudiced his case, having left it open to surmises unfavourable, as well as otherwise, and would explain, that during the period he acted under the supervision of Mr. Batkin, and previous to the separation of the local from the head office, in December, 1872, it was the custom of Postmasters and others requiring stamps, occasionally, to make remittances to the office in postage or duty stamps (the latter probably being unsaleable, or not required by them). In many instances, when this was done, instead of getting these stamps converted into money by application to stamp distributors (in which there was very often great difficulty) he paid the value of them himself out of his own money in order that the full remittance might be paid to the credit of the Public Account in the Bank, and he put aside the stamps so dealt with until opportunity should occur of converting them into money, or otherwise utilising them; or, in other words, the stamps he received were received on Government account, and could not be converted into money by any direct method, and having, for the purpose of simplifying the accounts, paid into the Bank to the Public Account the value of those stamps, he kept them and used them again on Government service when opportunity occurred.

The Commissioners report that there is no evidence, or any reasonable presumption, that he possessed himself of the stamps wrongfully, and after pointing out the only modes by which he could, had he desired so to

do, have obtained stamps improperly, they report that they could not find any reasonable grounds to suspect that he obtained stamps by either of the modes thus stated.

Your memorialist would urge, in extenuation of this irregularity, that he was at the time the acting head of the office; that the way in which the requisitions referred to in charge No. 1 were supplied was recorded by memoranda thereof being endorsed on the requisitions themselves, and the issue of the stamps shown in the post-office receipt book, and that all the requisitions were among the office papers.

Your memorialist submits that in this charge is shown one of the results of the false position in which he was placed, as admitted by the Commissioners, in having the responsibility and acting with authority as the head of the department while deemed censurable for a deviation in the routine or procedure of the office as a subordinate.

As to charge No. 3, of dealing in and buying and exchanging stamps, he admits it to the extent before referred to, but it was in his official capacity as Chief Clerk of the department; and he denies that he has ever sold stamps to the public, or in any way held himself out to be a distributor or vendor of stamps. He did, occasionally, for the purpose of obliging them, supply stamps of his own to officers of the service, but in no instance whatever has he derived any pecuniary or other benefit, either directly or indirectly.

With reference to charge No. 4, that of having kept certain stamps in a private drawer, and not having entered them in the books of the office, your memorialist would explain that the whole of the twopenny stamps (563 in number) had been rendered practically useless by the provisions of the amending Stamp Act of 1872. They had been sent to the Stamp Office for destruction, had passed through the hands of the examining officer, and were not received by your memorialist in the first instance. It was impossible, therefore, that he could know from whom they had been received if the clerk whose duty it was to attend to that work foiled to examine them with care, and to enter them into the accounts in the usual way. Your memorialist may also state that the twopenny stamps after being so sent in could not have been made profitable, or in any way converted into money by an officer; application must have been made at the local office to have their value repaid, but that would have been done only on an affidavit that they were the private property of the applicant.

With reference to charge No. 5, your memorialist, since the receipt of the Report, has had called to his remembrance (by Mr. Quick, of the firm of Brandon & Quick of this city) an incident which will corroborate his statement that he had Mr. Batkin's permission to make up succession duty accounts. Mr. Quick has reminded him that in a conversation between them some four or five years since your memorialist then stated that he had spoken to Mr. Batkin on the subject, and that Mr. Batkin had said that he saw no objection to your memorialist so doing, provided it did not interfere with the business of the office. With all due respect to the Commissioners, there appeal's to your memorialist to be some misunderstanding by them of the procedure of the office with reference to the nature of these accounts, or of the action of your memorialist therein, for what possible difference can there be in assisting persons in "unravelling these intricate matters" gratuitously in office hours, and doing so after office hours, whether gratuitously or for fee, so far as any relation could exist as between him and the taxpayer. The accounts in both cases would be compiled from vouchers and papers supplied by the parties, and when completed returned to them to be sworn to as correct in the usual form. He certainly never was instructed that it was his duty to assist in making up these accounts, nor could he possibly have done so generally without very materially interfering with the other immediate duties of his office, to the performance of which it is admitted he gave time considerably beyond the usual office hours.

With reference to the serious breach of duty mentioned as having occurred in 1873 your Memorialist would explain that the error, if one, arose in his retaining a crossed cheque tendered to and left with him for succession duty by Messrs. Brandon & Quick. The accounts to which this duty referred were not completed and vouched for in the manner required by the office, he refused therefore to accept them and returned them to Messrs. Brandon & Quick in order that they might be completed and the requisite vouchers produced; he did not deem it right to accept the cheque in payment of duty to the Government until the accounts were finally rendered in the shape he required them, and supported by the proper vouchers. Immediately this was done the cheque was handed over to the person to whom the duty was payable. The delay in procuring the requisite vouchers arose, as he was informed, from the absence of the Agent for the Executor from the Province, and at this time there was no regulation against the reception by your Memorialist of succession duty under such circumstances.

The Commissioners point out that your Memorialist had a large amount of work and heavy responsibilities imposed upon him; that he had been placed in a false position, and that he had in fact to perform the duties of Secretary for Stamps, in addition to those of Chief Clerk and Accountant, and that in dealing with his case his peculiar position should be taken into consideration.

That the Commissioners call your Excellency's attention to the necessity of some change in the organisation of the Stamp Department, and especially of some more satisfactory check than exists at present in the use of the machines for impressing stamps.

That your Memorialist is not responsible for the organisation of the office. That he has himself from time to

time made suggestions for the better administration of the Department and particularly with respect to an inspection of the various branches throughout the Colony, and repeating the recommendation of Dr. Knight (the Auditor-General) that there should be some satisfactory check in the manufacture of Stamps. And lastly, your Memorialist would ask your Excellency's attention to the evidence of Mr. O'Rorke, lately the Ministerial Head of the Department, contained in a telegram which appears to have been received since the date of the Report, and trusts that your Excellency will see fit to comply with the prayer of your Memorialist that the decision which has been given in this case may be reconsidered.

E. BRANDON.

NOTE.—No notice has been taken of this Memorial.

E.B.

Colonial Secretary's Office, Wellington,

7th November, 1874.

SIR,

I am directed by the Colonial Secretary to enclose a copy of an article, appearing in the *Otago Daily Times*, of the 30th ultimo, purporting to be a telegraphic communication from a Wellington correspondent. As this communication is said to be give a description of the contents of the Report of the Commission appointed to hear and report upon the charges against you, which Report has not been accessible to any person outside the Civil Service except to yourself or through communication from you, Dr. Pollen desires to be informed by what means a series of statements so scandalously untrue found their way into the public prints.

I have, &c.,

G. S. COOPER.

Eustace Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Extract from the *Otago Daily Times*, Friday, 30th October,

. . ."Mr. Brandon, of the Stamp Office, has been furnished with a copy of the Report of the Commission's charges against him, and the Government's decision. The Report is that all charges affecting his honesty were either withdrawn or broke down; that he had been guilty of injudicious or irregular conduct in several instances, but most of them upwards of two years ago, when Batkin was the chief of office, since which Brandon had been made acting head of the department; that one case occurred in 1873, but that latterly the Commissioner of Audit had reported a most marked improvement in the conduct of the office; that he had duties for which he was unequal thrust upon him, and that the charge of general inefficiency and negligence were not sustained by evidence. Further, that although deserving some punishment for irregularities, he had done nothing to justify dismissal from the service. On this Report the Government has reduced his salary from £300 to £200, to date from his suspension, and ordered him to hold himself in readiness to be transferred to some other part of the Colony, which will necessitate the loss of another appointment worth £50 a year. The decision is generally considered excessively harsh, and unwarranted by the Report."

Wellington,

7th November, 1874.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this day's date, enclosing a copy of an article appearing in the *Otago Daily Times*, of the 30th ultimo, purporting, as stated by you, to be a description of the contents of the Report of the Commissioners appointed to hear and report upon charges against me, and in which you inform me that the Report not having been accessible to any person but myself outside the Civil Service, Dr. Pollen desires to be informed "by what means a series of statements so scandalously untrue found their way into the public prints." In reply, I have to inform you that I am not responsible, either directly or indirectly, for the article in question, or for any other article on the same subject that may have appeared in the newspapers.

I have shown the Report alluded to by you to my friends, who were naturally anxious to learn, the result of the enquiry, and in so doing I apprehend that I was not only justified, but in duty to my relatives I was bound to

satisfy them that the serious charges which had been made against me by the Government had proved to have been preferred without the slightest foundation.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Wellington.

The Notice as Gazetted by Government.

Public Notification. Colonial Secretary's Office, Wellington,

10th November, 1874.

WHEREAS certain charges have been made on behalf of the Stamp Department against Mr. Henry Eustace de Bathe Brandon, lately Chief Clerk and Accountant in that Department: And whereas a Commission was appointed by His Excellency the Governor to enquire into the truth of such charges : And whereas the said Commissioners have reported,—

1st. That certain specific charges so made "had been proved, and the truth of them in fact admitted by Mr. Brandon."

2nd. With regard to the charge of habitual negligence in the discharge of his official duties, "That, on the whole, whilst it is certain that Mr. Brandon's conduct has been irregular, we do not think that the irregularities proved are sufficient, apart from the specific charges, to support a charge of habitual negligence."

And whereas the Commissioners have further reported as follows :—"We think Mr. Brandon should receive some punishment for the grave irregularities he has been guilty of, but that dismissal from the Civil Service of the Colony would be an unnecessarily severe sentence:"

It is hereby notified, in accordance with the provisions of section 32 of the Civil Service Regulations, that Mr. Henry Eustace de Bathe Brandon has been removed from the Stamp Office, and will be appointed to another Department of the Government; and that his salary has been reduced from £300 per annum to £200, at which rate it will be paid from the date of his suspension from office.

By order of the Colonial Secretary,

G. S. COOPER.

Colonial Secretary's Office, Wellington,

12th November, 1874.

SIR,

Adverting to Dr. Pollen's letter No. 604, of 28th October, I am directed to request that you will attend to any instructions you may receive from Mr. Strange Williams, the Registrar-General of Lands.

I have, &c.,
G. S. COOPER.

H. E. de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

[Telegram]. Christchurch,

13th November, 1874.

E. de B. Brandon, Wellington,

Will you proceed to Napier by first opportunity and report yourself to the District Land Registrar there, he will instruct you as to your duties.

J. S. WILLIAMS,

Registrar for Land.

On receipt of this telegram, I asked what position I was to fill, and what salary I should receive, to which I received the following reply.

[Telegram.] Christchurch,

14th November, 1874.

Eustace Brandon, Esq., Wellington,

Salary same as at present, viz., two hundred pounds per annum as Extra Clerk in Land Transfer and Deeds Registry Office. At present it is uncertain whether you would remain at Napier permanently. Please telegraph when you propose leaving.

J. S. WILLIAMS,

Registrar-General Land.

[Telegram.] Wellington,

16th November, 1874.

J. S. Williams, Registrar-General Land, Christchurch,

Almost impossible proceed Napier. Absolute loss £90 per annum. Can you not kindly arrange for Wellington.

E. BRANDON.

[Telegram.] Christchurch,

17th November, 1874.

E. Brandon, Esq., Wellington,

I am sorry that it is impossible to arrange for you to remain in Wellington.

J. S. WILLIAMS, R.G.L.

Wellington,

17th November, 1874,

SIR,

Adverting to your telegrams respecting my transfer to Napier as an Extra Clerk in the Land Transfer office, I have the honor to inform you that after mature consideration I have felt myself compelled to decline the offer. I therefore tender my resignation of office in the Deeds Registry and Land Transfer Department. Permit me to express my thanks to you for the courteous manner in which the officer was conveyed.

I have, &c.,

E. BRANDON.

J. S. Williams, Esq.,
Registrar-General Land, Christchurch.

Office Registrar-General of Land, Christchurch,

14th December, 1874.

SIR,

In reply to your letter of the 17th of November last, tendering your resignation of office in the Deeds Registry and Land Transfer Department, I have the honor to inform you that your resignation has been accepted.

I have, &c.,
JOSHUA STRANGE WILLIAMS,

Registrar-General Land.
E de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Wellington,

31st October, 1874.

SIR,

Referring to the recent enquiry into the truth of certain charges preferred against me as Chief Clerk and Accountant of the Stamp Office, I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to direct that a copy of the evidence taken before the Commissioners may be supplied to me.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Wellington.

Colonial Secretary's Office, Wellington,

12th December, 1874.

SIR,

I am directed by Dr. Pollen to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, and to inform you in reply that he declines to furnish you with the evidence taken before the Commissioners in your case.

I have, &c.,
G. S. COOPER.

E. de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Wellington,

25th September, 1874.

SIR,

I have the honor to request that I may be permitted to have all private papers and property left by me in the Stamp Office in August last.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon. the Commissioner of Stamps,
Wellington.

Office of the Commissioner of Stamps, Wellington,

28th September, 1874.

SIR,

In reply to your letter dated the 25th instant, I have the honor to inform you that the Hon. the Commissioner of Stamp Duties has directed that your private papers may be given up to you.

I have, &c.,
W. H. WARREN.

E. Brandon, Esq., Boulcott street,
Wellington.

Wellington,

30th November, 1874.

SIR,

I have the honor to request that the promissory note and adhesive stamps belonging to me, and which were found in the drawer of the office table, may be returned to me. I have also to request that the probate of the will, post-office order, and other papers relative to Ingram's estate may be forwarded to me, as the parties interested are anxious that the estate should be wound up with as little delay as possible.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Hon. the Commissioner of Stumps,
Wellington.

Office of the Commissioner of Stamps, Wellington,

11th February, 1875.

SIR,

Adverting to your letter of the 30th November, requesting the return of certain stamps and the papers in Ingram's estate, I am directed by the Hon. the Commissioner of Stamp Duties to enclose all papers in connection with this estate, with the sole exception of Mr. Ross' letter to you, dated 7th July last, which I retain for the present.

The post-office order enclosed in Mr. Ross' letter above alluded to is forwarded herewith.

Respecting the stamps found in the drawer of the office table, I shall do myself the honor of communicating with you on another occasion.

I have, &c.,
R. C. HAMMERTON,

Acting Secretary.
E. de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Wellington,

12th July, 1874.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, forwarding the papers in Ingram's estate, with the exception of Mr. Ross' letter to myself, dated 7th July last. As, however, you have thought fit to retain that letter (although it is part of the same transaction, and on which I submit the Government have no possible claim) I shall feel obliged if you will forward me a copy of the letter alluded to at your earliest convenience.

With reference to the stamps found in the drawer of the office table, and for which I also applied, I may remind you that the Commissioners appointed to investigate the matter decided that the stamps in question were my own property, I fail to see therefore on what ground they are still retained in the office.

I have, &c.,
E. BRANDON.

The Commissioner of Stamp Duties,
Wellington.

NOTE.—I have since received no communication on this point, nor have the stamps been returned to me.

Office of the Commissioner of Stamps, Wellington,

19th February, 1875.

SIR,

In compliance with the request contained in your letter of 12th instant, which came to hand only yesterday, I have the honor, by direction of the Hon. the Commissioner of Stamps, to forward a copy of Mr. Ross' letter to you, dated 7th July last.

I have, &c.,
R. C. HAMMERTON,

Secretary for Stamps.
H. E. de B. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Marion,

7th July, 1874.

DEAR BRANDON,

I send you per book post this day accounts, &c., in the estate of the late Archibald Ingram, for winding up to meet the Stamp Office, and finally wind up. Can you put them in train for me? I send also a post-office order for £2 2s., to cover the expenses, which will, I trust, cover what is required. It seems there is not much to do.

I must send you my father's estate soon.

Yours sincerely,

ALFRED ROSS.

E. Brandon, Esq., Stamp Office,
Wellington.

Treasury, Wellington,

15th February, 1875.

SIR,

In reply to your letter of the 11th instant, calling attention to a claim made by you for special allowance under vote 32 of the Schedule to the Appropriation Act, I have the honor, by direction of the Honorable the Colonial Treasurer, to inform you that your application is before the Honorable Dr. Pollen and will be dealt with on his return to the Scat of Government.

I have, &c.,
C. T. BATKIN,

Paymaster-General.
E. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Treasury, Wellington,

22nd March, 1875.

SIR,

Referring to my letter of the 15th February informing you that your application to participate in the special allowance granted under section 32 of "The Appropriation Act, 1874," would be dealt with on the return of the Honorable Dr. Pollen to the Scat of Government; I am now directed to inform you that, in view of the circumstances which lead to your retirement from the Public Service, your claim to share in the grant referred to cannot be admitted.

I have, &c.,
C. T. BATKIN,

Paymaster-General.
E. Brandon, Esq.,
Wellington.

Wellington,

2nd April, 1875.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 328, of the 22nd ultimo, informing mo that "in view of the circumstances which led to your retirement from the public service your claim to share in the grant referred to cannot be admitted," and in reply, I beg to state that my retirement from the service was entirely and solely owing to the very harsh and unjust conduct of the Government towards me.

I have, etc.,

E. BRANDON.

The Paymaster-General,
Wellington.

Biennial Report of the President of the Board of Education to the Legislature of 1874.

Reign of his Majesty Kalakaua.—first Year.

To the Legislative Assembly of the Hawaiian Islands :

In conformity to law, I have the honor to lay before you the following Report of the Bureau of Public Instruction, and the transactions of its Board for the biennial period ending March 31st, 1874.

School Statistics.

II.—common Schools.

ATTENDANCE.

Table 1 shows the number of pupils in attendance in the common schools at the present time to be 5,522. The number in attendance in 1872 was 6,274, leaving a decrease for 1874 of 752. Of this number 220 must be credited to the increase of pupils in the select schools, during the past biennial period, thus leaving a decrease of 532 to be accounted for.

The tables of the schools on Hawaii show a decrease of 258 pupils, those of Maui of 150, of Oahu 98, of Kauai 39, and of Lanai of 11; whilst Molokai is credited with an increase of 23, and Niihau of 1.

The withdrawal of children by their parents and guardians immediately upon the expiration of their lawful school age, is probably one of the causes of the decrease of pupils in the common schools. The percentage of school children over fifteen years of age in actual attendance at the common schools is very small,—probably not over *three* per cent. The demand for labor on sugar plantations also tends to draw all available help to itself, including the labor of school children. Still, eighty-seven per cent, of the school population of the Kingdom are in attendance at school, as shown by the census returns of 1872. (See table 5.)

EFFICIENCY OF THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

The principle of grading classes in the common schools has been adhered to during the past biennial period; and in proportion as this principle has been understood by the teachers and applied, it has produced the most satisfactory results. The proportion of teachers who have applied the theory of graded classes to their school organization has largely increased, and their schools are in a progressive state. The system upon which the common schools are now conducted is briefly this : Each school is graded into two, three or four classes, according to the intelligence and proficiency of the pupils.

CLASS I. *Curriculum of study.*—Reading, mental and written arithmetic, geography, penmanship and composition.

CLASS II. Reading, mental arithmetic, geography, penmanship.

CLASS III. Reading, first principles of arithmetic, penmanship.

CLASS IV. Primer, use of slate and pencil.

The youngest children are not classified until they can put letters together in syllables.

Vocal music is taught wherever competent teachers are found.

TEACHERS' CONVENTIONS have been continued, and have added much to the efficiency of the teachers. They have supplied in a measure the place of normal schools in the training of teachers actually employed as such, but do not afford fresh material from which to draw in case of need.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

The following is a list of text books in use in the common schools :

Kumumua, ano hou—An illustrated primer.

Ao-heluhelu—A progressive reader.

Helukamalii—An elementary mental arithmetic.

Helunaau—A translation of Colburn's Mental Arithmetic.

Huinahelu Hou—A translation of Thompson's Higher Arithmetic.

Ka Honua Nei—A translation of "Our World," number one, with Hawaiian geography added.

The edition of the "Ao-heluhelu" is running low, and another edition, revised, will be needed before the close of the current biennial period.

"Ka Honua Nei" is an elementary work on geography, finely illustrated, for the publication of which your Honorable Body at its last regular session voted means. An edition of 7,000 copies has been printed, at a total cost of \$3,968 56. The book has been extensively introduced into the common schools, and will be the means of extending the knowledge of geography amongst both teachers and pupils. Copies of the book will be submitted for your inspection.

A translation of "Our World," number two, is in the course of preparation at the office of the Board. The maps and plates for the work have been received, at a cost of \$1,800 44, paid for from the proceeds of the sales of school books, but a further appropriation will be necessary before the work can be completed and placed in the schools.

SCHOOL HOUSES AND FURNITURE.

Every district of the Kingdom is now supplied with good school houses, and but a small amount of money is necessary to keep the same in repair. There is a great lack, however, of the proper school furniture, such as comfortable forms for the pupils, and desks for the teachers. These deficiencies are gradually being supplied by the school agents of the various districts.

SCHOOL FINANCES.

Owing to the liberality of your Honorable Body in past years, the common schools of the Kingdom have been enabled to keep full sessions. Your supplementary grants to the destitute districts are still necessary, and will I trust be continued.

III.—Government Select Schools.

The English language is made a vehicle of instruction in these schools, though by no means to the exclusion of the Hawaiian.

Government Boarding Schools.

LAHAINALUNA SEMINARY.

Number of students, 88.

This institution maintains its reputation for thoroughness of instruction in the branches taught. A beginning has been made in normal school instruction; but, to reap the full benefit of such a course, a normal school department should be added to the institution, which should be entirely separate from the collegiate course now pursued, and be continued for two years. That period would be sufficient to thoroughly prepare young men for the vocation of common school teachers. At present not more than one-half of each entering class remain at the institution during the full term of four years. The remainder drop out gradually, for various reasons. A normal school course of two years would tend to obviate this evil. Pupils could enter such a course, regularly graduate at the end of two years, and receive diplomas as graduates.

This plan, fully carried out, would necessitate the employment of an additional assistant in the seminary, so as to enable one of the chief teachers to devote the greater part of his time and attention to the normal school department. Our common school teachers ought to be specially educated for their work; and if Lahainaluna cannot do it, where shall it be done?

HALEAKALA BOYS' BOARDING SCHOOL.

Number of pupils, 41.

This is now a boarding school, and is in a flourishing condition. The discipline of the school, based upon the military plan, is a success. It banishes the rod, and teaches the boys self-government. It develops a vivacity and precision of movement, and a quickness of perception not easily learned, but of great value. The health of the pupils has been excellent, and the diet, though plain, is abundant.

The school is an industrial one, and the pupils share in the pecuniary profits of their labor. The washing, carpentering, fence making, and dairy work is all performed by them. A ten acre lot has been enclosed with a

wire fence put up by the boys, under the supervision of Messrs. Clark and Rogers, and it is now being plowed by young oxen trained by them.

THE DAIRY is a very important adjunct of the school. On the first day of February, 1871, the live stock connected with the school numbered 197;—consisting of 91 cows, 16 calves, and 90 miscellaneous cattle. The valuation of dairy-house stock at the same time was 125 dollars.

On the first day of January, 1874, the live stock had increased to 406; consisting of 140 cows, 30 calves, 30 trained oxen, and 206 miscellaneous cattle. These figures are exclusive of 41 head of cattle killed for the use of the school. At the same date the dairy-house stock was valued at \$462.50.

The present accommodations at the school for boarders being filled to their utmost capacity, and the need of a good dwelling house for the principal having long been a necessity, the Board of Education, in January last, authorized alterations and extensions of the school buildings and of the dwelling house of the principal to be made. A contract was made by the Inspector General, acting for the Board of Education, with Messrs. Snell & King, carpenters, to do the whole work according to specified plans, and including freight and cartage, for the sum of \$5,401.75.

After the alterations and additions shall have been completed the buildings will accommodate sixty pupils. At present the school labors under the disadvantage of an uncertain water supply. The summers of 1872 and 1873 were protracted seasons of extreme drouth; and the water supply at the school was made to last out the drouth, only by the severest economy and at a great sacrifice of cleanliness. Two new cisterns are in the course of construction and every foot of roof surface will be utilized; and should no more long continued drouths occur, the cistern capacity, about 3000 barrels, will be sufficient, if the institution is enabled to enter upon each summer with full cisterns. However, a sufficient and certain water supply can be secured for all purposes connected with the school and dairy, by laying down pipes two and one-half miles to a spring in the mountain, called Waihou. This spring is on government land, and flowed, during the driest months of the drouth of last summer, 380 barrels of water every twenty-four hours.

No school under the control of government possesses so great advantages, as this institution, for development into a practical, industrial school, at which the mechanical trades in common demand may be taught to the youth of this Kingdom. I would respectfully call the attention of Your Honorable Body to the importance of this school, and to suggest that means may be furnished to obtain a certain water supply.

Industrial and Reformatory Schools.

SCHOOL AT KAPALAMA.

Number of pupils, 56.

This school continues to merit the support of the country. The youth committed to it receive the benefit of continued occupation. They are schooled in book knowledge three hours per day for four days in the week. Those of their number who show an aptitude for acquiring English are taught the rudiments of that language, and the remainder receive a good elementary education in Hawaiian. The lands belonging to the school are cultivated by the boys, who likewise do the tailoring for the institution, under the general supervision of the teachers.

A department for girls, in the Reformatory School, is very much needed; but heretofore it has been found difficult to secure a suitable teacher or matron to take charge of it; and to have made it an entirely separate establishment would have caused an expense exceeding the means at the disposal of the Board.

Government Select Day Schools.

HILO UNION FREE SCHOOL.

Number of pupils, 182; boys, 92; girls, 90.

This school, under the energetic guidance of its present efficient principal, maintains its place in the front rank of our schools. The progress made by the pupils has been very commendable. The plan pursued is to afford an elementary education in English to all the pupils who show an aptitude therefor, whilst those who do not are offered the advantages of acquiring a better education in their own language than they can obtain in the majority of common schools.

The corps of teachers is paid, as formerly, partly from the fund for the support of English and Hawaiian schools, and partly from the school fund of the district.

LAHAINA UNION FREE SCHOOL.

Number of pupils, 168; boys, 94; girls, 74.

This is a new institution, modeled after the Union School at Hilo. It was inaugurated by resolution of the Board of Education in April, 1873. It comprises the pupils of the five common schools existing at that time in the town of Lahaina. The commodious and central premises known as "Halealoha" were secured from the trustees of the Wainee Church at the nominal rental of ten dollars a year for the term of five years, with the privilege of a renewal of the lease at the expiration of that time. One of the common school houses was moved over to the premises, and an additional building erected thereon, the cost of which was very nearly met by the sale of two of the remaining school houses of the town. During the opening year of the school much time has been spent in the fatiguing labor of reducing the wild, undisciplined youth of the common schools of Lahaina to a state of order, and in grading the classes.

The corps of teachers is paid from the fund for the support of English and Hawaiian schools, and from the Lahaina school fund. The school is in a satisfactory state of progress.

ROYAL SCHOOL.

Number of pupils, 167.

The primary department of this school has not latterly been carried on with as much energy and interest as is desirable, and I trust there will be a change for the better.

POHUKAINA GIRLS' SCHOOL.

(Formerly the Mililani School.)

Number of pupils, 75.

This school was reported in 1872 as being in a languishing condition, the number of pupils at that time being only 38. I am happy to report a different state of affairs at the present time. The number of pupils has doubled, and the school is in a very prosperous condition, owing to the indefatigable efforts of the principal, ably seconded by her assistant. In January last the Board of Education exchanged with the Minister of the Interior its right and title to the school premises at Mililani for a retired and very desirable locality on Punchbowl street, called Pohukaina. To this spot was conveyed the upper wooden story of the Mililani school house, formerly known as the old Charity school house. This has been put in thorough order, and a fine commodious building also erected on the new premises. The two buildings will afford accommodation for one hundred or more pupils, and the total cost for the transfer of the school to its present site has been \$4,438 54.

FORT STREET SCHOOL.

Number of pupils, 69; boys, 64; girls, 5.

I cannot report as satisfactory a state of affairs at this school as I could wish. With a view to bring up the standard of the school to the requirements of the English-speaking portion of the population, and make it a school at which their children might acquire a useful education, the Board of Education, in September of last year, authorized the Inspector General to prepare a curriculum of studies for the school, which should embrace an elective high school course. Such a course was prepared, approved by the Board, and published; and will be enforced.

This school is much more expensive to the Board than was anticipated, and more so than it ought to be, considering the means of many of those who patronize it. It is to be hoped that payment for tuition will be made more promptly; and that the school will increase in merit and popularity.

IV.—schools Aided by Government.

The English language forms the chief vehicle of education in all of these schools.

Boarding Schools for Girls.

EAST MAUI FEMALE SEMINARY.

Number of pupils, 51.

This institution maintains the efficiency of its educational advantages. The domestic training of the girls is

excellent, and their school room education is unsurpassed by any institution in the land. It is to be regretted, however, that the parents of some of the pupils do not pay their school bills more promptly.

Those parents and guardians who send their girls to the family boarding schools, and pay \$50 or less per annum for board and tuition, should bear in mind that they do not pay the whole cost thereof. The capitation fees from the Board of Education, contributions from benevolent societies and individuals, gratuitous services of some of the teachers, and others, free rent, etc., make up the large deficiency.. The interests of the schools and the cause of education call for more strictness in collecting the bills for board and tuition. The natural inclination is to undervalue those good things which are received without effort or cost.

SCHOOL OF SAINT CROSS, LAHAINA.

Number of pupils, 37.

Although the number of pupils attending this school has decreased, its excellence is unimpaired. There has been a considerable amount of sickness at the school during the past few months, probably caused by the unusual amount of rainy weather, and one pupil has died. At present the health of the pupils is good, and their progress in education fair.

KAWAIAHAO FEMALE SEMINARY.

Number of pupils, 40.

Prosperity continues to attend this popular institution. The health of the school is good, and the pupils have progressed commendably in their studies.

WAIALUA FEMALE SEMINARY.

Number of pupils, 31.

This Seminary has had many obstacles to contend against during the past year. Its moral health has suffered, and twelve of the older pupils have been expelled on account of gross insubordination. The trustees may be carrying on the school with too small a teaching force to maintain an efficient discipline, and the boarding fee charged is too small to give a satisfactory bill of fare and pay the current expenses of the establishment. Instead of \$30 per annum, the charge should be at least \$40, and \$50 would not be too much.

The principal and her assistant are laborious, conscientious teachers, and at the present time, the Seminary appears to be gaining a more healthy tone. The pupils remaining in it are, for the most part, very young, ranging from three to sixteen or seventeen years of age.

ST. ANDREW'S PRIORY.

With several Assistants.

Number of pupils, 73; boarders, 26 : day scholars, 47.

This large and important school continues to share the confidence of the parents and guardians of the children attending it. Applicants stand ready to send their children whenever opportunity is offered them.

With the purpose to encourage the entry at family boarding schools of girls at an early age, before they may have formed vicious habits, and in order to so apply the limited means at its disposal for the benefit of those who attend such schools as to do the most good, the Board on the 22d day of January last made and published the following regulation, viz:

Notice to Family Boarding Schools for Hawaiian Girls.

From and after July 1st, 1874, no capitation fees will be allowed by the Board of Education for any pupil over ten years of age who shall have been entered at any family boarding school after the date above named; and no claim for capitation fees will be allowed after July 1st, 1874, for any pupils over sixteen years of age.

Capitation fees will be allowed for pupils who shall have attended schools of this class regularly from their tenth year, should they have been transferred to another family boarding school at any time between their tenth and sixteenth years of age; but the *rate* of capitations for such pupils shall be reckoned only from the date at which they shall have been admitted into the school claiming fees thereon, without reference to the time that shall have been spent in schools previously attended.

It shall be necessary that pupils transferred as above stated, and for whom capitation fees shall be asked, shall have been creditably discharged from the schools previously attended; and that the schools claiming fees thereon shall be subject to the regulations of the Board of Education published June 8th, 1865.

By order of the Board of Education.

W. JAS. SMITH.
Secretary.

Honolulu,

Jan. 26th, 1874.

Boarding Schools for Boys.

HILO BOARDING SCHOOL.

Two native assistants. Number of pupils, 79.
Amount of aid granted, \$1,800.

This school continues to be in a prosperous condition. It has recently sustained a severe loss in the death of its energetic native assistant, Mr. Huluhulu. An invitation has been extended to Mr. Makaimoku, of Lahainaluna, to return to his former charge at the school.

OAHU COLLEGE.

Number of pupils, 89; boys, 51, girls, 38.

This institution has more than doubled the number of its pupils since the last biennial report. It is in reality a high school, and stands at the head of our public educational institutions. The three government scholarships are worthily filled by youth of Hawaiian extraction.

AHUIMANU COLLEGE.

Pupils, 41.

The Board of Education having been applied to by the faculty of this school for aid, voted to grant to it the sum of \$400 for one year from September 1st, 1873. This grant was made in the form of eight Hawaiian scholarships, to be given to pupils nominated by the principal, and approved of by the Board, and it is hoped that the Board will be enabled to continue this aid.

IOLANI COLLEGE.

Pupils, 20.

The Board of Education maintains ten scholarships at this institution, at an annual cost of \$100 per annum, per capita for board, lodging, and tuition.

IOLE BOARDING SCHOOL.

Number of pupils, 20.

The native teacher is paid fifty cents a day from the Kohala District school fund.

Day Shools Subsidized by Government.

Hilo Foreign School, (formerly Miss H. F. Coan's School), Miss E. A. Arms, teacher. Number of pupils, 29; boys, 11, girls, 18. A board of trustees elected from amongst the foreign residents of Hilo, has the control of this school. It is in a flourishing condition and receives an annual grant of \$100 from the district school fund. The Board of Education has recently made a grant of \$300 to the trustees to aid them in building a school house.

ST. JOSEPH'S SCHOOL, Hilo, numbers 54 pupils on its roll; boys, 34, girls, 20; and receives a grant of \$200 per annum from the Hilo district school fund.

MRS. LIDGATE'S SCHOOL, Hilo, receives a grant of \$40 per year from the school fund. No proper return of the number of pupils in attendance has been received at the office of the Board.

WEST MAUI ENGLISH SCHOOL, G. W. Hart, teacher. Pupils, 60; boys, 31, girls, 29. This school receives an annual grant of \$200 from the Wailuku School Fund.

REV. AUBERT'S SCHOOL, Lahaina, numbers 82 pupils on its roll. The Board of Education has made an annual grant to the school of \$150, to be paid from the Lahaina District School Fund.

BETHEL CHINESE SCHOOL, Honolulu; E. Dunscombe, teacher; pupils 13. This school receives a grant of \$200 per annum, from the appropriation for Hawaiian and English schools.

MISS JOHNSON'S SCHOOL, Hanalei, continues to receive \$500 per annum from the same fund. Number of pupils, 37; boys, 21, girls, 16.

V.—Independent Schools.

The following table gives the returns from all this class of schools. The English language is taught in them all.

VI.—The Census.

In accordance with the provisions of law, the Board of Education ordered the census of the Kingdom to be taken, December 27th, 1872. Every precaution was observed at the Office of the Board to insure as correct a return as possible. The following figures relating to the children in the nation will tend to diminish the sorrow felt at the continued decrease of the population.

The total cost incurred in taking the census has been \$3,515.

Copies of the tables accompany this report.

VII.—School Laws—their Operation.

The great majority of our school laws have worked well, and have been faithfully carried out. The Act passed by the Legislature in 1870, providing for the election, by the parents and guardians of children attending the common schools, of a third member for the school board of each district, and defining the powers of those boards, has been inoperative. During the four years that the Act has been in force, observation has proved that in a great majority of school districts, not only are parents and guardians entirely apathetic in the matter of the choice of a third member for their district school board, but it has also demonstrated that a door has been opened by it to a very shiftless portion of our population to enter our common schools as teachers.

The Board of Education, through its authorized agents, has ever been ready to listen to all the reasonable requests of the parents of any district in matters pertaining to the education of their children. I respectfully recommend that your Honorable Body repeal this Act.

MANUAL LABOR IN THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

I am of the opinion that manual labor should be made a part of our system of common school education. There are Government lands lying contiguous to common school houses, now unemployed. In many localities a portion of this could be utilized by the pupils and teachers in raising remunerative crops. I would recommend that an act be passed by your Honorable Body empowering the Board of Education to introduce manual labor into the educational course of the common schools, and setting apart, under certain conditions, portions of the public domain, adjoining the various school houses, which may be fit for cultivation of crops, to the uses of the pupils and teacher, wherever no school lands can be made available for the purpose, and also to lease suitable lands and to arrange for the cultivation of crops on shares or otherwise.

Three or four hours per day of earnest attention to school lessons, and two or three hours of manual labor out of doors, would promote health and industrious habits; the avails of the labor would add to the income of the teachers and furnish the pupils with means to pay for books, and would, if properly carried out, be an improvement upon the present system.

It is frequently remarked that the rising generation are not as industrious as their ancestors were; that they—and especially those educated in the higher schools and in the English language—have wrong ideas about labor; in short, are lazy and idle, and have much more of pride and conceit than is good for them.

If the general effect of education under our present system, is to destroy or lessen respect for honest industry, or for thrift and independence acquired by manual labor, then is there something wrong or wanting in that system, and it behooves all friends of the race to search for a better one. But if such ideas are exceptional, and proceed from the inexperience of youth, and the lack of proper home instruction and training, then may we hope that their bad influence will be temporary, and that time and necessity will correct them. Hawaiian parents are as a rule over-indulgent with their children, and no schooling which the Government can provide will wholly remedy the damage resulting from neglect of paternal discipline.

It is important that in all of the schools, those for girls as well as those for the boys, a desire to be able to provide for their own wants in an honest way, and respect for the industrious and virtuous, however humble their station and employment may seem to be, should be inculcated. Where else so well as in family schools, or

in well-ordered households, can such instruction be given and such ideas imparted?

The school tax of two dollars pays only about thirty-seven per cent, of the whole annual expenditure for education; and though the expenditure has seemed large considering the amount of the entire revenue of the Kingdom, it is confidently hoped that your Honorable Body will not be inclined to reduce the sum asked for in the Budget for the current two years, which is \$8,300 less than the appropriation for schools 1872 and 1873.

GOD SAVE THE KING.

Chas. R. Bishop, *President of the Board of Education.*

Hawaiian and English Schools.

Support of Common Schools.

Industrial and Reformatory School.

Building New School Houses.

Printing, &c., of Hawaiian Geography.

School Fund.

Cash Receipts and Disbursements.

Receipts and Expenditures for Common Schools.

The Schools of the Hawaiian Kingdom, January 1st, 1874

THE NATIONAL SCHOOLS. SCHOOLS AIDED BY GOVERNMENT. COMMON SCHOOLS. BOARDING SCHOOLS. HAWAIIAN-ENGLISH DAY SCHOOLS. BOARDING SCHOOLS DAY SCHOOLS. DAY SCHOOLS. GRAND TOTALS. DISTRICT. NO. BOYS. GIRLS. TOTAL. SCHOOL. BOYS. GIRLS. TOTAL. SCHOOL. GIRLS. TOTAL. NAME. BOYS. GIRLS. TOTAL. NAME. BOYS. GIRLS. TOTAL. BOYS. GIRLS. TOTAL. NAME. BOYS. GIRLS. TOTAL. Hilo 5 88 69 157 Union School 92 90 182 Hilo Boarding School 79 79 Hilo Foreign School 11 18 29 315 206 521 HAWAII. Puna 11 127 111 238 St. Joseph's School, Hilo 34 20 54 Clement's English-Hawaiian School 10 10 20 137 121 258 Kau 7 125 86 211 Mrs. Lidgate's School, Hilo 11 9 20 125 86 211 South Kona 11 202 121 323 Christ Church School 7 4 11 209 125 334 North Kona 11 222 161 383 222 161 383 South Kohala 5 81 66 147 Wakola Family School 2 5 7 95 72 467 North Kohala 11 173 135 313 Iole Boarding School 14 14 Grammar school, Waimea 12 1 13 Halwa English School 22 20 42 214 155 369 Hamakua 10 123 90 213 123 90 213 Total 71 1146 839 1985 92 90 182 93 93 56 47 103 14 6 20 39 34 73 1440 1016 2456 Wailuku 14 224 168 392 West Maui English School 31 29 60 Wailuku English School 2 8 10 257 205 462 MAUI Makawao 9 139 94 233 Haleakala Boys' School 41 41 East Maui Female Seminary 51 51 180 145 325 Hana 14 947 175 422 247 175 422 Lahaina 5 70 48 118 Lahainaluna Seminary 88 88 Union School 94 School of St. Cross 37 37 Father Aubert's School 47 35 82 Kaanapali English School 12 8 90 311 202 513 Lanai 2 17 14 31 17 14 31 Molokai 12 176 113 289 176 113 289 Total 56 873 612 1485 129 129 74 168 88 88 78 64 142 14 16 30 1188 854 2042 Honolulu 19 449 371 820 Industrial and Reformatory 56 56 Royal School 165 2 167 Kawaihāo Female Seminary 40 40 Chinese School, Bethel 13 13 Sisterhood of the Sacred Hearts 56 56 Mrs. Smith's Private School 8 16 24 986 845 1831 Ewa & Waianae 7 120 91 211 Fort Street School 64 5 69 Iolani College 20 20 Oahu College 33 36 69 Sisterhood of the Sacred Hearts 78 78 120 91 211 OAHU. Waialua 3 47 30 77 Girls' School 75 75 Oahu College 14 6 20 St. Andrew's Priory 47 47 Mrs. Mary Weed's School, Fort St. 9 15 24 Koolauloa 8 94 56 150 St. Andrew's Priory 26 26 Kawaihāo English Schools 43 39 75 70 64 134 Koolaupoko 7 100 84 184 Ahuimmanu College 41 41 Kaunakapili School 57 16 73 Waialua Female Seminary 31 31 Select English School, Kawaihāo 8 10 18 121 74 195 St. Alban's College 47 47 Laiewai School 27 18 45 141 84 225

Waiialua English school 23 3 26 Mrs. Owen's School, Nuuanu 14 14 Total 44 810 632 1442 56 56 229 82 311
 75 103 178 46 83 129 56 56 222 202 424 1438 1158 2590 Lihue 6 83 55 138 83 55 138 KAUAI Hanalei 7 103
 64 167 Miss Johnson's School 21 16 37 124 42 105 Koloa 4 51 40 91 Kola English School 12 9 14 63 42 105
 Waimea 7 107 77 184 107 77 184 Niihau 1 20 10 30 20 10 30 Total 25 364 246 610 21 16 37 12 2 14 397 264
 661 Grand totals. 196 3193 2329 5522 3 185 185 5 415 246 661 168 191 359 9 201 210 411 3 14 62 76 16 287
 254 541 4463 3292 7755

Census of the Hawaiian Islands, Taken December 27, 1872.

Papa helu I na kanaka o ka Pae Aina o Hawaii, I heluia I ka la 27 o Dekemaba, 1872.

NATIONALITY-ONE HANAU. OCCUPATION-OIHANA LAWELAWE. INCREASE AND DECREASE SINCE 1866. SEX. AGE-NA MAKAHIKI. Married-Mareia ISLANDS AND DISTRICTS. Males. Females. Total population. Males under 6 years of age. Females under 6 years age. Males between 6 and 15 years. Females between 6 and 15 years. Males between 15 and 40 years. Females between 15 and 40 years. Males over 40 years. Females over 40 years. Married males. Married females. Native males. Native females. Half-caste males. Half caste females. Chinese males. Chinese females. Hawaiian born, both parents bring foreigners, males. Hawaiian born, both parents being foreigners, females American males. American females. British males British females. German males. German females. French males. French females. Portuguese males. Portuguese females. Other foreigners, males Other foreigners, females. Clergymen. Teachers. Licensed Physicians. Lawyers. Merchants. Mechanics. Agriculturists. Freeholders. Total number of foreigners in 1866. Total number of foreigners in 1872. Increase of foreigners since 1866. Decrease of foreigners since 1866. Total natives in 1866. Total natives in 1872. Increase of natives since 1866. Decrease of natives since 1866. Total increase since 1866. Total decrease since 1866 Total decrease of population since 1866. Na kane. Na wahine. Ka huina pau loa o na kanaka. Na keikikane malalo o 6 makahiki. Na kaikamahine malalo o 6 makahiki. Na keikikane iwaena o ka 6 me ka 15 mak. Na kaikamahine iwaena o ka 6 me ka 15 mak. Na kane iwaena o ka 15 me ka 40 makahiki. Na whine iwaena o ka 15 me ka 40 makabiki. Na kane maluna ae o ka 40 makahilki. Na wahine maluna ae o ku 40 makahiki. Na kane ua marcia. Na wahine na mareia. Na kane kanaka maoli. Na wahine kanaka maoli. Na hapahaole kane. Na hapahaole wahine. Na Pake kane. Na Pake wahine. Hanauia ma Hawaii nei. he haole na makua. makane. Hanauia ma Haw. nei. he haole na makua, na wahine Na haole kane America. Na haole wahine America. Na haole kane Beretania. Na haole wahine Beretania. Na haole kane Geremania. Na haole wahine Geremania. Na haole kane Farani. Na haole wahine Farani. Na haole kane Pukiki. Na baole wahine Pukiki. Na haole kane e ae. Na haole wahine e ae. Na Kahunapule. Na Kumukula. Na Kahuna Lapaau i laikini la. Na Loio. Na poe oihana kalepa. Na poe oihana hana lima akamai. Na poe oihana mahi aina. Na mea kulcana aina. Huina pau loa o na haole i ka makahikli 1866. Huina pau loa o na haole i ka makahiki 1872. Ka mahuahua o na haole mai ka mak. 1866. Ka emi o na haole mai ka makahiki 1866. Huina pau loa o na kanaka maoli i ka mak. 1866 Huina pau loa o na kanaka maoli i ka mak. 1872 Ka mahuahua o na kanaka maoli mai ka mak. 1866 Ka emi o na kanaka maoli mai ka mak. 1866. Ka huina mahuahua mai ka makahiki 1866. Ka huina emi mai ka makahiki 1866. Ka huina pau loa o ka emi, mai ka mak. 1866 HAWAII—Hilo 2561 1659 4220 195 217 289 245 1278 690 799 507 1002 877 2065 1522 84 78 292 16 24 29 25 10 19 3 7 1 3 9 33 8 25 2 9 40 117 606 842 348 320 471 151 4335 3749 586 435 Puna 653 635 1288 103 83 114 120 151 189 285 243 323 327 6642 632 5 3 1 1 1 1 2 3 9 1 1 4 7 106 10 41 6 6 1926 1282 644 644 Kau 992 873 1865 126 118 143 146 416 342 307 267 500 494 909 845 25 24 22 1 2 13 1 5 3 2 6 7 9 10 1 16 62 484 221 232 48 62 14 1972 1803 169 155 South Kona 1006 910 1916 189 161 213 170 310 333 294 246 459 454 947 876 25 18 6 8 7 6 9 9 4 1 3 15 1 1 21 177 460 37 179 47 50 3 2402 1866 536 533 North Kona 1163 1055 2218 185 162 226 211 346 353 406 329 517 521 1110 1027 29 28 7 5 6 1 2 2 1 5 9 3 42 271 17 266 29 24 5 3239 2194 1045 1050 South Kohala 479 413 892 75 63 71 64 191 185 142 101 229 217 398 377 38 26 9 3 4 8 2 15 3 1 2 1 4 1 2 10 1 13 37 92 17 54 40 53 13 1049 839 210 197 North Kohala 1097 989 2086 110 140 175 170 438 345 374 334 570 554 975 935 54 42 9 7 9 7 1 14 1 4 10 17 1 4 17 4 2 6 23 400 335 180 63 80 17 2282 2006 276 259 Hamakua 796 720 1516 96 92 127 97 259 246 314 285 399 425 737 697 25 19 8 5 3 8 5 3 3 1 2 5 8 4 25 61 507 26 193 19 38 19 2031 1478 553 534 Totals 8747 7254 16001 1079 1036 1858 1223 3389 2683 2921 2312 3999 3869 7783 6911 285 238 354 17 47 54 73 14 73 16 21 1 13 32 1 66 2 39 103 8 19 128 526 2926 1505 1493 572 784 217 5 19236 15217 4019 3807 MAUI—Lahaina 1741 1261 3002 202 153 264 229 794 480 491 399 627 526 1402 1145 41 69 89 1 43 31 42 7 33 4 7 1 5 27 3 52 7 18 1 4 84 195 528 394 411 104 345 241 34 77 2657 820 579 Wailuku 2286 1774 4060 272 209 331 275 1059 818 624 472 916 908 1820 1623 117 93 154 5 32 23 66 21 25 6 3 5 2 21 43 1 9 14 4 5 56 177 487 993 507 318 407 89 3982 3653 329 240 Hana 1464 1296 2760 224 198 258

229 462 450 520 419 790 786 1417 1275 14 15 6 1 4 6 6 1 2 1 11 1 6 15 1 1 10 25 716 119 357 21 39 18 3480
 2721 759 741 Makawao 1471 1041 2512 161 145 219 199 727 487 364 210 598 534 1155 940 86 66 135 15 16
 8 36 10 19 2 7 10 7 3 12 0 3 21 91 307 578 261 162 265 103 2491 2247 244 141 Totals 6962 5372 12334 859
 705 1062 932 3042 2235 1999 1500 2931 2754 5794 4983 258 243 384 21 92 66 150 38 83 13 19 1 11 2 58 3
 113 2 25 59 8 13 171 488 2038 2084 1536 605 1056 451 13430 11278 2152 1701 MOLOKAI 1319 1030 2349
 125 123 225 150 528 422 441 335 574 506 1264 993 33 37 3 1 5 4 4 2 2 2 3 5 13 4 3 70 28 466 33 280 29 22 7
 2270 2327 57 50 LANAI 190 158 348 18 26 37 24 64 56 71 52 74 75 178 150 7 7 2 2 1 1 ... 1 2 9 105 1 19 9 6
 3 385 342 43 46 OAHU—Honolulu 8100 6752 14852 785 779 1 1 6 1 1064 3659 3039 2495 1870 2951 3034
 5776 5434 440 573 591 11 240 290 372 178 240 141 108 42 29 17 198 24 106 12 26 87 22 35 266 761 330 111
 1566 2221 2629 408 11300 12223 923 1331 Ewa and Waianae 948 723 1671 101 111 141 113 374 303 332
 196 399 384 779 691 22 25 88 4 4 2 9 3 5 38 5 1 3 6 2 3 5 34 340 49 261 73 154 81 1711 1517 194 113
 Waialua 473 378 851 54 51 83 74 168 120 168 133 189 173 404 363 6 9 27 4 4 5 1 4 1 2 16 4 2 5 1 16 31 194
 62 182 37 69 32 1099 782 317 285 Koolauloa 716 553 1269 80 61 129 95 270 221 237 176 318 239 640 540
 14 9 50 1 1 6 3 1 2 2 2 6 2 21 405 78 201 56 66 10 1107 1203 96 106 Koolaupoko 1224 804 2028 113 95 166
 111 553 335 392 263 433 440 970 769 49 29 114 2 11 1 10 15 1 4 6 20 25 2 7 11 1 4 9 7 644 256 361 187 211
 24 2008 1817 191 167 Totals 11461 9210 20671 1183 1097 1680 1457 5024 4018 3624 2638 4290 4270 8569
 7797 531 645 870 47 260 298 402 182 263 143 116 42 41 17 269 24 140 15 40 115 25 45 299 854 2913 556
 2571 2574 3129 555 17225 17542 1019 702 1437 565 KAUAI—Waimea, 675 594 1269 87 90 108 95 231 209
 249 200 330 350 642 578 6 6 15 3 4 2 1 5 5 1 .. 1 2 10 4 17 375 4 171 25 37 12 1526 1232 294 282 Koloa 492
 341 833 54 46 61 52 206 147 171 96 212 202 383 295 32 33 47 6 6 3 9 2 4 4 1 6 2 4 7 1 10 20 167 125 125 197
 90 7 987 743 244 251 Puna 751 550 1301 82 69 102 77 324 219 243 185 282 255 670 524 6 16 40 9 6 2 1 2 10
 3 12 1 6 1 23 140 222 147 145 33 85 52 1445 1216 229 177 Koolau and Hanalei 930 628 1558 122 87 141 104
 437 255 230 182 328 340 725 574 67 37 116 16 4 1 5 4 1 6 2 3 8 I 10 23 28 371 317 239 237 155 82 1949 1403
 546 628 Totals 2848 2113 4961 345 292 412 328 1198 830 893 663 1152 1147 2420 1971 111 92 218 22 18 13
 17 5 16 5 19 3 2 6 21 2 10 31 2 11 60 205 1135 593 680 392 367 64 89 5907 4594 1313 1338 NHHAU 123 110
 233 15 16 29 14 37 35 42 45 57 61 122 109 5 87 1 13 2 11 312 231 81 92 Grand Totals 31650 25247 56897
 3574 3295 4803 4128 13282 10279 9991 7545 13077 12682 126130 22914 1225 1262 1831 107 418 431 649
 240 441 178 117 47 69 19 367 28 343 21 120 324 47 91 728 2115 9670 4772 6580 4194 5366 1287 115 58765
 51531 1076 8310 1487 7549 6062 SUMMARY. Total number of natives in 1872 49,044 Total number of
 half-castes in 1872 2,487 Total number of Chinese in 1872 1,938 Total number of Americans in 1872 889 Total
 number of Hawaiian born of foreign parents, 1872 849 Total number of Britons in 1872 619 Total number of
 Portuguese in 1872 395 Total number of Germans in 1872 224 Total number of French in 1872 88 Total
 number of other foreigners in 1872 364 Total population in 1872 56,897 Total number of natives, including
 half-castes, in 1866 58,765 Total number of natives, including half-castes, in 1872 51,531 Decrease since 1866
 7,234 Total number of foreigners in 1872 5,366 Total number of foreigners in 1866 4,194 Increase since 1866
 1,172 Total decrease of natives since 1866 7,234 Total increase of Total decrease of population since 1866
 1,172 Total decrease of population since 1872 6,062 Total number of half-castes in 1872 2,487 Total number of
 half-castes in 1866 1,640 Total increase since 1866 847 The percentage of decrease of the whole population is
 as follows: 1850 to 1853 3 years 13.10 per cent. 1853 to 1860. 7 years 4.70 per cent. 1860 to 1866 6 years 9.67
 per cent. 1866 to 1872 6 years 9.62 per cent. N.B.—Of the 2,349 inhabitants reported above for the Island of
 Molokai, 438 were Lepers at the Leper Settlement at Kalaupapa.

Palapala Hoike i ka Peresidena o ka Papa Hoonaaauao, a Haolelo o ka Makahiki 1874.

(Unuahiiia E.J.E. Bush.)

Ka Noho Alii Ana o Ka Moi Kalakaua-Ka Makahiki Mua.

I ka Hale Ahadelo o ko Hawaii Pae Aina :

I kulike ai me ke kanawai, ua loa ia' u ka hanohano o ka waiho ana aku imua o oukou i ka Palapala Hoike maialo nei a ka Oihana Hoonaaauao, a me ka hana a ka Papa no na makahiki elua e pau ana i ka la 31 o Maraki, 1874.

Hoike Helu o na Rula.

II—Na Kula Kumumua.

KA HELE KULA O NA HAUMANA.

E hoike ana ka Papa 1 i ka nui o na haumana e hele ana i na Kula Kumumua, i keia manawa, aia ma 5522. O ka nui o na haumana hele kula i ka makahiki 1872 he 6,274, a e ike ia ua emi mai ko ka makahiki 1874, he 752. He 220 haumana hoi o keia helu'na emi e hoakaka ia aia ma na Kula Wae, oiai ua mahuahua ae na haumana oia ano kula iloko o ka makahiki elua o ke kau i hala, a koe iho la he 532 o ka emi o na haumana i akaka lea ole.

E hoike ana na Papa Helu o na Kula o Hawaii, he 258 ka nui o ka emi o na haumana, na Kula o Maui, he 150, o Oahu, he 98, o Kauai, he 39, a o Lanai, he 11; a iloko o ia manawa, ua pii ka nui o na haumana hele kula ma Molokai, he 23, a ma Niinau, he 1.

O ka unuhi ia'ku o na keiki e ko lakou man makua a me na kahu hanai, i ka manawa koke no e pau ae ai na makahiki hele kula o ke keiki, e like me ke kuhikuhi a ke kanawai, oia palm kekahi o na kumu o ka emi ana o na haumana e hele ana i na Kula Kumumua. He uuku loa no hoi ka averika o na keiki hele kula, i oi aku na makahiki i ka umikumamalima, e hele maoli ana i na Kula Kumumua—aole paha i oi ae i ka ekolu-hapa-haueri. O ka makemake nui o na mahi-ko i na paahana no lakou iho, a no ia hapukuia ana O ka poe hiki, ua komo pu aku na keiki hele kula i paahana. Aka hoi, ma ka hoike ana a ka papa helu lahui o 1872, eia no ke hele nei i na kula he kanawalukuma-mahiku-hapahaneri o ka lehulehu keiki hele kula o keia Paeaina. (E nana i ka Papa 5.)

KA HOLOMUA O NA KULA KUMUMUA.

O ka rula mau o ka hoonoho papa ana i na haumana, ua hoo-mauia no ia iloko o na makahiki elua i hala o keia kau e olelo ia nei ma keia hoike; a e like me ka nui o ka apo maopopo ia o keia rula e na kumu, a hoohana ia, pela no hoi i loa ai na hopena holopono. O ka nui o na kumu i hoohana i keia ano hana, ka hoonoho papa i na haumana ma ka lakou hooponopono kula ana, ua pii nui ae, a o ka lakou mau kula hoi aia ma ke kulana holomua. O ke ano hana e alakai ia nei na kula kumumua i keia manawa, ma ka wehewehe pokole, oia keia: Ua hoonohonoho papa ia na haumana ma kela me keia kula, he elua, ekolu, a he eha papa e like me ka ike a me ka makaukau o na haumana :

PAPA I. *Na Haawina Mau.*—Ao-Heluhelu, Helu-naau a me Helu-Kakau, Palapala-Aina, Kakau-Lima a me ka Haku-manao Kakau.

PAPA II. Ao-Heluhelu, Helu-naau, Palapala Aina, a me Kakaulima.

PAPA III. Heluhelu, Helukamalii, Kakaulima.

PAPA IV. Ma ka Hookeikui, Ao-kakau ma ka papa Pohaku.

Aole hoi i hoonohonoho papaia na keiki opio loa, aia a hiki ia lakou ke hookeikui i na mahele o ka huaolelo

E ao mau ia ana no na haumana i ka himeni ke loa na kumu kupono.

Ua hoomau ia aku no ka hui ana o na Kula Kumu, a ua pii ae no hoi ka makaukau o na Kumu. Ua hoopihia aku ke Kula Kumu e like me ka mea hiki, i ka hakahaka no ka nele i na Kula Ao Kumu, ma ka hoomakaukau ana i na Kumukula e lawe-lawe nei i ka oihana, aka, aole nae he poe kekahi ma waho ae o lakou e hoomakaukau ia ana i hiki ai i ka Papa ke kii aku i ka wa e makemake ia'i.

NA BUKE KULA.

Eia mai iho ka papa o na buke kula e ao ia nei ma na Kula Kumumua :

Kumumua, ano hou—Ka mua keia o ka buke Ao-heluhelu, i paiia me na kii.

Ao-Heluhelu—Ka Ina keia o ka buke Ao-heluhelu, no ka pii ae o ka ike o ka haumana.

Helukamalii—He buke hoomaamaa keia i ka haumana i ka helu hoopaanaau mua.

Helunaau—Ka buke helu hoopaanaau a Colburn. i unuhiia ma ka olelo Hawaii.

Huinahelu Hou—He buke helu ano kiekie keia a Thompson, i unuhiia ma ka olelo Hawaii.

Ka Honua Nei—He buke Palapala Aina keia, i unuhiia mai ka "Our World," Helu 1, a pakuiia aku ka Palapala Aina Hawaii.

Ke aneane aku nei e pau loa na buke "Ao-Heluhelu" i paiia iho nei, a e pau loa ana paha mamua ae o ka pau ana o na ma-kahiki elua o ke kau e hiki mai ana, nolaila ua makemake ia e pai hou keia buke, me ka hooponopono hou ia.

O "Ka Honua Nei," he buke Kumumua keia no na mea e pili ana i ka honua holookoa a me na kanaka, i hoonaniia i na kii maikai, a na keia Aha Hanohano no hoi i hooholo i puu dala e hiki ai ke paiia, i ke kau

ahaolelo mau i hala aku nei. Ua paiia he 7,000 kope o keia buke, a o ka huina pau o na lilo no ia hana he \$3,968.56. Ua hookomo nui ia keia buke iloko o na Kula Kumumua, a e lilo ana no ia i kumu e laulaha aku ai ka ike iwa-ena o na kumu a me na haumana no na mea e pili ana i ka Ho-nua. He mau buke no e waiho ia aku ana i ike iho oukou.

Eia ke hoomakaukau ia nei ma ke keena o ka Papa, no ka unuhi ana i "Ka Honua Nei," helu elua. Ua loa mai na pala-pala aina a me na papa kii no ke kumu lilo he \$1,80044, i hoo-kaa ia aku mai na loa o na buke kula i kuai ia'ku, aka aia a loa hou mai he haawina alaila hiki ke hoolawa pono ia keia hana a waiho ia aku ma na kula.

NA HALE A ME NA LAKO KULA.

Ua lako pono na apana a pau o keia Aupuni i keia manawa i na halekula kupono, a he mau wahi dala uuku wale no kai manao ia no ka hoomaemae ana. Aka hoi, he nui na hemahema no na lako kula kupono, oia hoi na noho-papa oluolu no na haumana, a me na papa kakau no na kumu. Oia mau hemahema a pau ke hoolako liilii ia nei e na Luna Kula o kela me keia apana.

NA DALA KULA.

Mamuli o ko oukou lokomaikai i na makahiki i hala, ua hiki ka hoomauia ana o na kula kumumua a pau pono ke kau. Ke mau nei no na kumu i pili ai no ka oukou mau kokua hoolawa i haawi mai ai no na apana nele, a ke hilinaia nei e hoomauia ana no ia haawina e oukou.

III.—Na Kula Wae o ke Aupuni.

O ka olelo Beritania, oia ka olelo nana e hooholo aku ka ike ma keia mau kula, aka nae, aole i kapae loa ia aku ke ao ia ana o ka olelo Hawaii i, no ia kumu.

Na Kula Hanai o ke Aupuni.

KULANUI O LAHAINALUNA.

Ka nui o na haumana, 88.

Ke mau nei no ke kaulana o keia kula no ka pau pono o ka ike ma na lala i ao ia. Ua hoomakaia ke ao ia ana o na ike kumu kula; aka, i mea e loa pau pono aku ai na ike oia ano, mamuli o ke ao ana aku me ia, he kupono e pakuiia aku ka oihana ao-kumu i keia kula, a e hookaawaleia ia hana mai na hana mau e ao ia nei, a e hoomau ia aku ke ao kumu ana he elua makahiki. Ua lawa iloko oia manawa ka hoomakaukau kupono ia o na kanaka opiopio no ka oihana ao-kumu no na kula kumumua. I keia manawa, aole i oi aku mamua o ka hookahi hapa-lua o na haumana komo hou mai i keia kula, ka poe e noho ana a pau pono na makahiki eha o ke kau hele kula. O ke koena o na haumana komo hou e haalele liilii ana no kela me keia kumu. Aia a ao maoli ia na haumana ma ke kula ao-kumu no na makahiki elua, oia ka meae pau ai keia hemahema. He hiki no i na haumana ke komo ma keia ala o ka ike, a hookuu ia i ka pau pono ana o na makahiki elua, me ka palapala hoomaikai e hoike ana he haumana lakou i oi ae ma ia lala.

No ka hooko pono ana i keia liana, he kupono ke hoolimalima hou aku i kumu kokua, i hiki ai i kekahi o na kumu nui o ke kula ke hoolilo i ka hapa-nui o kona manawa a me kona maka-ala i ka oihana kula ao-kumu. He pono e ao ia ko kakou mau kumu no na kula kumumua no ia hana wale no; a ina e hiki ole ma Lahainaluna, ihea 'la e hiki ai ia hana?

KE KULA HANAI O HALEAKALA NO NA KEIKIKANE.

Ka nui o na haumana, 41.

I keia wa ua hoololiia keia he kula hanai, a ua maikai no hoi kona kulana. Ua hookahuaia ka hooonopono ana o keia kula ma ke ano o na rula oihana koa, a he maikai maoli no hoi. No keia ano ao ua kapaeia ka laau hili a ke kumu, a e ao ana i na keiki i ka hoomalu kino ana. Ua hooulu ae i ka hoihoi a me ka hoo-pono i na oni kino, a me ka aapo o ka noonoo o na keiki i loa aku ma ke ao ikaika ana, a he pomaikai nui no hoi no lakou. He maikai no ke ola kino o na haumana, a ua lawa pono lakou i na ai kupono.

He kula hanalima no keia, a o na haumana kekahi i komo pu iloko o na loa o ka lakou mau hana. O ka holo ana, kamana ana, kukulu pa ana, a me na hana o ka hale hana waiubata, na lakou a pau e hana. Ua kukuluia kekahi pa-uwaea e na keiki, malalo o ke alakai a Mr. Clarke a me Mr. Rogers, e hoopuni ana he umi

eka aina, a ke palau ia nei i keia manawa e na bipi opio i ao ia no hoi e lakou.

He mea nui hoi ka hooiia ana mai o ka oihana hana waiubata me keia kula. Ma ka la 1 o Feberuari, 1871, o ka nui o na holoholona i pili no ke kula, he 197,—oia hoi he 91 bipi wahine, he 16 bipi keiki, a he 90 bipi o kela me keia ano. O ke kumukuai koho wale ia no ka hale a me na lako hana waiubata ia wa, he \$125.

Ma ka la mua o Ianuari, 1874, ua pii aku ka nui o na bipi a i ka 406 : oia hoi he 140 bipi wahine, he 30 bipi keiki, he 30 bipi hana, a he 206 bipi o kela me keia ano. He 41 mau bipi i pepehi ia no ke kula, a i hui ole ia me na bipi I helu ia ae 'la. A ma ia manawa no hoi he \$462.50 ke kumukuai koho wale ia o ka hale a me na lako hana waiubata.

No ka piha'loa o na rumi o na haumana noho ma ke kula, a no ka pilikia o ke kumu nui o ke kula i ka nele i ka hale noho kupono, ua kauoha ae ka Papa Hoonaaauao, e hana houia a e hoonui aku i ka halekula a me ka hale noho o ke Kumu. Ua hanaia he palapala aelike e ke Kahu Kula Nui, ma ka aoao o ka Papa Hoonaaauao, me Messrs. Snell & King, he mau kamana, e hana i na hana a pau e like me ke ano i hoakaka ia, me na lilo moku a me ke kauo ana i huipua, no ka uku he \$5,401.75.

Mahope o ka pau ana o na hoololi a me ka hoonui ana i na hale, e lawa ana ka noho ana o na haumana he kanaono ma keia kula. I keia manawa, aia ke kula ke noho 'la malalo o ka noho-'na hemahema i ka wai, oiai, e nele ana kahi e loa mai ai ka wai i kekahi wa. I ka makahiki 1872 a me 1873, he oi ia o na Kau pa-maloo i ike ia; a mamuli wale no o ke akahai loa, a me ko kapae ana i kekahi mau hana hoomaemae kino, i lawa ai ke kula i ka wai a hala ka wa maloo. Ke kukulu ia mai nei elua mau lua-wai nui hou, a e malaroa ia ana no hoi na pomaikai a pau o kaupaku o na hale no ua mau lua-wai la; a, ina aole e hiki hou mai ana kekahi kau maloo loihi, e lawa ana no ke kula i na lua-wai,—he aneane 3000 barela ka lawa kupono,—ke piha pono nae na lua a pau iloko o na malama hooilo. Aka hoi, he loa no ka wai mau e lawa ai ke kula a me na hana a pau e pili ana i ka hana waiubata, ke hoomoe ia na ha-wai he elua a me ka hapa mile ka loihi a hiki aku i ka waipuna i ka pali o Waihou. Ala keia waipuna iluna o ka aina Aupuni, a ua kahe mau ka wai, iloko o na mahina maloo loa o ke kau o ka makahiki i hala, he 380 barela wai i kela a me keia iwakalua-kumamaha hora.

Aole he kula malalo o ka mana o ke Aupuni i oi aku ka nui o na pomaikai, e like me keia, no ka hooulu ana a hoolilo aku i kula hoomaamaa ike hana-lima, kahi e ao ia'i na keiki o ke Aupuni i na hana-ike e ake mau ia nei maanei. Ke kono haahaa aku nei au i ka manao o keia Aba Hanohano no ke ano kupono o keia kula, a me ka paipai aku ia oukou i haawina no na lako ke hiki ai ke loa mau mai ka wai i keia kula.

Kula Hanalima me ka Hoopololei.

KULA MA KAPALAMA.

Ka nui o na haumana, 56.

Ka nui o na keiki i hoopaaia iloko o na makahiki elua o keia

Ke mau nei no ke kupono o ke kokua ia o keia Kula e ka lehu-lehu. E loa ana i na keiki i hoopaaia malaila ka pomaikai o ka hoomaamaa mauia i ka hana. Ua ao ia na keiki i na ike buke he ekolu hora o ka la no na la eha o ka hebedoma; a ua ao ia'ku no hoi kekahi mau keiki i ka olelo Beritania, i ike ia ko lakou aapo ia olelo; o ke koena ua ao ia ma ka ike kumumua o ka olelo Hawaii. Na na keiki no o keia kula e mahi i ka aina, a na lakou no hoi e humuhumu ko lakou mau lole, malalo o ka hooponopono a me ke alakai a na Kumu.

Ua makemake nui ia i wahi kupono no na kaikamahine ma ke Kula Hoopololei; aka, mamua aku nei, ua ike ia ka paakiki o ka imi ana a loa ke kumu, a kahu-wahine, kupono nana e malania; a o ke kukulu kaawale ana aku i hale no na kaikamahine, he kumu kanalua, oiai, ua maopopo e oi aku ana na lilo mamua ae o na dala ma ka waihona o ka Papa.

Na Kula Wae (La) o Ke Aupuni.

KULA HUI UKU-OLE O HILO.

Ka nui o na haumana, 182; keikikane, 92; kaikamahine, 90.

Aia keia kula malalo o ke alakai noeau a ke Kumu-nui, ke hoomau nei ma kona kulant, ma ka papa mua o ko kakou mau kula. He mea mahalo nui ia ka holomua o ka ike o na haumana. O ke ano o ke ao ana i hahaiia ma keia kula, oia ka haawi ana i ka ike i na keiki, i ike ia ka aapo ma na kumumua o ka ike ma ka olelo Beritania, a o na keiki hoi i loa ole keia haawina, ua waiho ia aku ia lakou na pono e loa ai ia lakou ka ike ma ka olelo Hawaii, i oi ae mamua o ka loa ana ia lakou ma ka hapanui o na kula kumumua.

Ua ukuia na kumu e like me mamua, kekahi hapa no loko mai no ia o ka puu dala i hookaawaleia no ke kokua ana i na Kula Hawaii ine Enelani, a o kekahi hapa no loko mai o ka puu dala kula o ka apana o Hilo.

KULA HUI UKU-OLE O LAHAINA.

Ka nui o na haumana, 168; keikikane, 94; kaikamahine, 74.

He kula hou keia i hoohalike ia me ke Kula Uku-ole o Hilo. Ua hoomakaia keia kula mamuli o ka olelo hooholo a ka Papa Hoonaaauao i ka malama o Aperila, 1873. Mailoko mai na hau- mana o keia kula o na kula kumumua elima o Lahaina ia manawa. Ua hoolimalimaia aku kela pa akea a kuwaena i ke kulana-kauhale, i kapaia o "Halealoha," no na dala he umi no ka makahiki hookahi, a no na makahiki elima. mai na Kahu malama o ka Halepule o Wainee, me ka hiki ke hoomauia aku i ka pau ana o ka hoolimalima mua. Ua hooneeia aku kekahi o na halekula kumumua ma ua pa 'la, a ua kukulu hon ia iho he halekula hou, a ua kokoke lawa na lilo i ke dala i loa mai i ke kuaiia ana'ku o na halekula elua o ke aupuni e waiho wale ana ma ia kulanakauhale. I ka makahiki mua i weheia ae ai keia kula, he nui ka manawa i hoolilo ia ma ka hana luhi o ke ao ana i na keiki ahiu, a ike rula ole o na kula kumumua o Lahaina, a loa mai ia lakou ke ano hoopolei, a me ka hoonoho papa ana i na haumana.

Ua ukua na kumu o keia kula mai ka puu dala no ke kokua o na Kula Enelani me na Kula Hawaii, a mai ka puu dala kula o Lahaina. Ke mau nei ke kupono o ka holomua o keia kula.

KULA O KAHEHITNA.

Ka nui o na haumana, 167.

Aole hoi i hooikaika kuponoia ke ao ia'na o na haumana ma ka oihana kumumua o ka ike ma keia kula e like me ka mea i make-make ia, ma ka manawa i hala ae nei, a ke manaolana nei au e loli ana na hana ma keia mahele o keia kula, no ka maikai aku.

KULA KAIKAMAHINE O POHUKAINA.

(Ke kula keia o Mililani mamua.)

Ka nui o na haumana, 75.

Ua hoike ia'ku i ka makahiki 1872, ka onawaliwali o keia kula, oiai he 38 wale no ka nui o na haumana e hele ana malaila ia manawa. Ua hauoli au i ka hoike aku i ke ano e ana mai o ke kulana o keia kula i keia manawa, no ka maikai. Ua pii ae a palua ka nui o na haumana, a ua maalahi loa ke kulana o keia kula i keia wa, mamuli o ka hooikaika mau o ke kumu, i kokuaia mai e ka hope kumu. I ka malama o Ianuari, ua panai aku ka Papa Hoonaaauao me ke Kuhina Kalaiaina i kona pono a me ke kuleana i ka pa-kula ma Mililani no kela wahi maluhia a kupono no hoi ma Alanui Puowaina, i kapaia o Pohukaina. Ua lawe ia aku ka hapa-luna o ka halekula o Mililani, i kapa ia hoi i ka wa mamua, ka Halekula Kokua Manawalea. A o keia hale kaupaku i lawe ia'ku, ua hooponopono houia a pan pono na hemahema, a ma ia pa hookahi n0 ua kukulu houia he halekula akea maikai. He hiki ke hoolawaia ma keia mau hale elua he haneri a oi na haumana, a o ka huina o na lilo n0 ka hoololii ana o ke kula a ma kahi e ku nei i keia wa, aia ma \$4,438.54.

KULA ALANUI PAPU.

Ka nui o na haumana, 69; keikikane, 64; kaikamahine, 5.

Aole hoi e hiki ia'u ke hoike aku, e like me ke kupono i ko'u makemake, i ka hololea o ke kulana o na hana ma keia kula. Me ka manao e hookikie ae i ke ano o keia kula n0 ka pono o ka le hulehu olelo-haole, a e hoolilo ae i kula kahi e ao ia ai ka lako mau keiki ma na ao kupono o ka naauao, ua kauoha aku ka Papa Hoonaaauao i ke Kahukula Nui, i ka malama o Sepatemaba o ka makahiki i hala, e hoomakaukau i papa alakai o na mea i manao ia e ao aku ma ua kula 'la, a e huipuaia hoi maloko o ia papa na haawina i loa ai i na haumana ke kulana hiki ke hele aku ma na kula kiekie. Oia papa haawina ua hoomakaukauia, aponoia e ka Papa, a hoolahaia aku i ke akea; a e hookoia ana n0 hoi.

Ua raahuahua ae na lilo o keia kula mamua o ka ka Papa i manao ai, a ua oi aku no hoi mamila o ke kupono, ke hoomaopopoia ke ano kuonoono o kekahi o ka poe e hoouna ana i ka lakou mau keiki Ua lana ae ka manao e hookaa pono ia mai ana Da uku kula, e ulu ae ana ka pono e makemake nui ia mai ai keia kula.

IV.—Na Kula i Kokuaia e ke Aupuni.

O ka olelo Enelani oia ka mole o ke alakai ma ka ike iloko o keia mau kula.

Na Kula Hanai no na Kaikamahine.

KULA HANAI O NA KAIKAMAHINE, MAUI HIKINA.

Ka nui o na haumana, 51.

Ke mau nei no ka makaukau o keia kula ma na haawina o ka naauao. He maikai ke ao ia ana o na kaikamahine i na ike o ka noho'na, a aole i oi ae ka naauao i ao ia ma na kula e ae o ka aina mamua o ka ike i ao ia ma keia kula. He mea minamina, nae hoi, ka hoopalaleha ana o na makua i ka hookaa mai i ka uku kula o na haumana.

E hoomanao hoi na makua a me na kahu-hanai e hoouna ana i na kaikamahine i ke kula hanai, a e uku ana he \$50 a emi iho i ka makahiki, no ka ai, kahi noho a me ke ao ana, aole lakou i hoolawa i na lilo o ka malama ana. Na na uku kokua a ka Papa Hoonaaauao, na na kokua mai na hui manawalea a me ka poe manao aloha, na hana kokua wale a na kumu a me kekahi poe e ae, ka uku hoolimalima ole, &c., e hoolawa nei i ke koena nui. Ua kono mai ka pono o na kula a me ka pono o ka hoonaaauao ana e hoomaopopo ia ka hookaa ana o na bila kikoo o ke kula. Me he 'la o ke ano maoli o ke kanaka o ka hooemi i ke ano o na pomaikai e loa wale ana me ka hooikaka a me ka lilo ole.

KULA O ST. CROSS, LAHAINA.

Ka nui o na haumana, 37.

Oiai ua emi mai ka nui o na haumana e hele ana i keia kula, aka ke mau nei no ka maikai. Ua nui a makuahua mai ka mai ma keia kula iloko o keia mau malama i hala aku nei, me he 'la o ke kumu no ke ano koukou i ka noho mau o ka ua, a ua make aku hookahi o lakou. I keia manawa, ua ano maikai ke ola kino o na haumana, a ua holomua no ma na mea i ao ia.

KULA KAIKAMAHINE O KAWAIAHAO.

Ka nui o na haumana, 40.

Ke ukali mau nei no ka pomaikai i keia kula kaulana. He maikai ke ola o na haumana, a ua holomua ka ike ma na mea i ao ia ma keia kula.

KULA KAIKAMAHINE O WAIALUA.

Ka nui o na haumana, 31.

He nui na alaalai kue a keia kula i hooikaika aku ai iloko o ka makahiki i hala Ua hoopilikia ia kona kulana hoopono, a ua ki-paku ia aku he umikumamalua o na haumana oo, no ko lakou kue kumu ole i na rula. Me he ala ua uuku loa na kumu e kupono ai ka malama ana i ka pono maluhia o keia kula, a he uuku loa no hoi ka uku o na haumana e hiki ai ke hoolawa kupono i na lako ai a me na lilo e ae. Aole hoi o ke \$30 o ka makahiki, aka, o ke \$40, a aole no paha he nui loa ina he \$50, ka uku kupono o na haumana.

He mau kumu hooikaika a manao hoopono ko keia kula, a ma keia manawa ua ike ia ka ulu ana mai o na hiohiona maikai ma-laila. He opiopio ka nui o na keiki e noho nei i ke kula, a aia ma waena o ka ekolu a ka umikumama-ono ko lakou makahiki.

KE KULA ST. ANERU.

Me kekahi mau Kokua.

Ka nui o na haumana, 73; na haumana noho, 26; ua haumana ma ka la, 47.

Ke mau nei ka loa o ka mahalo a me ka hiline nui o na ma-kua a me na kahu-hanai o na keiki, e hele ana i keia kula nui a ano koikoi. E ake mau ana na makua e hoouna aku i na keiki ke loa kahi hakahaka.

Me ka manao o ka Papa e alakai aku i ka hoouna ana i na kaikamahine opiopio ma na Kula Hanai, mamua ae o ka paa ana o na hiohiona ino i na keiki, a i mea e hiki ai ke hoolilo aku i ka-hi haawina uuku ma kona waihona no ka pono o na keiki e hele ana ia ano kula, i hiki ai ke loa mahuahua mai ka pomaikai, no-laila, ua hana a ua hoolaha aku ka Papa, ma ka la 22 o Ianuari i hala, i keia mau rula, penei:

OLELO HOOLAHA I NA KULA HANAI KAIKAMAHINE HAWAII.—Mai ka la 1 o Iulai, 1874, a ma ia hope aku, aole e uku ana ka Papa Hoonaaauao i ka uku e uku mau ia nei, no na kaikamahine e hoo-komo ia ana ma ia mau Kula, ina ua oi aku ka nui o na makahiki i ka umi (10), i ka wa i hookomoia aku ai; a mai ia manawa, a mahope aku, aole e uku ia ana no na kaikamahine i oi aku na makahiki mamua o ka umikumamaono (16).

Ina ua hele mau ka haumana i kekahi kula o keia ano, mai ka umi (10) mai o kona mau makahiki, a hoololiia aku i kekahi kula e ae o ia ano, oiai oia e hele ana iloko o ka palena o ka umi (10) a hiki i ka umikumamaono (16) o kona mau makahiki, e loa aku ana no i ke Kula ka uku nona; aka, e uku ia ana no nae

no ka loihi o ka manawa i hala ai mai ke komo mua ana i ke kula ana i hele hope ai, a i noi ae ai hoi i ka uku nona; me ka hoomanao ole ia o ka loihi o ka manawa i hala ai iaia i na kula i hele mua ia.

I mea nae e loa ai ka uku i oleloia, no na haumana e hoololiia ana e like me ka mea i haiia maluna, e hoomaopopo pono ia ka hookuu maikai ia ana o ka haumana mai ke kula i hele mua ia ai, oia iho no hoi, o ke kula e noi ana i ka uku no ia ano haumana, aia ia malalo o na rula a ka Papa Hoonaaauao i hoolahaia i ka la 8 o Iune, 1865.

Ma ke Kauoha o ka Papa Hoonaaauao.

W. Jas. Smith.

Kakauolelo o ka Papa Hoonaaauao.

Honolulu,

Ian. 26, 1874.

Na Kula Hanai no na Keikikane.

KULA HANAI O HILO.

Elua mau kokua kanaka maoli, Ka nui o na haumana, 79.

Ke mau nei no ka maikai o ke ano o ke kula. Ua ilihia ia mai e ka poino ma ka make ana aku o kekahi kokua ikaika, o Mr. Huluhulu. Ua waiho ia'ku ke noi ia Mr. Makaimoku o Lahaina-luna, e hoi mai ma kahi mua ona i keia kula.

KULA NUI O OAHU.

Ka nui o na haumana, 89; keikikane, 51, kaikamahine 38.

Ua ulu palua ae a oi aku ka nui o na haumana e hele nei i keia kula, mai ka manawa i waiho ia'ku ai ka palapala hoike a ka Papa o ke kau i hala. O kona ano maoli he kula kiekie, a aia ia ma ke poo o ko kakou mau kula hoonaaauao. Ua hoopihia kupono ia na wahi o ke kokua haumana ekolu a ke Aupuni i na keiki Hawaii.

KULA NUI O AHUIMANU.

Na haumana, 41.

Mamuli o ka noi ia ana mai o ka Papa Hoonaaauao e na kumu o keia kula, ua hooholoia ehaawi ia'ku he \$400 no ka makahiki hoo-kahi mai Sepatemaba 1, 1873. Ua loa aku keia haawina ma ke ano kokua haumana Hawaii ewalu, e haawi ia no na haumana a ke kumn-nui e koho ai, a e aponoia ana e ka Papa, a ua manaolana ka Papa e loa mai ana ke kokua e hiki ai ke hoornau ia aku keia haawina.

KULA NUI O IOLANI.

Na haumana, 20.

Eia ke malama nei ka Papa Hoonaaauao he umi mau haumana kokuaia ma keia kula, no ka uku makahiki he \$100 no ka ai, kahi moe, a me ke ao ana i ka haumana hookahi.

KULA HANAI O IOLE.

Ka nui o na haumana, 20.

Ua uku ia ka kumu Hawaii o keia kula he 50 keneta o ka la mai loko mai o ka puu dala kula o ka Apana o Kohala.

Na Kula Ia i Kokuaia e ke Aupuni.

Kula Haole ma Hilo, (kula a Miss H. F. Coan mamua) Miss E. A. Arms. Kumu. Ka nui o na haumana, 29; Keikikane, 11; Kaikamahine, 18. Aia keia kula malalo o ka mana o ka Papa Kahu-malama, i kohoia ae mai na haole o Hilo. He maikai no kona kulana i keia manawa, a e loa ana iaia ka haawina makahiki he \$100 mailoko ae o ka puu dala kula o ia apana. Ua haawi aku ka Papa Hoonaaauao he \$300 ina kahu-malama, i keia wa pokole aku nei, i mea e kokua ai ia lakou i ke kukulu ana i hale kula.

ST. JOSEPH KULA, Hilo—e hoike ana he 54 haumana ma ka papa inoa; he 34 keikikane; na kaikamahine, 20; a e loa ana he \$200 kokua no ka makahiki, mai ka puu dala kula o ka Apana o Hilo.

KULA A MRS. LIDGATE, Hilo. E loa ana he \$40 kokua no ka makahiki mai ka puu dala kula mai. Aole i loa mai ka hoike kupono no ka nui o na haumana ma keia kula i ke keena o ka Papa.

KULA HAOLE O MAUI KOMOHANA, O G. W. Hart, ke kumu. Na haumana, he 60; keikikane, 31; kaikamahine, 29. He \$200 kokua e loa nei i keia kula no ka makahiki mai loko ae o ka puu dala kula o ka apana o Wailuku.

KULA A ABEREKE, Lahaina. He 82 ka nui o na haumana ma ka papa inoa o keia kula. Ua haawi aku ka Papa Hoonaaauo he \$150 kokua makahiki, e uku ia mai loko ae o ka puu dala kula o Lahaina.

BETHEL KULA PAKE, Honolulu, o E. Dunscombe, ke kumu. Na haumana, 13. Ke loa nei he \$200 kokua makahiki mai loko ae o ka haawina no na kula Hawaii me Eenelani.

KULA A MISS JOHNSON, Hanalei. Ke mau nei ka loa o ka \$500 kokua makahiki mai loko ae o ia puu dala. Ka nui o na haumana, he 37; keikikane, 21; kaikamahine, 16.

V.—Na Kula Kuokoa.

Eia malalo iho ka hoike mai na kula a pau o keia ano. O ka olelo haole kai ao ia ma ia mau kula :

VI.—ka Hoike Helu Lahui.

I kulike ai me na olelo o ke kanawai, ua kauoha ae ka Papa Hoonaaauo e helu nui i na kanaka o keia Paeaina, i ka la 27 o Dekemaba, 1872. Ua malama makaala loa ia ma ke keena o ka Papa na mea a pau e pili ana i keia hana i loa ai ka heluna ku-pono e like me ka hiki ke hana ia. He kumu hoomanalo i ka manao nunanuna o ke kanaka, no ka emi mau o ka Lalmi, ka ike ana iho malalo nei i na huahelu e pili ana i ka poe hanau hou o ka aina.

He \$3,515 ka huina o na lilo no ka hana helu lahui. Eia pu me keia palapala hoike na kope o ka papa helu.

VII.—Na Kanawai Kula—ka Hookeoia Ana.

Ua holopono ka hana ma ka hapanui o ko kakou man kana-wai kula, a ua hooko pono ia. Ua waiho pu ke kanawai i hoo-holoia i ka makahiki 1870, e hoomaopopo ana no ke koho ana i ke kolu o na hoa o ka Papa Kula o kela me keia apana, e na makua a me na kahu-hanai o na keiki, a e hoakaka ana i ka mana o ia papa. Iloko o na makahiki eha i kauia ai keia kanawai, ua ike akaka lea ia, ma ka hapanui o na apana kula, aole hoi o ka hoopalaleha wale o na makua a me na kahu-hanai ma ke koho ana i ke kolu o na hoa o ka papa kula apana, aka, o ka hoike akaka ana ae kekani i ka hoohamamaia o ka puka i ka poe kupono ole o ka lehulehu e komo mai i kumu ma ko kakou mau kula Kumumua.

Ua makaukau mau ka Papa Hoonaaauo, ma o ko lakou mau hope i kauohaia, e hoolohe i na hoopii kupono a na makua e noho ana ma na apana no na mea e pili ana i ka hoonaaauo ana i ka lakou mau keiki. Ke noi haahaa aku nei au e kapae aku keia Aha Hanohano i keia kanawai.

Ka Hana-Lima ma na Kula.

KUMUMUA.

I ko'u manao he kupono ka huiia o ke ao hana-lima me na ao ike palapala e ao ia nei ma na kula Kumumua. He nui na aina o ke Aupuni e waiho kokoke aku ana i na Halekula Kumumua, a e waiho wale nei i keia manawa. Ma na wahi he nui wale he hiki ke mahiia ka aina e na haumana a me na kumu a loa mai ka pomaikai o na mea ulu. Ke paipai aku nei au i keia Aha Hano-hano e hooholo i kanawai e haawi ana i ka Papa Hoonaaauo i ka mana e hoo-hui mai i ka liana-lima me na alakai hoonaaauo o na kula kumumua, a e hookaawale ana, malalo o kekahi mau Kumu i kekahi mau apana o na aina o ke Aupuni e pili kokoke mai ana i na halekula, i kupono no ka mahi ana i na mea ulu no ka pono o na haumana a me na kumu, ma kahi nele i na aina kula no ka hana i haiia ae 'Ia; a e hiki ai no hoi ke hoolimalima i na aina kupono me ka hoo-pono-pono no ka mahi ana i na mea ulu ma ka mahele ana a me na ano e ae.

O ke ao ikaika ana i na haawina kula, he ekolu a he eha paha hora o ka la, he elua a he ekolu paha hora ma ka hana-lima ma-waho o ke kula, he mea ia e ulu ai ke ola kino, a me ka hoomaamaa ana i ka hana; e hoomahuahua ana i na loa o ka hana i ka uku o ke kumu, a e hoolako ana i na haumana i ke kumu e kuai aku ai i na buke kula, a he mea no hoi e hooi ae ai, ina e hooko pono ia, i ke ano o na hana hoonaaauo, mamua o keia manawa.

He pinepine ka olelo ia aole ka he like o ka hooikaika hana o ka poe e ulu ae nei, me ko ka poe o ka wa kahiko; a o lakou—o ka poe i ao ia ma na Kula Kiekie a me na Kula Beritania kai olelo nui ia—ua kuhihewa na manao no ka hana lima; oia hoi keia, ma ka pokole, he molowa, a he palaualelo, a ua piha loa o loko i ka hookano a me na manao kaena i oi ae mamua o ke kupono no ko lakou pono iho.

Ina o ka hopena i loa mai ma ke ano o ka hoonaaauao ana i keia manawa, o ka hoopoino a hooemi paha i ka manao maikai no ka hana ka pomaikai a me ke kuokoa i loa ma ka hana-lima, alaila ua hewa a ua hemahema ke ano o ka hoonaaauao ana e ao ia nei, a ua kupono i keia me keia makamaka o ka lahui e imi aku i ke ano kupono o ke ao ana. Aka, ina he kakaikahi ia mea i ike ia, a ua ulu ae mamuli o ka hemahema o na la opio, a me ka pa-laka o ke ao ia ana ma na home, alaila e manaolana aku kakou he pokole wale no ka mau ana o ia mau kumu alakai ino, a na ke au o ka manawa a me na pilikia e hoopono mai. O ka rula mau o na makua Hawaii, he palupalu loa ma ke ao ana i ka lakou mau keiki, a aole no hoi e pau loa ana ka poino i loohia i na keiki ma-muli o ka hemahema o ka na makua ao ana, ma na kula ana a ke Aupuni i hoolako aku ai.

He mea nui ke ao kuonoona ana ma na kula a pau, na kula o na keikikane a me na kula o na kaikamahine, i ka manao iini i na haumana no ka hoolako ana i ko lakou mau hemahema ma ka hana, a me ka manao mahalo no ka poe hana a me ka poe noho pono, oiai ia poe ma ke kulana a e hana ana ma na hana haahaa. O kahi hea la kai oi ae o ka maikai mamua o na kula ohana, a me na ohana hoopono, e hiki ai ke ao ia aku na manao oia ano?

E kaa ana i na dala auhau kula elua o ka makahiki, he kana-kolu-kumamahiku hapa haneri wale no o na lilo no na hana hoonaaauao; a oiai, ma ka nana ana aku ua nui ka lilo 110 na kula, ke noonooia iho me ka nui o na loa o ke aupuni, aka, ua lana ka manao o ka Papa aole e hooemi mai ana keia. Aha Hanohano i ka haawina o keia oihana i noiia ma ka Bila Haawina no na makahiki elua e hiki mai ana, oiai no hoi ua emi iho, he \$8,300, malalo o ka haawina no na kula o ka makahiki 1872 me 1873.

E OLA KA MOI I KE AKUA.

Chas. R. Bishop,

Peresidena o ka Papa Hoonaaauao.

Haawina no na Kula Hawaii me na Kula Beritania.

Na Kokua no na Kula Kumumua.

Kula Hanalima me Hoopololei.

Kukulu Ana i na Hale Kula Hou.

Ke Pai Ana, &c., i Ka Palapala Aina.

Puu Dala Kula.

Na Dala o ka Oihana i Loa Mai, a i Hooliloia.

Na Loa Mr na Lilo o na Kula Aupuni.

Na Kula o ka Paeaina Hawaii, Ianuari 1, 1874.

NA KULA LAHUI. NA KULA I KOKULA E KE AUPUNI. NA KULA KUOKOA NA KULA KUMUMA. NA KULA HANAI. NA KULA LA BERITANIA NO NA HA WAI NA KULA HANAI. NA KULA LA. NA KULA HANAI. NA KULA LA. HUINA NUI. APANA. NA KULA. K. K. K.M. H'N. KULA. K.K. K.M. H'N. KULA. K. K. K. M. H'N. INOA. K.K. K.M. H'N. INOA. K.K. K.M. H'N. INOA. K.K. K. M. H'N. INOA. K. K. K. M. H'N. K. K. K. M. H'N. HAWAII. Hilo 5 88 69 157 Kula Hui 92 90 182 Kula Hanai o Hilo 79 79 Kula Haole o Hilo 11 18 29 315 206 521 Puna 11 197 111 938 Kula St. Joseph, Hilo 34 20 54 Kula haole a Clement no na Hawaii 10 10 20 137 121 258 Kau 7 125 86 211 Kula a Mrs. Lidgate, Hilo 11 9 20 125 86 211 Kona Hema 11 202 121 323 kula o Hale o ka Haku 7 4 11 209 125 334 Kona Akau 11 222 161 383 222

161 383 Kohala Hema.. 5 81 66 147 Kula Ohana, Waikoloa. 2 5 7 95 72 167 Kohala Akau 11 178 135 313
 Kula Hanai o Iole 14 14 Kula o Waimea 12 1 13 Kula Beritania o Halawa 22 20 42 214 155 369 Hamakua 10
 123 90 213 123 90 213 Huina 71 178 839 1985 92 90 182 93 93 56 47 103 14 6 20 39 34 73 1440 1016 2456
 MAUI. Wailuku 14 224 168 392 Kula Beritania, M. Komh'a 31 29 60 Kula Beritania o Wailuku. 2 8 10 257
 205 462 Makawao 9 139 94 233 Kula Keikikane, Haleakala 41 41 Kula Keikamahine, M. Hikina 51 51 180
 145 325 Hana 14 247 175 422 247 175 422 Lahaina 5 70 48 118 Kulanui o Lahainaluna 88 88 Kula Hui 94 74
 168 Kula o St. Cross 37 37 Kula a Rev. Aubert 47 35 82 Kula Beritania o Kaanapali 12 8 20 311 202 513 Lanai
 2 17 14 31 17 14 31 Molokai 12 176 113 289 176 113 289 Huina 56 873 612 1485 129 129 74 168 88 88 78 64
 142 14 16 30 1188 854 2042 OAHU. Honolulu 19 449 371 820 Kula Hoopololei, etc 56 56 Kula Alii 165 2 167
 Kula Kaikamahine, Kawai'h'o 40 40 Kula Pake, Bethel 13 13 Kula a na Hoa o ka Puuwai Laa 56 56 Kula a
 Mrs. Smith 8 16 24 986 845 1831 Ewa & Waianae 7 120 91 211 Kula Ala Papu 64 5 69 Kulanui o Iolani 20 20
 Kulanui o Oahu 33 36 69 Kula a na Hoa o ka Puuwai Laa 8 16 78 120 91 211 Waialua 3 47 30 77 Kula
 Kaikamahine 75 75 Kulanui o Oahu 14 6 20 Kula o St. Andrew's Priory 47 47 Kula a Mrs. Mary weed, Ala
 Papu 9 15 24 Koolauloa 8 94 56 150 Kulanui o St. Andrew 26 26 Kula Beritania o Kawaihahao 43 32 75 70 64
 134 Koolaupoko 7 100 84 184 Kulanui o Ahuimanu 41 41 Kula o Kaunakapili 57 16 73 Kula Kaikamahine,
 Waialua 31 31 Kula Wae o Kawaihahao 8 10 18 121 74 195 Kulanui o St. Alban 47 47 Kula o Laiewai 27 18 45
 141 84 225 Kula Beritania o Waialua 23 3 26 Kula a Mrs. Owen, Nuuanu 14 14 Huina 44 810 632 1442 56 56
 229 82 311 75 103 178 46 83 129 56 56 222 202 424 1438 1158 2596 KAUAI. Lihue 6 83 55 138 83 55 138
 Hanalei 7 103 64 167 Kula a Miss Johnson 21 16 37 124 80 204 Koloa 4 51 40 91 Kula Beritania o Koloa 12 2
 14 63 42 105 Waimea 7 107 77 184 107 77 184 Niihau 1 20 10 30 20 10 30 Huina 25 364 246 610 21 16 37 12
 2 14 397 264 661 Huina Nui 196 3193 2329 5522 3 185 185 5 415 246 661 10 168 191 359 9 201 210 411 3 14
 62 76 16 287 954 541 4463 3292 7755

A Plea On Behalf of the Working Classes, for the immediate establishment of A Victorian Sunday League, to counteract the immoral tendencies of "The Sunday Observance Society".

No. 13.] [Second thousand.

A treatise on The commonly misapprehended 4th Commandment; on The Christian abrogation of the intire Mosaic code of Laws; on The fallacy of Jesus's ever having endorsed the Decalogue; on The Sabbatist's bugbear—"the *Continental Sabbath*"; on The bounden duty of Governments to instruct the Young and educate the Adults, making Secular-instruction *compulsory*, while leaving Religious-education *free*; Opening all Educational-institutions on Sunday, such as Public Libraries, Museums, Galleries of Art, etc. also, the Parks and Gardens belonging to the People, and permitting the running of Railway trains, Steamboats, etc. together with unrestricted access to the Telegraph wires :

By B. S. Nayler, supported by the authority of Jesus and his Apostles, by the Fathers of the Church, by the Reformers, by Clergymen and Dissenting Ministers, by Moralists, Philosophers, Statesmen, Philanthropists, and by Common sense.

I write as to persons of understanding, judge ye what I say.

Printed by Evans Brothers Melbourne 44 Collins Street, West Published, *Gratis*, B. S. Nayler 35 Stephen Street 1871

From a Fund voluntarily subscribed by Promoters of the Cause.

An Appeal to the Commonsense of Victorians, on the long-vexed Sabbath-question; elucidating both

What the Fourth Cammandment Is, and What it is Not.

TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN. We are on the eve of a general Election of Legislators; and it behooves the Working-classes especially, to elect such Members of Parliament as may faithfully represent their interests in the Councils of the Colony; pleading for the enactment of New laws, and urging the abrogation of Old ones, as circumstances may demand.

One of the many subjects expected to engage the attention of the New parliament, is the consideration of the so-called *Sabbath-question*, in which the masses of the people are particularly interested; as they have already been defrauded of their rights as men, and robbed of their privileges as citizens, by the interference of

an influential but lamentably uninformed clique of Sabbatarian Idolaters; who, blinded by prejudice and stimulated by fanaticism, have most unhappily succeeded in effecting the spread of *immorality* in our midst, to a deplorable extent; and who, through the agency of an intolerant "Sunday Observance Society," operating on the mental weaknesses of the populace, are now plotting (either in ignorance or in wickedness) to render the poor man's Sunday the most insufferable day of the week, instead of its being the happiest and least immoral day of all the seven—such as Moses designed it, and such as Jesus taught it should be; a day of *rest and recreation*, set apart for man's rational enjoyment, whereon he may lawfully indulge in whatever innocent amusements fall in his way. And as all the fanaticism of Pulpits, and all the mistaken Legislation upon the Sabbath-question are chiefly attributable to ignorance—to misconceptions of its nature and import—now is a fitting time to place this important subject in its proper light before Victorians of every grade.

The Sabbath-question is environed with a diversity of opinions; most of which have arisen from the Prejudices of Education; for, generally speaking, we are what our nurses, our parents, and our friends have made us; we having passively adopted the notions of those with whom we happened to be associated; many of us not yet having arrived at that state of manhood which prompts us to think and judge for ourselves—in feet, we are little else than Copies of those by whom we have been casually surrounded. We are romanists or protestants, calvinists or arminians, trinitarians or unitarians (or anything else) from no other cause, and for no better reason, than that we were accidentally brought up in the belief of such sentiments; for, but very few of us are *what me are* from conviction; thinking (alas) being the least exerted privilege of even cultivated humanity! Had we been born in India, Turkey, or China, in all probability we should not now be ranked among Christians; and those of us who are today essentially different from what we once were, owe that difference to our having taken the liberty of *thinking for ourselves*.

I certainly ought to take shame to myself, if, at 75 years of age, and after all the peculiar advantages which have fallen to my lot, had I not now an opinion of my own; and I should assuredly be a moral coward, were I afraid of expressing my convictions, because of the currency or multitude of other men's sentiments. I have read scores and hundreds of theological treatises holding forth, as veritable doctrines, a vast variety of conflicting and for ever irreconcilable dogmas; most of which I now consider as not only demonstrably erroneous, but exceedingly uncharitable—inasmuch as they unceremoniously condemn me for *not* believing *each* and *all* of the diametrically opposite tenets: and as I cannot any longer pin my faith on anyone's sleeve, I plead in extenuation of what some may deem an unauthorized liberty (the liberty of thinking for myself) the fundamental principle of Protestantism, expressed in these memorable words pointing hand *Each man's own judgement is to Himself, though to nobody else, the Standard of Truth!*"

I was brought up a pretty staunch Sabbatist; but, on mixing with men of other nations, many of whom entertained views widely different from mine, Light gradually dawned on my benighted mind, and much of what I had been taught to accept, as Christianity, I discovered to be little else than Judaism or Paganism. I have undergone many conversions; among others I long since renounced my early cherished Sabbatism, and conscientiously became a Sabbath breaker—that is, a Sabbath breaker in the eyes of those who esteemed one day *above* another; and I occasionally broke the sabbath of set purpose, in imitation of Jesus, who, as everyone knows, was a notorious Sabbath breaker, and who had the boldness to maintain in the very face of the Pharisees, that he had a right to break it; asserting, that the Sabbath was made for Man, *not* Man for the Sabbath! In short, when I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child; but, when I became a man, I put away childish things; and not being any longer partial to what Paul terms "the weak and beggarly elements," observing "days, and months, and times, and years," I got rid of the Sabbath-incubus despite the powerful prejudices of my education, and was thoroughly persuaded in my own mind, that Every man shall give an account of *himself* to God. I then cast all denominational creeds and liturgies and dogmas to the moles and the bats, in the fullest assurance that He who feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him, no matter by what name he may be called, Jew, Turk, Infidel, or Christian; all of whom are the Children of one God—our Father who is in heaven.

To all who quote scripture in support of a sanctimonious Sunday, I may safely say what Jesus said to those who sought to perplex Him with quotations from Moses, *Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures*" (that is, while acquainted with the *words*, they did not apprehend their *import*) for, neither the Old nor the New covenant countenances our keeping such puritanical Sundays as Sabbatists would tyrannically impose upon us; and I hesitate not to declare (in biblical phrase) that our rigid Melbourne Sabbatists are "Drunk! though not drunken with wine"—but, drunk with bigotry and superstition, and some of them even Mad with fanaticism and intolerance—as manifested in their over-righteousness and unchristianlike persecutions.

I must not, however, deal too harshly with our Sabbatarian Opponents, as many of them may have been educated (as I was) in sabbatical notions, and drilled from infancy in puritanical absurdities; many (like myself) erroneously taught to "keep *holy* the Sabbath day"—that is, trained to believe that *holy* in the 4th Commandment means *holily* in English; whereas, there is not an iota of *holiness* in it or about it—there is no

more *holiness* connected with the Sabbath than with the *holy flesh*, the *holy linnen*, the *holy oil*, the *holy place*, the *holy water*, and other holy things mentioned in the Bible.

One of the nicest and most agreeable money-making *holies* I know of, is the *holy ground* which Priestcraft can manufacture out of any sort of rock, clay, or soil, immaterial in what country or clime it may be. Holiness of character in the Priest, however, has not any effect upon the ground : as the most upright and godly man in the church, if below the dignity of a Bishop, might repeat the magical words till he became black in the face, without the earth's feeling any holy influence; but, let any graceless Bishop only mumble the words of conversion, and straightway certain previously measured-off grounds belonging to churches, chapels, cemeteries, etc. become *holy unto the Lord*, and bring pounds, shillings, and pence into the Priest's pocket—if the ground happen to have been twice consecrated, *double fees* are exacted for anyone's being buried in a doubly-safe and doubly-comfortable spot! This solemn mockery of dedicating tit bits of land, and making them *holy unto the Lord* is carried on in open day even in Victoria, as if we knew not that "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof"!

Bishop Hare, after urging the necessity of the scriptures being properly understood, and without which, as he justly observes, they are a rule of faith *in name only*, adds—

For, it is not the words of Scripture, but the sense which is the rule; and so far as that is not understood, so far the Scriptures are not our rule, whatever we pretend, but the sense men have put upon them—men fallible as ourselves, and who were by no means so well furnished as the learned at present are, with the proper helps to find out the true meaning of Scripture."

To make this matter plain—my having believed for 25 or for 50 years, that *holiness* was inseparably associated with the keeping of the Sabbath, did not make *holiness* a constituent part of the Sabbath—the belief of my parents and predecessors for the long space of 500 or 5,000 years, neither the accumulated beliefs of all Christendom, can invest the 4th Commandment with a particle of *holiness*, if there was not any *holiness* connected with it at the time Moses delivered it at Mount Sinai—neither time nor numbers, neither belief nor disbelief, can *change* the 4th Commandment from what it originally was, nor can an Error be changed into a Truth by the unanimous belief of all the inhabitants of the earth—In short, what the Commandment was, it now is, and ever must be!

What was, and what is, the fourth Commandment?

In our bible the passage ought to have been translated, *Remember the Sabbathday to keep it separate* (to set it apart) for that is the English meaning. Never mind what it means or is made to mean in Latin or in Greek, in French, German, or Italian, what we need to know is, simply the English meaning of the Hebrew word *kadesh*; for, all the fuss and botheration, all the theological quarrels and persecutions, all the cruelties inflicted on individuals, families, and states, all the imprisonments and deaths, consequent on the intolerance of Sabbatists, are ascribable to either the *misunderstanding*, or the *wilful misinterpretation* of a single word in the Original text—*kadesh*.

If pardon can be found for professed religious instructors in consideration of their Ignorance, I confess my nature will not permit me to indulge in the forgiveness of those who *knowingly* deceive their congregations; who believe one thing and teach the very opposite; following the abominable practice of several Church-fathers, who (in imitation of Paul) scrupled not "to Lie for Truth's sake"; and that such despicable characters have infested the churches in all ages, no well-read man will venture to dispute. Mosheim assures us (vol. I.P. 130) "that it was not only lawful but commendable, to Deceive and Lie for the sake of Truth and Piety, among the Christians of the second century"; and that "*pious frauds and impositions* were among the causes of the extension of Christianity!" See p. 155. And I am thoroughly convinced, that several Melbourne Sabbatists "do evil, that good may come;" quieting their accommodative consciences with the unctuous proverb, "the end justifies the means." I, for one, do not, cannot believe it possible, that our Pulpit ministers are so ignorant as *not to know*, that every time they repeat "keep *holy* the Sabbath day", they propagate a *false dogma*!

In the XX chapter of Exodus, stands—*Remember the sabbathday to keep it holy*; and in the V chapter of Deuteronomy stands—*Keep the sabbathday to sanctify it*; yet, it must be well known to our Sabbatists, that the word which may be called *the pivot* whereon the Sabbath-question turns, is a *false* translation; I cannot believe that scholars can be so ignorant as *not to know*, that *holy*, *sanctify*, *hallow*, ought to have been rendered by our word *separate*; and well-read theologians must necessarily know, that scores and hundreds of learned writers, including doctors of divinity, archdeacons, deans, bishops, and archbishops, have in their published works repudiated *holy* and substituted *separate* in its stead.

"The word holy signifies separate. The Hebrew is kadosh, "to set apart." Park-hurst renders it "to separate, or set apart from its common to some higher use or purpose;" and describes it as corresponding with the word badil, which signifies divide, and first occurs in Genesis I. 4, "God divided the light from the darkness." The

vessels of the Sanctuary were to be "holy unto the Lord;" that is, they were to be kept strictly separate for the service of the Sanctuary. The 4th Commandment of the Decalogue may therefore be rendered, Remember the Seventh day to keep it separate: and these terms convey its full meaning.

An Inquiry into the Origin of Septenary Institutions.

Tell me, Is there one among our *unco guid* Melbourne sabbatists, who is *not* aware that Calvin was as thorough an Anti-sabbatist as his fellow-reformer Luther? Is there one among them, who is *not* aware that whenever they mention Calvin as a supporter of Sabbatism, they grossly *misrepresent* him? Is there any one among them who dares to put in print but a tithe of the nonsense and fallacies and lies they utter from their Pulpits respecting Calvin's authority for keeping "the Lord's day strictly *holy*"? I cannot think any one of them so ignorant of Calvin's detestation of Sabbatism, as to hold them guiltless of cool, deliberate, wilful lying, when representing Calvin as a puritan-ical Sabbatist. In 1860 I reviewed a clever work,

The whole doctrine of [*unclear*: Calvin] about *the Sabbath* and *the Lord's* [*unclear*: say]: extracted from his Commentaries, [*unclear*: Catechisms]. and Institutes of the Christian religion. By Robert Cox. April 1860. Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. London.

by that prince of Anti-sabbatists, Robert Cox of Edinburgh, wherein he has collected all the various passages relating to the Sabbath and Sunday, which lie scattered up and down the 24 volumes of the Reformer's works—with that book in my hand, I should be able to silence every *canny* lying Sabbatist in Melbourne.

Not to waste paper over what every well-read theologian knows, accept a couple only of extracts from his Commentaries in proof of Calvin's repudiation of the botheratious word *holy*—

Kadesh, with the Hebrews, is to separate from the common number. God therefore sanctifies the seventh day when he renders it illustrious, that by a special law it may be distinguished from the rest. Gen. ii. 3.

If anyone wishes to render sanctify by one word, it will be to separate. Ezek. xx. 12.

The colossal Calmet interprets to *sanctify* or *hallow*, by *to set apart*, *to separate*.

Bishop Horsley, by far the most able among the recent Advocates of "the christian sabbath," observes on "*He hallowed it, that God distinguished this particular day, and set it apart from the rest.*"

*"How sweet to him, who all the week
Through city crowds must push his way,
To stroll at ease through fields and woods,
And hallow thus the Sabbathday."*

Readers of theological writings know as well as Cranmer, Ridley, Chillingworth, Jeremy Taylor, Warburton, Paley, and Arnold knew, that *holy* does *not* mean *holy* in scores of passages; and *honest* preachers ought to tell their congregations so, and not bamboozle them with incongruities and lies : they know, for instance, that *kadesh* is applied to the men selected for soldiers, men *set apart* to cut each others throats—a nice sort of *holy men* truly! The english word *holy* has been employed by our translators (but improperly so) to represent qualities which are not holy in themselves, as in *Dent*, xxiii. 14—

The Lord thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, to deliver thee, and to give up thine enemies before thee; therefore, shall thy camp be holy: that he see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee.

Evidently the word *holy* ought to have been rendered *clean*—and *cleanse* to have been used instead of *sanctify* in *Exodus* xix. 10—

The Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their clothes.

Even the great stickler for Sabbatism, Dr. Wardlaw, says in his *Discourses on the Sabbath* (p. 185) The primary import of the word *holy* is, that the day is *set apart*."

See Dr. Campbell's Translation of the Gospels; the Epistle to the Romans, by Dr. Chalmers—and hundreds beside, all in opposition to the employment of the word *holy* by Sabbatists.

It is surely high time that the lovers of Truth should tear off the robes of imposition and deceit with which our Melbourne puritanical wolves (in sheep-clothing) have invested themselves; and show to the Working classes especially, the *genuine* meaning of the 4th Commandment; which, if properly kept, would prove a general blessing (not a curse) and render Sunday the most gladsome day of the week; when man may *rest* from his 6 days fatigue, recruiting his strength by participating in the allowable pleasures of a recreative and exhilarating 7th day—such as Hebrews delight in, and such as Jesus and his Apostles have taught, we Christians may lawfully and innocently enjoy. There are thousands of thousands who would heartily trample all the irksome restrictions of a puritanical "Lord's day" under their feet, if once convinced that such "Sabbaths" have not anything whatever to do with Christian duties on Sunday; and it is impossible that *all* classes of Victorians should thoroughly apprehend the 4th Commandment, while so many Pulpits *knowingly* and *of set*

purpose misrepresent it—or (possibly) do not understand its meaning themselves.

Why the 7th day should be kept *separate, set apart* from the other days of the week, is so explicitly pointed out in the Commandment itself that it requires some pains to misrepresent it, or even to receive it in the false light in which our Pulpits and Prayerbooks have contrived to *pervert* it; here it is—

In the first insertion we are told, that the 7th day was to be *set apart* because the Creator rested (*jetched breath* is the accurate translation) on that day from his laborious work of creation; but, in the second record we are told, that the seventh day was to be set apart as a remembrancer of Jehovah's having delivered the Israelites out of Egyptian bondage; which, If the true cause of the institution of the law contained in the 4th Commandment, then, I ask, in the name of commonsense, What have I to do with that law? How can that law possibly affect me? I am not an Israelite, nor was I ever a slave in Egypt; consequently that ceremonial law (like all other laws given by Moses) is not, *cannot* be binding upon me—*neither will I submit to it!*

Notwithstanding the reason assigned in Exodus for setting the 7th day *apart*, differs (irreconcilably

Believers in plenary inspiration must admit, however unwillingly, that the 22nd verse of the Vth ch. of Deuteronomy impugns the authority of the 11th verse of the XXth ch. of Exodus. And what can they say to the unmistakable words, *He added no more?* Who then added the extra words?

) from the reason given in Deuteronomy, still, both Copies of the Decalogue agree that *rest* constituted the grand object Moses had in view—nor is there the least intimation in either of them, of anything relating to *holiness* or to *worship*—the two prominent misrepresentations uttered Sunday after Sunday in all our churches and chapels!

The Greeks (renowned for their wisdom) counted their month (lunar month) by 3 periods of 10 days each; and the Romans (celebrated for their practical measures) kept every 8th day as a marketday; yet, neither of these highly lauded nations ever proclaimed *a day of rest*— never ordered a cessation from bodily labor—never appointed fixed seasons of *recreation* for the people at large: but, the clear-sighted Moses perceived *the physical need of man's weekly recurring rest*, and considerately instituted the unappreciable blessing of the recreative Sabbath—whence we derived our inestimable Sunday's cessation from bodily fatigue, of the full and allowable enjoyment of which, the *unco guid* have already robbed us to a monstrous extent, and are now plotting how they may successfully deprive us of the few lawful and innocent gratifications yet left us—"Shame burn their cheeks to cinder!"

Although Moses may not primarily have intended that the Sabbath should be so strictly observed as the words literally imply, yet, his having issued the Decalogue to the Israelites with the imposing assurance of the words having been written on the tables of stone, "*with the finger of God*" Moses could not do otherwise than enforce the Law of the Sabbath in its rigor, even to the stoning of a poor fellow to death, for having merely gathered a few sticks upon the sabbathday—which simple act of *gathering*, Moses and Aaron (after consultation) decided to be *a species of work*; and as all work was rigidly forbidden on the 7th day, the people brutally stoned the man with stones untill he died!

"Six days shall work be done, but, on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord: whosoever doeth work therein, shall be put to death.

"Six days thou shalt work; but, on the seventh day thou shalt resi: in earing time, and in harvest, thou shalt rest." Yet, in the face of this Mosaic command, archbishop Cranmer (author of the XXXIX Articles of the church of England, and chief compiler of the Book of Common Prayer) directed his Clergy to teach the people—"They would grievously offend God, if they abstained from working on Sundays in harvest time." Sec Visitation Articles.

Exodus xxxv. 2.

Moses, great as he was as a Lawgiver to a barbarous race, overshot his mark in the stringency of many items of his Code; and was, I think, rather too fond of *hanging* and *burning* and *shooting* and *stoning* the pitiably ignorant Israelites, for mere trifles—just as I have seen men, women, and children, strung up on the gallows in England, when British Statesmen valued human life at 5s. a Head!

The Laws of Moses underwent several modifications in the succeeding ages of the more enlightened Prophets; yet, there have ever existed those banes to society the *unco quid*, whose inhumanities have been branded on every age of the world—and, would it were not so, they are visible in Victoria! Fortunately, we are not without our Ezras and Nehemiahs and Levites in Melbourne, who are capable of instructing the people in the *true meaning* of the words and texts of scripture, which are too often strangely and perniciously warped in churches and chapels. When the Hebrews had become wretchedly Priest-ridden, and were depressed beyond longer endurance, they called for Ezra to bring forth the Book of the Law of Moses; and Ezra brought the Law before the congregation in the street; and Ezra stood upon a platform of wood, made for the purpose; and Ezra opened the Book in the sight of all the people; and Ezra, with others, read therein, from the morning untill miaday—

"So they read in the Book of the Law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand

the reading."

Whence we gather, that the Readers were not mumblers, like the generality of our Pulpit gentry in 1871, who cannot read a chapter in the Bible intelligibly; for, it is written, they read *distinctly*, and in such an effective manner, as to *give the sense*—which, to their shame be it said, but very few Melbourne ministers are capable of doing—easy as the Art of *good-reading* is of acquirement, and unpardonable as *bad-reading* is, when it can be cured in the short space of a few days only!

But, to proceed with this interesting biblical account, as recorded in the VIIIth chapter of Nehemiah—And Nehemiah, and Ezra, and the Levites that taught the people, said unto all the people—This day is *holy* unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep (for all the people wept, when they heard the words of the Law) then he said unto them, Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet; and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared; for, this day is *holy* unto our Lord; neither be ye sorry, for, the joy of the Lord is your strength! So the Levites stilled all the people, saying, Hold your peace, for, the day is *holy*; neither be ye grieved.

Hence we learn, that the people had been misinformed as to the nature and purport of *sabbaths*, and *holy days*, and *holy weeks*, and *holy years*, which Ezra and Nehemiah and the Levites taught them to appreciate rightly, as days and times and seasons of pleasurable rest, innocent recreation, and rational enjoyment; for we read—

And all the people went their way to eat, and to drink, and to send portions, and to make great mirth; because, they had understood the words that were declared unto them."

And, rely upon it, as soon as our Victorian ascetics (whether preachers or catechists) shall themselves have learned *the biblical import* of the Sabbath, they too will teach the people that Sunday was made for Man's recreation, not for Man to be put into a moral prison once a week, confining him in closely pent up places of worship, wherein he may regale himself with psalmsinging, muttering heartless prayers, and dozing over dry-as-dust theological disquisitions.

Theology is a thing of the *head*, while religion has its seat in the *heart*. Religion cannot be bought or sold; but there is a roaring trade driven in Theology—it is one of the best-paying trades a-going.

*"Go thou and seek the House of Prayer!
I to the Woodlands wend, and there
In lovely Nature see the God of Love.
The swelling organ's peal
Wakes not my soul to zeal
Like the wild music of the wind-swept grove.
The gorgeous altar and the mystic vest
Rouse not such ardor in my breast
As where the noontide beam,
Flashed from the broken stream,
Quick vibrates on the dazzled sight;
Or, when the cloud-suspended rain
Sweeps in shadows o'er the plain;
Or, when reclining on the clift's huge height
I mark the billows burst in silver light.*

*Go thou and seek the House of Prayer!
I to the Woodlands shall repair,
Feed with all Nature's charms my eyes,
And hear all Nature's melodies.
The primrose bank shall there dispense
Faint fragrance to the awakened sense;
The morning beams that life and joy impart,
Shall with their influence warm my heart,
And the full tear that down my cheek will steal,
Shall speak the prayer of praise I feel!*

Go thou and seek the House of Prayer!
 I to the Woodlands bend my way
 And meet Religion there!
 She needs 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 cowslipped dale,
 Or, seek the shelter of the embowering grove,
 Or, with the streamlet wind along the vale.
 Sweet are these scenes to her; and when the night
 Pours in the north her silver streams of light,
 She woos Reflection in the silent gloom,
 And ponders on the world to come!

SOUTHEY.

That holy days (*festivals*) are common among Hebrew families, is well known. I have been a frequent participater in their 7th day festivities, and also in several of their special ceremonial gatherings; and I embrace this opportunity of recording, that Hebrew celebrations of *holy days* and *holy seasons*, partake of much more genuine conviviality, and considerably less of irreligion and indiscretion, than similar feasts among Christians. During upwards of a quarter of a century's residence on the Continent of Europe, it was my good fortune to spend several hours every week in company with Hebrews; and I now bear testimony to their outshining most Christians in decorum, and several of the boasted christian virtues—especially in family affection, and in humane feelings—"Honor to whom honor is Due!"

Although Melbourne and its suburbs may boast of a long list of "religious teachers" who would as soon think of going to a *cricket-match*, a *boat-race*, or a *bowling-green* on a Sunday, as to a *convivial party*, yet, when their acknowledged Lord and Master was invited to a *festival* on the 7th day, He not only accepted the invitation, but went—Jesus went to the feast on the Sabbathday. Perhaps, if Jesus were to make his appearance in Melbourne, and be known as Jesus by our *unco guid*, and our worthy Governor were to invite Jesus and all our Pulpit ministers to a *Sunday festival* at Toorak, most of them would turn their backs on Jesus, when they saw him going to the *feast*; for they preach and print, that "there is nothing worse could befall us, than the introduction of Continental Sabbaths; nothing worse than the Continental desecration of the Lord's day"—but, I maintain, that there are many worse things already among us! Our priests, parsons, and preachers *trafficking in superstition*, is worse; their *trading in men and women's mental mealinesses*, is worse; their proclaiming the *infallibility* of creeds and canons and beliefs, is worse; their *anathamizing* and *persecuting* all who differ from them in opinion, is worse; and their *thwarting the spread of knowledge*, by debarring the masses of the people from being instructed in school acquirements, and educated in our museums on Sundays, is worse, considerably worse; and if our colonial Newspapers have not reported infamous scandals and arrant lies, then, several of our "religious teachers" and "pious instructors" have done deeds that are a hundred, a thousand times worse! Our cantankerous Sabbatists should remove the splinters out of their own eyes, before they presume to attempt taking motes out of the eyes of their less guilty neighbors. But, our *unco guid*, like certain gentry mentioned in the Bible, strain out gnats and swallow camels.

When seen from a political and special point of view, the Laws of Moses merit our approbation; for, with all their defects and deformities, they extort our approval of their general aptness; yet, excelent as they were in their day, they certainly are not suited to the advanced minds of 1871; they are not sufficiently refined: for, even much of their Morality, is gross Immorality with us; despite all our shortcomings, we have progressed far beyond the condition of the barbarous Israelites when Moses conducted them out of the land of Egypt, where they had long been held in bondage and steeped in ignorance. Neither the world nor the people in it, have been at a *still-stand* during the centuries that have elapsed since the framing of the Mosaic laws; many of which were laws of expedience, laws of dire necessity, not even in accordance with the views and sentiments of the better-informed Moses, but given in statesmanlike consideration of the extreme hardness of heart peculiar to that stiff-necked race.

The Prophets, in succeeding ages, modified the Mosaic Code; and 1800 years ago, incomparably superior Laws were given from Mount Olivet, by him who spake as never man spake, and who for ever abolished the Laws given on Mount Sinai—at least for those of us who are not Hebrews; as the old dispensation of Moses *ceased*, and the new dispensation of Jesus *commenced*; consequently, Christians have no more to do with the laws in the Pentateuch, than with the laws in the Zend-Avesta of Zoroaster, or, the laws in the Koran of

Mahomet.

Hence, the glaring impropriety of Sabbatists striving to force upon us the observance of a mere ceremonial Hebrew law, contained in the 4th Commandment—rendering the enforcement tenfold more censurable by their attaching to that law a meaning which all their sophistry cannot establish. Many of them know perfectly well, that rest, and rest only, was the special object of that law; they know that the 4th Commandment has not so much as the shadow of a shade of *holiness* implied in it; yet, like thousands of their predecessors, existing Pulpit teachers continue to promulgate known error, and hesitate not, under Church sanction, to "Lie for Truth's sake;" and, for the sake of their darling Sabbatism, commit "pious frauds" to their own lasting disgrace, and the perversion of genuine Christianity!

The Melbourne "Sunday Observance Society" is a standing reproach to our avowed "Christian denominations," and a withering sarcasm on our pretensions to civilisation and intellectual improvement; for, that Society is an amalgamation of Mosaic commands and Christian precepts; a hodge-podge of retrogradation and advancement; a sickening mixture of sense and nonsense, perfectly disgusting to every lover of social, political, moral, intellectual, and religious culture!

Yet, let us not huddle up *all* Pulpits in one enormous mass of enmity to human progress, as there are many honorable Exceptions among our religious teachers; brave men and true, whose adamant virtues preserve the mass of priests, parsons, and preachers from being utterly washed away by the floods of righteous indignation!

As to the 4th Commandment's instituting the 7th day as a "*Day of Worship*, requiring all Christians to assemble themselves together in churches and chapels, for prayer and praise," there is not a syllable about *worship*, or anything akin to it, from beginning to end! 'Tis true, we have been told, that

"The most prominent and characteristic duty of the Sabbath, is the duty of attendance on the public worship of God in the sanctuary "

The Duty and Privilege of Keeping the Sabbath, p. 57.

—
but, I fearlessly pronounce that so-called *duty*, a degradation of the 4th Commandment itself, which teaches no other duty than that of *refraining from work*; and those who would impose upon us the *duty of public worship* on the 7th day, need to be reminded of *Deut. iv. 2*—Ye shall *not add* unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it," etc. Did the Israelites ever conceive it to be their *duty* to spend the Sabbath in religious exercises? No! Did the Pharisees? No! Did Jesus? No! Did his Apostles? No! Is there any record in the bible of the Hebrews ever having been charged with dereliction of duty by not performing acts of devotion on the Sabbath? No! Is the profanation of the Sabbath ever represented in scripture as anything else than *work*? No! Then why are we to be pestered by a parcel of Bible-improvers who neither understand the words nor apprehend the meaning of the Decalogue?

I am credibly informed, that some of our Melbourne *unco guid* pulpit-ministers are indignant at *the change* which has of late years been manifested by several ministers in Scotland, who have gradually swerved from their rigid Sabbatarian prejudices, and become lenient towards those of liberal sentiments. Our *canny* Melbourne sabbatists deeply regret "the good old times," when persecutions by fine, imprisonment, and floggings, were the order of the day for all who "profaned the holy Sabbath"—

"Because of the contempt of the Word, and evil keeping of the Sabbath, the Session ordains, that the maister and maistress of every house, and sa mony as are of years of judgement (except when need requireth otherwise) shall be present in the Kirk in due time every Sabbath to hear the sermon before and after noon, under pain of 12d. the first, 2s. the second, and for the third 5s. also 5s. toties quoties thereafter; as also for the third fault, to be debarred fra the benefits of the Kirk till they make repentance as the Session sall enjoin."

"An abstract is given of cases of Sabbath breaking, found in the Record of the Session of St. Cuthbert's, Edinburgh. In 1587, David Dugall is censured for going to Cramond on the Lord's day morning with shoes—a delightful walk, by which he must have been greatly refreshed, and probably was enabled to visit his relations : repeating the offense in 1595, he is publicly rebuked, and obliged to find surety that he shall never be guilty of a similar offense, under a penalty, for the first transgression, of 20s.; for the second of 40s.; for the third, of banishment from the parish. In 1598, several persons in West Port, Potterrow, and Water of Leith, for profaning the Sabbath by May games, were referred to the Bailies of their respective districts. In 1599, five persons, for drinking in the country on the Lord's day, were admonished, and obliged to find security for their good behavior in future, under a penalty of 40s. In 1602, David Ochiltree "for fishing on Sabbath, and other crimes," was delivered over to the civil magistrate. In 1605, David Knipper was "set at the pillar" for playing at bowls on Sabbath. In 1610, three individuals were referred to the Session for Edinburgh, for playing at the "Pennystones" on Sabbath. In 1614, several were fined 20s. each for playing at football on that day. In 1619, this penalty was imposed upon two women for "flying" [scolding] on the Lord's day; and in 1625, upon three men for selling bread, one of whom was "imprisoned because he could not pay his fine." In 1630, several persons were fined 20s. for taking "laverocks" [larks] on Sabbath. In 1631, several, for fishing on Sabbath,

were fined 20s. each, and imprisoned." In 1652, John Coutts and others were fined 40s. each "for selling milk on the Lord's day"—But enough! I can quote scores of pages of Scotch intolerance, such as would delight the hearts of some of our Melbourne canny Sabbatarian Evil-doers to see re-enacted in this colony!

But, quitting the 4th Commandment, I proceed farther, and pronounce, without fear of rational contradiction, that All the laws of Moses, *without exception*, were totally annulled upwards of 1800 years ago—Controvert this who can!

It is an insult to commonsense, it is degrading to us as men and christians, that a handful of Melbourne Sabbatists should take upon themselves the *re-introduction* of Laws, for our observance, which scores and hundreds of the most erudite and celebrated theologians have for ages declared obsolete; and if pardon can be found for the consummate impudence of our Sabbatists, it can only be in consideration of the profundity of their ignorance. But, the day has arrived when these reckless Sabbatarian Pests to Society must be told in plain terms, that Jesus and his Apostles maintained the abrogation of All the laws of Moses—that the Church-fathers maintained their abrogation—that Clergymen and Dissenting-ministers have long maintained their abrogation—that Moralists, Philosophers, Statesmen, Literati, and Philanthropists, have never ceased maintaining their abrogation—the full and complete and intire abrogation of All the laws of Moses—and that wide-awake Victorians, repulse with scorn and contempt all efforts of the "Sunday Observance Society" to bring them into subjection to laws which are not suited to our conditions as a people—capable of thinking, judging, and acting for ourselves! It is preposterous to think that *manhood* should learn of *infancy*; that comparatively civilized Christians should learn of barbarous Hebrews! Out, I say, upon all the meddlesome and mischievous and mendacious crimpers of our rights as men and citizens! Out upon all who would deprive us of our privileges as christians! Out upon all Sabbatists, from the least unto the greatest!

Passing over more Anti-sabbatists in number than all the Pulpit-teachers in Melbourne put together, I shall quote, very briefly, from a few only, in support of my assertion.

The great and indomitable Luther, in his "Explanations of the ten Commandments," writes as follows—

We must remark at the outset, that the X Commandments do not apply to us Gentiles and Christians, but, to the Jews only—in the New testament, Moses comes to an end, and his Laws lose their force—He must bow in the presence of Christ—Moses died, and his government terminated when Christ came"—Etc.

The celebrated Hooker, a host in himself, writes in the IV book of his "Ecclesiastical Polity"—

They which honor the Law as an image of the wisdom of God himself, are, notwithstanding, to know, that the same had an end in Christ."

That favorite child of Genius, Jeremy Taylor, bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, avers—

The Lord's day did not succeed in the place of the Sabbath, for, the Sabbath was abrogated. The Lord's day was merely an ecclesiastical institution."

The prince of theologians, Milton, is as curt as he is decisive on this point—

On the introduction of the Gospel, or New covenant through faith in Christ, the whole of the preceding covenant—in other words, the intire Mosaic Law was abolished!"

The Rev. H. W. Parkinson exclaims—You may read those Commandments in churches, but, I do not care, I will pay no attention to them. All Christian precept is summed up in this, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy Neighbor as thyself." I do not find any morality in the Decalogue at all; I find it only in the words of Jesus. The Jewish Sabbath has passed away—Christians do not observe the Sabbathday, do not begin to rest at sunset, do not refrain from every manner of work. Seeing then, that the Old testament Sabbath is repealed, does the New testament appoint one? No! a hundred times No! a thousand times No! There is no day now sanctified and set apart by Divine appointment. The Christian dispensation does not recognize distinctions either of place or of time. All places and times are alike in its eyes, and God claims them all. Under the Mosaic economy, Jerusalem was holier than any other city, and the Temple holier than any other place in the city, and the Sanctuary within the veil holier than any other place in the Temple. All that has passed away. Men try to perpetuate Jewish notions by consecrating churches and cemetaries, and all that nonsense, but, this great truth overrides them all—"The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof."

A little consideration would teach all who are willing to learn, that our "Sunday Observance Society" has been established in Ignorance and continues to exist solely by the prevalence of Superstition; for,

"Were the Lord's Day a real substitute for the Sabbath, not the rattling of a wheel, not the clang of a horse's hoof would be heard on that day in our streets, from sunset on Saturday night to sunset on Sunday evening; not a fire would burn during that period on any hearth, nor a streak of smoke hover over any chimney; for, it is clearly and distinctly prescribed by the law, "That thy cattle, and thy male servant, and thy female servant shall fast"—and again, "Ye shall not kindle a fire in any of your habitations on the Sabbathday." The Jewish Chronicle.

The Rev. Dr. Hook, Vicar of Leeds (after the Sabbatists had disgraced themselves by their *riotous* conduct) preached a sermon in the parish church, on the Observance of Sunday, from Col. II. 16, telling his hearers—

- That the Jewish Sabbath, as a divine institution was *abrogated* by Christ and his Apostles;
- That the modern Sunday is simply an *ecclesiastical* ordinance; and
- That *Recreation* is not only *allowable* but *desirable on Sunday*, as maintained by the Reformers, by Matthew Parker (the first Protestant archbishop of Canterbury) by Aylmer (bishop of London) and many others."

In 1858, the Scotch Presbytery took into serious consideration, the most effectual means of preventing "the frightful desecration of the Sabbath *by the people walking out*, to the great scandal of godly persons"! and we are now told that our "Sunday Observance Society" is endeavoring to prevent the citizens of Melbourne from any longer taking a walk with their wives and families in any of *their own* parks and gardens on a Sunday! What next? Should these over-righteous Sabbatarian robbers succeed in their unwarrantable attempts, we shall soon have a repetition of such insufferable enactments as the following—

"No man shall run on the Sabbathday, or, walk in the garden, or elsewhere, except reverently to and from Meeting.

"No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave, on the Sabbathday.

"No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath, or Fastingday.

"If any man shall kiss his wife, or wife her husband, on the Lord's day, the party in fault shall be punished at the discretion of the Magistrates"

The whole doctrine of the Sabbath.

Such are some of the *blessings* the "Sunday Observance Society" has in store for us. Confound their vigilance! the mischievous members of the Melbourne "Sunday Observance Society" have not only closed our Public Libraries, our Galleries of Art, and our Museums against us, and are now plotting to shut us out of our Parks and our Gardens, but, what is more, not satisfied with pulling the wires which make their own Puppets dance, they are at this very time contriving how best they may pull our Telegraph wires out of the hands of the Public, and are assiduously exerting their influence to curtail, if they cannot at once succeed in robbing us of all the pleasurable advantages we derive from our Steamboats, and our Railroads on Sunday! I trust, however, that as soon as ever the masses of the Working classes shall become thoroughly persuaded that Sunday was made for their rational enjoyment, and they themselves *not* made to be the slaves of a parcel of canting, whining, sycophantic Sabbatists, that Petitions from all parts of the colony may be poured into our Houses of Legislature, praying for the redress of grievances inflicted upon Victorians by the pernicious "Sunday Observance Society"—and that the *Sunday-question* may be used at the coming Elections as one of the touchstones whereon to try the sincerity of Aspirants to seats in the New parliament, as true Representatives of the People.

It is provoking to hear Clergymen, and other so-called Expounders of the scriptures, annexing precepts and commands (which are restricted in their very nature to but One class of persons) to any and to all classes indiscriminately; reminding me of a judicious observation in the writings of that chief of the Swiss divines, Ostervald—

It is a great fault, not to expound the Scripture according to the true scope of it; instead of applying all that it contains to all sorts of persons, without distinction."

When certain busy bodies told the Gentile converts, "Except ye be circumcized, after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved;" sturdy Peter would not stand their superstition and fanatical nonsense, but manfully opposed their subjecting Gentiles to the ordinances of Moses, saying—

Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the Disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? We believe, that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."

And the decision of the Apostles and Elders at the notable Council in Jerusalem, with James as chairman, was—that Gentiles were *not* to be annoyed by having the Mosaic laws thrust upon them; neither will we Victorians permit our Sabbatarian busy bodies to palm the abrogated laws of Moses upon us!

Paul, more than any other of the apostles, strove to eradicate Mosaic doctrines out of the Christian churches, and to get rid of the trammels of the Laws, and the authority of Moses: to the Romans he wrote—

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."

To the Galatians he wrote—

Now, after that ye have known God—or rather, are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, where unto 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 labor in vain!"

To the Colossians he wrote—

Let no man judge you in meat, or, in drink, or, in respect of a holy day, or, of the new moon, or of the sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come—but, the body is Christ."

Were Paul to visit our Victorian churches and chapels, he would be shocked on discovering that we are so

enamored of the "beggarly elements;" still clinging to worn-out laws; still groping in Egyptian darkness, after the lapse of 18 centuries!

But, what said Jesus? Has he thrown any light on the darkened Sabbath-question? Can we gather anything definite from Him, regarding the abrogation of the laws of Moses? He said—

Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, or, the Prophets; I am not come to destroy, but, to fulfil."

Short, but, pithy; containing a volume of matter for our consideration—"I came *not to destroy, but to fulfil*"—Did he fulfil the law? or, did he not? If he did *not* fulfil the Law, then, was his coming abortive, his mission vain; but, if he accomplished his object, then, was the Law fulfilled; the Mosaic dispensation *closed*, and a New dispensation *opened*—Law was superseded by Grace; and all the laws in the Pentateuch annulled, abrogated, abolished, at once and for ever!

Clearly, the simplest and the most judicious thing for those to do who find themselves *nailed* by the cogency of reason, is—frankly to acknowledge that the Law was given by Moses, and that Grace and Truth came by Jesus; and, like sensible converts to a more rational doctrine, let them, with all their heart and soul and strength, shovel the Rabbinical Sabbath out of the way, with the rest of the Puritanical rubbish, and follow him who not only broke the Sabbath, again and again, and said he had a right to break it, but, who fearlessly declared, that the Sabbath was made for Man!

There is no convincing men against their will; and as soon as one objection is overthrown, another starts up, until one gets tired of knocking Sabbatarian antagonists down. After all that I have advanced, I may still be told, with more assurance than modesty, that "*the Decalogue at least is still in full force, having been endorsed by Christ, over and over again.*" No such thing; Jesus *never* endorsed the Decalogue; and it is a calumny to assert it! As a Hebrew he was bound to respect it, and as the Fulfiller of the Law, he could not have done otherwise; but, having fulfilled it, as a matter of course it was at an end, utterly abolished—except to Hebrews alone. I am told by an out and outer, that, "when asked, *What good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?*" Christ answered, If thou wilt enter into life, Keep the Commandments; and by that reply, Christ *endorsed* the Decalogue." I repeat, Jesus *never* endorsed the Decalogue; the inferences drawn from that dialogue are false, and cannot bear scrutiny—here it is :

Behold one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? and he said unto him, Why callest thou Me good? there is none good but One, and that is God: but, if thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother, and Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Matt. XIX.

But, these Commandments, instanced by Jesus, do not constitute the Decalogue; and the last, the most important of them, is not in the Decalogue at all. More than this, in the Commandments quoted by Jesus, there is not a syllable about either of the 2 precepts, the punctilious observance of which, the Pharisees attached the most weight—neither *the making of graven images*, nor *the keeping of the sabbath*, are so much as even hinted at—therefore, I again repeat, Jesus *never* endorsed the Decalogue!

In XXII of Matt, we have a still more remarkable allusion to the Commandments, thus recorded—

A lawyer asked him a question, tempting him, saying, Master which is the great Commandment in the Law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; this is the first and great Commandment; and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself—on these 2 Commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets I"

Here we have a marked token of disrespect paid to the Decalogue, by Jesus, who quoted 2 precepts *which are, not in the Decalogue*, as constituting the pith of the whole Law (Love to God and Love to Man) therefore, I once more repeat, defying the "Sunday Observance Society" to convict me of error, Jesus *never* endorsed the Decalogue!

In Mr. J. Baxter Langley's able reply to a Sermon, preached by the Rev. Robert Maguire (1857) occur the 2 following paragraphs—

The Sabbath is a ceremonial; it can be kept by those who have no religion in the heart. In this, it is essentially Jewish, and opposed to that deeper religion that has no external forms, but which leads the heart to worship God in spirit and in truth, and which teaches that "a broken and a contrite heart" is more acceptable than all "burnt offerings and sacrifices." The observance of the Sabbath is not moral in itself; and hence, the greatest Sabbatarians were not the best men, nor always good men. Sir John Dean Paul and his fellows, with Redpath and others, were strict Sabbatarians; and the most Sabbatarian city in the world, is the most drunken.

If anyone would carefully read Deuteronomy IX. 9, 11, 15, and also Deut. X. 4, comparing these passages with Exodus XX. 18, they will see that the 2 tables of stone contained the 10 Commandments only; that these alone were given with such terrific display of thunder and lightning and fire. Now, if reference is made to the 2nd. Corinthians III. the Apostle will be found instituting a comparison between the new epistle of Christ, written "not on tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the heart," and describing that which was written on

tables of stone as "the ministration of death," "the ministration of condemnation," as "that which is done away," and as "that which is abolished." Similar views are expressed in Colossians II. 14. It is clear from this passage, that St. Paul regarded the X Commandments as abolished, and, with them, the Sabbath."

Another objection to our spending a rational Sunday, is that frightful bugbear "The Continental Sabbath"! just as if the modes of keeping Sunday on the Continent of Europe, could vie with the *drunkenness*, *debauchery*, and *vice* practised in Australia! just as if England, Ireland, and Scotland, did not cast France, Germany, and Holland quite into the shade in the committal of *hypocrisy*, *superstition*, and *crime!* just as if we British subjects were not immeasurably deeper sunk in *domestic strife*, *social depravity*, and *flagrant immorality*, than any of the nations held up to our abhorrence by the slanderous "Sunday Observance Society!"

None but those who have never seen with their own eyes, never heard with their own ears, could so expose their ignorance, so calumniate others much less guilty than themselves, so unblushingly and wickedly bear false witness against their neighbors! Did space permit, I could bring scores of eyewitnesses and earwitnesses to confront the *infamous* representations of the foul aspersers connected with the "Sunday Observance Society," which would stamp them as execrable defamers of men much better than themselves!

Dr. Copleston (Bishop of Llandaff) wrote home from Shaffhausen; much that would put our "Sunday Observance Society" to shame; and, among other things, he stated—

In all places of worship I have attended (except One) I must say, that there was greater appearance of devotion, than the English church ordinarily presents. The people seemed to make it more their own business. They come before the Service begins; many sit there an hour with their books, and seem to be engaged in private prayer. I confess, I cannot understand the ground upon which the English boast themselves to be a peculiarly religious people. I observe on the Continent, Sunday is regarded as a festival, and all sorts of innocent amusements go on in the evening after divine service is over. This is the case as much in Protestant as in Catholic countries; and I believe Heylin (in his treatise on the Sabbath) is right, in saying that the Day was never, in the History of the Church, considered as profaned by the practice, till about the latter end of our Elizabeth's reign, when the puritan notions began to prevail."

The Rev. Dr. Guthrie informed his *canny* countrymen (in his *Plea*, 1850) that he spent some months in Paris; and although his avocations led him frequently through the worst parts of the city, and occasionally late in the evening (a city then containing a population 6 times larger than Edinburgh) he saw "but One drunken man, and No drunken woman"! But, this is not all the Rev. Dr. told his toddy-loving countrymen; he adds—

We stepped from the Steamer upon one of the London quays, and had not gone many paces, when our national pride was humbled, and any Christianity we may have had was put to the blush, by the disgusting spectacle of Drunkards reeling along the streets, and filling the air with strange and horrid imprecations. In one hour we saw in London—and in Edinburgh, with all her schools and churches and piety, we see every day—more Drunkenness than we saw in five long months in guilty Paris! "Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon." Surely these facts disclose a state of things for which British Christians ought to blush." *Plea on behalf of Drunkenness*, etc.

Dr. Guthrie, to show his calumnious Sabbatarian countrymen that France is not a solitary instance of superiority in this respect over Scotland, quotes other examples; one from a gentleman presiding over the Horticultural Gardens in Ceylon, who published a book of Travels in the Brazils, in reference to which the Rev. Doctor observes—

Most people know the low state of morality in the Brazils, that there, the marriage tie is almost intirely loosed, and that Priests and People are one sweltern mass of corruption. This gentleman, glad to breathe once more the pure air of religious land, reached Liverpool on a Sabbath morning; but, what was the scene which met him on his native shores? On that sacred day, ere he had spent as many Hours in Liverpool as he had spent Years in the Brazils, he saw more Drunkards than he had seen during his whole sojourn in a country where the ordinary decencies of life are laughed to scorn! Whether our nation is or is not the most Drunken nation in the world, we leave others to settle; but surely, these are facts which ought to fill us with shame."

Let us now take a peep at Amsterdam, the capital of Holland, where it was my privilege to reside upwards of a quarter of a century; and how, think you, do the Dutch spend Sunday? I'll tell you.

With the Dutch, Sunday is a day of rest and worship, and social enjoyment, interspersed with *a variety of innocent pleasures and lawful gratifications*—the most agreeable day of the week, welcomed by all grades of society. Although the 4th Commandment does not enjoin, does not so much as intimate anything about *Worship*, yet, the Dutch scrupulously set certain hours apart on their leisure-day, to acknowledge and adore Uncreated Beneficence; the Ministers of the various Sects joining their Congregations in the innocent amusements commonly indulged in there, on Sundays.

After morning service, it is customary to stroll from church or chapel into the Botanical, Zo-ological, and other Gardens, to admire the Creator in his manifold works; or, to enter the Galleries of Art; or, to delight in other pleasurable and instructive sights; making Sunday (as 30,000 Hebrews in Amsterdam make Saturday) the

most gladsome of days, recruiting themselves from the fatigues of the week, and gathering fresh energy for the prosecution of their avocations in life.

The afternoon services are only partially attended, as the generality of persons prefer paying family or friendly visits, to dozing after a comfortable dinner, under the nap-stimulating influence of a prosy sermon.

Generally speaking, the evening services are not so thronged as those of the morning; many persons, male and female, being more inclined for walking out, to see and to be seen; or, sitting by the sides of the river Y, or the river Amstel; or taking excursions on the Water; or, by Rail; or, surrounding the detached tables in some of the many Tea-gardens in the vicinity of the city, where, listening to various species of Music, they can breathe the invigorating air, delighting in each others company—talk, sing, gambol, swing, run, dance, or play, as their inclination dictates. But observe—and it is worthy of every Australian's observation, I cannot call to mind a single instance of anyone's being Drunk in any of those places of pleasurable resort and convivial gratification, except———my own Countrymen!

I have traversed Holland, have spent days and weeks in the different Provinces of the Netherlands, have witnessed hundreds of popular gatherings, and several National festivals; yet, during the long space of 28 years, I saw not Half the *licentiousness*, *rioting*, and *drunkenness*, which may be seen any day and every day in Melbourne alone! Let me not be misunderstood, neither misinterpreted—I *have seen more immorality* in a single Day in Melbourne, *than I saw* during my 28 years residence in Holland!

Read this, and blush if you can, ye calumnious and lying defamers of "*Continental Sabbath breakers*" as ye piously designate those Foreigners, the latchets of whose shoes ye are not worthy to unloose! Out upon your "Sunday Observance Society"! which, under the cloak of *morality*, is a fruitful source of immorality, by your closing the public Educational Institutions on the only day in the week when the Workingmen, with their Wives and their Children, can conveniently visit them: where Lecturers might teach them how to look through Nature up to nature's God; elevating and humanizing the masses of the people, and clearing the streets of Melbourne, on Sundays at least, of both Loafers and Larrikins. Throw but open *all* the public Schools of Instruction (Libraries, Galleries of Art, Museums, etc.) and the Magistrates will soon have "nothing to do" in the Police Courts on Monday. *A marts wife and family are his best safeguards against immoral and brutalizing tendencies and temptations*; just as lawful and elevating Enjoyment is the surest way to prevent unlawful and debasing Gratifications.

Summary

Of the Preceding Observations.

I. The 4th Commandment has not anything to do with *holiness*, in the English acceptance of the word; nor has it any relation whatever to *worship*: all that it enjoins, is, *total cessation from work*.

Pulpits may preach what they please, but, after a careful perusal of my Bible, I assure the doubtful reader of these pages, that the Laws of Moses did not appoint Public Worship to be performed by the Hebrews on the Sabbath; and, what may be more startling still, Jesus never imposed any such duty on his followers, either by precept or example! In all the writings of Moses, you cannot find that he ever taught the Israelites anything concerning a future state; neither did he ever hold out to them as inducements to Obedience, any other than temporal rewards and punishments: but, Jesus brought life and immortality to light, through the Gospel; and, ere long, thousands of thousands shall discover that the 4th Commandment does not form any portion of the Laws of Jesus.

Therefore, as Scripture does not impose upon us the duty of observing a puritanical Sunday, of esteeming one day above another, of abstaining from rational recreation on the first, the seventh, or any other day in the week, let us shake off the superstitious shackles of our predecessors, and, like reasonable beings, enjoy our weekly holiday to our hearts content, conformably with the dictates of our understandings and with consciences void of offense before God and Man!

II. All the Laws of Moses were *abrogated, abolished, done away with*, to all intents and purposes, at the instant that Jesus *fulfilled* the Law; consequently, the Mosaic Code is for ever a dead letter to all—but Hebrews.

Should the authorities quoted for the abrogation be insufficient for any reader, I have scores and hundreds more, ready to produce, from the writings of distinguished men of many denominations.

III. The Decalogue never was endorsed by Jesus.

All the Pulpits in Christendom cannot substantiate the silly assertion, that "the Decalogue remains in full force, in consequence of its having been endorsed by Jesus"; for, Jesus never did endorse it; but, on the contrary, He paid it signal disrespect.

IV. The Sabbatist's bugbear—*Continental Sabbath breaking!*

As a matter of course, I can quote the testimonies of numerous recent Travelers in different countries,

against the members of the calumnious "Sunday Observance Society," who are incessantly croaking forth their false accusations against those who are considerably less guilty of "Sabbath desecration" than themselves.

Having cleared the way towards introducing the grand object of this Pamphlet, I may now enter upon it without further prelude.

The bounden duty of the Government
to

Instruct every Individual in the Colony.

Professor Austin, in his celebrated work on Jurisprudence, maintains, One of the weightiest of the *duties* which God has laid upon Governments, is the Education of the People;"

and Barlow, in his Advice to the Privileged Orders, tells them,

It may be safely pronounced, that a State has no right to punish a man, to whom it has given no previous instruction."

while the great Sir Thomas More asks, in his too-little known *Utopia*, which the world is now first beginning to appreciate as it deserves,

If you suffer your People to be ill-educated, and their manners to be corrupted from their Infancy, and then punish them for those Crimes to which their first Education disposes them; what else is to be concluded from this, but that you make Thieves, and then punish them?"

And Aristotle confidently asserts, that

All who have meditated on the Art of governing mankind, have been convinced, that the fate of Empires depends on the Education of Youth."

"In whatever light we view Education, it cannot fail to appear the most important subject that can engage the attention of mankind. When we contrast the ignorance, the rudeness, and the helplessness of the savage, with the knowledge, the refinement, and the resources of civilized man, the difference appears so wide, that they can hardly be regarded as of one and the same species. All the difference which is afterwards to distinguish them, depends upon their Education.

DUGALD STEWART.

Instruction is the younger sister of *Education*; and if Governments do not and will not teach the Rising generation the *rudiments of Knowledge*, do not and will not *devellop the understandings* of the Adult portion of the community, they are remiss in the performance of *the most important duty* belonging to Legislation—the instruction of every young, and the development of every adult member of the State!

"If we may give credence to the records of remote antiquity, the Institutions of one ancient nation, in order to obviate the mischiefs produced by the ignorance or the inattention of Parents, provided, by compulsory laws, for the Public education, according to an established system of all children born within its precincts; and there have not been wanting Philosophers, both of ancient and of modern times who, maintaining the principle that a State has a paramount interest in the welfare and good conduct of those who are born within its limits, have vindicated and applauded such Institutions.

SHEPHERD and JOYCE'S *Systematic Education*

And if our Legislature does not at once set about the Reformation of this Colony, by instituting *compulsory instruction* on all children between 5 and 14 years of age, it will be chargeable with gross dereliction of duty as a Government; and every inactive Member of Parliament will deserve to be hooted in the streets, as a driveler, by every Constituent who is a friend to Humanity!

Without occupying 100 pages, in controverting the 1,000 Objections which have been raised against *Compulsory Education*, I shall assume, that all intelligent minds in the Colony allow of the *propriety*, and that all real friends of the rising generation admit of the *necessity* of Education, and that all legislators who have examined the question will give their support to the most eligible measures which may be brought forward in our Houses of Parliament—and as not anything short of *a compulsory measure* can possibly reach Every Individual in the State, I shall assume, that

Compulsory Instruction will be instituted in Victoria:

how it is to be carried out, is a secondary consideration; nor will it be a thousandth part so difficult to arrange the performance, as conflicting Sects and Parties imagine. But, that I may not be misunderstood, Secular, not Religious education, must be Compulsory.

Here, of course, a hue and cry will go forth, among the various denominations of the colony, shouting at the top of their voices, that

Secular instruction *cannot be separated* from Religious education!

but, I say it *can*, and *ought*, and *must*. For upwards of a quarter of a century, I have witnessed the *combination* and *separation* of Secular and Religious instruction carried out with unexceptionable propriety and admirable effect; and if our Statesmen be not too wise to learn, I shall show them *how* Secular instruction may be communicated to *all* the Children of the State, without obtruding sectarian principles on any recipients of the

rudiments of education.

Some time ago, I furnished Messieurs Higinbotham and Fellows with a sketch of the Dutch mode of simplifying the intricacies of what is called *National Education*; and although I never received so much as an acknowledgement, from either of the gentlemen, of the receipt of the Pamphlet

"The Ago we Live in." Published at 35 Stephen Street. Price 6d.

handed to them (by a mutual acquaintance) I can perceive the *effects* in the turn which has been given to the Educational-question now before the Colony.

Chambers (in Tract 44) has related the result of his "Visit to Holland," undertaken for the express purpose of satisfying himself as to what he had heard of the practicability and expediency of the Dutch method of carrying out "*united yet separate* Instruction, under legal sanctions, in connection with National Education"; and if our legislators, our sectists, and our writers for the press, would only be at the pains of reading the communications of Chambers, they would, not talk and write so much arrant nonsense, on a question they are but partially acquainted with. Chambers recounts his visits to various Schools in Holland, his conversations with the Teachers, his examination of the Pupils, and closes his interesting and valuable Tract in the following words—*I came away with the impression, that a Problem, which has long vexed Statesmen in England, had, by our intelligent neighbors, Been Happily Solved!*"

And though some Englishmen and Australians may "turn up their noses" at my recommending the Dutch mode of imparting National Education, I venture to tell such contemners, that those who taught us Navigation, are, to my knowledge, equally capable of teaching us how to manage Public Instruction.

The paramount duty of the State is, to effect what the enlightened Pius IX was prevented (by the machinations of Priestcraft) from carrying out at the commencement of his career—"not to have a Child in his dominions, that could not *readly write*, and *cipher*"; which is simply Secular instruction. This is the first and grand requisite; and this fairly established, all other concomitants must follow in due course. But, if you wait untill all obstacles be removed, and all exactions on theological grounds be satisfied, you may wait till doomsday; and the Children of the State will continue, age after age, defrauded of their legitimate right to rudimentary Education.

Christianity, as you are aware, has been split up into upwards of 500 different and contending Sects; and each Sect would gladly have the unrestricted controll of the Religious education of *all* the children in the Colony; fancying, that the most direct road to heaven, is through their own wicket; and that all other roads lead to inevitable destruction—very few of them being liberal enough to admit that whosoever feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him, and that *all* are the children of one beneficent Father.

If we are to credit all that our Newspapers report, the Roman Catholics

"*Roman Catholics* I have spoken with several intelligent Roman catholics on the subject of National Education, and I am bound, in common justice towards that numerous and highly respectable body to insert, in a Note, that I am of opinion, it is *but a clique*, calling themselves Members of the "*Society of Jesus*" who are making themselves so vexatiously busy and troublesome on the present occasion. Every well-read man knows, that the Jesuits are and always have been, the bane of every community wherein they got footing; and that, despite all their professions of good-will towards men, they have ever been the most a rant posts to society! I know them personally, and I know their history from Ignatius Loyola down to the present day; and I know that they have been spurned, cast out banished from every community, east and west, north and south; and I know that none have been more inveterate against them, than the Roman catholics themselves—bishops, archbishops, cardinals, and popes! Therefore, do not impute to the great body of respectable Roman catholics, the machinations of the clique called *Jesuits*; for, the better informed of our Roman catholic citizens, are perfectly ashamed to be thought of having any immediate association with such a pestilential race of "Corruptors of Youth," and "Disturbers of the public peace."

are at present highly incensed against the Bill expected shortly to occupy the attention of our Legislature; conceiving, that should the measure be carried, great injustice will be done to their particular denomination : other Sects are not less alarmed, fancying, that should Roman catholics succeed in monopolizing the instruction to be dealt out to the rising generation, incalculable injury to all other denominations would be the result.

In Holland, Presbyterians and Baptists and Lutherans and Hebrews and Moravians, etc. are promiscuously associated together in one and the same Class, all receiving the same Secular instruction, unmixed with sectarian dogmas, and free of all petty jealousies; the Teachers leaving to the Ministers the duty of inculcating the lessons of religion, agreeably with the particular beliefs of the parents: the children usually assembling at their respective Clergymen's houses, at stated times. The Schoolmaster's business is to attend to the *head*—the *heart* he leaves to the care of the Ecclesiastic; they never interfere with each other's department, and wrangling is never heard of!

Our Legislators will not, cannot, be so unwise as to place the Religious instruction of *all* the Children in the colony in the hands of any One Sect whatever; for, what is bishop Perry in the estimation of Romanists, but *an*

apostate from the true church, and a poor deluded heretic? and what is bishop Goold in the eyes of Protestants, but a *tool of the scarlet whore of Babylon?* and what are both those trinitarian bishops in the appreciation of the Rev. Mr. Higginson, but a couple of *idolaters, worshipping more Gods than one?* Let the Ministers of each Sect look after their own flocks, and each inculcate what seemeth unto him good, without let or hinderance; for, all have an equal claim to religious freedom, and an equal right to private judgement—but, let not any Sect thwart the Government in carrying out *Compulsory Secular Instruction*, which must necessarily be established, sooner or later; the Age requires it, the Welfare of the masses of the people demands it, and Justice insists on its immediate accomplishment!

In addition to the *Instruction of Youth*, our Legislators are bound to *Educate the Adult*; for, every Individual in the colony has an undoubted claim on the protection and assistance of the Government.

What though the tens of thousands of our Working classes cannot now be put to School, cannot now be taught to *read, write, and cipher*, under similar arrangements as those adapted for the Rising generations; still, much may yet be done towards developing the minds of Adults, and raising them very considerably in the scale of Humanity. We have a variety of public schools in Melbourne, wherein adults might be taught numerous pleasing and useful lessons, without putting the State to any expense; but, unfortunately, the doors are closed against the Laboring-man on the only day in the week when he can conveniently visit those schools, with his wife and children; and as those schools are not private but public property, belonging to the poor as well as the rich, I cherish the hope that our New parliament may be induced, *for the Public good*, to open our

Public Libraries, Galleries of Art, Museums, etc.

On Sundays.

Tell me not that our Adults are incapable of being enlightened and elevated by beholding the thousands of objects contained in those Schools, and by listening to explanatory lectures from qualified men; for, their lack of *scientific* education will not prevent them from deriving incalculable benefit: and, in the course of time, our Australian populace may rival the ancient Athenians, who are allowed to have been the most intelligent community the world has ever seen; yet, what were their *scientific* acquirements? why, there were but few among those who gazed on the Parthenon, few who listened to Pericles, few who were enraptured with Eschylus, and few who applauded Sophocles, who knew either to *write* or to *read!* And why should not *unlettered* Australians have their minds enlarged? their thoughts developed? their tastes cultivated?

Besides, the peace, safety, and general welfare of the State would be insured, by raising the low and disorderly members into sober and well-behaved citizens; for, as Everett has observed—

An intelligent class can scarce ever be, as a class, vicious; never as a class, indolent: the excited mental activity operates as a counterpoise to the stimulus of sense and appetite;"

corroborating the shrewd remark of Austin, that—

An enlightened People were a better auxiliary to the Judge, than an army of Policemen."

Did my pecuniary circumstances allow it, I could furnish scores of valuable opinions on this point, far outweighing the opinion of thousands who have never seriously examined the subject; such, for instance, as that of the able Curator of the British Museum, who, in his evidence before the Fine Arts Committee, said—

I do not anticipate any difficulty in making arrangements for Opening on Sunday afternoon. The same assistance by the Police as on great Holidays, might be adopted. If the British Museum were Open on the Afternoon of Sunday, many Men who now go alone for pleasure trips to the country, would accompany their Wives and Children to the British Museum; and I see no objection to the admission of Children with their Parents. Judging from the attention on the Holidays, when the Husband and Wife visit the Museum together, there is evidently a great desire to avail themselves of the Instruction which the place affords. The behavior of the people is very good. I am delighted to see the manner in which they examine the Collection on Holidays. The Mechanics appear much interested in the Specimens, and, frequently, One who knows more than the others, will demonstrate for the rest of the party. GREAT ADVANTAGES are derived from the perusal of the Collection. It gives the mass of the people a general taste for the study of Nature; which must be highly advantageous to their Morals. I consider the Museum one of the Greatest Educational Establishments in the country, and one of those places where people may gain sound knowledge. Galleries of works of Art, I regard in the same light; and, I think, they ought to be as free as possible. Having formerly practised as a Medical man in one of the largest districts of Spitalfields, I am well aware there is a mass of people who have no opportunity of visiting the Museum, or any Gallery of Art, save on the Sunday; and many of whom would rather spend their Sunday afternoon in that manner, than as they have hitherto been accustomed!

Such was a part only of the evidence given by one of the clearest-headed men in London, Dr. Grey; and Sir Joshua Walmsley, on introducing the subject to the House of Commons, told the Members, that

"He regarded this Motion as purely an Educational one; and he should indeed rejoice, could he induce others to look upon it in that light. It was Educational, in the most impressive sense, and would extend that blessing to tens of thousands whom the millions spent on a Church establishment had not yet reached!"

I have scores and hundreds of extracts from the speeches and letters of other Advocates for the rights and privileges of the Workingclasses; such as Mr. Heyworth, who says—

I believe, that by Opening the British Museum and the National Galleries to the multitude, on the Sabbathday, a source of knowledge would be made available to them, from which they are now virtually excluded. Thus the eyes of their understanding would be opened, and the mental darkness of Ignorance, which now obscures the perception of the pure light of the Gospel, would be expelled."

But, to proceed still further, going out of the boundaries of Education into the territories of pure Gratification, I insist on the expediency and strict religious propriety of our enjoying every rational Recreation that may fall in our way on Sundays, whether on foot or in vehicles, whether on land or water, whether in steamboats or rail carriages, the Sabbath having; been made for Man, *not* Man for the Sabbath; in which expediency I am countenanced by men more celebrated in the religious world, than any of our "Sunday Observance Society;" such as Dr. Arnold, who, in his letter of 1 April, 1840, writes—

That Sunday should be a day of greater leisure than other days, and of the suspension as far as may be of the common business of life, I quite allow; and if the Railway enables the people in the great towns to get out into the country on a Sunday, I should think it a very great Good."

The Rev. John Griffith, Vicar of Aberdare, in a letter published 27 Nov. 1852 (in the Cardiff and Merthyr Guardian) after expressing his hearty approval of the proposed Opening of the Crystal Palace on Sunday afternoons, as a means of diminishing *drunkenness, gambling, and fighting* among the lower orders, proceeds in the following words—

It is the same thing with Sunday Trains. A great outcry has been raised against them. I say it, with every consciousness of the responsibility I incur, as Incumbent of one of the largest parishes in Wales, and with abundant opportunity of testing their usefulness—that, were it not for Sunday Trains, we should have Ten times more Sabbathbreaking in this country than we have now. I can hardly conceive a greater calamity, in a Moral point of view, to a parish like mine, with its 16,000 workmen, than if some Puritanical panic were to seize the Directors of the Taff Vale and Vale of Neath, so that all the Sunday Trains were to be stopped! There would be no living on the Sabbath here. Let the Sunday Trains run as now, resting during Church service, and they will effect, as they are constantly effecting, a great Moral change in the people! I have spoken my mind honestly on this subject, because I think it is time the Clergy should speak. I will yield to none in doing all and everything to "Keep holy the Sabbathday;" and I am quite sure my Parishioners will bear me witness in this. But, there is a vast difference between keeping this day holy, and that rigid Sabbatarianism which has well-nigh threatened, more than once, to bring back the vapid emptiness of the days of the Roundheads. The question is not one of desecration of the Sabbath, but the enlightenment, the recreation, the rest, the elevation of the Workingman. Lord Derby has done a noble act, and I trust he will be supported in it. I fear nothing of "Continental desecration;" I fear nothing for Religion, or, the Church! Open people's Minds; and let us, the Clergy, pray God to open ours as well: and "the city that is set on a hill, can never be hid!"

I cannot resist making room for a few passages, at least, out of Lord Stanley's clever, liberal, and statesmanlike address on the Sabbath-question, in the House of Commons—

"He apprehended, the Object of the Resolution before the House, was not to ask for liberty to stay away from the British Museum or National Gallery on Sunday—that they had already. The opponents of the Resolution, asked not to be allowed to keep the Seventh day in their own way, but, to have power placed in their hands to Compel all others to do the same. In doing that, He believed, they mistook not only the theory of Government, but, the nature of a religious duty. If the whole question at issue, were merely the Opening of One or Two institutions, he would admit that the object was scarcely worth the effort it cost; but this was not simply a question of maintaining new privileges—it was rather one of keeping those which the public already possessed. There was no argument against the Opening of the Museum, which did not apply with equal force to excursion Trains; and which, urged to its legitimate limits, would not go to the closing of places of refreshment, the stopping of omnibuses, and the laying of an embargo on river steamers. This city was, from east to west, six miles across, and a man living in the centre, could not take his family into the country except by employing some cheap public conveyance. On what pretext of fair play, or, common humanity, could they shut up in Shoreditch or Bethnal Green, on a Sunday, the thousands who populated those districts, when they knew that every man who had a sick child would hasten, let the day of the week be what it might, to remove it from the smoke and filth of London to the pure, fresh breeze of the country? He did not wish to raise the cry of one law for the rich, and another for the poor; but, if this was the spirit in which the House of Commons was going to legislate for the country, that cry, depend upon it, would be raised sooner or later, and in tones louder than had yet been heard. [Hear, hear] Another argument against the resolution was, that it would impose

compulsory labor on the Government officials. He could not very well understand the force of this objection, for they had no particular tenderness for the Police, to whom Sunday was a day of labor, and not much sympathy for the Clerks in the Post Office. But the difficulty, such as it was, might be evaded by two methods. It would be easy to exempt, with proportionate deductions, those who had a conscientious objection to work on Sundays—he did not believe the number would be very great; and, on the other hand, it would be quite practicable so to arrange the relays of the service, that no official should be employed to superintend any public building on more than one Sunday out of three or four. [Hear, hear] With regard to the objection, that this measure would interfere with religious worship, he did not believe that it would have any such operation. He would not dwell upon the fact, that a large majority of the workmen in this metropolis did not attend any place of worship whatever; and that if they should be disposed to do so, there would not be Churches enough to hold them. He would not dwell on that, for the state of things which it indicated, might only be temporary, although it did seem hard to say, that one generation should be left to pass their Sunday in the pot-house in order that the next generation may have rather less inducement to stay away from Church. But, they would do well to remember, that an intire day passed in mental attention to abstruse subjects was difficult, even to the educated, and to the untaught or half-educated, impossible. [Hear, hear] There was time on Sunday, both for religious worship and for innocent recreation. There need not be any competition between the Church and the Museum. He hoped that between the Museum and the Publichouse there would be much competition. He did not expect that the Resolution would command a large amount of support in that House; but, of this they might be assured, that If they legislated in their present temper—if they continued old restrictions and created new ones, they would make religion unpopular, and throw back education. The clergy would gain nothing—the people would lose much; but, one class, he admitted, would thank them for their efforts—they would have swelled the profits and gladdened the hearts of every Brewer, Distiller, and Publican in the United Kingdom."

Pursuing the subject still farther, I come to the Parks and Gardens belonging to the Public, which the mischievous Members of the "Sunday Observance Society" are now striving to Close on the only day in the week when they are most needed to be Open. It is monstrous, that a handful of Sabbatarian Evil-doers should presume to *prevent* all the the inhabitants of Melbourne and its suburbs from enjoying the fresh air on a Sunday in *their own* Gardens! To whom do those Parks and Gardens belong? to the Public at large? or, to a clique, a sorry, an insignificant, a pitiable clique of Sabbatists? And who has the charge of our Parks and Gardens? the "Sunday Observance Society"? or, the Government? And can the Government sacrifice the well-being of *the many*, to the superstition of *a few*? It cannot be! It must not be!

Not only should our Gardens be open, but, they should be made attractive; resounding with music; enticing our tens of thousands away from closely pent-up localities; and providing innocent amusements, to allure even the lowest of our Loafers and Larrikins from the scenes of wretchedness and crime in which they drag out the most blessed day of the week. Depend upon it, the way to make men *better*, is to make them *happier*. If such men as Calvin, bishop Aylmer, and archbishop Laud, could play at bowls on Sundays, why should not our unlettered masses be indulged in such innocent amusements? Even our ascetic archdeacon Denison (notorious for his illiberal prosecution of Colenso) has recently declared his readiness to participate in such innocent games "after Service on Sundays"! And if the Members of our New parliament of 1871 will but take the trouble of ascertaining the Opinions of the more advanced Members of the British parliament, on the Sabbath-question, they will pause before curtailing the gratifications of the public of Victoria on Sundays. Accept but half-a-dozen (abbreviated) opinions—

Lord Palmerston (when Prime Minister) expressed himself as follows—

I concurred in the arrangements for performances by military bands in Kensington Gardens and in the Parks, for a couple of hours on Sunday afternoons, after divine service; because, I thought that those arrangements would afford the inhabitants of the metropolis innocent intellectual recreation, combined with fresh, air and healthy exercise; and such recreation did not seem to me to be at variance with the soundest and purest sentiments of religion. Such was my opinion, and such is my opinion still; for, I have heard nothing on the part of those who object to these arrangements, which has altered my view of the matter."

Sir Benjamin Hall repeatedly spoke, as well as acted, *in favor of Sunday bands*; and when the Discussion on the notorious Memorial, signed by the Reverend Secretaries of *three* metropolitan *mosaic* Associations (styling themselves *Christians*) for what they were pleased to term "the better Observance of the Lord's day," took place in the House of Commons, Sir Benjamin said—

"He had frequent reports from the Park-keepers, and from the Superintendent of the Parks; but, he had not heard of a single complaint of the conduct of the people—on the contrary, he believed that the cases before the magistrates on Monday had materially diminished. [Hear, hear] Last year, during the playing of the bands sanctioned by the Government, upwards of 200,000 people visited the Parks on one Sunday; and yet, not a single case arising out of the Bands, came before the magistrates. [Hear, hear.]

The Times. 11 Aug. 1857

In an article on the Sunday Band Question the *Weekly Dispatch* says—

When we surveyed the vast mass of persons assembled on the sward, we were amazed at the orderly conduct that prevailed. Every one seemed delighted with the Music, and at the opportunity thus afforded them of listening to its delightful sounds. We could have wished the presence of those sanctified mortals who lately petitioned the Legislature for a better Observance of the Lord's day, and bored the Minister, through deputations, to prevent every species of amusement taking place. They would have witnessed such a scene as would have convinced them (if they are at all open to conviction) that Sunday recreation of the kind vouchsafed to the public by Sir Benjamin Hall, is neither offensive to common decency nor displeasing to the Deity. We are quite sure, that if her Majesty (the most religious and virtuous queen that ever sat upon the throne of these realms) imagined for a moment that it is a desecration of the Sabbath to allow the band to play in her palaces and in the grounds surrounding them, on Sundays, the practice would immediately be discontinued. But the Queen views the question in a different and liberal light. Seeing that recreation is essential to the toiling millions, her Majesty patronizes those amusements which she thinks best calculated to raise the standard of morality, and she seeks that object by proclaiming to her people that innocent Sunday recreation is, of all things, best calculated to elevate the mind and make the future man."

Such readers as are aware of the interest taken in *the Sunday enjoyments of the people*, by the Earl of Derby, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Stanley, will not be surprised at the declaration of Lord John Manners, on Sunday Bands—

I may now be permitted to say a few words in reply to the question which has been put to me by Mr. Stevenson, in reference to the playing of Musical bands upon the Sabbath. The subject is one to which my attention has not yet been particularly directed; but, so far as I can now form a judgement with respect to it, I see no reason to depart from the arrangement which existed last year, under the direction of Sir Benjamin Hall."

The Times. 9 March, 1858.

Lyndhurst, the venerable recent Lord Chancellor of England, expressed to his Peers an unequivocal approval of the Music for the gratification of the people—

I consider the performance of the bands in the Victoria and Regent's Parks of Sundays, a most excellent and laudable establishment."

In a couple of sheets only, it is not possible to meet every Objection liable to be made against this Plea, neither to quote authorities substantiating every point; for, the subject is voluminous: but, having heard a few remarks while the Pamphlet has been passing through the press, I may as well notice them.

The objection against my treating on *theological* subjects, "because I am not a Clergyman," Milton (himself a Layman of much profounder biblical learning than any of the Clergy of his day) has answered fully; and Watson, the bishop of Llandaff (1737-1816) told his Clergy, that

Laymen are as much interested in the truth of Christianity as Churchmen are, and in this enlightened age, are as capable of seeing what is revealed in their bible."

Luther and Calvin—that these two Reformers (like all the others) were Anti-sabbatists is no doubtful matter. Luther (1483-1546) writes

All days are holy days, as Isaiah had prophesied. And, on the other hand, all days are working days. Yet, rest is necessary. 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 reprove this encroachment on the Christian spirit and liberty."

And Beza (1519-1605) who was associated with Calvin) (1509-156) has left it on record, that a Proposition of Calvin's was discussed by the Geneva Protestants, for holding their religious services on a *Thursday*, rather than on Sunday or Saturday; that they might more effectually discourage the notion of *any one day*, under the Christian dispensation, being more or less sacred than *any other day*: and Calvin himself writes,

Paul informs us, that Christians are not to be judged in respect of its Observance; because, it is a shadow of something to come. Col. II. 16. And, accordingly, He expresses a fear, lest his labor among the Galatians should prove in vain, because they still observed Days. Gal. IV. 10 11. And he tells the Romans, that it is superstitious to make one day differ from another. Rom. XIV. 5."

Tyndale or Tindale (b. 1477—martyred, at Antwerp, in 1536) whose Name is the greatest in the History of the English Reformation, writes plainly—

As for the Sabbath, we be lords over the Sabbath, 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 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 without it.

Tyndale's Answer to Sir T. More.

It is sheer nonsense to call Sunday the *Sabbath*, or the *Lord's day*, or the *Christian sabbath*, as heard from Pulpits; Constantine called it "the venerable day of the Sun," and it was *first* appointed to be kept as a *day of rest* from labor in the year 321, confirmed in 325; yet, Pulpits pretend that the Apostles changed the day of rest from Saturday to Sunday—no such thing! It is equally absurd in Christian ministers (in their prayers and sermons) to lard their English with Hebraisms, calling churches and chapels and meetinghouses, *tabernacles* and *temples* and *sanctuaries*; Pulpit teachers ought to call things by their right names. Professor Newman says,

It is truly vexatious, 1800 years after Paul's career, to have to fight Paul's battles against those who profess themselves not only his grateful children, but his unreasoning obedient disciples. It is, indeed, superfluous here to prove, what is on the face of the New testament, that Sundays are not Sabbaths, that Sabbaths are no part of Gentile Christianity, and that Sundays have in the Scripture nothing to do with abstinence from worldly business. The Puritan school of England and Scotland shuts its eyes to the plainest facts, because it believes it to be useful to hold that Sunday is Sabbath, and Sabbath binding upon us. In vain shall we point to Paul's contemptuous disavowals of Sabbaths, and to his declaration that He who disregards sacred Days is justified, so that He only disregard them to the Lord. In vain may it be proved from the Christian history, that untill Constantine, Sunday was a working-day with Christians. In vain will it be shown, that all the great Reformers held the ancient and catholic doctrine, that the observance of Sunday is a mere ordinance of the Church, not a command of God; and that untill the English and Scotch sabbatarians (late in the 16th century) invented the Puritanical doctrine on this subject, it was unknown to the Christian church. As long as Englishmen care more for supposed Expediency than for Truth, they will, through thick and thin, stickle for a divinely obligatory Sabbath, unless one show them that this falsehood has its evil and dangerous side. p. 121.

Our ears are dinned with the False cry, "The Sabbath, the boon of the Workingman!" In many cases, say rather, his bane. More sin of every kind in England and Scotland is committed on Sunday, than on any other Day of the week; and of this, the (so-called) Sabbatical Institution is in great measure guilty, p. 122

"Sundays are now a political institution; no one can propose to abolish them: but let everyone try to make the best of it. I. By abandoning the false pretence of their observance being a Divine command—itself an intrinsic incredible absurdity, as well as without a shadow of New testament proof. II. By encouraging mental cultivation of the largest and most liberal kind on that day, and greatly shortening the prayers—but of this more will be said. III. By facilitating and inviting attendance at Church, wherever masses of people are disposed to flock for the recreation of country air; as at Richmond and Greenwich near London, and many other places near to great cities. IV. By solemnly urging, that Religion demands the whole heart for God on every day, and that no compromise can be made by looking grave or dressing clean for One day. p. 122.

Justly, then, do I hate the Sabbatical fiction, as a cause of real Sin to the anxious and well-intentioned, as well as to the careless and uncontrolled, p. 123.

The Soul; its Sorrows and its Aspirations Ed. of 1858,

What I have written, I have written; and though hastily, not unadvisedly. Should my efforts on behalf of the Workingclasses prove beneficial, this Plea shall stand me in the stead of glory, be the delight of my age, and an additional consolation at the close of my earthly existence—the prelude to those ineffable gratifications which await me on my transition into that other and better world, where I shall mingle with Immortals in ever-during and ever-increasing bliss.

B. S. N.

Courteous and Humane Reader,

if you think that the dissemination of the preceding pages is likely to be productive of Good and not Evil, then, I call upon you, in the name of Humanity, to assist me, by your Contribution (check, stamps, or cash) to issue this pamphlet *gratis* far and wide, to both rich and poor—but, do it quickly, or your assistance may be for ever too late.

pointing hand Those who favor me with their address (plainly written) shall receive pamphlets (free of expense) for distribution.

Evans Brothers, Printers, 44 Collins Street West, Melbourne.

Victoriæ Reginæ. coat of arms

Anno Vicesimo Quarto & Vicesimo Quinto

Cap. CVII.

An Act to alter and amend the Law relating to Parochial and Burgh Schools, and to the Test required to be taken by Schoolmasters in Scotland.—[6th August 1861.]

WHEREAS an Act was passed in the Forty-third Year of the Reign of His Majesty *George* the Third, Chapter Fifty-four, intituled *An Act for making letter Provision for*

the Parochial Schoolmasters, and for making further Regulations for the better Government of the Parish Schools in Scotland : And whereas it is expedient to amend the said Act, and to make further and other Provisions for the Maintenance and Government of the said Schoolmasters and Schools, and to abolish the Test imposed by Law on Schoolmasters in *Scotland*: Be it enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, as follows :

I. Where not inconsistent with the Context, the following Interpretation of Terms.

Expressions shall have the Meaning herein-after assigned them; that is to say,

The Expression "Parochial School" shall mean and include every School established or to be established or provided for under the said recited Act:

The Expression "Burgh School" shall mean and include every every Burgh, Grammar, or other public School, not being a Parochial School.

Salaries of School-masters to be not less than 35*l.* nor more than 70*l.* per Annum, but where Two or more Schools, Salaries not to be less than 50*l.* nor more than 80*l.*

II. From and after the Term of *Martinmas* next after the passing of this Act the Salary of every Schoolmaster of any Parochial School shall not be less than the Sum of Thirty-five Pounds nor more than the Sum of Seventy Pounds *per Annum*: Provided always, that where Two or more Schools have been or shall be established in any Parish in Terms of the said Act the total Amount of the Salary payable to the Schoolmasters therein shall not be less than Fifty Pounds nor more than Eighty Pounds *per Annum*, to be apportioned among the said Schoolmasters as the Heritors shall determine, in the Manner provided by the said Act; and the Salaries herein provided shall be in lieu of the Salaries payable under the Provisions of the said Act: Provided also, that it shall be lawful for the Heritors, if they shall think fit, to make any Addition granted by them to the Salary of any Schoolmaster beyond the minimum Amount hereby fixed to be dependent upon the Number of Scholars receiving Instruction in his School, under such Regulations as they may deem expedient.

Salary to be fixed by the Heritors and Minister, and to be payable in Money at the Terms and under Conditions now in use.

III. The Minister of every Parish in which there is a Parochial School shall, within Three Months from and after the passing of this Act, and on every Occasion of a Vacancy in the Office of Schoolmaster within Six Weeks after such Vacancy shall have taken place, call a Meeting of the Heritors together with the said Minister, in the Manner prescribed in the said recited Act, for the Purpose of fixing the Salary of the Schoolmaster under this Act, subject always to the Appeal provided in the said recited Act; and the Salary to be so fixed shall be payable in Sterling Money, at the same Terms and under the same Conditions, Provisions, and Regulations as are at present in use; and in case in regard to any Parish such Meeting shall not have been held or the Salary shall not have been fixed in manner and within the Period herein prescribed, the Salary shall, until such Meeting shall have been held and such Salary so fixed, be held as fixed at the Amount of Fifty Pounds *per Annum*, which Amount shall be payable to the Schoolmaster in manner herein-before prescribed; and where Two or more Schools have been established in any One Parish, the said Sum of Fifty Pounds shall be payable to the several Schoolmasters thereof, in the same Proportion according to which their several Salaries were payable before the passing of this Act: Provided always, that where any Parish shall be vacant at the Time of the passing of this Act, or become vacant before any such Meeting shall be called, or where any Minister shall decline or delay calling such Meeting, after having been required so to do by any Heritor or Heritors holding not less than One Third of the Valuation of the Parish, it shall be competent for such Heritor or Heritors to call, by Notice affixed to the Door of the Parish Church, and either a Circular sent to each Heritor, or an Advertisement published in a Newspaper of general Circulation in the District, a Meeting for the Purpose of fixing the Salary of the Schoolmaster under this Act, and the Salary fixed at such Meeting within the Limits specified in this Act shall be the Salary of the Schoolmaster or Schoolmasters.

IV. At the Meeting aforesaid it shall be lawful for the Heritors may discontinue existing Side Schools.

Heritors and Minister to resolve to discontinue, from and after a Date to be fixed by them, any subsisting Side School in the Parish : Provided always, that if such Side School is not vacant at the Date of such Meeting they shall provide to the School-master thereof during his Life, from and after its Discontinuance, an annual Payment equal in Amount to the full Salary to which at the Date of the passing of this Act he had Right by Law, under the Provisions of the said recited Act, together with the annual Value of any Dwelling House to which he may have been entitled as such Schoolmaster, as the same is or shall be valued by the Assessor for the County, which Amount shall be assessed, levied, and paid over and above the Salaries payable under this Act, and in like Manner as such Salaries are hereby directed to be assessed, levied, and paid.

V. It shall be lawful for the Heritors and Minister, at the Heritors nifty establish a Female Teacher.

Meeting aforesaid, or at any subsequent Meeting duly called for that Purpose, to resolve that a Female Teacher shall be established, to give Instruction in such Branches of Female Industrial and Household Training, as well as of Elementary Education, as they shall then or from Time to Time prescribe, and to provide, over and above the Salary herein-before mentioned, a yearly Sum not exceeding Thirty Pounds as a Salary for such Female Teacher, which yearly Sum shall be assessed, levied, and paid in like Manner as such herein-before mentioned Salary is hereby directed to be assessed, levied and paid; and it shall be lawful for the said Heritors and Minister to engage and appoint such Female Teacher for such Period of Time and on such Terms and Conditions as shall be agreed on.

VI. It shall be lawful for the Heritors and Minister, at such

Side School Teacher may be required to resign, on increasing Salaries, Provision being made for him during Life.

Meeting as aforesaid, to resolve to require the Teacher of any Side School in the Parish, on a Notice of not less than Three Months, to resign his Office, on their providing to him during his Life an annual Payment equal in Amount to the full Salary to which at the Date of the passing of this Act he had Right by Law, under the Provisions of the said recited Act, together with the annual Value of any Dwelling House to which he may have been entitled as such Schoolmaster, as the same is or shall be valued by the Assessor of the County, which Amount shall be assessed, levied, and paid over and above the Salaries payable under this Act, and in like Manner as such Salaries are hereby directed to be assessed, levied, and paid; and at the Expiry of Three Months from Notice as aforesaid, if such Teacher shall not previously have given in his Resignation, the Heritors and Minister having made Provision for such annual Payment as aforesaid, the Right of such Teacher to his Office shall cease and determine.

Salaries where not fixed at the maximum Amount may be increased.

VII. If in any Parish the Salary shall have been fixed at a yearly Sum less than the maximum Amount herein-before specified, it shall be lawful to the Heritors and Minister, at any Meeting to be called and held in the Manner before prescribed, from Time to Time to increase the Amount of such Salary, provided the same shall not exceed the said maximum Amount, and on any Vacancy in the Office of Schoolmaster from Time to Time to reduce the Salary, so that it shall not be less than the minimum Salary herein-before specified; provided that it shall be the Duty of the Minister to call such Meeting only on the Requisition of any Heritor or Heritors being Proprietors of not less than One Fourth Part of the whole Lands and Heritages situate within the Parish.

Office of School-master may be declared vacant where retiring Salary has already been agreed upon between Heritors and School-master. Examination by Examiners appointed by the Universities to come in the Place of the Examination by the Presbytery.

VIII. In case the Heritors shall, previously to the passing of this Act, have entered into any Agreement with the School-master of any Parish for his Retirement from the Performance of the Duties of his Office, on Payment to him of a retiring Allowance or otherwise, it shall be lawful to the Heritors, at any Meeting to be called and held as aforesaid, to declare the Office of Schoolmaster of such Parish vacant, and to proceed to elect another Schoolmaster, and to grant such retiring Allowance or other Terms to such retiring Schoolmaster as may have been agreed upon as aforesaid, payable during the Remainder of his Life, which retiring Allowance shall be payable in all respects in like Manner with the Salary of the Schoolmaster.

IX. The Sixteenth Section of the said recited Act shall be and is hereby repealed; and in place of the Examination by the Presbytery therein prescribed it is hereby enacted as follows; viz.,

(1.) It shall be the Duty of the University Court of each University in *Scotland*, as soon as conveniently may be, and in no Case later than Two Months after the passing of this Act, and thereafter from Time to Time, to appoint Six Persons to be Examiners of Parochial Schoolmasters, Three of such Persons being Professors in the Faculty of Arts, and Three of such Persons being Professors in the Faculty of Divinity of the University.

(2.) The Persons so appointed shall continue to be Examiners

Examiners to hold the Office for Two Years, but may be re-appointed; and Vacancies to be filled, up during Two Years from and after the Date of their respective Appointments, and until other Persons shall have been in like Manner appointed in their Room; provided that it shall be lawful to the University Court to re-appoint all or any of the same Persons to be such Examiners, and to fill up from Time to Time any Vacancy which may occur by the Death, Resignation, or Disqualification of any of the Examiners; and it shall be lawful to each of the Persons so appointed to nominate as his Deputy, with Power to act as his Substitute in case of his Absence at any Meeting of the Examiners, any Person who may have become a Graduate in Arts of the University not later than Three Years prior to such Nomination; provided that such Nomination shall be approved by the University Court, and also provided that the Persons nominated by such Examiners as are Professors in the Faculty of Divinity shall be Ministers or Licentiates of the Church of *Scotland*:

(3.) It shall be lawful to the Examiners to make, on or before Examiners to make and publish Regulations with Approval of University Court. the Eleventh Day of *November* One thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and thereafter from Time to Time, such Regulations as they shall see fit in regard to the Time and Manner of Examinations, and as to the Subjects to which the same shall extend, and to regulate the Notice to be given thereof, regard being always had in the framing of these Regulations to the Circumstances of each particular District; provided that such Regulations shall be approved of by the University Court; and the said Regulations, when so approved, shall be published by Advertisement in such Manner as the University Court shall direct and the Examiners may appoint One of their own Number, or any One of their Substitutes, to act as their Secretary; and such Examinations shall be held within the Buildings of the University, and at such Time and Place as shall be fixed by the University Court:

(4.) For the Purposes of the Examination of Parochial Scotland to be divided into Four Districts as in Schedule (A.) Schoolmasters the Parochial Schools in *Scotland* shall be and are hereby distributed into Four Districts each in connexion with One of the Universities, as set forth in the Schedule (A.) hereto annexed:

Persons elected School-masters to be examined by the Examiners.

(5.) Every Person elected to be a Parochial Schoolmaster under the Provisions of this and the said recited Act, and every Person elected to be a Schoolmaster under the Provisions of the Act of the First and Second Years of the Reign of Her Majesty, Chapter Eighty-seven, shall, before his Admission to the said Office, and as a Condition thereof, submit himself to the Trial and Examination of the Examiners for the District to which the Parish for which he has been elected appertains, as to his Fitness and Qualifications for the Duties of the said Office; and being found qualified, the said Examiners shall furnish to him a Certificate to that Effect subscribed by them or by a Majority of their Number, which Certificate shall be conclusive Evidence that he has passed the requisite Examination, and been found qualified for the said Office, and the Examiners shall have Power, with Consent of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, to require the Attendance at any such Examination, for the Purpose of assisting therein, of One of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

Electors of School master may choose more than One Candidate to be tried by Examiners.

X. It shall be lawful for the Persons entitled to elect any Burgh or Parochial Schoolmaster, if they shall see fit, instead of electing some One Person to the vacant Office, to choose and nominate Two Persons or Three Persons to be tried by the Examiners, whose Duty it shall be to make Trial of the comparative Fitness and Qualifications of the Persons so chosen and nominated, and to determine which of them is the best qualified and most fit for the School with reference to which they have been so chosen, and to give the Person so preferred by them a Certificate to that Effect, and such Certificate, along with the Minute of Nomination by the Persons entitled to elect, and also, in the Case of a Parochial Schoolmaster, the Certificate of his having emitted the Declaration herein-after set forth, shall complete the Right of the Person so preferred to the Office of Schoolmaster : Provided always, that if the Examiners shall not be satisfied of the Fitness and Qualifications of any of the Persons nominated as aforesaid, they may decline to grant a Certificate to any of them, of which Declinature they shall forthwith cause Intimation to be made to the Persons having the Right of Election; and provided further, that in the event of Two or more Candidates for the Office of Schoolmaster being remitted by the Heritors and Minister to the Examiners for competitive Examination, the Heritors shall pay to each of the Examiners a Fee of Ten Shillings for each additional Candidate so examined; and in the event of the Magistrates of any Burgh remitting any Candidate for Examination to the Examiners, they shall pay to each of the Examiners a Fee of One Pound One Shilling if there be only One, and a Fee of Ten Shillings for each additional Candidate.

XI. It shall be lawful to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Commissioners of the Treasury to pay 21s. to each of the Examiners in respect of each Examination, and 15s. to their Secretary.

Treasury to pay out of any Monies which may be voted by Parliament for that Purpose the Sum of One Pound One Shilling to each of the said Examiners for and in respect of every Person examined by them under the Provisions of this Act, and also the Sum of Fifteen Shillings for each such Examination to the Secretary of the Examiners, out of which Sum he shall defray the Expense of the Advertisements required by this Act and other incidental Expenses.

XII. From and after the passing of this Act, it shall not be necessary for any Schoolmaster, or for any Person elected a Schoolmaster, of any Parochial School, or of any School under the Provisions of the Act of the First and Second Years of the

Parochial School-masters not to be required to sign Confession of Faith or Formula but to make a Declaration and to undertake to conform to the Shorter Catechism.

Reign of Her Majesty, Chapter Eighty-seven, to profess or subscribe the Confession of Faith, or the

Formula of the Church of *Scotland*, or to profess that he will submit himself to the Government and Discipline thereof: Provided always, that every Person elected a Schoolmaster of any such School shall as a Condition of the Office, and before Admission thereto, produce before the Principal, or, in case of his Absence or Inability to act, before One or other of the Professors in the Faculty of Divinity of the University in which he has been examined, an Extract or certified Copy of the Minutes of his Election, together with the said Certificate by the Examiners, and shall in the Presence of the Principal or Professor emit and subscribe a Declaration in the following Terms; that is to say,

I A.B. do solemnly and sincerely, in the Presence of God profess, testify, and declare, That as Schoolmaster of the Parochial School at _____ in the Parish of _____, and in the Discharge of the said Office, I will never endeavour, directly or indirectly, to teach or inculcate any Opinions opposed to the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, or to the Doctrines contained in the Shorter Catechism agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, and approved by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the Year One thousand six hundred and forty-eight; and that I will faithfully conform thereto in my teaching of the said School, and that I will not exercise the Functions of the said Office to the Prejudice or Subversion of the Church of Scotland as by Law established, or the Doctrines and Privileges thereof.'

And the Person elected to be Schoolmaster, having made such Productions and Declaration, shall be furnished with an Attestation to that Effect subscribed by the said Principal or Professor, which Attestation shall complete his Right to the Emoluments provided by this Act.

Presbytery of the Bounds may present a Complaint to Secretary of State against School-master.

XIII. It shall be competent for the Presbytery of the Bounds, or for the Heritors, whensoever they shall see Cause for instituting Proceedings against the Schoolmaster of any Parish, for Contravention of the said Declaration, to present a Complaint to One of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State against such Schoolmaster; and it shall be lawful to the Secretary of State thereupon to appoint a Commission to inquire into the said Charge, and to censure, suspend, or deprive such Schoolmaster, as they shall find to be just; provided that no such Sentence shall take effect until it has been confirmed and approved of by the Secretary of State.

Jurisdiction of the Presbytery in Cases of immoral Conduct or Cruelty transferred to the Sheriff.

XIV. So much of the Twenty-first Section of the said recited Act as provides that the Presbytery shall take cognizance of, and, if they see Cause, proceed by Libel against any Schoolmaster in respect of any Complaint charging him with immoral Conduct, or cruel and improper Treatment of the Scholars under his Charge, is hereby repealed; and in lieu thereof it is hereby enacted, That it shall be lawful to the Heritors and Ministers, or the Clerk of the Presbytery of the Bounds, by the Authority of the said Presbytery, given on the Application of the Heritors and Minister, or of any Six Heads of Families in the Parish whose Children are attending the School, to make a Complaint in Writing to the Sheriff of the County in which the School is situate, charging the Schoolmaster with immoral Conduct, or cruel and improper Treatment of the Scholars under his Charge, and specifying in such Complaint the particular Acts in respect of which the Complaint is made; and a Copy of such Complaint shall be served upon the Schoolmaster, who shall be required, on an Induciae of Fourteen Days, to appear before the Sheriff, by himself or his Agent, to answer to the said Complaint; and the Schoolmaster accused shall, if he deny the Charge, if he think fit, answer the Particulars of the Complaint, such Answer to be in Writing, and to be lodged within the said Fourteen Days, or may, when the Cause comes to be tried, state his Plea to be Not Guilty; and the Sheriff shall thereafter proceed to the Trial of the Complaint, and take the Evidence in the same Way as and under the same Rules as those which are in force in the Sheriff Court in regard to Process in Civil Causes; and in the event that he shall find such Complaint or any material and relevant Part thereof to be proved, the Sheriff shall give Judgment accordingly, and shall pass such Sentence of Censure, Suspension, or Deprivation, as in his Opinion the Case requires, which Sentence shall be final and not subject to Review, and shall have all the Effects consequent before the passing of this Act on any similar Sentence of any Presbytery under the Provisions of the last recited Section of the said Act, and no Sentence of Censure, Suspension, or Deprivation otherwise pronounced on such Charges shall be valid or effectual: Provided always, that where Sentence of Suspension shall be pronounced the Salary of the Schoolmaster in respect of his Office shall cease and determine from the Date of such Sentence until the next Term of *Whitsunday* or *Martinmas* following the Expiration of the Term of Suspension specified in such Sentence, and the Salary accruing during the said Period shall be applied by the Heritors and Minister towards providing a Substitute for such Schoolmaster during the Period of the Suspension.

XV. The Sheriff shall by his Decerniture ascertain and

Expenses incurred by the Complainers to be repaid out of the Rogue Money.

specify the Amount of the Expenses properly incurred by the Complainers in the Proceedings connected with any Complaint against the Schoolmaster of any Parochial School; and the Complainers shall be entitled to recover the Amount so ascertained from the Collector, and out of the readiest Proceeds of the Assessments commonly called the Rogue Money levied for the County within which the School is situate, under the

Provisions of an Act passed in the Eleventh Year of the Reign of His Majesty *George* the First, Chapter Twenty-six; and the Receipt of the Agent of the Complainers shall be a sufficient Discharge to the said Collector for any Payments so made by him out of the said Rogue Money or Assessments.

XVI. So much of the Second Section of the said recited Act

Repeal of Clauses of the recited Act requiring an Estimate of the Value of Grain to be made at successive Periods.

as provides that where the Salaries of Parochial Schoolmasters had been before the passing thereof payable in Grain or Meal such Salary in Grain or Meal should continue to be paid, and also the Third, Fourth, and Sixth Sections of the said recited Act, shall be and are hereby repealed; and it is hereby declared and provided, that the Right of electing a Parochial Schoolmaster, *jure devoluto*, conferred by the Fifteenth Section of the said recited Act on the Commissioners of Supply of the County, after the Expiration of Four Months from the Time when the Vacancy in any Parochial School shall have taken place, shall not arise or accrue to the Commissioners of Supply until the Expiration of Six Months from the Time of such Vacancy.

XVII. Where in any Parish it shall be necessary to provide

School-master's House to consist of Four Apartments.

a House for the Parochial Schoolmaster, in Terms of the recited Act, and of an Act passed in the First and Second Years of the Reign of Her present Majesty, intituled *An Act to facilitate the Foundation and Endowment of additional Schools in Scotland*, or either of them, such House shall consist of at least Three Apartments besides the Kitchen.

Act not to interfere with Arrangements as to Retirement of School master.

XVIII. Nothing in this Act shall be held to interfere with any Arrangement which may have been concluded between the Heritors and Schoolmaster of any Parish for the Retirement of such Schoolmaster, except as regards the House and Garden, and Premises attached thereto, which shall in every Case be made over at the Term of *Whitsunday* next after the passing of this Act to the Person actually discharging the Duties of Schoolmaster, and where the Use of such Premises may have formed Part of a retiring Allowance the Heritors shall make reasonable Compensation to the Ex-Schoolmaster.

Heritors and Ministers may permit or require School master to resign.

XIX. In case it shall be found, on a Report by One of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, made on the Application of the Heritors of the Parish, and concurred in by the Presbytery of the Bounds, that the Schoolmaster of any Parish is disqualified because of Infirmary or Old Age for the due Performance of the Duties of his Office, or that from Negligence or Inattention he has failed efficiently to discharge such Duties, it shall be lawful to the Heritors and Minister, at any Meeting called and held as aforesaid, to permit or require such Schoolmaster to resign his said Office, and in case of his refusal so to do to dismiss or suspend such Schoolmaster, and when necessary to declare the School vacant; and in every Case of such Resignation the Heritors and Minister may grant to such Schoolmaster a retiring Allowance payable during the Remainder of his Life; provided that where such Resignation shall not be occasioned by any Fault on the Part of the Schoolmaster the Heritors shall grant a retiring Allowance the Amount whereof shall not be less than Two Third Parts of the Amount of the Salary pertaining to said Office at the Date of such Resignation thereof, and shall not exceed the gross Amount of such Salary, which retiring Allowance shall be payable in all respects in like Manner with the Salary of the Schoolmaster; provided also, that no Schoolmaster shall be suspended for a longer Period than Three Months, or be dismissed for Neglect of Duty, excepting under the above Provisions.

Minister and Heritors may grant annual Allowance to School master, in addition to retiring Allowance.

XX. In all Cases in which the Minister and Heritors are by this Act empowered to provide a retiring Allowance for a Schoolmaster who shall resign or shall be removed from his Office, it shall be lawful for them, if they see fit, to provide for such Schoolmaster, in addition to such Allowance, and in like Manner, a further yearly Sum, equal in Amount to the annual Value of any Dwelling House and Garden to which he may be entitled as such Schoolmaster, as the same shall be valued by the Assessor for the County.

XXI. The whole Provisions of an Act passed in the Twentieth

20 & 21 Vict. c. 59. repealed.

and Twenty-first Years of the Reign of Her present Majesty, Chapter Fifty-nine, intituled *An Act concerning the Parochial Schoolmasters in Scotland*, shall be and are hereby repealed.

XXII. From and after the passing of this Act, it shall not

School-masters in Royal Burghs not to be required to sign Confession of Faith or Formula of Church of Scotland.

be necessary for any Person elected to be a Schoolmaster of any Burgh School to profess or subscribe the Confession of Faith, or the Formula of the Church of *Scotland*, or to profess that he will submit himself to the Government and Discipline thereof, nor shall any such Schoolmaster be subject to the Trial, Judgment, or Censure of the Presbytery of the Bounds for his Sufficiency, Qualifications, or Deportment in his Office, any

Statute to the contrary notwithstanding; and this Enactment shall be a sufficient Defence in answer to any Proceedings against any Schoolmaster of any Burgh School in respect that he has not made such Profession or Subscription.

XXIII. Nothing herein contained shall repeal, alter, or affect

Not to affect Provisions relating to Parochial Schools, &c. Short Title.

the Provisions of the recited Act, or of any other Act relating to Parochial Schools or Schoolmasters in *Scotland*, excepting in so far only as shall be necessary to give Effect to the Provisions of this Act.

XXIV. This Act may be quoted in all Proceedings as "The Parochial and Burgh Schoolmasters (*Scotland*) Act, 1861."

Schedule

Schedule (A.)

Licence—In terms of Her Majesty's Letters Patent to Her Printers for Scotland, and of the Instructions Issued by Her Majesty In Council, dated Eleventh July Eighteen Hundred and Thirty-nine, I hereby Licence and Authorize WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS, Printers in Edinburgh to Print and Publish, as by the authority of Her Majesty, Acts of Parliament, Edicts, Proclamations, or other Papers printed by Royal Authority, as proposed in their Declaration, dated Twenty-sixth February Eighteen Hundred and Forty-eight: the terms and conditions of the said Instructions in this matter being always and In all points fully complied with and observed by the said WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS.

LONDON,

31st March 1848

And. Rutherford

Plain Rules for the Guidance of Persons Desiring to Insure their Lives or to Purchase Government Annuities.

THE Government Annuities Commissioner is empowered under the Act of the New Zealand Assembly, entitled "The Government Annuities Act, 1869," to Insure the Lives of persons of either sex between the ages of 16 and 60. He is also empowered to grant Annuities Immediate or Deferred on the lives of persons of either sex, of the age of 10 years and upwards.

The various forms of Insurance and Annuities and the modes of payment, will be found set out in the tables prepared for the purpose.

Persons whose lives are insured, or to whom Annuities are granted, will have Government Security for the payment of all moneys due to them. It was the object and intention of the Legislature by affording this security, to leave no excuse to persons for failing to make provision for the future. As profit is not the object of the Government, the tables are framed with the view of simply making a fair charge for the risks undertaken. The Government are able to undertake such risks lower than private associations, because—

- They have their own Government Securities in which to invest from time to time the accumulations.
- Without leaving idle an undue amount of accumulations, they have always ample funds to satisfy all payments due.
- They will save the charges of agents to which private associations are subjected.
- They require neither an extra staff, nor costly buildings, and in short, all the expenses are less.

Great stress should be laid on these circumstances by persons proposing to assure their lives or purchase annuities. The State is much interested in encouraging amongst the people provident habits; to persons making such provision the Government have provided a scheme affording absolute security, at a minimum rate of charge. Private institutions can neither offer such security, nor can they in safety be content with so low a rate of charge. The very exceptional nature of the transaction exonerates the Government from undue interference with private enterprise. A person who contracts for an Insurance on his life, or for a deferred annuity, enters

into an undertaking to make a series of payments for a more or less prolonged period. After investing his savings for ten, twenty, thirty, or even fifty years, he should be protected from all risk of loss.

2. Certain post offices, the names of which may be obtained at any post office, have been opened for the receipt of proposals for the Insurance of Lives, and the purchase of Annuities, and forms of proposal with full instructions for filling up and delivering these forms may be obtained at these post offices.

3. Tables of the various premiums to be charged may be seen and procured at the post offices which have been opened for the receipt of proposals, or they will be sent post free on written application. The following pages contain the principal tables exclusive of the deferred annuities, but it may be mentioned that a more extensive set of tables is in course of preparation, and will shortly be published.

4 The premiums to be charged for the Insurance of Lives vary with the age of the persons whose lives are to be insured, and with the mode in which they are to be paid.

5. If, after having duly made his payments for a period of five years, the insured person shall be unable to continue, or shall desire to discontinue, such payments, a portion of the premiums paid by him, will be returned to him.

6. The sums to be charged for the purchase of Deferred Annuities, will vary with the age and sex of the person on whose life the Annuity is to depend; and with the length of the term for which the Annuity is deferred, (or, in other words, with the number of years which are to pass before the commencement of the Annuity), and with the conditions of the contract as to the mode of purchase, mode of payment, and return or non return of purchase money. When the condition of the contract is to be that, in the event of the death of the person on whose life the Annuity is to depend before the commencement of the Annuity, the purchase money is to be returned to his representatives, and that if the purchaser at any time before the commencement of the Annuity is unable to continue, or wishes to discontinue, the purchase, the purchase money shall be returned to him; the price charged will be higher than when no such condition is made.

7. Persons contracting for the Insurance of their Lives, or for the purchase of Annuities, will be allowed to pay their periodical premiums or instalments of purchase money at such of the Post Offices, which have been or may hereafter be opened for the purpose, as will suit them best.

8. Persons proposing to effect Insurances on their Lives, must provide at, their cost such certificates of birth, or other evidence of age, as shall be required of them, but will not be required to pay any fee for medical examination, or to pay the cost of any inquiry which the Commissioner may think fit to make with regard to their health, habits, age, and occupation, or to pay any fee for the issue of any contracts which may be made in accordance with their proposals, or to pay any postage for the transmission of their proposals, or for the transmission of any correspondence arising out of such proposals between them and the Commissioner, inasmuch as a provision for all such costs and charges is included in the premiums which they will, be required to pay, in accordance with the Tables framed for the purpose for the Insurance of their Lives.

9. Persons proposing to purchase Immediate or Deferred Annuities, must provide at their own cost such certificates of birth or baptism, or other evidence of age as shall be required of them; and, inasmuch as the premiums fixed by the Tables framed for the grant of such Annuities do not include any provision for costs and charges, must pay, at the time of purchase, a fee of 1s. for every £1 of Annuity purchased.

Composition Grammar and Analysis

And Their Combined Teaching from the First With Composition as the Basis and end

A Lecture DELIVERED Before the Nairnshire Association of Teachers On the 20th of JANUARY 1872

WILLIAM JOLLY

H.M. Inspector of Schools

Published at the Desire of the Association

William Blackwood & Sons London 45 George Street, Edinburgh : 37 Paternoster Row MDCCCLXXII

Price One Selling.]

Printed by William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh.

Prefatory.

ONE special aim of Associations of Teachers should be the discussion of points in the wide field of Method, and the discovery of the best means of doing the daily work of the schoolroom. It is in accordance with such a practical purpose that I seek on the present occasion to bring before you certain ideas on an important practical subject—the teaching of English. I do so, because I am convinced that more might be done in this subject than one daily sees to be done. Its teaching should be attended with greater pleasure to both teacher and scholar than it is. It should produce higher results than we see, and give our children greater practical power over the language when they leave school for the great business of life, in which it is the chief instrument.

As far as its structure and use are considered, English is taught in our common schools under the three heads of Grammar, Analysis, and Composition. These subjects I shall treat of separately and in the order named, and then take up the special point of Method I desire to bring before you now—their combined teaching from the first, with Composition as the medium and end.

Part First

Grammar, Analysis, and Composition: Notes on their Teaching.

Grammar.

GRAMMAR may be considered under two aspects,—as a course of logical training, and as a means of knowing the laws of language.

Under the first aspect in which it is viewed apart from its application to the right use of language, Grammar has its chief end in mental regimen. Properly taught, Grammar should form the school course of Logic, towards which it can be made a most efficient instrument, quite within the grasp of children, in which they may be made to take positive pleasure. It should be made a means of training and exercising them more or less in abstract thought, in correct reasoning, in clear and ready discrimination of differentia, in classification, and definition, in the discovery of fallacy, and indeed in all the chief processes of the science of Logic—a logical course which will be all that most of our children will ever know of Logic and scientific method.

Its success will therefore depend on the correctness and logical accuracy of the definitions, classifications, and reasoning processes of our grammatical course both as to the general principles of grammar and their application to English.

I.—Our Common Grammars Defective.

Yet it is remarkable that our English grammar, as it has been till lately taught, and as even now too generally taught in our common class-books, is very far from all this, and is full of positive error and illogical classification. English grammar is the least correct and least scientific part of our school course in text-book and practice. This is a grave charge to make, but it is too true. Indeed, so much is this the case that a good grammarian could, without fear, undertake to show error, deficiency, or logical fallacy in almost every page of the most of our grammars, and most successfully in those in most common use, and that by a few questions given to an average class. Into this subject and the substantiation of this charge, we cannot now enter at any length. We shall only adduce a few examples, as pointing out what any one may discover for himself, and which it is his duty to do, if his teaching on this most important subject is to produce the result it is calculated to do. Let us glance hurriedly through the pages of most of our common school grammars, and note a few points.

The Noun.

The definition of a noun, where it departs from the simple statement that a noun is a name, or the name of anything, is generally either defective or redundant, or both.

In the definition of *gender* a confusion is made between *gender*, which is a distinction of words, and *sex*, which is a distinction of *animals*. The classification of words by gender is made the same as the sexual differences in animals, and English gender is declared to be of two kinds. Gender, however, is a *verbal* distinction. It is *based upon* difference in sex, but is not sex. Sex is dual, but words in English may have five genders or kinds as *based on sex*:—*masculine*= he of male; *feminine*=she or female; *neuter*= what has no sex, hence its name—*neither*; *common*; what has either sex; and words including *both sexes*, as children: or shortly thus,—*he* and *she*; and then *either*, *neither*, or *both*—all the possible varieties based on the idea of the two sexes.

Neuter is too often defined as "that which is without life"; one hears it almost daily. The word, of course, tells its own meaning; neuter is neither—*i.e.*, neither "he" nor "she," life being only an accidental idea, which may be present or not. If *neuter* is without life, what is the gender of "spirit," "soul," which = *it*? What is the gender of the whole vegetable world, which certainly has life? A tree lives, and can die, and yet it is neuter.

Case.—In our grammars, English is said to have three cases, and yet, in these same books, we read not only of nominative possessive, and objective, but of the absolute case and the case of address. Then what is to determine case—inflection or function in a sentence? Let us adhere to either the one idea or the other. If it is to be determined by *inflection*, nouns have only two cases, pronouns three, if not four. If by *function*, English will be found to have at least these cases—nominative, genitive or possessive, objective or accusative, case of address or vocative, case absolute, and the dative case, which last it has both functionally and historically, as in him, "m" being the old dative termination.

Then, *nominative* absolute is a misnomer, and unphilosophic, *nominative* being the case in all languages of the *subject*, and the absolute case being always one of the oblique cases,—“genitive,” as in Greek; “ablative,” as in Latin; “dative,” as in Saxon, &c.: “case absolute” would perhaps be the simplest name in modern English. The same objection holds of *nominative* of address.

The Adjective.

The definition of the adjective is equally defective. If it is defined by quality, what of adjectives of quantity? and if by quality and quantity, what of adjectives of distinction?

Then it is generally defined as being added to a *noun*, and, more fully, a pronoun. What of phrases, and sentences, and ideas expressed by paragraphs or otherwise?

Then one still hears that the comparative sometimes expresses a *less* degree of comparison, as “smaller.” The comparative “er” always, of course, expresses a *higher* degree of the idea of the positive.

The *superlative* is often stated to be the *highest* degree of the positive, ignoring the true conception of *comparison*, that the comparative and superlative are only higher and highest of *certain things compared*; while the same positive in another instance may be much higher in degree, than its own superlative in this instance. The general statement, that adjectives have three degrees, should therefore be modified by the statement that, when *things are compared*, adjectives take three degrees. Absolutely, they have many degrees expressed in various ways.

The positive is also stated to express an idea without any reference to another, which is only true in a very limited sense; for, when I assert any man to be tall, I can do so only by reference to others.

There is a fertile source of error and confusion in not distinguishing between adjectives and pronouns. Many words have both functions in most languages, as the demonstrative, distributive, indefinite, and relative. They are, of course, adjectives when they qualify, and pronouns when they stand alone—*i.e.*, stand for a noun. Yet we hear of a demonstrative *adjective pronoun*, &c., as if both at once. “Did he tell you that?” *That* is either an adjective *or* a pronoun, not both.

One seldom now hears of *nine* parts of speech, and the articles are referred to their true class of adjective. But this is frequently carried too far. These articles form a distinct class by themselves, and should not be coolly allocated to the demonstratives and numerals. They are absent in some languages and present in others, and add to the completeness of any language that has them. They should be made one of the classes of adjectives.

The Pronoun.

Pronouns are generally stated to be used to prevent the too frequent occurrence of the noun, which is a subsidiary idea. Each of them conveys certain specific additional conceptions which are their distinctive functions.

The *personal* pronoun is stated to be the mere substitute for a noun, which is only the general definition of a *pronoun*, and misses the specific function of the personals—that of expressing the relation of the speaker or writer to the persons or things spoken of.

Then, *personal* is explained as meaning, standing for *persons*. What of the *neuters*, which are oftener spoken of than persons? The true meaning of the word lies in the dramatic meaning of “persona,” denoting the part played in speech.

Again, *demonstratives* point out. What, then, are “they,” “theirs,” “them,” “he,” “she,” “it,” which can do this as distinctly as “this” and “that,” can be used interchangeably with them, and are derived from them etymologically? Our classification of pronouns sadly lacks reform.

Again, the *relative* has as its special definition, that it relates to something going before it, which is simply stating a property of *all* pronouns. One distinctive function is missed—that of joining sentences, suggesting *conjunctive* as a better term. If *relative* is retained, it should be explained not as relating to a *noun*, but as *relating*, that is, *joining*, sentences.

The first person expresses the one speaking; the second, the one spoken to. But *all* pronouns are *spoken of*, however used. What of this definition?

The word *compound* is used with confusing vagueness. *Compound* should be used either of etymological structure or of function, not of both. "Whatever" is compound by structure, yet "what" is also called compound, but in quite a different sense; hence confusion.

Words like "myself," "himself," &c., are classed as *pronouns*. are they so, in use or derivation? They are simply nouns with possessive pronouns prefixed and sometimes attached. But you ask, what of "himself," &c.? "Him" is simply put for "his" by way of euphony. It existed in old English, and still exists in Scotch. Yet we see them variously called emphatic, reflective, and reciprocal *pronouns*, for this good reason, that in Latin and some other languages such ideas *are* expressed by *pronouns*, ignoring the plain fact that English has a different idiom, and expresses these by *nouns*.

The word *indefinite* is most indefinitely used as applied to pronouns. Surely "all," "both," "none," and others, are the most definite of words. These pronouns are indefinite in special and different senses. Some, as "many," "all," are indefinite in number, and should be called indefinite *numerals*; others, in selection of person, as "another," "other," though definite enough in number. Others are definite in both number and individuality, as "both." These ought to be discriminated.

The Verb.

The definition of the verb is often erroneous or defective. Its radical idea of making a statement has come into our grammars only recently. The common one mostly heard yet, that it "expresses being, doing, or suffering," is true of nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and in short is the basis of all idea and of its expression in words. Every conception must express being or doing or suffering.

The definition of *transitive* is peculiar. "An action that passes over to an object," is at least a strange idea, if we think of it, and I fear turns out to be unreal. What is an action that passes over to an object? Can the thing be done? The idea of a transitive verb can be given with greater simplicity from the necessity for a completion of the conception.

There is a confusion between *tense* and *time*. *Tense*, like gender, is a conception belonging to *words*; *time* to *things*. Tense is *based on time*, but is more than time. There are only three *times*, but there may be many *tenses*.

Mood requires reform and re-determination. If the indicative is the mood of direct statement, we demolish potential. "He can lift a ton" is as much *indicative* in every sense as "he is able to lift a ton." Some late grammarians have therefore rightly put this Latin mood aside.

Nothing requires more urgent reform than the infinitive and participles. The *infinitive* is the *noun* of the verb, yet we hear of the participles being used as nouns. The truth is, that we have at least three infinitives—an infinitive *with to*, an infinitive *without to*, and an infinitive with *ing*, which is a corruption of the old Saxon infinitive in *an*; while the *ing* of the participle is a corruption of the participial termination in *and* or *end*. The confusion has been made from the modern form *ing* representing two old terminations and two different moods.

The *to* of the infinitive also requires investigation; it is sometimes the preposition *to* in form and function, sometimes something else: but though it is interesting, into this we cannot enter.

The division of the infinitive and participle into present and past is, of course, erroneous. They have no *time* in the sense of the other moods, but take their time from the words to which they are joined. Their classification should be based on the state of the action, as complete or incomplete.

The *future tense* is generally wrongly given in our grammars, heard in our schools, and spoken in common speech by those that should know better. There are at least three tenses included in the one so-called future; one of simple statement of futurity, and two of determination, the one that of the speaker, the other that of the subject of the verb. Another form of the same tense is used, conveying the idea of the original meaning of "shall"= ought, as "Thou shalt not kill."

These should be distinguished and thoroughly conquered. If they were, we should hear less frequently the daily errors made in even good society.

But we must cease our criticism. Not half the field has been traversed, and in that gone over only a mere indication of the surprising extent of the incorrectness of our grammatical knowledge as shown in our common text-books. Indeed, so much is this the case that Latham declares:—

"I have no hesitation in asserting that out of every hundred statements made by the current writers on English grammar, ninety-nine come under one of the two following predicaments: they either contain that which is incorrect, and better not known at all, or something that was known before, and would have been known independent of any grammatical lesson whatever."

Much has lately been done towards rendering our grammars more correct, and banishing common traditional errors, but much more still remains to be done. English grammarians have been bound hand and foot by traditional definitions and classifications, and most of all by painful adherence to Latin grammar. The English language has never received sufficient justice as an independent tongue, having its own idioms, and

governed by its own laws and by those of the cognate Teutonic languages. On the revival of letters, the only grammar known and taught was, of course, the classical; and its forms and divisions got into our schools and scholars, and by these, and these only, the structure and forms of *our* language were determined and interpreted; to these it was made by every means to conform. No matter that the languages were those of very differing types. The classical grammar was so and so, the greatest and only grammar, and the English must be the same; and to this rock the undying Prometheus of the English tongue has been bound, with his strong thews stretched and twisted until now; and only recently have some of these bonds been untied. Our English tongue must be interpreted by its own principles and idioms and by those of its sister Teutonic tongues, and all foreign antagonistic systems and classifications must be rigorously expelled. English grammar, as taught in our schools, must be based on the genius and history of the English language. The great want in grammatical study is a *historical* English grammar. Many works have of late come into the field, and our noble language will ere long receive the full justice to which its independent and firmly-knit structure entitle it.

II.—How to use Defective Text-Books.

With text-books so defective, it becomes a pressing question, What are teachers to do, and how is grammar to be taught? The only right thing to do is, that each man for himself choose the best grammar he can find, and make it his text-book. But in addition to any text-book, he should possess himself of *several* of the best grammars, and investigate the subject for himself, making choice of the best points in each under any head, and forming an eclectic grammar for himself. But whatever definitions he adopts, let him see to it that they are *correct*, as far as he can judge, and that his classifications are simple, complete, and logical. Let him at once discard everything useless, imperfect, or wrong. During the last few years, grammars more or less correct, and great improvements on the grammars of our own youth, have appeared at reasonable prices.

But there is abundant and often insurmountable difficulty in introducing new books! Do not let this deter any one. Grammar is best taught orally; and where it is best taught, and best understood by the children, I generally find it taught orally. In a school where I knew it better taught than anywhere else, it was done without any text-book.

Then, where a defective text-book is used, do not slavishly follow its dictation, but make it a basis for criticism and the better understanding of the language, and for finding better definitions and classifications. In several ways, a defective grammar is an advantage; and, all things considered, it may be preferred by some. I know a teacher who took a grammar lately issued under a well-known name, but containing very little of late and more accurate conclusions, and made it a subject of textual grammatical criticism with his highest class. Choose a good text-book, or use the defective one you have. But see that a natural order of procedure is followed. Do not begin as the old books begin, with general conceptions of grammar and its relation to other sciences, ushering in the ponderous subject under great Latin words, "Orthography" heading the list, thus placing lions in the way to the House Beautiful. Begin at once with the noun and the verb, and let the other parts of speech follow naturally as related to these.

III.—Grammar a Logical Course.

But throughout the teaching of grammar as grammar, and apart from its application to the writing of English, let it be steadily borne in mind, as already said, that one great purpose that it serves in school-work is that of mental exercise, of training the mind, in some degree, to logical, scientific, and abstract thinking and discrimination. It should, therefore, be instinct at every step with intelligence. The reason of every statement should be brought out, and expressed with logical accuracy. All rote-work must be banished. The scholar must be able at every point to state why such a thing is what he states, and then why that again is so, and so backwards till he come to the fundamental postulates and axioms of the subject. It should be as rigorously, but pleasantly, taught as mathematics. Yet how little is this done! No one that has not seen many schools and their work would believe that grammar is so little taught with intelligence as it is. Instead of this, it is a mere matter of the heavy memory of difficult and unknown technicalities. So-called "parsing," even in upper classes, is little more than the glib repetition of a certain unvarying form of words, and is often best done where least understood, because the form of speech has been more frequently repeated than where it is better taught. A little questioning as to the structure of the sentence and the relations of the words they have so trippingly described, and the reasons for the descriptions given, exposes the hollowness of the whole performance. It is an exercise, eliciting, as Professor Bain truly says, the very minimum of thought. Yet teachers remonstrate that their children are not accustomed to be questioned as to the reason why! If they are not, it is high time they should be, in a subject which is intended to exercise the reasoning powers and train to correct thinking.

The great source of error lies in not realising and acting on this idea, that grammar supplies the logical

course it can be made. Let the knowledge communicated and the words used be fully understood, and, therefore, such as can be comprehended at the stage at which the child is; let the subject be intelligently taught with a definite aim at mental training; let every step be firmly taken before another is attempted,—and we may assure ourselves of thorough and pleasing success, and of making it a study in which children take intelligent and positive delight. I speak from my own experience both as scholar and teacher, and can vividly recall the painful dislike the subject inspired under one teacher, and the glow of delight and mental impetus it inspired under another who taught it as it should be taught.

Analysis of Sentences.

The analysis of sentences should be taught with the same practical aim, of not only seeing that the child understands the subject, but of giving him the power of putting it into practice, in sentences made by himself. Every new name, every new sentence or clause, should not only be taught and known, but should be exemplified by sentences drawn from the pupil; so that he not only knows a compound or complex sentence, but can make it—not only can point a clause of concession or reason or degree, but can construct one, a noun, adjective, infinitive, or participial phrase, but there it is from himself at command.

Thus we combine with Analysis of sentences, which is only one half of a subject, its converse and complement, Synthesis of sentences, with which it should always be accompanied. We should not only be able to take to pieces and parcel out sentences made by others, but should have a facility in constructing, from materials given, sentences of like structure. Attention has been too exclusively given to the analysis of sentences, and too little to its more important correlative, the synthesis; but our later books on composition give exercises on the latter, though not so fully as they should. Every lesson in analysis should therefore be accompanied by the synthesis of similar sentences. This synthesis is the more important, because it is the putting to practical effect in the use of our language the merely theoretical principles of the subject; and it is the carrying out of the principle that should pervade all our teaching of this and other subjects, not only the giving of knowledge, but, what is more important, the communicating, or rather the educating, of practical power.

Composition.

One of the chief ends of our whole school course is to give a boy the power, on leaving school, of using correctly, and if possible with ease and power, our English tongue. This being so, a stranger unacquainted with our school system would expect that a careful, systematic, and graduated course of instruction with exercises in the practical use of the language, in other words, in Composition, would be given; and that if one thing would receive more constant and careful attention than another, it would be this. Yet strangest of all possible things in any educational course, little or nothing of this is done in our schools generally. Where it is attempted, the course is, in most cases, very partial and unsystematic, and the mass of our children leave school with little practical power of using the language by which they are to do the business of life with correctness or power, and fewer still, with any degree of harmony or taste. This is scarcely credible, and, the more one thinks of it, the stranger does it appear.

Yet in the northern district, I could not name six schools where composition is fully and systematically taught. In the few that teach it, weekly exercises are given out, which are corrected by the teacher, and in which errors are pointed out as they casually occur. In the mass of schools, not even this is done, and the child leaves school with little or no attempt having been made by the teacher towards this most practical of ends. I have taken special note on this point, as I attach to it special importance, and I therefore speak with the greater certainty, but with the greater sorrow. After I came to the northern district, I wrote few reports, in which this subject was not specifically recommended. This ought not to be, and we should set ourselves to rectify our procedure in this important and practical matter.

I.—All Grammar Should be Practically Used in Composition.

Every step we take in our grammatical course should be put to practical use in sentences made by the children. Every part of speech, every new idea or rule regarding it, should at once be fully exercised on in composition. The child should not merely know and understand a word when seen, but he should be able to use it correctly in speech and in writing. Of course, exercises are given on all these points by every careful teacher, but the exercises should not only be such as will insure that the different facts in grammar are apprehended and known by the child, but other exercises should be given directly framed with a view towards Composition, towards giving the child the power of using them in actual speech in full and correct sentences.

For example, the children should not only be able to tell the different ways of forming the plural or possessive, but should be able to put the words thus given into sentences. They should not only know the

irregular adjectives, but should use them in living language. All the pronouns should not only be pointed out and named, but used in sentence-making with ease and correctness. Indefinites, interrogatives, ordinals, distributives should be real words so well known to him that he can at once put his knowledge to practical effect in composition. A transitive verb should not only be pointed out but made; the "future perfect" not only named but used in practical speech; the auxiliaries, the impersonals should be real coins for the transaction of lingual business in school life. And so of every single point in our otherwise dead grammar. We should not only exercise on words till they are known, named, and pointed out by the children, but should, in addition to this, put it definitely and continually before us, as the more important thing to do, to embody these dry details, these dead forms, in actual speech made by the children themselves under the guidance of the teacher. And just reflect what a mighty gain such a practical conversion of grammar into composition, of lifeless terminology into living thought and speech, would give a child after he has traversed the grammatical field. He not only can speak of, point out, and know when seen, an adverb of degree, or an interjection of surprise, or a co-ordinative conjunction, or a compound relative, but he is able, readily and correctly, to use these on the spot in sentences made by himself.

II.—The Idioms of our Language Should be Conquered by Systematic Practice.

But our English tongue has, like every language, its own idioms, which we should not only know, but be able to use with case and skill. These idioms are as expressive, as delicate, as quaint, as comprehensive, as succinct, and as beautiful, as those of any language. In order to be used with ease and effect, they require as careful and repeated practice as those of Latin or Greek. Yet this is a subject which has received comparatively little attention. Look at the innumerable text-books with the most careful and systematic course of graduated exercises in Latin and Greek Construction, at which boys spend the greater part of their whole school course to acquire the power of using correctly. It inspires pleasure and pride to see the immense care bestowed on the systematic study of these languages, and the elaboration of a skilfully graduated course of instruction in their beautiful idioms by examples made by the pupils. But it more than surprises one to find how little has been done, in this respect, for our own language, equally full of vigorous idiomatic expressions. Where can we point to a book in which the most distant approach has been made towards giving as elaborate and graduated a course of sentence making and construction in English as in these dead but grand old languages? We cannot; it yet remains to be done. The field is as extensive, the material for practice as peculiar and difficult of attainment as the classical, and the subject can be conquered only by a like careful series of exercises in English syntactical and idiomatic structure.

Let us enumerate some of these peculiar idiomatic constructions, to realise more vividly the necessity for thus conquering them, by a systematic course of constructive examples.

1. The peculiar use of "shall" and "will," by which we can give succinct expression to delicate shades of meaning peculiar to English, already spoken of; their distinctive use in indirect sentences; and their different construction in interrogation.

2. The varied meanings expressible by our *possessive*, in the use of the 's, or ', or simple "s" to form it; the different ideas given by its use or non-use, as in "he is a friend of my son," and "of my son's;" its special use in names of places, as St Paul's; its use in enumerations, as A., B., & C.'s works, and A.'s, B.'s, and C.'s works.

3. The peculiar use of "the" in English; as in "the lion," to indicate a species, and its non-use as in "gold," to express a like idea; its pretty use with different meanings, as "the professor and the president," and "the professor and president;" its use with adjectives, as "the wise;" its use with comparatives, as in "the better of the two," and the peculiar idiom in "all the greater," &c.

4. The various true indefinites, like the French "on," usable in English, each with its special force and special occasion; such as "one," "we," "you," "a man," "men," "any one."

5. The very varied forms of the tenses in English, each with its own special shade of meaning and association, and special occasion for use.

Under every *time*—present, past, or future—we have a remarkable variety of ideas and expressions, greater than in most languages: the indefinite or general form, the simple progressive, the perfect, the perfect progressive, the emphatic, the expletive, the interrogative in various forms, the negative in various ways. In addition to these, we have special uses of various tenses—the tense for the expression of general truths, the use of the present for the future, the use of the present for the past, or historical present, the use of the progressive for a continuous action, the use of the present-perfect for a thing completed in past time, the use of the present-perfect for a historical tense, the use of the past for a habitual state, and so on.

6. The different moods of the verb, each with its own peculiar phase of thought—the indicative, the potential form of the indicative, the conditional, the hypothetical in its two forms, the different forms of

expressing command, the infinitive in its different forms of *to*, *ing*, and gerundive, and the attributive or participial.

7. The use of "would" and "should," for intention, obligation, condition; and their use as the past of "will" and "shall," in reported speech and hypothetical sentences, which is a frequent source of error even with educated people.

8. The differing uses of *a* or *an* as the indefinite article; its use after "such," "many," "too," &c.; before *few*, *little*, &c.: the different meanings with and without *a*; the peculiar idiom in "a good and a true man," and "a good and true man," "a better general than a ruler," and "a better general than ruler,"—and many more.

9. The different and peculiar uses of *as*.

10. The difficult and peculiar uses of "*only*."

11. The proper occasions and different uses of *that*.

12. The *former* and *latter*; the *one*, the *other*; *this* and *that*.

13. Words plural in form and singular in meaning.

14. *Ten sail*, *three score*, *sixpence* and *sixpennies*.

15. Correlative words, as *either*, *or*; verbs followed by certain prepositions; pronouns, like *such* followed by *as*, &c.

16. The use of relatives to introduce *co-ordinate* as well as subordinate sentences.

17. The use of the adjective and the adverb after substantive verbs, which should be carefully distinguished.

18. The use of the substitutional words "*it*," "*there*."

The foregoing gives but a slight indication of the immense wealth of peculiar idiomatic phraseology possessed by the English language. To be known they *must be used*, and to be known and used with case and security, they must receive as careful and graduated practice as those of Latin and Greek.

III.—The General Principles of Composition Should be Systematically Taught.

But over and above this practice in composition of the grammatical forms and idioms of our language, Composition thoroughly taught aims at and achieves more.

It investigates, teaches, and exercises on the whole subject of the structure of sentences. It reduces to practice the principles embodied under the name of analysis and synthesis of sentences. It exercises in paraphrasing. It instructs in the writing paragraphs and themes and essays. A boy should leave school with a thorough knowledge of what is necessary to correct and classical English writing and good style. He should know the principles that determine the choice of *words* to express an idea with correctness and power; those that regulate the structure of *sentences and paragraphs*; and those that guide in discovering, selecting, and arranging his *subject-matter*. For example, he ought fully to know regarding *words* that they should be—

- Correct in *spelling*.
- Correct in *meaning and application*, with careful discrimination of pseudo-synonymous words.
- *Simple*, to the avoidance of unusual, provincial, professional, or obsolete words.
- *Specific*, without ambiguity, with as great a use as possible of the Saxon element of the language.
- *Classical*, as avoiding vulgarisms and foreign words.
- *Adapted* to style and aim, whether plain, conversational, ornamental, pathetic, or sublime.

Regarding *sentences*, he ought to know, for example, that they should be—

- *Grammatically correct*.
- *Clear* without ambiguity in expression or collocation.
- *One in thought and structure*; one clear thought with its necessary adjuncts.
- *Concise and precise*, without circumlocution and redundancy.
- *Energetic*, with the use of figure and illustration.
- *Idiomatic*, peculiarly English in words and structure.
- *Varied in length, structure, and kind*.
- *Harmonious*, a harmony adapted to the thought.

And so on, more or less fully, according to age, capacity, and time. So, also, of the *subject-matter*, not the least important.

Such principles should be gradually, but simply, taught more or less from the very beginning. In our upper classes, they should be taught systematically, and every point fully exercised on, the aim of course being that a child shall not only know them, but as far as possible be able with ease and pleasure, and some degree of power, to put them to practice. In our upper classes, the pupils should be able to tell what things are to be attended to in the choice of words and the structure of sentences, and have these so clearly before them as to be able to enumerate them at any time, and construct examples in accordance.

The most of this work to be done by an upper class is most inviting, interesting, and instructive, and may be made a splendid instrument for the critical discrimination of the meanings, character, vigour, and uses of words; the varied and most appropriate means of expressing ideas; the cultivation of taste, judgment, harmony, and intelligence; and for the critical examination of the styles of our best authors,—thus imparting the capacity of deriving a new and exquisite pleasure from the use of language, equivalent to the possession of a new faculty. Its educating power is of the highest.

Part Second.

The Combined Teaching of Grammar, Analysis, and Composition From the First.

WE shall now speak of the important practical matter we wished specially to bring before you now as to the method of teaching these subjects, Grammar, Analysis, and Composition.

First, then, we hold that they should be taught Simultaneously from the very first.

They are but different parts of the same subject, the knowledge and practical use of the English language. Grammar inquires into the nature and relations of words; Analysis and Synthesis into the manner of combining these into phrases and sentences; and Composition seeks to put both to practical use in expressing thought on any subject. They should therefore be taught so as mutually to assist and illustrate each other; and this can only be done efficiently by teaching them together.

Second, we hold that *Composition is the most important subject*, inasmuch as the chief end of our teaching in English is to impart the power of writing the English language with correctness, and if possible with effect and taste; and, therefore, that *this practical use of the language in the making of sentences should be that with which we should begin, continue, and conclude*—the other subjects being helps and means towards this most desirable end.

These are the two positions in the teaching of these subjects to which we desire your special attention viz.,—that Grammar, Analysis, and Composition should be taught from the first *simultaneously*; and that Composition, being the most important, should receive most attention, and should regulate the teaching of the others, and be the instrument by which they are taught. In short, we advocate a combined course of Composition, Grammar, and Analysis, with Composition as the basis, medium, and end.

It follows, therefore, in our view, that if any one of these subjects requires from any cause to be omitted, any one of them may be omitted *except Composition*. Moreover, we hold that Composition should always, even in the humblest schools, be one of the branches taught, and should receive as regular and careful instruction as even the three R's.

These positions we consider of very great importance, and to them we ask your special attention, as we attempt to show how they are to be worked out.

Let it be distinctly understood throughout, that technicalities are only to be introduced gradually, according to the capacity of the child, and as they become necessary or useful for further progress. Technical terms are but means to an end. The important matter is the getting a thorough grasp of the *principles, the ideas*, of which technical words are merely the expression, which the skill and perception of the teacher will determine the fittest time to employ. Care must be taken that they are used as a *help* to the ideas. When they become a burden, they are given too early, and are worse than useless. Before the technical word is used, let the principle it expresses be fully understood, practised, and conquered, and then these forbidding terms become valuable, as gathering up gains already made, and as expressing much in little, as coins representing many smaller sums, handy tools for the performance, with certainty and celerity, of future work.

I.—Method of Beginning the Conjoint Teaching of these Subjects.

FIRST STAGE: *The Elementary Composition of the Simple Sentence.*

Let us take a class that are about to begin the subject, and therefore know nothing of it. To be able to do this, the children only require to be able to write to dictation simple sentences on the slate. They are at all times, when being taught, to have their slates in hand, ready for use when required.

I. The Radical Idea of a Simple Sentence—Its Duality—The Noun, and Verb, and Pronoun.

1. The first thing to do is to give them the radical idea of what constitutes a simple sentence—its necessary *duality*—its two parts of subject and predicate, of noun and verb. This can be easily done; materials are abundant all about. Take the pencil in your hand; say something about it; make them say something. Point out the two necessary parts—the thing to speak of, and what is said about it. Take other subjects—the window, the desk, Johnny, Mary, &c. &c.

This root conception of the necessary duality of a sentence should be illustrated by numberless examples till it is apprehended fully. This should of course be done *orally*.

Next use the Board. Let one of the sentences be written down, and let its two parts be clearly separated to the eye. Let this be written *on the slates* with like separation. Let several be written on the board in the same way and transferred to the slates. Let others be written on the slate *at once*, and the two parts clearly marked. Let this radical duality be otherwise exercised on by the teacher, in ways he knows best for his own pupils, as by sending them to their seats to write short sentences, clearly separated, on subjects written on the board; by exercising them on the reading lesson of the day in separating the simpler sentences there; and so on. Let the same duality be exhibited in sentences of different length. Let both slate and mouth be constantly used. It may extend over many lessons, and should not be left till they have a thorough grasp of this radical idea.

2. *Application of this Duality to Grammar.*—We thus gain the true idea of the *noun* and the *verb*—the *noun*, the name of everything we can speak of; the *verb*, the word that can tell or assert something. These words should be given and used, and their definitions and uses learnt. Subject and predicate may be used if the children are old enough.

3. Introduce next the need for the *pronoun* by making two or more sentences about the same thing. Give its definition and use, and frame sentences with this new element.

II. Adjuncts to these two Radical Elements—the Adjective and Adverb.

The next stage is the adding of adjuncts to these two chief parts of the sentence—the extending the idea of each by the addition of explanatory words.

1. *Extension to Noun*—as green, square, large, &c.

Give name and simple definition of *adjective*.

Make sentences orally, and on board and slate, with this new element.

2. *Extension to Verb*.—Show how similar explanations can be added to the second part or verb.

Give name and simple definition of *adverb*.

Make sentences with new element in same way.

III. Writing of Short Compositions with Preceding Elements.

The next step is to exercise them in writing short compositions or themes on one subject, with all the preceding elements. This is an important step, and requires care.

1. *Use the Black Board.*—Take, say a book, and put it on the desk. Draw from them by questioning and otherwise several facts regarding it, taking special care that the sentences are *theirs*, got from them and formed under your guidance. Use any or all of the elements already known.

As each sentence is formed to your satisfaction, let it be written on the board correctly, with capitals and period in place. The series may be of any variety, and will be greatly determined by the answers and sentences made by the children, it being your wisdom to use and adapt *their* material. In this way such a series as this may be formed:—

"The reading-book lies on the master's desk. It is used every day by the second class. It is very interesting. The boy takes great care of it. Other boys are sometimes careless of theirs."

We have here five sentences on the board regarding this book—in other words, we have drawn from the children a piece of composition regarding the book. *They* have formed them, and the work is therefore quite within their capacity.

2. Let this be copied by them *on their slates*. Let similar exercises be frequently done on the board and transferred to the slate, then blotted from the board, and read by the children from their copy.

3. *On Slate from Memory of Board.*—Let such an exercise be done on the board, read over several times, and the succession of ideas and anything else worthy of remark, pointed out. Let it be transferred to the slates, and then blotted out from the slates, and then let the board be turned round. Let the children now take their seats, and reproduce it from memory, at first, in the same or equivalent phraseology. It will be well that the sentences thus asked be simple and few, and that the ideas of each be mentioned on the board. Let the class be

recalled, and the slates be compared with the original on the board, the errors pointed out and corrected, and equivalent correct expressions praised. They have now produced a composition *so far* from themselves. Of course this exercise will vary in difficulty according to the age of the children. Do not overdo it; let the work be slow and sure.

4. *On Slate without Board.*—Next, let a like series of sentences be made on any subject, and let them be written down at once on the slate without the board. Let them be read over, corrected, and improved. Let them be rubbed out, one copy being kept, and let them be reproduced in the seats, then examined and corrected, then rewritten till they are done with ease and without error. Let the same be done with a great number of common simple subjects, till the children gain power and security in first framing sentences and then reproducing them.

5. *Reproduced at Home.*—Next, let the exercise thus made and reproduced in school, be done at home on slate, and by-and-by on paper, and brought next day and corrected. Let this corrected exercise be written out fully, and in a fair and correct copy.

Let this be continued till they bring a really good exercise from home, and can produce one in school when asked. They will acquire ability and ease more quickly than one who has not tried it would imagine.

6. *Done without direction—unaided.*—All the previous exercises have been done so far by the help of the teacher, he furnishing materials for the ideas to be expressed in the seat and home exercises.

Now, however, let them make sentences in school, unaided, on a subject named by you. The subject will, at first, be simple and the sentences few, but gradually increasing in number and difficulty as they gain power. Let these self-produced compositions be examined and corrected as before, and then rewritten till quite accurately produced. Let this be done in school and then at home, and continued till they have real and felt ease and ability in producing a little composition on any simple matter, with some degree of credit.

Remarks on this First Stage.

This would end what I would call the *first stage* in this combined course.

Its aim is to give the children the power of making a series of simple sentences, or short theme, on a given subject, with certain simple elements.

It begins with a thorough and careful laying of the foundation of all writing, the duality of all sentences; proceeds by numerous steps, and gradually-lessening assistance from the teacher, from single simple sentences on separate subjects to a series on the same subject; from oral, through board, slate, and, if of age, paper exercises, in sentences produced by the aid of the teacher, till they come at length to produce a short series for themselves without assistance, in other words, a short composition. The road is more or less lengthy, according to the capacity of the children, but it must be carefully and thoroughly traversed to be thoroughly efficient. We must attain the end we aim at, the self-production of a little exercise on a simple subject, descriptive or narrative.

The chief aim has therefore been to produce a certain power of *Elementary Composition*, because this power is the means for prosecuting the whole of the subsequent more advanced course. Other things have been so far only incidental, and have only been taught where necessary and auxiliary to this end. But we have incidentally taught the other subjects of our course. In *Grammar*, we have explained, defined, and exercised on the noun, the verb, the pronoun, the adjective, and adverb. These words and parts of speech we have introduced in the order we saw best, but, after being known, we have used them freely. A certain amount of *Analysis* has also been given—viz., that there are two chief divisions of the sentence, and that each of these may be extended and qualified, the one by the adjective and the other by the adverb, and that the first element or subject, as well as other nouns, may have a substitute in the pronoun.

In contrast to the usual mode of procedure we make *Composition* the main aim in this first course, for these reasons :—

- The writing of good English should be the great end and aim of all our teaching in the structure of the English language.
- This elementary composition is quite within the power of even very young children, and may be graduated in difficulty, according to age and capacity.
- It utilises a power they hourly use, that of making sentences in common speech, corrects and extends it, and therefore builds on the known and common.
- The material for the work is abundant and simple.
- It is the most thorough means of giving the elementary ideas of grammar and analysis, because the things are known and used before they are designated.
- It is the best basis for the efficient teaching of the after more formal course of grammar and analysis, in which, as already shown, the practical use of the grammatical forms must form a main idea; and it gives a practical ability in composition, which will be at command when the higher principles of composition come to be formally taught.

- It can be done with very great pleasure to the children—a most important matter, especially in beginning a subject more or less difficult.
- It is attended with a growing feeling of power over the subject, than which nothing is more valuable in any part of school-work.
- Not least, it imparts to young children the ability of writing a composition on a subject, and of giving an account of anything, which may be all the composition the most of the children in our common schools will likely ever get. This is a most important consideration, and one that should insure the teaching of composition from the very first, by some such elementary course.
- It will correct and improve the general style of their answering and speech at all times, and give them greater and readier insight into the meaning of all they read.
- It will give pleasure to parents, by no means a mean element to be taken into account, who will appreciate such real practical ability in writing, of which they themselves feel the want, and see the importance in common life.

II.—The Rest of this Combined Course.

It would be impossible to give a complete plan of the Combined English Course we advocate, in an address. This it was not our intention to do. We wished merely to indicate the general method to be pursued, and the spirit in which it should be worked out, and to show at some length, as we have done, the mode of conducting the first and most important stage.

For the rest of the course, each teacher must construct a plan of procedure for himself, arranging the various parts of grammar, analysis, and composition as he thinks best for himself and his pupils. The materials for such a course are abundant, and to be found in our common text-books on the subjects. I cannot name any one book in which what I recommend is done. But the course is not difficult to construct. Let a teacher place before him several of our best text-books of grammar, analysis, and composition. From the abundant materials and exercises there presented, let him arrange for himself a graduated series of lessons on these conjoint subjects. In doing this, let him attend to the following points :—

1. The great principle that should pervade the course is that it is one based on, and having as its aim, the practical use of the language—in other words, that it is through a Course of *Composition*; and, therefore, that everything in Grammar and Analysis is to be reduced to practice in Composition. It should, as far as possible, be made a rigorous postulate—nothing *taught* without being *done*.

2. Let, therefore, the order in which Grammar is taught be that best adapted to progress in practical Composition. Do not follow Grammar text-books implicitly, but only where the order coincides with this practical aim. For example, the conjunction should not be begun till the children are ready to begin the forming of compound sentences, and then only the coordinative conjunctions, which are used to form these. So again, the relative, and the subordinate conjunctions (which are almost all derived from the relative, and should therefore be treated of along with it) should be taken only when the children are able to make complex sentences, in which these elements are used.

3. Gradually teach Analysis, as it contributes to the better understanding of Grammar, and to improved power in Composition.

4. Make a list, as easily got from our text-books, of the different principles in Composition proper that you purpose to teach the children; arrange these according to the order of difficulty, beginning with the simplest; and combine these with the grammatical and analytic course, so that each shall most assist the others.

5. Every teacher will determine for himself, according to the age and capacity of his children, and the time they remain at school, what principles in these three subjects he ought to take up, whether few or many, general or particular, in order to gain the aim he sets before him in this study—that of giving them the power, on leaving school, of writing at least a creditable composition, narrative and descriptive; and he will make the points he takes up more or less minute accordingly.

6. Though thus taught conjointly, it should always be kept in mind, that we are teaching three distinct but related subjects, each having its own rules and exercises. Exercises should therefore be given in each separately, in Grammar as Grammar, in Analysis as Analysis, and in Composition. Though combined, and having a distinct series of exercises as thus combined, in which all together are put to practice, they should also be examined and exercised on in the regular way as given in our text-books.

Such a plan of combined teaching of these important subjects he will, I am sure, find to be easier than he may at first sight imagine, with this advantage—that it is his own, and to be worked out by himself, for a definite and most commendable end. I can promise him, that he will be amply repaid for his trouble by the growing power his children acquire in the use of English in writing and speaking, and the firmer and more intelligent understanding of the grammatical structure of the language which such a course will secure.

III.—General Remarks on the Combined Course.

1. *Can the General Principles of Composition be taught from the beginning?*

But can the advanced, and more or less abstruse, principles of Composition, which are generally taught only to our highest classes, be taught at the early age we advocate? *They can.* Custom and traditionary method have pronounced differently, but these must stand aside when better things are to be done. Under the first stage, just review the number of such principles we introduced and exercised on—the duality of sentences; the making the idea of the sentence clearer by qualifying either or both of these parts; the fact that each sentence begins with a capital and ends with a period; the necessity for varying sentences in their length, in their beginning, and in their construction to make a good exercise; and, in some degree, the discrimination of synonyms, and the necessity of using specific words to express an idea strongly.

The principles of Composition are, as a whole, quite within the capacity of common children, and only seem beyond them from the sesquipedalian names in which they are clothed.

For instance, in Composition we must avoid Ambiguity of expression. What is this but that we must not use a word with a double meaning, which any child can understand? We must avoid Circumlocution. What is this but saying what we have got to say, in as few words as possible? We must avoid Redundancy. What is this but taking care not to say the same thing twice over in different words? And so of every one of the technicalities of our books on Composition. The ideas can be easily given from the first and at an early stage; the names can follow when convenient.

It is only the bare truth to say, that the principles of Composition are simpler and more easily understood by children than those of Grammar, and can be taught and exercised on much earlier, with ease and pleasure to the child, and gratifying results to the teacher.

2. *Age for Beginning.*

At what age should we begin such a course? This may be guessed from what we have already said. It can be begun from the time that children are able to write down sentences on their slates; certainly when they are in the III. Standard, and even orally and on the board to the II. Standard—that is, from eight to ten. At this age, they are quite capable of doing the work required, and understanding the things spoken of, provided, of course, it is done skilfully and with sparing use of technicalities.

In recommending this to teachers, this question of age has been one of the first inquiries, and the answer has generally called forth astonishment and incredulity—that Grammar, not to speak of Composition, which have been relegated to the higher part of the school, should be begun at that age! I have frequently, with their permission, taken on the spot a combined II. and III. Standard, and drawn from the children, who did such work for the first time, a series of sentences on the pencil in my hand or other simple subject, which they wrote on their slates, and read out as a little composition ten minutes after. Many teachers have determined to try it; should they do so earnestly and systematically, I have no fear of the result.

3. *Composition should be Taught in Elementary Schools even when Grammar cannot be Taught.*

If I were asked regarding a very elementary school, with great irregularity and short attendance, in which only the most necessary subjects can be taught—if I were asked whether Grammar or Composition should be left out, I would unhesitatingly answer, Grammar as Grammar. In addition to the three "R's," what more important power can be given to children than the power of using the language with some degree of correctness and ease, in writing to their friends, or otherwise using the pen?

Away in the north-west part of the northern district, I find teachers, with laudable but painful industry, pegging away at Grammar, and hear the children deliver themselves of all its most forbidding technicalities with only the very slightest apprehension of their meaning, even when they can with difficulty express themselves in the simplest forms of English, and understand only a modicum of their simple reading-books. It is painful to see such a waste of time and energy; and therefore to such teachers I strongly recommend the giving up of *Grammar* as a subject, and the teaching of Elementary Composition or Sentence-making in the way already described; taking up the simpler points in Grammar as they are necessary in the Elementary Composition course, but laying it wholly aside as a separate branch of school instruction.

The plan recommends itself to teachers, especially after seeing on the spot, with their rude material, the thing easily and pleasurably done. Its advantages would be very great in all schools, but especially in schools with another tongue in constant use outside the school-door. It supplies the one thing most wanted there—a

knowledge of words, a knowledge of the simple structure of an English sentence, and the power, by-and-by, of combining these, and writing a simple composition on a common subject. I am sure were this to be done from the III. Standard onwards, and exercised on for only fifteen minutes or half an hour daily, the result in intelligence and in knowledge of the language would be remarkable.

This would be my advice to all our elementary schools in which the teaching of grammar is reckoned the right thing to do, and in which the children can stay only a short time at school. Teach the children to know the great principles of love to God and love to man; to read, write, and cipher; and to use our English tongue so as to be able, at least, to write a letter decently. All this can be done in the most elementary school. The last has not been done in most of such schools, and where done, not done systematically. It should be done, and it can be done, with ease and pleasure. Do not, in our elementary schools, put off time teaching them about indefinites and subjunctives and distributives, and such impractical matters. Take them through such a simple course of Elementary Composition as shall give them the power of writing a little theme or letter well, and only teach Grammar as far as it helps towards this desirable and most practical end; and you give the children a power for life which they will feel the pleasure and advantage of, and for which they will ever give you thanks.

We have now traversed the field we had before us. The subject recommends itself to every teacher and to every one interested in education. It is eminently practical and eminently pressing, and good can be done only by the adoption of some such combined course from early years in our daily school-work. Most earnestly do I urge you to do this. If the thing is to be done, it must be done by the profession—each man for himself. The best books on the subject may be made, but unless you teachers unite to work it out systematically in school, little good will result.

It is most gratifying to note the change that is gradually taking place in our text-books on English, and their gradual recognition of practical power over the language as the aim and end of all our grammatical course. We have now not a few really good books constructed more or less on the plan we advocate. The last ten years have seen marked improvement in this direction. But these better class-books are not in general use, and the idea that an English course has its only true purpose in practical power in Composition has not yet taken possession of the profession. It will be something for this Association to seize the idea and put it to real practical effect in school-work.

But we live at the beginning of even greater changes still in the teaching of English.

The eyes of English scholars and educationists are beginning to be opened to the great wealth of English idioms, and the necessity for their practice from the first in the manner of the classical languages. They are becoming awake to the fact that, rightly used and exercised on, the English Language can afford as varied and thorough mental training as these ancient languages, that English has not received its due in this matter, that it is time that it should, and that it is only simple justice and practical wisdom to employ this great instrument of daily speech, thought and writing, for such training, and for increased skill in its use. Just reflect on the practical power with which a boy would leave school, from a thorough course in English similar to what has been applied to the classics, begun in early years, and carried on so many hours daily, with as numerous and efficient a system of exercises in the use of our glorious English tongue. The result would be astonishing, and the gain for life in business, literature, and thought, incalculable. The battle has begun of mere Classicism *versus* English, and the issue is certain. Henceforth, our greatest instrument in mental training, culture, and practical use of language is English. It lies mainly with Teachers to prove its power in this field, and to lead to this "consummation so devoutly to be wished."

Final Report

By the Sub-Committee Appointed to Circulate Information With Reference to Deepening the Upper Harbour, Dunedin.

March, 1874.

Printed at the "Daily Times" Office Dunedin Rattray Street

Final Report of Sub-Committee for Improving Dunedin Harbour.

THE COMMITTEE appointed by the Public Meeting held on 4th September 1873 having now completed their investigations, beg to lay before the public the results. In doing so they would remind the public that they printed and circulated a preliminary Report, along with the late Mr. Balfour's Reports and Plan, and stated their conviction that the proposal to bring every steamer and ship that enters Otago Heads up to Dunedin to load and discharge was not only desirable and practicable, but can be accomplished at a cost remarkably small as

compared with the immense advantages to be derived from it, and the profits, direct and indirect, which will accrue to the whole Province by its accomplishment. Further investigations and careful study have only tended to confirm this conviction; to such a degree, in fact, that they unhesitatingly give it as their opinion that no more urgent and advantageous public work could be undertaken at the present moment by the Government, nor one in the benefits of which all parts of the Province, north and south, and all classes of industries would more generally or beneficially participate.

Immediately after the publication of the above Reports, steps were taken to obtain from the Civil Engineers resident here Reports upon the matter. The Reports of Messrs. J. T. Thomson, Blair, M'Gregor, and Barr are hereto appended, and the Committee have to record their gratitude to these gentlemen for the liberal manner in which they have placed their professional knowledge at the service of the Committee, without fee or reward of any sort beyond the best thanks of their fellow-citizens, which the Committee feel sure will be unanimously awarded them.

Digest of Engineers' Reports.

It would be as uncourteous to these gentlemen as it would be altogether beside the duties of this Committee to enter upon anything like a criticism of these reports, or to pronounce judgment upon them in any way; but it may not altogether be out of place, and may help the public the better to arrive at something like sound and fixed conclusions on this important subject, if the various points in which these Reports agree, and in which they differ, are clearly and concisely stated.

First.—There is but one opinion amongst professional men as to the desirability and feasibility of improving the Upper Harbour, so as to enable all vessels entering the Heads to come up to Dunedin.

Mr. M'GREGOR says :—"I believe dredging plant was never applied to an easier piece of work than deepening the Harbour of Dunedin, and I am of opinion that the largest vessels that enter Otago Heads can be brought up and berthed alongside the Dunedin wharves within two years from the date of commencing dredging operations; and if the scheme I have suggested were carried out, Dunedin would possess one of the finest commercial harbours in New Zealand."

Mr. BARR says :—"The three most important portions of these Public Works, viz., Harbour Improvement, Reclamation, and Sewage should be carried out as a whole. With reference specially to the latter, this subject must be decided one way or another within a few years, unless the health of the inhabitants is to suffer to a probably alarming extent."

Mr. BLAIR enters at length into an explanation of the forces now in operation which are slowly but surely deteriorating our Harbour, and which are to be counteracted in a great measure by improving the Upper Harbour. He states generally :—"There can be no doubt that the principle of Mr. Balfour's scheme is a correct one." And again, "I think, however, that I am safe in saying that the largest ship frequenting the port can be brought up to Dunedin at a nominal expenditure."

Mr. THOMSON writes on the matter as taken for granted, and says :—"The limit of depth at Dunedin will be governed by the depth of water on the bar, and this will allow vessels drawing 21 feet at neaps, and 22 feet at springs, to safely come up to Dunedin."

Second.—There is absolute unanimity amongst the Engineers as to dredging, on a more or less extensive scale, constituting the main feature in any scheme of Harbour Improvement. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the best means of keeping the deep water channel open after it has been dug out, or as to the best description of machinery to be employed for the purpose of dredging, or the most economical mode of disposing of the stuff excavated, there is only one opinion—that by dredging operations first of all must the much-desired deep water channel be formed.

Mr. BLAIR states that "Dredging is indispensable and common to all the schemes for Harbour Improvement." Again, "Whatever plan of Harbour Improvement is adopted, I would recommend that the dredging be first commenced. It is the key to the whole scheme, and the work can be arranged so that the smallest instalment will be beneficial."

A perusal of the Reports of the other Engineers will show that in this their views coincide. Mr. BLAIR estimates the cost of dredging a channel the same width as the Suez Canal, 72 feet, which he thinks might accommodate our traffic for some years, by 21 feet deep, at £63,250, taking the cost at double the Clyde rate, exclusive of plant, which Mr. BALFOUR reckons at £40,000. And "the dredged stuff would reclaim land sufficient to pay for the cost of cutting the channel." "One dredge could accomplish the work in 350 working days."

Mr. THOMSON estimates the cost of dredging a channel from 100 to 130 yards wide, and 21 feet deep, with a dock for vessels to lay in 23 feet deep, at about £65,784, including plant, but excluding wharves.

Mr. BARR estimates the cost of dredging a channel 150 feet wide by 21 feet deep, and a channel along a circular wall in front of Dunedin, at £65,610 exclusive of plant, which he reckons at £22,500, and the time he

puts down at five years.

Mr. M'GREGOR, who seems to have had the most recent information as to dredgers, and who describes a new "Combined Screw Hopper Dredge" which is being largely employed by the Canadian Government after full trial, and which is capable of making the voyage to New Zealand under steam and canvas, reckons the cost of dredging a channel 250 feet wide, by 21 feet deep, with a large deep water area in front of Dunedin, at £50,000, and the cost of two dredgers at £25,000, one of which could however afterwards be sold, making the cost in all about £62,500, and the time as stated already, two years.

It will be at once seen that there is a remarkable agreement as to cost in these various estimates, and the Committee have no hesitation in saying that, making allowance for differences of methods, sizes of channels, &c., there can be no doubt that most reliable data as to the probable limit of cost of this portion of the work have been obtained, and that it may safely be put down at not more than £65,000.

Third.—All agree that as little reclamation as possible should take place in the Upper Harbour. Mr. THOMSON states that, since he reported to the Government in 1859 and 1868, greater reclamation has been proceeded with than he advised. He lays it down as one of the principles which he recommends, "that as little reclamation as possible should be gone on with and he winds up his Report with this statement—

"To extensive reclamation I am also opposed. 1st. As regards the town of Dunedin. That such would obstruct properly-inclined sewerage, and thus create pest centres dangerous to the health of the inhabitants. And 2nd. That, as regards the Harbour itself, to diminish the water flowing up and down the Harbour (the effect of reclamation) is to diminish the water on your bar, and thus deteriorate the Harbour as a shipping port."

Mr. BLAIR says :—"On the principle of prevention being better than cure, I would be inclined to lay down as an axiom that no reclamation whatever should be made without a corresponding amount of excavation in the tidal area." And further on—"Without admitting the desirability of reclamation in any form, it is quite evident that a certain quantity must be done in the neighbourhood of the Docks and Wharves. I would, therefore, be inclined to apply the dredged materials towards reclaiming land in the most valuable position for building sites."

Mr. M'GREGOR proposes to carry the dredged stuff to sea, and not to reclaim any land with it, and makes the following important suggestion :—"It is part of my scheme for improving the Upper Harbour to dredge off the tops from all shoal banks that project above the level of low water. My object in doing this is to increase the tidal capacity of the Upper Harbour, and thereby increase the mechanical power for permanently maintaining it. Another advantage would be, that by removing the tops of the banks there would be no danger of deposit being washed into the deep water channel. Nothing could get into the channel but the deposit from the hill sides surrounding the Upper Harbour, and a large proportion of this even would be intercepted," &c. He also says:—"I would, however, on no account recommend that any wharves or piers of any kind should be projected beyond the present end of Rattray street Jetty. All projections beyond this I should remove."

Mr. BARR also, all through his Report, refers to the reclamation as a part of the work which should only be carried out so far as is absolutely necessary. The Committee, therefore, are fully satisfied that the "axiom" laid down by Mr. BLAIR is indisputably the only safe principle to be guided by as regards reclamation, and the only differences amongst the Engineers on this matter are in relation to the economical utilising of the dredged stuff; and it is fair to assume that if the taking the stuff to sea, as recommended by Mr M'GREGOR, were proved to be cheapest, all would agree in reclaiming only so much as is involved in the construction of the quays, wharves, and basins that may be determined upon.

Fourth.—These Reports all show clearly that any comprehensive scheme of Harbour Improvement must embrace and fix the principles on which the future scheme of sewerage for the City shall be carried out, discarding (as they all do) any idea of carrying the sewerage in any other direction than the natural outlet—the Harbour.

Mr. THOMSON says :—"In connection with this subject, it would be an oversight in me were I not also to notice the sewerage of the town of Dunedin, as the works are intimately connected. Various schemes have been propounded for this, some Engineers wishing to carry it to the Ocean Beach; others, as far as the Taieri Plain—[See Swyer's Report.] These would involve sewers and pumping machinery such as only a wealthy city like London, for instance, could afford. I note, too, that one important fact has been lost sight of by all the parties reporting on this—viz., that the Harbour being salt water, it acts as a disinfectant; and this renders sewerage innocuous. The only objection to the sewerage going into it is, therefore, merely its bulk or quantity, in as far as its solids are concerned. This, for many years, must be an immaterial consideration."

Mr. BARR'S opinion on this has already been quoted under the first head, and Mr. BLAIR and Mr. M'GREGOR both propose making provision for it going into the Harbour. There are, however, two modes of dealing with it contemplated by these gentlemen, Messrs. THOMSON and M'GREGOR agreeing in their mode, and Mr. BLAIR and Mr. BARR generally in theirs. Mr. THOMSON would "carry the outlet of the sewerage into the middle of the

stream below Pelichet Bay, where in future years covered reservoirs would be constructed to pen up the liquid till the tide ebbed. Thus, by this measure, none of the offensive matter would flow up the Harbour in front of the Town. This arrangement would be far preferable to having the sewerage carried backwards and forwards by the flow and ebb in front of the Town, however rapid these might be." Mr. M'GREGOR says—" I would suggest that the deep water wharf (in front of the City) should be constructed of stone and concrete in a substantial manner, and in the centre of the wall I would form a main intercepting sewer capable of receiving the whole of the surface drainage of the City. The sewer should have a fall from the centre north and south; and at each end, at some convenient spot near Pelichet Bay and Anderson's Bay, silt basins would be constructed, so as to receive the deposit from the sewer, and nothing but water discharged into the Harbour. This plan would remove all the objections brought forward regarding the danger of filling up the dredged channel from the surface deposit now discharged into the Harbour. Moreover, it would keep the future cost of maintaining the permanent depth down to a minimum."

On the other hand Mr. BLAIR would depend largely upon the artificial current created by the central training wall to sweep the shores of the upper part of the Harbour of the sewerage of the City. He also suggests an idea to increase the scour, viz.—"To make the Railway embankment at Pelichet Bay watertight, and to run another of the same kind (to be utilised as a road or railway) from Jetty Street to Burns's Point on the Peninsula, and to use the area thus enclosed for holding the tide till near low water, when it would be allowed to escape into the channel. This method of scouring is extensively used in tidal basins throughout Europe."

Mr. BARR, while also advocating an artificial tidal current past the City, says—" At this stage, however, I am more in a position to urge what not to do with the refuse than what to do with it, which, after the expenditure of much money and years of experiment in Britain, is just the position that scores of Municipal Corporations find themselves in with regard to their sewerage. The only general and indisputable conclusion that has been come to is not to discharge it in its unpurified state into any Harbour or River, and that is the only extent to which I would feel justified in giving a decided opinion at present with regard to our own case." He then proceeds "to throw out a few hints" as to how the proposed improvements may be made to fit into the system of sewerage disposal by a system of intermittent filtration and irrigation, which has been found most successful in the older towns of Britain; to be carried out on an area of about ten acres partially reclaimed near Anderson's Bay, and covered to a depth of three feet with sand from the Ocean Beach. For the details of this, however, we must refer the reader to his own Report.

The only serious differences of opinions in these Reports are threefold:—

First—As to the creation of an artificial tidal current. Second—As to the construction of the retaining walls along the dredged channel. Third—As to the economy of utilising the stuff dredged from the channel as opposed to carrying it to sea.

First.—Mr. BLAIR endorses the principle laid down in Mr. BALFOUR'S scheme of a central training wall up the centre of the Harbour to direct and control the tidal currents as a correct one, but would, instead of starting from the Portobello Peninsula, start it from the Quarantine island and close up the channel between the Island and the Peninsula. He would, also, extend it further up the Harbour. He also condemns the scheme which seems at present to be in operation—the simple cutting of a channel from Burke's to Dunedin, protected by a timber training wall, over which dredged material is thrown.

Mr. BARR also approves of the general principles laid down by Mr. BALFOUR "as established by long experience," but considers the estimate of cost inadequate, and suggests a modification of his scheme, which will cost less than his large scheme, while securing the same or nearly the same advantages. At the same time he considers it free from certain grave objections to Mr. BALFOUR'S smaller scheme from an engineering point of view. His proposal is to construct the wall from Bare Head instead of either from Portobello or from Green Point.

It would be unfair, however, not to point out that neither Mr. BLAIR nor Mr. BARR propound schemes of their own for the improvement of the Harbour. They simply profess to state their opinions with regard to the scheme suggested by the late Mr. BALFOUR for Harbour Improvement, and give their views on the general question without reference to any scheme which, after thorough investigation, and procuring detailed information, they might recommend.

Mr. THOMSON, on the other hand, advocates a dead water channel, and is strongly opposed to the creation of any tidal currents beyond those at present existing. He also considers no obstructions whatever should be placed against the easy influx and reflux of the tide. Mr. M'GREGOR also makes the dredging of a deep water channel from Blanket Bay to the Head of the Harbour, widening out and sweeping round the foreshore of Dunedin, the salient feature of his scheme. He would prefer waiting to see the effects before interfering with the

tidal currents, and would only propose utilising the first of the flood and last of the ebb towards scouring the artificial channel.

These two latter opinions the Committee consider worthy of great weight—especially as Mr. BALFOUR'S training wall would be by far the most expensive portion of his scheme, and is not considered by any of the Engineers essential to the bringing of the largest ships to Dunedin at first, and might be altogether dispensed with ultimately; and also because the dispensing with the central training wall would remove the very grave objection of interfering with the water communication now existing between the Peninsula and Port Chalmers.

Second.—Mr. BLAIR would make the retaining walls along the dredged channel higher than high tide, and watertight, if constructed at all, so as to command and direct the tide. Mr. BARR would construct them higher than water-mark, but would make them at first not watertight, and seems to consider that the action of cross currents would not materially affect the success of the scheme. Mr. THOMSON, on the other hand, considers cross currents such very formidable affairs, if attempted to be diverted in such a body of water as the Upper Harbour, that he would commence the works at the head of the Harbour and proceed downwards so as to prevent difficulties from them. And so much is he against any real or apparent obstruction to the tidal currents that he would restrict the height of the training walls to that only which may be necessary to guard the artificial channel from having the dug-out mud coming back upon it. He also advises that "nothing that is a mere experiment should be attempted."

Mr. M'GREGOR would also keep the walls of the channel low, and would dispense with them altogether where the channel could be maintained without them, so as to offer as little obstruction as possible to the flood tide filling the Harbour. Where erected, he would only raise them a little above low water line, just sufficient to guide the low water through the artificial channel, and would mark out the channel by buoys on both sides.

Third.—As to the relative economy of utilising the dredge stuff in reclamation, or of carrying it out to sea. Mr. M'GREGOR stands alone in his opinion, that it will be cheaper to carry the stuff to sea than to deposit it on the foreshore, or behind any wall. But this opinion is based upon the information he possesses as to the capabilities of the new combined Hopper Dredge; and certainly, if after careful investigation its powers are found to be equal to what they are represented, it is probable the other Engineers would modify their opinions somewhat. Indeed Mr. Blair in one part of his Report states that Mr. BALFOUR'S plan of taking the stuff outside the Heads "is undoubtedly the cheapest way of getting rid of it"; though afterwards he modifies this by saying "that if reclamation can make it worth 4s. or 5s. per yard, there is a large balance on the other side," and recommends the employment of light punts, and machinery to haul them up for discharge at levels above water-mark. Both Mr. THOMSON and Mr. BARR disapprove of sending the mud to sea on the ground of expense, and favour the employment of the travelling shoot that has already been in operation for the conveyance of the stuff.

In addition to the foregoing subjects treated of fully in these Reports (which the Committee would earnestly recommend to the perusal of every one), both Mr. THOMSON and Mr. M'GREGOR recommend the principle of deep water docks or basins for the accommodation of vessels loading or unloading; whilst Mr. BLAIR prefers, as a better plan, one large square basin, with short jetties at sides. He thinks that the Harbour is so well sheltered, and the tide so small, that it is not necessary to have basins enclosed.

Mr. BARR also points out an important fact, that "the tide rises about three feet higher on the Ocean Beach than at the head of the Harbour; and it is not unreasonable to expect that of this quantity some of it will be gained by the improvements contemplated, probably from one to two feet."

Total cost of the Works proposed (including rubble walling for the protection of the dredged channel, and which may be largely dispensed with), Plant and contingencies, but excluding Wharves, is—

The extra walling accounting for the difference.

Mr. BLAIR has not worked out in his Report any estimate of total cost. It may, however, be confidently asserted by the Committee that for a sum of £150,000 all the shipping at present frequenting the Port could be brought up to Dunedin and comfortably berthed there.

The Committee, in bringing their investigations at present to a close, would point out that there are four ways in which the contemplated improvements might be carried out. First—by the Provincial Government direct. This would no doubt be the simplest and quickest way, but from the multifarious duties devolving upon the Executive, and the frequent changes inseparable from political institutions, there is little doubt that this would prove in the long run the most expensive and most inefficient channel through which to effect the object desired. Second—the City Council. The benefit to the City, apart from the question of sewage, would fully justify the Corporation in taking the matter up, but the same objection applies to them as to the Provincial Government; besides, as the Harbour belongs to the Province as a whole, and as its proper management is a matter in which the country even more than the City is interested, it is questionable whether it would be wise to entrust its entire management to a body who would naturally view everything connected with it, merely from a City point of view. Third—a Private Company. There is no doubt were the necessary concessions made to such

a body, the whole matter would soon be carried out expeditiously and profitably. In fact, it is well known that there are parties now ready to take it up on this footing. But, unless as a last resource, the Committee could not recommend this course. The principle that all such undertakings should be the property of the public and under their immediate control, is too well understood now to require any further comment, and the experience of the past few years in regard to similar public undertakings is sufficient warning against this lucrative enterprise being allowed to pass into the hands of any private individual or corporation. Fourth—a Harbour Trust composed of men representing the various sections of the community immediately interested, and who will devote their full attention and energies to this particular means of benefiting the Province. The Committee would therefore submit the following

Recommendations.

The Committee recommend for the proper and vigorous carrying out of the proposed Harbour Improvements, the creation of a Harbour Trust, composed of nine members—three appointed by the Provincial Council, three by the Dunedin City Council, and three by the Dunedin Chamber of Commerce.

It would be advisable that this Trust should also be put in charge of the whole Harbour Department, Lower as well as Upper, including the Pilot service and Towing.

The Committee are advised that it is necessary that this Harbour Trust should be constituted by the Superintendent and Provincial Council, and empowered by them so far as the "Harbour Boards Act, 1870" gives them authority; but, that afterwards application should be made by the Trust to the General Assembly for a special Act to enable them to borrow two hundred thousand pounds (£200,000) upon six per cent, debentures, secured on the Harbour Rates, and having the collateral guarantee of the Provincial Government.

From the Engineers' Reports referred to above it will be seen that £150,000 may safely be considered sufficient to construct the engineering and dredging works, but it would be desirable that the further sum of £50,000 should be within the reach of the Trust as provision for unforeseen contingencies.

The Committee have not thought it necessary to take into their estimate of cost the question of Wharves, as these need only be proceeded with as required, and it is fair to assume that the cost of these would be more than recovered from the sale of the building sites gained by the necessary reclamation involved in their erection.

The annual expenditure of the Trust, exclusive of the Lower Harbour Department, the Committee after full consideration believe, may be estimated at £9000 for interest at 0 per cent on £150,000, and £6000 for maintenance and management after the works are completed; in all £15,000 per annum.

To provide a sufficient income for the Trust, the Committee suggest the levying of a rate on each ton of merchandise and produce exported, and on each ton of merchandise imported; the present jetty dues being of course abolished. In order to ascertain what rating would be required, the Committee have had statistics of the trade of the port extracted from the Custom House books, from which they learn that the quantity of merchandise of every kind which arrived in the year 1873 from all quarters was 200,000 tons, and that the quantity exported in the same year of wool, grain, and general merchandise equalled 110,000 tons. The Committee believe that when the rating comes to be fixed, a differential scale will be reasonable and necessary, but for the present purpose of estimating the income of the suggested Trust the Committee consider that a rate of 2s. per ton on imports, and of 1s. per ton on exports may be assumed, and in order to estimate the trade of the port within safe bounds, and to allow for such branches of that trade as may from various causes be exempted from the rates, they assume the inward trade to equal at present 160,000 tons per annum, and the outward trade 70,000 tons.

Or a surplus over interest and cost of maintenance of £4500.

The Committee would also recommend that the main energies of the Trust should first be directed to the speedy, economical, and efficient dredging of a Ship Channel to Dunedin.

The Committee desire to point out, that should the whole Harbour Department be put under the management of the suggested Trust, there will be a considerable saving in salaries, and other branches of the expenditure estimated above. They would also observe that the expenditure of the Trust not being liable to increase, the scale of rates could be reduced from year to year as the trade of the port advanced. The progress of that trade in the future may be judged of by its progress in the past.

In 1868 the total register tonnage of vessels arriving in our port was 146,500 tons; in 1873 it was 175,000 tons. In like manner the export trade passing through Dunedin must increase as population and settlement proceed throughout the Province. Last year only some 5000 tons of grain were shipped from the port, but for this year 20,000 tons would be a moderate estimate; and within 10 years 50,000 tons is likely to be the annual export.

These Returns of Imports and Exports suggest the reflection that, could the 3s. per ton, which the Harbour Works now proposed will save for the future, have been saved for the last ten years upon the immense mass of

merchandise and produce represented by these Returns, the Colonists of Otago would be some £200,000 richer than they now are. Or, looking at it in another light, judging the future from the past, and making no allowance for an accelerated rate of progress, the entire cost of the scheme now proposed to be carried out would be saved to the Province within the next ten years.

Robert Gillies,
Chairman.
Members of Sub-Committee.
John Davie
Hugh McNeill
Henry Tewsley
James Rattray
Keith Ramsay

March, 1874.

Appendix.

Mr. J. T. Thomson's Report.

Dunedin,

15TH OCTOBER, 1873.

MESSRS. TEWSLEY AND DAVIE.

GENTLEMEN—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 13th inst., requesting me to furnish you with an outline plan, such as I would consider fit for the improvement of Dunedin Upper Harbour; and, in reply, I beg to forward to you a tracing herewith. On considering the subject at this date, I find that I had reported on the Harbour, in letters dated 27th December, 1859, and 31st March, 1868, and in both periods I advised adherence to the same principle, though in the upper section fronting the town, as reclamation has since proceeded across my intended dock and quay, the plan must now be so far modified. In the tracing herewith, therefore, I have drawn out a new scheme suited to the present circumstances of town extension. I have also shown the original scheme in faint blue lines, from whence the artificial channel or canal followed the same direction down to the Fork as now delineated. It would appear also that the reclamation recommended by me did not exceed 208 acres, the large reclamation of 402 acres having been laid out at the instance of the late Captain CARGILL, who was at that time Superintendent of the Province. The black lines show the reclamation proposed by Mr. SWYER, amounting to 402 acres, and the plans of the late Mr. BALFOUR being in your hands, I need say nothing further regarding them.

The principles that I have always recommended in dealing with the Harbour are to interfere with it as little as possible, for to do this is to create other tidal actions that we may not anticipate, and which may prove detrimental, and to go on with as little reclamation as possible; further, that there should be no obstructions placed against the easy influx and reflux of the tide. There are at present two channels used by vessels coming up to Dunedin—viz., the North and the South—the latter being the deeper and wider, and which at the Fork is approached by what is called the cross channel. My advice has been, and is now, to retain the deeper and wider channel intact, and for its present use—viz., the coasting trade, and with which the improvement of the north channel will in no way interfere. Vested interests in property, and in the villages on the Peninsula, which will have large future expansion, will also thus be respected.

So much am I against any real or apparent obstruction to the tidal currents, that I would restrict the height of the training walls to that only which may be necessary to guard the artificial channel from having the dug-out mud coming back upon it.

Commencing at Dunedin, there will be 3,800 feet half-tide wall, then 12,000 feet low-tide, then 2,500 feet high-tide, and 13,000 feet of three-quarters tide wall. As there are only 17 feet on the bar below Port Chalmers, this limit of depth will govern the artificial channel in the Upper Harbour. I have therefore estimated the excavation to that depth. This will allow vessels drawing 21 feet at neaps and 22 feet at springs to safely come up to Dunedin. The upper dock for this purpose would have to be excavated to a depth of 23 feet. I would suggest that Dock No. 1 would suffice for many years to come, after which Nos. 2, 3, and 4 would follow in succession as the settlement increased.

HIGH HALF TIDE WALL PLAN OF DEEP WATER CHANNEL UPPER HARBOUR, OTAGO.
J.T. THOMSON, C.E. DUNEDIN, 1873. PART OF THE CITY OF DUNEDIN PELICHET BAY
ANDERSON'S BAY HIGH AND HALF TIDE WALL 2 Low Tide Wall 12000 ft Black Jack Pt 3 High Tide
Wall 2300 THREE QUARTER TIDE WALL SAWYERS BAY LOW TIDE WALL Scales 4Ft: to of an inch
TOWN OF PORT CHALMERS?

The cost of the works will be as follows (not including Wharves):—

Rubble Training Wall— £ s. D. 1,266 lineal yards $\frac{1}{2}$ -tide @ 23/ 1,455 18 0 4,000 lineal yards low tide @ 183/ 36,600 0 0 833 lineal yards high tide @ 70/ 2,965 10 0 4,333 lineal yards $\frac{3}{4}$ -tide @ 53/ 11,482 9 0 52,503 17 0 Excavation— YDS. YDS. CUBIC YDS. 666 lineal yards 130 wide 5 deep 432,900 600 lineal yards 100 wide $3\frac{1}{3}$ deep 200,000 4,000 lineal yards 100 wide $\frac{1}{3}$ deep 933,333 833 lineal yards 100 wide $4\frac{2}{3}$ deep 388,733 4,333 lineal yards 100 wide 1 deep 433,300 2,388,266 @ -/4 39,804 8 2 Plant, say 20,000 0 0 112,308 5 2 Contingencies, 10 per cent. 11,230 16 0 £123,539 1 2

I may state that in my estimate I have taken Mr. BALFOUR'S highest price for rubble—viz., that for his mud bank walls, $\frac{3}{4}$; his deep water wall being at the rate of only $\frac{1}{2}$ per cubic yard. The dredging I estimate to be done with the travelling mud shoot which I designed and had in very successful operation when I was formerly in charge of the works, and which Mr. BARR, my successor, found only to cost 31-10d per cubic yard (see Report of 31st March, 1869). I would use this in all the first excavations, as to send the mud out to sea in Hopper barges, as recommended by some Engineers, would cost at least 3/ per cubic yard, that is, eight times the present estimate. Ultimately, no doubt, it would be advisable to use mud barges for the annual clearing of the channel, but at first the backing of the training walls by material would be beneficial rather than otherwise, and would in no way affect detrimentally so wide an expanse as Otago Harbour presents.

The works should commence at the head of the Harbour, proceeding downwards. By this means no difficulties would occur from having to deal with cross currents; very formidable affairs if attempted to be diverted in such a body of water as the volume of the Upper Harbour. No scheme, therefore, should be attempted that is a mere experiment, and which involves measures of which we have had no previous example.

In connection with this subject, it would be an oversight in me, were I not also to notice the sewerage of the town of Dunedin, as the works are intimately connected. Various schemes have been propounded for this, some Engineers wishing to carry it to the Ocean Beach, others as far as the Taieri Plain (see SWYER'S Report). These would involve sewers and pumping machinery such as only a wealthy city—like London, for instance—could afford. I note that one important fact has been lost sight of by all the persons reporting on this—viz., that the Harbour being salt water, it acts as a disinfectant, and thus renders sewerage innocuous. The only objection to the sewerage going into it is, therefore, merely its bulk or quantity in as far as its solids are concerned. This for many years will be an immaterial consideration. I have, therefore, shown the outlet, of the sewerage to be carried into the middle of the stream below Pelichet Bay, where in future years covered reservoirs would be constructed to pen up the liquid till the tide ebb. Thus, by this measure, none of the offensive matter would flow up the Harbour in front of the town. This arrangement would be far preferable to having the sewerage carried backwards and forwards by the flow and ebb in front of the town, however rapid these might be.

To extensive reclamation I am also opposed. 1st, As regards the town of Dunedin, that such would obstruct properly-inclined sewerage, and thus create pest centres dangerous to the health of the inhabitants. And 2nd, That, as regards the Harbour itself, to diminish the water flowing up and down the Harbour (the effect of reclamation) is to diminish the water on your bar, and thus deteriorate the Harbour as a shipping port.

I remain,

Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

J. T. Thomson, C.E.

Mr. George M. Barr's Report.

Dunedin,

13TH JANUARY, 1874.

ROBERT GILLIES, ESQ.

SIR—In response to the desire conveyed to me by one of the members of the Committee appointed to

circulate information with reference to the deepening of the Upper Harbour, Dunedin, and of which you are Chairman, that I should, in common with other members of the Engineering profession in Dunedin, state my opinion with regard to the scheme suggested by the late Mr. BALFOUR for improving the navigation, I now beg to submit the following remarks thereupon, and upon the general question under discussion, regretting at the same time that pressure of business has somewhat delayed this matter, and has also precluded my going so much into detail as the importance of the subject deserves.

It is quite unnecessary to discuss the general principles in Harbour improvements laid down by Mr. BALFOUR, as they have been established by long experience, and are such as are acted upon by the leading engineers in their most important and successful works; therefore all that is called for at present is a few practical considerations upon this particular case.

The chief inquiries as regards the suggestions of Mr. BALFOUR are naturally:—

- Are their main features such as, if carried into practice, would be likely to counteract the tendency of the Upper Harbour to shoal?
- Is Mr. BALFOUR'S scheme practicable?
- Can it be executed within a cost not too great in proportion to the benefits to be derived? and
- If not, can any modification of his own larger scheme, either as proposed by himself or in any other manner, be substituted for it, giving the main advantages sought at an expenditure within the means of whatever public body may undertake these improvements.

First, then, as regards the relation between Mr. BALFOUR'S main scheme and the form of the Upper Harbour and its banks. The wide extent of the Harbour from the Islands upwards, compared to the narrow passages between these, has doubtless been the original cause of the shoaling of that part; for immediately the tidal water has got through the narrow passages the slacking of the current has allowed the deposit of such solid material as may have been carried by the water from the Lower Harbour; while the gentle nature of the outflowing tide, from the same wide dispersion and unassisted by any fresh water-flow of any consequence, has been insufficient to carry to any distance the heavier portions of the matter derived from the sides of the Bay, which has thus assisted in the general shoaling. The other evil in this part of the Harbour, much dwelt upon by Mr. BALFOUR—viz., the bifurcation of the channel above Sawyer's Bay—is a result of the joint action of the widening of the tidal waters and the configuration of the shores upon both sides. With the inflowing tide, the action of the projecting point above Sawyer's Bay has induced a deflection of the current towards the other side, and in the direction of the cross channel, but probably in the direction of the beach upon the eastern side, from Bare Head southward, has been the chief cause in the original formation and subsequent maintenance of that channel, in so far as it has directed the force of the outflowing current, and prevented the deposit of material in that line as upon the contiguous banks. Possibly also the similarity between the inclination of the ground upon the two sides of the Harbour has had some effect in the maintenance of the two channels, by preventing the operation of those laws according to which rivers creep along under the steepest sides of a valley, though this being an arm of the sea, and not a fresh water current, such could have but little more than a theoretical effect. Viewing Mr. BALFOUR'S proposal for a central training wall from the Islands up to opposite Dunedin in connection with these two principal evils in our Harbour, I think there can be no doubt, that if carried out, the result would be highly beneficial, for the tide would be confined within such limits as to secure that its effect would be powerful as a scouring agency, while the complete blocking up of the cross channel would remove the other objectionable feature of the present condition of the Harbour.

2nd. As regards now the practicability of Mr. BALFOUR'S scheme. I am of opinion that, given unlimited funds, it is not impracticable; but the cost set down by him I consider inadequate for the purpose; and, indeed, throughout the whole course of his Report, he appears to under-estimate the difficulty which would be experienced in completely

Cross Sections of Walls.

H.W. To be filled up with good material from Dredging Circular Wall a.a.a.a. of Mr. Balfour's Plan H.W B. Wall on Banks. H.W C. Deep Water Wall Scale-5ft-1 inch

blocking up the channel and forming a watertight wall to restrain and direct so large a body of water as requires to be dealt with. In the following portion I shall submit estimate of this scheme for the same length of wall, but with these differences, that I would not at first attempt the construction of the wall either in its length or at its crossings of the channels of a watertight nature, believing that the same results, in the main, may be attained by one otherwise made, while the risk in execution would be much diminished. Instead of the wall with clay hearting and rubble facing, I would suggest that the work be commenced with a simple rubble wall, the stones being pitched in and allowed to form their own slope and bed; care being taken that they are of such sizes as to be of sufficient weight to resist the force of the current at the different places; heavy stones being used across channels, and lighter ones upon the banks and shallow parts. It is true that some of the water would

pass laterally through the wall, and thus be of less effect for scouring in the channel; but on the other hand the ease of construction would, I consider, more than compensate for the loss of the comparatively small quantity of water at first. Probably, the result, before long, would be the silting up of these interstices between the stones, and a watertight wall in all parts, except where the current was particularly strong, obtained at less risk than with the works contemplated by Mr. BALFOUR. Very satisfactory results have been obtained upon the Clyde, from the River Cart downwards, with rubble walls; but, as in this case, watertight walls could ultimately be constructed at but little comparatively additional cost. I would recommend these at those parts where the strongest scour would be required—viz., where dredging would be necessary in order to attain the depth of water required. At those parts it would be advisable, shortly after the deposit of the rubble wall, and when the current has been so far controlled, to deposit waterproof material upon the Peninsula or eastern side of the wall; and experience of the nature of the material in the bed of the Harbour has shown me that no better than it could be obtained for this purpose. The cheapest and best mode of deposit would be that already employed in the dredging operations below Black Jack's Point and other parts—viz., by the use of the discharging apparatus which has been proved to possess undoubted advantages over the system of punting. Hitherto the greatest length the material has been carried by this means in our Harbour has been a little over one hundred feet from the buckets of the dredge, but for the purposes of these works a greater length of carriage would be necessary, but still not beyond the power of similar, though larger, machinery to effect. The extra cost thus involved has been allowed for in the following estimates. It would not be prudent to deposit in that situation any more than absolutely necessary to prevent the lateral flow of the water from one side of the wall to the other, as all the space thus taken up between high and low water is so much deducted from the tidal water coming into the Upper Harbour; but even bearing this in view, the most economical and best mode of construction would simply be to allow the material to take its natural slope about one vertical to four or five horizontal, in which position no facing of stone on the eastern side would be required to prevent its being washed away. This has already been found so in different parts of the Harbour, except with the fine silt and soft mud in the neighbourhood of Dunedin, the mixture of shells and clay forming the bulk of the bed, possessing a tenacity and solidifying power which enables it to consolidate within a very short time after deposit. Moreover, only a very faint current would wash along this part, as the main part would keep nearer the Peninsula side. It may be urged against this, that considerable bodies of water would find their way through those parts not rendered watertight, and in the case of the inflowing tide travel in the direction of the head of the Bay, meeting the advancing tide also rising upon the Peninsula channel, and thus to a certain extent retard the force which we wish to encourage. This would be true to a certain extent, but not to a degree such as could materially affect the success of the scheme, but would be, roughly stated, proportional to the relations between the interstices of the rubble and the area allowed for the free flow along the new channel as formed by the training walls. The whole practical effect would be, that probably the deposit of material, which invariably results at the head of any bay or current, instead of being close to the back of the wall at the Islands, would be at some distance nearer Dunedin, where the two currents met. Even this would disappear as the rubble got silted up, as probable; but, at the worst, if this were found a practical evil, and spontaneous silting did not lessen it year by year, it would be much easier to form these walls watertight after the body of the water was directed by the rubble, than it would be at the first off going to carry out works of that strong and watertight nature contemplated by Mr. BALFOUR. In dealing with water, abrupt modes of treatment should never be resorted to, unless a more gradual course be impossible; for in the latter case the forces we seek to control can often be utilised for the purpose of constructing our works; while in the former, the same forces, intensified by our interference, would possess more than their natural intensity.

3rd. Concerning the cost, I would submit the following, as an estimate of Mr. BALFOUR'S length and locality of walls in his larger scheme, but with mode of construction as shown in Sections A B and C.

Estimate No. I.

MR. BALFOUR'S POSITION OF WALLS.

Circular Wall A, 5000 lineal yards @ 33/6 £8,375 Dredging at do. do. (150ft. by 3ft.) @ 50/ £12,500
 Temporary Bridges (price included in cost of filling for reclamation). Reclamation (to be derived principally from dredging, and included in its price, except top portions. See below). 4,900 lineal yards Deep water
 Training Wall, as in Section C @ £11 53,900 Allow for Cross Channels 400 lineal yards @ £13 5,200 8100
 lineal yards Wall B on bank @ 30/ 12,150 (Backing of this to be ultimately taken from Dredging, and charged with it). Dredging (to give minimum channel of 150ft. wide by 21ft. deep at high water) 832,000 cubic yards @
 ½ 48,533 79,625 61,033 Contingencies, say 7½ per cent 5,972 4,577 Total cost of Walling Plant for Dredging
 £85,597 65,610 45,000 110,610 Re-sale of portion of Plant 22,500 Total Dredging 88,110 Total Walling 85,597
 Total cost of the Scheme £173,707

In placing the above estimate before you, it will be necessary to remark upon several of the items, and more

especially upon the dredging and reclamation, taken both separately and conjointly. In Mr. BALFOUR'S Estimate No. I., in his Report of 7th September, 1864, no account is taken of the dredging which would be necessary in order to obtain the full advantages of his scheme. But in his final Report, before leaving the Province (15th November, 1865), he has stated both a quantity and expenditure upon it, which would probably be required before a channel twenty-one feet deep and one hundred and fifty feet wide could be obtained to Dunedin. As regards his quantity, I find that calculations I have made coincide very closely with his; but in price, I consider that he is in excess, whether it be viewed in connection with the cost at which dredging has already been done in this Harbour, or with the cost at which it is being done in the Clyde and Tyne in Britain. From my own experience in connection with dredging operations here, I can state that hitherto the price has ranged from 3.1d. per cubic yard up to 11d., according to depth, nature of material, and distance to deposit ground. In one case, for a small quantity raised and deposited under most disadvantageous circumstances, the cost per yard was about three times the highest price stated above, but this was so exceptional as to be altogether out of the question in considering an average.

In the year 1870-71 the cost of dredging and deposit in three rivers in Britain were—

- CLYDE.—9 3-100d. per cubic yard. Average over all the dredging, some of it deposited on land, and some carried about 40 miles to Loch Long.
- TYNE.—5 7-10d. per cubic yard. Carried on an average seven miles and dropped in the sea.
- DEE.—9 64-100d. per cubic yard. This was deposited by crane at the back of a new Quay wall.

The great disparity between the rates upon the Clyde and Tyne, where the most extensive operations are carried on, arises chiefly from the fact that on the former river considerable quantities were deposited on land at the cost of 1/ per cubic yard for deposit alone, as against 3d. when carried to Loch Long; whereas on the Tyne, the rate quoted applies only to the sea-borne material, scarcely any being placed upon the land. Where it has been done, however, the cost, including both dredging and deposit, has been 11d. per cubic yard. On review of these figures, then, both as regards our own Harbour and the ones in Britain, I consider the rate of ½ per cubic yard as a fair average at which we may expect the dredging and deposit to be effected here in the main channel, and 1/ per yard along the wall A A A A. In previous part of this Report I have indicated how a portion of the dredged material would be deposited behind the rubble wall, but the main bulk of it I would recommend being carried to those parts of the beach which Mr. BALFOUR has shown as proper to be reclaimed, and there dropped out of the punts when the tide was suitable. This mode of deposit would be cheaper than carrying to sea, the length of haulage being very much shorter; while it would possess the main advantage of that mode—viz., the getting quit of it without the necessity of handling, if punts of construction similar to those in use upon our own Harbour for the last four years were adopted. This would all be so much gain towards the reclamation of that area, though both for sanitary and financial reasons it might be better to complete it with material derived from the land. Of the total quantity of dredging, probably about 70,000 cubic yards would be laid behind the rubble training wall, leaving 1,012,000 cubic yards available for reclamation, which, to an average depth of 3 feet, would cover 209 acres; and supposing this area covered to a further depth of 3 feet with material from the land at 1/9 per cubic yard, the 209 acres would be rendered fit for building, &c., at a cost of £88,550, in addition to the cost above set down for dredging. Probably this is too large an area for the reclamation to be undertaken at once, so that it might be well to undertake only a smaller portion, as it would be unadvisable, in a sanitary view, partly to reclaim same and leave it lying alternately dry and covered by the tide. If the dredged material were used to fill up the ground to its permanent level, of course the cost of deposit would be somewhat greater, and the question would arise as to whether to do so or use material from the kind—a question which can only be dealt with when the actual facts of the case come to be decided upon, and which may be presently omitted from a Report of this general nature, it being sufficient merely to indicate that the dredging should be made to assist the reclamation as far as possible.

The cost of plant necessary to execute the dredging in, say five years, would be about £45,000—which includes three dredges, one tug, fifteen punts, and the self-acting discharging apparatus. Probably, at the completion of the works, one dredge and a few punts could be retained, and the remainder sold and realise half the above.

In the calculation of the quantities of materials to be dredged, it has been assumed that the high water level, after these improvements are accomplished, will be the same as at present, though, probably, it would be higher to an appreciable extent, though how much of course cannot at present be more than conjectured. From levels recently taken, I find that the tide rises about three feet higher on the Ocean Beach than at the head of the Harbour; and it is not unreasonable to expect that of this quantity some of it would be gained by the improvements contemplated, though looking at the great obstructions which the Islands are to the rising tide, we cannot probably expect to gain more than from one to two feet. I do not think it would be unreasonable to look forward to this, provided the location of the wall be judiciously chosen, and an easy run made for the tide, so far as that could be done at moderate cost; but it would be improper to count upon this in any estimates

formed at present, founded as these necessarily are upon the meagre facts presently known as to the figure of the bottom of the Harbour, and the slope of the high and low water lines. Making no allowance in the meantime for the probable gain will keep these estimates upon the safe side in this particular.

4. The fourth inquiry now remains to be investigated—viz., as to whether any modification of Mr. BALFOUR'S principal scheme can be suggested which would secure the same, or nearly the same, advantages at less cost. His own suggestion, as you are aware, was the shortening of the training wall, so that it would be only about half the length of the one in his original suggestion, his chief reason for this evidently being to meet the objection which would be urged against his scheme of cutting off the Peninsula settlers from direct communication with Port Chalmers. I am not inclined to give the same weight to that objection, under the present circumstances, as he was when he propounded his scheme, though in the face of the considerable expense which the larger scheme would involve, I would suggest for your consideration the construction of a wall from Bare Head of Captain Stoke's chart up to opposite the centre of Dunedin, an estimate for which you will find below. It may be asked, if my reason for this suggestion be an economical one, why not adopt Mr. BALFOUR'S alternative one, which, being shorter, would be correspondingly cheaper; but, in reply, I think I may urge that there are grave objections to this. Principally these are, that its direction being nearly parallel to the general direction of the channel between Green Point and Dunedin, would probably lead the current across the bank towards the Peninsula side, and possibly scour it to such an extent as to form a channel corresponding in its nature and effects to that already referred to further down the Harbour; neither would it block up that same channel which Mr. BALFOUR recognises as one of the main evils in our Harbour; and, lastly, it would not improve the scour at some parts of the dredged channel where such improvement would be most necessary for its maintenance. In the position I suggest no risk of the formation of a new channel would be likely, seeing that the current would naturally cling to the side opposite the bank, on account of its concavity, while the present one would be crossed, and, therefore, stopped by the wall at Bare Head.

The estimate is as follows :—

Estimate No. II.

WALL STARTING FROM BARE HEAD, WITH CROSS SECTIONS AS A B C.

Circular Wall A as before £8,375 Dredging at do £12,500 Temporary Bridges do. Reclamation do. 4,600
lineal yards Deep-water Training Wall @ £11 50,600 Closing Cross Channel, 200 lineal yards @ £13 2,600
4,300 lineal yards Training Wall on Banks @ 30/ 6,450 Dredging 832,000 cubic yards @ ½ 48,533 68,025
61,033 Contingencies, 7½ per cent 5,102 4,577 Total cost of Walling £73,127 65,610 Plant for Dredging
45,000 110,610 Re-sale of portion of Plant 22,500 Total Cost of Dredging 88,110 Total Cost of Walling 73,127
£161,237

The saving effected by this would be about £12,470; but as it is upon the cost of the Training Wall alone, the Circular Wall and the Dredging being the same, it is really more than at first appears in relation to the whole sum. In an engineering point, too, this possesses the advantage of offering no impediment to the inward flow of the tide at the Islands, as the long wall would to a certain amount, by being directly across its direction immediately the water gets inside.

In either of these schemes, it would be well that these works should be carried out as a whole, though if it were an object to save a few thousands in first cost, probably only portion of the Circular Wall and portion of the Dredging in front might be undertaken in the meantime. By this a sum of possibly £10,000 to £12,000 in works and plant might be saved.

I cannot close these remarks upon Harbour Improvements without reference to the subject of the disposal of the sewage of Dunedin, the more so as this subject must be decided one way or another within a few years, unless the health of the inhabitants is to suffer to a probably alarming extent. At this stage, however, I am more in a position to urge what not to do with the refuse, than what to do with it, which, after the expenditure of much money and years of experiment in Britain, is just the position that scores of municipal corporations find themselves in with regard to their sewage. The only general and indubitable conclusion that has been come to is *not* to discharge it in its unpurified state into any harbour or river, and that is the only extent to which I would feel justified in giving a decided opinion at present with regard to our own case; but as the subject of reclamation of some of the tidal beaches in the neighbourhood is treated of in connection with these Harbour Improvements, I shall only just throw out a few hints as to how this part of the proposed improvements may be made to fit into the system of sewage disposal which has been found most successful in the older towns of Britain. A little more than three hundred years ago the system of utilising the sewage of Edinburgh, by irrigating lands in the neighbourhood, was commenced, and the latest findings of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the disposal of the Sewage of Towns and into the Pollution of Rivers, are to the effect that no other system is to be preferred to it, provided that the crops grown, the areas irrigated, and the distribution of the sewage are adapted to each other.

The relation then between the Harbour Improvements and the sewage, which I would at this stage wish to indicate is, that portion of the reclamation area either about Pelichet Bay or towards Anderson's Bay should be prepared for the receipt of the sewage, as it would cost scarcely any more to do so than to prepare it for any other purpose, the only difference being that it would be better that say three feet of the ground should be made up of a material more porous than the clay taken from the bed of the Harbour, and for this purpose the sand in the neighbourhood of the Ocean Beach or Anderson's Bay would be admirably adapted.

If we take the case of Merthyr Tydvil, where the system of intermittent filtration and irrigation has been tried by the recommendation of the Commissioners on the Pollution of Rivers, an area of about ten acres would be sufficient for the present population of Dunedin. We have seen above that material more than sufficient for this will be taken from the Harbour under any circumstances, so that only the cost of the sand deposit would be charged against the disposal of the sewage. No fear need be entertained by the residents in the neighbourhood of the irrigation ground that such a scheme would prove a nuisance, as, under proper arrangements, not the slightest unpleasant odour could be detected; and indeed, in the case of Croydon, the localities in the closest contiguity to the irrigation are those in which the smallest death-rate occurs.

After the above remarks, it is scarcely necessary to point out that the three most important portions of these Public Works—viz., Harbour Improvement, Reclamation, and Sewage—should be carried out as a whole, as they are so intimately linked together and fit into each other as parts of the same system.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

George M. Barr, C.E.

Mr. W. N. Blair's Report.

Dunedin,

28TH OCTOBER, 1873.

GENTLEMEN—In accordance with your request, I have much pleasure in placing at your disposal the following Report on the Improvement of Dunedin Harbour.

Although I have occasionally given the subject considerable attention, and generally keep myself informed of the various schemes that are proposed, the changes that are taking place in the Harbour itself, and the increasing requirements of the shipping trade, I am not prepared to indicate any definite course of action, or express a decided opinion with reference to any scheme. In the absence of detailed information and a through investigation of the whole question, any suggestions I make must be taken as provisional, and subject to considerable modifications.

Reclamation.

Any scheme for the improvement of Dunedin Harbour must necessarily embrace the reclamation of land; and as this has an important bearing on the future, not only of the Harbour but of the Port generally, I shall first direct your attention to it.

In all bar-harbours like this there are two antagonistic forces at work. The sea outside is continually closing the entrance by heaping up sand, mud, and shingle, and the rivers or tidal currents from within are as constantly removing the obstructions. When the opposing forces are equal, the width and direction of the channel and the depth of water on the bar are always the same; but should anything occur to disturb the equilibrium, a change immediately takes place. There are no large rivers flowing into Otago Harbour, consequently the channel at the Heads is kept open solely by the tidal currents. Therefore, if we wish to preserve intact the capabilities of the Port, nothing must be done to decrease the force of the tide, and every cubic yard of solid materials deposited between high and low water level is so much towards doing so.

On referring to the Harbour Master's Reports of 1864 and previous years, I find that it was then considered necessary to drag a kind of harrow over the bar, to accelerate its removal by the tide. This proves that the forces engaged in obstructing the channel are naturally very little inferior to those that act in the other direction. For the last few years the channel at the Heads has been deeper than formerly, a result which, I understand, is attributed to the tidal-wave of 1868. Such a formidable scouring agent cannot often be reckoned upon, consequently we must direct our attention to the preservation of the more natural though less powerful one of

the daily tides.

Every acre of land reclaimed between high and low water level displaces upwards of 7000 tons of water. From a rough calculation, I find that about 100 acres, averaging about three-fourths of this depth, have already been reclaimed in the Harbour. As the tide passes over the bar four times in 24 hours, we have thus a daily loss of the scouring power of 2,100,000 tons of water.

Besides the injury done to the Harbour by artificial means, there is another element at work destroying the equilibrium of forces at the Heads—*i.e.*, the silting up caused by alluvial deposits. Before the settlement of the Province, and while the site occupied by Dunedin was all forest and swamp, the quantity of sedimentary matter brought down was comparatively small; but now, when the land is broken up and cultivated, and the heavy traffic is continually grinding the streets into dust and mud, every shower of rain carries tons into the Harbour.

Assuming that a deposit of one foot has taken place on all the tidal banks down to the "White Stone," we have a further displacement of 2,900,000 tons, making a total daily loss of the scouring power of five million tons. I am not aware of any rule by which this can be reduced to width and depth of channel, but when we consider that water flowing at from two to three miles an hour—the speed of the tides near the Heads—will sweep away loose stones 3 inches diameter, it is quite obvious that, without counteracting agencies, there must be a sensible diminution of scouring power.

Against this view of the question, it is urged that as the area reclaimed bears so small a proportion (say 1-500th) to the total area of the Harbour, the effect of the reclamation is practically *nil*, the channel being only reduced by a five-hundredth part. If the time occupied by the ebb and flow of the tide was shortened in the same proportion, the argument would hold good; but as the greater quantity of water had to flow over the bar in exactly the same time as the lesser, it is quite evident that the current was swifter, or the channel larger than at present. The injury is therefore of a twofold character—first, the scour of the water excluded is entirely lost; and second, the action of what remains is greatly diminished.

I think this will show that whatever relation exists between the tidal area of a harbour like this and the capacity of its entrance, it certainly is not the law of direct proportion; and in calculating on the diminution of scour, we must allow for the greatest possible amount.

Mr. BALFOUR entered fully into this question in the Report of the Port Chalmers Extension Commission (see "Votes and Proceedings of Provincial Council, Session XIX."); but although he clearly pointed out the pernicious tendency of indiscriminate reclamation throughout the Harbour, his advice seems hitherto to have been disregarded.

There is, however, one part of his scheme with which I disagree. He relies on the construction of training walls or groynes at the Heads, for counteracting the evil. Any works in this situation would be very costly and difficult to construct, and expensive to maintain, while their efficacy is doubtful. On the principle of prevention being better than cure, I would be inclined to lay down as an axiom, that no reclamation whatever should be made without a corresponding amount of excavation in the tidal area.

Docks.

I think Mr. SWYER was the first to propose a system of Docks at Dunedin. He intended to have three distinct Docks at Jetty, Stuart, and Rattray Streets. The two former were to have a wharf half way down the centre, and, so far as I am able to judge from the plan, all were to be shut in with gates.

I agree in the principle of Docks at Dunedin, but think the better plan would be to have one large square basin with short jetties at the sides. The Harbour is well sheltered, and the rise and fall of the tide is comparatively small, consequently it would not be necessary to have the basin enclosed all round.

Mr. Balfour's Plans.

The Reports reprinted by your Committee contain two distinct schemes of Harbour improvement. The first was designed principally to meet the sanitary requirements of the city, but was also calculated to maintain, and possibly to assist in forming, a deep-water channel on the northern side of the Harbour. The other was intended solely for the improvement of the navigation. In considering these plans, I shall, for convenience, treat them as one scheme.

The principal feature in Mr. BALFOUR'S works is the construction of a longitudinal training wall, commencing at the headland near Portobello, and running up the centre of the Harbour to within half-a-mile of the city. Its object was to lengthen the distance travelled by the tide, and so increase the current and scour. It would also remove the head of the navigation from Dunedin to Portobello, consequently there would be no still water in front of the city to receive and retain sewerage matter and other injurious deposits.

There can be no doubt that the principle of the scheme is a correct one. It is the application of the immense power contained in the ebb and flow of the tide to the cleansing of the city and deepening the navigable

channel. There are, however, several practical objections to this plan. First, it is almost impossible to construct a wall of the section proposed by Mr. BALFOUR. It is only about 2 feet wide at the top, consequently it could not be constructed from the shore by laying a temporary railway on it, which is the most economical way of forming an embankment. The materials would require to be conveyed on punts, and as the greater portion of the wall runs on banks that are dry at low water, the work would be tedious and expensive in the extreme. He also assumed that the bottom is hard, and takes the average depth below high water at about 4 feet. Now it is well known that the ground on some of the banks is very soft and treacherous, consequently the average depth, including subsidence, cannot be much less than 10 feet. Taking it at this figure, and assuming the bank to be wide enough for a line of rails, I make the total cost of the central training wall to be £120,000, against Mr. BALFOUR'S estimate of £45,000. The other portions of the estimate for the works, under the sanitary scheme, may stand, for although some items are too low, they are balanced by others that have a margin on the opposite side. Another objection to the central training wall is, that it commences at the headland near Portobello, and leaves a deep-water channel round the Quarantine Island. This would cause the wearing away of the adjacent banks, possibly to the detriment of other parts of the Harbour, and would also create a strong cross current at the entrance to the main channel. I think the better plan would be to close the channel between the Quarantine Island and the Peninsula altogether, and begin the wall at the island. By this means, all the tide that enters the Upper Harbour would be concentrated and sent into one channel, in the direction best calculated to scour it out.

In addition to the above, the central training wall is objected to on the ground that, as the current would set strongly round its upper end, it would be almost impossible to construct or maintain it. I think this objection is not a serious one. If the cross channel was not closed up till the last, there could be no scour round the end of the new work, and there would be no difficulty whatever in securing the permanent head by ordinary piling. In all probability, the wall would chiefly be made by running out materials on temporary staging from the nearest points on the Peninsula, so it might be convenient to leave the filling up of the cross channel to the last.

Mr. BALFOUR himself pointed out three objections to the central training wall. The principal, and in my opinion the only important one, was the severing of the Peninsula from direct communication with Port Chalmers. I think the construction of the railway has to a considerable extent removed it. The passenger trade between Dunedin and Port Chalmers is independent of water communication, and the only steamer now running is solely for the accommodation of the Peninsula settlers; and as their principal trade is with Dunedin, no serious inconvenience would result from the closing of the cross channel.

With reference to the circular walls proposed to be constructed round the foreshore of the Upper Harbour, I think they are not essential to the scheme. I think the object sought for by them would be obtained by carrying the contralt wall half a mile further on. I may also point out that the railway across Pelichet Bay and the road across Anderson's Bay are so much towards the work. If the circular wall could be dispensed with, a saving of £11,000 would be made on Mr. BALFOUR'S estimate.

Mr. BALFOUR'S scheme for the improvement of the navigation, although not fully described, seems to have been simply that of dredging a channel 150 feet wide and 21 feet deep at high water, from the deep water at Burke's Brewery to Dunedin. Taking the cost at upwards of double the rates on the Clyde, he estimated the work at £100,000, including plant, and states that it would take four years to complete; he calculated that the dredged materials would be deposited in deep water outside the Heads, which, so far as its mere disposal is concerned, is undoubtedly the cheapest way of getting rid of it. As dredging is indispensable and common to all the schemes for Harbour improvement, I shall refer further to it, when considering other works.

Plan Now Adopted.

I have not seen the complete plans for Harbour improvement, of which the present training wall is an instalment; but from isolated Reports and the work itself I gather that the scheme is simply the cutting of a channel from Burke's to Dunedin, to be protected on each side by a timber training wall, over which the dredged material will be thrown. The advantages of this plan are, the protection it affords to the banks of the new channel, and the facilities it presents for disposing of dredged materials. I think, however, that these are more than balanced by the following objections :—

1st. The position and design of the training wall is diametrically opposed to the idea of creating a shore current to remove and disseminate sewerage matter.

2nd. No advantage is taken of the tide to scour the channel; on the contrary, the tidal current is effectually excluded. It will therefore become a receptacle for sewerage and other sediment, which must be removed by dredging.

3rd. The dredgings deposited on the outside of the training walls will be earned by the waves and currents to tidal banks, there to accumulate and augment the evils of reclamation. In proof of this assertion, I find the Harbour Master reporting that the channel at Rattray Street had shoaled nearly two feet from April, 1871, to April, 1872. Now, as this could not possibly be alluvial deposit, we must conclude that it was dredgings carried

there by the action of the sea.

I think that the above objections alone are fatal to the present scheme of Harbour improvement; and, except it possesses some other great advantage of which I am not aware, I would not be inclined to recommend its adoption.

Suggestions as to Works.

I shall now proceed to offer some suggestions as to alterations on former schemes, and the substitution of new ones. In doing so, I would remind the Committee that I have at the outset reserved the right of modifying them, should the information on which they are based be incorrect or incomplete.

With reference to the central training wall proposed by Mr. BALFOUR. Before proceeding to construct it, I would be inclined to make some experiments to determine whether any benefit would result from the erection of certain portions of it, or if the remainder could not be altogether dispensed with. The most important of those experiments would be one at the point where the channel divides into two. It is quite evident that the principal if not the only cause of this division is the existence of a very prominent headland between Sawyer and Blanket Bays, together with a shoal or rock immediately opposite, directly in the centre of the channel. If the latter is composed of hard material, that alone would split the current, and deflect it into the present courses. Now, if the obstruction in mid-channel is removed, and a groyne thrown out on the north-east corner of the lower bank, it is possible that the greater portion of the tide now flowing into the south channel may be diverted into the north one. If so, the scour would be greatly increased, and in all probability the channel deepened. The cost of making the experiment would be comparatively trifling, and as the chances are that it would be beneficial, it is well worth trying.

Another experiment is the construction of that portion of the training wall between Bull Island and Black Jack's Point. By referring to the chart, it will be observed that the two channels rejoin about the former place—or rather, that they cease altogether there—for above it the Harbour is a uniform depth right across. The erection of this portion of the training wall might be the means of confining the water and increasing the scour, and extending the channel towards Dunedin. It is also possible that the scour would be further increased by producing the wall to the line of Vauxhall Jetty, and doubling it back in a pear shape.

Another idea has occurred to me with reference to increasing the scour. It is, to make the railway embankment across Pelichet Bay watertight, and to run another of the same kind from about Jetty Street to Burns's Point on the Peninsula, and to use the area thus enclosed for holding the tide till near low water, when it would be allowed to escape into the channel. This method of scouring is extensively used in tidal basins throughout Europe. I believe that the effect from the two reservoirs above named would be perceptible for at least two miles down the Harbour. Of course, the embankment across to the Peninsula could be utilised as a road or railway.

Dredging.

The following are some notes with reference to the cost of dredging, and the amount of work that can be done in a given time.

In 1804, six dredges on the Tyne raised 4,180,000 tons, at 1¾d. per ton. In 1866, the cost of conveying the materials about 6 miles, to deep water, was barely 1⅓d. Adding repairs, interest, and depreciation 10 per cent., equal to 1½d., we have a total of 5d. per ton, or 7½d. per cubic yard. In 1871, the cost of dredging on the Clyde, including conveying to Loch Long, a distance of 27 miles, was 3¾d. per cubic yard. Adding 10 per cent, interest and depreciation, equal to 1¾d., we have a total of 5½d. per cubic yard. The total cost of dredging and depositing on the river bank for the same year, including 3½d. for interest and depreciation as above, was 16½d., which leaves a balance of 11d. in favour of carrying the materials to deep water. On the Elbe, dredging costs a little under 4d. a cubic yard, exclusive of interest and depreciation.

In 1872, one dredge on the Clyde raised 255 cubic feet, equal to 290 tons, per hour, for five consecutive days. A dredge at Carlingford Lough, in Ireland, has raised 4660 tons in one day from an exposed bar, and in easy stuff 600 tons per hour can be dredged. The most powerful dredge in the world is one manufactured by Wingate, of Whiteinch, for the Tyne Commissioners; it can raise 1000 tons per hour from a depth of 35 feet.

The cost of an iron dredger in England ranges from £10,000 to £20,000, according to its capacity.

Mr. BALFOUR'S idea was to dredge a channel 150 feet wide, the contents of which he calculated at 1,248,000 tons. The width of the Suez Canal is 72 feet. Now as it would only be 4½ miles long, I think a channel of this size might accommodate our traffic for some years to come. Assuming such to be the case, the amount of dredging would be about 460,000 cubic yards, or 690,000 tons. Taking the rate for dredging and depositing on land at twice that on the Clyde—say 2s. 9d. per cubic yard the total cost of the work would be £63,250. Of course, this does not include the value of plant, which would cost, according to Mr. BALFOUR,

about £40,000. Under ordinary circumstances, by far the cheapest way of disposing of the material would be to convey it outside the Heads in Hopper barges. But if each yard can be deposited on land in a position that makes it worth 4s. or 5s., there is a large balance on the other side.

Without admitting the desirability of reclamation in any form, it is quite evident that a certain quantity must be done in the neighbourhood of the Docks and Wharves. I would therefore be inclined to apply the dredged materials towards reclaiming land in the most valuable position for business sites. The dredgings from the 72 feet channel would reclaim about 23 acres in the vicinity of the present jetties, allowing 3 acres for street and wharves. The balance, at prices now fetched by land in similar situations, would pay for the cutting of the channel. I do not wish the Committee to infer from this that the whole expenditure can be met in the same manner. Although a profit might be made by widening the channel to 150 feet, and reclaiming 20 acres more, it would not be sufficient to pay for the Docks, Wharves, and training walls that are necessary. I think, however, that I am safe in saying that the largest ship frequenting the Port can be brought up to Dunedin at a nominal expenditure.

Another argument against carrying the dredging to sea is, that it would be necessary to employ a large number of steam barges to keep the dredge working full time. An ordinary barge can be filled in an hour, and as each trip could not be done under six hours, six or seven barges would be constantly required. If the material is deposited on land, common punts, towed by little steam launches, can be employed, and by making them of moderate capacity—say to weigh not more than 20 tons—when full they can be hauled up an incline, and emptied into the ordinary earth wagons. An 8-horse engine could pull up one of these punts in a minute, and 20 punts and 3 steam launches would keep the dredge in constant work. By using lighter punts, an arrangement might be made for running them direct to the embankment, and so save one handling of the stuff.

I believe the high cost of depositing materials on the banks of the Clyde is caused by its being placed in isolated and detached situations where machinery cannot be economically employed for hauling it up. That drawback would not exist at Dunedin, as all the reclamation might be within a radius of 20 chains. One dredge of moderate capacity, with the other appliances above described, would cut a channel 72 feet wide in the bottom, and 21 feet deep at high water, up to Dunedin in 350 working days, and one of the same width, but only 18 feet deep, in 180 days.

Whatever plan of Harbour improvement is adopted, I would recommend that the dredging be first commenced. It is the key to the whole scheme, and the work can be arranged so that the smallest instalment will be beneficial.

The question naturally arises, Will the sides of a channel cut in this manner, and left without protection, not fall in at once? I think not. So far as I am aware, the bottom of the Harbour is composed of tenacious silt and clay, capable of resisting the action of water to a considerable extent, and the sides can be easily sloped off to any inclination required. Besides, as the whole of the cut will be under low water level, it cannot be much exposed to the influence of the waves.

Surveys.

The Committee seems to be under the impression that a complete survey of the Harbour is absolutely necessary before anything can be done in the way of designing works. It would certainly be very desirable to have a correct plan to work upon; but I do not think that the mere depth of water at certain places, which probably is all that the plan will show, is nearly so essential as other information that might be collected. For instance, the following:—

1st. A complete record of the rise and fall of the tides at Dunedin, Port Chalmers, and the Heads, together with observations, extending over at least one month, at the White Stone and a point on the Peninsula exactly opposite.

2nd. A complete plan of the currents, showing their direction, duration, and force.

3rd. A note of the character of the strata throughout the Harbour wherever works are proposed or suggested.

4th. Such information as it is possible to obtain with reference to the quantity of alluvial matter carried into the Harbour, and where the deposits chiefly take place.

Trusting that this Report, which has been rather hurriedly thrown together, will be of service to the Committee in considering this important subject,

I remain, Gentlemen,

Yours faithfully,

W. N. Blair.

Mr. John McGregor's Report.

Dunedin,

JANUARY 19TH, 1874.

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DUNEDIN HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE.

SIR,

As requested by the Harbour Improvement Committee, I have the honour to submit the following suggestions, accompanied by a plan and section, showing how, in my opinion, the Harbour can be improved so as to admit of large vessels coming up to Dunedin wharves.

The salient features of the plan I propose can be explained in a very few words.

It consists of a channel starting from the deep water off Blanket Bay, and carried right up to the head of the Harbour, widening out and sweeping round the foreshore of Dunedin, and terminating a little below Grant's Braes, on the Peninsula side.

The dimensions of the channel, from the starting point to Black Jack's Point, I have shown on the section to be 250 feet wide at the surface, and 21 feet deep at high water. From Black Jack's Point upwards the Harbour should be deepened over a greater width, so as to give ample room for all purposes of navigation, and this object would be attained by constructing the channel according to the form shown on plan.

It is proposed to guide the channel by double walls, with the exception of the points along the course that are bounded by hard beaches. These guiding walls are only to be raised a few feet above low water line, just sufficient to conduct the early and late currents of the tide; and the course of the channel would be marked out by occasional buoys on both sides.

By keeping the walls low, they would offer very little obstruction to the flood tide from filling the Harbour, while at the same time they would guide the low water through the artificial channel.

The secondary channel off the head of Sawyer's Bay, leading towards the Peninsula, would probably require to be closed; but I am not prepared to say definitely whether it would be absolutely necessary to the success of the scheme or not.

It is usual while carrying out improvements of the nature proposed in Dunedin Harbour to close subsidiary channels; but before closing the one I am referring to, I should like to see what effect leaving it open would have on the deep-water channel shown on the plan. It is a part of my scheme for improving the Upper Harbour to dredge off the tops from all shoal banks that project above the level of low water. My object in doing this is to increase the tidal capacity of the Upper Harbour, and thereby increase the mechanical power for permanently maintaining it. Another advantage would be, that by removing the tops of the banks there would be no danger of deposit being washed into the deep water channel. Nothing could get into the channel but the deposit from the hill sides surrounding the Upper Harbour, and a large proportion of this, oven, would be intercepted by the guiding walls on each side of the channel.

Coming to Dunedin, I should suggest that a deep-water wharf be constructed, starting from Pelichet Bay and sweeping round the foreshore of the City towards Anderson's Bay, keeping the line of wharf as close in as possible, so as to get the shipping near the warehouses, railway stations, and other centres of traffic.

It would not be necessary to build the whole length of this wharf at once; the portion opposite the present centre of the City could be finished first, and gradually extended north and south as the requirements of the trade increased. I would, however, on no account recommend that any wharves or piers of any kind should be projected beyond the present end of Rattray Street Jetty. All projections beyond this I should remove, so as to get an unbroken line of wharf from end to end in front of the City.

Whatever accommodation might be required for smaller vessels should be provided for within this wall, which can be very easily done, and would no doubt be of very great use for special trades, such as timber, coal, &c.

I would suggest that the deep-water wharf should be constructed of stone and concrete, in a substantial manner, and in the centre of the wall I would form a main intercepting sewer, capable of receiving the whole of the surface drainage of the city. The sewer should have a fall from the centre, north and south; and at each end, at some convenient spot near Pelichet Bay and Anderson's Bay, silt basins would be constructed, so as to receive the deposit from the sewer, and nothing but water discharged into the Harbour. This plan would remove all the objections brought forward regarding the danger of filling up the dredged channel from the surface deposit now discharged into the Harbour. Moreover, it would keep the future cost of maintaining the permanent depth down to a minimum.

Dredging.

My attention has been directed for some time back to the subject of dredging the Dunedin Harbour, and about a year ago I procured, through the kindness of a Dunedin merchant who was visiting England, some reliable information relating to the very latest improvements in dredging machinery.

The most recent invention in dredging plant is a Combined Screw Hopper Dredge, patented by Messrs. Simons and Co., London Works, Renfrew; and in reply to a memorandum of mine, this firm state "that there will be no difficulty in one of our Patent Combined Hopper Dredges accomplishing the voyage to New Zealand under steam and canvas, so that there would be no necessity for constructing it in pieces.

"The last one we made for the Canadian Government steamed over the Atlantic to Halifax in 17 days, without coaling anywhere, and had 50 tons of coal left in her bunkers, and so satisfied are they with this vessel, that they have last mail written us about building a duplicate vessel twice the size.

"A new Patent Hopper Dredger, similar to the 'Canada,' completed, tried, and delivered here, will cost £10,000. The working expenses weekly, at present Clyde rates, will be:—

"When working in free-lifting ground, in less than 20 feet depth of water, 500 tons lifted and conveyed about 10 miles off per day, or 3,000 tons weekly may be expected in ordinary circumstances. A small vessel, to lift 100 to 150 tons in an hour and a half, will cost £6,500. The first-mentioned vessel would be quite fit to make the voyage out to New Zealand."

The advantages claimed for this new system of dredging apparatus are, that the work of raising the material and conveying it to the place of discharge is performed by the same vessel, engines, and crew. That the stuff can be delivered at the level of a few feet above the deck, thus avoiding the usual long bucket ladder, and high level of discharge required for delivering into punts or barges moored alongside the dredge. And, lastly, the Patentees claim a considerable saving of expense, not only in dredging, but in depositing the stuff at a distant point from where it is excavated.

The chief recommendation of the new Hopper Dredger for the work proposed to be carried out in Otago Harbour, is the fact that the whole of the dredging operations can be worked with one crew, whereas the old system of dredging would require at least four steam Hopper Barges to keep one large fixed Dredger in constant work, if the stuff had to be conveyed by barges outside the Heads. Each of these steam barges would require separate crews, coals, and stores, and would cost when new about £5,000 each. From a study of these particulars, I am inclined to think that the best system to adopt for deepening our Harbour would be to get two powerful Combined Hopper Dredges, similar to or even larger than the "Canada," which will cost less than one ordinary dredger and the necessary Hopper barges, and it will be obvious that the annual working expenses will be very much less, for there will only be two crews instead of five, and only two vessels to supply with coals and stores instead of five.

It may be said that a large quantity of the dredged stuff from the channel could be deposited behind the circular pier in front of Dunedin, and reclaim valuable land, at the same time; also, in filling up Pelichet and Anderson's Bays, and other convenient spots on both sides of the Upper Harbour, thus obviating the necessity of carrying the stuff out to sea.

At first sight this plan would seem to recommend itself in preference to any other; but from a financial point of view it would be found by experience that it would be cheaper to carry the stuff 20 miles than deposit it on the foreshore of the Harbour, in such positions where it would be safe from the influence of the tides, and kept from being drawn back again into the dredged channel.

The Clyde experience is that it costs about an average of 1s. 3d. per cubic yard to deposit the stuff on the alvens of the river from the punts, whereas it is deposited in Loch Long, 27 miles from Glasgow, by steam Hopper barges, at a cost of 5.46 pence per cubic yard.

The chief reason why the latter system is so much cheaper than the former is, that once the stuff is delivered into the vessel that carries it, there is no more handling required until it is dropped out at sea; but to deposit the stuff on shore requires frequent handling, as well as numerous punts for carrying it—hence the difference in cost. Another system has been adopted recently for depositing dredged mud by means of a variety of pumps, forcing the stuff through wooden tubing in a semi-fluid state. But this can only be carried out economically when the ground to be reclaimed is situated close to the dredger.

In preparing an estimate of the total cost of my scheme for deepening and improving the Harbour, I am placed at a little disadvantage, from the fact that there are no reliable surveys in existence that quantities can be taken from; but from such data as I have been able to collect, I have prepared the following estimate of the cost and probable time required for completion. The whole design may be divided into four distinct items, consisting of :—

The wharf is calculated for a length of 3,000 feet, but of course a much shorter length would be sufficient for some time to come; and, in connection with this wharf, very valuable sites for warehouses and

manufactories would be reclaimed in the centre of the city. It is superfluous for me to point out to the Committee that every extension of this wharf, both north and south, would reclaim valuable areas of land in proportion to the length of extension, and, therefore, the length proposed to be finished at the outset is purely arbitrary; because it might be found that the demand for the sites behind the pier would justify a much greater length being carried out as the large ships began to come up to Dunedin.

It is also very probable that much shorter guiding walls than I have shown on plan for the new channel would be sufficient; but this could only be determined as the channel was being dredged out, and would depend very much on the nature of the stuff cut through.

If less walling would maintain the channel, then, of course, my estimate of cost would be so much less, but I think it better to make a liberal provision for this item in case it might be required.

In conclusion, I think I should state that I believe dredging plant was never applied to an easier piece of work than deepening the Harbour of Dunedin, and I am of opinion that the largest vessels that enter Otago Heads can be brought up and berthed alongside of Dunedin wharves within two years from the date of commencing dredging operations; and if the scheme I have suggested were carried out, Dunedin would possess one of the finest commercial harbours in New Zealand.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

John McGregor.

Dunedin,

FEBRUARY 5TH, 1874.

TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE DUNEDIN HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE.

SIR—In further illustration of my design for improving the Harbour of Dunedin, and of providing accommodation for shipping inside the deepwater pier, as referred to in my Report, I beg to submit the accompanying plan, which will explain more clearly how I intend to provide basins suitable for special trades, and a proper classification of the shipping. I wish both plans to be considered together, as illustrating my complete scheme for Harbour Improvement.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

John McGregor.

OTAGO HARBOUR SHEWING THE PROPOSED DEEP WATER CHANNEL. SECTION OF CHANNEL 250 Feet

Map of Dunedin WITH THE RECLAIMED LAND & CORPORATION RESERVES Published by FERGUSSON & MITCHELL, Engratbers Stathors & Printers SEPTEMBER, 1872 Richmond Hill Monington Osborne Note_ Area tinted red sites for Warehouses and Manufactories

As Regards Protoplasm.

BY JAMES HUTCHISON STIRLING, F.R.C.S., AND LL.D., EDIN.

New and Improved Edition, Completed by Addition of

Part II., In Reference to Mr Huxley'S *Second Issue*,

And of Preface, In Reply to Mr Huxley in "*Yeast*."

Longmans, Green, & Co London 1872

[*All Rights Reserved.*]

Colston & Son, Law and General Printers, Edinburgh.

Preface.

WHEN this Essay was first published, the following was the prefatory note (October 1869):—

"The substance of the greater part of this paper, which has been in the present form for some time, was delivered, as a lecture, at a Conversazione of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, in the Hall of the College, on the evening of Friday, the 30th of April last.

It will be found to support itself, so far as the facts are concerned, on the most recent German physiological literature, as represented by Rindfleisch, Kühne, and especially Strieker, with which last, for the production of his 'Handbuch,' there is associated every great histological name in Germany."

I may now state, without any more particular reference to the motives, whether general or special, which gave rise to it, that this essay of mine had but one thing to do,—to protest, namely, against the thoughtless extinction of certain essential *differences* in a supposed *common identity*. I may illustrate this by a remark in a letter to me on the subject by the late lamented Professor Ueberweg, which (the letter itself is dated Jan. 16, 1870) is as follows:—"As I am neither a physiologist nor a zoologist, I cannot be expected to follow your argument into its details, but I am vividly interested by its logical or dialectical leading thought—the contention, namely, for the right of the logical category of Difference, as against that of Identity one-sidedly accentuated, as it seems, by Huxley." My reply to this was, "that he (Ueberweg) had hit the mark—that I had been simply laughing all through, and holding up to the category of identity, the *equally authentic* category of difference—but that it had taken a German to find me out."

In the same letter, Ueberweg proceeded to say that the question, in the first place, therefore, was evidently a *logical* one. Now this, doubtless, is true; but this, nevertheless, is not enough. If the question involves at bottom logical issues, it has been really addressed by Mr Huxley to physiological ones; and it is only in the interest of scientific accuracy to point out that the inference to a physiological identity has been attempted to be made good by Mr Huxley, solely through means of an unwarrantable trampling out of (perhaps, for the moment, involuntary blindness to) the most essential physiological differences. For example, if you *identify* all life in protoplasm, the counter-reminder is only fair that you must equally *differentiate* all life in protoplasm; for of no one living thing, and of the organs of no one living thing, is the protoplasm interchangeable with that of another; and this involves, instead of Mr Huxley's universal *identity* in power, in form, and in substance, infinite *difference* in all these respects.

In the statement of this difference—which is really a veritable scientific interest—I was led into a variety of expositions, and, among these, into an historical one. So far, now, as it was *history* that was concerned in this, I could not, of course, in one way, take any credit to myself; still it was precisely here that, in another way, I did think I might take some little credit to myself. If in the course of the essay, indeed, there was anything else that seemed to me similarly situated, it was the summaries—the summaries of Mr Huxley's views, namely, with which I always prefaced my criticism of these. I confess that I thought them *exact*—short, that is, to the shortest, but full to the fullest, and certainly fair to the fairest, if not also clear to the clearest. It has pleased Mr Huxley, however, rudely to shock my not immoderate complacency in both respects. Neither history nor summaries, it seems, can he regard with satisfaction. That is, it was alone for what was not mine in the whole essay that I allowed myself to take any credit *as* mine, and this Mr Huxley denies me. In the reply, namely, to which, after two years' interval, he has at length brought himself, it has pleased Mr Huxley—in those few sour-humoured words of his in the *Contemporary Review* for December 1871—to call the history a "travesty," and (by implication) the summaries "utter misrepresentations." That Mr Huxley, fairly looking at either history or summaries, should yet feel himself free to speak so, throws me back—I confess it—on thoughts *of him*.

If, as I say, the summaries could not, as wholly referring to the matter of another, be called my own, so neither could the history be called my own, and for a like reason. Nevertheless, as I also say, I had such consciousness of *honest work* in either respect, that I could not help allowing myself a certain satisfaction in both. The grounds, more especially for this as regards the history—the summaries I dismiss for the present—lay as well in the *pains* that still throbbed before consciousness, as in the fact that the narrative involved was known to me to be then only for the first time presented in English.

By way of *indirect* testimony here, let me refer to an eminent physiological Professor who, on a late occasion, speaking of protoplasm, before the British Association, displayed this severe impartiality between us that, while he gave *my* account of protoplasm, it was Mr Huxley alone he *named*!

I fancied, indeed, that Mr Huxley himself would applaud here, for I believed him partial to a scientific historiette. Had I but known that he had *in petto* a *rival* history! I confess I had no anticipations of this: and, as to that indeed, perhaps he had it not *in petto*. Perhaps Mr Huxley has only benevolently got it up since—for *my* correction—by *example of him*? There at least it is—my historiette is a "travesty," it seems, and Mr Huxley, in

the pages of the *Contemporary Review*, replaces it by *his*. Loudly! Ay, Mr Huxley, I venture to say, is not less loud here than the legitimate blind beggar whom Mr Home represents to abuse the interloping one thus:—

*"I am the genuine blind man,
That villain seeks to grind one,
And poach one's field;
But I'll not yield,—
What! leave old rights behind one!"*

*"I am the real blind man,
The genuine real blind man!
As for that thief
With eyes, may grief
Consume him! I am the blind man!"*

But it will be only fair to Mr Huxley that the readers of the present essay should see his objections to it in his own words. The yeast-organism affording him an exceedingly eligible starting-ground for his lively representative ways, Mr Huxley begins with it, and is thereby enabled to give a little, not unwelcome, additional show of bulk to—after all—the somewhat *scanty* historical forces he has only desperately driven together. With these skilful preliminary dispositions, the attack itself—and in its entirety—is this:—

"Dr Stirling, for example, made my essay the subject of a special critical lecture, which I have read with much interest, though, I confess, the meaning of much of it remains as dark to me as does the 'Secret of Hegel,' after Dr Stirling's elaborate revelation of it. Dr Stirling's method of dealing with the subject is peculiar. 'Protoplasm' is a question of history, so far as it is a name; of fact, so far as it is a thing. Dr Stirling has not taken the trouble to refer to the original authorities for his history, which is consequently a travesty; and, still less, has he concerned himself with looking at the facts, but contents himself with taking them also at second hand. A most amusing example of this fashion of dealing with scientific statements is furnished by Dr Stirling's remarks upon my account of the protoplasm of the nettle hair. That account was drawn up from careful and often-repeated observation of the facts. Dr Stirling thinks he is offering a valid criticism, when he says that my valued friend, Professor Stricker, gives a somewhat different statement about protoplasm. But why in the world did not this distinguished Hegelian look at a nettle hair for himself, before venturing to speak about the matter at all? Why trouble himself about what either Stricker or I say, when any tyro can see the facts for himself, if he is provided with those not rare articles—a nettle and a microscope? But I suppose this would have been 'Aufklärung'—a recurrence to the base common-sense philosophy of the eighteenth century, which liked to see before it believed, and to understand before it criticised. Dr Stirling winds up his paper with the following paragraph:—'In short, the whole position of Mr Huxley, (1) that all organisms consist alike of the same life-matter, (2) which life-matter is, for its part, due only to chemistry, must be pronounced untenable—nor less untenable (3) the materialism he would found on it.'

"The paragraph contains three distinct assertions concerning my views, and just the same number of utter misrepresentations of them. That which I have numbered (1) turns on the ambiguity of the word 'same,' for a discussion of which I would refer Dr Stirling to a great hero of 'Aufklärung,' Archbishop Whately; statement number (2) is, in my judgment, absurd; and certainly I have never said anything resembling it; while, as to number (3), one great object of my essay was to show that what is called 'materialism' has no sound philosophical basis!"

Now this, so far as it is anything, is, as one sees, clever; but it is not an answer: it is only *business*. "My flock will expect a word from me, and will probably not be the worse of one: it will be, so far, a satisfaction to them, and convenient in use, perhaps!"

Be the nature of the cleverity what it may, then, one must pity the necessity of the shift; and, but for Mr Huxley's authority with the public—an authority quite just in its place, doubtless—the record, so far as I am concerned, might very well close here. That authority considered, however, perhaps it would be only duly respectful to the public—and even to Mr Huxley himself—that I should examine his observations in reply to my essay *seriatim* and at full. This, then, I shall now do.

To begin at the end, and travel *gradually* upwards, I must avow that it is certainly clever to take the three short clauses of the short concluding sentence of my essay as together representative of the whole, and so, in destroying them, destroy it! There is management in this—especially in view of Dr Beale's quotation of the

sentence; but the question remains—has Mr Huxley destroyed, not my essay, but even this its short last sentence?

His answer to my proposition that assumes him to hold "that all organisms consist alike of the same life-matter," is only that it turns on the ambiguity of the word "same." Will it be possible to make this good, however? Does Mr Huxley try it? Or is the reference to Whately enough for that? As for the word "same," I do not believe it to occur more than twice or thrice throughout the whole essay: identity is the term I use for the most part. I have no objection to the word, however, and think it perfectly justifiable: identity itself is certainly sameness. But more—I shall accept Mr Huxley's reference to the authority of Archbishop Whately in regard to it, and the ambiguity of its *two* senses. Of these, the primary one is that of numerical sameness, "applicable," says Whately, "to a single object;" as, I wore to-day the same boots I wore yesterday, meaning, of course, the same individual boots. In reference to the secondary one, again, the Archbishop's words are these:—"When several objects are undistinguishably alike, *one single description* will apply equally to any of them; and thence they are said to be all of *one and the same* nature, appearance, etc.: as *e.g.* when we say, this house is built of the *same* stone with such another, we only mean that the stones are undistinguishable in their qualities; not that the one building was pulled down, and the other constructed with the materials." Now, this latter sense is the sense in which Mr Huxley, I, and everybody else, for the most part, use the word; but whether Mr Huxley, I, or anybody else use the word, the context will always show if it be the rarer, primary, numerical sense that is intended or not. Does Mr Huxley insinuate that I represent him as arguing that the protoplasm of this monkey is *numerically* the same as the protoplasm of that man? I feel sure that it is impossible for either of us to be so absurd. But if he does not mean that, what *can* he mean by the ambiguity he flourishes, and his reference to Archbishop Whately? Whatever he means, I take him at his word; I tell him that, when he holds all living things to consist of the "same" protoplasm, "same" is not to him the term as used in Whately's primary, but as used in Whately's secondary sense; I tell him also that as it is to him, so it is to me. According to Whately, when we say, "this house is built of the same *stone* with such another, we merely mean that the *stones* are undistinguishable in their qualities:" similarly Mr Huxley, when he said that all life was built of the same *protoplasm*, meant it to be understood that the *protoplasms* were "undistinguishable in their qualities;" and—using words quite in his own sense—it was *that* I denied. Ambiguity there was none, and Archbishop Whately, Mr Huxley's own reference, but proves my case. Consider one or two of Mr Huxley's own phrases! "There is such *a* thing as *a* physical basis or matter of life;" . . . or "*the* physical basis or matter of life." There is "a single physical basis of life," and through its unity "the whole living world" is pervaded by "a three-fold unity"—"namely, a unity of power or faculty, a unity of form, and a unity of substantial composition." With such expressions ringing in our ears—and they occur on every page—which of us, Mr Huxley or I, shall be said to be the one who rather *pushes* identity?

Omitting the deep logical question that lies at the bottom of all, may I not say, then, that my whole argument is a completely valid and scientific one, founded on scientific difference as opposed to Mr Huxley's argument from scientific identity? And, in short, in attempting to stamp out all essential differences in the one *non-existent* identity of a vital *matter*, has not Mr Huxley simply deluded himself? If I only hold up, then, the *difference* he *ignores* to the *identity* he *proclaims*, that is much more than the "ambiguity" of the word "same."

In answer to my proposition which speaks of "life-matter" as, in Mr Huxley's belief, "due only to chemistry," Mr Huxley affirms "statement number (2) is, in my judgment, absurd; and certainly I have never said anything resembling it." One is pleased to think that Mr Huxley has now come to consider such an opinion "absurd," but—"certainly I have never said anything resembling it!" Mr Huxley, for aught I know, may have some quibble in his mind about the phrase "due to chemistry;" but he has always, and everywhere, for all that, described his "life-matter as due to chemistry," and here are a few examples:—

"If the properties of water may be properly said to result from the nature and disposition of its component molecules, I can find no intelligible ground for refusing to say that the properties of protoplasm result from the nature and disposition of its molecules."

Is it possible for words more definitely to convey the statement that the properties of water and protoplasm are precisely on the same level, and that as the former are of molecular (physical, chemical) origin, so are the latter? Again, after having told us that protoplasm is carbonic acid, water, and ammonia, "which certainly possess no properties but those of ordinary matter," he proceeds to speak as follows:—

"Carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen are all lifeless bodies. Of these carbon and oxygen unite in certain proportions and under certain conditions, to give rise to carbonic acid; hydrogen and oxygen produce water; nitrogen and hydrogen give rise to ammonia. These new compounds, like the elementary bodies of which they are composed, are lifeless."

So far then, surely, I am allowed to say that these new compounds are *due* to chemistry. Observe now what follows:—

"But when they" (the compounds) "are brought together, under certain conditions, they give rise to the still

more complex body, protoplasm, and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomena of life. I see no break in this series of steps in molecular complication, and I am unable to understand why the language which is applicable to any one term of the series, may not be used to any of the others."

Here, evidently, I am *ordered* by Mr Huxley himself, not to change my language, but to characterise these latter results as I characterised those former ones. If I spoke then of ammonia, etc., as due to chemistry, so must I now speak of protoplasm, life-matter, as due to chemistry—a statement which Mr Huxley not only orders *me* to make, but makes *himself*. Very curious all this, then. When I do what he bids me do, when I say what he says—that if ammonia, etc., are due to chemistry, protoplasm is also due to chemistry—Mr Huxley turns round and calls out that I am saying an "absurdity," which he, for his part, "certainly never said!" But let me make just one other quotation:—

"When hydrogen and oxygen are mixed in a certain proportion, and an electric spark is passed through them, they disappear, and a quantity of water equal in weight to the sum of their weights appears in their place."

Now, no one in his senses will dispute that this is a question of chemistry, and of nothing but chemistry; but it is Mr Huxley himself who asks in immediate and direct reference here:—

"Is the case in any way changed when carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and in their place, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm, an equivalent weight of the matter of life makes its appearance?"

Surely Mr Huxley has no object whatever here but to place before us the genesis of protoplasm, and surely also this genesis is a purely chemical one! The very "influence of pre-existing living protoplasm,"—which *pre-existence* could not itself exist for the benefit of the *first* protoplasm that came into existence,—is asserted to be in precisely the same case with reference to the one process as that of the electric spark with reference to the other. And yet, in the teeth of such passages, Mr Huxley feels himself at liberty to say now, "statement number (2) is, in my judgment, absurd, and *certainly I have never said anything resembling it*" It is a pity to see a man in the position of Mr Huxley so strangely *forget* himself!

Mr Huxley's next charge of "utter misrepresentation" on my part is, that I have talked of him as *founding* materialism, while it was "one great object" with him to *resist* it! I have been quite explicit everywhere as to Mr Huxley's *double* issue; but in the passage he refers to, I have only his first issue in consideration, as is the pitch of my essay in its first form generally indeed, and as—is perfectly well known to Mr Huxley. To attempt to hide his *first* issue from himself, then,—he can hide it from nobody else—by thrusting his head into the second, is but the sagacity of the ostrich. Seeing, however, that he resents my want of complete and formal analysis of the second or philosophical part of his essay, I have, in this edition, added it.

It is not every gentleman who allows himself so lightly such heavy weapons as "utter misrepresentations;" and I can only say, as regards them all, that I am really sorry Mr Huxley should have so indulged himself.

Let it be borne in mind, too, that Mr Huxley's critique, as above resisted, applies not to my essay, but to its short last sentence; which sentence, by the bye, happens (though I by no means disown, but completely homologate it) to have been a mere *addition* to the *proof* of my manuscript. Even so, he who reads again said last sentence, will find Mr Huxley's objections not only to be but word-deep—mere catch-words, then,—but to glance from the surface, without a scratch.

Passing now, then, from these three main and summarising objections of Mr Huxley's, I shall consider the others, taking them as they come in the extract, but, as said, in a course upwards.

The first that so comes concerns the nettle hair. I shall have contented myself, it seems, with taking my facts "at second hand." "A most amusing example," etc. . . . "but why in the world did not this distinguished Hegelian look at a nettle hair for himself?" Now, my single action being only to oppose difference to identity, I contend that, if, of the nettle hair, Stricker said A while Huxley said B, I had a perfect warrant to point out as much—let my own results of examination of the nettle hair have been what they might, and for the obvious reason that the known Stricker was an *authority*, whereas I, unknown, was none. But all that is beside the point, and I seize Mr Huxley here in the act, as is usual with him in my case, of mere word-catching. I do *not* meet Mr Huxley's description of the protoplasm of the nettle hair by Stricker's description in the same reference. My action, on the contrary, is this: To Mr Huxley's description of protoplasm *in general*, I oppose Stricker's description of protoplasm equally *in general*, and I point to the difference between them. Mr Huxley will probably exclaim, But it was the protoplasm of the nettle hair *I* described! To this my answer is, Yes; but you immediately proceeded, and at great length, to identify all protoplasm with that of the nettle hair; and, therefore, I was perfectly warranted in assuming your description of the protoplasm of the nettle hair in the first instance, to be your description also of protoplasm in general and in all instances. Reference to a sentence or two will prove this :—"Not the sting only," Mr Huxley tells us, "but the whole substance of the nettle is made up of a *repetition* of *such* masses of nucleated protoplasm." Further, possession is expressly inferred "by many other organic forms" of such protoplasm as is possessed by the nettle; and when he talks of "the comparison of such a

protoplasm to a body with an internal circulation," "put forward by an eminent physiologist," he has no idea whatever, he says, of *confining* this comparison to the protoplasm of the nettle sting. He says also: "Currents similar to those of the hairs of the nettle have been observed in a great multitude of very different plants, and weighty authorities have suggested that they probably occur in more or less perfection in all young vegetable cells." And, immediately thereafter, in a burst of poetry as exuberant as the very vegetation he describes, he proceeds as follows:—"If such be the case, the *wonderful noonday silence* of a *tropical forest* is, after all, due only to *the dulness of our hearing*; and could our ears catch the *murmurs* of these *tiny Maelstroms*, as they whirl in the *innumerable myriads* of living cells which constitute each tree, we should be *stunned* as with the *roar of a great city*." Surely there is here an extension ample enough to warrant me in assuming Mr Huxley to believe the same description to apply to protoplasm in general, which applied to the nettle hair in particular. But the main interest turned on *circulation*: that Stricker denied to exist in protoplasm in general. Was I wrong, then, in an argument that sought only an accumulation of differences, to quote, as opposing Mr Huxley's so unexceptive authority *for* circulation, Stricker's equally decided authority *against* it? Why, too, should Mr Huxley cry shame on me for adducing the evidence of *authorities*, and not of my *own eyes*? Had he himself not already set me the example? What are these "weighty authorities" he alludes to, and what is the effect of them? Is not that effect to "commend the poisoned chalice to his own lips?" "Why in the world did not this distinguished" Biologist "look for himself" at all these "young vegetable cells" and "tropical forests," "before venturing to speak a word about the matter at all?"

But I have not yet given Mr Huxley's description of protoplasm one half the extension he himself gives it. "The proto- plasm of Algæ and Fungi," he tells us, "exhibits movements of its whole mass." Further still, he asserts of these phenomena that, "so far as they have been studied," "they are the same for the animal as for the plant." He says also of the white corpuscles of the blood, "The substance which is thus active is a mass of protoplasm, and its activity differs in detail, rather than in principle, from that of the protoplasm of the nettle." Then, "beast and fowl, reptile and fish, mollusc, worm, and polype, are all composed of structural units of the same character, namely, masses of protoplasm with a nucleus." Lastly, read this :—"The *nettle* arises, as the *man* does, in a mass of nucleated protoplasm!" After such enormous extension of the analogy of the nettle hair on the part of Mr Huxley, I really do not think I have any reason to apologise to him for regarding his description of nettle protoplasm as applicable to protoplasm in general, and for opposing to his expressions in that reference, Stricker's in the same. Mr Huxley, then, must consent to be self-convicted, not only of incautious word-catching here, but of being his own "most amusing example," for, as we have already seen, he appeals to *authorities*, when he might have used *his own eyes*.

Mr Huxley's next stroke of the knife, so far as attempt goes, is:—

"Dr Stirling has not taken the trouble to refer to the original authorities for his history, which is consequently a travesty."

One sees how much the "history" sticks in Mr Huxley's gorge! The authorities I specially name, however, are Rind-fleisch, Kühne, and Stricker; these, surely, are original authorities (though necessarily not all the original authorities in existence), for they have all contributed something (Kühne is about the greatest living name) to the actual march of the science in question; and, surely also, they are, historically, the very strongest authorities that it is possible to mention. These three names I have used as vouchers for the correctness of my narrative; are we to understand that Mr Huxley impugns *them*? Stricker's "Handbuch," to which I "*especially*" refer, is now in English; and all, or all but all, the testimony I can possibly need will be found there. There indeed, *substantially*, is the same history that I have given; shall we understand Mr Huxley to call this "history" a "travesty,"—on the part of "his valued friend, Professor Strieker?" "*Substantially*" I say, and reference to *sources* on my part has been frank from the first. Nevertheless, this "*substantially*" does not wholly deny to me all grounds for complacency in my own *work*, and in regard to facts that were then for the first time communicated to Englishmen. But more, though I referred to these three names only as my supporting authorities for the history in question, that "history" itself, beginning with Hunter, passes through the names of Schleiden, Müller, Brown, Valentin, Schwann, Virchow, Leydig, Bergmann, Haeckel, Dujardin, Remak, and, alluding to Meyen, Siebold, Reichert, Ecker, Henle, Kölliker, Beale, Huxley, and John Goodsir, ends with—to my mind; the three greatest and latest names in this connection—Brücke, Kühne, and Max Schultze. Now, though—and like Mr Huxley, I am *professionally* educated—I cannot profess to have read *all* the works this list indicates (who can?), yet surely, if in view of nothing but said education, I must have read *some* of them,

Surely *I may* have consulted all of them—I ought to add, perhaps. At least it is not usual for one medical brother to deny another the freedom of the guild. Elsewhere, of course, Mr Huxley has so good a right to be proud of his own possession of "a nettle and a microscope," that I cannot resent his denial of "those not rare articles" to me.

and surely these are *the* "original authorities!" On that head I appeal to my own referees, and as to the meagre half-dozen names mentioned by Mr Huxley in his *rival* history, I would not think it desirable to admit

into my own history a single one of them, unless, perhaps, that of Cohn. Mr Huxley opines that "Dr Stirling's method of dealing with the subject is peculiar." I rather think, however, that my reader will now *transfer* the stricture, and wonder at the power of countenance that could lead any man to say "travesty" in such a case.

I have now to thank Mr Huxley for having read my essay "with much interest." Interest on his part in any writing of mine I must hold to be a distinguished compliment. All the more, then, is my regret that "much of it" should remain as "dark" to him as "does the 'Secret of Hegel.'" Perhaps it may be natural in me, with my own progeny before me, to wonder how this should be in either case, but I cannot omit acknowledging the singular *good nature and loyalty* of the reference in the latter of them. Still, somehow, I have that confidence in the excellent faculty of Mr Huxley, that I must think he does himself injustice here. I cannot believe my essay not to have proved sun-clear to him everywhere, unless in the *wee, wee* bit into which the word *idea* entered, for a moment, with a somewhat Hegelian shade. Might I venture to hint, too, that Mr Huxley, if he still honours me with his interest, may find every difficulty in all these references dispelled in the popular statement (only fifteen pages long) of my first lecture on the Philosophy of Law?

I have given my reader the opportunity of seeing for himself every direct word that concerns me in Mr Huxley's essay, and I know but a single indirect one. That, too, I shall not withhold; it is this. The words immediately preceding the direct ones I have extracted, refer to "quite superfluous explosions on the part of some who should have been better informed" (then follow, as already quoted, "Dr Stirling, *for example*," etc.); and perhaps I shall not be wrong in taking this as an intimation on Mr Huxley's part, that I (the "for example") should have been "better informed." Well, it is a consummation always devoutly to be wished; but where, may I be allowed to ask, ought I, in *this* matter, to be "better informed?" That protoplasm, for example, was no longer an infinite variety of different cells, but an indifferent one material, as it were, in web? Well—perhaps so—but how then about the Germans? Really, *where* ought I in *this* matter to be better informed?—but no! I will not press farther this rhetorical hack! I will not as much as speak of Mr Huxley's poetry—of giant Californian pines and Indian figs—no! not even of the "great Finner whale, hugest of beasts that live, or have lived, disporting his eighty or ninety feet of bone, muscle, and blubber, *with easy roll*, among waves in which the stoutest ship that ever left dockyard," etc. Did my reader ever hear of "the great ring-tailed bab-boon from "———But no!—[*unclear*: It] will refrain. Mr Huxley writes always an excellent clear English, and he does not generally yield to the charlatanism" of the platform.

It would probably be now in place for me, as against such serious charges as "travesty" and "utter misrepresentation," to bring forward the counter-testimony of other experts of equal, or perhaps higher, rank than even Mr Huxley. This, too, I will now forego. I will refer only to Beale, Bastian, Gamgee, to Dr John Brown, to Dr Hodge of Princeton; and I will quote, in allusion to my essay, this single sentence from Sir John Herschel:—

"Anything more complete and final in the way of refutation than this Essay, I cannot well imagine."

On the whole, perhaps it would have been as well if Mr Huxley had not found it necessary to say anything more in this matter, whether for "his own," or for or against anybody else. At all events, "travesty" and "utter misrepresentation" return straight home to the nest that hatched them.

In a business reference, perhaps I may be allowed to add that I sincerely apologise to the public for the length of time this little essay (though republished in America) has been kept out of print in Great Britain. That I was not the blameable cause of this admits of an easy explanation. The public, too, will perhaps kindly excuse the augmented price of the present edition in consideration of the increase of matter it contains, as well as of the fact that, at the price put upon it, the first edition did not pay expenses. The very convincing proof of this is that my late very liberal publishers, though they sold an edition of 750 copies in a few months, found it necessary not only to divide nothing, but to apply to me for three-and-fi'pence, which had been expended in postage stamps.

J. Hutchison Stirling.

MARCH, 1872.

As Regards Protoplasm, ETC.

Part I.

THE FIRST (PHYSIOLOGICAL) ISSUE; OR THE "PLUNGE" INTO THE "MATERIALISTIC SLOUGH."

IT is a pleasure to perceive Mr Huxley open his clear little essay with what we may hold, perhaps, to be the manly and orthodox view of the character and products of the French writer, Auguste Comte. "In applying the name of 'the new philosophy' to that estimate of the limits of philosophical inquiry which he" (Professor Huxley), "in common with many other men of science, holds to be just," the Archbishop of York confounds, it seems, this new philosophy with the Positive philosophy of M. Comte; and thereat Mr Huxley expresses himself as greatly astonished. Some of us, for our parts, may be inclined at first to feel astonished at Mr Huxley's astonishment; for the school to which, at least on the philosophical side, Mr Huxley seems to belong, is even notorious for its prostration before Auguste Comte, whom, especially so far as method and systematisation are concerned, it regards as the greatest intellect since Bacon. For such, as it was the opinion of Mr Buckle, is understood to be the opinion also of Messrs Grote, Bain, and Mill. In fact, we may say that such is commonly and currently considered the characteristic and distinctive opinion of that whole perverted or inverted reaction which has been called the *Revulsion*. That is to say, to give this word a moment's explanation, that the Voltaires and Humes and Gibbons having long enjoyed an immunity of sneer at man's blind pride and wretched superstition—at *his* silly non-natural honour and *her* silly non-natural virtue—a reaction had set in, exulting in poetry, in the splendour of nature, the nobleness of man, and the purity of woman, from which reaction again we have, almost within the last decennium, been revulsively, as it were, called back,—shall we say by some "bolder" spirits—the Buckles, the Mills, etc.?—to the old illumination or enlightenment of a hundred years ago, in regard to the weakness and stupidity of man's pretensions over the animality and materiality that limit him. Of this revulsion, then, as said, a main feature, especially in England, has been prostration before the vast bulk of Comte; and so it was that Mr Huxley's protest in this reference, considering the philosophy he professed, had that in it to surprise at first. But if there was surprise, there was also pleasure; for Mr Huxley's estimate of Comte is undoubtedly the right one. "So far as I am concerned," he says, "the most reverend prelate" (the Archbishop of York) "might dialectically hew M. Comte in pieces as a modem Agag, and I should not attempt to stay his hand; for, so far as my study of what specially characterises the Positive philosophy has led me, I find therein little or nothing of any scientific value, and a great deal which is as thoroughly antagonistic to the very essence of science as anything in ultramontane Catholicism." "It was enough," he says again, "to make David Hume turn in his grave, that here, almost within earshot of his house, an instructed audience should have listened without a murmur while his most characteristic doctrines were attributed to a French writer of fifty years' later date, in whose dreary and verbose pages we miss alike the vigour of thought and the exquisite clearness of style of the man whom I make bold to term the most acute thinker of the eighteenth century—even though that century produced Kant."

Of the doctrines themselves which are alluded to here, I shall say nothing now; but of much else that is said, there is only to be expressed a hearty and even gratified approval. I demur, to be sure, to the exaltation of Hume over Kant—high as I place the former. Hume, with infinite fertility, surprised us, it may be said, perhaps, into attention on a great variety of points which had hitherto passed unquestioned; but, even on these points, his success was of an interrupted, scattered, and inconclusive nature. He set the world adrift, but he set man too, reeling and miserable, adrift with it. Kant, again, with gravity and reverence, desired to refix, but in purity and truth, all those relations and institutions which alone give value to existence—which alone *are* humanity, in fact—but which Hume, with levity and mockery, had approached to shake. Kant built up again an entire new world for us of knowledge and duty, and, in a certain way, even belief; whereas Hume had sought to dispossess us of every support that man as man could hope to cling to. In a word, with at *least* equal fertility, Kant was, as compared with Hume, a graver, deeper, and so to speak, a more consecutive, more comprehensive spirit. Graces there were indeed, or even, it may be, subtleties, in which Hume had the advantage perhaps. He is still in England an unsurpassed master of expression—this, certainly, in his History, if in his Essays he somewhat baffles his own self by a certain laboured breadth of conscious fine writing, often singularly inexact and infelicitous. Still Kant, with reference to his products, must be allowed much the greater importance. In the history of philosophy he will probably always command as influential a place in the modern world as Socrates in the ancient; while, as probably, Hume will occupy at best some such position as that of Heraclitus or Protagoras. Hume, nevertheless, if unequal to Kant, must, in view at once of his own subjective ability and his enormous influence, be pronounced one of the most important of writers. It would be difficult to rate too high the value of his French predecessors and contemporaries as regards purification of their oppressed and corrupt country; and Hume must be allowed, though with less call, to have subserved some such function in the land we

live in. In preferring Kant, indeed, I must be acquitted of any undue partiality; for all that appertains to personal bias was naturally, and by reason of early and numerous associations, on the side of my countryman.

Demurring, then, to Mr Huxley's opinion on this matter, and postponing remark on the doctrines to which he alludes, I must express a hearty concurrence with every word he utters on Comte. In him I too "find little or nothing of any scientific value." I too have been lost in the mere mirage and sands of "those dreary and verbose pages;" and I acknowledge in Mr Huxley's every word the ring of a genuine experience. M. Comte was certainly a man of some mathematical and scientific proficiency, as well as of quick but biassed intelligence. A member of the *Aufklärung*, he had seen the immense advance of physical science since Newton, under, as is usually said, the method of Bacon; and, like Hume, like Reid, like Kant, *who had all anticipated him, in this*, he sought to transfer that method to the domain of mind. In this he failed; and though in a sociological aspect he is not without true glances into the present disintegration of society and the conditions of it, anything of importance cannot be claimed for him. There is not a sentence in his book that, in the hollow elaboration and windy pretentiousness of its build, is not an exact type of its own constructor. On the whole, indeed, when we consider the little to which he attained, the empty inflation of his claims, the monstrous and maniacal self-conceit into which he was *exalted*, it may appear, perhaps, that charity to M. Comte himself, to say nothing of the world, should induce us to wish that both his name and his works were buried in oblivion. Now, truly, that Mr Huxley (the "call" being for the moment his) has so pronounced himself, especially as the facts of the case are exactly and absolutely what he indicates, perhaps we may expect this consummation not to be so very long delayed. More than those members of the revulsion already mentioned, one is apt to suspect, will be anxious now to beat a retreat. Not that this, however, is so certain to be allowed them; for their estimate of M. Comte is a valuable element in our estimate of them.

Frankness on the part of Mr Huxley is not limited to his opinion of M. Comte; it accompanies us throughout his whole essay. He seems even to take pride, indeed, in naming always and everywhere his object at the plainest. That object, in a general point of view, relates, he tells us, solely to materialism, but with a double issue. While it is his declared purpose, in the first place, namely, to lead us into materialism, it is equally his declared purpose, in the second place, to lead us out of materialism. On the first issue, for example, he directly warns his audience that to accept the conclusions which he conceives himself to have established on protoplasm, is to accept these also: That "all vital action" is but "the result of the molecular forces" of the physical basis; and that, by consequence, to use his own words to his audience, "the thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them are but the expression of molecular changes in that matter of life which is the source of our other vital phenomena." And, so far, I think, we shall not disagree with Mr Huxley when he says that "most undoubtedly the terms of his propositions are distinctly materialistic." Still, on the second issue, Mr Huxley asserts that he is "individually no materialist." "On the contrary, he believes materialism to involve grave philosophical error;" and the "union of materialistic terminology with the repudiation of materialistic philosophy" he conceives himself to share "with some of the most thoughtful men with whom he is acquainted." In short, to unite both issues, we have it in Mr Huxley's own words, that it is the single object of his essay "to explain how such a union is not only consistent with, but necessitated by, sound logic;" and that, accordingly, he will, in the first place, "lead us through the territory of vital phenomena to the materialistic slough," while pointing out, in the second, "the sole path by which, in his judgment, extrication is possible." Mr Huxley's essay, then, falls evidently into two parts; and of these two parts we may say, further, that while the one—that in which he leads us into materialism—will be predominately physiological, the other—or that in which he leads us out of materialism—will be predominately philosophical. Two corresponding parts would thus seem to be prescribed to any full discussion of the essay; and of these, in the present needs of the world, it is evidently the latter that has the more promising theme. The truth is, however, that Mr Huxley, after having exerted all his strength in his first part to throw us into "the materialistic slough," by *clear necessity of knowledge*, only calls to us, in his second part, cheerily, as it were, to come out of this slough again, on the somewhat *obscure necessity of ignorance*. This, then, is but a lop-sided balance, where a scale in the air only seems to struggle vainly to raise its well-weighted fellow on the ground. Mr Huxley, in fact, possesses no remedy for materialism but what lies in the expression that, while he knows not what matter is in itself, he certainly knows that causality is but contingent succession; and thus, like the so-called "philosophy" of the Revulsion, Mr Huxley would only mock us into the intensest dogmatism on the one side by a fallacious reference to the intensest scepticism on the other.

The present paper, then, will regard mainly Mr Huxley's argument *for* materialism, but say what is required, at the same time, on his alleged argument—which is merely the imaginary, or imaginative, impregnation of ignorance—*against it*

Mr Huxley's own extraordinary charge of "utter misrepresentation" in the above reference, has necessitated (in this edition) the present Part II., in express consideration of what Mr Huxley says "*against*" materialism. This essay is thus now quite too large, as compared with the one that gave rise to it—if quite too small on the

other hand, for the matter (especially philosophical), it attempts in the end to discuss—a matter which has interest, perhaps, beyond Mr Huxley's reference.

Following Mr Huxley's own steps in his essay, the course of his positions will be found to run, in summary, thus :—

What is meant by the physical basis of life is, that there is one kind of matter common to all living beings, and it is named protoplasm. No doubt it may appear at first sight that, in the various kinds of living beings, we have only *difference* before us, as in the lichen on the rock and the painter that paints it,—the microscopic animalcule or fungus and the Finner whale or Indian fig—the flower in the hair of a girl and the blood in her veins, etc. Nevertheless, throughout these and all other diversities, there really exists a threefold *unity*: a unity of faculty, a unity of form, and a unity of substance.

On the first head, for example, or as regards faculty, power, the action exhibited, there are but three categories of *human* activity—contractility, alimentation, and reproduction; and there are no fewer for the *lower* forms of life, whether animal or vegetable. In the nettle, for instance, we find the woody case of its sting lined by a granulated, semi-fluid layer, that is possessed of contractility. But in this respect—that is, in the possession of contractile substance—other plants are as the nettle, and all animals are as plants. Protoplasm—for the nettle-layer alluded to is protoplasm—is common to the whole of them. The difference, in short, between the powers of the lowest plant or animal and those of the highest is one only of degree and not of kind.

But, on the second head, it is not otherwise in form, or external appearance and manifested structure. Not the sting only, but the whole nettle, is made up of protoplasm; and of all the other vegetables the nettle is but a type. Nor are animals different. The colourless blood-corpuscles in man and the rest are identical with the protoplasm of the nettle; and both he and they consisted at first only of an aggregation of such. Protoplasm is the common constituent—the common origin. At last, as at first, all that lives, and every part of all that lives, are but nucleated or unnucleated, modified or unmodified, protoplasm.

But, on the third head, or with reference to unity of substance, to internal composition, chemistry establishes this also. All forms of protoplasm, that is, consist alike of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, and behave similarly under similar reagents.

So, now, a uniform character having in this threefold manner been proved for protoplasm, what is its origin, and what is its fate? Of these the latter is not far to seek. The fate of protoplasm is death—death into its chemical constituents; and this determines its origin also. Protoplasm can originate only in that into which it dies,—the elements—the carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen—of which it was found to consist. Hydrogen, with oxygen, forms water; carbon, with oxygen, carbonic acid; and hydrogen, with nitrogen, ammonia. Similarly, water, carbonic acid, and ammonia form, in union, protoplasm. The influence of pre-existing protoplasm only determines combination in *its* case, as that of the electric spark determines combination in the case of water. Protoplasm, then, is but an aggregate of physical materials, exhibiting in combination—only as was to be expected—new properties. The properties of water are not more different from those of hydrogen and oxygen than the properties of protoplasm are different from those of water, carbonic acid, and ammonia. We have the same warrant to attribute the consequences to the premises in the one case as in the other. If, on the first stage of combination, represented by that of water, *simples* could unite into something so different from themselves, why, on the second stage of combination, represented by that of protoplasm, should not *compounds* similarly unite into something equally different from themselves? If the constituents are credited with the properties *there*, why refuse to credit the constituents with the properties *here*? To the constituents of protoplasm, in truth, any new element, named vitality, has no more been added, than to the constituents of water any new element, named aquosity. Nor is there any logical halting-place between this conclusion and the further and final one: That all vital action whatever, intellectual included, is but the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it.

These sentences will be acknowledged, I think, *at least* fairly to represent Mr Huxley's relative deliverances, and, consequently, as I may be allowed to explain again, the only important—while much the larger—part of the whole essay. Mr Huxley, that is, while devoting fifty paragraphs to our physiological immersion in the "materialistic slough," grants but one-and-twenty towards our philosophical escape from it; the fifty besides being, so to speak, in reality the wind, and the one-and-twenty only the whistle for it. What these latter say, in effect, is no more than this, that—matter being known not in itself but only in its qualities, and cause and effect not in their nexus, but only in their sequence,—matter may be spirit or spirit matter, cause effect or effect cause—in short, for aught that Mr Huxley more than phenomenally knows, this may be that or that this, first second, or second first, but the conclusion shall be this, that he will lay out all our *knowledge* materially, and we may lay out all our *ignorance* immaterially—if we will. Which reasoning and conclusion, I may merely remark, come precisely to this: That Mr Huxley—who, hoping yet to see each object (a pin, say) not in its qualities but in *itself*, still, consistently antithetic, cannot believe in the extinction of fire by water or of life by the rope, for any *reason* or for any *necessity* that lies in the nature of the case, but simply for the habit of

the thing—has not yet put himself at home with the metaphysical categories of *substance* and *causality*; thanks, perhaps, to those guides of his whom we, the amusing Britons that we are, bravely proclaim "the foremost thinkers of the day!"

See note page 21.

The matter and manner of the whole essay are now fairly before us, and I think that, with the approbation of the reader, its procedure, generally, may be described as an attempt to establish, not by any complete and systematic induction, but by a variety of partial and illustrative assertions, two propositions. Of these propositions the first is, That all animal and vegetable organisms are essentially alike in power, in form, and in substance; and the second, That all vital and intellectual functions are the properties of the molecular disposition and changes of the material basis (protoplasm) of which the various animals and vegetables consist. In both propositions, the agent of proof is this same alleged material basis of life, or protoplasm. For the first proposition, all animal and vegetable organisms shall be identified in protoplasm; and for the second, a simple chemical analogy shall assign intellect and vitality to the molecular constituents of the protoplasm, in connection with which they are at least exhibited.

In order, then, to obtain a footing on the ground offered us, the first question we naturally put is, What is Protoplasm? And an answer to this question can be obtained only by a reference to the historical progress of the physiological cell theory.

That theory may be said to have wholly grown up since John Hunter wrote his celebrated work *On the Nature of the Blood*, etc. New growths to Hunter depended on an exudation of the plasma of the blood, in which, by virtue of its own *plasticity*, vessels formed, and conditioned the further progress. The influence of these ideas seems to have still acted, even after a conception of the cell was arrived at. For starting element, Schleiden required an intracellular plasma, and Schwann a structureless exudation, in which minute granules, if not indeed already pre-existent, formed, and by aggregation grew into nuclei, round which singly the production of a membrane at length enclosed a cell. It was then that, in this connection, we heard of the terms blastema and cyto-blastema. The theory of the vegetable cell was completed earlier than that of the animal one. Completion of this latter, again, seems to have been first effected by Schwann, after Müller had insisted on the analogy between animal and vegetable tissue, and Valentin had demonstrated a nucleus in the animal cell, as previously Brown in the vegetable one. But assuming Schwann's labour, and what surrounded it, to have been a first stage, the wonderful ability of Virchow may be said to have raised the theory of the cell fully to a second stage. Now, of this second stage, it is the dissolution or resolution that has led to the emergence of the word Protoplasm.

The body, to Virchow, constituted a free state of individual subjects, with equal rights but unequal capacities. These were the cells, which consisted each of an enclosing membrane, and an enclosed nucleus with surrounding intracellular matrix or matter. These cells, further, propagated themselves, chiefly by partition or division; and the fundamental principle of the whole theory was expressed in the dictum, "*Omnis cellula e cellula*." That is, the nucleus, becoming gradually elongated, at last parted in the midst; and each half, acting as centre of attraction to the surrounding intracellular matrix or contained matter, stood forth as a new nucleus to a new cell, formed by division at length of the original cell.

The first step taken in resolution of this theory was completed by Max Schultze, preceded by Leydig. This was the elimination, on the whole, of an investing membrane. Such membrane may, and does, ultimately form; but in the first instance, for the most part, it appears, the cell is naked. The second step in the resolution belongs perhaps to Brücke, though preceded by Bergmann, and though Max Schultze, Kühne, Haeckel, and others ought to be mentioned in the same connection. This step was the elimination, or at least subordination, of the nucleus. The nucleus, we are to understand now, is necessary, it may be, neither to the division nor to the existence of the cell.

Thus, then, stripped of its membrane, relieved of its nucleus, what now remains for the cell? Why, nothing but what *was* the contained matter, the intracellular matrix, and *is*—Protoplasm.

In the application of this word itself, however, to the element in question, there are also a step or two to be noticed. The first step was Dujardin's discovery of sarcode; and the second the introduction (by Mohl) of the term protoplasm as the name for the layer of the *vegetable* cell that lined the cellulose, and enclosed the nucleus. Sarcode, found in certain of the lower forms of life, was a simple substance that exhibited powers of spontaneous contraction and movement. Thus, processes of such simple, soft, contractile matter are protuded by the rhizopods, and locomotion by their means effected. Remak first extended the use of the term protoplasm from the layer which bore that name in the vegetable cell to the analogous element in the animal cell; but it was Max Schultze, in particular, who, by applying the name to the intracellular matrix, or contained matter, when divested of membrane, and by identifying this substance itself with sarcode, first fairly established protoplasm, name and thing, in its present prominence.

In this account I have necessarily omitted many subordinate and intervening steps in the successive

establishment, apparently, of the *contractility*, superior *importance*, and complete *isolation* of this thing to which, under the name of protoplasm, Mr Huxley of late has called such vast attention, Besides the names mentioned, there are others of great eminence in this connection, such as Meyen, Siebold, Reichert, Ecker, Henle, and Kölliker among the Germans; and among ourselves, Beale and Huxley himself. John Goodsir will be mentioned again.

We have now, perhaps, obtained a general idea of protoplasm. Brücke, when he talks of it as "living cell-body or elementary organism," comes very near the leading idea of Mr Huxley as expressed in his phrase, "the physiological basis, or matter, of life." Living cell-body, elementary organism, primitive living matter—that, evidently, is the quest of Mr Huxley. There is aqueous matter, he would say, perhaps, composed of hydrogen and oxygen, and it is the same thing whether in the rain-drop or the ocean; so, similarly, there is vital matter, which, composed of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, is the same thing whether in cryptogams or in elephants, in animalcules or in men. What, in fact, Mr Huxley seeks, probably, is living protein—protein, so to speak, struck into life. Just such appears to him to be the nature of protoplasm, and in it he believes himself to possess at last *a living clay* wherewith to build the whole organic world.

The question, What is Protoplasm? is answered, then; but, for the understanding of what is to follow, there is still one general consideration to be premised.

Mr Huxley's conception of protoplasm, as we have seen, is that of living matter, living protein; what we may call, perhaps, elementary life-stuff. Now, is it quite certain that Mr Huxley is correct in this conception? Are we to understand, for example, that cells have now definitively vanished, and left in their place only a uniform and universal *matter* of quite indefinite proportions? No; such an understanding would be quite wrong. Whatever may be the opinion of the adherents of the molecular theory of generation (namely, that physical molecules combine of themselves into living organisms), it is certain that all the great German histologists still hold by the cell, and can hardly open their mouths without mention of it. I do not allude here to any special adherents of either nucleus or membrane, but to the most advanced innovators in both respects; to such men as Schultze and Brücke and Kühne. These, as we have seen, pretty well confine their attention, like Mr Huxley, to the protoplasm. But they do not the less on that account talk of the cell. For them, it is only in cells that protoplasm exists. To their view, we cannot fancy protoplasm as so much matter in a pot, in an ointment-box, any portion of which scooped out in an ear-picker would be so much life-stuff, and, though a part, quite as good as the whole. This seems to be Mr Huxley's conception, but it is not theirs. A certain *measure* goes with protoplasm to constitute it an organism to them, and worthy of their attention. They refuse to give consideration to any mere protoplasm-shred that may not have yet ceased, perhaps, to exhibit all sign of contractility under the microscope, and demand a protoplasm-cell. In short, protoplasm is to them still distributed in cells, and only that measure of protoplasm is cell that is adequate to the whole group of vital manifestations. Brücke, for example, of all innovators probably the most innovating, and denying, or inclined to deny, both nucleus and membrane, does not hesitate, according to Stricker, to speak still of cells as self-complete organisms, that move and grow, that nourish and reproduce themselves, and that perform specific function. "Omnis cellula e cellula," is the rubric they work under as much now as ever. The heart of a turtle, they say, is not a turtle; so neither is a protoplasm-shred a protoplasm-cell.

This, then, is the general consideration which I think it necessary to premise; and it seems, almost of itself, to negate Mr Huxley's reasonings in advance, for it warrants us in denying that physiological clay of which all living things are but bricks baked, Mr Huxley intimates, and in establishing in its place cells as before—living cells that differ infinitely the one from the other, and so differ from the very first moment of their existence. This consideration shall not be allowed to pretermite, however, an examination of Mr Huxley's own proofs, which will only the more and more avail to indicate the difference suggested.

These proofs, as has been said, would, by means of the single fulcrum of protoplasm, establish first, the identity, and second, the materiality of all life, whether vegetable or animal. These are, shortly, the two propositions which we have already seen, and to which, in their order, we now pass.

All organisms then, whether animal or vegetable, have been understood for some time back to originate in and consist of cells; but the progress of physiology has *seemed* now to substitute for cells a single matter of life, protoplasm; and it is here that Mr Huxley, rather too precipitately, perhaps, sees his cue. Mr Huxley's very first word is the "physical basis or matter of life;" and he supposes (in his advanced knowledge), "that to many the idea that there is such a thing may be novel." This then, so far, is, though a misunderstanding, what is *new* in Mr Huxley's contribution. He seems to have said to himself, if formerly the whole world was thought kin in an "ideal" or formal element, organisation, I shall now, by (supposed) aid of the Germans, finally complete this identification in a "physical" or material element, protoplasm. In short, what at this stage we are asked to witness in the essay is, the identification of all living beings whatever in the identity of protoplasm. As there is a single matter, clay, which is the matter of all bricks, so there is a single matter, protoplasm, which is the matter of all organisms. "Protoplasm is the clay of the potter, which, bake it and paint it as he will, remains

clay, separated by artifice, and not by nature, from the commonest brick or sun-dried clod." Now here I cannot help stopping a moment to remark that Mr Huxley puts emphatically his whole soul into this sentence, and evidently believes it to be, if we may use the word, a *clincher*. But, after all, does it say much? or rather, does it say anything? To the question, "Of what are you made?" the answer, for a long time now, and by the great mass of human beings who are supposed civilised, has been "Dust." Dust, and the same dust, has been allowed to constitute us all. But materialism has not on that account been the irresistible result. Attention hitherto—and surely excusably, or even laudably in such a case—has been given not so much to the dust as to the "potter," and the "artifice" by which he could so transform, or, as Mr Huxley will have it, *modify* it. To ask us to say clay, or even protoplasm, instead of dust, is not to ask us for much, then, seeing that even to Mr Huxley there still remain both the "potter" and his "artifice."

But to return: To Mr Huxley, when he says all bricks, being made of clay, are the same thing, we answer, Yes, undoubtedly, if they are made of the same clay. That is, the bricks are identical if the clay is identical; but, on the other hand, by as much as the clay differs wall the bricks differ. And, similarly, all organisms can be identified only if their composing proto-plasm can be identified. To this stake is the argument of Mr Huxley tied.

This argument itself takes, as we have seen, a threefold course: Mr Huxley will prove his position in this place by reference, firstly, to unity of faculty; secondly, to unity of form; and thirdly, to unity of substance. It is this course of proof, then, which we have now to follow, but taking the question of substance, as simplest, first, and the others later.

By substance, Mr Huxley understands the internal or chemical composition; and, with a mere reference to the action of reagents, he asserts the protoplasm of all living beings to be an identical combination of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. It is for us to ask, then, Are all samples of protoplasm identical first, in their chemical composition, and, second, under the action of the various reagents?

On the first clause, we may say, in the first place, towards a proof of difference which will only cumulate, I hope, that, even should we grant in all protoplasm an identity of chemical ingredients, what is called *Allotropy* may still have introduced no inconsiderable variety. Ozone is not antozone, nor is oxygen either, though in chemical constitution all are alike. In the second place, again, we may say that, with *varying proportions*, the same component parts produce very various results. By way of illustration, it will suffice to refer to such different things as the proteids, gluten, albumen, fibrin, gelatine, &c., compared with the urinary products, urea and uric acid; or with the biliary products, glyocol, glyocholic acid, bili-rubin, bili-verdin, &c.; and yet all these substances, varying so much the one from the other, are, as protoplasm is, compounds of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. But, in the third place, we are not limited to a *may say*; we can assert the fact that all protoplasm is not chemically identical. All the tissues of the organism are called protoplasm by Mr Huxley; but can we predicate chemical identity of muscle and bone, for example? In such cases Mr Huxley, it is true, may bring the word "modified" into use; but the objection of modification we shall examine later. In the meantime, we are justified, by Mr Huxley's very argument, in regarding all organised tissues whatever as protoplasm; for if these tissues are not to be identified in protoplasm, we must suppose denied what it was his one business to affirm. And it is against that affirmation that we point to the fact of much chemical difference obtaining among the tissues, not only in the *proportions* of their fundamental elements, but also in the *addition* (and proportions as well) of such others as chlorine, sulphur, phosphorus, potass, soda, lime, magnesia, iron, etc. Vast differences vitally must be legitimately assumed for tissues that are so different chemically. But, in the fourth place, we have the authority of the Germans for asserting that the cells themselves—and they now, to the most advanced, are only protoplasm—do differ chemically, some being found to contain glycogen, some Cholesterine, some protagon, and some myosin. Now such substances, let the chemical analogy be what it may, must still be allowed to introduce chemical difference. In the last place, Mr Huxley's analysis is an analysis of *dead* protoplasm, and indecisive, consequently, for that which lives. Mr Huxley betrays sensitiveness in advance to this objection; for he seeks to rise above both sensitiveness and objection at once by styling the latter "frivolous." Nevertheless the Germans say pointedly that it is unknown whether the same elements are to be referred to the cells after as before death. Kühne does not consider it proved that living muscle contains syntonin; yet Mr Huxley tells us, in his Physiology, that "syntonin is the chief constituent of muscle and flesh." In general, we may say, according to Stricker, that all weight is put now on the examination of living tissue, and that the difference is fully allowed between that and dead tissue.

On the second clause now, or with regard to the action of reagents, these must be denied to produce the like result on the various forms of protoplasm. With reference to temperature, for example, Kühne reports the movements of the amoeba to be arrested in iced water; while, in the same medium, the ova of the trout furrow famously, but perish even in a warmed room. Others, again, we are told, may be actually dried, and yet live. Of ova in general, in this connection, it is said that they live or die according as the temperature to which they are exposed differs little or much from that which is natural to the organisms producing them. In some, according

to Max Schultze, even distilled water is enough to arrest movement. Now, not to dwell longer here, both amoeba and ova are to Mr Huxley pure protoplasm; and such difference of result, according to difference of temperature, etc., must assuredly be allowed to point to a difference of original nature. Any conclusion so far, then, in regard to unity of substance, whether the chemical composition or the action of reagents be considered, cannot be said to bear out the views of Mr Huxley.

What now of the unities of form and power in protoplasm? By form, Mr Huxley will be found to mean the general appearance and structure; and by faculty or power, the action exhibited. Now it will be very easy to prove that, in neither respect, do all specimens of protoplasm agree. Mr Huxley's representative protoplasm, it appears, is that of the nettle-sting; and he describes it as a granulated, semi-fluid body, contractile in mass, and contractile also in detail to the development of a species of circulation. Stricker, again, speaks of it as a homogeneous substance, in which any granules that may appear must be considered of foreign importation, and in which there are no evidences of circulation. In this last respect, then, that Mr Huxley should talk of "tiny Maelstroms," such as even in the silence of a tropical noon might stun us, if heard, as "with the roar of a great city," may be viewed, perhaps, as a rise into poetry—beyond the occasion.

Further, according to Stricker, protoplasm varies almost infinitely in consistence, in shape, in structure, and in function. In consistence, it is sometimes so fluid as to be capable of forming in drops; sometimes semi-fluid and gelatinous; sometimes of considerable resistance. In shape—for to Stricker the cells are now protoplasm—we have club-shaped protoplasm, globe-shaped protoplasm, cup-shaped protoplasm, bottle-shaped protoplasm—spindle-shaped protoplasm—branched, threaded, ciliated protoplasm—circle-headed protoplasm—flat, conical, cylindrical, longitudinal, prismatic, polyhedral, and palisade-like protoplasm. In structure, again, it is sometimes uniform and sometimes reticulated into interspaces that contain fluid. In function, lastly—and here we have entered on the consideration of faculty or power—some protoplasm is vagrant (so to translate *wandernd*), and of unknown use, like the colourless blood-corpuscles.—

(In reference to these, as strengthening the argument, and throwing much light generally, I break off a moment to say that, very interesting as they are in themselves, and as Recklinghausen, in especial, has made them, Mr Huxley's theory of them disagrees considerably with the prevalent German one. He speaks of them as the source of the body in general, yet, in his Physiology, he talks of the spleen, the lymphatics, and even the liver—*parts* of the body—as *their* source. They are so few in number that, while Mr Huxley is thankful to be able to point to the inside of the lips as a seat for them, they bear to the red corpuscles only the proportion of 1 to 450. This disproportion, however, is no bar to Mr Huxley's derivation of the latter from the former. But the fact is questioned. The Germans, generally, for their part, describe the colourless, or vagrant, blood-corpuscles as probably media of conjugation or reparation, but acknowledge their function to be as yet quite unknown; while Rindfleisch, characterising the spleen as the grave of the red, and the womb of the white, corpuscles, evidently refers the latter to the former. This, indeed, is a matter of direct assertion with Preyer, who has "shown that pieces of red blood-corpuscles may be eaten by the amoeboid cells of the frog," and holds that the latter (the white corpuscles) proceed directly from the former (the red corpuscles); so that it seems to be determined in the meantime that there is no proof of the reverse being the fact).

—In function, then, to resume, some protoplasm is vagrant, and of unknown use. Some again produces pepsine, and some fat. Some at least contains pigment. Then there is nerve-protoplasm, brain-protoplasm, bone-protoplasm, muscle-protoplasm, and protoplasm of all the other tissues, no one of which but produces only its own kind, and is uninterchangeable with the rest. Lastly, on this head, we have to point to the overwhelming fact that there is the infinitely different protoplasm of the various infinitely different plants and animals, in each of which its own protoplasm, as in the case of that of the various tissues, but produces its own kind, and is uninterchangeable with that of the rest.

It may be objected, indeed, that these latter are examples of modified protoplasm. The objection of modification, as said, we have to see by itself later; but, in the meantime, it may be asked, Where are we to begin, *not* to have modified protoplasm? We have the example of Mr Huxley himself, who, in the nettle-sting, begins already with modified protoplasm; and we have the authority of Rindfleisch for asserting that "in every different tissue we must look for a different initial term of the productive series." This, evidently, is a very strong light on the original multiplicity of protoplasm, which the consideration, as we have seen, of the various plants and animals, has made, further, infinite. This is enough; but there is no wish to evade beginning with the very beginning—with absolutely pure initial protoplasm, if it can but be given us in any reference. The simple egg—that, probably, is the beginning—that, probably, is the original identity; yet even there we find already distribution of the identity into infinite difference. This, certainly, with reference to the various organisms, but with reference also to the various tissues. That we regard the egg as the beginning, and that we do not start, like the smaller exceptional physiological school, with molecules themselves, and the assumption of their spontaneous combination into organised life, depends on this, that the great Germans so often alluded to, Kühne

among them, still trust in the experiments of Pasteur; and while they do not deny the possibility, or even the fact, of molecular generation, still feel justified in denying the existence of any observation that yet unassailably attests a *generatio æquivoca* (the production of life without preceding life). By such authority as this the simple philosophical spectator has no choice but to take his stand; and therefore it is that I assume the egg as the established beginning, so far, of all vegetable and animal organisms. To the egg, too, as the beginning, Mr Huxley, though the lining of the nettle-sting is his representative protoplasm, at least refers. "In the earliest condition of the human organism," he says, in allusion to the white (vagrant) corpuscles of the blood, "in that state in which it has but just become distinguished from the egg in which it arises, it is nothing but an aggregation of such corpuscles, and every organ of the body was once no more than such an aggregation." Now, in beginning with the egg—an absolute beginning being denied us in consequence of the pre-existent infinite difference of the egg or eggs themselves—we may gather from the German physiologists some such account of the actual facts as this.

The first change signalled in the impregnated egg seems that of *Furchung*, or furrowing—what the Germans call the *Furchungskugeln*, the *Dotterkugeln*, form. Then these *Kugeln*—clumps, eminences, monticles, we may translate the word—break into cells; and these are the cells of the embryo. Mr Huxley, as quoted, refers to the whole body, and every organ of the body, as at first but an aggregation of colourless blood-corpuscles; but in the very statement which would render the identity alone explicit, the difference is quite as plainly implicit. As much as this lies in the word "organs," to say nothing of "human." The cells of the "organs," to which he refers, are even then uninterchangeable, and produce but themselves. The Germans tell us of the *Keimblatt*, the germ-leaf, in which all these organs originate. This *Blatt*, or leaf, is threefold, it seems; but even these folds are not indifferent. The various cells have their distinct places in them from the first. While what in this connection are called the epithelial and endothelial tissues spring respectively from the *upper* and *under* leaf, connective tissues, with muscle and blood, spring from the *middle* one. Surely in such facts we have a perfect warrant to assert the initial non-identity of protoplasm, and to insist on this, that, from the very earliest moment—even literally *ab ovo*—brain-cells only generate brain-cells, bone-cells, bone-cells, and so on.

These considerations on function all concern faculty or power; but we have to notice now that the characteristic and fundamental form of power is to Mr Huxley *contractility*. He even quotes Goethe in proof of contractility being the main power or faculty of *Man!* Nevertheless it is to be said at once that, while there are differences in what protoplasm *is* contractile, all protoplasm is not contractile, nor dependent on contractility for its functions. In the former respect, for example, muscle, while it is the contractile tissue special, is also to Mr Huxley protoplasm; yet Strieker asserts the inner construction of the contractile substance, of which muscle-fibre virtually consists, to be essentially different from contractile protoplasm. Here, then, we have the contractile *substance* proper "essentially different" from the contractile *source* proper. In the latter respect, again, we shall not call in the uncontractile substances which Mr Huxley himself denominates protoplasm—bread, namely, roast mutton, and boiled lobster; but we may ask where—even in the case of a living body;—is the contractility of white of egg? In this reference, too, we may remark that Kühne, who divides the protoplasm of the epidermis into three classes, has been unable to distinguish contractility in his own third class. Lastly, where, in relation to the protoplasm of the nervous system, is there evidence of its contractility? Has any one pretended that thought is but the contraction of the brain; or is it by contraction that the very nerves operate contraction—the nerves that supply muscles, namely? Mr Huxley himself, in his *Physiology*, describes nervous action very differently. There *conduction* is spoken of without a hint of contraction. Of the higher faculties of man I have to speak again; but let us just ask where, in the case of any pure sensation—smell, taste, touch, sound, colour—is there proof of any contraction? Are we to suppose that between the physical cause of heat without and the mental sensation of heat within, contraction is anywhere interpolated? Generally, in conclusion here, while reminding of Virchow's testimony to the inherent inequalities of cell-capacity, let us but, on the question of faculty, contrast the kidney and the brain, even as these organs are viewed by Mr Huxley. To him the one is but a sieve for the extrusion of refuse: the other thinks Newton's 'Principia' and Iliads of Homer.

Probably, then, in regard to any continuity in protoplasm of power, of form, or of substance, we have seen *lacunæ* enow. Nay, Mr Huxley himself can be adduced in evidence on the same side. Not rarely do we find in his essay admissions of *probability* where it is *certainty* that is alone in place. He says, for example, "It is more than probable that *when* the vegetable world *is* thoroughly explored we *shall* find all plants in possession of the same powers." When a conclusion is decidedly announced, it is rather disappointing to be told, as here, that the premises are still to collect. "*So far*," he says again, "as the conditions of the manifestations of the phenomena of contractility have *yet* been studied." Now, such a *so far* need not be *very far*; and we may confess in passing, that from Mr Huxley the phrase, "the conditions of the *manifestations* of the *phenomena*," grates. We hear again that it is "the rule *rather* than the exception," or that "weighty authorities have *suggested*" that such and such things "probably occur," or, while contemplating the nettle-sting, that such "*possible* complexity" in other cases

"dawns upon one." On other occasions he expresses himself to the effect that "perhaps it would not yet be safe to say that *all* forms," etc. Nay, not only does he directly *say* that "it is by no means his intention to suggest that there is no difference between the lowest plant and the highest, or between plants and animals." but he directly proves what he says, for he demonstrates in plants and animals an *essential difference of power*. Plants *can* assimilate inorganic matters, animals *can not*, etc. Again, here is a passage in which he is seen to cut his own "*basis*" from beneath his own feet. After telling us that all forms of protoplasm consist of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen "in very complex union," he continues, "To this complex combination, *the nature of which has never been determined with exactness*, the name of protein has been applied." This, plainly, is an identification, on Mr Huxley's own part, of protoplasm and protein; and what is said of the one being necessarily true of the other, it follows that Mr Huxley admits the nature of protoplasm never to have been determined with exactness, and that, even in his eyes, the *lis* is still *sub judice*. This admission is strengthened by the words, too, "If we use this term "(protein)" with such *caution* as may properly arise out of our *comparative ignorance* of the things for which it stands;" which entitle us to demand, in consequence "of our comparative ignorance of the things for which it stands," "*caution*" in the use of the term protoplasm. In such a state of the case we cannot wonder that Mr Huxley's own conclusion here is: Therefore "all living matter is more or less albuminoid." All living matter is more or less albuminoid. That, indeed, is the single conclusion of Mr Huxley's whole industry; but it is a conclusion that, far from requiring the intervention of protoplasm, had been reached long before the word itself had been, in this connection, used.

It is in this way, then, that Mr Huxley can be adduced in refutation of himself; and I think his resort to an epigram of Goethe's for reduction of the powers of man to those of contraction, digestion, and reproduction, can be regarded as an admission to the same effect. The epigram runs thus:—

*"Warum treibt sich das Volk so, und schreit? Es will sich ernähren,
Kinder zeugen, und die nähren so gut es vermag.
Weiter bringt es kein Mensch, stell' er sich wie er auch will"*

That means, quite literally translated, "Why do the folks make such a pother and stir? They want to feed themselves, get children, and then feed them as best they can; no man does more, let him do as he may." This, really, is Mr Huxley's sole proof for his classification of the powers of man. Is it sufficient? Does it not apply rather to the birds of the air, the fish of the sea, and the beasts of the field, than to man? Did Newton only feed himself, beget children, and then feed them? Was it impossible for him to do any more, let him do as he might? And what we ask of Newton we may ask of all the rest. To elevate, therefore, the passing whim of mere literary *Laune* into a cosmical axiom and a proof in place—this we cannot help adding to the other productions here in which Mr Huxley appears against himself.

But were it impossible either for him or us to point to these *lacunæ*, it would still be our right and our duty to refer to the present conditions of microscopic science in *general* as well as in *particular*, and to demur to the erection of its *dicta*, constituted as they yet are, into established columns and buttresses in support of any theory of life, material or other.

The most delicate and dubious of all the sciences, it is also the youngest. In its manipulations the slightest change may operate as a destructive drought, or an equally destructive deluge. Its very tools may positively create the structure it actually examines. The present state of the science, and what warrant it gives Mr Huxley to dogmatise on protoplasm, we may understand from this avowal of Kühne's: "To-day we believe that we see" such or such fact, "but know not that further improvements in the means of observation will not reveal what is assumed for certainty to be only illusion," With such authority to lean on—and it is the highest we can have—we may be allowed to entertain the conjecture, that it is just possible that some certainties, even of Mr Huxley, may yet reveal themselves as illusions.

But, in resistance to any sweeping conclusions built on it, we are not confined to a reference to the imperfections involved in the very nature and epoch of the science itself in *general*. With yet greater assurance of carrying conviction with us, we may point in *particular* to the actual opinions of its present professors. We have seen already, in the consideration premised, that Mr Huxley's hypothesis of a protoplasm *matter* is unsupported, even by the most innovating Germans, who as yet will not advance, the most advanced of them, beyond a protoplasm-cell; and that his whole argument is thus sapped in advance. But what threatens more absolute extinction of this argument still, *all* the German physiologists do *not* accept even the *protoplasm-cell*. Rindfleisch, for example, in his recently published "Lehrbuch der pathologischen Gewebelehre," speaks of the cell very much as we understand Virchow to have spoken of it. To him there is in the cell not only protoplasm but nucleus, and perhaps membrane as well. To him, too, the cell propagates itself quite as we have been hitherto fancying it to do, by division of the nucleus, increase of the protoplasm, and ultimate partition of the

cell itself. Yet he knows withal of the opinions of others, and accepts them in a manner. He mentions Kühne's account of the membrane as at first but a mere physical limit of two fluids—a mere peripheral film or curdling; still he assumes a formal and decided membrane at last. Even Leydig and Schultze, who shall be the express eliminators of the membrane—the one by initiation and the other by consummation—confess that, as regards the cells of certain tissues, they have never been able to detect in them the absence of a membrane.

As regards the nucleus again, the case is very much stronger. When we have admitted with Brücke that certain cryptogam cells, with Haeckel that certain protists, with Cienkowsky that two monads, and with Schultze that one amoeba, are without nucleus—when we have admitted that division of the cell *may* take place without implicating that of the nucleus—that the movements of the nucleus *may* be passive and due to those of the protoplasm—that Baer and Stricker demonstrate the disappearance of the original nucleus in the impregnated egg,—when we have admitted this, we have admitted also all that can be said in degradation of the nucleus. Even those who say all this, still attribute to the nucleus an important and unknown *rôle*, and describe the formation in the impregnated egg of a new nucleus; while there are others again who resist every attempt to degrade it. Böttcher asserts movement for the nucleus, even when wholly removed from the cell; Neumann points to such movement in dead or dying cells; and there is other testimony to a like effect, as well as to peculiarities of the nucleus otherwise that indicate spontaneity. In this reference, we may allude to the weighty opinion of the late Professor Goodsir, who anticipated in so remarkable a manner certain of the determinations of Virchow. Goodsir, in that anticipation, wonderfully rich and ingenious as he is everywhere, is perhaps nowhere more interesting and successful than in what concerns the nucleus. Of the whole cell, the nucleus is to him, as it was to Schleiden, Schwann, and others, the most important element. And this is the view to which I, who have little business to speak, wish success. This universe is not an accidental cavity, in which an accidental dust has been accidentally swept into heaps for the accidental evolution of the majestic spectacle of organic and inorganic life. That majestic spectacle is a spectacle as plainly for the eye of reason as any diagram of mathematic. That majestic spectacle could have been constructed, *was* constructed, only in reason, for reason, and by reason. From beyond Orion and the Pleiades, across the green hem of earth, up to the imperial personality of man, all, the furthest, the deadest, the dustiest, is for fusion in the invisible point of the single Ego—*which alone glorifies it*. For the subject, and on the model of the subject, all is made. Therefore it is that—though precisely as there are acephalous monsters by way of exception and deformity, there may be also at the very extremity of animated existence cells without a nucleus—I cannot help believing that this nucleus itself, as analogue of the subject, will yet be proved the most important and indispensable of all the normal cell elements. Even the phenomena of the impregnated egg seem to me to support this view. In the egg, on impregnation, it seems to me natural (I say it with a smile) that the old sun that ruled it should go down, and that a new sun, stronger in the combination of the new and the old, should ascend into its place!

Be these things as they may, we have now overwhelming evidence before us for concluding, with reference to Mr Huxley's first proposition, that—in view of the nature of microscopic science—in view of the state of belief that obtains at present as regards nucleus, membrane, and entire cell—even in view of the supporters of protoplasm itself—Mr Huxley is not authorised to speak of a physical matter of life; which, for the rest, if granted, would, for innumerable and, as it appears to me, irrefragable reasons, be obliged to acknowledge for itself, not identity, but an infinite diversity in power, in form, and in substance.

So much for the first proposition in Mr Huxley's essay, or that which concerns protoplasm, as a supposed matter of life, identical itself, and involving the identity of all the various organs and organisms which it is assumed to compose. What now of the second proposition, or that which concerns the materiality at once of protoplasm, and of all that is conceived to derive from protoplasm? In other words, though, so to speak, for organic bricks anything like an organic clay still awaits the proof, I ask, if the bricks are not the same, because the clay is not the same, what if the materiality of the former is equally unsupported by the materiality of the latter? Or what if the functions of protoplasm are not the properties of its mere molecular constitution?

For this is Mr Huxley's second proposition, namely, That all vital and intellectual functions are but the properties of the molecular disposition and changes of the material basis (protoplasm) of which the various animals and vegetables consist. With the conclusions now before us, it is evident that to enter at all on this part of Mr Huxley's argumentation is, so far as we are concerned, only a matter of grace. In order that it should have any weight, we must grant the fact, at once of the existence of a matter of life, and of all organs and organisms being but aggregates of it. This, obviously, we cannot now do. By way of hypothesis, however, we may assume it. Let it be granted, then, that *pro hue vice* there *is* a physical basis of life with all the consequences named; and now let us see how Mr Huxley proceeds to establish its materiality.

The whole former part of Mr Huxley's essay consists (as said) of fifty paragraphs, and the argument immediately concerned is confined to the latter ten of them. This argument (see also p. 22) is the simple chemical analogy that, under stimulus of an electric spark, hydrogen and oxygen uniting into an equivalent weight of water, and, under stimulus of pre-existing protoplasm, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen

uniting into an equivalent weight of protoplasm, there is the same warrant for attributing the properties of the consequent to the properties of the antecedents in the latter case as in the former. The properties of protoplasm are, in origin and character, precisely on the same level as the properties of water. The cases are perfectly parallel. It is as absurd to attribute a new entity vitality to protoplasm, as a new entity aqueosity to water. Or, if it is by its mere chemical and physical structure that water exhibits certain properties called aqueous, it is also by its mere chemical and physical structure that protoplasm exhibits certain properties called vital. All that is necessary in either case is, "under certain conditions," to bring the chemical constituents together. If water is a molecular complication, protoplasm is equally a molecular complication, and for the description of the one or the other there is no change of language required. A new substance with new qualities results in precisely the same way here, as a new substance with new qualities there; and the derivative qualities are not more different from the primitive qualities in the one instance, than the derivative qualities are different from the primitive qualities in the other. Lastly, the *modus operandi* of pre-existent protoplasm is not more unintelligible than that of the electric spark. The conclusion is irresistible, then, that all protoplasm being reciprocally convertible, and consequently identical, the properties it displays, vitality and intellect included, are as much the result of molecular constitution as those of water itself.

It is evident, then, that the fulcrum on which Mr Huxley's second proposition rests, is a single inference from a chemical analogy. Analogy, however, being never identity, is apt to betray. The difference it hides may be essential, that is, while the likeness it shows may be inessential—so far as the conclusion is concerned. That this mischance has overtaken Mr Huxley here, it will, I fancy, not be difficult to demonstrate.

The analogy to which Mr Huxley trusts has two references: one to chemical composition, and one to a certain stimulus that determines it. As regards chemical composition, we are asked, by virtue of the analogy obtaining, to identify, as equally simple instances of it, protoplasm here and water there; and, as regards the stimulus in question, we are asked to admit the action of the electric spark in the one case to be quite analogous to the action of pre-existing protoplasm in the other. In both references I shall endeavour to point out that the analogy fails; or, as we may say it also, that, even to Mr Huxley, it can only seem to succeed by discounting the elements of difference that still subsist.

To begin with chemical combination, it is not unjust to demand that the analogy which must be admitted to exist in that, and a general physical respect, should not be strained beyond its legitimate limits. Protoplasm cannot be denied to be a chemical substance; protoplasm cannot be denied to be a physical substance. As a compound of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, it comports itself chemically—at least in ultimate instance—in a manner not essentially different from that in which water, as a compound of hydrogen and oxygen, comports itself chemically. In mere physical aspect, again, it may count quality for quality with water in the same aspect. In short, so far as it is on chemical and physical structure that the possession of distinctive properties in any case depends, both bodies may be allowed to be pretty well on a par. The analogy must be allowed to hold so far; so far but no farther. One step farther and we see not only that protoplasm has, like water, a chemical and physical structure; but that, unlike water, it has also an organised or organic structure. Now this, on the part of protoplasm, is a possession in excess; and with relation to that excess there can be no grounds for analogy. This, perhaps, is what Mr Huxley has omitted to consider. When insisting on attributing to protoplasm the qualities it possessed, because of its chemical and physical structure, if it was for chemical and physical structure that we attributed to water *its* qualities, he has simply forgotten the addition to protoplasm of a third structure that can only be named organic. "If the phenomena exhibited by water are its properties, so are those presented by protoplasm, living or dead, its properties." When Mr Huxley speaks thus, Exactly so, we may answer: "living or dead"—organic or inorganic! That alternative is simply slipped in and passed; but it is in that alternative that the whole matter lies. Chemically, dead protoplasm is to Mr Huxley quite as good as living protoplasm. As a sample of the article, he is quite content with dead protoplasm, and even swallows it, he says, in the shape of bread, lobster, mutton, etc., with all the satisfactory results to be desired. We shall not grudge Mr Huxley his bread, his lobster, or his mutton. Still, as concerns the argument, it must be pointed out that it is only these that (as inorganic) can be placed on the same level as water; and that living protoplasm is not only unlike water, but it is unlike dead protoplasm. Living protoplasm, namely, is identical with dead protoplasm only so far as its chemistry is concerned (if even so far as that); and it is quite evident, consequently, that difference between the two cannot depend on that in which they are identical—cannot depend on the chemistry. Life, then, is no affair of chemical and physical structure, and must find its explanation in something else. It is thus that, lifted high enough, the light of the analogy between water and protoplasm is seen to go out. Water, in fact, when formed from hydrogen and oxygen, is, in a certain way, and in relation to them, no new product; it has still, like them, only chemical and physical qualities; it is still, as they are, inorganic. So far as *kind* of power is concerned, they are still on the same level. But not so protoplasm, where, with preservation of the chemical and physical likeness, there is the addition of the unlikeness of life, of organisation, and of ideas. But the addition is a new world—a new and higher world, the world of a

self-realising thought, the world of an *entelechy*. The change of language objected to by Mr Huxley is thus a matter of necessity, for it is *not* mere molecular complication that we have any longer before us, and the qualities of the derivative are essentially and absolutely different from the qualities of the primitive. If we did invent the term aquosity, then, as an abstract sign for all the qualities of water, we should really do very little harm; but aquosity and vitality would still remain essentially unlike. While for the invention of aquosity there is little or no call, however, the fact in the other case is that we are not only compelled to invent, but to *perceive* vitality. We are quite willing to do as Mr Huxley would have us to do: look on, watch the phenomena, and name the results. But just in proportion to our faithfulness in these respects is the necessity for the recognition of a new world and a new nomenclature. It is possible, certainly, to object that there are different *states* of water, as ice and steam. But the relation of the solid to the liquid, or of either to the vapour, surely offers no analogy to the relation of protoplasm dead to protoplasm alive. That relation is not an analogy but an antithesis. The antithesis of antitheses. In it, in fact, we are in presence of the one incommunicable gulf—the gulf of all gulfs—that gulf which Mr Huxley's protoplasm is as powerless to efface as any other material expedient that has ever been suggested since the eyes of men first looked into it—the mighty gulf between death and life.

The differences alluded to (they are, in order, 1, organisation and life, 2, the objective idea—design, and 3, the subjective idea—thought), it may be remarked, are admitted by those very Germans to whom protoplasm, name and tiling, is due. They, the most advanced and innovating of them, directly avow that there is present in the cell "an architectonic principle that has not yet been detected." In pronouncing protoplasm capable of active or vital movements, they do by that refer, they admit also, to an immaterial force, and they ascribe the processes exhibited by protoplasm—in so many words—not to the molecules, but to organisation and life. It is pointed out by Kant generally, that the reason of the specific mode of existence of every part of a living body lies in the whole, whilst with dead masses each part bears this reason within itself; and this indeed is how the two worlds are differentiated. A drop of water, once formed, is there passive for ever, susceptible to influence, but indifferent to influence, and what influence reaches it is wholly from without. It may be added to, it may be subtracted from; but infinitely apathetic quantitatively, it is qualitatively independent. It is indifferent to its own physical parts. It is without contractility, without alimentation, without reproduction, without specific function. Not so the cell, in which the parts are dependent on the whole, and the whole on the parts; which has its activity and *raison d'être* within; which manifests all the powers which we have described water to want; and which requires for its continuance conditions of which water is independent. It is only so far as organisation and life are concerned, however, that the cell is thus different from water. Chemically and physically, as said, it can show with it quality for quality. How strangely Mr Huxley's deliverances show beside these facts! He can "see no break in the series of steps in molecular complication;" but, glaringly obvious, there is a step added that is not molecular at all, and that has its supporting conditions completely elsewhere. The molecules are as fully accounted for in protoplasm as in water; but the sum of qualities, thus exhausted in the latter, is not so exhausted in the former, in which there are qualities due, plainly, not to the molecules as molecules, but to the form into which they are thrown, and the force that makes that form one. When the chemical elements are brought together, Mr Huxley says, protoplasm is formed, "and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomena of life;" but he ought to have added that these phenomena are themselves added to the phenomena for which all that relates to chemistry stands, and are there, consequently, only by reason of some other determinant. New consequents necessarily demand new antecedents. "We think fit to call different kinds of matter carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen, and to speak of the various powers and activities of these substances as the properties of the matter of which they are composed." That, doubtless, is true, we say; but such statements do not exhaust the facts. We call water hydrogen and oxygen, and attribute *its* properties to the properties of them. In a chemical point of view, we ought to do the same thing for ice and steam; yet, maugre the chemical identity of the three, water is not ice, nor is either steam. Do we, then, in these cases, make nothing of the *difference*, and in its despite enjoy the satisfaction of viewing the three as one? Not so; we ask a reason for the difference; we demand an antecedent that shall render the consequent intelligible. The chemistry of oxygen and hydrogen is not enough in explanation of the threefold form; and by the very necessity of the facts we are driven to the addition of heat. It is precisely so with protoplasm in its twofold form. The chemistry remaining the same in each (if it really does so), we are compelled to seek elsewhere a reason for the difference of living from dead protoplasm. As the differences of ice and steam from water lay not in the hydrogen and oxygen, but in the heat, so the difference of living from dead protoplasm lies not in the carbon, the hydrogen, the oxygen, and the nitrogen, but in the vital organisation. In all cases, for the new quality, plainly, we must have a new explanation. The qualities of a steam-engine are not the results of its simple chemistry. We do apply to protoplasm the same conceptions, then, that are legitimate elsewhere, and in allocating properties and explaining phenomena we simply insist on Mr Huxley's own distinction of "living or dead." That, in fact, is to us the distinction of distinctions, and we admit no vital action whatever, not even the dullest, to be the result of the *molecular* action of the protoplasm that displays it. The very protoplasm of the nettle-sting, with which Mr

Huxley begins, is already vitally organised, and in that organisation as much superior to its own molecules as the steam-engine, in its mechanism, to its own wood and iron. It were indeed as rational to say that there is no principle concerned in a steam-engine or a watch but that of its molecular forces, as to make this assertion of organised matter. Still there are degrees in organisation, and the highest forms of life are widely different from the lowest. Degrees similar we see even in the inorganic world. The persistent flow of a river is, to the mighty reason of the solar system, in some such proportion, perhaps, as the rhizopod to man. In protoplasm, even the lowest, then, but much more conspicuously in the highest, there is, in addition to the molecular force, another force unsignalled by Mr Huxley—the force of vital organisation.

But this force is a rational unity, and that is an idea; and this I would point to as a *second* form of the addition to the chemistry and physics of protoplasm. We have just seen, it is true, that an idea may be found in inorganic matter, as in the solar and sidereal systems generally. But the idea in organised matter is not one operative, so to speak, from without; it is one operative from within, and in an infinitely more intimate and pervading manner. The units that form the complement of an inorganic system are but independently and externally in place, like units in a procession; but in what is organised there is no individual that is not sublated into the unity of the single life. This is so even in protoplasm. Mr Huxley, it is true, desiderates, as result of mere ordinary chemical process, a life-stuff in mass, as it were in the web, to which he has only to resort for cuttings and cuttings in order to produce, by aggregation, what organised individual he pleases. But the facts are not so: we cannot have protoplasm in the web, but the piece. There is as yet no *matter* of life; there are still *cells* of life. It is no shred of protoplasm—no spoonful or toothpickful—that can be recognised as adequate to the function and the name. Such shred may wriggle a moment, but it produces nought, and it dies. In the smallest, lowest protoplasm cell, then, we have this rational unity of a complement of individuals that only are for the whole and exist in the whole. This is an idea, therefore; this is design: the organised concert of many to a single common purpose. The rudest savage that should, as in Paley's illustration, find a watch, and should observe the various contrivances all controlled by the single end in view, would be obliged to acknowledge—though in his own way—that what he had before him was no mere physical, no mere molecular product. So in protoplasm: even from the first, but, quite undeniably, in the completed organisation at last, which alone it was there to produce; for a single idea has been its one manifestation throughout. And in what machinery does it not at length issue? Was it molecular powers that invented a respiration—that perforated the posterior ear to give a balance of air—that compensated the *fenestra oralis* by a *fenestra rotunda*—that placed in the auricular sacs those *otolithes*, those express stones for hearing? Such machinery! The *chordæ tendineæ* are to the valves of the heart exactly adjusted check-strings; and the contractile *columnæ carneæ* are set in, under contraction and expansion, to equalise the length of these strings to their office. Membranes, rods, and liquids—it required the express experiment of man to make good the fact that the structure of the ear exhibited really the most perfect apparatus possible for the purpose. And are we to conceive such machinery, such apparatus, such contrivances merely molecular? Are molecules adequate to such things—molecules in their blind passivity, and dead, dull insensibility? Is it to molecular agency Mr Huxley himself owes that "singular inward laboratory" of which he speaks, and without which all the protoplasm in the world would be useless to him? Surely, in the presence of these manifest ideas, it is impossible to attribute the single peculiar feature of protoplasm—its vitality, namely—to mere molecular chemistry. Protoplasm, it is true, breaks up into carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, as water does into hydrogen and oxygen; but the watch breaks similarly up into mere brass, and steel, and glass. The loose materials of the watch—even its chemical materials if you will—replace its weight, quite as accurately as the constituents, carbon, etc., replace the weight of the protoplasm. But neither these nor those replace the vanished idea, which was alone the important element. Mr Huxley saw no break in the series of steps in molecular complication; but, though not molecular, it is difficult to understand what more striking, what more absolute break could be desired than the break into an idea. It is of that break alone that we think in the watch; and it is of that break alone that we should think in the protoplasm which, far more cunningly, far more rationally, constructs a heart, an eye, or an ear. That is the break of breaks, and explain it as we may, we shall never explain it by molecules.

But, if inorganic elements as such are inadequate to account either for vital organisation or the objective idea of design, much more are they inadequate, in the *third* place, to account for the subjective idea, for the phenomena of thought as thought. Yet Mr Huxley tells us that thought is but the expression of the molecular changes of protoplasm. This he only tells us; this he does not prove. He merely says that, if we admit the functions of the lowest forms of life to be but "direct results of the nature of the matter of which they are composed," we must admit as much for the functions of the highest. We have not admitted Mr Huxley's presupposition; but, even with its admission, we should not feel bound to admit his conclusion. In such a mighty system of differences, there are ample room and verge enough for the introduction of new motives. We can say here at once, in fact, that as thought, let its connection be what it may with, has never been proved to result from, organisation, no improvement of the proof required will be found in protoplasm. No one power that

Mr Huxley signalises in protoplasm can account for thought: not alimentation, and not reproduction, certainly; but not even contractility. We have seen already that there is no proof of contraction being necessary even for the simplest sensation; but much less is there any proof of a necessity of contraction for the inner and independent operations of the mind. Mr Huxley himself admits this. He says: "Speech, gesture, and every other form of human action are, in the long-run, resolvable into muscular contraction;" and so, "even those manifestations of intellect, of feeling, and of will, which we rightly name the higher faculties, are not excluded from this classification, inasmuch as to every one *but the subject of them*, they are known only as transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body." The concession is made here, we see, that these manifestations are differently known to the subject of them. But we may first object that, if even that privileged "every one but the subject" were limited to a knowledge of contractions, he would not know much. It is only because he knows, first of all, a thinker and wilier of contractions that these themselves cease to be but passing externalities, and transitory contingencies. Neither is it reasonable to assert an identity of nature for contractions, and for that which they only represent. It would hardly be fair to confound either the receiver or the sender of a telegraphic message, with the movements which alone bore it, and without which it would have been impossible. The sign is not the thing signified, it is but the servant of the signifier—his own arbitrary mark—and intelligible, in the first place, only to him. It is the meaning, in all cases, that is alone vital; the sign is but an accident. To convert the internality into the arbitrary externality that simply expresses it, is for Mr Huxley only an oversight. Your ideas are made known to your neighbour by contractions, therefore your ideas are of the same nature as contractions! Or, even to take it from the other side, your neighbour perceives in you contractions only, and therefore your ideas are contractions! Are not the vital elements here present the two correspondent internalities, between which the contractions constitute but an arbitrary chain of external communication, that is so now, but may be otherwise again? The ringing of the bell at the window is not precisely the dwarf within. Nor are Engineer Chappe's "wooden arms and elbow-joints jerking and fugging in the air," to be identified with Engineer Chappe himself. For the higher faculties, even for speech, etc., assuredly Mr Huxley might have well spared himself this superfluous and inapplicable reference to contraction.

But, in the middle of it, as we have seen, Mr Huxley concedes that these manifestations are differently known to the subject of them. If so, what becomes of his assertion of but a certain number of powers for protoplasm? The manifestations of the higher faculties are not known to the subject of them by contraction, etc. By what, then, are they known? According to Mr Huxley, they can only be known by the powers of protoplasm; and therefore, by his own showing, protoplasm must possess powers other than those of his own assertion. Precisely, then, his one great power of contractility, Mr Huxley himself confesses to be inapplicable here. Indeed, in his *Physiology* (p. 193), he makes such an avowal as this:—"We class *sensations*, along with *emotions*, and *volitions*, and *thoughts* under the common head of states of *consciousness*; but what consciousness is we know not, and how it is that anything so remarkable as a state of consciousness comes about as the result of irritating nervous tissue, is just as unaccountable as the the Djin when Alladin rubbed his lamp in the story." Consciousness plainly was not muscular contraction to Mr Huxley when he wrote his *Physiology*; it is only since then that he has gone over to the assertion of no power in protoplasm but the triple power, contractility, etc. But the truth is only as his *Physiology* has it—the cleft is simply, as Mr Huxley acknowledges it there, absolute. On one side there is the world of externality, where all is body by body, and away from one another—the boundless reciprocal exclusion of the infinite object. On the other side, there is the world of internality, where all is soul to soul, and away into one another—the boundless reciprocal inclusion of the infinite subject. This—even while it is true that, for subject to be subject, and object object, the boundless intussuscepted multiplicity of the single invisible point of the one, is but the dimensionless casket into which the illimitable Genius of the other must retract and withdraw itself—is the difference of differences; and certainly it is not internality that can be abolished before externality. The proof for the absoluteness of thought, the subject, the mind, is, on its side, pretty well perfect. It is not necessary here, however, to enter into that proof at length. Before passing on, I may simply point to the fact that, if thought is to be called a function of matter, it must be acknowledged to be a function wholly peculiar and unlike any other. In all other functions, we are present to processes which are in the same sense physical as the organs themselves. So it is with lung, stomach, liver, kidney, where every step can be followed, so to speak, with eye and hand; but all is changed when we have to do with mind as the function of brain. Then, indeed, as Mr Huxley thought in his *Physiology*, we are admitted, as if by touch of Aladdin's lamp, to a world absolutely different and essentially new—to a world, on its side of the incommunicable cleft, as complete, entire, independent, self-contained, and absolutely *sui generis*, as the world of matter on the other side. It will be sufficient here to allude to as much as this, with special reference to the fact that, so far as this argument is concerned, protoplasm has not introduced any the very slightest difference. All the ancient reasons for the independence of thought as against organisation, can be used with even more striking effect as against protoplasm; but it will be sufficient to indicate this, so much are the arguments in question a common property now. Thought, in fact, brings with it its own warrant; or it brings

with it, to use the phrase of Burns, "its patent of nobility direct from Almighty God." And that is the strongest argument on this whole aspect. Throughout the entire universe, organic and inorganic, thought is the controlling sovereign; nor does matter anywhere refuse its allegiance. So it is in thought, too, that man has *his* patent of nobility, believes that he is created in the image of God, and knows himself a freeman of infinitude.

But the analogy, in the hands of Mr Huxley, has, we have seen, a second reference—that, namely, to the excitants, if we may call them so, which *determine* combination. The *modus operandi*, Mr Huxley tells us, of pre-existing protoplasm in determining the formation of new protoplasm, is not more unintelligible than the *modus operandi* of the electric spark in determining the formation of water; and so both, we are left to infer, are perfectly analogous. The inferential turn here is rather a favourite with Mr Huxley. "But objectors of this class," he says on an earlier occasion, in allusion to those who hesitate to conclude from dead to living matter, "do not seem to reflect that it is also, in strictness, true that we know nothing about the composition of any body whatever as it is." In the same neighbourhood, too, he argues that, though impotent to restore to decomposed calc-spar its original form, we do not hesitate to accept the chemical analysis assigned to it, and should not, consequently, any more hesitate because of any mere difference of form to accept the analysis of dead for that of living protoplasm. It is certainly fair to point out that, if we bear ignorance and impotence with equanimity in one case, we may equally so bear them in another; but it is not fair to convert ignorance into knowledge, nor impotence into power. Yet it is usual to take such statements loosely, and let them pass. It is not considered that, if we know nothing about the composition of any body whatever as it is, then we do know nothing, and that it is strangely idle to offer absolute ignorance as a support for the most dogmatic knowledge. If such statements are, as is really expected for them, to be accepted, yet not accepted, they are the stultification of all logic. Is the chemistry of living to be seen to be the same as the chemistry of dead protoplasm, because we know nothing about the composition of any body whatever as it is? We know perfectly well that black is white, for we are absolutely ignorant of either as it is! The *form*, of the calc-spar, which we *can* analyse, we cannot restore; therefore the *form* of the protoplasm, which we *cannot* analyse, has nothing to do with the matter in hand; and the chemistry of what is dead may be accepted as the chemistry of what is living! In the case of reasoning so irrelevant it is hardly worth while referring to what concerns the forms themselves; that they are totally incommensurable, that in all forms of calc-spar there is no question but of what is physical, while in protoplasm the change of form is introduction into an entire new world. As in these illustrations, so in the case immediately before us. No appeal to ignorance in regard to something else, the electric spark, should be allowed to transform another ignorance, that of the action of pre-existing protoplasm, into knowledge, here into *the* knowledge that the two unknown things, because of non-knowledge, are—perfectly analogous! That this analogy does not exist—that the electric spark and pre-existing protoplasm are, in their relative places, *not* on the same chemical level—this is the main point for us to see; and Mr Huxley's allusion to our ignorance must not be allowed to blind us to it. Here we have in a glass vessel so much hydrogen and oxygen, into which we discharge an electric spark, and water is the result. Now what analogy is it possible to perceive between this production of water by external experiment and the production of protoplasm by protoplasm? The discrepancy is so palpable that it were impertinent to enlarge on it.

[point out below, however, as one instance of this discrepancy, that were the cases really analogous, the spark ought to produce not water, but itself. The Rev. Mr Martin, in an article in the "British and Foreign Evangelical Review" for Jan. 1870, adds (I do not quote his exact words)—"or the water ought to have been produced, not by a spark, but by water." I beg to thank Mr Martin for the suggestion, as well as for the great kindness that inspires his eloquent article.

The truth is just this, that the measured and mixed gases, the vessel, and the spark, in the one case, are as unlike the fortuitous food, the living organs, and the long process of assimilation in the other case, as the product water is unlike the product protoplasm. No; that the action of the electric spark should be unknown, is no reason why we should not insist on protoplasm for protoplasm, on life for life. Protoplasm can only be produced by protoplasm, and each of all the innumerable varieties of protoplasm, only by its own kind. For the protoplasm of the worm we must go to the worm, and for that of the toad-stool to the toad-stool. In fact, if all living beings come from protoplasm, it is quite as certain that, but for living beings, protoplasm would disappear. Without an egg you cannot have a hen—that is true; but it is equally true that, without a hen, you cannot have an egg. So in protoplasm; which, consequently, in the production of itself, offers no analogy to the production, or precipitation by the electric spark, *not of itself*, but of water. Besides, if, for protoplasm, pre-existing protoplasm is always necessary, how was there ever a first protoplasm?

Generally, then, the analogy does not hold, whether in the one reference or the other, and Mr Huxley has no warrant for the reduction of protoplasm to the mere chemical level which he assigns it in either. That level is brought very prominently forward in such expressions as these: That it is only necessary to bring the chemical elements "together," "under certain conditions," to give rise to the more complex body, protoplasm, just as there is a similar expedient to give rise to water; and that, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm,

carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and an equivalent weight of protoplasm makes its appearance, just as, under the influence of the electric spark, hydrogen and oxygen disappear, and an equivalent weight of water makes its appearance. All this, plainly, is to assume for protoplasm such mere chemical place and nature as consist not with the facts. The cases are, in truth, not parallel, and the "certain conditions" are wholly diverse. All that is said we can do at will for water, but nothing of what is said can we do at will for protoplasm. To say we can feed protoplasm, and so make protoplasm at will produce protoplasm, is very much, in the circumstances, only to say, and is not to say that, in this way, we make a chemical experiment. To insist on a chemical analogy, in fact, between water and protoplasm, is to omit the differences not covered by the analogy at all—thought, design, life, and all the processes of organisation; and it is but simple procedure to omit these differences only by an appeal to ignorance elsewhere.

It is hardly worth while, perhaps, to refer now again to the difference—here, however, once more incidentally suggested—between protoplasm and protoplasm. Mr Huxley, that is, almost in his very last word on this part of the argument (see page 38), seems to become aware of the bearing of this on what relates to materiality, and he would again stamp protoplasm (and with it life and intellect), into an indifferent identity. In order that there should be no break between the lowest functions and the highest (the functions of the fungus and the functions of man), he has "endeavoured to prove," he says, that the rotoplasm of the lowest organisms is "essentially identical with, and most readily *converted* into that of any animal." On this alleged reciprocal *convertibility* of protoplasm, then, Mr Huxley would again found as well an inference of identity, as the further conclusion that the functions of the highest, not less than those of the lowest animals, are but the molecular manifestations of their common protoplasm.

Is this alleged reciprocal *convertibility* true, then? Is it true that every organism can digest every other organism, and that thus a relation of identity is established between that which digests and whatever is digested? These questions place Mr Huxley's general enterprise, perhaps, in the most glaring light yet; for it is very evident that there is an end of the argument if all foods and all feeders are essentially identical both with themselves and with each other. The facts of the case, however, I believe to be too well known to require a single word here on my part. It is not long since Mr Huxley himself pointed out the great difference between the foods of plants and the foods of animals; and the reader may be safely left to think for himself of *ruminantia* and *carnivora*, of soft bills and hard bills, of molluscs and men. Mr Huxley talks feelingly of the possibility of himself feeding the lobster quite as much as of the lobster feeding him; but such pathos is not always applicable: it is not likely that a sponge would be to the stomach of Mr Huxley any more than Mr Huxley to the stomach of a sponge.

But a more important point is this, that the functions themselves remain quite apart from the alleged convertibility. We can neither acquire the functions of what we eat, nor impart our functions to what eats us. We shall not come to fly by feeding on vultures, nor they to speak by feeding on us. No possible manure of human brains will enable a corn-field to reason. But if functions are inconvertible, the convertibility of the protoplasm is idle. In this inconvertibility, indeed, functions will be seen to be independent of mere chemical composition. And that is the truth: for function there is more required than either chemistry or physics.

It is to be acknowledged—to notice a collateral but indispensable consideration, for the sake of completeness, and by way of transition to the final question of possible objections—that Mr Huxley would be very much assisted in his identification of differences, were but the theories of the molecularists, on the one hand, and of Mr Darwin, on the other, once for all established. The three modes of theorising indicated, indeed, are not without a tendency to approach one another; and it is precisely their union that would secure a definitive triumph for the doctrine of materialism. Mr Huxley, as we have seen—though what he desiderates is an autoplasmic living *matter* that, produced by ordinary chemical processes, is yet capable of continuing and developing itself into new and higher forms—still begins with the egg. Now the theory of the molecularists would, for its part, remove all the difficulties that, for materialism, are involved in the necessity of an egg; it would place protoplasm, as formed from molecules, undeniably at length on a merely chemical level; and, his theory being sound, would fairly enable Mr Darwin, supplemented by such a life-stuff, to account by natural means for everything like an idea or thought that appears in creation. The misfortune is, however, that we must believe the theory of the molecularists still to await the proof; while the theory of Mr Darwin has many difficulties peculiar to itself. This theory, philosophically, or in ultimate analysis, is an attempt to prove that design, or the objective idea, especially in the organic world, is developed *in time* by natural means. The time which Mr Darwin demands, it is true, is an infinite time; and he thus gains the advantage of his processes being allowed greater *clearness* for the understanding, in consequence of the *obscurity* of the infinite past in which they are placed, and of which it is difficult in the first instance to deny any possibility whatever. Still it remains to be asked, Are such processes credible in any time? What Mr Darwin has done in aid of his view is, first, to lay before us a knowledge of facts in natural history of surprising richness; and, second, to support this knowledge by an inexhaustible ingenuity of hypothesis in arrangement of appearances. Now, in both respects,

whether for information or even interest, the value of Mr Darwin's contribution will probably always remain independent of the argument or arguments that might destroy his leading proposition; and it is with this proposition that we have here alone to do. As said, we ask only, Is it true that the objective idea, the design which we see in the organised world, is the result in infinite time of the necessary adaptation of living structures to the peculiarities of the conditions by which they are surrounded?

Against this theory, then, its own absolute generalisation may be viewed as our first objection. In ultimate abstraction, that is, the only agency postulated by Mr Darwin is time—infinite time; and as regards actually existent beings and actually existent conditions, it is hardly possible to deny any possibility whatever to infinitude. If told, for example, that the elephant, if only obliged *infinitely* to run, might be converted into the stag, how should we be able to deny? So also, if the lengthening of the giraffe's neck were hypothetically attributed to a succession of dearths in infinite time that only left the leaves of trees for long-necked animals to live on, we should be similarly situated as regards denial. Still it can be pointed out that ingenuity of natural conjecture has, in such cases, no less wide a field for the negation than for the affirmation; and that, on the question of fact, nothing is capable of being determined. But we can also say more than that—we can say that any fruitful application even of *infinite time* to the *general problem of difference* in the world is inconceivable. To explain all from an absolute beginning requires us to commence with nothing; but to this nothing time itself is an addition. Time is an entity, a something, a difference added to the original identity; whence or how came time? Time cannot account for its own self; how is it that there is such a thing as time? Then no conceivable brooding even of infinite time could hatch the infinitude of space. How is it there is such a thing as space? No possible clasps of time and space, further, could ever conceivably thicken into matter. How is it that there is such a thing as matter? Lastly, so far, no conceivable brooding, or even gyrating, of a single matter in time and space could account for the specification of matter—carbon, gold, iodine, etc.—as we see and know it. Time itself remaining unaccounted for, space, matter, and the whole inorganic world, thus appear impassive to the action even of infinite time; all *these* differences are incapable of being accounted for so.

But suppose no curiosity had ever been felt in this reference, which, though scientifically indefensible, is quite possible, how about the transition of the inorganic into the organic? Mr Huxley tells us that, for food, the plant needs nothing but its bath of smelling-salts. Suppose this bath now—a pool of a solution of carbonate of ammonia; can any action of sun, or air, or electricity, be conceived to develop a cell—or even so much lump-protoplasm—in this solution? The production of an initial organism in any such manner will not allow itself to be realised to thought. Then we have just to think for a moment of the vast differences into which, for the production of the present organised world, this organism must be distributed, to shake our heads and say we cannot well refuse anything to an infinite time, but still we must pronounce a problem of this reach hopeless.

It is precisely in conditions, however, that Mr Darwin claims a solution of this problem. Conditions concern all that relates to air, heat, light, land, water, and whatever they imply. Our second objection, consequently, is, that conditions are quite inadequate to account for present organised differences, from a single cell. Geological time, for example, falls short, after all, of infinite time; or, in known geological eras, let us calculate them as liberally as we may, there is not time enough to account for the presently-existing varieties, from one, or even several, primordial forms. So to speak, it is not *in* geological time to account for the transformation of the elephant into the stag from acceleration, or for that of the stag into the elephant from retardation, of movement. And we may speak similarly of the growth of the neck of the giraffe, or even of the elevation of the monkey into man. Moreover, time apart, conditions have no such power in themselves. It is impossible to conceive of animal or vegetable effluvia ever creating the nerve by which they are felt, and so gradually the Schneiderian membrane, nose, and whole olfactory apparatus. Yet these effluvia are the conditions of smell, and, *ex hypothesi*, ought to have created it. Did light, or did the pulsations of the air, ever by any length of time, indent into the sensitive cell, eyes, and a pair of eyes—ears, and a pair of ears? Light conceivably might shine for ever without such a wonderfully complicated result as an eye. Similarly, for delicacy and marvellous ingenuity of structure, the ear is scarcely inferior to the eye; and surely it is possible to think of a whole infinitude of those fitful and fortuitous air-tremblings, which we call sound, without indentation into anything whatever of such an organ.

A third objection to Mr Darwin's theory is, that the play of natural contingency in regard to the vicissitudes of conditions, has no title to be named *selection*. Naturalists have long known and spoken of the "influence of accidental causes;" but Mr Darwin was the first to apply the term *selection* to the action of these, and thus convert accident into design. The agency to which Mr Darwin attributes all the changes which he would signalise in animals is really the fortuitous contingency of brute nature; and it is altogether fallacious to call such process, or such non-process, by a term involving foresight and a purpose. We have here, indeed, only a metaphor wholly misapplied. The German writer who, many years ago, said "even the *genera* are wholly a prey to the changes of the external universal life," saw precisely what Mr Darwin sees, but it never struck him to style contingency selection. Yet, how dangerous, how infectious, has not this ungrounded metaphor proved! It

has become a *principle*, a *law*, and been transferred by very genuine men into their own sciences of philology, physiology, and what not. People will wonder at all this by-and-by. But to point out the inapplicability of such a word to the processes of nature referred to by Mr Darwin, is to point out also the impossibility of any such contingencies proceeding, by graduated rise, from stage to stage, into the great symmetrical organic system—the vast plan—the grand harmonious whole—by which we are surrounded. This rise, this system, is really the objective idea; but it is utterly incapable of being accounted for by any such agency as natural contingency in geological, or infinite, or any time. And it is this which the word selection tends to conceal.

We may say, lastly, in objection, here, that, in the fact of "reversion" or "atavism," Mr Darwin acknowledges his own failure. We thus see that the species as species is something independent, and holds its own *insita vis naturæ* within itself.

Probably it is not his theory, then, that gives value to Mr Darwin's book; nor even his ready ingenuity, whatever interest it may lend: it is the material information it contains. The ingenuity, namely, verges somewhat on that Humian expedient of natural conjecture so copiously exemplified, on occasion of a few trite texts, in Mr Buckle. But that natural conjecture is always insecure, equivocal, and many-sided. It may be said that ancient warfare, for example, giving victory always to the personally ablest and bravest, must have resulted in the improvement of the race; or that, the weakest being always necessarily left at home, the improvement was balanced by deterioration; or that the ablest were necessarily the most exposed to danger, and so, etc., etc., according to ingenuity, *usque ad infinitum*. Trustworthy conclusion is not possible to this method, but only to the induction of facts, or to scientific demonstration.

Neither molecularists nor Darwinians, then, are able to level out the difference between organic and inorganic, or between genera and genera, or species and species. The differences persist despite of both; the distributed identity remains unaccounted for. Nor, consequently, is Mr Darwin's theory competent to explain the objective idea by any reference to time and conditions. Living beings do exist in a mighty chain from the moss to the man; but that chain, far from founding, is founded in the idea, and is not the result of any mere natural *growth* of this into that. That chain is itself the most brilliant stamp, the sign-manual, of design. On every ledge of nature, from the lowest to the highest, there is a life that is *its*,—a creature to represent it, reflect it—so to speak, pasture on it. The last, highest, brightest link of this chain is man; the incarnation of thought itself, which is the summation of this universe; man, that includes in himself all other links and their single secret—the personified universe, the subject of the world. Mr Huxley makes but small reference to thought; he only tucks it in, as it were, as a mere appendicle of course.

It may be objected, indeed—to reach the last stage in this discussion—that, if Mr Huxley has not disproved the conception of thought and life "as a something which works through matter, but is independent of it," neither have we proved it. But it is easy for us to reply that, if "*independent of*," means here "*unconnected with*" we have had no such object. We have had no object whatever, in fact, but to resist, now the extravagant assertion that all organised tissue, from the lichen to Leibnitz, is alike in faculty, and again the equally extravagant assertion that life and thought are but ordinary products of molecular chemistry. As regards the latter assertion, we have endeavoured to show that the processes of vital organisation (as self-production, etc.) belong to another sphere, higher than, and very different from, those of mechanical juxtaposition or chemical neutralisation; that life, then, is no mere product of matter as matter; that if no life can be pointed to independent of matter, neither is there any life-stuff independent of life; and that life, consequently, adds a new and higher force to chemistry, as chemistry a new and higher force to mechanics, etc. As for thought, the endeavour was to show that it was as independent on the one side as matter on the other, that it controlled, used, summed, and was the reason of matter. Thought, then, is not to be reached by any bridge from matter, that is a hybrid of both, and explains the connection. The relation of matter to mind is not to be explained as a transition, but as a *contrescoup*. In this relation, however, it is not the material, but the mental side, which the whole universe declares to be the dominant one.

As regards any objections to the arguments which we have brought against the identity of protoplasm, again, these will lie in the phrase, probably, "difference not of kind, but degree," or in the word "modification." The "phrase" may be now passed, for generic or specific difference must be allowed in protoplasm, if not for the overwhelming reason that an infinitude of various kinds exist in it, each of which is self-productive and uninterchangeable with the rest, then for Mr Huxley's own reason, that plants assimilate inorganic matter and animals only organic. As for the objection "modification," again, the same consideration of generic difference must prove fatal to it. This were otherwise, indeed, could but the molecularists and Mr Darwin succeed in destroying generic difference; but in this, as we have seen, they have failed. And this will be always so: who dogs identify, difference dogs him. It is quite a justifiable endeavour, for example, to point out the identity that obtains between veins and arteries on the one hand, as between these and capillaries on the other; but all the time the difference is behind us; and when we turn to look, we see, for circulation, the valves of the veins and the elastic coats of the arteries as opposed to one another, and, for irrigation, the permeable walls of the

capillaries as opposed to both.

Generic differences exist then, and we cannot allow the word "modification" to efface them in the interest of the identity claimed for protoplasm. Brain-protoplasm is not bone-protoplasm, nor the protoplasm of the fungus the protoplasm of man. Similarly, it is very questionable how far the word "modification" will warrant us in regarding with Mr Huxley the "ducts, fibres, pollen, and ovules" of the nettle as identical with the protoplasm of its sting. Things that originate alike may surely eventuate in others which, chemically and vitally, far from being mere modifications, must be pronounced totally different. Such eventuation must be held competent to what can only be named generic or specific difference. The "child" is only "*father* of the man"—it is not the man; who, moreover, in the course of an ordinary life, we are told, has totally changed himself, not once, but many times, retaining at the last not one single particle of matter with which he set out. Such eventuations, whether called modifications or not, certainly involve essential difference. And so situated are the "ducts, fibres, pollen, and ovules" of the nettle, which, whether compared with the protoplasm of the nettle-sting, or with that in which they originated, must be held to have assumed, by their own actions, indisputable differences, physical, chemical, and vital, or in form, substance, and faculty.

Much, in fact, depends on definition here; and, in reference to modification, it may be regarded as arbitrary when identity shall be admitted to cease and difference to begin. There are the old Greek puzzles of the Bald Head and the Heap, for example. How many grains, or how many hairs, may we remove before a heap of wheat is no heap, or a head of hair bald? These concern quantity alone; but, in other cases, bone, muscle, brain, fungus, tree, man, there is not only a quantitative, but a qualitative difference; and in regard to such differences, the word modification can be regarded as but a cloak, under which identity is to be shuffled into difference, but remain identity all the same. The brick is but modified clay, Mr Huxley intimates, bake it and paint it as you may; but is the difference introduced by the baking and painting to be ignored? Is what Mr Huxley calls the "artifice" not to be taken into account, leave alone the "potter"? The strong firm rope is about as exact an example of modification proper—modification of the weak loose hemp—as can well be found; but are we to exclude from our consideration the whole element of difference due to the hand and brain of man? Not far from Burns's Monument, on the Calton Hill of Edinburgh, there lies a mass of stones which is potentially a church, the former Trinity College Church. Were this church again realised, would it be fair to call it a mere modification of the previous stones? Look now to the egg and the full-feathered fowl. Chaucer describes to us the cock, "hight chaunteclere," that was to his "faire Pertelotte" so dear:—

*"His comb was redder than the fine corall,
Embattled, as it were a castle-wall;
His bill was black, and as the jet it shone;
Like azure were his legges and his tone (toes);
His nailes whiter than the lilie flour,
And like the burned gold was his colour."*

Would it be even as fair to call this fine fellow—comb, wattles, spurs, and all—a modified yolk, as to call the church, but modified stones I If, in the latter case, an element of difference, altogether undeniable, seems to have intervened, is not such intervention at least quite as well marked in the former? It requires but a slight analysis to detect that all the stones in question are marked and numbered; but will any analysis point out within the shell the various parts that only need arrangement to become the fowl? Are the men that may take the stones, and, in a re-erected Trinity College Church, realise anew the idea of its architect, in any respect more wonderful than the unknown disposers of the materials of the fowl? That what realises the idea should, in the one case, be from without, and, in the other, from within, is no reason for seeing more modification and less wonder in the latter than the former. There is certainly no more reason for seeing the fowl in the egg, and as identical with the egg, than for seeing a re-built Trinity College Church as identical with its unarranged materials. A part cannot be taken for the whole, whether in space *or in time*. Mr Huxley misses this. He is so absorbed in the identity out of which, that he will not see the difference into which, progress is made. As the idea of the church has the stones, so the idea of the fowl has the egg, for its commencement. But to this idea, and in both cases, the terminal additions belong, quite as much as the initial materials. If the idea, then, add sulphur, phosphorus, iron, and what not, it must be credited with these not less than with the carbon, hydrogen, etc., with which it began. It is not fair to mutter modification, as if it were a charm to destroy all the industry of time. The protoplasm of the egg of the fowl is no more the fowl than the stones the church; and to identify, by juggle of a mere word, parts in time and wholes in time so different, is but self-deception. Nay, in protoplasm, as we have so often seen, difference is as much present at first as at last. Even in its germ, even in its initial identity, to call it so, protoplasm is already different, for it issues in differences infinite.

Omission of the consideration of difference, it is to be acknowledged, is not nowadays restricted to Mr Huxley. In the wonder that is usually expressed, for example, at Oken's *identification* of the skull with so many vertebras, it is forgot that there is still implicated the wonder which we ought to feel at the unknown power that could, in the end, so *differentiate* them. If the cornea of the eye and the enamel of the teeth are alike but modified protoplasm, we must be pardoned for thinking more of the adjective than of the substantive. Our wonder is how, for one idea, protoplasm could become one thing here, and, for another idea, another so different thing there. We are more curious about the modification than the protoplasm. In the difference, rather than in the identity, it is, indeed, that the wonder lies. Here are several thousand pieces of protoplasm; analysis can detect no difference in them. They are to us, let us say, as they are to Mr Huxley, identical in power, in form, and in substance; and yet on all these several thousand little bits of apparently indistinguishable matter an element of difference so pervading and so persistent has been impressed, that, of them all, not one is interchangeable with another! Each seed feeds its own kind. The protoplasm of the gnat will no more grow into the fly than it will grow into an elephant. Protoplasm is protoplasm: yes, but man's protoplasm is man's protoplasm, and the mushroom's the mushroom's. In short, it is quite evident that the word modification, if it would conceal, is powerless to withdraw, the difference; which difference, moreover, is one of kind and not of degree.

This consideration of possible objections, then, is the last we have to attend to; and it only remains to draw the general conclusion. All animal and vegetable organisms are alike in power, in form, and in substance, only if the protoplasm of which they are composed is similarly alike; and the functions of all animal and vegetable organisms are but properties of the molecular affections of their chemical constituents, only if the functions of the protoplasm, of which they are composed, are but properties of the molecular affections of *its* chemical constituents. In disproof of the affirmative in both clauses, there has been no object but to demonstrate, on the one hand, the infinite non-identity of protoplasm, and, on the other, the dependence of its functions upon other factors than its molecular constituents.

In short, the whole position of Mr Huxley, that all organisms consist alike of the same life-matter, which life-matter is, for its part, due only to chemistry, must be pronounced untenable—nor less untenable the materialism he would found on it.

Part II.

THE SECOND (PHILOSOPHICAL) ISSUE; OR, THE ESCAPE FROM MATERIALISM THROUGH THE MODERN IDEALISM OF IGNORANCE.

IN his necessity to say something, if only for "his own," Mr Huxley, in reference to my phrase "the materialism he would found on it," remarks, "one great object of my Essay was to show that what is called 'materialism' has no sound philosophical basis!" The note of admiration I retain here is Mr Huxley's own, and I am humbly of opinion that it is more in place at the end of *my* sentence than at the end of *his*. At the end of his, namely, it intimates indignation that an express effort to resist, should be treated as an express effort to found, materialism. At the end of mine, again, it intimates surprise that Mr Huxley should seek to hide his alpha beneath his beta, and upbraid me for openly signalling alpha alone, whereas I equally openly signalled beta—though placing it on one side. If Mr Huxley does *two* things namely—attempts, first, to set up materialism,—attempts, second, to knock down materialism (see pages 20, 21, 23)—how can allusion to the materialism he sets up, guarded by an equal allusion to the materialism he knocks down, be an "utter misrepresentation?" "One great object of my Essay," says Mr Huxley! Yes, truly; but what of the *other*—great, greater, and greatest—object? "Utter misrepresentation!" The only utter misrepresentation concerned here is—Pshaw! the whole thing is beneath speech.

Nevertheless, my previous, merely parenthetic, treatment of Mr Huxley's second issue shall now be completed by a consideration in detail. We are to understand, then, that what Mr Huxley claimed to have effected (physiologically) in fifty paragraphs—for materialism, he now claims equally to effect (philosophically) in one-and-twenty—against it; and the means to this are "the principles which the Archbishop of York holds up to reprobation." These, as it is easy to know, concern the so-called "limits of philosophical inquiry," and may be reduced to what Mr Huxley holds to be our *three ignorances*: our ignorance, namely, first,

of *cause*; second, of *substance*; and, third, of *externality*, or an external world. The evangile, according to Mr Huxley, consequently, is that, lost by *knowledge*, we may be saved by *ignorance*! Indeed, it must be allowed that the whole matter stands there very clear, consistent, definite, irrefutable, satisfactory, before Mr Huxley's own consciousness. The progress of knowledge generally, he is sure, has been ever more and more towards the reduction of all phenomena into the series and successions of material antecedents and consequents; and there cannot be a doubt but that life, and will, and thought, must, in the end, be all similarly tucked in. *These*, too, *when* explained, will only be explained as "results of the disposition of material molecules." It does not follow, for all that, is Mr Huxley's further thought, that what is called materialism is true, or that "there is nothing in the world but matter, force, and necessity;" I indeed have reduced all, we may further figure him to say, into material terms, and connected all in material sequence; but this system of a world may conceivably lie all the same, so to speak, in the drop of water in the hollow of an Arab boy's hand. That is, firstly, I know not any necessity of connection in the phenomena of the world, though I know the fact of it; and so volition *may* be free. Secondly, I know not what *anything* is *in itself*, whether it be named of matter, or whether it be named of mind; and so matter as matter is not established, and mind as mind is not destroyed. Thirdly, there is no doubt but that the system—all that we know—the whole world—does lie, not indeed in the hollow of an Arab boy's hand, but in consciousness: all that we know are but modes of consciousness—bundles of our own consciousnesses. In this way, while there is a most pleasing *definiteness* for our *knowledge*, there is also a most pleasing *indefiniteness*, for our *ignorance*. Or in this way, while, in *knowledge*, science is secured its rights, and thought its freedom, we may quite satisfactorily limn God, free will, immortality, and all that sort of thing (if we really do want it) in the mist of our ignorance !

This is Mr Huxley's relative position—even to the irony, though that is not so certain. It is just possible in that respect, namely, that Mr Huxley is as simple and serious on the one side, as he is simple and serious on the other—as simple and serious and self-complacent in regard to ignorance, as he is simple, serious, and self-complacent in regard to knowledge. For my part, indeed, I must confess myself to find Mr Huxley, however valuable in his knowledge, much more interesting in his ignorance—in his ignorance and in the faith that is born of it. I don't know anything about *cause*, he seems to say to himself, or *substance*, or *actual externality*; and *therefore* there is all that—dream—possible! What a comfort, when the prose of knowledge wearies—when materialism is a horror to our natural hopes—to possess in the poetry of ignorance a secret and sacred chamber in which I can shut myself up legitimately to dream! What a comfort to be able to retire to this *my* Fetish and strong god to listen to my prayers! "Where ignorance is bliss, 't were folly to be wise;" and surely it is ignorance that is the blissful side here. Sufficiently curious, it is, too, that the Revulsion, to which *knowledge* is professedly all in all, cannot do, nevertheless, without the refuge of ignorance. How Mr Buckle mouths solemnly roundabout, in that ample, empty, pretentious way of his, dwelling ever on the sacredness of a man's religious conviction, *which is for silence and secrecy alone*! One would think it more natural that we should thank a man for *communicating* to us that which, as most precious for him, might prove most precious for us too. But no! gabble, chatter as you like about your lower interests, but be absolutely silent about your higher ones! That is the wisdom of the perfectly admirable Mr Buckle; and Mr Huxley, as we see, is not without a certain approach to it. Let us listen benevolently, he seems to say, to knowledge in public; but let us all the more worship ignorance in private! It is this ignorance we shall now consider in the order of its three forms already named.

1. What concerns *causality* may be stated thus :—The material phenomena which constitute knowledge, are commonly regarded as in *connection* the one with the other; but into the *nature* of this connection, into the *necessity* of this connection, we do not at all see. All that we do see is the *fact* of *invariable association* among them. We certainly have grounds for the expectation that this association *will* not vary; but these grounds reducing themselves to this, that on the whole, it has not yet varied; it is impossible for us to say, it *can* not, or it *must* not vary. Knowing the fact only, and not its conditioning reason, we are obliged to say in fairness, it *may* vary. When the sun rises, it is day *this* day, and any day we ever heard of; but to-morrow it may be night. A stone flung into the air returns to-day, but to-morrow it may not. Cork floats at present, but in the future it may sink. The knife cuts the apple now, but an hour hence the apple may cut the knife. To-day sugar sweetens tea, to-morrow it may salt it. To-day the stick breaks the window, to-morrow the window may break the stick. To-day the gunpowder but *repeats* the spark, to-morrow it may *quench* it. To-day the cloak *depends*; to-morrow it may *suspend*, etc., etc. Of course, we have no reason to expect these changes; but we have no guarantee against them. We do not any day know what "pastures new" await us. And this is good; for this is philosophy, and in such philosophy we have a checkmate to superstition, we have a checkmate to the priest, who dare not any longer, in the face of such verifications, *dogmatise*.

2. These are great advantages, but they are not greater than those the same "New Philosophy" extends to us from the consideration of *substance*. What do I know about this that you call substance? Where is it? What is it? Can you let me see it? I will believe it when I see it. Meantime I know qualities only—I know all things in

their qualities, not *in themselves*, not in their *substance*. And this, that we know not substance, is "the greatest discovery of psychology." Consider, too, how, in turn, it is related to infallible knowledge and—dogmas! We are emancipated from the priest when we can show him that we know appearances only. To pretend to know all *that*, when he does not know what bread is!

3. But a due application of the same principles to the question of *externality*, elicits even greater advantages perhaps, and in a double kind. For it not only secures us from what the priest can do *against* us, but it renders us independent of what he can do *for* us. I know no external world—namely, or I know no certainty of an external world. That fire that burns, that sea that rages—I know nothing of either but as a state of my own. What I know of external things—what I *can* know of external things *must* be in my consciousness. What are called such external things, then, are but bundles of my own consciousnesses. To tell me, consequently, all that miraculous story, is to tell me something which, even the existence of the external world being unguaranteed, I must hold also to be unguaranteed. This, at the same time, too, that my ignorance of any actual external world and of any necessity, whether of causality or substantiality in it, plenarily empowers imagination to bring to my feet, in freedom, all the good things the priest can only bring me in bondage—God, Immortality, Free-will.

This, then, is the "New Philosophy;" and who will deny its might, and its majesty? Knowledge is precipitation into a "slough," but ignorance is "escape!" To be awake with the understanding is to fall into "crass materialism;" but to dream with the imagination is to be safe within the crystal battlements of eternal idealism! Knowledge is but the wretched old oil-lamp, that spills, and bothers us with its wick and its filth; it is ignorance that is the Aladdin's lamp, and brings elysium!

But do these gentlemen mean it to be so? To Mr Bain, for example, is not the materialism all that is for him fundamental? and is not the idealism but, profanely to say it, the tongue in the cheek—to the priest, who incontinently sinks silent, dumbfounded? But how are *we* to look at this extraordinary *Zwitterling*. this extraordinary hermaphrodite? Is the world, then, no stable system of reason? Is it only as the unsteady iridescence in the water-drop in the Arab boy's hand? Thus and thus to-day, *may* all things work loose from one another tomorrow? Shall we never know anything but appearances—never know truth? Ah! well might Descartes doubt whether he who sent us were not "a powerful and malicious being who took pleasure in deluding us!"

But let us just see whether all these things cannot be looked at otherwise.

1. There is no *cause*, then; there is only a *first* followed by a *second*, an A by a B. Nexus between them there is none discernible: there is only one imagined. Under the name of *power*, it is familiar enough to conception to be sure, and current enough in speech, but, all the same, it is a mere fancy, a voluntary-involuntary phantasm, a gratuitous symbol, a vicarious image, a personified abstraction, a Comtian entity, an Hegelian *Vorstellung*—a myth!

It is to this meaning I would confine the word *conception*, and for good and sufficient reasons, it may be, despite the *etymology*. *Idea* is, of course, *Idee*, and can take on every one of its significations. Kant, when exact and authoritative—Hegel always—translates *Begriff* by *Notio*. There is left only *Conception* for *Vorstellung*, and Hegel actually does render *Vorstellungen* by *Conceptionen*. *We have no choice then!* And reflection will only the more and more approve the result. *Representation*, for example, is a hideous word that will never pass current; and Dugald Stewart's admirable chapter on "Conception" will show that that word to him was quite the Hegelian *Vorstellung*. *Concept*, again, reminds too much of *conception* satisfactorily to render *Begriff*, and is, for the most part, only in philosophical use by an authority that in another generation will cease to be significant. All this, however, only where exactitude is required. Otherwise and in general, *idea* conveys perfectly well, not only *Begriff*, but even *Vorstellung*. Any interchange of the words in question is perhaps possible to the experienced translator, except only the unpardonable barbarism of *notion* for *Vorstellung*. *Notion* ought to be kept sacred for the *logical* notion.

The knowledge of this we owe to Hume, and this one point is the spore from which that vast bulk of German philosophy grew.

Nevertheless, it was but by counterstroke, so to speak, that from that spore this bulk grew; and it is not so certain that Hume's faith corresponded with his speech. Indeed, it is only a mistake, perhaps, to suppose that the sly Hume believed any such view of cause and effect, though, with his usual arch mischief, for perplexity to the priest, he wickedly started the difficulties that gave rise to it. Perfectly willing to "undermine the foundations" of anything whatever that had seemed hitherto only to serve "as a shelter to superstition," he knew all the same, that "Nature would always maintain her rights, and prevail in the end over any abstract reasoning whatsoever." So it was that, even when *just mentioning*—with such an air of simple reference to what was a matter of course for everybody—the *transparent fact*, that, "in all reasonings from experience, there is a step taken by the mind, which is not supported by any argument or process of the understanding"—so it was, I say, that even when just mentioning this, and remarking that "we cannot penetrate into the reason of the conjunction" of cause and effect, he knew and admitted that that "step" and that "reason" lay in "a *natural* relation."

In reality, the whole thing has been, on the part of Hume, but a wicked riddle, the sly rogue (or the *arch* rogue if you will) always speaking with such an air of innocent conviction, that his allegation—"no reason can be discovered"—was taken at once without a moment's misgiving quite as the matter of fact for which it seemed to be taken by himself.

But, suppose we ask *now*—after all these years, and after all that breadth of clamour—*is* it matter of fact? Can it possibly be matter of fact? Must not the reason of the *conjunction* of things, as cause and effect, lie, as Hume admits, in "a *natural* relation?" And must not that natural relation be discoverable? In other words, must not "the step of the mind," the "process of the understanding," which Hume seemed to assume to fail, actually not fail?—and must it not be capable of being demonstrated?

Let the reader fully realise to himself what the assertion means, that the cause A is only an invariable *first*, and the effect B only an invariable *second*. All, so, is evidently reduced to the single character *succession*, and with the single predicate *invari-able*, the explanation being added the *invariability* is only what we may call a *positive* one. That is: so far as we know yet, A *has* been first, B *has* been second, but this invariable succession so far as experience goes, must be seen to be what it is—only an invariable succession *so far as experience goes*. We have but a *fact* before us, we know not how, or whence, or why; we have absolutely no *reason* whatever *for* the fact. The succession *is, has* been, *may* be; but it is a *dry* fact—a dry fact of *mere* succession. It is but a conjunction of *abstracts*; it is no *concrete*—no concrete of two, the one *from* the other, and *in* the other, and *through* the other. There is no *reason* in the very midst of the succession, by virtue of which the one is only because the other is. It is a fact that there is A *now*, and B *then*; there is no relation whatever between them but that of the order in time. A is A, B is B; each on its own side is for itself, and *sui generis*, and independent. There is no community between them. They are absolutely disparate—heterogeneous. Each is foreign, alien to the other. Different from, they are indifferent to, each other. They are not inwardly in union; they are but outwardly beside each other. But for the order in time, they are not one whit more connected, the one with the other, than this ink-bottle and yonder coal-scuttle.

Surely the statement itself is its own involuntary *felo de se!* To the *humano capiti*, shall we join then the *cervicem equinam*? Shall the *mulier formosa superne* be indeed desinent in the *atrum piscem*? Or if, whether for us, or the poet, there shall be a concrete that is rational, a concrete that is even *natural*, a concrete that *is* a concrete, shall not the one term, in all cases, *grow* out of the other? All will be different *then*. The terms shall not be heterogeneous, but homogeneous. The succession shall not be only *positively*, arbitrarily, invariable, but *necessarily, rationally* invariable. The succession, in fact, shall not be a succession at all. As what in *all* nature is closest, it shall be seen to be also what in its *own* nature is closest—not a succession, but a conjunction, a connection, a union, the most intimate, the most deeply inward union possible—at all events, the most intimate, the most deeply inward union the whole inorganic world can show.

Hume shall have simply hoaxed us, then—shall have simply hoaxed metaphysics—hoaxed metaphysics with his billiard balls, as Charles the Second did physics with his fish?

Yes; it is really so. Neither *à priori* nor *à posteriori* is there the incommunicable gulf in causality which Hume so naturally assumed, and so speciously glossed over.

Billiard balls are not by any means all that may be regarded, or alone what may be regarded, as types of causality. Here is a full sponge, and here is a hand that contracts on it—with an effect that is known. Have we here but an indifferent A, and an indifferent B, that are only outwardly beside each other, and not at all inwardly, and with reason, wrought together? Can we conceive of what happens here as but *succession*—a succession that, though thus to-day, may be otherwise to-morrow? A bit of wood weighed after immersion in water is found to be heavier than it was before immersion. In the same way, a letter that in India weighed under the ounce, may in England weigh over it. But, in either case, is the one fact but an indifferent *second* to the other? Expose the boards of a book to the fire, and, *Scotice*, they "*gizzen*," but not without a perfect intelligence on our part of why. When the pound in the one scale plumps on the board, and the ounce in the other kicks the beam, does any one settle his chin in his neckerchief, and gravely expatiate on a first and a second in all times past that *may*, nevertheless, reverse themselves to-morrow? Surely arithmetic here has absolute possession—and to the perfect conviction of everybody—of the entire mystery! When to divide a sheet of paper evenly, I fold it in two and tear in the line of the fold, is the result a mere invariable consequent without perception of a reason? So, also, that a blunt knife is a better paper-cutter than a sharp one—surely we see why! Place a cannon ball on a sofa cushion, is the indentation that follows, a mere consequent, the reason of which we cannot understand. Doors slam, shutters rattle, draughts whistle—in such events, or in the action of windmills and watermills, of the teeth of saws or of the teeth of men, can it be pretended that we have before us only dry facts, the one now and the other again, but without any reason of connection inwardly that makes the one but a birth out of the other? Is it really just once for all so, that the lees sink and the scum rises, or is there an explanation for both events? When, overhearing your wonder at the strangely blazing windows in a wood in France, the kindly Commère threw in, "C'est par rapport au soleil, Messieurs I" was not that *rapport* precisely

the "step" the "understanding" wanted? The Nile periodically overflows, but it does not only *just do so*—we now know why. An eclipse involves, not only an invariable first, and an invariable second, but a reason as well. It is surely not inexplicable why bodies throw shadows. So it is also with day and night, with the seasons, with the tides—in all these cases we have not only an invariable succession, but a *reasoned* invariable succession. It is really no mystery why the key fits the lock, or why Bruce's calthrops overthrew the English horse. To varnish an egg preserves it, but we are not left with the naked fact only, we can give an account of it as well. If you turn a turtle on its back, you do not wonder at it remaining so, anymore than at the cut stalk falling, or the bladder you prick collapsing. You do not draw your boots on with a pair of skewers, and you do not say the only reason *why not* is that boot-hooks are the invariable antecedents. Candle-making (-dipping) admits of explanation. A glass-house is not the unconnected, the *dry* antecedent of strawberries at Christmas. The navvie that digs, uses his pick first and his shovel second—with perfect satisfaction as well to understanding as to perception. The paint on my house-door has its sufficient reason in that painter's pot. Antarctic regions have more sea than Arctic ones; and yet, though warmer in summer, they are colder in winter; not without "*rapport*," perhaps, to the relative distance at these seasons of the sun from either. The mason uses a mallet of wood rather than a hammer of iron, and there is a rationale of his act which is not uninteresting (in the case of the mallet a deflection in striking hardly *tells*, and the action of the point of the chisel is more delicately modifiable perhaps.) The water that runs clear from the filter was brown when it entered; but it has left its sufficient reason behind it. A wedge splits a tree—this you understand, and you are not surprised that a knife does not. The same breath that cools your soup will warm your hands; but in neither case is the first to the second only a *dry* one; it brings foison with it, and the virtue that connects them. Why rag is better for a cut than paper, why a watch-spring acts, why a stone hurts and a feather-pillow does not—all that you see. The fire that hardens clay will soften wax: you can tell why in the one case, if, perhaps, not in the other. For this, too, is to be admitted, that we cannot always tell why. This, however, is but a moment's jar, *and the jar itself is the proof of the position*. When the king, of the dumpling in Peter Pindar, wonders "How, how the devil got the apple in!" we laugh; but the wonder we laugh at is the *naïve* confutation, as at hands of general mankind indeed, of the mere pedantry that has made Hume's riddle a *theory*! If *here* got *there*, there must have been a *door of communication* between them. In all cases of causality, the first is not just on this side and the other just on that side, because it is once for all just so: in all cases of causality there is—whether we know it or not—a *door of communication* between the two sides. Hume made believe to shut this door up, and half a dozen worthy men have taken him at his word!

It is worth while considering, however, that the very men who—*explicitly*—deny all this sort of concrete virtue in the facts themselves, and assert as well a mere provisional invariability as a mere dry succession of an abstract first and an abstract second—those very men are in certain circumstances very in-terestingly forward to refute themselves—*implicitly*. Just tell Mr Mill that Moses with a dry rod brought water from a dry rock! I do not think that that eminent philosopher will have any difficulty *there*. And yet if causality is but a *succession*—a succession that *may vary*—a succession in which the first is *only* the first, the second *only* the second—one would expect, on the part of Comte and his disciples, rather a desire to accept the miracle than that hot haste to reject it. Nay, the miracle they refuse at the hands of Moses, they are ready to accept at the hands of Mr Crosse: they are quite ready to believe it possible for *him* to grind *wet* maggots out of *dry* electricity!

It may illustrate the position, at all events, should I say here that the impossibility the Revulsion feels in regard to miracles is precisely the impossibility I feel in regard to abstract succession. I cannot entertain the idea of mere *positivity* of association, without community, without intermediating nexus. Very curious! Our modern Berkeleians, too, wry themselves into the same inhumanity: they, too, see indifferent units indifferently in succession, but at the will of God—contriving to secure for themselves thus (see Browning's "Caliban") a Setebos to worship, and the creation of a Setebos to admire!

Independent succession is no belief of society at large, however, in which reference I hold Sir John Herschel to name the true concrete state of the case (in his "Astronomy," p. 232), thus :—

"Whatever attempts have been made by metaphysical writers to reason away the connection of cause and effect, and fritter it down into the unsatisfactory relation of habitual sequence, it is certain that the conception of some more real and intimate connection is quite as strongly impressed upon the human mind as that of the existence of an external world."

Beyond all doubt, then, there is a certain community between the cause and the effect, and in this community lies the reason of the nexus. In short, the reason of the causal nexus is—Identity. "The rain," says Hegel, "is the cause of the wetness," "but it is the same water in the wetness that is in the rain." It is the same physical water on the street, then, that was in the cloud, and, similarly, the water in my beard is the same physical water that was in my breath. A like state of the case is visible in every one of the various examples of causality that we have seen above.

Nor is it different with Hume's billiard balls : it is identically the same motion now in the one that was then

in the other, and the examination of *them*, before the motion, or after the motion, as *independent individuals*, was beside the point. That is, abstraction was made by Hume from all that constituted causality in the balls, and no wonder he could not find in them what he himself had just thrown out. The motion was alone the cause, and it was idle to examine *them* apart from *it*. And here we see that what are regarded as causes are, commonly, concrete objects with a variety of elements in them beside that or those which may stand at the moment in the causal nexus. *Contraction* in the hand, and in the sponge; *water* in the cloud, and on the street; *motion* in the bat, and in the ball : in all such cases we see but a single *import*, and it is *common* to the cause and to the effect. It, in effect, is *both*. So far as this *import* goes, then, there is a relation of identity between the cause and the effect, however different *they* are otherwise. They are not only *externally associated*, they are *internally united*—they are united in a relation of identity, and this, whatever elements of difference they may bring with them otherwise. The hand is very different from the sponge, the cloud from the street, the ball from the bat; but as copula between the respective pairs of *differents*, we have, in order, the identity of contraction, of water, and of motion. The knife cuts the apple : shall we, like Hume, examine knife and apple apart, and say how *different* they are—blinding ourselves to the one single absolute identity that is in the cause and the effect of which they are but the vehicles?

Sometimes, too, plainly, the identity may not be *explicit*, but only *implicit*; or it may even be present in the form of diversity. It is really by identity that you would explain shadows, eclipses, etc., and yet the shadow (darkness) is the reverse of light.

This, then, is the assertion : In all cases of causality, the tie, the copula, denied by Hume really exists; the "step taken by the mind" really *is* supported on a "process of the understanding;" this tie, copula, step, process, has—explicitly, or implicitly—its grounds and sufficient reason in Identity.

One can conjecture much opposition here. Is the pain of a burn identical with the flame that caused it, then? This, one can hear the Revulsion bawl out; to a man! Causality as such, however, ceases with the inorganic world. *A such*, it has no place in will, reason; and vitality itself has already set bounds to it—not but that a good stick may smash my skull and my wife's pipkin on precisely the same principles.

It is the motion, then, that is both the true cause and the true effect in the case of the billiard balls. In the ordinary row of such balls suspended for experiment by strings, the motion with which the last leaps off is precisely the same motion with which the first was allowed to impinge. It may seem a contradiction and a difficulty here that *both* balls—the first and the last—being allowed, at once, and similarly, to impinge on the rest, the one motion seems merely to be counteracted and destroyed by the other. Is the *double* motion, thus, then, only neutralised and lost? No; the motion counterbalanced in mass reappears in molecule; and we meet here the doctrine of the Conservation of Force or Energy. Not quite stable in its metaphysics yet, this doctrine is probably sound, so far, in its physics. Light and heat, however they may express themselves to sentiency, or to a medium that *dilates* on molecular *vibration*, are, *in themselves*, it seems, only motions, as magnetism, galvanism, etc., in some unexplained way, may also be. In that case, we may conceive nothing in space but matter and motion. Nay, in that case, may we not *conceive* nothing in space but motion alone? Matter itself shall be but counterbalanced motion—as it were *implicit* motion, which the flutter of a feather, in changing the direction of opposing tendencies, may instantly render *explicit*. A weight on a spring—these are but countervailing motions, and the slightest shift would enable them to express themselves. The earth itself, then, may be conceived—not that I deny matter—as but a congeries of belts of countervailing motions; and something of a rational basis may be seen thus to be extended to those who *feign* matter to be the expression of innumerable centres—whence, what, or how, one knows not!—of force. The fact of *countervailing* motion must be allowed, however, to demonstrate—as in the spring and the weight—the reality of motion without its expression. One can see also the possible *dispersion* of any motion in mass through the conduction of motion in molecule—vibration.

It is not in any man's power, then, to set bounds to the *stored motion* of the universe, and it is not even in any man's power to prove the molecular motion of the sun perishable. If all energy *must* end, why *has it not* ended? The infinitude of the past gives the same possibility of an end in the past, as the infinitude of the future the possibility of an end in the future. Energy, then, has either begun, or has always been. If *begun*, the principles of the beginning, in all probability, *still are*; if *always been*, then it *always will be*.

It is through this doctrine of the conservation of force that, in regard to causality, Mr Bain, with a very proper air of modest self-denial, makes a clutch at originality. He attributes to himself the "innovation" of "rendering" "cause" "by the new doctrine called the Conservation of Force," etc. But is such "clutch" possible to one who denies *power*, and asserts *succession* only? There is the mechanical equivalent of heat: what meaning can M E have for Mr Bain? Will he believe that there is heat *here*, and M E *there*, only as two units of a mere succession which in their own nature are not identical! Manifestly, there is a *community of nature* in the two sides of the conservation of force that summarily truncates any use of them by Mr Bain—at the same time that it is admirably corroborative of the true theory of causality which places its principle in Identity. Heat is

motion, and really precisely the same motion is M E. When stopped by a wall (say), the motion of a cannon ball vanishes as in mass, but reappears as in molecule—heat. We see, then, in such an example, very strikingly, how the virtue that conjoins the two terms in causality is Identity. *Power*, therefore, is no abstraction, but has an *implement, a, filling—of identity*. Instead, consequently, of the conservation of force explaining causality, as is preposterously the proposition of Mr Bam, it is causality that, on the contrary, explains *it*. That is, Causality, as the universal, subsumes the Conservation of Force, as the particular, under it. It is but inconsistency, then, in Mr Bain, that—though the *temptation* may be acknowledged—would lead him, self-paralysed, as he is, in regard to *power*, to the *clutch* alluded to.

With reference to Mr Huxley, now, the result, so far, is this :—There *is* a necessary nexus in the relation of cause and effect, and no interest of spirit is to be rescued from materialism by the denial of it.

2. Nor is this one whit more possible by means of the expedient that we do not know things *in themselves*—that we only know phenomena—that we do not know what *substance* is. Mr Huxley's reason for ignorance here is precisely my reason, and everybody else's, for knowledge. As little as the causal nexus disappears because it is no mere affair of sense, so little does substance disappear for any similar reason. We can know a substance only through its qualities, and it is but an absurdity to adduce this, our knowledge of it, only as the proof and the guarantee of our ignorance of it. Consider this! We know substance only by reason of qualities, therefore we do *not* know it. That is, we do *not* know by means of the very reason through which we *do* know! Is not this a mere paying of ourselves with words? A thing that does not act can never be known, and is only equal to nothing. Is it reasonable, then, to say that, precisely when it makes itself known by acting, precisely then it makes itself unknown by acting, as if it had never acted? How else *can* a thing be known but by acting—by its qualities? and is the only medium of admission to be made also the single medium of exclusion! We do not know things in themselves, because we only know what they are for us! Well, but what they are *for us*, is really what they are *in themselves*? A thing, a substance, is not a bundle, is not a *collection* of qualities; it is as much an intussusception of its qualities as an ego is of its ideas. There is not greenness here in this crystal, transparency there, and sourness yonder. It is the substance, the single and individual unit, the *it*, that is green, and likewise transparent, and also sour. Would you have me, in independence of the greenness, and transparency, and sourness, take you out the *it* and show it you? and even then, would you be able to *know* it, but as otherwise or similarly green, and transparent, and sour, etc. If you will blindfold yourself then you *must*; but it is your own act. I know the character of a man only by knowing what this character is for me; but do I not also then know what it is in itself? After I have thoroughly put myself at home with Shakespeare, or Burns, or Cromwell, am I immediately to turn round and stultify myself by figuring some substance, some *in itself* that is only gratuitous and foreign to the case. Mr Huxley is in his chamber: Does he then mystify himself into an impossible chaos by muttering to himself—Ah, that fire, that carpet, that table, these chairs, these books, they are really something quite else than what they are for me—what they are for me is a small matter—nothing—but what they are *not* for me—Ah! that *were* something, did I but know that! Does Mr Huxley really hide from himself what that picture on the wall is for him and in itself, by disconsolately murmuring, I am absolutely ignorant—I can never know what canvas, what hemp is in itself? Is not all that talk about an *in itself* that is not for him idle? Does he not *inhabit* the room? and is it not a thoroughly-intelligible system? So with the world : it is an intelligible—external—system. This stone that I take up, am I really to mystify or stultify myself in its regard by saying—If my muscles were infinitely stronger, it would dissolve in my grasp? It *is* black, it *might* be red. What then? Is not the lobster boiled the same lobster that it was unboiled? Mr Huxley, surely, does not expect us to follow him into that silly, wholly antiquated and effete rubbish that bids us cross our fingers to examine a pea, or squint our eyes to look at the table. Shall we, then, only behold the world aright—by putting our head between our legs? Is a cramp truth, convulsions reason, or distortion philosophy?

I do know substance, and I know it by and through the qualities with which I know so well how to serve myself. Here is a printed Shakespeare: is there in its regard an *in itself* which I do not know, but which, if known, would dwarf into insignificance all that I do know? Why, I do know it in itself—its very paper and boards, if you like—I know them in themselves too. There is no such thing anywhere in it as this in itself, that is said to be unknown. All that the book need be, should be, can be—in itself, it is for me. The true *in itself* there is Shakespeare's soul, and that I have access to—at least, all that *can* be done *is* done for my access. Thinkers like Mr Huxley are very wroth at *obscurantism*; but, by the same involuntary retribution through which they fall into the miraculous by fleeing it, they themselves are the obscurantists proper. At the very moment that they insist on knowledge, they insist also on dream—a dream that stultifies all knowledge into fragments of an unknown inane. We must not delude ourselves with phrases, then—phrases that are but subterfuges and evasions. God has not sent us to know only mockeries here—appearances. On the contrary, He has given it us to know things—things in themselves—a concrete *system* of things, as well external as internal, that is perfectly intelligible.

3. And this brings us to Mr Huxley's last ignorance—the ignorance of *externality*, the reason for which is that we know only consciousnesses, and *in* consciousness. Mr Huxley makes only a convenience of this, however; in his actual world it is no ingredient. That actual world is simply materialism; and the idealism it talks of in consciousness is only, as it were, an occasional flash from a private lantern that is peculiarly convenient at times for the reassurance of others, perhaps of ourselves! Let us have the materialism of knowledge for our daily work, he says, but the idealism of ignorance for our nightly dream—and the good of our souls, if we will! The expedient, therefore, does not seem a very hopeful one—an expedient that would counsel reason to take refuge in ignorance. But neither are the facts on its side. That we only know *within* is no reason that what we know may not be really *without*. The truth is that we can test it, and try it, and lay stumbling blocks in the way of it, and experiment on it, and prove it in a thousand ways—to the result that we do know an actually independent external system of things. To attempt to crush all this into the water-drop in the hollow of an Arab boy's hand, or, what is about the same thing, into the point of consciousness, and *leave* it there, is but supererogatory delusion, and the trick of a word.

But, so, we have a demonstration at once of the nullity of Mr Huxley's "extrication" and of the reality of his materialism. Doubt is always an unusual substitute for certainty; but doubt in regard to causality, or substantiality, or externality, is gratuitous and unfounded. We must decline, then, the safeguard of scepticism with which Mr Huxley would make believe to protect us from materialism; and even hint, but as gently as possible, that he who, at the hour that now is, would seriously proffer us—(the two fingers gravely crossed over the pea!)—any such doctrines, is, philosophically, as late, as he was, physiologically, precipitate. Perhaps that he is late in the one case is the why he was precipitate in the other. But, all that being so, at the same time that he would express all phenomena in terms of matter—would explain mind itself by the "disposition of mere material molecules," I cannot see that Mr Huxley is possessed of any—the very smallest—reason for refusing for himself the name of materialist. When he has placed *materialism* as an entire *system* of *knowledge* over or on his right hand, he cannot expect much confidence from us in what *may* be the sneer that points to *ignorance*, and the *word* idealism, profanely to say it, *over the left*. Would Mr Huxley but really take refuge in the principle of Descartes—self-consciousness! Is philosophy—are the philosophers, Plato, Aristotle, Plotinus, Proclus, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibnitz, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel—these, and all the rest, with their enormous writings—are they only there to say, We know nothing but successive phenomena *in* consciousness? Knowing that, are we dispensed from the *labour* of the region? Knowing that, and saying that, are we, while we work only *for* science, and *in* matter, perfectly cultivated, enlightened minds in the centre who hold the balance even? That is in one word the position of Mr Huxley; but is it likely that the vast, heaven-scaling mountain of philosophy has yielded only such a drowned mouse of a result? And can we claim to be philosophers by knowing no more? It is quite certain, however, that Messrs Mill and Bain write enormous books and for no other result—After all, then, Mr Huxley may have his own excuse! It is for us to know, nevertheless, that the position is wrong—that philosophy, perhaps, only begins where Mr Huxley ends; for the problem of said phenomena is to it—*what* they are, not simply *that* they are. But into this, plainly, we cannot enter at present.

Note.

It is argued by Mr Huxley in his essay on "Yeast," as against Kant, who conceived generally, "the special peculiarity of the living body to be that the parts exist for the sake of the whole, and the whole for the sake of the parts," that by the resolution of the living body "into an aggregation of quasi-independent cells," "this conception has ceased to be tenable." But it is not so certain that this is so, whether as regards the cells, or as regards the body. A cell is still a *whole* of *parts*, and both parts and whole are in the relation assigned by Kant. Then, when the actual inter-connections of the body and the cells are studied, the result is not what Mr Huxley would seem to infer as to the *primacy*, so to speak, and independence of the cells. They, rather, are seen to be but subservient ministers, while the body itself is the prime and dominating agent. In illustration here, let me quote from my review of Dr Beale's recent work on Protoplasm, in the *Edinburgh Courant* for February 25, 1870:—

"All the tissues and organs of which we consist are built up, according to Dr Beale, by millions of minute living particles. Each of these is a unit of germinal matter, surrounded or faced by formed material. This formed material goes to constitute the tissue or organ—skin, muscle, bone, liver, lung, etc.—in which the living particle of germinal matter finds itself. . . Materials from the blood constantly pass into the centres of the particles of the germinal matter. These particles are thus fed, for they convert the materials they receive into their own substance, at the same time that, at their own surfaces, they themselves are constantly passing into the non-living state of formed material. This, then, is the process. Germinal matter (a cell) converts pabulum (from the blood) into itself, multiplies, and lastly dies (in an external ring or external surface) into formed

material. The three matters italicised constitute thus Dr Beale's physiological elements, and of these the germinal matter alone lives. . . . The least erudite reader may be able to form to himself, perhaps now, a perfectly clear idea of the nature, place, and business of these working units (the cells or germinal particles) in the general economy. It is not difficult for any one to picture a skeleton, or to conceive it filled up with muscles, and covered with skin. As little difficult will it be, imaginatively, to place lungs, heart, stomach, and viscera, within the trunk, and to connect every part of these, as well as of bone, muscle, and skin, with the marrowy brain within the skull, by means of the threads of the nerves. These are the general outlines of the structure, and this structure is now on the whole to be conceived as formed material thrown up by millions of germinal particles seated beneath or around it. The entire surface of the skin, for example, is to be conceived as so much formed material casing so many millions of germinal particles that cluster over its inner surface. Vessels, again, in similar illustration, are to be viewed as so many pipes and pipelets, the solid canals of which are only the formed material of innumerable germinal particles around them. In this way, then, the germinal particles' almost show as so many living paving-beetles constantly pushing up the continuity of the streets and walls—of the bone, skin, brain, that constitute man. But this being so, is it possible to avoid realising to ourselves, and in a very vivid manner, the absurdity of the pretensions of Mr Huxley to materialise all the processes of the organism by means of the microscope? Why, of this organisation itself as such—that is, of the mechanical apparatus it presents to us—the microscope tells us nothing whatever. The microscope only enables us to see a single paving-beetle, a single cell, a single germinal particle in connection with more or less of its own portion of formed material—a single coral, so to speak, and the polype that died into it: it tells us nothing whatever of the vast machine which these polypes have all unconsciously built up with their coral. The mighty and complex fabric of man is, after all, despite its innumerable parts, a unity : all these parts but go towards that unity, are sublated into it. Now, what of all that does microscopic observation tell us? Why, simply nothing. Myriads of miserable Egyptians carried stones to the Pyramid; but no microscopic watching of any one of these, stone and all, would ever explain the Pyramid itself—its many to a one. So with the frame of man; on which, would we understand it aright, it is infinitely more necessary to turn the lens, so to speak, of an all-embracing telescope, than to turn on its infinitesimal particles the minuteness of the microscope. . . . It must be evident, indeed, that the microscopic particle throws but small light on, so to speak, the telescopic whole. Consider the supply of pabulum alone. If with that pabulum the germinal particles build up individually the various units of the machine, it is the machine itself, and as a whole, that supplies that pabulum. Nay, it is the machine itself that properly alone lives, that connects all particles, living or dead, into a unity and purpose of which unity the particles themselves, whether living or dead, know naught. . . . The probability is, then, that the germinal particles have little action besides providing for the keeping up of the tissues, and that it is on these tissues, for the most part, that the functions of the single unity depend."

In short, man's life is in his mechanism as a whole—in his coral; and not in the polypes that supplied it to him. That is, it is the so-called dead formed material that alone truly lives, and not the so-called living germinal matter that is assumed to die into it. Or, as I said at first, the cells are but as servants to the body itself, which is alone the lord; the primacy lies with the latter and not with the former; Kant's dictum is as valid to-day as it was yesterday.

A Short Address to the Clergy of all Denominations and to Earnest Enquirers After Truth,
By A Layman.

"Light is come into the world and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

"He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light."

"The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness compre-bendeth it not."

Price, One Shilling.

E. Purton & Co., Printers Melbourne 106 Elizabeth Street. 1875

OH! Merciful Father, Thou Infinite Spirit of Life, Source of all Love—all Wisdom—all Light, Who hast, in Thy goodness graciously as with a dew drop from Thy great exhaustless Fountain of intelligence, endowed mankind with reason, grant that we may be enabled at all times to utilize that Divine Gift, so that every thing we think, say, and do, may be in accordance therewith, and let us not bury that precious talent which Thou hast entrusted us with, but let it shine forth in every action of our lives, and thereby induce others to follow in the grand and eternal pathway of progression, so strengthen us that we may understand the necessities of our nature, and by the knowledge of them, live in harmony with Thy laws, and so come nearer to Thee. Help us through the ministry of Thy servants our Brothers and Sisters, that we may do our duty to ourselves and to our fellows. We would aspire to knowledge and wisdom not for our own sakes only, but for the good of all. Teach us the knowledge of ourselves and thereby shall we gain wisdom. Enable us to pass through this mundane existence unmoved by the vicissitudes and trials of life, let us not be cast down in adversity, nor yet elated in prosperity, let us not be indolent in the calm of life, nor yet perplexed nor dismayed when the storm and tempest of death and trouble assail us or those dear to us. Strengthen us under every trial and disappointment,

enabling us at all times to say "Thy will be done" giving to the needy the help our means allow, doing unto others as we would be done by, and may we abide in the Truth for ever, casting its shining beams around us, as Thou hast with liberal hand scattered Thy Fatherly blessings universally upon all Thy creatures. We ask Thee not for special blessings for ourselves, nor that Thou shouldst alter Thine unerring laws to suit our conceptions of what is right, as do those who know not Thee, nor that Thy laws are as fixed and as unalterable as Thou art—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, but we pray that they who are still blinded by superstition, and whose conceptions of Thee and of Thy great laws have been so perverted by their early teachings, may be released from the mental slavery in which they are still unconsciously enthralled and be brought to the fullness of the light of Thy eternal Love, so that they also may with us be participaters of that joy which the knowledge of the Holy Truth brings with it.

Melbourne,

August 1875.

A Short Address to the Clergy of all Denominations and to Earnest Enquirers After Truth.

"If an offence come out of Truth, better is it that the offence come, than that the Truth be concealed."

GENTLEMEN,—

You must excuse my not addressing you as Reverend Sirs, as I dislike irony in treating on serious matters, you must also excuse the unsophisticated manner in which I handle the subject under consideration, I have an aversion to clerical phraseology and scholastic jargon, which only help to mystify instead of elucidating the truth, the object I have in view in penning the following observations. This is not intended, I may state, as a learned dissertation, but consists merely of a few simple remarks by a plain man, engaged in business, and which are dictated by common sense, the outcome of unbiased and unprejudiced investigation by a reasoning mind. Doubtless many of you will consider it presumptuous on my part in assuming to address such a numerous, and as a rule, well educated body of men, but remember a great authority is reported to have said "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise" Matt. xxi. 16; and of whom the Jews are reported to have spoken in this manner "We know that God spake unto Moses: as for this fellow we know not from whence he is." Let me assure you that in whatever light my observations may appear to you, I have no desire to offend, but on the contrary to address you with all due respect and with the best intentions, though you may not credit me with such. I am however a non-respecter of persons, knowing full well that the Jewish Rabbi, the Romish Pope, the Episcopalian Archbishop, the Presbyterian Minister, the Methodist Preacher, and myself, are but animals imbued with an immortal spark of deity, constituting us brothers with the humblest beggar who treads the earth. I shall be as brief in my observations as possible, as the eternal truth requires no garnishing. Should almost similar remarks be repeated in the course of my observations, it must be borne in mind that frequently the same arguments hold good in addressing different classes of people on the same subject, which must be accepted as my excuse therefore. It is said, "a good thing cannot be too often repeated, so long as it does not injure any one." That many of my statements will call forth ridicule from a certain class of minds I am well aware, but to such I may quote:

*"A moral, sensible, and well bred man
Will not offend me—and no other can."*

The mind conscious of right is not easily disturbed by the scoffs and sneers of bigoted or ignorant adversaries. I may farther remark that the observations contained herein are the outcome of earnest and prayerful research, which owing to the false teachings of my youth have entailed on me considerable mental conflicts at times, but for which I now feel amply repaid, and that whilst others have occupied themselves in the attainment of political distinction, or literary fame I have for many years past devoted my spare hours to theological study, not for the purpose of advancing my social or monetary position, but from the delight I have

experienced in the investigation of this important subject, and in the hope of benefiting myself and others thereby.

A distinguished author of a recent publication, writes as follows :

"Whoever has had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the mental condition of the intelligent classes in Europe, America, "and elsewhere," must have perceived that there is a great and rapidly-increasing departure from the public religious faith, and that, while among the more frank this divergence is not concealed, there is a far more extensive and far more dangerous (?) secession, private-and unacknowledged.

So widespread and so powerful is this secession that it can neither be treated with contempt nor with punishment. It cannot be extinguished by derision, by vituperation, or by force. The time is rapidly approaching when it will give rise to serious political results.

Ecclesiastical spirit no longer inspires the policy of the world. Military fervor in behalf of faith has disappeared. Its only souvenirs are the marble effigies of crusading knights, reposing in the silent crypts of churches on their tombs.

That a crisis is impending is shown by the attitude of the great powers towards the papacy. The papacy represents the ideas and aspirations of two-thirds of the population of Europe—it insists on a political supremacy in accordance with its claims to a divine origin and mission, and a restoration of the mediaeval order of things, loudly declaring that it will accept no reconciliation with modern civilization.

The antagonism we thus witness between Religion and Science is the continuation of a struggle that commenced when Christianity began to attain political power. A divine revelation must necessarily be intolerant of contradiction; it must repudiate all improvement in itself, and view with disdain that arising from the progressive intellectual development of man. But our opinions on every subject are continually liable to modification, from the irresistible advance of human knowledge.

Can we exaggerate the importance of a contention in which every thoughtful person must take part, whether he will or no? In a matter so solemn as that of religion, all men, whose temporal interests are not involved in existing institutions, earnestly desire to find the truth. They seek information as to the subjects in dispute, and as to the conduct of the disputants.

*The history of science is not a mere record of isolated discoveries; it is a narrative of the conflict of two contending powers, the expansive force of the human intellect on one side, and the compression arising from traditional faith on the other * * * * * Science has never sought to ally herself to civil power—she has never attempted to throw odium or inflict social ruin on any human being—she has never subjected anyone to mental torment, physical torture, least of all to death, for the purpose of upholding or promoting her ideas. She presents herself unstained by cruelties and crimes. But in the Vatican—we have only to recall the Inquisition—the hands that are now raised in appeals to the Most Merciful are crimsoned. They have been steeped in Blood * * * * * The attention of many truth-seeking persons has been so exclusively given to the details of sectarian dissensions that the long strife, in the conflict between religion and science, is popularly but little known * * * * **

No spectacle can be presented to the thoughtful mind more solemn, more mournful, than that of the dying of an ancient religion, which in its day has given consolation to many generations of men."

But if that religion is based on a wrong foundation, and if the hopes held out thereby are fallacious and deceptive, surely in all reason the sooner the errors of that religious belief, or beliefs are pointed out the better, especially when a religion more in accordance with our experience of God's mercy, love, justice, and wisdom, more rational, and one more worthy of man's highest aspirations, can be pointed out, the truth of which moreover can, by personal investigation, be proved and demonstrated beyond the possibility of doubt. Although I write so confidently, I have no desire to dictate, on the contrary I do not wish that anyone should be led by what I state, or give credence to my statements, but only so far as their reason approves. It is easy to mislead others by appealing to their feelings, and thus warp their judgment, but it is not so in addressing their reason. The great difficulty is to get people to use their reason, free from bias and prejudice in religious matters, owing to the incrustation of antiquated superstition which surrounds or blinds their reason, and which they have been taught and still look upon as religion. To many the facts stated herein, I am aware, are not new, but to such they are worthy of reconsideration. All objections to, and comments thereon, based on reason, will be read by the writer with much interest, as the elucidation of truth is his sole object, not victory for his views, which he holds subject to amendment on approved suggestions from whatever source emanating.

Allow me to respectfully ask, "Have you ever, free from bias, seriously contemplated the foundations on which your various religious tenets, beliefs, teachings, and hopes are based?" If not it is high time you did, and if you have, (assuming I am addressing rational beings,) you must be fully aware of the absurd superstitious nonsense which you and your churches inculcate as the truth of God. I shall take the Jewish Rabbi first.

Sir,

Four people in all parts of the world for many ages past have had the credit of being cute enough in the business of every day life, so I suppose you as one of their descendants, are not devoid of reason nor of observation. Experience must have taught you, or if not it should have, that the laws of nature are fixed, and like their Great Maker are the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, whilst at the same time you profess to believe that the Old Testament (as Christians call it) is the directly inspired word of the Great Creator of the Universe, which implies that He formerly manifested Himself to man, differently to what He now does, and wherein at the commencement, it is stated that a serpent spoke to a woman called Eve, telling her the truth, that she would not die when she ate of a certain fruit, leaving it to be inferred that He who is perfection, and to whom we are led to understand in other parts, a lie was an abomination, told that which was false, for he is represented as having said, "in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Now, Sir, if nature's laws are fixed as science has clearly demonstrated that they are, and the biblical words reliable, we should have had serpents talking to women in succeeding ages—did you ever meet a talking serpent? I have not, and I have travelled a good deal on three continents of the globe, nor have I ever yet met with anyone who did. Again, if God is a non-respecter of persons, and the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, surely it is plain, if He appeared and spoke to Adam, Abraham, Moses, &c., in olden times as reported, He would appear and speak to others now, and if He, whom no man hath seen nor heard His voice at, any time, does not do so in our day, then we may be perfectly sure He never did. Either the book or the authorship imputed to it must be false, you can choose which you like. Do not imagine that by even imputing a lie to the Great Creator, or more properly the Great Evolver, of all things, that you can sin against God, for let me assure you, and all the world besides, that man can neither debase nor elevate the Ruler of All, he can only sin against himself; he is a perfectly free-will being within the bounds of nature's laws; he can debase himself by giving way to his animal passions, or he can elevate himself by cultivating his divine attributes, viz., love, wisdom, truth, justice, &c. The Great Lawgiver being perfection, it follows as a matter of necessity that all His laws are perfect, requiring no amending, as those of man, which have to be altered to suit circumstances, owing to the eternal law of progression. God's laws being perfection, all contingencies that may arise through their working are duly provided for therein, which the writers of that book, which you revere as the direct Word of God, were unaware of, living as they did in semi-savage times. You, Sir, and your people like most other religionists, are led away by early teachings and your veneration for the antiquity of the writings of that book, forgetting that antiquity cannot make that which is false true, nor eternity, cause a truth to be a lie. I am well aware of the sacred care with which your ancient writings have been preserved and handed down, and I freely grant their genuineness as copies, but it is the fallacy and irrationality of the originals against which I protest. You must admit that there are many things in those ancient writings that, if told you by your dearest friends, as happening now, you would not believe; then, why believe them because they were written as having occurred a few thousand years ago? If their occurrence in the present day, when you can investigate them, is unworthy of belief, then *surely* their occurrence in olden times is equally worthy of a rational being's discrediting; and, if you still deny this, pray when did the Great Lawgiver bring in His amending act, or acts?

I have only referred to one or two of the minor circumstances of which there are hundreds equally as glaring in your belief, but sufficient I consider, to show an unprejudiced mind open to conviction, the absurdity of your religion, notwithstanding its antiquity, and by your allowing many of the more barbaric ordinances and commands of the Mosaic law to fall into disuse, you confirm my assertion. Deny it as you like, the reason God has given you, if freed from bias, tells you that what I state is the truth; you as well as I know that the voice of reason is the only voice of God that hath spoken to man now or at any time. Passing over the horrible commands which Moses is represented as having received from God, Who is Love, to murder all the males, and the females who had lain with men, belonging to the enemies of the children of Israel, but to spare the virgins, evidently for the gratification of their lustful desires; let us take the 12th chap, of Numbers where Miriam and her brother Aaran are represented to have indulged in a little scandal against Moses for having married the negro woman, and where it is also reported that the great Ruler of countless worlds, besides this small planet, is reported to have said unto Moses, "If her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven days? let her be shut out from the camp seven days, and after that let her be received in again." Just for one moment contemplate such small talk as this being ascribed to the Great Creator! Did you ever consider if Moses wrote the five books, the authorship of which he is credited with, what an extraordinary clever man he must have been to write an account of his own death and burial? I must, however, admit that the bible is consistent in some respects. The King, to whom the authorship of the Psalms is imputed, but who acted the part of a villain so well in the case of Uriah the Hittite, in sending him to the front of the battle, with instructions to Joab to retire from

him and let him be killed, in order that he the king, might retain the services of Uriah's wife, Bath-sheba, for his lustful purposes, and whom he had in Uriah's absence previously seduced, might be well termed a man after God's own heart, that is, of the Jewish deity, who sent so many plagues upon poor old Pharaoh, in order to induce him to let the children of Israel depart out of Egyptian bondage, yet each time hardening his heart; that he should not let them go, and of which Deity it is written, that he will laugh at his enemies when their calamity cometh; what a hideous demon! not a God.

I should like to know whether your Deity has got tired of the smell of the fat of oxen, &c., or have you got tired of offering sweet smelling savours of this kind to your God? If the anthropomorphic deity of the bible were the God of the universe, God help mankind. Thanks be to our merciful, heavenly Father, we have incontrovertible evidences in nature and in our own experience, that both the Jewish Deity and its Satan, are mythical beings, unworthy of retention in the minds of rational beings, however much they may be hedged around by mystery, or sanctified by antiquity. It is said "distance lends enchantment to the view," and surely in the case of the Jewish records it has done so in a marked degree. To me it is evident that the demons of Adam, Abraham, Moses, and the other biblical personages have been mistaken for God, the Father of all, who is in other parts alluded to, and that through ignorance and misconception, the Almighty and the Jewish demons have been jumbled together, as all one and the same, this will explain many of the absurdities contained in the Bible. We are told in the xxii. chapter of Genesis, that God tempted Abraham to take his only son, Isaac, to the land of Moriah and there offer him for a burnt offering, and in another part that God tempteth no man, which clearly shows that it was an evil spirit that tempted Abraham to do such an absurd and wrong action. What would the Great Creator of the Universe want with the sacrifice of an innocent, little child, or all the oxen, sheep or goats in the world? Let your reason, unbiased, decide. At the 11th verse of the chapter referred to, we are told an angel or good spirit told Abraham not to injure the child, which advice he very sensibly took. You may say all this took place in order that God might try Abraham's faith, as if God, like man, did not know without trying. You may ask, has not God then revealed Himself to man? and I reply yes, in all ages and by the same means, viz : through His eternal and inscrutable laws which man terms nature's laws, and He will continue to reveal Himself to man through the same, throughout eternity and by no other means. God not being a personal deity, as man has ignorantly assumed, He requires not the glory of man, for all His works glorify Him. Who by searching can find out God, let Him be true and every man a liar. As one of your people once said to me, "if we were God's chosen people He must have had a bad lot to choose from," and I agreed with him, although I admit I have known and still have a few worthy Jews as friends, and I look upon a Jew, born more than 18 centuries ago as the greatest Reformer the world has ever witnessed, whom his ignorant countrymen murdered, but whom I am proud to call my elder brother. The simple truths which he taught and exemplified in his life, notwithstanding all their perversion and adding to since, have not been and never can be, refuted by the greatest or most learned philosophers. It is said that one-third of the Christians in the world worship a Jew, and the remaining two-thirds a Jewess, his mother, whom they have deified as the Queen of Heaven, which is quite consistent with the title given to her son, viz: "the Prince of the House of David." You may further ask, if I do not admit the Bible as the inspired word of God, how do I account for the prophecies it contains and their fulfilment? I admit the inspiration of the sublime truths which the Bible contains, but not as from God direct, but mediately through ministering angels, and as for the prophecies and their fulfilment, many of which I acknowledge; I shall explain on another occasion. Let me however, assure you if these few remarks have called forth your reason and shaken your faith in your ancient fables, that I never pull down without I can put a better edifice in the place thereof, but remember that there is a time for all things, a time for pulling down and a time for erecting, a time for scattering and a time for gathering—so have patience, Mr. Rabbi,—Moses did not bring the Children of Israel through the desert in a week, nor was Rome built in a day.

TO THE ROMISH PRIEST—

Sir—Your church, professing to be the original one from which all the other so-called Christian sects have sprung, calls for my attention next. You claim direct authority as the Church of Christ from St. Peter. Well, as far as Peter is concerned, I will admit this, for I am aware the key, which you boast of having received from him, was the secret of spiritual power by which your Church in former times was enabled to perform acts which, to the uninitiated, appeared miraculous, and which it falsely claimed as such. This power is now lost to your Church, although it is almost universally manifested outside the pale thereof, but where did Peter obtain the authority to constitute your Church alone, with all its pomp and ceremonies, as Christ's special Church? No doubt you will reply—from Jesus himself. I deny it, and facts bear me out. Jesus had no Vatican, cathedrals, nor churches; no highly decorated and paid cardinals and priests; he encouraged no high mass nor grand ceremonial displays; no painted pictures of saints, martyrs, or their mothers; no long set forms of public prayers

in a language unknown to most of his listeners; on the contrary, he told his followers to take no scrip nor money when they went forth to preach the simple truths he taught, and exemplified, saying, the laborer was worthy of his food, or, in other words, "don't make a trade of religion, and if the simple but grand truths I have taught you do not command from your hearers the voluntary supply of the necessaries of life, don't preach them to them, but shake the dust of their streets off your feet." You may plead that you have no fixed salaries like the clergy of other denominations. I maintain, however, that your Church is, and has been supported by a system of black mail levied upon its followers, by your holding out to them false hopes, and by intimidation, through credulity and fear, which you have at all times made a special point of cultivating. As for public prayers, are we not told that Jesus condemned the Pharisees for their long prayers printed or written on the borders of their garments, standing at the corners of the streets, and did he not say, "when ye pray enter into your closets, and pray in secret, and that God Who seeth in secret shall reward thee openly"? As for claiming to be Deity, did he not rebuke those who even called him Good Master? saying, there was none good save God. When asked how to pray, did he say My Father but your God which art in heaven? no, he said, "Our Father which art in heaven," also, "I go to my Father and to your Father, to my God and to your God." He also frequently stated he was the Son of Man, but in no place did he say he was the Son of the Holy Ghost, and if he were God, as you assume he was, he could not be the son of Mary, nor of any other woman. Did he mention anything in his beautiful sermon on the mount, as reported, about the wrath of our merciful Heavenly Father to be appeased by himself being murdered, or about the sins of those then living, and of countless millions yet unborn, being washed out by his blood, or that his followers were to be redeemed through his martyrdom? No! he had better sense; he knew that as an earthly parent forgives the errors of his children so our Heavenly Father is always more ready to forgive our sins than we are to ask or receive, otherwise we should not exist. He also knew that his crucifixion, or the crucifixion of all the world, would not alter either in this life, or in that which is to come, the fixed and certain law of effect following cause, no more than the sacrifice of a thousand bullocks on a thousand Jewish altars would affect or change any other of nature's laws. Jesus was the great exemplar of mankind, not the Saviour of man. It is by following out the beautiful example he set us in his life, not by trusting to the effects of his cruel murder upon our souls, that we shall raise ourselves to the position of being worthy to be called the sons of God, remember this—Jesus said, "For I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done," &c.—John xiii., 15. You must be well aware that Jesus taught none of the absurd doctrines, which are diametrically opposed to, and not in accordance with, his simple truths, that some of his biographers and followers afterwards ascribed to him, hard to be understood, as Peter truly remarked. The learned and energetic Saul of Tarsus, afterwards designated St. Paul, never saw Jesus in this life, he only saw him in a vision, which had the effect of converting him to Spiritualism, and he, like Swedenborg, and many of those professing to be Spiritualists at the present day, tried his hand at improving the communications he received, mixing up his early Jewish sacrificial teachings therewith, and spoiling thereby, the cause which he meant to support. Jesus is reported to have said, that love to God and man, comprised all the law and the prophets, supposing he was addressing rational beings he did not think it necessary to add and use the reason God has given you in all things, as he himself did and acted up thereto. This utilization of the divine gift, is a commandment very much wanted in the present day, especially when we see the superstitious nonsense of the dark ages taught, in this falsely called enlightened ago as the eternal truth of God, but in this I fear you will not have the candour and magnanimity to agree with me, although you must be fully aware of its truth and rationality as well as I am.

By what authority, I ask, Sir, "did the early Fathers of the Church of Rome" constitute themselves as God's arbitrators, selecting from a number of old manuscripts, which were, and which were not His writings. I maintain it was the very height of arrogance for a lot of fallible men to presume to pronounce by their *ipse dixit* which were fallible writings, and which were infallible. Allow me to tell you that there is only one infallible, the Great Creator, who has given all men reason, but which so few have made use of, owing to the superstitious nonsense they have been taught under the name of religion. There is no infallible book, for God has never inspired any man direct; there is no infallible man, and I maintain, any one who claims to be so, must be antechrist, for Jesus, as I have before written, said there was *none* good but God, and I think you even will admit that, were it possible that a man could be infallible, he would require first of all to be good. What say you? We are told that that mythical being, Satan, was expelled from heaven for trying to be equal with God. Is not the claiming to be infallible an attribute pertaining to God alone, very much similar to Satan's pretensions? Surely you would be sorry to hear of your Pope meeting a like fate to Satan in the next world. He had better at once renounce infallibility, if Satan's case can be relied on as genuine.

You are nearer the mark, I am aware, in your notions regarding the future life with respect to the purgatorial state, than the Protestants, with their arbitrary notion, of either perfect purity and *entré* into the immediate presence of God, or utter depravity and prompt ushering into the company of the mythical monster called the Devil; but I consider you outdo Barnum, Barnum himself in selling absolution and in the granting of special indulgences; how you must enjoy the joke, when drinking your convivial glasses of wine together, as

you talk over the confessions of your various dupes. I think you should give up the impanation of Deity notion, as the national education scheme is making it too dangerous to continue this doctrine of God, in a bit of bread much longer; in fact I wonder how you manage to get them to swallow the wafer even now. Can you tell me who first concocted this transubstantiation doctrine? It was worthy of St. Paul, whom I believe was the first to conceive the monstrous notion of the incarnation of Deity in person. I observe some one in America, has started afresh the old doctrine which had died out, of the re-incarnation of the soul. By the way, won't this, if it becomes popular, make a mull of the resurrection of the body theory? Just fancy several resuscitated bodies, and only one poor soul to divide amongst the lot!

But to be serious, for it is beyond a joke to think that in the nineteenth century people otherwise rational and well-educated allow such imbecile barbaric notions to have a footing at all. Do not the downright absurdities which man has tagged on to the simple teachings of Jesus, and the monstrous cruelties which were practised by your Church, under the name of religion, demonstrate beyond the possibility of doubt, that wrath is not an attribute of the Almighty's, so falsely ascribed to Him in the Bible? Surely, if He were revengeful, the absurdities imputed to Him by man in his ignorance, and the tortures inflicted in His name, have been more than sufficient to raise the wrath of Him, who is represented as saying—"Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." I may here, however, remark that I had no fear of my earthly father, who was a good man in many respects (although the prefix Rev. was fixed to his name), for I had too much love for him; so in like manner I have no fear of my merciful Heavenly Father, for I have greater love for Him, and I have truly experienced, that perfect love casteth out fear, so that I can say, since I have, as is open to all, had revealed to me the knowledge of the eternal truth of God as opposed to that of men or sects; I fear neither God, man, nor devil, for I know the first that He is love, that the second cannot injure my soul, its immortality having been proved and demonstrated to me beyond the possibility of doubt, and that as for the third, the only Devil which exists, is in man's own evili maginations. The result is, the truth has made me free, which will explain the off-band manner I now treat those absurdities which I formerly looked upon with such superstitious awe and reverence. From your stand-point I may appear worse than an infidel, but this does not affect me. All reformers are veiwed in this light at first, but when you have gained a knowledge of the eternal truth you will think otherwise.

TO THE PROTESTANT PARSON, whether you are an Episcopalian Archbishop with £30,000 a year, a poor Curate, preferring genteel poverty to honest hard work, a Scotch kirk minister, or a Methodist preacher it matters not.
SIR,—

Many of the observations I have made to the Jewish Rabbi and Romish priest, are equally applicable to your case, so please appropriate them and thus save repetition. I must tell you at the outset, that the Jews and Papists are in many respects more consistent than you are, in some of the tenets of your churches, for instance the former in respect to the unity and indivisibility of the deity, and the Catholics, in regard to the interpretation of the Scriptures, their priests say to their dupes, you must not contemplate it by your own judgment you must take my interpretation of it only, whereas your churches profess the right of individual interpretation; but no sooner does one of your people attempt to exercise this boasted right beyond a slight limit, than you look upon and hold him up as an infidel and probably pray for him as one on the sure road to perdition—for what? For having had the barefaced effrontery to exercise this professed right and use his reason, God's grandest gift to man; and what is the result? You have in a degree, I admit, stifled open enquiry; but do you think you have stopped the yearnings of thirsting souls for more light? No! far from it, for ninetenths of those who for form's sake attend your meetings and outwardly conform to your ordinances, do not believe one half of what you preach to them; why? Because their reason revolts at it as derogatory to their conceptions of their merciful, heavenly Father, and as opposed to their experience of His boundless love and mercy, as well as repugnant to their reason. While they are hungering for the bread of life, you are offering them the stones of dogma, and while they are thirsting for the knowledge of the future life and of its reality, you are preaching about some foolish superstitious fable as the word of the living God, which neither you nor they really believe at heart; in consequence of this the universal cry is, that faith is dead, and no wonder, necessitating your having recourse to all sorts of dodges to keep the flickering spark alive by revival excitements, such as the disgraceful exhibitions of hysterical women and maudlin men, including dukes and duchesses if you like, who are reported as thronging in thousands round Sankey A Moody, whom I expect they will be making graven images of directly, and when they pass away no doubt, like Tiberius Cæsar, who is said to have proposed the deification of Jesus to the Roman Senate, some of their idolizing followers will propose to have them added to the incomprehensible trinity, in the same way as the 7 ver. of the v. chap, of I. John, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are One," the chief corner-stone of the trinitarian absurdity, was surreptitiously added to the Bible in the tenth or twelfth century to try and square the triangular

fallacy. Well might Tertullian, orthodox as he was, exclaim—"I reverence the Christian religion because it is contemptible, I adore it because it is absurd, I believe it, because it is impossible," as literally rendered by a translator.

The humble Jesus never said anything about the Trinity, on the contrary he acknowledged only one God, and one Father of us all; but his biographers and followers assumed they knew a great deal better than he did, in the same way as whilst he inculcated secret prayer the clergy knew much better, and insist on public worship, because otherwise they could not pluck their geese, who, through constant habit, have become accustomed to the process, in fact to look upon it as a necessity—a sort of salve to their guilty consciences, and a necessary tax to be mulcted in, for appearing respectable Christians in the eyes of the world. When one has been emancipated from the bondage of this ceremonial mummery falsely termed religion, and can look back on all the solemn mockery he has gone through, and the valuable time that he has spent therein, he sees how foolish he has been in not having, long before, used the divine gift of reason, with which an all-merciful, heavenly Father had endowed him, and thereby discerned that religion consisted alone in a principle actuating man's every thought and action, instead of as he was taught, of a set creed, at variance with his reason and his experience, and a lot of useless forms, ceremonies, preachings and prayings in public, &c., resulting in hypocrisy and deceit in the place of true holiness, purity, and good actions.

Now, Sir, with all your assumption as a professional teacher of religion, what can you tell your credulous flock or others of the future life? Not a fraction more than any schoolboy can read for himself in that book which is composed of so much history and geography of the past, from the Jewish stand-point, but so very little about that which, had it been the inspired word of God as claimed for it, it would have principally consisted; and even the slight insight which it professes to give of man's future existence is so vague, so irrational, and so improbable, that few, very few indeed, and those only the most credulous and weak-minded amongst your followers, really believe the biblical accounts of the future existence of man's immortal soul, with its inert eternal anthem singing on the one hand, and its material lake of fire and brimstone for the eternal physical torture of a spiritual soul on the other. Did you ever consider the blasphemous character of the doctrine of eternal torment? I cannot imagine you have, unless you are prepared to admit that God is a thousand fold more unjust than man His creature, for even a thousand years torment would be out of all proportion for committing the greatest of crimes, during the longest life of a man on earth, far less that of eternal punishment. Contemplate for one instant never-ending torment! and say if you think it worthy of being ascribed to, or believed of our merciful Heavenly Father, and in accordance with our experience of His love and goodness to us here. Truly the heart of man is deceitful and desperately wicked to even suppose, that the change called death is to turn an all-just and merciful Father into a hideous demon of cruelty. No! the very book you call God's Word states otherwise—"I am the Lord, I change not."—Malachi iii. 6, and "with Whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."—James i. 17; or, as the hymn has it—

*"O let us then at length be taught
What we are still so slow to learn—
That God is love, and changeth not,
Nor knows the shadow of a turn."*

The very doctrine, that of original sin, on which your religion is based, is fallacious, and is derogatory to the character of God, who is perfection, and "Whose acts are consequently perfect, and do not require to be repented of, as falsely represented. The doctrine of original sin implies that man was created imperfect—that he was placed in the garden of Eden with a temptation before him that he had not the power to resist, and for his weakness in not resisting this temptation, a weakness he was not responsible for; that he and all his race are under the curse of the Creator our Heavenly Father, "Who, if the Bible is to be relied on, took over two thousand years or more to perfect a scheme for appeasing His wrath, the satisfaction of His sense of justice, and the redemption of His creatures, viz., the cruel murder on the cross of the most exemplary man the world has ever seen. Now, Sir, if you had a number of sons, and one of them committed an error, would you hold the others guilty also for that, or, if all of them except one committed errors, would you, if you dared to do so, have the guiltless cruelly murdered in order to appease your wrath for the errors of the others? I would not, and I am sure my God is not more unjust, more cruel, and more irrational than I am. You may say, "at! but it was decreed before the world was created that Jesus was to redeem the world from sin." This only makes the matter worse, and represents the character of your God in a more hideous light still. You may further say, "but Jesus was God as well as man, and gave himself to death for man's redemption." This is still more absurd. Just consider your God offering Himself as a sacrifice to appease His own wrath! But you still further remark, "Jesus was the second person of the Godhead." Then you must deny the unity of the Deity, for two persons cannot be one

individuality, neither in this nor the future life. Man and wife are by the law of the land said to be one, but wherever you travel with your wife, you will find that you are charged for two notwithstanding. If you believe there is only one God, that Jesus is God, and at the same time that he is your elder brother, then it follows of necessity that you believe yourself to be brother to that Invisible Being Who is clothed with honor and majesty, Who covereth Himself with light as with a garment, Who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain, Who layeth the beams of His chambers in the waters, Who maketh the clouds His chariot, Who walk-eth upon the wings of the wind; Brother to Him who chargeth His angels with folly, while the heavens themselves are not clear in His sight? Brother to Him whom no man hath seen, nor can see, neither hath any man heard His voice at any time, or seen His shape, and Whose ways are past finding out? A belief as presumptuous and impious in man, as it is profane and blasphemous towards God. Why, sir, if your will look into it with the eye of unbiased reason, you will find you profess to believe in that which is revolting to common sense, and in that which you would not believe if told you by your wife or daughter, or sworn to by your dearest friends as having occurred in the present day. I do not know which is the most revolting to common sense—the imputation of incompetency on the part of the Omnipotent One in creating mankind, or that of injustice and irrationality in the scheme of salvation by the All-wise Ruler.

The bible must necessarily give way whenever it clashes with man's reason, experience, and with science, which have won immortal victories for the human race; still, I am not unmindful of the many glorious truths set forth therein, nor of my indebtedness thereto for the grand lessons learnt through frequent perusal of many of its pages, and I would here remark that the bible, viewed in a rational light, considering the barbaric and semi-barbaric times in which its various parts were written, and allowing for the superstitious notions in those days prevalent, is one of, if not the most remarkable book of ancient literature extant, and to my mind bearing on the face of it the evidence of its inspirational character, though not from the exalted source generally claimed for it, but from a mediate source, more in accordance with reason and demonstrable facts.

We are told that "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Could the devil be a revolutionary angel expelled from heaven before heaven was made? Because Joseph dreamed a dream, are we to believe what is contrary to nature? and do we place implicit confidence in our own dreams? The more the Bible is examined, the more apparent is it that it won't stand a rational analysis. Some of an imaginative turn of mind say that the Bible should be taken in an allegorical sense; and others, partly allegorically and partly literally; the more rational take it in its literal sense, they don't take bread to mean a stone, nor a fish to mean a serpent, nor yet truth to mean an ambiguity. The original Bible, as you ought to be aware, contained twenty-two books analagous to the number of letters constituting the Hebrew alphabet. Our Old Testament contains thirty-nine books, exclusive of the Apocrypha, which formerly was included. The original Bible was burnt by Antiochus Epiphanes during his war against the Jews. The version which we have the copies of now; was compiled by Ezra at a comparatively recent date.

Immaculate conceptions and celestial descents were so currently received in olden times, that whoever had greatly distinguished himself in worldly matters was considered to be of supernatural lineage, Romulus, the founder of Rome, was declared to be the son of Mars, who seduced the virgin Rhea Sylvia one day as she went to the spring for water, pitcher in hand. Jupiter Ammon was said to be the father of Alexander, who styled himself "King Alexander the son of Jupiter Ammon," but allow me to say this did not make it the fact that it was so. It is recorded that his mother Olympias who ought certainly to have known the facts of the case, used jestingly to remark that "she wished Alexander would cease from incessantly embroiling her with Jupiter Ammon's wife."

In the second century Celsus wrote a work for the purpose of exposing the folly and madness of Christianity as then enunciated, and which he terms "a pernicious superstition." Tacitus describes Christians in his day as a set of people who were holden in abhorrence for their crimes, and states that their distinguishing characteristic was a hatred to all mankind not of their way of thinking. Porphyry, the Emperor Julian, and several others, wrote works condemning and exposing the absurdity of the doctrines of Christianity in their time; but we are informed the priests of that day succeeded in consigning every copy of those works which were adverse to their interests to the flames, as many of the more bigoted would like to do now if they could. Of the writings of Celsus we have only a few fragments preserved in the works of Origen, he having answered one of the works by Celsus about fifty years after it was written. (See Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, vol II.) For further information I must refer you to my address to earnest enquirers after truth :—

*"Not in the church, by thousands trod,
Seek I, and find Thee, oh my God!
Not where the swelling anthems rise,*

*And lifted eyes salute the skies;
Not where hired priests alone may dare
The truth (?) to speak, to breathe the prayer,
And crowded congregations stand,
To talk with God at second hand;
For there come human pomp and pride,
Fashion and vice stand side by side—
The hypocrite with shining face,
And the backsliding saint embrace.
Park hearts and blood-stained hands are there,
Souls dead to truth, cars deaf to prayer;
Men who their brethren buy and sell,
Who seek not heaven, who fear not hell,
Men who on gold their hopes have built
Who covet gain, and wink at guilt;
Men who on sensual visions gloat,
While prayers and praises fill the throat;
And there the preachers (richly feed)
Their empty declarations read
Set prayers pronounce, set forms go through
And talk the good they ought to do"*

*"Not there, my God—I come not there,
Thy presence and its joys to share;
Not there my spirit feels Thee near;
Not there Thy still small voice I hear;
Not there my heart with love swells high,
Not there I learn to live and die;
Not there the inward strength is given
To conquer earth, and enter heaven."*

*"But 'neath the broad, o'erarching sky,
In the free winds that hurry by,
In the bright orbs that shine above,
In all things that have life, and move,
In the deep sea's resistless might,
In the still watches of the night,
In song of birds, and laughing rills,
In cultivated vales and wood crowned hills,
In all that greets my wondering eye,
I feel, I own that Thou art nigh."*

*"No mediator there I need—
His child, will not my Father heed?
Freely my spirit soars and glows,
Freely God's love, descending, flows;
Voiceless, before His shining throne,
I bend and pray in heart alone;
For words are vain, and speech is nought*

*To Him who knows each inmost thought;
Seraphs a fitting song might raise,
But silence is man's noblest praise!"*

TO EARNEST ENQUIRERS AFTER TRUTH—

Friends—I have addressed the clergy first on this vital and important subject, not in the hope of making much impression on them, for from their opportunities they must, or ought to have been fully aware of the plain truths comprised in my address to them; but from a sense of duty, and because I consider the head of a department is the proper quarter to appeal against any wrong in the first place. Although I have not minced matters in my remarks to them, as I stated I have no intention of offending them or any one, nor have I any desire to see a sudden change take place in regard to religion, as I am aware that all great movements come slowly to the birth, and that forced religious revivals and other revolutionary outbursts, whether in matters social, political, or religious, are attended with disastrous consequences; on the other hand, I am anxious that the coming reformation in regard to religion, which is as inevitable as that day follows night, should commence as soon as possible, and I consider that the clergy are the proper parties to lead the van, by preparing the minds of their followers, through their preaching, for the glorious change from darkness to light, although I must confess I have little hopes of their doing so, and feel assured the change will be brought about by the thoughtful amongst the masses, and not by those who should lead. In a worldly point the clergy are not to be blamed so much for this, for, judging by the experience of those of their number who have had the candour and boldness to declare their convictions, in opposition to the articles of their church, a clergyman's position in such a case is anything but an enviable one. I wish it to be distinctly understood that in using the term orthodox, I do so as applied to the current established beliefs,—not in its literal sense. To those who are still in the bonds of superstition my style of writing on such a subject may appear blunt, or even harsh, but it is not meant so. With these few remarks I shall commence my address to you on the matter.

The Truth (I mean God's holy truth, not that of men or sects) is like the great Creator—unalterable, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Eternity cannot make truth a lie, nor antiquity cause a lie to be the truth. I think you will coincide with me in this; but how often is it that the length of time a thing has been believed in, is held up as a proof of its truth; how many absurdities which are repugnant to our reason, have we been taught as truth, merely because they were written in olden times by some angel-inspired semi-savage, who in his day was looked up to by his ignorant companions as an infallible authority, and which were afterwards selected from a number of old manuscripts, and pronounced by a lot of fallible men, audaciously, as being the directly inspired word of the infallible Creator of the Universe? Don't think from this that I condemn the Bible as a whole; no! far from that, I only condemn those portions which are contrary to reason and debasing to the character of the Almighty, and I repudiate it as being God's Word, because it contains so many inaccuracies, contradictions, and childish fables, totally unworthy of the writings even of a good man, far less of the Great Ruler of all, Whose laws are perfection, and visible to all mankind in the open book of nature, which the most unlearned require no paid priest or parson to interpret for them. The Bible, I admit, is all very well as our guide, but *not* as our master. Why should we let old superstition prevent us judging it, as we do any other book, by the light of reason? Think you this divine gift was given us by our Merciful Heavenly Father, and that we were not to use it in matters concerning religion as well as in everything else? He that feareth to use his reason is a superstitious coward; he that won't use it is a simpleton; but he that uses it in all things is a rational being.

The priest says, you must not contemplate the Bible by your own judgment—you must take my interpretation of it. The parson says, you must not judge it by your reason but by faith, which in this case is another name for credulity. Now, I ask you as rational beings, are not both of these absurd and contrary to your reason? The priest, the parson, a Spurgeon, a Moody, a Sankey, or any other man, may affect your feelings by appealing in pathetic strains, to your tender emotions, and thus warp your judgment, but they *cannot* affect your reason; "an appeal to the imagination is much more alluring than the employment of reason." It has been through the clergy in all ages working upon the feelings of mankind, that the barbaric superstitions of the past have been perpetuated to the present day under the name of religion. Look at the pompous ceremonies and humbug of which the religions of the world are principally made up, resulting, as is apparent to everyone, in hypocrisy and deceit; and then let us consider what in reality *is* true religion? Religion, I maintain, consists of a principle which should actuate our every thought, word, and action, throughout life. Love to God and man comprised all the law and the prophets, said the truthful and noble Nazarene Reformer 1800 years ago.

What is Truth? (John xviii. 38), is the question Pilate put to Jesus; unfortunately his reply thereto is not recorded, but we have the answer to it in his actions and teachings. We are told he went about doing good, and that he said, on the commandments of love to God and our neighbour, hang all the law and the prophets, no doubt, supposing he was addressing rational beings, he did not consider it necessary to add, and use your reason, which is a new commandment very much wanted in the present day. I believe it is generally admitted that "reason is a Divine gift" and consequently that we should use it in all things. Let me ask you if there is aught else by which we can judge anything? we certainly cannot by faith, which is another name for credulity, unless it is based upon that which is rational, and in accordance with our experience. "Come now, and let us reason together saith Isaiah," (Isaiah i. 18,) I quote this not as the Word of God, but of Isaiah inspirationally, (I shall treat of inspiration presently.) Our Heavenly Father in His goodness and mercy to mankind hath graciously endowed all with reason, even those whom we term idiots or lunatics possess the Divine gift, but in their case it is latent to a greater or less extent, owing to the organization of their brain being wholly or partially defective. Although this grand gift is so universally bestowed upon man, how very few comparatively make use of it in all things, how few indeed are worthy of the name of rational beings? This applies equally, if not more so, to the learned as to the ignorant, though both ignore the fact and indignantly repudiate the assertion, whilst to the unprejudiced it is as clear, palpable, and easy of demonstration, as that two and two are four. This, which is falsely termed the enlightened age, is in reality little better in some respects, than the dark ages, when viewed from a rational stand point. True, vast advances have been made in the various branches of science, and immense improvements in the arts, manufactures, &c., but how little progression has been made in the true philosophy of religion. Why? Because in regard to this, the most important subject of all, comprising as it does man's happiness both in this life and in the life to come, the majority of mankind have allowed their reason to be enslaved by the superstition of the past in which they have been cradled, and which has been inculcated by a designing priesthood chiefly for diplomatic purposes, or in plainer language, to swell the ranks of their various sects, not from a conscientious though erroneous intention of benefitting mankind at large, as their hatred, or at least antagonism to each other clearly proves.

The great obstacles in the way of a rational view being taken of religion are, in the case of those who have been brought up in the orthodox sects, the casting aside of the green spectacles of superstition with which they have been erroneously taught, and accustomed to look through at all matters pertaining to religion, secondly, in the case of materialists and atheists, to realize that beyond the physical tangible form, there exists an intelligent immortal principle, because it cannot be grasped, analyzed chemically, or brought within the range of the telescope or microscope, and also on account of the irrational doctrines held and taught by those who believe in the immortality of the human soul according to the Biblical account, with its chimerical Heaven, and its physical Hell, and also from the absurd, anthropomorphic ideas of God entertained by the believers in the Bible as the inspired Word of God. Had the Bible been inspired by God it would have been perfect in all parts, nought could have assailed it, there would have been no statements in it which the discoveries of science would have afterwards refuted or contradicted, in fact the whole of it would have been of such a character that neither science, reason, nor time could do otherwise than corroborate it from beginning to end. The Bible therefore, being imperfect and full of errors and contradictions, it follows as a consequence that the principles on which, all religious sects are founded upon it as the infallible Word of God, must be erroneous, as is fully corroborated by their results. Do you find Jews, Catholics, or Protestants more honest, merciful, charitable or kind than your God-loving neighbour who does not hold the Bible as God's Word? my experience, and it has been considerable amongst all classes, tells me not.

As some through blind or prejudiced ignorance may deny that the Bible contains contradictions, I shall enumerate a few, which they can study at their leisure. Gen. i. 31, v. Gen. vi. 6; 2 Chr. vii. 12-16, v. Acts vii. 48; 1 Tim. vi. 16, v. 1 Kings viii. 12; Ex. xxxiii. 23, v. John i. 18; Ex. xxxi. 17, v. Is. xl. 28; Prov. xv. 3, v. Gen. xviii. 20-21; Acts i. 24, v. Deut. xiii. 3; Jer. xxxii. 27, v. Judg. i. 19; Num, xxiii. 19, v. Gen. vi. 6; Rom. ii. 11, v. Rom. ix. 11-12-13; Is. xiv. 7, v. 1 Cor. xiv 33; James i. 5, v. John xii. 40; Prov. viii. 17, v. Prov. i. 23; Ex. xv. 3, v. Rom. xv. 33; Jer. xiii. 14, v. Jam. v. 11; Num. xxv. 4, v. Ps. ciii. 8; Ex. xxix. 36, v. Is. i. 11, 12, 13; Gen xxii. 1, v. Jas. i. 13; Heb. vi. 18, v. 2 Thes. ii. 11; Gen. vi. 5-7, v. Gen. vii. 21; Rom. i. 20, v. Job. xi. 7; Deut. vi. 4, v. 1 John v. 7; Ex. iii. 21-22, v. Lev. xix. 13; 1 Kings xxii. 21-22, v. Prov. xii. 22; 2 Kings xiv. 7-3, v. Deut. xxiii. 7; Ex. xxxii. 27, v. Ex. xx. 13. I could fill pages with similar examples, but the above will suffice for any one open to conviction.

Some may suggest that those who reject the Bible as the Word of God would wish all the Bibles burnt, as did the early Christian Fathers with the books adverse to their way of thinking, but we are, thank God, more enlightened, and consequently more charitable, in this respect at least. We would no more dream of destroying the Old Book because it contains many inaccuracies and absurdities mixed up with the sublime truths it comprehends, than we would burn and destroy a stack of wheat because as well as the grain, it comprises a quantity of chaff and straw. Judging the Bible as we do all things else by our reason we take it as our guide, but

not as our master, what in it is worthy of our appreciation we adopt, what is not so, we reject. Whilst we value the edifying portions it contains, we hold that its old fashioned fables regarding the Most High are as incompatible with the truth, as are the feeble attempts of man to imitate the works of Him who is all-powerful in wisdom and all-potent in design and intention.

Mohammedans, Jews, Roman Catholics, Protestants of all denominations, Unitarians, &c., are agreed on the three cardinal points of religion, viz., the existence of a Supreme Power, the immortality of the human soul, and the doing unto others as we would be done by—so far we are all of one mind regarding religion. On those fundamental principles as a base have nearly all existing religions been built up; on this foundation have been erected, during the course of time, the superstitious, imaginative and absurd superstructures of the past, which have accomplished so little during their term of existence, except the conservation of priestly influence, the discouragement of all scientific discoveries which were at variance with their circumscribed views of God and His laws, and particularly the constant aggrandisement of the churches, by securing the greatest number of supporters, and the largest amount of material wealth possible. What a hollow sham do priests and parsons offer to their dupes at the close of their earthly existence, after a life spent in subjection to their churches' mandates, their sectarian dogmas, and the sacerdotal will of their clergy? What information do these old superstitious religions give respecting the life to come? How chimerical and unsatisfactory is the little information they profess to give? and which is as vague and indefinite as it is absurd and improbable. I do not know which, the sensual heaven of the Koran, or the senseless heaven of the Bible, is the more contemptible. The Jews and Mohammedans are more rational in respect to the indivisibility of the Almighty; the Papists in conceiving that there is an intermediate condition or purgatory in contradistinction to the Protestants' belief in an arbitrary line in the future life drawn between the perfectly good, who are pure enough to enter the immediate presence of God, and the totally depraved, vile enough to be eternal slaves to a fallen angel a demon in cruelty, who, if a large majority is a sign of popularity, is represented as having much the greater number of subjects, though not of such a high order as those in heaven. But of all absurdities the Papists' ideas of Eucharistical impanation, and the forgiveness of sins by proxy, transcend all others. I may forgive my son if he commits a crime, but the laws of the country must be vindicated; so in like manner does our Heavenly Father forgive the sins of His children; otherwise we would not now be in existence; but He does not alter His fixed law of effect following cause, neither in this life nor in that which is to come; therefore, as we sow here, so shall we reap hereafter, crucifixion, absolution, and high mass notwithstanding.

How few seriously consider what absolute nonsense they have been taught as, and believe to be, the truth. Many pass from the cradle to the grave without ever calling the divine gift of reason into question regarding their belief, though shrewd enough in all other matters; some even admit that there are many doctrines and dogmas included in their religion which even as children they could not swallow, but who, from indolence in the way of thinking the subject out, superstitious fears, or knowledge that their belief won't stand the test of investigation, and dread thereby being cast on a sea of doubt, prefer the ease of following what they are aware is a popular, and therefore a respectable delusion, rather than face the labor of searching for the truth, and proving all things, only holding fast that which is good, as by such a course they would lower themselves in the estimation of the social and religious circles in which they move. Orthodox Christianity is, in childhood, innocent belief in what is beyond the comprehension—in youth, a continual conflict between the natural inclinations and perverted conscience,—in middle life, chronic delusion and hypocrisy,—and in old age, confirmed deception,—in death, a deceiving lie. If it were once to become fashionable, or popularly to be held as correct, for everyone to use the reason God has given them, in matters religious, as is considered proper in every other subject, the superstitious delusions comprehended under the current established religions would soon be discarded by the intelligent portion of their adherents, and the ignorant remainder would soon follow in their wake, leaving the priests, parsons, cathedrals, churches, and all the paraphernalia connected therewith, as things of the past. Even as it is, this will be the case ere long, for notwithstanding the unpopularity of free-thought, and the stigma under which all its adherents rest, the fact that they are daily increasing, and that those who have moved into a fuller light are more tolerated, and also that religious discussions are not tabooed in society as formerly, indicate the change that is dawning on the religious horizon, according to the old saying "coming events cast their shadows before them."

Another great sign of the times is the liberal sentiments expressed in regard to religion both in newspapers and books. I shall take for an example of the latter a quotation from a work entitled "Supernatural Religion." The author tersely writes thus of the teachings of the Bible:—

"We are asked to believe that God made man in his own image, pure and sinless, and intended him to continue so, but that scarcely had this His noblest work, left the hands of the Creator, than man was tempted into sin by Satan, an all-powerful and persistent enemy of God, whose existence and antagonism to a Being in whose mind sin is an abomination, are not accounted for, and are incredible. Adam's fall brought a curse upon the earth, and incurred the penalty of death for himself and for the whole of his posterity. The human race,

although created perfect and without sin, thus disappointed the expectations of the Creator, and became daily more wicked, the evil spirit having succeeded in frustrating the designs of the Almighty, so that God repented that he had made man, and at length destroyed by a deluge all the inhabitants of the earth, with the exception of eight persons who feared Him. This sweeping purification, however, was as futile as the original design, and the race of men soon became more wicked than ever. The final and only adequate remedy devised by God for the salvation of His creatures, become so desperately and hopelessly evil, was the incarnation of Himself in the person of 'the Son,' the second person in a mysterious Trinity of which the Godhead is said to be composed (who was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary), and his death upon the cross as a vicarious expiation of the sins of the world, without which supposed satisfaction of the justice of God, His mercy could not possibly be extended to the frail and sinful work of His own hands. The crucifixion of the incarnate God was the crowning guilt of a nation whom God Himself had selected as His own peculiar people, and whom He had condescended to guide by constant direct revelations of His will; but who, from the first, had displayed the most persistent and remarkable proclivity to sin against Him, and, in spite of the wonderful miracles wrought on their behalf, to forsake His service for the worship of other Gods. We are asked to believe, therefore, in the frustration of the divine design of creation and in the fall of man into a state of wickedness hateful to God, requiring and justifying the divine design of a revelation, and such a revelation as this, as a preliminary to the further proposition that, on the supposition of such a design, miracles would not be contrary to reason."

"Antecedently, nothing could be more absolutely incredible or contrary to reason than these statements or the supposition of such a design. The whole theory of this abortive design of creation, with such impotent efforts to amend it, is emphatically contradicted by the glorious perfection and invariability of the order of nature. It is difficult to say whether the details of the scheme, or the circumstances which are supposed to have led to its adoption, are more shocking to reason or to moral sense. The imperfection ascribed to the divine work is scarcely more derogatory to the power and wisdom of the Creator, than the supposed satisfaction of His justice in the death of Himself incarnate, the innocent for the guilty, is degrading to the idea of His moral perfection. The supposed necessity of repeated interference to correct the imperfection of the original creation, the nature of the means employed, and the triumphant opposition of Satan, are anthropomorphic conceptions totally incompatible with the idea of an Infinitely Wise and Almighty Being. The constitution of nature, so far from favouring any hypothesis of original perfection and subsequent deterioration, bears everywhere the record of systematic upward progression."

The great mistake made by mankind from the earliest ages in regard to religion has been the mixing up of creeds with good deeds, True religion consists not of beliefs, forms, and ceremonies, but, as I have before stated, of a principle actuating man's every thought, word, and action. Had deeds, not creeds, been the watchword of the world, how different would have been the state of humanity at the present day, and how bright would have been the pages of the history of the past in comparison to what they are, with all their horrible bloodshed and cruelty, and until this principle is everywhere adopted we need not look for that reign of peace and happiness upon the earth which every well-meaning mind desires. I challenge all the clergy in the world to refute these statements, simple as they are. Away with your creeds and ceremonial rights, which are but solemn mockery. Seek the eternal truth, and, having found it, tell it to your neighbour, and go out into the highways and byways, following the example of the noble Jesus, who went about doing good, and who said "I come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance;" and also, "They that be whole need not a physician." When creeds and ceremonies are laid aside, and this is universally adopted, the time will be near at hand when they shall not require to teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord, for all shall know Him from the least to the greatest.

For what purpose and benefit has all the fuss and ceremony been made in time past, and still continued, by those professing to be rational beings under the name of religion? Is it for the glorifying of God? If so, it is only so much time wasted in solemn mockery, for Our Merciful Father, the Great Creator of the Universe, requires not the glory of man, as all creation glorifies Him. Man can best glorify his Heavenly Father by making use of the reason God has given him, so that all his thoughts, words, and actions, may be in accordance therewith. As an earthly father requires not of his children that they should go through a lot of forms and ceremonies in return for the care and trouble he has had in rearing them, neither does our Heavenly Father require us to waste our time in this way, which could be more profitably occupied in the acquirement of useful knowledge, and in the benefiting of our fellow creatures. Is God more irrational than man think ye? "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven?"

From the anthropomorphic ideas of the Great Creator, of this and millions of worlds besides, which have been instilled into our minds from childhood, we have been accustomed to look upon all our actions as affecting Him, in other words that we can sin against God. How absurd this appears to the rational mind when enlightened by the eternal truth. Man cannot sin against God, when he sins, he sins against himself. Man can

neither by his thoughts, words or actions exalt nor debase the Great Ruler of the Universe, who in His supreme wisdom and boundless love and mercy, has established fixed and unerring laws, and endowed man with reason, whereby he can contemplate the cause, and thereby know that by conforming to these grand and immutable laws, he can secure for himself happiness, both here and hereafter, or by the disregarding of which, and acting contrary to his reason, he will bring upon himself, misery, both in this life, and that which is to come. Man therefore, within the bounds of nature's law, is a perfectly free-will being, he can even in this life make it a heaven or a hell for himself, he can by giving way to his animal lusts and passions, debase himself beneath the beasts of the field, (as unfortunately is too frequently the case,) or he can by cultivating his moral, intellectual, and spiritual faculties, raise himself to the sonship of God, as did our elder brother the great Reformer 1800 years ago, who his followers in their enthusiasm, and admiration of his precepts (exemplified in his actions, as well as in his teachings,) ascribed deity to, through their superstitious ignorance, although he himself would not allow them even to call him Good Master, saying, there was none good, save God. Whilst the Jews would not acknowledge him as the Messiah, or promised Messenger of the truth, and his own brethren we are told, did not believe in him; his followers insisted in making him out as the Truth Himself, or God, instead of what he claimed, the mere messenger of the truth, which he proclaimed in all humility, as coming from his Father and our Father, from his God and our God. When asked to teach his followers a prayer, he did not say, my Father, but your God, which art in Heaven, but Our Father, which art in Heaven. Jesus might well have said, "save me from my friends," for to his followers is due the fact that his simple teachings have been turned into the most absurd doctrines, as contemptible as they are impossible and absurd, viewed by the light of unbiased reason. As already stated, the orthodox Tertullian glorying in the principles of the Christian faith, even as enunciated in his day, is said to have exclaimed, "I reverence it because it is contemptible; I adore it because it is absurd; I believe it because it is impossible." And so it was, and is.

Jesus taught that love to God and man comprised all, and is reported to have said, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." How different to his simple teachings are the dogmas and doctrines forged upon him, and now held by those who consider themselves orthodox Christians, which are as contemptible and absurd as they are impossible and incomprehensible "hard to be understood" as Peter remarks. One writer states that "Christianity has been so corrupted, that it will be a work of ages to restore it to its original purity" and another writes, "the Christian religion has been tried for 1800 years, the religion of Jesus remains to be tried" both of which statements I cordially endorse. The simple religion of Jesus has been over and over again improved (?) upon by the incorporation therewith of superstitious, Pagan rights and ceremonies, in order to suit the ends of a designing priesthood the meek and lowly Jesus had no cathedrals, churches, or chapels, no vatican palace, deanery, nor manse, no state aid, fixed stipend, sale of indulgences, absolution-money, tithes or pew rents, on the contrary he taught his followers in going forth to declare the truths he proclaimed, to "provide neither gold, nor silver nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves; for the workman is worthy of his meat" He also said "take no thought for your life what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on." Now take away the above named superfluities according to Jesus, from the orthodox priests and parsons, and see how many will continue in their avocation for the sole love of doing good, glorifying God and the propagation of the truth as they term what is in reality merely superstition. Either the teachings of Jesus or their teachings must be wrong, for they are as I have shewn diametrically opposed to each other.

Again Jesus taught "when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret, &c.," but this simple style of worship would not suit priescraft, there would be no means thus, of extorting money from the people; knowing a great deal better than their professed Master, though certainly not their Exemplar, they introduced and have continued to erect houses (to a God Who dwelleth not in houses made with hands,) wherein they might "be as the hypocrites, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues &c." Oh! man how long will you continue to be deluded, and support these superstitious deceivers "in sheep's clothing." Awake to the light of reason, and let the eternal truth of God dispel the mists of man's "improvements" thereon, "and the truth shall make you free." God's truth differs from man's versions of it, inasmuch as it requires no book to contain it, neither Bible nor Koran, no forms or ceremonies, no feasts or fasts, no set days' of observance, or towering cathedrals or churches to worship Him in, He not dwelling in houses made with hands, or being a personal Deity, as man in his ignorance and arrogance hath portrayed Him, for "in Him we live and move and have our being." *He* requires not the glory of man, for all His works glorify Him. All that God requires of man is, to use in all things the reason which He in His goodness and mercy hath endowed him with. If man would only use his reason unbiased in all things, he would be a law unto himself, and would thus best glorify his Maker. Has Christianity as professed, after 1800 years trial, made mankind in general even honest? Look at our prisons, our law-courts, and the rascalities daily reported by the press, has it subdued the savage passions of man's animal nature? Has it had the effect of making man love his neighbour as himself? or of causing woman to take by the hand her erring sister? Has it demonstrated a rational

and happy future for all, if they act aright, and thus taken away the sting of death? No! my friends and it never will, until reinstated in its original purity, and simplicity. Why? because soon after the cruel murder by the Jews of the Great Teacher and Exemplar of the truth, Christianity lost its spirituality, by being by its professors transformed from a principle into a state church, with paid and mercenary priests; and it is still carried on by hireling priests and parsons, not for the sole glory of God as they profess, nor for the benefit of their followers, but in reality for their own interests, as their actions, not their preachings, clearly demonstrate. If the clergy have given the subject a moment's serious and rational consideration, as they ought to have done, they must be fully aware that the doctrines they preach are the opposite to their actions and therefore it is perfect humbug from beginning to end, doubtless most of them are cognizant of this, but dare not acknowledge it, for fear of instant dismissal from office, and consequent loss of stipend. Is it not the case that some of them would sooner that one of their parishioners would go to perdition, by what they consider the orthodox road, than that they should, by joining an opposition sect, go to Heaven? This may appear strong language, but it is nevertheless true, as many know it to be the case, and as I could exemplify by what has come under my own observation. Now let us consider the preachings of the clergy, and compare therewith their actions. They tell their hearers to eschew filthy lucre, it is the root of all evil, and with the same breath they say, "but my dear friends give me a little of it, I can't do without it any more than you can." Again, "condescend to men of low estate"; whilst they tack themselves on to the greatest bigwigs they can get hold of; also, "never mind what you eat or drink, nor what you put on"; whilst they live on the fat of the land, and dress in the best of broadcloth. "Now my dear friends" say they, "let us follow the example of our blessed Master, who had not where to lay His head, the foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head. I have however a comfortable parsonage, fitted with the best of furniture, and extra superfine tapestry carpets, much better than some of you my dear dupes. Ah! dear friends" they continue, "if you have only faith as a grain of mustard seed, you can remove mountains, if you say unto that mountain, be thou removed, it shall be cast into the sea but to tell you the truth, I, and all the clergy in the world combined, cannot remove even a mole-hill by faith, far less a mountain. Now, dear friends, lastly, and to conclude, in all earnestness, and with the sincerity of a loving pastor, I tell you that unless you take up the cross of Christ and follow him you are none of his; but to be candid, the only cross I take up is the gout occasionally from over-rich living," &c., &c. Such is Christianity in the main, as preached and enacted by the clergy in general at the present day. How very different to that of its humble but great founder, who acted what he taught, and went about doing good. No doubt the clergy will maintain that the labourer is worthy of his hire, and therefore, like Barnum, they should be well paid for deluding their hearers, and to a certain extent I may agree with them, as it is not so much the fault of the clergy individually I believe, as the necessity by the rules and articles of their churches, of their conforming to the tenets and doctrines of their various sects, however repugnant they may be to their reason, that causes them to be such arrant hypocrites in many cases, but it is for their inconsistency and want of manly independence that I blame the clergy as a body. Let me remind them, however, as they must or ought to be fully aware of, that although the physical lake of fire and brimstone with which many intimidate their credulous followers is a myth, retributive justice must have its own in their case as well as in that of all others, as certainly as that effect follows cause, all the prayers, crucifixions, and ceremonies in the world cannot alter this inevitable and fixed law of God, and that as they sow here so shall they reap hereafter. Faiths, creeds, and beliefs are of no avail in the future life; our thoughts and actions governed by our reason in this life, alone determine the mansion in our Father's kingdom, for which our souls on entrance into life eternal are fitted, and is this not more in accordance with reason than that, if we believe in things which are irrational we shall go to heaven, but if we use our reason, God's grandest gift to man, we shall be damned everlastingly, as orthodoxy teaches—

*"Believe, and all your sins forgiven,
Only believe, and yours is heaven."*

which is a very easy and comfortable belief, but a very delusive one, and which, if not unlearned here, has to be unlearned hereafter. It is not those who call Lord, Lord, who are the true followers of Jesus, but those who follow his example in thought, word, and deed. Among all the professors of Christianity whom I have known, I have never yet met *one* thorough Christian by the standard by which they profess to go, nor one who has given up *all* for Christ's sake, or who could do greater works than he did. I have met a few partial Christians, and thousands of arrant hypocrites as far as practical religion was concerned, though nominally they were respectable Christians, and in the same way I have frequently met those who professed to be Atheists, and others who even boasted in the name, but I do not believe there ever existed a genuine Atheist, no more than I believe there ever existed a man totally depraved, for in the greatest scoundrel that ever lived I believe there was some better quality, which if it had only had the opportunity of cultivation, might have *far* outshone the

corresponding feature in many of us. I am fully persuaded that the prevalence of disbelief in our midst arises principally, if not entirely, from the absurd doctrines taught under the name of Christianity, and the glaring inconsistencies and hypocrisies witnessed daily in the lives of those calling themselves Christians.

If all the means and time now wasted by the clergy of all denominations and their congregations in preaching and listening to sermons, the substance of which is by all of them as well known before as after their delivery, were expended in following the example of Jesus, who went about doing good, how much more rational it would be, and with what different results, to the present solemn mockery system practised weekly or oftener by millions of professed followers of the Great Exemplar. Let those grand edifices termed cathedrals, churches, synagogues, &c., be turned into meeting-houses for devising schemes for the benefit of mankind, and instead of the clergy wasting their time and racking their brains in order to serve up some old threadbare text in new and elaborate phraseology, etc., in preaching the same, and the congregations wasting their time in listening thereto, let them all go out into the highways and byways of their various localities, and instruct their less fortunate brethren who are wayfarers on the rugged paths of this life, showing them the benefit of using the reason a merciful heavenly Father has graciously endowed them with, in all things, of eschewing all that is of a debasing nature, of practising cleanliness, industry, and moderation; of appreciating the bounties of a benevolent Creator by going out into the green fields whenever they have the opportunity, and the weather is fine, to enjoy the fresh air and healthful light of the sun, instead of loitering about the close lanes and dark allies of our cities with their fetid atmosphere, in which so many of the needy reside, and explaining to them the advantage of morality, sobriety, and frugality, over debauchery and waste. How very much better and more rational would this be than the present church-going system with its senseless cant, mummery, and hypocrisy.

Did you ever consider how many current religions there are in the world, each sect believing as earnestly as the other that theirs is the only infallible religion, and the only special one approved of by the Great Creator of the Universe, yet each differing so widely on material points in a subject, in which in *reality* there can by *no* possibility be any difference, variableness, nor shadow of turning? It is impossible for them all to be true, but it is *possible* for them all to be false; this being the case it follows that in the very small portion, on which they all agree, there is truth, and all the rest is false. Now, I maintain that this is the fact, for it is this minute quantum of truth, on which mostly all religions have been started, causing such devoted earnestness in their incipient stage, that has enabled the priesthood of the world to build the hideous superstructures of superstition, and to palm them off on the masses as the eternal truth, so long as the people could be kept in the dark as to the reality of the principal portion of what they had been taught as the truth of God, being only a lot of man-invented fables perpetuated to sustain the power of the priesthood over their followers, and enable a lot of clerical drones to live in ease and comfort at the expense of the industrious working bees, who even still, with a superstitious reverence look up to and touch their hats as they pass their reverend deceivers, many of whom doubtless laugh in their sleeve at their dupes, as they quaff their good old wine in their comfortable parsonages.

It is curious what a weight in the case of most people the term Rev. carries with it, especially when accompanied with the true clerical deportment properly acquired, representing to the rational observer benign pompous humility personified. Whilst what they the clergy say or preach may consist of the veriest nonsense and twaddle, both illogical and meaningless, it is listened to with a sort of reverential awe and professed credence by their hearers, whereas if a layman, one of themselves, dares to speak rationally on religion, notwithstanding whatever impress of truth may stamp what he says, his statements are distorted and perverted by many of his charitable(?) religious listeners, and he is by them branded as an infidel, a setter forth of evil doctrines, a subverter of morality, &c., and he is looked upon as a poacher and a trespasser on what is assumed as clerical preserves, however earnest he may be in the cause of truth, and howsoever exemplary both socially and morally his conduct may be. It is no wonder that this was the case in the days of the Jewish Reformer and during the dark ages, but it is high time, now that education is becoming a national institution in all the more intelligent countries, that such a state of things were altered. The unity of the races and the peace of the world, so much desired by all well-meaning people, will alone be attained through independent thinkers who earnestly search for the eternal truth, and who are bold enough to declare it individually against the collective power of the swarms of interested priests and parsons. It has been truly written that "they who do not seek truth from truth itself, but from the dictate of others, may as easily embrace and believe the false as the true, and may also attest it until at last it appears to be true; for whatever is attested puts on the appearance of truth, and there is nothing, however absurd, which cannot be attested by the credulous and simple-minded."

When I reflect on my own case, that less than a dozen years ago I was an idolater, a blasphemer, and a believer in superstitious fables, questionable improvements on the heathen mythology whence most of them were derived, I am more than amazed. I used to ridicule the Roman Catholics for believing a man to be infallible, whilst I equally absurdly believed a book to be infallible, which book itself lays no claim thereto. I wondered how any sensible men could even have the audacity to profess to believe in the priests having the power to convert a piece of bread, or wafer, into the actual body of Jesus, and also the power to forgive sins,

whilst I believed in many things equally impossible and contemptible, such as that our merciful Heavenly Father had predestined the majority of His creatures to eternal roasting in a lake of fire and brimstone, that God had two co-partners on an equality with Himself, the three forming one celestial firm or Godhead, that one of these exalted spiritual beings seduced a young woman in Judea some eighteen centuries ago, and that whilst she was espoused to a respectable young man, and that she, being still a virgin, brought forth a son, who was as old as his Father, and the creator of his mother and of all things else, that when he grew up he proved himself to be Deity by performing miracles or acts in contravention of his own natural and generally supposed fixed laws, earning thereby the title of King of the Jews from his followers, for which, and many good acts done by him, the Jews tried, and afterwards crucified, this God in the shape of a man, and that he cried in his death agonies that his partner or partners (for it could not be himself) had forsaken him. That unless I believed that which I would not, in the case of my sister, my wife, my daughter, or my dearest friends, namely, that Mary brought forth without the intervention of man, and that Jesus was the Son of God, in a different light from all other men, and that he was God himself, I should be damned eternally; but that if I ignored the divine gift of reason, and believed in the foregoing absurdities and impossibilities, I should when I died be blessed by being admitted into a sort of heavenly poultry yard, where I should eternally flap my celestial wings, crowing or singing angelic anthems everlastingly to a great giant sitting on an immense white throne, who had continually four beasts with six wings each, and lots of eyes within, falling down before him, alternately with four and twenty elders in white robes and gold crowns, both the beasts and elders continually praising him who sat upon the throne, while the majority of my friends and mankind would be suffering eternally the torments of hell, the fire of which is never quenched, and all in accordance with the decrees of a beneficent, loving, Heavenly Father. Truly, our Merciful Father, Thou hast "not dealt with us after our sins, neither rewarded us according to our iniquities," otherwise thou would'st have crushed me out of Thy sight for believing in such superstitious blasphemous nonsense, after having blessed me with the divine gift of reason. Truly may I call upon Thee with a contrite heart in the words of the psalmist of old—"Hide Thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities," for I am verily ashamed of my former beliefs and conceptions of Thee, my God.

As long as I allowed my reason to be enslaved, in accordance with my early teachings in regard to religious matters, and until from diligent and prayerful study of that book, which I had been taught to look upon as the direct and plenary inspired Word of God, and the fact was forced upon my understanding that if so, in many respects, the great Creator of the Universe must be incomparably worse than many of His creatures. I viewed all who had the boldness and honesty to declare against the Bible being God's Word as impious, profane, and wicked people, in the same way as many who are still under the bondage of superstition look upon me now, and who in their credulity, under the specious name of faith, believe in the God dishonoring doctrines of Jewish and Pagan barbaric fables, selected by a lot of fallible men many years ago from a number of old manuscripts, and who had the audacity to brand their selection as containing the fully-inspired Word of the Great Creator of the universe to man. I fearlessly declare that no unbiased rational being, who has studied the Bible thoroughly, and who will give it his serious and unprejudiced contemplation, can after having done so, for an instant, maintain that it is God's Word. So far from it being worthy of an omnipotent Deity, in many places and parts it is totally unworthy of a good man. Its manifold contradictions, its incongruities, its absurd fables, and its lewd passages, almost nullify its sublime portions, and clearly stamp it as unworthy of the Author of nature's perfect book, wherein there are no dubious sentences, no inconsistencies, but all is harmony and beauty, and which the humblest require no paid priests to interpret.

Every one who worships Jesus as God is an idolater; and every one who believes the Bible to be the Word of the Creator is a blasphemer, unconsciously it may be from ignorance, but there is a legal maxim—"Ignorance is no plea in law." The book itself proves the above assertions :—"I am the Great Jehovah, and there is none else." "I am the Great Jehovah, and my glory shall I not divide with another." "Thou shalt worship no other God." "Thou shalt have no God but me, for there is no Saviour beside me." "There is one God, and there is none other but He." "There is none other God but one." "I am the first, and I am the last, and beside me there is no God." "One God and Father of all, who is above all." And Jesus said, "why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." I could quote dozens of other passages to the same effect, but consider the foregoing sufficient evidence to prove the first assertion—"trinity in unity is inconceivable in idea, and impossible in fact." Now for the second:—

The Great Creator of the Universe being perfection, and absolute goodness, anything stated to the contrary must of necessity be blasphemy. "I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh." "Your God will come with vengeance," "Vengeance is mine saith the Lord" "For I the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers, upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me." "God is jealous, and the Lord avengeth; the Lord revengeth and is furious; the Lord will take vengeance on His adversaries, and He reserveth wrath for His enemies" "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." "Our God is a consuming fire," "The Lord heard this, and was wroth." These with

hundreds of other similar sentences to be found in the Bible, together with the many horrible demoniacal commands to kill and slaughter, represented as having been given by our Merciful Heavenly Father to Moses, but to keep the women and children alive, that had not known a man by lying with him, evidently for lustful purposes, are I consider more than sufficient to demonstrate the second assertion, viz : that every one who believes the Bible to be the Word of God, is a blasphemer. If the Bible were the Word of the Great Creator of the Universe, God help us, it would truly be better that we had not been born. Were wrath and vengeance attributes of the Almighty, I for one would not be in existence, and I think most people can say the same. No! "God is love" "true love worketh no evil" and "perfect love casteth out fear." To follow this, to me, revolting conception of our Merciful Heavenly Father further, it would appear by the Biblical account that Satan being the only other mentioned at the time referred to, besides the Deity, was female, as it states "God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness" "male and female created He them." It is stated, "Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living, and the Lord God said, behold the man is become one of us." Again, Cain is represented as having said to our Merciful Heavenly Father, "my punishment is greater than I can bear" also, "and it shall come to pass that every one that findeth me, shall slay me. Now if there were no other people on the face of the earth, who were there to slay him? But I forgot, there were giants in the earth in those days, and sons of God who came in unto the daughters of men, seeing they were fair, &c. Surely even these few examples and inconsistencies are enough to show that the Bible is not the Word of God, the God of Nature.

Jesus we read would not allow himself to be called even good Master, saying there was *none* good save God, but this exemplary man no sooner passed away from this life, than superstition made him out as a God, equal with the Great Creator of the Universe. Is this in accordance with reason I ask you? If he were a God after the Jews murdered him, he certainly was a God before, and could not therefore have been the Son of Man, nor of Mary, nor would he have been amenable to death. So far from his claiming to be the Almighty, he prayed to Him very frequently, and taught his followers to do the same, saying, "Our Father which art in Heaven, &c." The Biblical history of Jesus is copied in many parts from the Chrishna of India, and the idea of the Trinity was taken, with a few variations introduced, from the Hindoo Trinity. The Hindoo Chrishna or rather Christna, is stated to have been born in a lowly condition, though of royal origin, and is represented as a saviour; from being the Supreme God he is stated to have descended and taken upon himself the simple state of humanity, washed the feet of the Brahmins, had a box of ointment poured on his head by a woman, performed miracles, &c., &c. The Indian Chrishna and Trinity were both long anterior to our version. With such facts, and hundreds of others equally glaring, staring us in the face, no wonder we have so many atheists, deniers of the existence of any God at all, in our midst, and surely it is high time we had some revelation which will completely dispel such hideous barbaric conceptions of Deity, one more in accordance with the enlightenment of the times, consequently more rational, and which will not conflict with the great book of Nature, whoso pages are ever open to mankind, displaying order, harmony and beauty, and forcing conviction on their minds of perfection on the part of the Great Originator and Ruler of all. Thanks be to Him, such a revelation is within the reach of all who diligently seek it. I and thousands of others have found it, where we least expected to find that pearl which is without price, the Holy Truth, and which is destined to ennoble mankind in time. It may be asked by some, why do I denounce the faith of others. I do so because it is erroneous, and being based on a false foundation it is unsafe, like one trusting to a broken reed, or to a house built upon sand, the foundations of which the waters of enlightenment are fast washing away. Others may say it has stood for 1800 years, yes, and if it had stood for 18000 years, that would not make a lie a truth. It may also be asked if you take the Bible away as the inspired Word of God, what will be left to teach us the way to the future life? Why the inspired Book of Nature will be left, and our reason will be left, to select from the Bible its beautiful grains of truth from out the chaff of superstition and error, with which they are mixed up, and until this is the case, cant, deceit and humbug will remain rampant as at present, rendering Christianity another term for hypocrisy.

That many portions of the Bible were inspired I admit, and even maintain, not, however, by the Almighty, but mediately by ministering angels, "seeing we are compassed about by such a cloud of witnesses." If the Bible were the Word of God, instead of His being unity, as testified throughout the Old Testament, or trinity as assumed in the New Testament, He would in reality be duality, a Deity and a demon, God and Satan; but in this case He would not be eternal, for it is said a house divided against itself cannot stand. By the biblical account God is represented as having said to Adam and Eve, "In the day that thou eatest of the forbidden fruit thou shalt surely die," and Satan is stated, in the form of a serpent, to have paid to Eve, "ye shall not surely die." Now, as she and Adam lived and had children after this, it is evident that the Bible makes out that Satan told the truth, and the Almighty to have spoken falsely, whereas we believe God is truth, and hateth a lie. "Let God be true, and every man a liar."

Mahomed is said to have fed 30,000 men with the heart of a sheep; that he cut the moon in two; made fountains issue from his fingers; gave speech to the brutes; caused himself to be followed by the forests, and

saluted by the mountains. Millions of people believe these just as millions believe in the infallibility of the Bible records; but their believing these does not make them the truth. The days of superstition are numbered, thanks to the advance of intellectual improvement. Up to the present time to surround anything, however monstrous and ridiculous, with an air *of* mystery, has been to invest it with a secret charm and power of attraction, which to the masses is irresistible; and it is a well known fact that the generality of people merely give an unintelligent acquiescence to what their religion teaches.

How do you account, asks another, for the prophecies and their fulfilment, if the Bible is not God's written word? Some of the prophecies, I reply, were not fulfilled; others are said to be fulfilled by events which have happened, to which they had no reference. As an example of this I may refer to one which Matthew quotes, altering it to suit, viz., "They gave him vinegar, &c." In the Psalms it stands thus—"They gave me vinegar to drink," the context showing that David was alluding to himself, and if meant to apply to Jesus then the following in same chapter must apply to him also, "O God, Thou knowest my foolishness; and my sins are not hid from Thee." And those prophecies that were fulfilled I account for by the same power as I account for the fulfilment of occurrences foretold to me by various parties, although I did not credit them at the time they were told me. How frequently do we hear of some one having had a presentiment, and of its subsequent fulfilment. Normal inspiration is possessed by all mankind to a greater or less extent, although imperceptible, and many are highly gifted inspirationally without being aware of it. If God's laws are fixed and unchangeable, and people were inspired in olden times, as we have evidence of in the biblical writings (but understand me *not* as the inspired word of God, but inspired by ministering spirits), *so* people of the present day must also be inspired. If this is denied I should like to know at what period God's laws were changed, and what was the form of the amending act or acts? From man's debasing conceptions of the Great Ruler of the Universe, in consequence of his superstitious teachings, he imagines that because men require to alter and amend their laws, owing to the results of the eternal law of progression, the Almighty must do the same. No! God's laws proceeding from perfection must of necessity be perfect, and consequently adapted for all circumstances possible to arise through their operation throughout eternity.

The same law which causes the rainbow to appear in our day produced the same effect countless ages anterior to the days of Noah, and will continue to do so until, by the law of progression in the lapse of untold aeons of time, the elements composing this planet and its atmosphere are so altered and refined that the causes which produce the effect of the rainbow, shall have ceased to exist. It may be asked how I know this to be the case? I answer, I have it inspirationally, and I credit it because it is in accordance with my reason, but I do not wish *you* to believe it, unless it accords with yours. I may add, I don't believe it, "because it is written, and because that is enough for me," as some orthodox folks have said to me when attempting to give a reason for the hope that is in them, to whom I replied, I fear yours is a very fallacious hope, for it is also written that the cow jumped over the moon, but neither you nor I hope, nor expect to see such a feat accomplished, although I candidly admit it is no more improbable than Jonah's trip through the ocean as an inside passenger of a whale, Lot's pillar of salt, or other great wonders recorded. How prone are mankind in general to swallow a camel if only garnished with the mystery of antiquity, whilst a modern gnat served up plain chokes them instantly, as exemplified by the Jews in the case of Jesus when they said—"We know that God spake unto Moses; as for this fellow we know not from whence he is." When once the curtains of superstition and mystery, with which the simple truth has been enshrouded are removed, the priests' and parsons' occupations will be gone, for they *then* shall not require to teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord, for all shall know Him from the least to the greatest; and I tell you and them, (the priests and parsons,) that the time when this will be the case is not so far distant as may be thought, for already the green spectacles of superstition have been removed from the eyes of millions of thoughtful people in various parts of the globe, who, like myself, were once earnest but bigoted believers in the bible as the Word of God, and who, thanks to the law of progression, are at least in some of the most enlightened portions of the world, enabled, without molestation as formerly, to express to their fellow-man as I am now doing, the sentiments of their souls, while their hearts swell with gratitude to the Great Law-giver and Ruler of All for their deliverance from the thralldom of superstition, into the pure light of mental liberty and freedom, where they can realise the verity of the old quotation—"The truth shall make you free."

Do not suppose that from my having referred so frequently to the clergy that I have any ill-feeling towards any of them personally, no! no more than I have for a Buddhist priest (the followers of Buddhism, I may here remark parenthetically, vastly outnumber all the Christian sects put together), but as the clergy are the blind leaders of the blind, and as it is through their instrumentality that the monstrous delusions under the name of Christianity are perpetuated, whilst they presumptuously deny and denounce the modern demonstrations of the truth without investigation, clearly showing the weakness of their professed beliefs against demonstrable facts, therefore it is that I specially allude to them. Being in general a class of well-educated men, with plenty of time on their hands, very different in this respect to the majority of those upon whose industry they exist, and like

parasites sucking of necessity the nourishment from the limbs which support them, they are the very men who should investigate this subject, which in many instances is alienating the most thinking and intelligent minds from their churches, and after thorough investigation—not before—let them try to suggest an hypothesis other than spiritual power, which would account for all the modern spiritual phenomena, of the occurrence of which no educated person, unless blinded by superstition or prejudiced by bigotry, can be ignorant; but I defy the combined priesthood of the world—Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, and all others included—to suggest such an hypothesis. They may even call all their antagonists, the scientists of the day, to their aid, and they will *then* be unable to account for the modern spiritual phenomena, except through the source from which it professes to emanate, viz., the simple one of spiritual power, by which all the wonders that have actually taken place, and which have been falsely regarded as miracles or supernatural events in the past, are rationally explained as having occurred through natural laws, as yet unknown to the generality of the world, but as simple as any of the ordinary laws of nature when once explained, as they are to those who seriously and perseveringly investigate and enquire after them.

It is, to one who has had his eyes opened to the dawn of the eternal truth, lamentable to see the amount of valuable time and intellectual energy wasted day after day in all parts of Christendom in writing for and against the interminable disputes and assumptions of the various sects, such as their creedal differences, their ritualistic practices, their church governments, the infallibility of a man, the infallibility of a book, the power of one human being to forgive the sins of another, the necessity of infant or adult baptism, and hundreds of other absurdities, whilst the greater portion of the foundation on which their variegated Christianities are based is thoroughly rotten, and nothing more than a mass of superstition with a few simple truths sparsely intermixed therewith. They remind one of men on the top of a stack of straw, fighting about the best manner of topping it off, whilst the bottom portion of it is in flames, for whilst they are squabbling over the broken shell of religion they let the kernel of truth slip out of sight. Perhaps the supporters of these perverted Christianities may consider that "where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise," and in this they might be right, if there did not happen to be actually a future, and more important state of existence beyond the grave, of which I believe many of them have grave doubts, judging by their lives here, although they nominally profess otherwise; but when this future existence is once demonstrated by facts, as it has been to me and thousands besides, there can be no doubt nor possibility of doubt, and this demonstration is attainable by all who earnestly desire it, and are prepared to investigate the subject seriously, attentively, and perseveringly, undeterred by the ridicule of their ignorant or bigoted friends, and unbiased by prejudice or fear, testing everything by the reason that God has given them, only believing that which to their senses is rational, and rejecting all that is contrary to their unbiased reason, proving all things, holding fast to that which is good, and casting aside all that is evil. If everyone did this, we would soon see a change for the better in all things political and social, as well as religious, for when once it is clearly demonstrated to man that there is a rational progressive future life, where the thread of our existence is taken up exactly where left off here, and they realise the great fact that not as they have *appeared* to live here, but *as* they *have* lived, in thought, word, and deed, will be transparent as glass to every one with whom they come in contact in the future life, where the veil of flesh which now hides our thoughts from our neighbours will have been laid aside, having served its purpose as the cradle of the soul, then will they realise the truth that no crucifixion, absolution, prayers, nor creeds, can interfere with the eternal law of cause and effect, and that as they sow here so shall they reap hereafter, as was truly said of old—not that age would make this true, but because it is in consonance with reason and our experience in this life, where we find that God always helps those who honestly, industriously, and at the same time rationally help themselves.

It is recorded of a distinguished American statesman that he once remarked—"I don't care whether my neighbour believes in one God or in twenty, so long as he does not pick my pocket." It is evident from this he did not know the truth, or else he would not have said so, for he that has once participated in the joy which the knowledge of the truth brings with it, is constrained to bring under the observation of all with whom he comes in contact the blessings and happiness which he experiences on emancipation from the thralldom of superstition, and from the bondage of creeds and dogmas to the freedom of light and liberty, wherein every man is a law unto himself, his conscience his only priest, reason his guide, experience his interpreter, and his body the temple of his spirit, in which dwelleth his soul, the emanation from his Heavenly Father, the true and only God, with Whom is no partner nor partners.

Some may ask—Where and how is the truth to be found? I reply—"Ask and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." But stay, you must ask and seek aright, not according to what your superstitious notions are of right, but according to the will of our Heavenly Father, or to what unbiased reason dictates as the truth. For years I sought for diligently and prayed that the truth might be revealed to me, as I found that what I had been taught to revere as the truth was not in accordance with my reason, and I discovered it where I least expected to find it, and in that which I used to ridicule.

The way is open to you as well as to me, if you, as I did, earnestly desire it, for God is not a respecter of persons. He is the same Merciful Father to the whole of the human family, to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews; all are heirs to the eternal sonship of the Heavenly Father; even the greatest criminal cannot stamp out this glorious birthright; true he may, by giving way to his animal passions, debase himself below the beasts of the field, and thus darken his spiritual form for ages, but still the birthright of his eternal soul remains, and he will inherit celestial light and joy in time, which, with repentance, by the eternal law of progression, are the great renovators from all impurities. The blessedness of the knowledge of this great truth cannot be appreciated until attained; its value is beyond expression, and incomparably greater than the wealth of nations.

If it is conceded as it must be that God is unchangeable, as stated in the bible, and that His laws are fixed as demonstrated by science, then it follows that what would burn your fingers would have burnt Adam's; that as Noah's wonderful piece of naval architecture floated on the water, so will vessels float now; that if a spirit could lift Ezekiel up between the earth and the heaven, a spirit could lift Mrs. Guppy or others in like manner in these days; that if the hand of a spirit could write on the wall for Nebuchadnezzar, spirit hands can write on our walls now; that if spirits or angels could be seen, heard, felt, and could communicate in olden times, they can do so also now; and that if they could unlock doors without keys, and roll away stones in former days, they surely can move tables, chairs, &c., in our time; If St. Paul was surrounded by a cloud of witnesses, so are we and others now; and lastly, if the testimony of men on these points in olden times can be relied on as true, surely the testimony of living witnesses is equally worthy of credit?

If in reading ancient history we find described as an island, that which from the height of the neck of land connecting it with the mainland, and from the continuity of the strata of rock which form it, must for a certainty have been, as now, a peninsula, we allow such facts to overrule the assertion of the historian, however ancient, and otherwise reliable, then why not do so in regard to the bible if the same will have the effect of making it consistent and rational, instead of as it is, incongruous, contradictory and bewildering? From the people in olden times living less artificial lives than we do now, mediumship was more general, but from the superstition and ignorance then prevalent they construed every spirit good, bad, false, or true, whom they saw or who communicated with them, as the Great Spirit of All—the Creator of the Universe—Whom no man hath seen or can see, and Whose voice no man hath heard at any time, neither in the olden days nor in the present. This will also account for the innumerable gods and goddesses we read of in the heathen mythology; doubtless these deities, and fabulous accounts of the same, had their foundation in the spirits, ghosts, or angels (for they are all the same,) who were seen or who communicated with the heathen seers and mediums of old.

To prove to the sceptical that spirits can and do under certain conditions manifest themselves to some of those in the body, now as well as formerly, would take up too much space, and is beyond the scope of this pamphlet, but I may state briefly that the literature of all nations of every age, teem with accounts of spiritual manifestations. Almost every people of whom we have any record has believed in spirits, good and evil, in the power of communicating with them, and in the fact of spirits being brought into material contact with men in the body, and almost every family has its proof of the reality of the same, in some shape or form. It follows that a belief almost universal in spiritual manifestations, should thus be implanted in the human mind, and that there should be nothing in nature corresponding to it, would be an admission fatal to both natural and revealed religion, as well as to the hope of a future state. I make every allowance for the honest sceptic, no one having been more sceptical than myself on this subject till demonstrations and proofs innumerable forced conviction on my mind, notwithstanding all my prejudice against the power of spirits to manifest themselves to man in any way, but facts once demonstrated beyond the possibility of doubt, are stubborn things to get over, unless the mind be blinded by bigotry and self-presumption.

To arrive at truth whether in religion, philosophy or science, requires the mind to be perfectly free from prejudice, a condition I admit not easily attained, necessitating long study and mental discipline; I state this from personal experience. True wisdom is alone gained by knowledge of our own deficiencies. The greatest philosophers have admitted the infinitesimal character of their knowledge, the most ignorant generally think they know everything, and condemn and ridicule without investigation that which does not coincide with their circumscribed views. History repeats itself in this as well as in every thing else; look for example at the records concerning all discoveries which were not in consonance with public opinion, so it is with modern spiritual manifestations, which scientists and others continue to ignore with as much consistency as theologians repudiated the discoveries of science which contradicted and disproved many of the biblical statements, and which they now vainly try to reconcile, finding that demonstrable facts have greater weight with human reason than senseless faiths and creeds. Happily for mankind "dawn approaches, error is passing away, men arising shall hail the day."

As has been truly written by one in advance of the day he lives in. "For many ages men have turned their attention to matter, and confined all their investigations to the realms of material philosophy. It is true that here and there a noble spirit has turned his attention to scan the nature and powers of the human mind itself. But she

seemed to close her laboratory against their entrance, and forbid them to lay their hands upon her sacred shrine. In this condition there was no alternative but to judge of mind itself, from its vast and complicated operations, both mental and moral. That the mind itself could directly produce a physical result by its own living energies, seems never to have entered their thoughts. If you deny that mind or spirit has any power to produce a physical result, then how does the Creator govern the Universe? How can His Spirit come in contact with matter so as to produce any physical results? The creation and government are represented in the bible as the result of the divine will. "He doeth according to His will in the army of Heaven, and among the inhabitants of earth." The creation of the world and all its appendages is represented as the effect of His will. "He said, let there be light, and there was light." "He spake and it was done : He commanded and it stood fast." If, then, the Infinite Spirit, by holding His will unchangeable upon all the multifarious objects of creation, moves innumerable worlds, and governs the Universe, then there is also an energy and power in the human spirit proportionate to its greatness. If you grant that the Infinite Spirit by putting forth an infinite will, can produce infinite results, then surely a feeble finite spirit, by putting forth a feeble finite will, can produce a feeble finite result. I only ask the admission that the same cause shall produce the same effect."

"There can be no power without motion, nor can there be motion except it originate in mind. I care not through how many concatenations of cause and effect you may trace motion, it is after all, but secondary, and must be traced back to mind as its starting point. Thought, reason, and understanding are not mind, but the effects of mind. What is that which thinks, reasons and understands? It is mind. Then mind is something distinct from those effects by which it is made manifest. Mind is that within us, which has innate or living motion; and the result of that motion is thought, reason understanding, and therefore power. The will is not an attribute of the mind, but the result of all the attributes brought into counsel and action. It is the executive of the mind."

"We are floating in an immensity of space that knows no bounds, like the mote in the sunbeam; this is peopled with swarming worlds, in number beyond an angel's computation, and the residue which has not yet become the abodes of life, order, and beauty, is filled up with primal matter. The work of creation has been going on from eternity, and will continue to progress so long as God endures, without ever arriving at an end in the sublime career of creation. New creations are, therefore, every moment rolling from His Omnific hand, and that creating fiat will never cease. All this is effected by the energies of the Divine Mind. He fills immensity with His presence, stamping upon all His works, beauty, order and harmony, the reflected impressions of His own splendor."

"We live emphatically in an age of investigation and improvement, when light seems to be pouring in oceans on our world; and he who shuts his eyes, and then scoffs and sneers, because others open theirs and see, is not only recreant to duty, but does society an irreparable wrong. There always have been and still are, men who dare not think for themselves, but wholly lean upon the opinions of others. Their father, their minister, their doctor, and their lawyer, thought thus and so, and they think just so, too. Their fathers put down a central stake, gave them their length of line, and bid them travel round in that circle of revolving thought, till the day of their death! All beyond that circle is darkness! Their field of thought is as exactly measured off to them, and just as legally bequeathed to them, as their property. They received them both by inheritance. For the one they never Laboured, and for the other they never Thought! and they never questioned the truth of the one, any more than they did the title to the other." They were taught what to think, not how to think. "But Truth is immutable, it cannot bend to circumstances, and must stand independent of the belief or unbelief of men. It must soar on towering wing far above the reach of scorn and sooner or later triumph over all opposition."

On unprejudiced examination into this much-abused and ridiculed spiritual philosophy, it will be found the key whereby all religions can be rationalised, and their few grains of wheat easily separated from the accumulated masses of chaff and dust which the priests or parsons throw in the eyes of any of their people who at times dare to open them a little beyond the prescribed orthodox limits. It will also be found that the view of man's present state and future existence as unfolded through spiritual communications, now being received not in Judea only, but in all parts of the world, and by all classes of people, are in accordance with reason, and are borne out to a certain extent by our experiences, judging by analagous occurrences in the ordinary course of nature, in *our* time as well as throughout all ages, although they do not support the foolish, though sanctified notions instilled into our minds when young by loving parents and well-meaning friends, with the best intentions, and long cherished by us as sacred from early and endearing associations connected therewith; these most people assume as incontrovertible truths without, however, having tested them by the searching light of unbiased reason, from a childish superstitious fear engendered by the diplomatic teachings of priests and parsons, to bolster up their various religions, the only recommendations of which, are their antiquity, the pomp and ceremony connected with them, and the inhuman cruelties and injustices perpetrated under the plea of "all to the glory of God," but in reality for perpetuating priestly power, as is patent to every one who can unbiasedly and dispassionately study and consider the matter in the crystal light of liberty, unprejudiced by sectarian

views, and at the same time laying aside the biblical green spectacles, the constant use of which is so strongly recommended by the clerical fraternity, in case their dupes should have a taste of the fruit of that tree of knowledge and freedom, and consequently not return to their Noah's ark again.

It is lamentable that the generality of scientists of the present day, in their conceited wisdom, assume that they can determine the limits of nature's laws, refusing to investigate modern spiritual phenomena, and if not crucifying, ridiculing, and treating with contempt all those who are candid enough to boldly attest the fact of the actual occurrence of these phenomena, and the grand field for research and investigation opened out to mankind thereby. Astronomers might as reasonably assume that they have discovered the boundaries of the material universe, as for metaphysicians to presume that they have traversed and bounded the mental universe, the threshold of which they have hardly reached as yet. Until lately our learned Goliaths repudiated and denied the existence of the clairvoyant power, and did not give in their submission to the reality of it until forced to do so by overwhelming proofs of daily and worldwide occurrence. Even now they only tacitly admit it; so will it be with Spiritualism, the scientists and sectarians will continue to denounce and ridicule it and all its advocates, because it does not coincide with their assumptions nor corroborate their notions, and will refuse to investigate it until, like in the case of clairvoyance, the evidences will be so overwhelming and universal that they will be forced to admit not only its truth, but the grandeur of its philosophy.

I am not so much surprised at the opposition the spiritual philosophy has met with at the hands of religionists, as at the objection to investigate its phenomena it has received at the hands of scientists. For in the former case they are mentally so hedged in by superstitious doubts and fears, and have been like sheep so long accustomed to be penned in by sacerdotal hurdles, and to be driven in flocks under priestly direction, that they have as a rule no self-reliance left to attempt to gain their freedom by leaping the old hurdles, which are fast rotting under the influence of education, and will eventually fall from being unable to support their own weight, leaving the sheep still remaining within them, standing as a laughing-stock to the more enlightened portion of the world. I may further remark that as the Jews foolishly looked for a great conqueror, in the promised Messiah, to deliver them physically from the Roman thralldom, instead of a messenger of truth to release them mentally from the dark superstitions of their forefathers and their barbaric ceremonial law, and crucified the Great Reformer, so the Christians of the present day are blindly looking for the second advent of a murdered man, whose body has been more than 1800 years in the grave, instead of more rationally, as evidently was meant, for the second advent of the beautiful and simple truths he taught, which they now have in the shape of direct communications from the spiritual world if they would only receive them, but which they treat with contempt as the Jews did Jesus. Light has come into the world, but they prefer darkness rather than the light. In the case of the scientists it is different altogether: they nominally profess fearlessly to investigate all phenomena presented to them; they clear the material five-barred gates in grand style, but the spiritual wicket baulks them, principally I believe on account of its unpopularity and their fear of ridicule, more especially after having sneered at one or two of their distinguished companions in the field of science, who have had the courage to take the leap and lead the van of this grand philosophy, which though now so much despised and shunned by scientists and literati in general, is destined in time to revolutionise the whole of the political, religious, and social systems of the world, and truly they have much need of it, judging by results, for no one with the slightest claim to intelligence can shut his eyes to the thorough hypocrisy and humbug rampant throughout Christendom. Professing to uphold the doctrines taught by the Great Reformer, and claiming to be the most enlightened nations of the earth, what are their actions? Whilst glorying in the name of Christians, they are worse than the pagans, for the latter only carry out what they profess. Jesus is reported to have said—"A true commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another;" also, to love God and man; on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets Just cast your eyes back on the pages of history, and see the inhuman and brutal cruelties perpetrated in Christ's name, and all professing to be to the glory of our merciful and loving Heavenly Father; look at the present day with its immense standing armies of legalised murderers, with armaments of unprecedented life-destroying power, held by all the principle nations of Christendom, ready to be utilised against each other at a moment's notice, and entirely at the caprice in some cases of a single will. Visit the centres of population in Christian countries, and view the extravagance and licentiousness of the rich, and the squalid wretchedness and misery of the poor, and say if Christianity has not been turned into another name for hypocrisy and humbug—say if such a state of affairs is either in accordance with the teachings of Jesus or the dictates of reason. With such piteous suffering among the poor at home, within perhaps a stones-throw from their own doors we hear of large subscriptions being collected by the various Churches to christianise the natives of foreign countries; in many instances to change the happy children of nature, free as the wind, living on the bounties of nature's spontaneous growth, into a lot of drunken, thieving savages, wresting their lands from them whereon were their cocoanut groves, now cut down to make way for the white man's sugar or coffee plantation; and when they are unwilling to labour, from never having been used to constant drudgery, as has the slave to the customs of civilization, calling them lazy vagabonds, and perhaps

immuring them in prison as vagrants, where they can meditate on the happy days of their youth, when they were wont to recline beneath the shade of their cocoanut or breadfruit trees, before the unfortunate day for them that saw the pale-faced missionary land on their shores.

From personal observation I have often considered whether the ignorant savage, with his freedom from care and daily drudgery, has not the advantage over the civilised and educated, with his mental drudgery in the acquisition of education in youth, his mental or bodily exertion afterwards, or both combined, to maintain and provide for his family in the social position he has occupied, and until I learned the grand truth through spiritual communications that every description of knowledge and experience acquired in this life, especially if accompanied by true moral excellence, is of incalculable value in the life to come, I rather inclined to think the wild child of nature had the advantage on the whole over his more refined and educated brother, with his cares, troubles, and fight for civilized existence. Now, however, I know that this life is but the nursery of the soul, and that on awakening to spiritual existence we take up the alphabet of wisdom exactly where we left off here, to go on from knowledge to knowledge as nature's secrets are unfolded to our spiritual vision, according to our desire for progression and for the attainment of wisdom, all doubts are removed from my mind as to which state is most desirable, and this is but one of the many advantages that the knowledge of the truth of this grand philosophy brings with it. Wherein do any of the superstitious religions of the past and present day convey such information to mankind, I ask? I am well aware the full reality of even this advantage cannot be realised by those who have not had the good fortune to have had the truth of this grand philosophy clearly and unmistakably demonstrated, as I and others have had; my heart bounds with gratitude to our Merciful Father at the thought, and this is one of the reasons why I feel constrained to try to impart the glorious news of the truth of the spiritual philosophy to those who are still in darkness in respect thereto. Not that I expect to convince them of the truth, more than I was convinced by reading for years the statements of others equally as sincere and worthy of credit, but in the hope merely of calling their attention to the fact that the attainment of the knowledge of this grand truth is within the reach of all, if diligently and perseveringly sought for in a prayerful and receptive spirit; its value cannot be known or appreciated until it is attained. It is the pearl without price, the true philosopher's stone, notwithstanding all the odium that has been cast on it.

*"I see the dawn of that golden age
Which bards have sung with deep regret;
It stands as past on history's page,
But I perceive it is coming yet:
The iron age I allow is done,
But the golden age is yet to come."*

I admit that through imposition practised by unprincipled charlatans, and the conduct of some professing to be Spiritualists, odium and discredit has for a time been brought upon this grand philosophy and its true adherents, and that they are held in contempt by the public in consequence, in the same way as the early Christians are reported to have been held in abhorrence in their day; but in time these drawbacks will be surmounted and the truth prevail.

Those religionists who have not investigated the phenomena of modern spiritual manifestations, and who are ignorant of the grand truths demonstrated thereby, may say that my statements are mere assertions. Let me remind such that the same remark may be applied to the statements contained in that book on which their belief is grounded, only the former are open to the investigation of all, and only require their credence so far as they agree with their reason, whereas the latter cannot be proved by demonstration, and being assumed to be the direct inspired Word of God, must be swallowed *in globo*, whether its statements are rational or otherwise. From personal experience I am well aware of the difficulty there exists for those who have been reared and brought up in superstition, under the name of religion, to take a dispassionate view of this important subject, because the clergy of all denominations have inculcated blind belief and faith in the bible as God's Word, and in the statements thereof, irrespective of one's reason. If a scientist discovers a law in nature which is at variance with some fable in the Bible, and has the boldness to declare it, the pens of the whole army of critics belonging to the numerous religious sects, (each in their own opinion the genuine orthodox one,) are instantly raised against the unfortunate discoverer, and from innumerable pulpits goes forth a caution to avoid seditious doctrines calculated to mislead the weak-minded among the faithful, and to draw them away from the faith of their fathers, and the bible of their mothers. In time, however, common sense overrides the foolish priestly caution, and the demonstrated natural law is quietly adopted by both cautioner and cautioned, to the rejection of the biblical fabled version, but the clergy and their dupes have not then even the manliness to openly declare their error, nor the common honesty or decency to admit the injustice done towards the scientist who may have

spent years and years of anxious thought on the subject prior to the discovery.

History records too many instances of this kind to require me to enumerate them, but I may name Bruno and Galileo as two of the most prominent. The former for declaring the plurality of worlds, which was considered a doctrine repugnant to the whole tenor of Scripture, and inimical to revealed religion, especially as regards the plan of salvation, was confined in the prison of the Inquisition for years, still refusing to recant and to admit as truths the lies contained in that book, the authorship of which has been so wickedly ascribed to the Creator of the boundless universe, he was ordered to be burnt at the stake for the glory of God, Who is love, and Who delighteth in mercy. Bruno's noble reply to his amiable (?) Christian judges was grand in the extreme, he said—Perhaps it is with greater fear that you pass the sentence upon me than I receive it." Galileo, for having made various astronomical discoveries, and having proclaimed the fact that the earth moves round the sun, was summoned before the Inquisition at Rome and declared by his Christian judges (who were aware of the truth of his assertions), to have brought upon himself the penalties of heresy. He was forced by the dread of death to abjure and curse the doctrine of the movement of the earth, upon his knees, with his hand on the bible, and even then committed to prison, treated during the remaining ten years of his life with remorseless severity, after which his body was denied burial in consecrated ground. Is it not surprising that religions based upon a book, the continuance of the teachings of which required such barbarous acts to be perpetrated to prevent the exposure of its lying fables, has *still* existence in civilized nations? As the truths declared by these and many other illustrious intellectual men have survived and been adopted, notwithstanding their being diametrically opposed to the teachings both of the church and the bible, so will the grand spiritual philosophy, which is now denounced and ridiculed, outlive and eventually annihilate all the false religions of the world, based as they are on the superstitious barbaric fables of the past.

Spiritualism is no new doctrine; it has existed in all ages and in all nations, as may be found in the records of history; but each tribe and sect have perverted it, and on its strength reared debasing and incomprehensible structures under the name of religion, to suit their own purposes.

If the spirit of Samuel could communicate with Saul, if an invisible hand could write on the wall for Nebuchadnezzar, and if spirits could roll away stones in ancient times, God's laws being fixed and unalterable, similar phenomena for a certainty can take place in our day, and if they cannot *now*, they could not *then*, so either the bible lies in the narration of these events, or the occurrence of spiritual phenomena must be *acknowledged* by those who believe the bible. The only difference is that these powers were formerly ascribed to witchcraft, and once to Deity, but now more rationally to mediumship. Formerly when a communication was received, it was superstitiously accepted as infallible, and ascribed as coming from the Great Creator of the Universe; now more consistently, from the spirit of one who once trod this earth as we are now doing, which is the source from which they profess to come. Formerly these spiritual communications were ignorantly accepted as infallible, however absurd; now they are received as coming from fallible beings only a few stages higher than they were when in the flesh, who generally tell those with whom they communicate *only* to accept their messages so far as they coincide with their reason, that God is not a personal Deity as supposed by those on earth, that in spiritual life He can only be seen reflected in His works in the same way as on earth we see the operation of His perfect laws in nature, and that man can best worship Him by his actions guided by his reason, which is his chief gift from God who requires not the glory of man, as all His works glorify Him.

The question may be asked as I have before this had put to me, how can you prove the truth of the spiritual philosophy to an atheist? I reply I do not profess to prove its truth either to atheists or religionists, I merely desire to call the attention of both to the fact that demonstration of its truth is attainable by all, only however, by personal investigation when earnest desire springs up within one for a knowledge of the truth; the old saying—"Where there is a will there is a way," holds good here. A Spiritualist who probably has expended much time and thought in investigation to prove its truth to himself, is no more required to convince another by forcing the truth down his throat, than if you were to offer a shilling to a poor man in charity and he was too lazy to come for it, you would be bound to run after him and to put it in his pocket. It may also be asked, why in enunciating my own views regarding the truth do I run down the beliefs of others? For this reason—a man cannot hold two opposite religions as true at the same time, no more than two separate houses can at the same time be built on the one foundation; if the latter is unsound the whole edifice is dangerous to live in, and will require to be pulled down in order to put in a substantial foundation whereon to build the new and superior edifice, therefore we must pull down before we build. There can only be one version of the truth, but there can be innumerable versions of error, and in order to give free access for truth to the intelligence of the masses it is necessary in the first place to banish error. All reformers in the cause of truth must of necessity be iconoclasts when thoroughly convinced that they have the truth and that the views popularly held are erroneous, notwithstanding that otherwise they may be naturally conservative in principle, theirs is anything but a pleasant path to tread in; a sense of duty, however, is their impelling influence. It is a much easier course to swim with the stream of popular opinion, but if all were to shun their duty for fear of ridicule and reproach progression

would be slow indeed. No well-meaning man would desire to disintegrate established systems unless he was certain they were erroneous and that he had truer and consequently better to offer in their place; and surely that which is susceptible of proof and only claims to be received so far as it agrees with reason, is better than those which are undemonstrable and must be taken for granted as true, and which are repugnant to man's unbiased reason. Some think it is presumptuous for one to point out the errors which have been received and accepted by the majority as truth for centuries. If so, it was presumption on the part of Jesus, on the part of Luther, and on the part of all others who, by their innovations, endeavoured to do away with absurdities and errors which had existed for centuries before.

By the orthodox notion as derived from some of the teachings of the bible, it is to be inferred that in regard to religion the law of retrogression prevails; that in olden times mankind were in many instances much better than now; that the Great Creator of the Universe condescended to communicate with them direct, but that now-a-days mankind have so retrograded in this respect that it is considered an act of wicked presumption even to suppose, far less to state, that man can and does have communications from God's ministering angels or spirits; whereas in all things else the law of progression is admitted. Is this in accordance with reason? No! I maintain that if the Almighty spoke vocally to Adam, Moses, or any others in ancient times, he would in like manner speak vocally to some of their descendants in all ages; and if He directly inspired men in ancient times He would as certainly directly inspire them now, for His laws are fixed and unalterable, and their Results progressive in all cases; it is a libel both against God and man to assert otherwise. If miracles occurred formerly they would occur now; miraculous and supernatural are merely terms used by man to vindicate his ignorance of natural laws which are unknown to him. Do you not think if a serpent spoke to a woman in ancient times, that serpents could and would speak to other women in succeeding ages? and that if a virgin could bring forth a child without the intervention of man in one age, that succeeding ages would not witness similar phenomena? From our experiences of the laws of nature as well as from the records of natural history, it may be relied upon with certainty that the Great Law-maker never enacted a law to apply to *one* special case alone, and as a writer truly observes, "What is nonsense on a principle of reason will never be sense on a principle of religion."

If more recent and fuller information can be received regarding man's future existence and of the spiritual world, as I and thousands of others who have no object to gain in deceiving nor in being deceived solemnly and seriously assert after investigating the subject earnestly, having entered on the inquiry strongly prejudiced against its truth and reality, surely it is the duty of all thoughtful people to investigate this important matter for themselves instead of ridiculing it and those who have had its truth unmistakably demonstrated, whilst they believe in antiquated accounts of the same of a very meagre description, and evidently tinged with the superstitious notions of the media through whom these ancient communications were received, and which have been necessarily altered and varied in their transcription and translation. Allow me to ask you if you desired to know about a place you were travelling towards, would you prefer an antiquated gazeteer translated from some foreign language, to one of recent date written and printed in English? I rather think not. Surely people of the present day are as worthy of belief as Jews living in semi-savage times, although the former I admit are looked upon as sinners and the latter as saints, through superstitious reverence for antiquity. Notwithstanding the numerous references in the biblical writings to man's future life, what a vague idea and an unsatisfactory account do they convey of his spiritual existence and of the world to come. What a ridiculous notion is the doctrine of the resurrection of the body or animal portion of man! just imagine the indefinite time poor naked souls might have to wait for their resuscitated bodies with which, rendered incorruptible, they are said to be eventually clothed! what a commotion there will be among the tombstones in the cemeteries and graveyards on the resurrection day! As for the biblical judgment day, what a scene would it present for a photographer! These examples even are sufficient to call the attention of a rational being to what utter absurdities have been taught him as the eternal truth of God. How different and how much more rational are the teachings of the spiritual philosophy notwithstanding all the obloquy and ridicule that have been cast on it. Its teachings I maintain, shadow forth and uphold a glorious destiny eventually for all, more in accordance with our experience here of the love and mercy of our Heavenly Father, and more worthy of man's highest aspirations than do those of the bible, which is another proof of the eternal law of progression. "Now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held, that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter."—Rom. vii. 6.

Death, instead of being as we have been taught, that grim monster—the King of Terrors, is in reality the triumphal arch through which we pass to eternal existence, or to the glorious inner sphere of life, that is, to those who have cultivated truth, honesty, purity, and right actions, but to the unjust, proud, sensual, hypocritical or self-righteous, until progressed by development which requires a diligent and patient course of self-improvement and time—it is like to a debased, low, brutish man ushered into the society of those who have cultivated refinement and their intellectual faculties, uncongenial and unattractive; hence it is that the future life is such a hell to most at first, and such a heaven to others, though it is not the "orthodox" everlasting fire-raging

hell nor the eternal anthem-singing heaven with their fabulous monsters. Thus for the truly righteous death is verily robbed of its sting, and the grave of its victory.

Supposing for sake of argument that Christ was God, what did he do when on earth that was worthy of a Deity? It is as a man that the beauty of his character and life shine out so pre-eminent. Is he not reported to have said "I can of mine own self do nothing?" What is now taught as Christianity is totally at variance with the spirit, the teachings, and the example of our noble elder brother. The glorious truths taught by Jesus were received by him as a medium (the greatest the world has witnessed I admit), from the same source as similar truths are being received by those who in all seriousness seek that they may find the truth, not only in Judea but all over the world, now that the heavens are opened and the angels of God are ascending and descending upon the sons and daughters of men. Is it not written that "it shall come to pass afterwards I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions," &c., also "that the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, by the same spirit, to another the working of wonders, to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits, to another divers kinds of tongues." &c. Is it, therefore, right and sensible to refuse to accept these promised manifestations now that they *are* come and are open to everyone's investigation? Are you not told to prove all things and hold fast that which is good? If what you believe in is the truth it must stand, and if Spiritualism is false it must fall, and vice versa, for truth must conquer error eventually. Follow the example of the noble Berean's, search and inquire if these things are not so.

*"Oh God! we thank Thee that the time has come
To melt the shadow of the vast eclipse—
It rolls away—and lo! from those long dumb,
Hosannahs rise, and praise is on their lips!
The purple morning breaketh grand and sweet,
And brings a day the earth may not forget:
Its airy streamers flow before the feet
Of that glad sun which rises not to set."*

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" I admit that even the *clergy* can quote Scripture to suit their own purposes, so I claim an equal right to do the same. I do not expect that on a subject in which the generality of people are so prejudiced that my plain reasoning will have much effect, feeling assured that personal investigation alone will convince minds so biased, as was the case with myself and others who have had the reality and truth of spirit communion demonstrated, and I am not unmindful of the old adage—"Convince a man against his will, and he will be of the same opinion still." My object for giving the preceding scriptural quotation is for the purpose of exemplifying that if what I write on matters which you can test by your own reason has but slight effect on you, how little may be expected from my stating what I have ascertained concerning the future life; besides which, the teachings of the spiritual philosophy are so comprehensive that it would be utterly impossible in a mere pamphlet to give even a rough outline thereof. I may, however, here allude to a few of the lessons which I have learned through enquiry into the spiritual philosophy. One of the first is, never to ridicule that which I have not investigated thoroughly, for, until the power of spirits to communicate with those in the body was clearly and unmistakably demonstrated to me, beyond the possibility of doubt, (unless I ignored my own senses,) I used above all others to look upon Spiritualism as so much imaginary nonsense, and those who believed in it as deluded visionaries. Another is, that however much we may ridicule it, if we are not Spiritualists in this life, we shall of necessity be so sooner or later in the future life, and that they who ridicule and denounce those who are now candid enough to declare their adhesion to so unpopular a cause as is modern Spiritualism, had they lived in the apostolic times, would, as did the Jews 1800 years ago, have persecuted Jesus and his apostles for advocating Spiritualism and exemplifying its truth by means of its various phenomena, The spiritual philosophy alone reconciles science and religion: it teaches that primal matter was co-eternal with God but subservient to His powers, or, in other words, that God and matter are co-eternal principles, the one perfection, the other imperfection; the one unchangeable, the other changeable; the one positive, the other negative; the one the governor, the other the governed; the one the spiritual, the other the material; the one the greater, the other the less; and so on *ad infinitum*, as is exemplified throughout nature as man terms the visible results of God's laws on the natural, consequently visible universe, bearing out the adage, "The weaker is subject to the stronger." Light dispels darkness; beauty excels deformity; truth conquers error, &c. Nature's laws are slow but sure in

their effects. Take, for instance, the oak tree, it does not reach its stately proportions the hour, the day, or the year the acorn from which it springs is planted. No! Everything by God's eternal law of progression is slowly evolved, and this is consistent with the Great Power from whom all forces proceed, of whom it has been said that a thousand years are as but a day to Him, also that

*"Before the bills in order stood,
Or earth received her frame,
From everlasting Thou art God,
To endless years the same."*

Besides the forces, viz. mechanical, vital, and intellectual—love, wisdom, light, purity, and all that is good emanate from this Great Central Power though permeating all space, in Whom we live, move, and have our being, but invisible to our finite vision because spiritual.

Man is a microcosm, representing in his animal nature the physical universe which is material, consequently visible and changeable, and in his spiritual nature the eternal living principle of Deity invisible and immortal. Man's soul is as a dewdrop from God's eternal fount of love. From man's spiritual nature emanates all that is good, pure and holy, and from his animal nature all that we call evil. Man being the head of the animal creation, his animal nature partakes of the propensities of all beneath him—the cunningness of the fox, the boldness of the lion, the ferocity of the tiger, the impudence of the ape, &c., &c. in the same way as the apple contains the essences from the twig, the branch, the trunk, and the root of the apple tree. Unless man cultivates his spiritual nature, his animal passions and inclinations are apt to obtain the mastery. It was from Christ's abnegation of the latter, and his cultivation of his spiritual nature, that raised him so far above his fellows, and it is open for us to do likewise. The spiritual philosophy teaches that as this earth is but one of many planets, so our solar system is but one of numerous solar systems in the universe—that time and space are boundless, and may be termed twin sisters—that from matter springs plants, and from plants spring animals, at the head of which is man, whose ultimate is spirit. Man is therefore the connecting-link between matter and spirit, the beginning and the end of all things. He is, therefore, in this life of a dual nature—animal and spiritual—the one is temporal, the other is eternal; the one visible to the physical eyesight, the other invisible. Man is a free-will being within the laws of nature: he can cultivate his spiritual nature as did our noble Elder Brother 1800 years ago, so as to be worthy of the sonship of his Heavenly Father; or he can cultivate his animal nature by giving way to his lusts and passions, so as to degrade himself beneath the beasts of the field, as may be witnessed daily. Man cannot serve two masters; he must cultivate one nature to the prejudice of the other; he cannot be both sensual and spiritual, for, like oil and water, they will never blend. As the earth, which is the mother of the body, requires no intercessor to receive her own at death, so God the Father of all spirits, requires no intercessor in order to receive our spirits into life eternal. All flesh is but grass—the death of the body is the new birth of the spirit—according as we sow here so shall we reap hereafter, the law of cause and effect continuing in the future life as well as in this—the law of retributive justice tempered with mercy prevails there, and all is governed by natural laws there as here, the lower spheres of which are analagous to this world, only spiritual in place of material. There, there is no night; all is eternal day to those pure enough to receive its glorious light; pure morality, (the result of perfect control by the spiritual over the animal nature,) is the standard by which our starting point in that life is fixed. All knowledge gained in this life is advantageous in the next; but knowledge without purity is there like a title here without the means of sustaining it. No book is needed there containing all our actions good and bad, for our own spiritual forms bear the impress visible to both ourselves and others, not only of our every action here, but of our every thought and intention, as plainly as if written on a sheet of paper. Repentance and time can alone efface the stains our evil thoughts and actions here leave on our spiritual forms, therefore as we sow here so shall we reap hereafter. We rise the counterpart of what we were on earth with our individuality, idiosyncracies, beliefs, &c., intact, if truthful here, we are truthful there; if deceitful here, deceitful there until developed; but all is progression there, fast or slow according to our desires and exertions, no animal lusts being there to tend to deteriorate or to cause us to retrograde as on earth. The scheming scoundrel will find no insolvent court there wherein he can get whitewashed and have his rascally swindles legally coated over, whilst his less sophisticated brother scoundrel receives his mete reward for committing a fractional part of criminality compared to his. Love and wisdom, the attributes of perfection, are the two great prevailing themes in spiritual existence, where we eternally go on towards perfection, but not to perfection as generally supposed; perfection being an attribute pertaining to God alone, is unattainable by spirits however exalted.

Man's soul is an emanation from Deity; it is clothed with an electrical form or spirit which in this life is coated with an animal body. In the spiritual worlds there are no angels with wings, as we have been taught, and

all angels or spirits have at one time had a prior fleshly existence. In the higher grades of spiritual life unworthy sentiments and feelings have been eradicated completely, and all are ruled and guided by pure celestial love and wisdom—there all is harmony and peace. The lower spheres can be outlived in this life. This earth is but the vestibule or cloak-room of the world to come, which contains neither a mythical heaven nor a material hell of fire and brimstone. But the future life is a rational, progressive, intellectual state of existence, in every way worthy of its Great Ruler and of man's highest aspirations.

To those who have had the truth of Spiritualism clearly and unmistakably demonstrated to them, the puerile arguments against, and the miserable attempts to disprove ascertained facts by counterfeiting the phenomena by means of impudent, barefaced jugglery and sleight of hand, are most contemptible and insulting to reason. It might be as rationally attempted to disprove that the sun gives light to mankind by introducing in broad day a lighted candle, as to try to disprove ascertained facts by trickery and ridicule. A counterfeit shilling does not prove that there are none genuine, on the contrary it is evidence of there having been an original to copy from. People are too apt to forget that nature's laws are fixed and unalterable, and that if the modern spiritual phenomena are not reliable, then it of necessity follows that those of ancient times upon which they pin their faith, must be equally unreliable. For my own part (whether I am credited or not does not concern me much) I have had enough evidence and demonstration of the truth, that man can and does receive communications from those in the spiritual existence, to convince all the clergy, saints, sinners, and devils in existence, if only they are amenable to reason. And this being the case, which you as well as I are able to prove for yourself, I ask—"Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not?" And why not, instead of wasting your time in listening weekly to the flowery imaginative nonsense of some Rev. babbler, who at heart feels he knows as little about the future life as you do? Sit down earnestly and prayerfully with some friends in your own home, and see if you cannot get evidence from those who loved you and who were dear to you when on earth, and thus enable them to prove that they can communicate with you as well as my spiritual friends can with me. If you are successful, as I have no doubt you will be in time in receiving satisfactory evidences of the truth and reality of spiritual communications being received now as formerly, you will not be long in discovering the charm there exists therein, the delight experienced in renewing communications with those you loved, and the utter impossibility—as some of my orthodox friends have expressed their hopes that I should do—viz., of returning to antiquated superstition and humbug after having tasted of the joy of the eternal truth, light, and liberty; as well might they ask the bird, escaped from a snare, to return to its bondage. Credulity, I may add, is not a weakness that the writer of this is generally credited with. I would not believe the most trustworthy man, nor even the most exalted spirit, if they communicated that which my reason did not approve of. The coy-doves of orthodoxy may allure careless unbelievers to their cages who are too weak-minded to think for themselves, but it is an utter impossibility for them to drag a true Spiritualist back to what they well term the old sheepfold. Churchmen may ascend to spiritual light and liberty, but those who have had the truth demonstrated can never descend to old superstitious folly again, unless Balaam's talking donkey was to rise from the dead and convince them by logical argument that they were in error. Just imagine one of your friends being so superstitious as to allow his priest's or parson's advice and the dictates of an old book to prevent his receiving a telegram of importance from his friends at a distance, because they stated it was contrary to the laws of the God of Nature and because information therefrom was generally received by letter. Would you not say it was very foolish of your friend to listen to and be guided by such childish nonsense? It is the same with regard to spiritual communications; if God had not intended that they should be of benefit to mankind we may rely on it that their occurrence would not have been possible either in the olden time or in the present day. "Try the spirits whether they be good or evil" was said of old, and the same advice is equally applicable now. If the books ascribed to Moses were written by him, it must have been after he went to the spiritual world and through some medium, (possibly Ezra) as he could not otherwise have written an account of his death and burial. We cannot expect to receive a telegram before the telegraphic apparatus is fixed, so in like manner we cannot receive a spiritual communication until the necessary conditions are complied with.

The Roman Catholic Church admits the truth of Spiritualism as far as its dark side is concerned, viz: the power of evil spirits to return and control those in the flesh at the present day, as recent events in France and Germany clearly attest, and this fact is further corroborated by the instructions to priests for the exorcism of evil spirits, sanctioned by the Pope, on 28th January, 1851, and published in Latin, by authority, in 1869, under the title of "The method of liberating the afflicted from demons." As the same law of nature applies to all classes of men, so it is with spirits. If it is open for evil spirits to return to earth and influence mankind, surely it is only reasonable to admit that good spirits can do the same, otherwise it would be a one-sided law of nature contrary to both our experience and to the bible teachings. "For He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth the rain on the just and on the unjust.—Math, v., 45.

*"Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth
Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep."*

—*Paradise Lost*, Book iv., line 677.

"Washington Irving writes:—

"What could be more consoling than the idea that the souls of those whom we once loved were permitted to return and watch over our welfare?—that affectionate and guardian spirits sat by our pillows when we slept, keeping a vigil over our most helpless hours?—that beauty and innocence which had languished into the tomb yet smiled unseen around us, revealing themselves in those blest dreams wherein we live over again the hours of past endearment? A belief of this kind would, I think, be 'a new incentive to virtue,' rendering us circumspect even in our secret moments—from the idea that those we once loved and honoured, were invisible witnesses of all our actions."

A writer remarks that, in a letter to the editor of the *New Universal Magazine*, dated so far back as July 17, 1814, are to be found the following remarks :—

"In what way disembodied matter may be supposed to communicate with man it is not easy to determine, but there are few, I believe, who have not, at one time or other, been conscious of that occult influence upon the will, which impels us to one particular course of action rather than another,—almost without our being aware that we are under the influence of such impressions. They who would deny this operation I should suspect to be persons who have never attended very closely to the operations of their own minds."

*"There are more things in heaven and earth,
Horatio, than are dreamt of in our philosophy."*

It is only natural that the clergy of all denominations "holding a temporary power over the people, will, in order to maintain their power and position, misrepresent and denounce the person or medium through whom the truth is unfolded to the world. Man, with but few exceptions, knows not what truth is; he knows not where to find it—how to estimate it—how to separate it. If he has too little truth he is anxious; if truth is all he desires, he finds it; but should he seek truth, not for truth's sake, but for the sake of establishing an opinion, then he is discontented. It is not the quantity, but the quality of truth which makes us free."

"The theology of all nations tends to falsify the nature of death—even the Christian theology presents to the enquiring mind 'the dark shadow of the valley of death.' 'Death is an everlasting sleep,' and also the 'monster,' who is terrible and gigantic even to the strongest intellect. To the enlightened mind 'there is no more death,' 'nor sorrow, nor crying,' to those who live in constant conjunction with eternal truth. When a body dies on earth a soul is born in heaven! As the death of the germ is necessary to the birth or development of the flower; so is the death of man's physical body an indispensable precedent and indication of his spiritual birth. Night and sleep correspond to physical death; but the brilliant day and human wakefulness correspond to spiritual birth and individual elevation; the laws of nature are unchangeable and complete in their operations. To the oppressed and down-trodden; to those who are afflicted with the dread of coming death; to all, I would say—fear not, but follow truth, tread boldly where she leads, and, with philosophic calm go on—through the seeming mysterious process of death; for truth still guides, with light revealing to the awakening and more interior senses, a habitation of harmony and blessedness"—in accordance with the mercy of God and the highest aspirations of man. Better is it to have no religion at all than one derogatory to both God and man.

The day is not far distant when theologians as well as scientists will have, notwithstanding their inveterate antipathy thereto, to acknowledge the truth and reality of Spiritualism, as the following extract from the *Argus* newspaper of 28th Aug., 1875, written by its own London correspondent, indicates :—"The vice-president of the British Association of Spiritualists, one (*sic*) Dr. Stephenson, has proved to the satisfaction of scientists the existence of magnetic particles, impressed by thought and feeling, given off at right angles from the electricity of the nervous system." It is through electricity that one mind or spirit, whether in the body, or out of the body, acts on another mind or spirit in the physical body: the one is Mesmerism, the other Spiritualism; and further, it is through electricity, which pervades all matter and space, that the Divine Mind, or Spirit of Spirits, acts on the physical universe. Electricity and light will be the magic wands of the future.

I have drunk deeply of the crimsoned waters of superstition, and I have also drunk of the clear crystal waters of eternal truth, and have found as much difference in the two as there is between the damp chill blasts of darkest night and the mild zephyrs of a sunny day; go thou and do likewise and you will then, and not till then, be in a position to form a correct judgment. Remember that condemnation of anything you have not

carefully investigated, and in which you have had no experience, is the height of presumptuous arrogance and utter foolishness. "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good," whether you find it in the Bible, the Koran, in philosophy, or in science. All truth, all good, is of God the eternal Fountain of love, wisdom, justice, and mercy.

"He who rejoiceth in the happiness of another increaseth by it his own."

For further information on this subject I must refer you to a work entitled "The Holy Truth; or, the Coming Reformation," (universal and eternal because founded on demonstrable truth, and reconciling science with religion,) the first volume of which is now in course of publication, as it would be beyond the scope of this pamphlet to enter more fully into detail regarding this grand philosophy, which is destined eventually to dispel all superstition, false mummery, and all controversy on that subject in which, when the truth is known, there can exist no difference of opinion. It ought to be superfluous to add that there are innumerable books to be obtained on this subject, many of which are of high literary merit, but from their not confirming orthodox notions their publication is in general kept in the back ground. I shall conclude with a few lines which came into my thoughts one evening a short time ago :—

Oh! Truth, thou beauteous gem, thou pearl of all the seas,
Visible throughout God's works to men of all degrees,
Shine forth in all thy splendour, enlighten every mind,
Extinguish cherished errors, emancipate mankind.

From bigotry and priestcraft the souls of men release;
Let superstitious follies and false religions cease;
Then true worship by our acts shall senseless creeds displace,
And base notions of our God no longer man disgrace.

Then shall thy simple teachings, by Jesus first proclaimed,
Divested of all errors by which they've been defamed,
Shine as the second advent of the eternal truth,
And countless millenniums reign verily on earth.

Addenda.

The following address to "orthodox" Christians, from the spiritual world, was received on the evening of the day of Benjamin Suggitt Nayler's funeral, through the organism of J. H. B. Harris, trance medium, and taken down as uttered by a short-hand writer. I may state Mr. Harris, who is a young man, is a natural clairvoyant, and goes into the trance state without being magnetized by any of the sitters, as is necessary in the case of some trance mediums. He is totally unconscious of what is spoken through his organization when in this state, and in his normal condition is quite ignorant of the meaning of many of the expressions contained in the addresses delivered through him by his spirit controls or guardian angels.

To "ORTHODOX" CHRISTIANS.

In addressing you to-night I may be accused of having taken a liberty; but, believe me, that liberty is fraught with love—a love that I cherish for all mankind.

It is not every day that sees one of a liberal mind and fine character pass from your sight: a mind and character whose views may have appeared, from your standpoint, not only erroneous, but ungodly and unrighteous, as well as hostile to the principles which you profess.

The mind of that being whose mortal frame, a few hours ago, was placed beneath the sod, had become so expanded, so enlarged, that it could realise the glorious benefit of the life beyond, and its superiority over that from which he has so recently departed. His life was devoted to the amelioration of the condition of his fellows—to soothe the broken-hearted, and perform all the good that was in his power. In this, at least, you

cannot but admit that he is worthy of imitation, and I earnestly invoke you to summon all your energies to the task and emulate his example, thereby placing on record your approval of one phase of the character of him whom you deemed inimical to your religious beliefs.

Strive, my friends, to live purely and peacefully upon earth, smoothing, by your acts, the rougher paths of your fellow voyagers upon the ocean of life. You are not required to work the laws of the mighty universe, but merely to act justly, and tread the path of progress.

By many of the more uncharitable unbelievers in the Glorious Truth the soul of him to whose memory honor was performed at the interment of his remains, is believed to be tossing on waves of fire and brimstone, floating upon which his spiritual body is suffering the most excruciating pain!—that he is now paying the penalties attached to that ungodly belief which he was so desirous of propagating! In short, that his soul is—to use the "orthodox" expression—now "numbered with the damned!" To these cruel, blind, and prejudiced enemies of the Resplendent Reality which this released spirit now realises (and in which he could, to a certain extent, participate before his release), the mind and the very works he left behind him bear the impress of the Christian's devil, whose rivets are so firmly driven in that neither Time nor naught else can extract them! What a glorious feeling! What a Christian-like charity! What a delightful sensation will, doubtless, animate the minds of many benighted and bigoted creatures to-morrow,

This address was given on Saturday evening.

when, upon their knees they offer "to the Throne of Grace" (as they designate the supposed seat of their imaginary God) devotee thanks:

"That a sinner has been called away; that he who was so evil cannot possibly any more come in contact with us. His soul, as well as that body which now is food for worms, will perish; and that mind, animated by a devil bound in flesh, which so stirred the passions against us, has been cast by a wrathful God into perdition—meet reward for such iniquity!"

But there are others who, not less enlightened, take a different view. Christians! Christians! may you, every one of you, live the life of virtue—the life of love—which this grey-haired man has just terminated. The tenement which shrouded the soul and spirit of the old man (in his 80th year) is now cold; but the immortal parts are now more joyous and replete with life than ever that tenement was even in the heyday of its youth. The later years of that life, which appeared to you dreary and in a cloud, participated in the delights of those glorious heavens that are not always made manifest to man. He has gone from among you, friends, and to a world with which he was theoretically acquainted. He is now treading the paths he knew he would have to travel before his departure from the earth.

See his pamphlet, published a few days before his death.

It only remained for him to realise the smoothness of those paths. Unlike many of you, if now ushered into eternity, he is not surprised nor bewildered at the transformation around him in his new existence, for he had reverently studied to acquire some slight knowledge of the eternal existence beyond the grave. His character when upon earth was well known, so that it is needless for me to dwell upon it. His love and his good actions will long be remembered. He leaves his works behind him. It may seem strange to you to say that the impress of his labors will remain upon the very winds : breezes will blow his name long after your earthly forms have sunk into oblivion. I ask you to look to him with respect. He needs not your good wishes: he wants not your prayers; though it may be that some of the more zealous and charitable of the Christians will pray for his soul; but why pray if, as is supposed, he has been consigned to that place of eternal torment termed "hell?" Why pray ye when he is past redemption? Why sigh, when you believe that he is suffering all the just pains entailed upon him by his iniquitous belief: pains which an ingenious priesthood has so long held before the mind's eye of their dupes? After all the opprobrium and scorn you have hurled at him, he has passed away to a land beyond your ken; but not before he has performed his part towards bursting the erroneous and degrading views entertained of the Diety by too many professing a belief in the doctrines of Christianity : the errors, inconsistencies, and blasphemy of which he has exposed and shown in such a manner that all rational minds divested of prejudice will coincide in the main points of his belief. In the perusal of his writings and compiled works

See his book, entitled "A Discussion on the Unity, Duality, and Trinity of the Godhead," which clearly demonstrates the erroneous character of the popular belief.

much benefit may be derived by the earnest seeker after truth. His language was plain and outspoken; he had no inward thoughts which he dared not express, and he was one of those men who pass away with a true faith, knowing what they have to meet in the Eternal Hereafter. There are some here present who, in viewing his remains for the last time, dropped a tear to his memory. He will remember those tears with pleasurable feelings. The assembly of the earth's inhabitants this day at the grave of the energetic old man was far outnumbered by the thousands—aye, millions—of visitors who were there from the spiritual world.

Small things are the germs of larger ones. Little things have grown to a size which taxes your physical sight to scan. Four earth, for instance, from a handfull of atoms has, in the course of countless ages, spread over

thousands of miles of space. The expansion is a till continuing, and will continue, for nature is ever progressive and never idle. By the aggregation of atoms: by the incessant labors of animalcules; and by other means, the earth has been turned and enlarged in various ways and shapes: out of molehills have risen mountains; out of the mountains have risen trees. From this ever-revolving globe have proceeded the beings called men and women, whose earthly bodies return to the dust from whence they sprang; but whose spiritual forms contain a germ of life—a soul that can ne'er part with its glorious immortality.

That path which we now tread you and unborn myriads will also have to tread. Age is fast making its marks upon some of you; silvery locks, similar to those that adorned the head of him whom you consigned to the grave this day will, ere long, hang around the heads of many. To you that are young I would say : strip yourselves of all false pride as quickly as possible: rend it as a thing unfit to wear : cast it aside as deterrent to your spiritual progress. Fear not to express your sentiments and thoughts : throw aside the crouching disposition that is so wide-spread upon this earth sphere : allow not your souls to become engrossed by the vanities of this world, but entwine your thoughts with the flowers of virtue, so that each of you can confidently say, "I rise to Eternal Day." Oh! let your character be such that you need not fear any man's slanderous words, even if they savor of that venom which proceeds from a toad. Fear them not! for they will pass harmless over your unsullied character; a character that should be so spotless as to bear a strict examination by your fellow creatures. Whether your thoughts and acts in your earth-life have been in accord with purity and justice, your future life will determine. Have no fears that he who lately passed from your sight is now struggling on the fiery brimstone lake. Fear ye not that there is such a place, for 'tis a myth, a bug-bear that has too long obtained a place in the creeds of Christianity. Neither think ye, who deem yourselves religious and godly, that he is in heaven; for he is not there.

There is not one hour of your day, indeed, I might venture to say, there is not a minute, that spirits are not ushered into either light or darkness; but those states are not the heaven and hell of "orthodoxy"; the results of whose teachings are a sad commentary upon the influence of ignorance and mythology. I have no desire to convert you to Spiritualism; but I wish to impress upon your minds the necessity of cultivating and encouraging the faculties which will fully develop the God-like qualities of Love and Justice. If the sentiments which animate your being, in regard to the faith you cherish and venerate, be pure and void of taint, fear not to be outspoken in your language when you find it necessary to advance the cause you consider holy. Let your character be clear and your thoughts pure. The path which your recent contemporary is now traversing you also must tread; and think you not that it would, like him, well become you *to learn something of the nature of that path?* I venture to think that it would, so that your advent into the spirit-world will be attended by more of joy than of sorrow. When you become denizens of that world your character will be clearly perceived, for you will be divested of the earthly coating which now conceals your thoughts, and all will be open as the noonday.

Remember with love him who has lately passed from your view. Think of him as a spirit who has cast the bonds of earth away; think of him as one who is now endowed with immortal sensibilities—of one inspired by new and more expansive conceptions than it is possible for man to possess. Then rest, oh! earth-form that bore so well the fearless soul. Return to, and mingle with, the dust from whence thou arose, for thou hast performed thy part. The feet that bore up thy stately form can do so no longer. The hands are cold and paralyzed that once did trace with pen the thoughts of a vigorous mind; thoughts that, transferred to other minds from the pages upon which they are impressed, may have arrested the attention of some for the hour; while upon others an indelible and grateful impression has been effected by their perusal. The quick and electric brain that was replete with vitality and desire to expose and extirpate the vicious and detestable doctrines that are so rampant, now lies cold and covered o'er with earth; but from that now putrescent brain has emanated an organ corresponding to the surroundings of the higher life: a life which, to the progressive and ascending spirit, is bathed in celestial splendour! The flowers which loving hands placed upon thy coffin are now fading and crushed, and will soon mingle with the dust of thy body. But here behold a form that no spell-bound coffin holds! He stands erect with tranquillity, grateful that at length he has reached the higher state, where he will unfold in love and wisdom throughout everlasting spheres.

INVOCATION.

Oh! Father of Light, of Love, of Truth! waft Thy Eternal Glory around us. Wrap Thy earthly creatures in Thy halos of affinity. Make them to understand that they who have preceded them to the new and more perfect existence are not dead, but have been transferred to the Inner Sphere of Life.

We ask Thee not to save them from the pains attending the body, induced by disregarding Thy laws, for justice demands that such disregard should be followed by suffering. Oh! Father, Who drawest our souls towards Thee, teach them to bring their lives under the guidance of Thy beneficent laws, so that they may become enchanted with the lovely and the noble, and transfixed in their intentions of leading lives of truth and

honesty. Inspire them with a desire to seek Thy blessing, and make them to know that their paths may be strewn with flowers: that no darkness hangs around Thy Ancient Beauty; that no clouds dull Thy appearance, and that no monuments of man's erection contain Thee; but a Glorious and Eternal Life and Ever-Glorious Immortality hang around Thee, attracting the living and the so-called dead!

The grave is bridged: the channels are opened, and gushing waters pour forth. No pomp, no ceremony; but high on the hill, low in the dale, we can find Thee, there can we know Thee. We look to Thee, Thou Glorious Being, for all strength, and we regard Thee with love and gratitude, divested of every particle of fear. Good night.

The following is a communication from a student of astronomy, lately passed to the inner life, received through the mediumship of Miss Phillips, of Sandhurst:—

Stupendous and transcendental scenes! To the furthest verge of creation—where truth stands revealed, and where wonder, abashed, is dazzled by the yet higher glories in the vision, and in the contemplation of Deity—the countless luminaries of unfathomed worlds are blending in sweet accord, and everywhere the wisdom and love of the Great Father is expressed—not as told us of in the olden time. The happy sons and daughters of one happy Father rejoice in the matchless power He is ever scattering around them. Oh, can it be!—that man, so pitiful—so pitiful in his automatic impotence may *dare* to set up faiths and decrees at variance with those mighty laws prevailing the great Universe? And yet he dares to do so—puny in intellect, and insignificant as he appears, when compared to the immensity of creation—the illimitable source of glory and power that calls God "Maker." Oh! I have learned the blessedness of Truth; for, as I learn it, it tells me of God's mercy to man—to me—to you—to all His creatures. Deep is the joy with which I have learned to soar, and rich the reward I have reaped.

In earth-life I spent many anxious nights in learning something of the stretch of worlds which my tired brain sought to compass. Now! I count immeasurable galaxies of stars and systems—systems on systems—through the shining space—vaster and vaster in their grandeur—countless as dust—spangling space like unto the purest gems, and never feel oppressed. No more the night must close my happy study : no more the day, breaking upon a sleeping world, ends my vigils. I have gained those spheres where the entranced soul can revel in its glorious contemplations of infinity. Look around where I lead your thoughts : look around where the wishes of God are fulfilled, and see how tenderly He has sought to give you beauty. The stars o'er head express His love and power: all tell you of this—everything *so* beautiful in design, that if you are asked for a creed or faith in which you seek to worship God, let Nature be the happy Scriptures you are acquainted with; and learn from her the secrets alphabetically given here, until you learn to read the deeper lessons she holds in her bosom, and further, the chapter of life in which your Father tells you the principles of happiness—the destiny of mankind; for all that is around you holds the same simple examples of your higher life, and you know it not. Then learn, as I learned before I entered the happy bright "Beyond," that in the plants, and in the water, are hidden some of the elements you have within yourselves. How strong the heart grows when you inquire into and comprehend these secrets! The wise men of science are happy in such thoughts. You cannot fear a God *so* bright, *so* good; and in seeking to do your own part, you feel a consciousness that you have grown spiritually, from the contemplation of the beautiful and true.

*"The astronomer, with patient searching gaze,
Doth with his tube the depths of space explore :
Shows Neptune's orb, or, 'neath the solar blaze,
Reveals a world by man unseen before.
Justly the world rewards his arduous toil,
From land to land the breezes bear his name;
But he who doth a spirit-world reveal,
Not far in space, but near to every soul,
Which nought but mists of sense and sin conceal,
(Would from men, s' sight these mists at length might roll!)
He is with incredulity received,
Or with a slow, reluctant faith believed."*

Errata.

Page 5—For "excuse *therefore*," read "excuse *therefor*."

Page 9—For "*extraordinary* clever man," read, "*extraordinarily* clever man."

Page 10—For "the power is now lost to your church," read, "*comparatively* lost."

Page 12—For "*out do* Barnum, *Barnum himself*," read, "*out-Barnum-Barnum-[himself]*."

Page 14—For "as *literally* rendered by a translator" read, "*liberally* rendered."

From inadvertence on my part in revising, several errors in the punctuation &c. have crept in, which however, truthseekers for the sake of truth itself will overlook.

THE AUTHOR.

Lessons. In the English Language

For Maori Schools. Part I.

By Authority : George Didsbury, Government Printer. Wellington 1873

He Akoranga I Te Reo in Garihi Mo Te Kura Maori.

I.

Whakahuatanga.

E TAMA ma, kei hoha koutou ki te whakahua i nga reta e mau nei. Ahakoa roa noa te ako, me tohe tonu ki te whakahua. Ma konei ano hoki e tika ai te arero ki nga kupu Pakeha.

The teacher will observe, that, in the foregoing lessons, in the first place the English Vowel sounds are given alone:

Then, those sounds are joined to the consonants with which the Natives are already familiar:

And, lastly, they are joined to our harsh English consonants. The syllables in which *c* has the sound of *k*, are separated from those in which the same letter has the sound of *s*.

It will be found necessary that the children be well exercised in these lessons before they attempt to learn anything of the Grammar, or to read English words. The teacher can enliven this part of the work by writing on a large slate one or two words which begin or end with the double consonants given; as, after a lesson on atch, etch, &c. he may give catch, fetch, &c. and the boys may then copy these words on their slates, or write them in copy books, as the writing lesson for the clay. It will, of course, take a long time to perfect the children in the harder sounds, but the teacher will be repaid in the end for his trouble by the ease with which they will read any common book.

The pronunciation of English words will often be rendered easier to the native pupil, by breaking them up into several syllables, each syllable consisting of a consonant and a vowel or vowels following it.

For example the words *bend*, *branch*, *ground*, may be taught thus

The following rules will enable the pupils to ascertain which sound to give to *th* whenever they meet with it; whether to sound it (1) as in *this*, or (2) as in *thing*.

1. The first sound must be given to it in the beginning of all the following words :—

also in all cases where *th* is found between two vowels, or before the letter *s*, as in the following examples :—

2. The second sound must be given to it in all other cases.

S is pronounced as *sh* in the following and similar cases :—

The following groups of words are given as examples of the various sounds of the vowels. The business of the teacher will be to secure the accurate pronunciation of the English words. The Maori rendering of each word is given merely to make the lessons more interesting to the pupils :—

A.

E.

I.

O.

U.

II.

Ingoa.

Ki te veo Maori, i te mea e whakahuatia ana te ingoa o tetahi mea mo te mea kotahi, mo nga mea maha ranei, e tuturu tonu ana rga reta; kahore he reta e whaka-putaia ketia ana, kahore hoki he reta e apititia ana mai. Ki te reo *English* ia, e rere ke ana te whakakuatanga mo te mea kotahi, e rere ke ana ano mo nga mea e maha atu ana i te kotahi. Te kupu mo te mea kotahi, e kiia ana he *singular*; te kupu mo nga mea e maha atu ana i te kotahi, e kiia ana he *plural*.

1. Te tikanga mo te tini o te kupu, he apiti mai i te *s*, kia mohiotia he maha nga mea e korerotia ana; ina hoki enei;

2. I te mea ko tetahi o enei reta, *s, x, sh, eh, o*, te reta whakamutunga ka apititia mai he *es*, ina hoki enei;

3. I te mea he *y* te reta whakamutunga, ka whakarerea te *y*, ka whakanohoia ketia he *ies*, ina hoki enei;

Otira ki te mea he *ay, ey, oy, uy*, nga reta whakamutunga, ko te *s* kau e apititia mai, ina hoki enei :

4. I te mea he *f, fe* ranei, te whakamutunga, *ka* whakarerea aua reta, ka whakanohoia ketia *ves*, ina hoki enei :

Ko etahi ia e apititia kautia ana ki te *s*;

5. Tenei hoki etahi, i poka ke noa atu *te* tikanga;

Nouns for exercise in the formation of plurals:

Chair, cage, ass, flash, berry, loaf, bay, hedge, floor, dress, sty, dish, cargo, wedge, table, cross, dray, match, loaf, wall, judge, bush, gully, watch, sheaf, perch, hill, voice, folly, half, key, fence, ditch, field, wolf, horse, fox, river, dunce.

Ka korerotia tetahi wahi o tetahi mea, tetahi mea ranei a tetahi tangata, tenei nga tohu ki te reo Maori he *a*, he *o*, he *ta*, he *to* : tena, ki te reo *English*, he *s* te tohu, i apititia mai ki te reta whakamutunga, me tetahi *comma* (kama) ki runga, ki te taha ki mani o te *s*.

Ki te mea he *s* te reta whakamutunga e kore e tuhituhia tetahi *s*, engari ko te *comma* anake; e whakahuatia ana ano ia te *s*.

Tenei ano tetahi kupu, ko te *of*, he rite tonu ki te *a*, ki te *o*; ki te mauria ko tenei, ka whakarerea te *s* me tona *comma*.

Tetahi kupu e peneitia ana me te *of* ko te *for*; ki te reo Maori, he *mo*, he *ma*.

Tenei ano tetahi kupu a te Pakeha *it*; kahore a te tangata Maori kupu hei rite. Ko ta te tangata Maori kupu ko te *ia*; mo te tane tena—mo te wahine—mo nga mea manawa ora.

Na ko nga mea e kore nei e whai manawa ora, ko te whare—ko te rakau—kowhatu—ko te aha, kahore e tika mo era te *ia*. Erangi ko ta te Pakeha ko te *it*; te kupu tika mo nga mea katoa e kore nei e kiia he tane, he wahine.

Engari kei nga tamariki ririki e kore nei e whakaarohia he tane ranei he wahine ranei, ka tika: kei nga reme hoki, kei nga kuao, kei nga manu, e kore e whakaarohia, he toa, he uwaha, kei reira ka tika te *it*.

III.

Adjectives.

TE tikanga o etahi kupu, he whakaatu i te tu o tenei mea, o tera mea. Ka whakahuatia ko te ingoa kau o te tangata, o te rakau, o te whare, o te pouaka, e kore e mohiotia, he mea pewhea ranei, he mea pewhea ranei; tena, ka kiia, he tangata *pai*, he rakau *roa*, he whare *nui* he pouaka *taimaha*, ka matauria te tu o te mea e korerotia ana.

Number.

Te tekau ma rua o nga ra o Hanuere.—*The twelfth day of January.*

Te ono o nga ra o Aperira.—*The sixth day of April.*

Te tekau ma iwa o nga ra o Hune.—*The nineteenth day of June.*

Te rua tekau o nga ra o Hepetema.—*The twentieth day of September.*

Te rua tekau ma waru o nga ra o Nowema.—*The twenty-eighth day of November.*

Te toru tekau ma tahi o nga ra o Tihema.—*The thirty-first day of December.*

IV.

Am. is. was. Were.

Tenei etahi kupu, *am, is, are*; me enei, *was, were*. Kahore a te tangata Maori kupu hei rite mo enei; engari ma te titiro, ma te whakaaro ake, ka kitea ai te tikanga o tenei kupu, o tenei kupu. Ma te the tonu ki te korero i nga kupu e mau nei ka hohoro ai te mohio ki te tikanga o enei kupu.

He whare pai tenei, *this is a good house.*

He pai tenei whare, *this house is good.*

Ko toku whare tenei, *this is my house.*

Mo Hemi tera whare, *that house is for James.*

No ratou te whare, *the house is theirs.*

Kei Tauranga a Hoani, *John is at Tauranga.*

Kei roto i te whare te pukapuka, *the book is in the house.*

E ora ana a Pita, *Peter is well.*

Ko ena kupu, mo te mea kotahi, ara mo te whare kotahi, mo te pukapuka kotahi, mo te tangata kotahi, na reira i tika ai te *is*; ki te malia ia nga mea e korerotia ana, heoi ano te kupu tika ko te *are*.

He whare pai enei, *these are good houses.*

He pai enei whare, *these houses are good.*

Ko o matou whare enei, *these are our houses.*

Mo Herni raua ko Hoani enei whare e rua, *these two houses are for James and John.*

No ratou nga whare, *the houses are theirs.*

Kei Tauranga a Hemi ratou ko Hoani, ko Ropata, *James, John, and Robert are at Tauranga.*

Kei roto i te whare nga pukapuka, *the books are in the house.*

E ora ana maua ko Pita, *Peter and I are well.*

Ko te *are* ano hoki te kupu tika hei hoa mo te *you*, ahakoa i whakahuatia mo te tangata kotahi, ahakoa mo te tokorua, me to te tokomaha ranei, ara, mo enei kupu Maori, *koe, korua, koutou*.

He tangata roa koe, *you are a tall man.*

E hiakai ana koe, *you are hungry.*

No Waikato korua ko Tamati, *you and Thomas are from Waikato.*

E ora ana koutou, *you are well.*

I te mea e korerotia ana te kupu penei, *He tangata roa alum*, e kore e tika te *is*, te *are* ranei, engari te *am*.

He tangata roa ahau, *I am a tall man.*

E mate-kai ana ahau, *I am hungry.*

No Akarana ahau, *I am from Auckland.*

Time.

Ko ena kupu i runga ake na, ko te *am*, ko te *is*, ko te *are*, mo naianei, ara, mo te wa i te tangata e korero ana; ina hoki tenei, *I am hungry*, mo toku matenga i te kai i a au e korero atu nei, chara i te mea mo te matenga i te kai inanahi, i tetahi atu takiwa ranei. Me tenei kupu hoki, *The books are in the house*, ehara i te mea mo te takotoranga o nga pukapuka ki roto ki te whare inanahi, inawhea ranei, engari mo naianei tonu. Tena ka korerotia nga mea o mua, ka whakarerea te *am*, te *is*, te *are*, ka mauria ketia ko te *was*, mo te mea kotahi, ko te *were* mo nga mea maha.

He whare pai tenei i tera tau, *this was a good house last year.*

Noku tera whare inanahi, *that house was mine yesterday.*

I Tauranga a Hoani, *John was at Tauranga.*

I runga i te pouaka te pukapuka, *the book was on the box.*
He whare pai enei i tera tau, *these were good houses last year.*
No maua era whare inanahi, *those houses were ours yesterday.*
I Taupo a Hoani ratou ko Hemi, ko Tarnati, *John, James and Thomas were at Taupo.*
I runga i te tēpu a maua pukapuka, *our books were on the table.*

Whakakore.

Te tino kupu whakakore, ko te *not*.
Ekara tenei i te pukapuka pai, *this is not a good book.*
Ehara korua i te tangata kaka, *you are not strong men.*
Ekara tenei i te wkare o Tamati, *this is not Thomas's house.*
Ehara i a ia era hoiho e rua, *those two horses are not his.*
Ehara i te mea mo Hoani raua ko Hohepa nga koti mangu, *the black coats are not for John and Joseph.*
Kahore a Hoani i Tauranga, *John is not at Tauranga.*
Kahore a Pita i te ora, *Peter is not well.*

Patai.

Ko ena korero katoa, he korero noa, ehara i te korero patai. Ki te waiho nga kupu pena kei kupu patai ka rere ke te takoto, ka whakawhitia ketia te *am*, te *is*, to *are*, te *was*, te *were*, ki te timatanga tonu o te korero.

He whare pai ranei tenei? *Is this a good house?*
E ora ana ranei a Rapata? *Is Robert well?*
Kei Tauranga ranei a Hoani? *Is John at Tauranga?*
E maeke ana ranei koe? *Are you cold?*
Kei roto ranei i te whare nga pukapuka? *Are the books in the house?*
Mo korua ranei enei whare e rua? *Are these two houses for you?*
I maeke ranei ia inanahi? *Was he cold yesterday?*
I Whanganui ranei a Rapata, ratou ko Hemi, ko Pita? *Were Robert and James and Peter at Whanganui?*
Ehara oti tena i te pukapuka nui? *Is not that a large book?*
Ehara oti i a koe ena kakahu? *Are not those clothes yours?*
Kahore oti a Hoani i roto i te whare inapo? *Was not John in the house last night?*
Kahore koutou i mate i te wai inanahi? *Were not you thirsty yesterday?*
Ko wai tena? *Who is that?*
Ko wai tena tangata? *Who is that man?*
Ko wai era wahine? *Who are those women?*
Na wai nga hoiho e rima? *Whose are the five horses?*
Ma wai ena pukapuka ataahua? *For whom are those beautiful books?*
Ko to wai whare tenei? *Whose house is this?*
He aha tenei? *What is this?*
He aha tera? *What is that?*
Ko tehea whare to raua? *Which house is theirs?*
Ko wai tou ingoa? *What is your name?*
Ko wai nga ingoa o era wahine tokotoru? *What are the names of those three women?*

Comparison.

Ka titiro te tangata ki nga mea e rua, ka kitea, e rite ana ranei tetahi ki tetaki, i neke ake ranei tetahi i tetahi. Ki te kitea, he rite, ko te kupu *as*; kia rua nga *as*.

Me te huka ano te reka.—*As sweet as sugar.*

Me te kowhatu ano te pakeke.—*As hard as a stone.*

Me te uira ano te kohoro.—*As quick as lightning.*

Rite tonu tenei papa ki tera te roa.—*This plank is as long as that.*

Ka kitea, ko tetahi i neke ake, ko tetahi i koki iko, te nui ranei, te pai ranei, te aha ranei; ko te toku, ko te *er* hei te mutunga o te kupu mo te nui, mo te pai mo te aha ranei, me tetaki atu kupu e apititia mai ana, ara me te

than.

Nui atu te reka o tenei i to te huka.—*This is sweeter than sugar.*

He roa ke tena ara i tenei.—*That road is longer than this.*

Erangi a Hoani i a Hemi, e kaka ana.—*John is stronger than James.*

Nui atu tera rakau i tenei.—*That tree is larger than this.*

Ka kite ko tetahi i tino neke ake o nga mea katoa e tirohia ana, ko te *est* te tohu, hei te mutunga mai o te kupu.

Ko te nui tenei o nga rakau katoa.—*This is the largest of all the trees.*

Ko Hoani te tino tamaiti roa o te kura.—*John is the tallest boy in the school.*

Apopo te tino ra roa o te tau.—*To-morrow is the longest day in the year.*

Tokorima matou nei, he kaha kau matou, ko te tino kaha rawa ko Hoani.—*There are five of us, and we are all strong, but John is the strongest of all.*

Tenei etahi kupu e rere ke ana.

Very; *Rawa.*

Tetahi kupu mo te *rawa*, ko te *very*, mo nga whaka-huatanga penei me enei i raro iho nei.

He tino pouri rawa te po nei.—*This night is very dark.*

He taimaha rawa tenei peeke.—*This bag is very heavy.*

He nui rawa toku hiakai.—*I am very hungry.*

He nui rawa tona ngenge.—*He is very tired.*

GEORGE DIDSURRY, Kai-ta o te Kawanatanga, Ponete, Niu Tireni.