

Institute of Actuaries.

President's Inaugural Address.

AT the opening meeting of the present session on Monday, the 30th of November, MR. SPRAGUE read his inaugural address. He said:

Gentlemen,—On the present occasion I propose to submit to you a few remarks upon the business aspects of our work, and some of the circumstances upon which the prosperity of a life insurance office depends. In the first instance, it may be useful to examine what is the real importance of life insurance to the country; and for this purpose I will take some of the figures which are now available by means of the Board of Trade returns, and compare them with other figures relating to the position and progress of the country. It appears from the Board of Trade returns that the income and assets of the life offices are steadily, not to say rapidly, increasing, the total income of the British life offices having increased from nearly 14½ millions sterling in 1871 to over 22 millions in 1884. The total life funds of the same companies now amount to about 140 millions, the increase of the funds since 1871 having been over 52 millions. These are very large figures, and they prove that the business in which we are engaged is a very important one. If, however, we confine our attention to them, we shall, perhaps, conceive an exaggerated idea of the importance of our business, and I will, therefore, compare them with the figures relating to some other industries. Thus I find it stated in the *Statesman's Year Book* that the value of the total imports into the United Kingdom in the year 1883 was nearly 427 millions sterling, and the value of the exports of British produce about 240 millions, the largest articles of import being corn and flour of the value of about 67½ millions, and the largest item of export being cotton manufactures of the value of about 76½ millions. The value of coal raised in the year 1883 was 46 millions. The total paid-up capital of the railways of the United Kingdom was 785 millions, and the total annual receipts of the railways 71 millions. The amount of the National Debt in March, 1884, was 746 millions, the annual charge in respect of it being about 29½ millions. In Professor Leone Levi's work on the *Wages and Earnings of the Working Classes*, it is stated that in 1842 Mr. Porter estimated the amount of personal property of the country at £2,200,000,000, and of real property £3,282,000,000; total, £5,482,000,000. And in 1878 Mr. Giffen estimated the total at £8,500,000,000. In comparison with these larger figures, the funds and the business of the life offices seem small. The population of the country is estimated to have been about 36 millions in 1884; and it would be useful if we could determine what proportion of the population have their lives insured, and whether the proportion is increasing or not. Unfortunately, the returns required to be made to the Board of Trade give very little information bearing upon these points.

485 Millions of Life Assurance in Force.

It has been estimated—I do not know on what basis—that the total amount of the life insurance policies in force in 1884 was about 450 millions; but I am inclined to place the figure somewhat higher, namely, at 485 millions. The total premium income of insurance offices, as reported to the Board of Trade in 1884, was £15,300,000; made up of ordinary companies £12,300,000, industrial companies £3,000,000. Perhaps 3 per cent, will be a fair average premium for the ordinary companies, and this will give total insurances of about 410 millions; and, taking the average policy at £500, we get the total number of policies in ordinary companies 820,000. For the industrial companies the average rate of premium will be a good deal higher, and the average policy very much smaller. If we take 4 per cent, as the average premium, this will give the total sum assured with the industrial companies as about 75 millions; and if we take the average sum assured at £10, the number of policies will be 7½ millions. The question now suggests itself whether these totals are satisfactory, having regard to the population and wealth of the country,—in other words, is it to be supposed that the practice of life insurance is as widely adopted as can reasonably be expected, having regard to the present circumstances of the population, so that any future development in the business must arise simply from the increase in the prosperity of the population of the country? Or, may we hope to see the practice of life insurance occupy a more important position than at present, relatively to the resources of the country? My own belief is, that the results at present obtained cannot be regarded as so satisfactory that we should be content with them. The business of the life

insurance companies may, I believe, be largely increased, even if there should be no further increase in the population and wealth of the country. I cannot, however, under take to give figures in support of this opinion. Unfortunately, the course of my reading has not made me very familiar with the sources whence statistical information of this kind is to be obtained, and the time at my disposal has not permitted me to look up the necessary authorities. In order to make any satisfactory estimate on the subject it would be desirable to compare the premiums annually paid to the companies, as above stated, with the incomes of the population, as shown by the income-tax returns and inferred in other ways; also to compare the total amount of claims annually paid by the companies, nearly 12 millions, with the total amount of the estates of the persons who die each year, as deduced from the death duties. It would have to be borne in mind, also, that the figures I have given relate to policies, and not to lives assured; and that in order to determine the number of the latter, a very large deduction must be made from them on account of the same person in many cases having more than one policy on his life, either in the same or in different offices. The subject, in fact, offers a wide field of inquiry; and, as I do not see any probability of my being able to enter upon it and take possession of it myself, I venture to express the hope that some member of the Institute who wishes to contribute to its proceedings, and is looking out for a subject, will be led by my remarks to cultivate it and lay before us the results of his labours.

Life Assurance not a Trust.

In pursuance of my intention of considering the business aspect of life insurance, the first question I will discuss is—In what light are we to regard a life insurance company? And the answer I propose to submit to your consideration is, that every such company is to be considered as a trading concern, and to be administered on commercial principles. It has sometimes been urged by well-intentioned writers that life insurance must be considered by all engaged in it as a trust; but I cannot help thinking that, if this is the fundamental idea with which we start, it will lead us into various difficulties. My view rather is, that

Life Insurance is a Trade,

and that it must be conducted on business principles. It is true there are some points in which the transactions of a life office resemble those of a trust. In a trust the funds have to be carefully invested by the trustees in terms of their trust deed, or in accordance with rules laid down by the law courts; and in the same way the funds of a life office have to be carefully invested by the directors in the manner prescribed by the deed of partnership; and in both cases scrupulously accurate accounts must be kept of all the monetary transactions. Here, however, I think the similarity ceases. There is nothing in a trust at all analogous to the business carried on by every life insurance office. No trustees are permitted to enter into speculative transactions such as those that constitute the main business of life offices, namely, the guaranteeing of the payment of a fixed sum on the happening of an event depending on human life, which event may happen at some altogether uncertain time or not at all. Such transactions as even the purchase of reversions, which are habitually and very properly and advantageously entered into by modern life offices, would be quite unsuitable to trusts, which, from the nature of the case, require to have a steady income, and could not be carried on if the income were an uncertain or fluctuating profit dependent on the earlier or later death of the lives on which the reversions depend. The various processes essential to the granting of new policies, the keeping of an office in which proposals for insurance may be received from the public and inquiries answered, the medical examination of candidates for insurance, and all the other steps taken in connection with the issue of new policies, seem to me quite foreign to the idea of a trust. Still more alien from this idea is the payment of commission to agents or other persons introducing insurance, and when we contemplate the modern insurance company, of which we have now many examples, which has a head office located in a handsome and expensive building and officered by a highly-paid staff; also branch offices in all the important provincial towns, each with its resident secretary and clerks, and has, perhaps, in addition, several agency inspectors, whose object is to train up an army of agents to solicit insurances from the public—it is obvious we have an organisation which is wholly at variance with all ideas of a trust. The more correct view appears to be that a life insurance company is a trading partnership, of which the directors are the managing partners. In the case of a proprietary company the partners are the shareholders; but in the case of a mutual office, either the whole of the members or the participating members are the partners; and the rights of the partners and the powers of the directors are, or ought to be, strictly defined by the terms of the deed constituting the partnership. If now the manager of an insurance office takes up and acts on the idea that life insurance is a trust, it seems to me that this is likely to interfere—perhaps most seriously—with the success of his office. He will not be disposed to take the steps which experience shows to be necessary for the development of the business, and instead of sending out his emissaries in all directions to convince the public of their great need of life insurance, he will be content to sit in his arm-chair and attend to the few enlightened

persons who come to him to effect insurances on their lives without the usual solicitation.

"Profits" or "Surplus."

As another instance of a theoretical view of life insurance which may in certain cases be misleading in practice, I may mention the doctrine that seems to be very popular at the present time, namely, that life insurance offices make no profits, and that the sums distributed by them among their policyholders as bonuses should not be called "profits" but "surplus." This is a doctrine which I have myself never been able to sympathise with, or, indeed, fully to understand. It is quite clear, I think, that when life insurance was principally in the hands of proprietary companies all the surplus payments made by the assured fell into the general "profits" of the companies which were divided as dividend or bonus among the shareholders. When these companies one after the other agreed to give a greater or less share of their profits to the assured, the nature of the surplus was not thereby altered. If it was profit when it was paid to the shareholders, it seems to me that it still remained profit when it was paid to a certain number of the assured; in fact, the only logical position seems to me to be that ordinary life insurance offices are trading bodies which carry on the business of selling life insurance at certain rates calculated to yield a profit, and which take stock from time to time and divide the profits that have been earned among the persons entitled to them according to the partnership contract. This, I consider, is equally true, whether the premiums charged are high or low. In all other trades, the higher the price charged for any commodity, the larger, *cæteris paribus*, will be the rate of profit on the trading; and the same, in my opinion, is the case with life insurance. And this is true, whether the office is proprietary or mutual. The only exception, I would admit, is those offices which do not declare a bonus out of past profits, but make a yearly estimate of their liabilities, and on the basis of that estimate charge a reduced premium for the ensuing year, calculated so that, as far as can be foreseen, there will be no profit on that year's transactions.

Participation in Profits and Non-Participation.

Another theoretical view, which is, perhaps, only a development of the one last mentioned, finds expression in the opinion I have sometimes heard put forward—that it is an anomaly, if not an absurdity, for any person to effect a life policy with participation in profits, and that the more reasonable and in every way preferable course is in all cases to effect a non-participating policy. However logically this conclusion may follow from the premises adopted by the persons who hold it, as to which I am scarcely in a position to speak, it must be admitted that it takes no regard of the fact that the share of the surplus allotted to participating policies is, in almost all cases, of greater value and of greater advantage to the policyholders than the difference between the participating and non-participating rates of the premium. Whatever weight the above-mentioned doctrine may be entitled to carry with persons intending to insure, the manager of a life office should not allow himself to be influenced by it; and if he does adopt and act upon it, the interests of his office will be likely to suffer. It is his business to accommodate the regulations of his office to the wishes of his customers; and as there can be no doubt that the majority of these prefer to insure with profits, he will be quite right to give the greatest prominence to the regulations as to this class of insurances. As far as I understand the doctrine I have just referred to, it seems to me to proceed upon the idea that life insurance is exclusively a contract of indemnity, the object of which is to indemnify the family of the life assured against the loss they will suffer if he should die prematurely, and be deprived of the opportunity he might otherwise have had of saving money and making a provision for those dependent upon him. Looking at the matter more practically, it may be held that life insurance is also a species of investment; in fact, that an ordinary life insurance policy contains elements both of indemnity and of investment. The element of indemnity is required, as just mentioned, to insure against the risks of premature death. If a man were sure that he would live to, say, sixty-five, there would be little, if any inducement for him to insure at all, for it would be a simple matter to calculate how much he must save and invest each year in order to make what he considers a suitable provision for his own old age and for the wants of those dependent upon him; but observation and experience render it certain that all men will not live to be sixty-five, and it is impossible to say who will live and who will die prematurely.

The Indemnity Element of Life Insurance

is required to compensate this chance; but it has always seemed to me that this element is usefully supplemented by the investment element of life insurance, and that it may be fairly argued that a life policy is the best investment a man can make for the benefit of his family. If an indemnity only were desired, life insurance would logically cease at the age when the need for the indemnity has ceased; that is to say, when a man's working years are past, and he is no longer in a position to earn money by following his trade or profession. In fact, the logical conclusion is that all insurances should be term insurances expiring at about the

age of sixty-five. If the argument is pushed still further, it will follow that no man shall be called upon in any year to pay a larger sum than is necessary to provide the indemnity for the ensuing year, so that life insurance resolves itself into a series of short term insurances, each for the term of one year, the premium of course increasing with the increasing age of the life. Such a plan is, I believe, actually in use in America, and seems to me to be the natural result of giving undue prominence to the indemnity element in life assurance, and neglecting the investment element. This plan is only likely to be popular with those persons who wish to pay at the outset the smallest possible sum, and are satisfied that they can make better use of their money than an insurance office is likely to do; but in this country, whatever theorists may say, the investment element is popular, and I trust that I may be allowed to add that in my opinion it is deservedly popular. Persons who insure their lives are not only willing to pay the higher whole-term premium, but they are willing to pay the higher rate for a participating policy, instead of the lower rate of premium for a policy without participation in profits, because they have a well-grounded belief that the additional payment will be a good investment for the reason I have already mentioned, that in almost all cases the bonuses declared upon participating policies are much more than an equivalent in value to the difference between the participating and non-participating premiums.

Life Assurance Combines Indemnity With Investment.

The conception of a life insurance policy as a contract which combines indemnity with investment, seems to reach its highest development when the premiums are payable only for a limited term of years, say up to the same age as we have already mentioned—sixty-five, when the need for indemnity may generally be expected to cease, that is to say, when the earnings of the assured will generally be reduced, or altogether cease; when those formerly dependent upon him will be earning their own living, or be other-wise provided for, or have died off. When, for these reasons, the need of an indemnity is no longer felt, then, according to the view I have been endeavouring to lay before you, life assurance ceases to be a desirable investment. Consistently with the condition that the payment of premiums shall cease at the age of sixty-five, the policy may either be an endowment assurance, payable at sixty-five or previous death, or a whole-life policy, subject to premiums that cease at that age; the insured selecting the one form of policy if he anticipates that he will not be able in other ways to accumulate a sufficient provision for his old age, and the other form if he feels sure he can provide for himself, and only wishes to make a certain provision for those who come after him.

America and Tontine Policies.

America, which has already furnished us with an instance of a policy in which the indemnity idea has been carried to an extreme, furnishes us also with examples of the investment idea being carried to an extreme, namely, in the Tontine policies of which we have heard so much during recent years. I am inclined to think that this subject has called forth some unnecessary warmth of feeling.

The Tontine principle, as a matter of fact, enters largely into the ordinary arrangements of most British life offices; for example, when it is provided by the regulations of an office that a policy-holder shall not be entitled to a surrender value until he has paid three years' premiums, and shall not be entitled to the benefit of a bonus until his policy has been five years in force. It would, I think, be inconsistent for offices which have regulations of this kind to make objections to the Tontine principle. When that principle is carried so far that Tontine policyholders shall receive neither bonus nor surrender value until after their policies have attained a certain age, say fifteen or twenty years, it seems to me that this is simply carrying to an extreme the investment element of life assurance. The persons who take out policies of this kind are those who have a firm belief in their own ability to continue paying the premiums for the stipulated term, and they enter into a contract of the kind because they hope to secure a certain provision for their family if they should die within the term, and a good investment for themselves if they should survive it. Looking at the matter commercially, it seems to me that companies which make the grant of Tontine policies a special feature, need not be regarded as dangerous competitors by offices transacting ordinary life insurance; for I think it probable that persons are led to effect Tontine policies who would be unlikely to effect policies of the ordinary kind. In a word, I am inclined to think that the result of the competition of the American offices in this country has been to increase the total amount of life insurances effected, that they have, to a great extent, created the business which they transact, so that, for the most part, the insurances which they issue would not have been effected with other companies, and that their effect in withdrawing custom from the British offices has been comparatively small. I believe that competition is a good thing for all parties; that the more life offices there are working in the field the larger will be the total amount of life insurance policies effected, more especially if the offices do not all proceed upon the same plans, but have some material differences in their principles and practice. Hence I am not only content to see the American offices at work among us with every prospect of remaining here permanently, but I should

welcome some of the large Australian offices if they saw their way to open agencies in this country for the transaction of ordinary life insurance business.

The intercourse between Great Britain and its colonies is every year growing more frequent and intimate. In one respect the British offices may be said to be encroaching on the territory of the Australian offices, for they are learning how to invest their money in the colonies, and this business seems likely to attain large dimensions if it is not driven away by unwise legislation on the part of the colonies. I find from *White's Insurance Register* for 1885 that the mortgages on property out of the United Kingdom, most of these being probably on colonial securities, increased from £1,225,000 in 1881 to £1,578,000 in 1884, and quite recently it has been announced that one of our largest offices is sending out an experienced official to Australia to represent them here in the matter of investments, presumably with instructions to invest some of their millions upon good Australian securities. The foregoing remarks indicate various ways in which ideas as to our business, based on an erroneous theory, may mislead us in practice, and they may serve to suggest that we should be slow to accept and act upon the conclusions of theory unless they are confirmed by what may be called either educated common sense or the teachings of experience. In order to guide ourselves aright we must, I think, remember that although our business is built on a scientific basis, yet the institutions we advise, and in whose welfare we are interested,

Must be Conducted on Commercial Principles.

Whenever, therefore, we find that the conclusions of theory cannot be reconciled with those suggested by our business experience, then however apparently conclusive the reasoning may be the theoretical conclusions should be distrusted and most keenly scrutinised; and it will not unfrequently be found that the theory we have proceeded upon is imperfect, and has failed to take account of some important practical consideration.

Right-Surrender Values.

As an instance of this, I may mention the doctrine that has been put forth in some quarters that a member of a mutual insurance office ought to be at liberty at any time to withdraw his whole stake in the concern, by this being meant the full reserve that is made by the office for meeting its liability under his policy. When we test this doctrine by common sense, we have no difficulty in seeing that it might lead to disastrous results. It assumes, like the imperfect theory on which it is based, that all the lives assured are in the same average state of health, whereas the fact is, that some of them may be at the point of death, and others suffering from acute diseases which will soon kill them, and others from chronic diseases which will inevitably shorten their lives. If, then, the lives remaining in good health were allowed to act upon this doctrine, and to withdraw the full estimated values of their policies, which, according to the usual British practice, is the reserve made in respect of them, it is clear that the remaining fund would be wholly insufficient to meet the liabilities upon the damaged lives, who alone, according to the supposition, would remain insured. The case is, of course, materially altered if the office has in hand, in addition to the full estimated reserve for its policy liabilities, a large reserve fund accumulated out of undivided profit, as seems to be usually the case with the American offices. Another deduction of an opposite kind from the same incorrect theory is that the surrender value to be given to a retiring policyholder should never exceed the estimated liability under his policy, or the reserve made in respect of it; but if a life assured in the last stage of a lingering illness applies for an increased surrender value, it will evidently be to the advantage of the office to make special terms with him, and to pay a surrender value, not only much larger than would be ordinarily paid, but a surrender value that may be greatly in excess of the theoretical reserve made for the policy.

Theory v. Practice.

The true explanation of this want of harmony between the conclusions of theory and those of common sense is, as suggested above, that the theory is imperfect, inasmuch as it assumes that all persons of the same age are in the same state of health, and subject to the same rate of mortality. Every step that is taken in improving the theory will have the effect of removing some anomalies of this kind, and already considerable progress has been made in this direction. I trust I may be excused if in this connection I mention the labours of our honoured Fellow, Mr. J. A. Higham, and those of the late Mr. Spens. The subject seems to me not to have received the attention which its importance demands; but in saying this I make no confession of a default on my own part, for, as you are all aware, in my paper upon the "Select Mortality Tables," which I submitted to the Institute a few years ago, I claim to have given actuaries a means of obtaining approximately true answers to questions of the kind discussed above. It has been a source of great satisfaction to see that the line of investigation I there indicated has been successfully followed up in the case of the Government annuitants by a

gentleman who will, perhaps, allow me to call him, with every feeling of respect, the hereditary Government Actuary. The same blind adherence to an imperfect theory has led some authorities to insist upon applying the same valuation rules to all companies alike, irrespective of their special circumstances. The theoretical expression for the value of a policy takes no account of the expenses of management, and in adopting this formula as the basis of the valuation of a company, it is assumed that the expenses are in every case less than the uniform loading added to the uniform annual net premium. This is an assumption, however, which is not justified by the facts, both as regards the total business of most young companies, and as regards the new business of most old companies. It is therefore necessary, in order to get an appropriate formula, to introduce into our calculations the amount of expense at which the new business is obtained; and thus, for old and young companies alike, we conclude that the proper reserve to be made for the liabilities is less than that given by the ordinary net premium method of valuation.

Mistaken Methods of Valuation.

Those writers who have undertaken to defend the net premium method of valuation as the proper one to be applied in all cases, have found themselves forced to admit that in the case of young companies a smaller reserve is quite consistent, not only with solvency, but with prosperity. In order to get over this difficulty, they have argued that in such companies we may, in regard to the special circumstances, make a smaller reserve than is theoretically necessary. The more correct view, however, appears to me to be that those companies which make their valuations by the net premium method of valuation make a larger reserve than is theoretically necessary; in fact, that they set up a reserve fund which, although concealed from view, is none the less real. This method of procedure may be regarded as erring on the safe side, and, therefore, unobjectionable; but it has the inconvenience that in calculating the surrender values of policies, and in reasoning as to the rights of policyholders, if the larger reserve given by the net premium method is taken as the basis of our calculations, instead of the smaller one, which is obtained by making proper allowance for the expense of obtaining new business, we shall often be led to erroneous conclusions. Perhaps I may also venture to cite, as another instance of the same kind, the doctrine very strongly held in some quarters that the cash bonuses declared upon the same policy at successive divisions of profits should *cæteris paribus* be approximately constant, and that the reversionary bonuses should therefore form a diminishing series. This is, I believe, not a popular doctrine with the public, and it seems contrary to the suggestions of common sense, which would lead us to believe that the longer a policy remains in force, the larger in proportion to the time must be its contributions to the profit fund, and that, therefore, the bonuses allotted to it should form an increasing series. This commonsense view is found, upon examination, to be supported by theory when we introduce certain conditions which are neglected by the imperfect theory on which the above-mentioned doctrine is based. As a last instance of the way, in my opinion, too rigid an adherence to an imperfect theory may lead us astray, I take graduation of mortality tables. All attempts hitherto made to express the law of mortality by a mathematical formula have had only partial success, and I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, that no formula that has yet been proposed has been found entirely satisfactory. It is, therefore, in my opinion, unwise to attempt to force a set of observations on mortality experience into conformity with any assumed law, such as Gompertz's, which, although satisfactory enough for long periods, is not satisfactory throughout the whole of life. It is also a mistake to adopt any mechanical method of averages, or to use a formula by which the irregular facts given by observations are rendered less irregular by substituting for each one a new value obtained from a larger or smaller number of the adjoining values. I hope to show on some future occasion that any method of this sort virtually assumes that the law which the observations follow is of a particular kind, and it follows that if the method be applied to a series of figures following that particular law, it will leave them unaltered, whereas if it be applied to a series that follows any other law, it will alter the progression more or less; in fact, it will introduce an error into the series. If we assume, as seems reasonable, that the rate of human mortality follows a certain law that would be represented by a regular curve, if we could only ascertain what the law is, our present position is that we do not yet know what is the nature of that curve. It is, therefore, unwise to attempt to force our facts into correspondence with any known curve which is certainly not the correct one, and the better course is to adopt the graphic mode of graduation, which is the outcome of educated common sense, and according to which we draw a curve which represents approximately the observed facts, and we then correct it until we obtain a sufficient accordance between it and the facts. In making these remarks, I have no wish to undervalue the teachings of theory, but only to warn you against too exclusive a reliance upon them. I consider that theory is a most useful assistant, but not a guide to which we should trust ourselves blindfold. We must, on the contrary, always be on the watch to see whither it is leading us, and refuse to follow it when it is bringing us to conclusions that do not commend themselves to our educated common sense. I would, therefore, caution the actuary against being too much a man of theory, and would urge him to take every possible opportunity of

testing, by the teachings of experience, the doctrines of his theory. If our companies are to be successful, the theoretical advice of the pure actuary or the man of science must always be carefully scrutinised by the man of business from a practical point of view before they are acted upon; it should, therefore, be the aim of every actuary to combine these different qualifications in himself; in other words, to aim at being at the same time a skilled actuary and an experienced man of business, so as to be able to apply his mathematical knowledge to solve any new problem that may present itself in the course of his business, and then to submit the theoretical result given by his formulas to a searching scrutiny in the light of his business experience. Passing on now to consider

What The Success of a Life Office Depends Upon,

it will be seen from what I have said that I am of opinion that, in order for the management of a life office to be successful, it should be conducted on purely commercial principles. A life insurance office is not a benevolent or a charitable institution. Occasionally we see directors act as if they thought the society under their charge partook of this character. For instance, in times of public excitement directors of offices have voted sums for the relief of exceptional distress; but it seems to me that any such appropriation of the funds under their charge is of doubtful legality, and might successfully be challenged by any person interested in the company. Again, directors are sometimes disposed to deal more leniently with a poor policyholder than with a rich one. This also seems to me to be quite contrary to sound principle; and I hold that the poorer persons interested in a company should be dealt with on exactly the same principles as the rich. Such concessions, for instance, as making payment of a sum assured when it is small immediately on proof of death being furnished, while payment is delayed several months when the sum is larger, cannot, I think, be defended on any business principles; in fact, I would lay down the principle that those who wish to be charitable should do it at their own expense, and not at the expense of the trust funds they have to administer.

Not a Philanthropic Institution.

Nor should a life office claim to be a philanthropic institution, founded to promote the growth of provident habits among the people. This may very probably, let us hope, be one result of the operations of the life offices, but it is not their object, and it would be unwise to base their claims for public support on a ground of this kind. I will now consider some other points on which the success of a life office depends. In order to treat this subject exhaustively, it would, of course, be necessary to define precisely what is to be understood by the success of a life office; but this would be too wide a subject for me to enter upon to-night, and I will, therefore, content myself with saying that no life office can be considered to be successful unless the annual waste of the membership by deaths and secessions is fully supplied by the new business.

Tests of Success.

It is not sufficient that the amount of the funds should increase, but the total sum assured and the premium income should either increase, or, at all events, be permanently maintained; or, to speak more precisely, in every office of (say) less than 60 years' standing, the premium income and the sums assured should be increasing, and in older offices should be at least maintained; and any life office which does not satisfy this condition must be held to be lacking in one of the essential marks of success. It is, therefore, essential for every office to secure a constant accession of new business, and for this purpose it must take measures to attract customers; and here again the same principle may guide us which I have already laid down, namely, that a life insurance office must be considered a commercial undertaking, and must be managed upon commercial principles.

Methods to Attract Business.

It does not follow that all offices should take the same steps to attract new business. For life insurance offices the same principles hold good as for other commercial undertakings. It may be said that there are two principal means by which traders can get business—by advertising and by the employment of travellers. For some businesses, where it is desirable to appeal direct to the public, advertising is the preferable course; but where the public are not approached directly, but through the medium of middlemen, such as shopkeepers, it may be a simple loss of money to spend it upon advertisements, and the employment of travellers may be really the only suitable means for obtaining custom. The same seems to me to hold good with regard to life insurance. Some companies are from circumstances able to approach their public direct, and in fact do receive a great part of their business in proposals made over the counter, without any introduction that can be traced. For such

companies advertising is useful; but when a company obtains the bulk of its business from its paid agents, whether they are paid by salary or commission, it is probable that advertising is of very little advantage. Some traders are in the happy position of getting most of their business with very little exertion from a connection already established, and the same is probably the case with a number of life offices, as, for instance, when the bulk of the business is introduced by the directors; but there is a constant tendency in a business obtained in this way to shrink, as the supporters of the office either die, or grow old, and take less interest in business matters. It is, therefore, I think, certain that no office which trusts to its connection, can hope to be permanently successful; but every office must take active steps to make good from new sources the loss that it sustains in the manner just described. It must not be forgotten that in certain circumstances the two methods of obtaining business which I have mentioned may be inconsistent with each other. If, for instance, a trader relies principally upon the exertions of his travellers, and they are paid principally in proportion to the amount of business they introduce, it will scarcely be fair towards them to receive business direct from the public and give the traveller no benefit from the business that may probably be more or less due to his exertions; while, if the traveller's remuneration is so arranged that he derives a benefit from the whole of the business from a certain district, whether directly introduced by him or not, the office, if it advertises to any large extent, would be paying twice over for its business. In connection with this matter it must not be forgotten that life insurance is not a commodity which all persons feel the need of—that, in fact, most persons do not insure until they are solicited by some friend who represents, or is interested in, a particular office; and that, under these circumstances, they are not likely to read advertisements for the purpose of seeing which office offers the greatest advantages. So far as these considerations prevail, I am inclined to think that money spent upon advertisements is almost thrown away, and that it is better for an office to rely upon its agents. These considerations must, however, not be pushed too far. I believe that experience shows that, in populous places like London, there are a large number of prosperous professional and commercial men who certainly should be candidates for insurance, but who are not accessible to the solicitations of an agent in the same way as persons who stand somewhat lower in the social scale. In order to reach such persons, it will be necessary to advertise in some way, and it becomes a matter of careful study what form of advertisement is most likely to come under the notice of the persons in question.

Conditions of Assurance.

In the long run, I believe that the conditions of assurance will have a material effect in determining the success of an office, but the operation of this will be gradual and slow. When a man proposes to insure his life, it is, I believe, rare for him to scrutinize carefully the conditions of assurance. For example, he would very rarely think of asking, "What surrender value will you return to me if I wish to withdraw after a certain number of years?" or, "How will you deal with me if I wish to go abroad, or if I omit to pay my premium within the stipulated time?" But when one of these cases has happened, he will form a favourable opinion (or the contrary) of his company, according as he believes himself to have been fairly or harshly treated. Again, if a man whose life has been insured for thirty years commits suicide under the pressure of money or other troubles, the public sentiment will approve of the payment of the policy money to his innocent family; and if the company declares the policy void, the opinion will be held that, although they may have been within their legal rights, they have acted very harshly, and in this way a favourable or unfavourable opinion, as the case may be, will get abroad about the company, which cannot fail to have some influence upon its prosperity. It seems to me the object of the manager should be to ascertain what conditions public sentiment will generally approve as just and fair, and I believe that foremost among these may be placed the non-forfeiture regulations which are now being adopted by so many offices. The public will rightly hold that it is very harsh and inequitable that a policy which has been in force for many years, and has acquired a large surrender value, should be altogether forfeited by failure to pay the stipulated premium within the days of grace; and the managers of offices, therefore, in my opinion, act wisely in devising methods that will, to a greater or less extent, remove this hardship. Some of our friends are, perhaps, going too far, as when they virtually give a full year's insurance for a quarter of a year's premium, or when they charge no fine on the revival of a policy, so that the office gets no equivalent for the additional correspondence and trouble that is occasioned by the default of the assured; but the general move in the direction of liberalising the conditions of insurance is one upon which, I think, both the offices and the public are to be congratulated, and I do not doubt that it will have the effect of rendering, life insurance more popular, and increasing the business of the offices. As an instance of the manner in which the conditions of assurance have an effect on the business of an office, I may mention the early payment of claims. When a young man comes to receive the sum payable under his father's policy, this should be a very suitable opportunity for endeavouring to obtain an insurance proposal from him. If, however, the son finds that his father had policies in several offices, that one pays immediately after the claim certificates have been sent in, that another delays for three months, while a third, perhaps, does not pay until six months after the death has occurred, he is very

unlikely, if he effects an insurance on his own life, to give it to the office which delays the payment so long.

New Business.

I have placed first among the conditions of success the obtaining of a sufficient amount of new business, for I regard this as the most indispensable condition. It is in a large and old business that most of the questions will arise which will require the most careful consideration by the actuary, and if the business is small and of a simple character, the actuary's function becomes of comparatively small importance. But when the business has been obtained, there are other conditions that are quite as essential for keeping it together and managing it, so that the office may be considered as really successful. For instance, it is essential for the smooth working and permanence of an insurance company that careful attention should be given to the internal arrangements, and, consistently with what I have already said, I believe that the same principles are applicable here as in the case of other commercial institutions.

Remuneration of the Staff.

The questions that arise naturally in every large institution as to the remuneration of the staff and the promotion of certain members of it must be dealt with on broad and fixed principles, which must be laid down, not only with regard to the present, but also with a view to their probable working in the future. The fundamental object, of course, must be to obtain an efficient staff who are interested in their work, and to pay this staff at the least possible expense, consistently with its being thoroughly efficient. These are of exactly the same sort of questions as have to be considered by statesmen in considering as to the remuneration of the servants of the State, both civil and military; and they have to be decided upon similar principles. In considering these questions, a broad distinction must be drawn between those officials whom it is considered very desirable, or even essential, to retain in the service of the office, and those which could be replaced without difficulty, either by inviting applications from outsiders, who have had no special experience, or by promoting juniors. The principal considerations to be kept in view are threefold. In the first place it is desirable that all the officials of a large and wealthy company should have such remuneration that they may be able to live in comfort; and it would be very false economy to reduce the salaries to such a point that any members of the staff feel themselves to be placed at a disadvantage as regards other persons in their own rank of life or in similar employment. The other considerations which bear upon the question are (secondly), what salary could any member of the staff obtain elsewhere if he left the service of the company? and (thirdly), what would it cost the company to replace him? When an official is a man of experience and of more than average ability, it may be thought very desirable to retain his services, because it would cause inconvenience and additional expense to part with him. For instance, it may be clear that there is no junior member of the staff who could be promoted to take his place, and that therefore, if he left the service of the company, it would be necessary to invite the services of an experienced official from some other company, and in this case it is clear that the salary to be paid must be at least as much as the official could probably obtain in another company. But, if the official, although discharging his duties satisfactorily, could be easily replaced, then the question what he could obtain by leaving the service of the company becomes immaterial. In fact, the company can then take up the position—"You are perfectly at liberty to leave our service if you think you can better yourself elsewhere," and the salary has then to be adjusted simply with regard to the other two considerations. The regulations as to promotion are also very important. The conclusion at which I have arrived as the result of my observation and thought is, that

The Worst of all Possible Systems

is simple promotion by seniority. It is, I believe, essential to the welfare of every large and important institution that the principal officers should attain their position before they are too old; that they should be promoted to positions of increased responsibility while they are in the prime of life, with their vigour and energies unexhausted. Under a strict system of promotion by seniority this is not possible; and I therefore believe that

Promotion Should Always be Made by Selection.

Of course, the selection should be made, where possible, according to merit, and any arrangement that will give juniors an opportunity of distinguishing themselves beyond their fellows is, therefore, to be encouraged. For this reason it is desirable to encourage junior clerks in a life office to become members of the Institute of Actuaries, and to hold out to them the prospect of an increase of salary upon their passing the examinations. It

may be that, in some departments of the work, promotion by merit is not found practicable; that for the work required to be done, as I have seen it stated with regard to officers in the army, one man is just as good as another. In this case I would say that promotion must still be by selection. However invidious the task may be, those who are responsible for the welfare of the institution must make a selection, and in making this selection I think that, in default of more important distinctions, they may very properly be guided by personal and social considerations, and that promotion, even on this plan, will work better than promotion by simple seniority. I have said that the remuneration and promotion of the staff should be regulated by broad and fixed principles. The same should, I think, be the case as regards other classes of persons with which the office has dealings, as, for instance,

The Agents and the Public.

The rates of premium at which insurances are granted, as stated in the published prospectus, should be strictly adhered to, and any suggestion that a lower rate may be accepted in a particular case, because a rival office charges less, should be firmly resisted. So also the rates of commission to agents, as stated in the agents' instructions, should be similarly adhered to, and not increased in individual cases, because a rival office has offered a higher rate. Again, as regards the conditions of assurance, if it is thought just to relax any of these upon special application, as for instance, to provide that a policy in the hands of third parties shall not be void in consequence of the life assured going beyond the stipulated limits without their knowledge, then I hold that a similar protection should be given also to other policyholders who have not thought of applying for it. This branch of my subject may be summed up by saying that a life insurance company should not be squeezable. If the rules and conditions of the office are such as commend themselves by their fairness, then I hold that the public will think none the worse of the office if those rules and conditions are strictly adhered to.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, I feel some explanation is due to you for the course I have taken in introducing into my address a number of controverted subjects. I think my best apology for this course will be the statement that I have myself in former years derived great benefit from listening to the opinions expressed by my seniors in the profession, even in cases where I did not at the time see my way to agree with those opinions, and have since come to entirely contrary conclusions. This leads me to believe that it is an advantage to the junior members of any profession that the head of it for the time being should state the opinions he has formed upon the various questions that have recently come up for discussion, and the reflections and conclusions that have been suggested by his experience. The value of these opinions and reflections will be to a great extent independent of their truth. Even when they are most questionable they are still of value as stimulating thought in others; but when a man of experience, who has not been content simply to adopt the current opinions, but has independence enough to form opinions for himself, and, if necessary, the courage to give free expression to them, when such a man states the conclusions at which he has arrived, I believe it will always be found that, although his opinions may be onesided, there will be elements of truth in them. In all controverted matters, truth is best arrived at when each of the opposing views is supported by its own adherents and advocates, and in many such matters time is an essential element in coming to a correct conclusion. The persons who have taken part in a heated discussion are very rarely qualified to be impartial judges of its merits, and sometimes it is necessary to leave the decision to a new generation, who shall grow up without the prejudices of their predecessors, and who will thus be better able to recognise how much of truth there is in each of the conflicting views, and to form a final judgment, which may, perhaps, be very different from either of the original ones. In making these remarks, I have kept in view the fact that there is never any public discussion on the president's address, also that it would be in every way undesirable that a future president should criticise and discuss the address of one of his predecessors. There is, however, no objection to his taking the opposite view of any questions that have been discussed, and stating his own conclusions and the arguments in their favour. The discussions at this Institute have, I think, always been distinguished by the freedom with which opposing views have been stated and advocated by the members. As I have already mentioned, I believe that in this way the object which we all have at heart—viz., the search after truth—is best promoted, and I shall be gratified if time proves that the reflections I have put before you to-day are a contribution to this object.

M'Carron, Bird and Co., Printers, Melbourne.

The Absence of Design in Nature.

A LECTURE, Delivered Before the Philosophical Society of Chicago,

NOVEMBER 24TH, 1883,

BY PROF. H. D. GARRISON,

The Absence of Design in Nature,

IT IS CLAIMED by theologians that the order of Nature, when rightly interpreted, proves the existence of a great contriver or designer; and, it is further maintained, by many, that the chief, if not the sole object in view by that great designer is, and always has been, the welfare of the human race.

Assuming the existence of a Deity, endowed with the attributes of infinite wisdom and power, it follows as a logical necessity, that whatever he designs and executes must be faultless in plan and perfect in workmanship. In other words, a perfect God can make no mistakes. If we find what we believe to be mistakes in nature, we may explain their existence in one only of two ways. First, we may assume that we ourselves are mistaken; or, if this is not possible, then we must conclude that the imperfections observed are not the product of divine wisdom and workmanship.

The first explanation, which simply assumes that in all such cases we ourselves are in error, has proven so convenient to theologians and so anodyne to the human intellect that it is usually adopted, without question or remonstrance. We assume that what appears to be useless and purposeless in nature will present a different aspect when we come to more fully understand the matter; and if, after prolonged and thorough investigation, the difficulty still persists, we hush the voice of reason by still assuming that we have not yet gone deeply enough into the matter. We are invited into the field of nature to observe the evidences of design which are to prove the existence of a Great Designer, but at the very threshold of our inquiry are warned that we must only heed evidence in favor of the proposition in question. When difficulties appear and doubts arise, we are admonished that in times past it has often happened that what men have thought useless or even injurious has been found, on further inquiry, to be useful or even essential, and that, therefore, a like solution of every problem is certain to result from adequate investigation. We appeal to reason to prove a proposition, and then deliberately reject all the adverse evidence, assuming that it must be imperfect, misleading and false, or it would not be adverse. It is as if the State, which assumes all prisoners before trial to be innocent, should refuse to receive or credit the evidence of the prosecution, because it has often happened in times past that men, esteemed guilty beyond doubt, by the bench, the bar and the people have been shown by the developments of time to be absolutely innocent.

The alternative of this mode of disposing of the subject on *ex parte* evidence is, if imperfections and purposeless parts are found in nature, to deny that nature furnishes any proof of design. The existence of such harmony and adaptation of means to ends as we perceive about us, cannot be accepted as proofs of design, while there remains even one imperfect or purposeless structure in nature; for we cannot conceive that a perfect God made a single mistake, or left any work in an imperfect or unfinished condition. Nor can we conceive that God designed some parts of nature and neglected other parts. All is, therefore, the product of divine plan and workmanship, or none.

There is, however, a third method of solving this problem, which, at first glance is apparently very profound, but which, on investigation, proves to be a transparent sophistry. Thus, it is said that behind all matter and force there may exist an agency or being, who created the universe, with all its materials and forces, and who, having created matter and the laws to which it is subject, is content to allow nature to proceed in obedience to the original, divine plan. This is simply foreordination and predestination applied to the universe. But it will be noticed that in stating this proposition, we are obliged to refer to an agency or force *behind all force,*" which involves a contradiction of terms. In other words, we must assume that, somewhere behind all matter and force, there is yet another force, which is an absurd proposition.

Paley and others have written many volumes with a view of proving the existence of this hypothetical being behind nature, using arguments which, in the main, are analogous to the celebrated watch argument, which may be thus briefly stated: A traveler finds a watch, and, on examination of its mechanism, notes abundant evidence of design, which induces him to believe that the watch did not come by chance, but had a designer and maker. Next, the anatomist and physiologist examine the body of the watchmaker, and, on careful inspection, find it to be more wonderful in many respects than the watch, wherefore, they conclude that it must have been designed and manufactured by an artificer possessed of superhuman knowledge and power. The theologian now takes up the clue and finds that this Great Designer lives somewhere in the sky, or behind nature; and, although he does not frankly say as much, evidently concludes that this mighty being is so *very* wonderful that *he* did not require either a designer or maker at all! For the sake of argument, however, we may neglect the absurdity involved in the doctrine of design, that God himself must have been designed by a greater god, and him by another, and so on, *ad infinitum*, and address ourselves at once to the facts of nature.

That there is a remarkable adaptation of living beings to their environment, is apparent to all, and has in all

ages and among all peoples, originated and maintained the theory of an intelligent, designing Deity. Can this wonderful adaptation of living beings to their environment be otherwise explained? The doctrine of evolution—natural selection—the survival of the fittest, explains all in a most satisfactory manner. Evolution is, therefore, the designing hand. True, steps in the development of beings of every kind are not yet, and perhaps never will be made out with certainty. It may never be known, for example, what combination of circumstances drove the whale—originally a land animal—into the sea; but conditions having that tendency are readily conceivable. Those who refuse to accept the doctrine of evolution, because all the steps and stages in the evolution of animals and plants have not been observed, and cannot be reproduced experimentally, occupy the illogical position of rejecting the evidence of an army of witnesses simply because of the absence of one or a few, the testimony of whom they hope, almost against hope, would be contradictory to those at hand. For the same reason we might refuse to accept all the sciences, and indeed all knowledge, not excepting theology, which, indeed, would be the first to fail by this test.

Since all the adaptation observed in nature is fully and rationally accounted for by the theory of evolution—indeed, we might say, is required by that theory—it is plainly a violation of the fundamental laws of human reason to attempt to explain these relations by invoking miraculous agency—a cause unknown to science, and of the existence of which no proof can be given in this age.

Pushing aside for the time, however, all of these grave objections, which in themselves are fatal to the doctrine of design, let us see if the facts so much relied upon by Paley, Lord Brougham and others warrant, in any degree, the inferences drawn from them. As before remarked, any creature or organ designed and made by an omniscient and omnipotent creator should be absolutely perfect in every respect. What creature is perfectly adapted to its environment, or what organ performs its functions perfectly? The eye, on which teleologists place so much stress, is very far from perfection. The number of persons seen with eyeglasses and other devices to aid ordinary vision, shows that this organ is, to say the least, very easily disordered in many different ways. Optically, the eye is not perfectly planned to guard against spherical or chromatic aberration, while, in mechanical construction, it is inferior to the cheapest optical instrument in the market. Astigmatism, or want of sphericity of the cornea, is present in a greater or less degree in the case of every human eye, while the crystalline lens seems to be even more imperfect than the cornea in this respect. Moreover, these refracting media, the cornea and crystalline lens, are not truly centered, as Helmholtz has shown, on the optical axis of the eye. The refracting media of the eye, as the aqueous humor, the crystalline lens and vitreous humor, are not uniformly transparent, and hence, rays of light during transmission, undergo absorption and refraction, giving rise to various shadows, halos and fringes which fall upon the retina to the great impairment of vision. Even in the best of eyes there are numerous opaque granules or floating patches in the humors, giving rise to moving spots or spectres so well observed and yet so annoying while using the microscope, especially if the field is well illuminated. Long-sightedness and short-sightedness are common difficulties arising from want of proper relation between the refracting power of the eye and its depth, or the antero-posterior diameter. All of these difficulties are practically overcome or avoided in even the cheapest photographic cameras in the market, and yet no one has ever claimed that the camera had a miraculous origin or that the wonderful design manifest in its mechanism proves its designer to have been a god. In the inner corner of every human eye is seen a little mass of flesh containing a little plate of cartilage. It is the vestige of the *membrana nictitans* or third eye-lid of birds and reptiles, and is not of the slightest use to man. Why is it there? Its existence, which is inexplicable on the theory of design, is not only consistent with the theory of evolution, but is one among the thousands of unanswerable arguments in favor of that theory.

The ear is, in many respects, as imperfect as the eye. There are in the structure of the external ear, and attached to it, ten muscles—all in a rudimentary condition, and all absolutely useless. Indeed, all of the ear visible to the eye, except a small shell shaped depression immediately around the opening, and not so large as an ordinary teaspoon, is completely useless, and, in consequence of its liability to freeze, is to some extent, injurious. For what purpose, then, was this mass of useless material formed? Does its beauty or its utility as an additional member on which jewelry can be worn justify its existence? The internal construction of the ear is quite as faulty as that of the eye; but, for the present, we must content ourselves with only the observations that we cannot hear either very high or very low tones, and that we judge but very imperfectly of either the direction or distance of sounds.

Turning our attention now to other structures, we find, for example, on looking into the mouth of a child, a set of teeth beginning to appear soon after birth, and which continue to cut their way through swollen and tender gums from time to time, during two or three years. Hardly is the last one of these milk-teeth visible, before the whole set begins to vanish, before the incoming, so-called "permanent set." If the child is able to survive the toothaches and teething-syrups and diseases of a dangerous character incident to this period, and largely caused by the cutting and shedding of one set of teeth and the appearance of another set, it may hope, by the time it is able to vote, to have cut the last wisdom tooth. But, as a rule, long before this time the service of

the dentist is needed on the new crop of teeth. As a matter of fact, the dentist furnishes us the only strictly reliable and permanent teeth we ever have. No one can doubt that the process of teething, and the teeth produced, are far from bearing the impress of perfection. Indeed, few animals, having any teeth at all, are not better off in this respect than the human race.

Looking a little further down the throat, we observe a pair of tonsils, of no earthly use except as filling for a small amount of space which certainly might have been filled with some tissue not so liable to become inflamed and swollen, as in tonsillitis or quinsy. In surveying this region of the body we notice that the opening into the trachea, or windpipe, lies just *below* the opening into the oesophagus or gullet, so that every breath of air through the nostrils must cross the path of food to the stomach, and, what is worse, every grain of food and every drop of liquid, on its way to the stomach, *must pass over the opening into the trachea*, thus endangering the life of man every time a mouthful of food is swallowed. That the danger is real, and not simply imaginary, is abundantly proven by the large number of deaths due to choking caused by the impaction of pieces of food, often relatively small, in the glottis during meals. Even when death does not result, the evil of the arrangement is apparent in the spasmodic coughing caused by the entrance of small crumbs or drops of liquid during meals.

The arrangement of the various digestive fluids in the alimentary canal is far from being the best one possible. In the mouth, food meets saliva, an *alkaline* liquid having a tendency to convert starch into sugar, but this process is hardly begun before the food reaches the stomach, where it meets an *acid* liquid—the gastric juice—which effectually destroys the alkalinity of the saliva which had been swallowed, and thus at once and forever prevents its action. Even the ptyaline, the ferment principle of the saliva, is destroyed by the action of the gastric juice. After leaving the stomach food encounters two *alkaline* liquids—the bile and pancreatic juice, the latter secretion being simply *saliva again*. Here, digestion begun but not completed in the stomach, is arrested, and the kind which began in the mouth is again set up! Such an arrangement is not justified by any principles of chemistry or of economy with which we are acquainted.

These, and hundreds of similar defects, are wholly unaccountable by, and incompatible with any theory of theistic design, but they are in perfect harmony with the theory of evolution, which assumes that man has attained his present degree of perfection by the gradual modification and improvement of inferior organisms. His organization has been built up on the piece-upon-piece and patch upon-patch plan, and hence is far more complex, in many respects, than it might have been had it been directly planned by an all-wise architect, or even by a good physiologist.

Design implies *purpose*, as much as it does the existence of a designer. With this principle in view, let us glance at one or two sample facts in nature. For what purpose was such an animal as the tiger designed? This animal has been endowed with great strength, sharp teeth and claws, acuteness of sight and hearing, a favorable color, and remarkable cunning—all for what purpose? The only possible answer is, "to enable him to capture and kill other animals as food." But we find that the tiger's food has not been neglected. The antelope exhibits as much evidence of design as the tiger, but the purpose is evidently different. His acuteness of sight and hearing, and especially his fleetness, are designed to enable him to run away from the tiger! Here, then, is design working against design, and we are assured that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." If the antelope was designed as food for the tiger, why was he given such desire and capacity to run away and neglect his duty to the latter? Less design bestowed upon the antelope would have necessitated less elaboration of the tiger! It is worthy of note, however, that of all animals on which tigers love to dine, man was most easily captured and slain, until his own ingenuity gave him weapons for defense. Does this fact indicate that man was specially designed as food for tigers and lions? But, seriously, why should one animal have been designed to eat up another? What possible profit or pleasure can the Deity derive from this world-wide and incessant slaughter? Every second of time records the dying agonies of thousands of animals to whom life was, apparently, as sweet as it is to us. Indeed, this universal butchery and murder seen on every hand throughout the animal kingdom is one of the chief hindrances to the refinement of men. It is impossible to learn mercy from nature, and yet, without mercy, man is a brutal savage.

We are aware of the fact that, but for the existence of carnivorous animals, there would have been far less variety in the animal kingdom; but it is also evident that, with less variety, there might have been even a greater number of individuals in existence. If it is said that, but for carnivorous animals—including man for this argument—herbivorous animals would soon possess the earth and crowd out the human race, we answer, that a little design, causing them to multiply less rapidly, would have obviated that danger. If man was the chief object of the solicitude of the Great Designer, those troublesome animals might have been omitted altogether.

We have heard the explanation that God made all the animals, as well as everything else, "for his own glory," which implies that he is exceedingly fond of blood and carnage, and further, that, before he created them, he was not quite as glorious as he wished to be.

The old race of theologians—unfortunately not yet quite extinct—claimed boldly that everything in existence was made for the use and benefit of man, directly or indirectly. When Galileo announced the

discovery of the moons of Jupiter, the clergy asked him if they were visible to the unaided eye. On his replying that they were not, he was told that, since everything was made for the use of man, and since these alleged moons were not visible, and, therefore, were of no use to him, it followed, as a logical consequence, that they did not exist at all!

With the view of testing this theory, let us cull a few sample facts bearing upon this question from nature. There are at least half a million species of plants in existence, of which man uses, directly or indirectly, about one in every three hundred. Are the remaining two hundred and ninety-nine simply passive and neutral? By no means. They drain the earth and air of the nutriment which would otherwise go to the support of the useful plants. There can be no neutrality in this matter. "He that is not for us is against us." What shall we do with such facts as these? Shall we admit their logic and say that the Great Designer fails three hundred times as often as he succeeds? But the whole truth is not yet told. Even in those cases in which plants evince the most evidence of design, the degree of success attained is only partial. As articles of food, such fruits as crabapples, wild cherries, May-apples, pawpaws, persimmons, etc., are very defective, both in taste and nutritive constituents; while, as remedies, the entire vegetable kingdom fails to present a single perfect specimen. If medicinal plants had been designed by the Great Designer, who also designed the diseases they were intended to cure, we should have found them to be perfectly adapted to that end. With perfect remedies, the practice of medicine would, long since, have been a very simple and certain operation. Having diagnosed the case, the doctor might dismiss it, leaving the labor of looking up the right remedy in the catalogue and its administration to the patient or to his friends.

But even in the case of those plants found to be most useful as remedies, there is no relation between their place of growth and the use which is made of them. Thus, the cinchona tree, the most serviceable of all medicinal plants, is not found in low, marshy, malarious regions, where, as a remedy, it is most needed. On the contrary, it is found perched upon the top of a small area of the Andes mountains, a locality for a long time unknown, and now almost inaccessible to human beings. If we are told that the Creator put the cinchona in the best place for the welfare of the plant, we reply that man has since found a score of other localities in which it flourishes as well, and, in some cases, better, than in its original home; and, secondly, that a little touch of Infinite design might have made it grow about Peru, Illinois, as well as in Peru, South America. But who designed the palmella or ague-plant, but for which cinchona would have been far less necessary? Here we see an organism, and there are hundreds of similar instances, exquisitely designed to cause disease, and, on the other hand, we find a remedy imperfectly designed to cure it. Here is another case of design warring against design. Nature teems with similar instances. Evidently, less design bestowed on *actinomyces*, *trechina spiralis*, the itch animalcule, tapeworms, etc., would have obviated the necessity of designing an elaborate *materia medica*.

Turning our attention for a moment to the animal kingdom, we find that we use a score or two of animals largely and in various ways, and that we use the skins or other parts, and sometimes the flesh of a few hundred more; but naturalists believe there are fully a million species of animals, great and small, in existence. Therefore more than ninety-nine per cent, of the species of animals in existence are not only of no service to man, but are absolutely injurious. Here, as in the case of plants, neutrality is an impossibility.

Hundreds of carnivorous animals infest our forests and streams, while over three thousand kinds of snakes hiss and snap at us as we trudge along the path of life, including the copperheads and fifteen kinds of rattlesnakes, specially designed for and donated to us Americans. Oh, for a full appreciation of the length and breadth and depth of the beneficence manifested in the design of a rattlesnake! To make our earthly habitation a more perfect elysium, it has pleased the Great Designer to make the air almost hazy with hornets, wasps, flies, fleas and mosquitoes, giving us Americans several new kinds, as if the hornets which stung the Moabites, the Jebusites, the Amorites, and the Hittites were not good enough or bad enough for us.

The truth is, just as it should be, according to the doctrine of evolution, that man is simply a member of the animal kingdom, and that, like all other subjects of that great realm, he must struggle for his life from birth to death. He must contend with climate, disease, and enemies of all kinds. In this unceasing battle, he avails himself of every help and means within his reach. He uses such animals and plants as he can for food and clothing and as servants, and fights, with all his power, against the remainder. His ingenuity enables him to turn so many things to good account, in this contest, that his egotism prompts him to the belief that all things were made for him. But, as a matter of fact, every other living organism struggles for continued existence in substantially the same manner, and might with as much propriety set up the same claims.

There are those in every community who affect to believe that everything that occurs is specially designed and directed by an overruling Providence, and hence, on almost every coin we see the motto, "In God we trust," and almost every obituary notice begins, "Whereas, it has pleased an overruling Providence to remove Mr. Blank," &c., and yet, as everyone knows, the pious and orthodox are not more exempt from accidents, disease and death than are heretics. If an overruling Providence is managing these matters he ought to, and certainly

would, make some plain distinctions in the distribution of his gifts and punishments. There are, throughout the country, probably ten saloons and other infamous houses for every church, and yet it is no exaggeration to state that lightning strikes ten times as many churches as it does saloons. Of course, the steeples and spires of churches are very tempting to electricity, but lightning, directed by Omnipotence, should be able to strike a basement saloon as readily as a church-steeple. Not long since, we read of a minister who was struck by lightning and instantly killed while praying during the regular Sunday services, also of a pious man who was struck and killed while reading his bible. What shall we do with these and millions of similar facts? No one can harmonize them with the theory of design and an overruling Providence, except by assuming that, in some mysterious way, unknown to men, they are beneficial to our race. But the propriety and reasonableness of such an assumption are the very questions in dispute. Recognizing the fact that the good are as frequently stricken with the "visitations of Divine Providence" as the bad, theologians have evolved two explanations by which to pacify their flocks. The first is that all of these calamities—and, indeed, all the evil in the world—are the works of the Devil. But who is the Devil, on whom the *onus* of blame is thus shifted? Did he, like God, create himself, or is he the creature, the agent, the employee of God? In the affairs of this world we hold the proprietor responsible for the acts of the employee. Indeed, God himself, if correctly reported, gave us the correct principle of action governing this matter, when he said, "But if the ox (which had gored some one) were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or woman: the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death." Why has not this terribly vicious ox, the Devil, been "kept in" or "stoned" to death long ago?

The other explanation is by means of the argument of ignorance, which is usually sanctified and sugar-coated by the quotation, "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," implying that the evil or calamity is, after all, but a blessing in disguise. The argument in full may be thus summarized: Many things and events are plainly beneficial; others, apparently pernicious, finally prove to be advantageous; therefore, all things and events are blessings, either openly or in disguise. If, however, we invert this argument it will look as well, logically, and prove as much. "Many things and events are undoubtedly injurious; other things and events which at first seem to be advantageous, finally prove to be inimical; therefore, all things and occurrences are either openly or covertly hostile to mankind, and, therefore, essentially bad." The argument is as cogent in one form as in the other, and is but sophistry at best.

If God really wishes to prove to us his existence, can he not devise some proof not susceptible of any other interpretation? Can he not write? He is credited with painting all the exquisite colors and hues in nature. If so, can not he write a single sentence somewhere, and in some manner, which could not be counterfeited or explained away by men? If he controls the winds and clouds why does he not sometimes arrange the latter into significant forms, or paint on them some words giving us some reliable information? We do not ask for much. Let him simply say, "The bible is inspired," or, "Obey the pope," or, "Follow Talmadge," or, "Believe in Joseph Cook." Any little hint will suffice to eradicate infidelity from the world, when we are *certain that its origin is divine*. The matter in the tail of a comet might easily be arranged into a few words which all men could see. No matter in what language the information came, its translation would offer no difficulties. The surface of the moon might have been variegated with a few texts instead of with volcanic craters. We are aware that God is reported to have written two editions of the decalogue on stone tablets, but, unfortunately for the credibility of the account, Moses had to wait, in each case, forty days for the completion of the work; and now, there are those so depraved as to suggest that in that length of time, Moses might have done the work himself.

If God is really so solicitous in regard to the welfare of men, why does he not, at least sometimes, speak? He is said to have been very familiar and communicative two or three thousand years ago. Can he not talk now? The clergy will, of course, call these queries blasphemous, as they do everything which cannot be otherwise disposed of, but they are candid, and are the serious thoughts of every one who permits himself to think upon this subject. A little four-year-old girl, belonging to an acquaintance in Ohio, was, some time since, heard to soliloquize thus, when saying her evening prayer: "Now, God, I have talked to you often enough. If you hear me, why don't you talk back?" Sure enough! Why don't God talk, or act in response to prayer? It is the disgrace of wood and stone idols that, however much they are appealed to, to speak or act, they maintain a stolid indifference; but, in truth, does our God behave differently? Hundreds of millions of prayers, in the case of President Garfield, failed to evoke the slightest sign of even the existence of a God. Had these prayers been addressed to Bael or Joss, the result could not have been more disastrous. Billions of billions of prayers for the conversion of the wicked and the heathen have been presented, and yet—although this is evidently the proper thing to do—the work is scarcely farther advanced than it was a thousand years ago. Indeed, no one in this age, not even the preacher, expects a prayer to be answered.

Those who have abandoned all the usual arguments in favor of a Supreme being, based on the evidence of design, as intrinsically bad, but who still wish to fortify their belief in the existence of such a Being, often assert that the mere order of harmony observable in nature, offers them sufficient evidence. It is plain, however, that if

nature exists at all, some kind of order must exist, and that, whatever may be the course of events, some sort of harmony is a necessary consequence. If matter exists, it must assume some shape and occupy some position. If, however, the matter of the universe could be shown to be in the best possible forms, an argument for a supreme intelligence might rest on that basis, but he would possess a dull imagination indeed, who could not suggest numerous improvements in this respect, both in the form and qualities of matter, as we find it on our planet. The climate, for example, might have been made more genial and uniform, and the soil, in many districts, richer. Fewer mountains and deserts would have sufficed, and with less water better distributed, our world would have been better arranged. Indeed, a small amount of matter might have taken the form of homes, food and clothing, with evident advantage to mankind. The labor of the human race is chiefly expended in rearranging nature. The convenience of photographers, for example, would have been greatly enhanced if light had been endowed with such properties that it would not affect a sensitive plate before its passage through a lens. If we are told that such a modification of light would unfit it for use as a chemical agency in many other respects, we can only reply that, while we cannot so load a gun as that it shall hit a bear but miss a calf, this is just what is to be expected from one with whom "all things are possible."

I freely admit that the arrangement of matter and its qualities might have been much worse, but if they had been we should not have existed at all. In the case of our moon a worse arrangement is actually seen, and, as a consequence, life is believed to be absent from that body. Water might have been made to freeze at forty degrees above, or forty degrees below zero, with some advantages in both cases. Alcohol might have been made with a repulsive taste, or without its intoxicating properties, with evident advantage to mankind. Thus, we might proceed to point out changes and possible improvements in the form and properties of matter *ad infinitum*. Since it is possible therefore, to suggest improvements in the properties and state of aggregation in which we find matter, perfection in the order of nature cannot be claimed, unless it is assumed that in some way or other, not always manifest, every thing must be for the best, as we find it, which is simply the old argument of ignorance.

But if perfection in the order of nature is not made a part of the argument, then the simple proposition remains, that the existence of matter in any state of aggregation, and with any kind of properties, is sufficient to prove the existence of an intelligent designing Creator, who himself came into existence without any assistance or cause whatever, and then proceeded to create everything out of nothing! In the apt phraseology sometimes employed by gentlemen of the bar, those who use this argument go into and come out of the same hole.

So far as the doctrine of design implies the process of reasoning on the part of God, it is plainly absurd, because the divine mind can neither reason, nor learn, nor forget. Reasoning is that process by which finite minds glide by easy or difficult steps from the known to the unknown; but, since all possible knowledge is supposed to be ever-present in the Infinite mind, this process is both unnecessary and impossible. Therefore, while an unreasoning God may appear to be a kind of theological monstrosity, it is clear that a God who reasons is no God at all, but worse still is a God who reasons badly.

Finally, we may be asked if we deny the existence of God? Our reply is, "By no means." To do so, would imply that we have positive knowledge on this point. We neither affirm nor deny the existence of a Supreme Being, because we have no definite and conclusive information on that subject. We simply maintain that the evidence which has thus far been relied upon to prove the existence of such a Being, is insufficient and fallacious, if new evidence can be advanced, or if the old can be made more cogent, we shall be among the first to give the matter a full and fair reconsideration.

Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., and the Irish Nation.

What Charles Bradlaugh Has Said, and How he Has Voted, in Regard to Ireland.

Addressed to Irishmen of all Creeds.

by "Humanitas".

Freethought Publishing Company London 63, Fleet Street, E.C. 1885

Price Sixpence.

Printed by Annie Besant and Charles Bradlaugh London 63, Fleet Street, E.C.

Charles Bradlaugh, M.P., and the Irish Nation.

KNOWING Mr. Bradlaugh to be persistently and constantly misrepresented—not only by the Irish press generally, but by the national press, and the Irish national Parliamentary party in particular—I deem it due to the Irish people, as well as to himself, to place before them some absolute facts as to what he has said and how he has voted upon Irish questions.

In doing this I am anxious not to lay myself open to the charge of presumption. I am fully aware that there

is no man living who could state his case more forcibly than Charles Bradlaugh, but being one of the people, and knowing to some considerable extent what their feelings are upon, this matter, I thought I might do some good in showing the Irish people generally the light in which it is viewed by those who are willing, and who have the power, to help them. Because after all is said and done, it is by the votes of the people that not only what is called the "Bradlaugh question" but the Irish question itself will eventually have to be settled.

If the facts I purpose laying before you are doubted or contradicted, by anyone whomsoever, I ask you to remember that their truthfulness does not depend upon statements made by any party or leaders of a party. They are—I speak now of Mr. Bradlaugh's votes and speeches in the House—simple matters of Parliamentary history, and cannot by any kind of prejudice or animosity be made otherwise. This can be verified by reference to "Hansard", which gives the words uttered and votes recorded by members of Parliament upon all questions debated in the House. Therefore, in any person—even your most trusted leaders—should again seek to misrepresent Mr. Bradlaugh, and mislead you, by telling you that he is politically an enemy of Ireland; that he is a "Coercionist"; that he voted against Ireland, etc. etc.; I ask you in justice to yourselves and to him, to DEMAND that he who so tells you, no matter who he may be, shall prove his charge from the official and undoubted record to which I have referred. Do not be misled by falsehoods. Do not be induced to do an injustice to a man whose only crime is that he cannot think in matters of religion as you do; but who has nevertheless raised his voice loudly and fearlessly, both in and out of Parliament, in condemnation of what he conceived to be your wrongs. In doing this he has risked, and in some cases lost, the goodwill of those who might otherwise have stood his friends. Do not, then, basely return evil for good. Dare to be just in this matter. He does not seek *favor* at your hands, nor at anyone's hands. He would scorn to beg, for that which he knows he should demand as a right. That right, which he now demands, is simple, but full citizenship. And I warn you that if this rightful demand be refused by you through your representatives in Parliament, under any pretext whatsoever, you are, by such refusal, setting up an example and a precedent which may one day annihilate every vestige of that religious freedom which you now enjoy. It would be an evil day for you, and for all who are not of the dominant faith, if the principle of the odious religious tests were once again established.

Cardinal Manning would do well to bear this in mind, when he is again tempted to coerce those over whom he exercises ecclesiastical control into inflicting a wrong upon others similar to that from which his own people suffered so grievously in the past.

One of the great principles of the struggle in which Mr. Bradlaugh is engaged is to render for ever impossible the re-imposition of those tests which weighed so heavily upon you, and the abolition of which opened the doors of honorable membership and office to you, by freeing your consciences from those shackles which you now endeavor to force upon his.

You doubtless think, and rightly think, that it was glorious for O'Connell to wipe from the Statute Book those clauses which enslaved and insulted your own consciences, and the consciences of your co-religionists. Is it then less glorious to grant to this man the freedom which O'Connell won for you? Nay; but is it not degrading on your part to seek to place round his neck the yoke which galled you so sorely, and which—but for the efforts of men who, though not going so far as he does, yet travelled in the same direction—would have continued to gall you down to the present moment? For you must remember that O'Connell won Catholic emancipation by the aid of men whose sense of justice and right rose above this creed or that dogma. And he certainly won it in opposition and defiance of that party with which your representatives of to-day are, upon this question, in unnatural alliance.

The work which Messrs. Parnell, Churchill, and Co. have joined hands to do is to crush the conscience of a man, deprive him of his civil rights, and through him destroy the civil rights of a constituency which has elected him no less than four times. In doing this they are striking a blow which, if allowed to take effect, would be fatal to the first and most fundamental principle of the Constitution; which is, that we govern ourselves through those whom we elect to represent us in Parliament. This, however, the English Tories and the Irish Nationalists, aided by some few who disgrace the name of "Liberal", are prepared to do, in order to prevent what they sham-piously call "the profanation of the oath"; but this in reality means that both parties are simply full of religious hatred—which hatred, on the Tory side for certain, is leavened with fears of a much more real and substantial nature. They both cordially hate and mistrust each other; but are willing to sink that hatred and mistrust and join forces in order to crush one man. With the Tories this is but natural. They have reasons of a more—to them—alarming character than the "profanation of the oath" for keeping him out. But with the Irish Nationalists the case is different: with them it is not only unnatural, but it is ungrateful, as well as being a most serious mistake. It lies with the Radicals and the true Liberals of both countries—I think Scotland upon the whole can be relied upon—to see that the danger with which this strange and "unholy alliance" is fraught, shall be averted.

I say most solemnly that the people of these islands are not worthy of their history and traditions, if they suffer themselves to be thus deprived of their political existence by the alliance of sordid fear on the one hand,

and on the other ingrate fanaticism. These may be strong words, but the spectacle of one man toiling incessantly for six weary years against such forces demands strong words. But it also demands strong actions, which, if I mistake not, will be taken.

To the Tories—to those high and sublime (?) creatures who regard us, the people, as "the mob" and "the scum"—I do not here appeal. But I would ask Irishmen of all creeds to think well of this matter, and not to allow religious bias to influence their judgment. I put it to them that Mr. Bradlaugh does but dare to think as his conscience bids him. He not only admits that you have an inalienable right to do the same, but would insure your perfect liberty by law to do so. In the address which he has recently issued to the electors of Finsbury he says: "I hold that the duty of the State is to be impartial to all forms of thought, PROTECTING IN THEIR ALL THOSE WHO THINK IT THEIR DUTY TO WORSHIP, but giving privilege to no one sect, and imposing no penalty or disability for non-belief on any." I appeal to your sense of right, to your sense of freedom and fair play; and I ask you if this is not just and honorable, as between man and man? He can no more help his non-belief than you can your belief; then why punish him for it? His sincerity and intelligence lead him in one direction, and yours lead you in another. But he would not by force deprive you of one single article of your faith, nor of one atom of your civil rights, by reason of that faith. Why, then, should you seek to deprive him of his civil rights—to worse than outlaw him—because he has honestly said he cannot accept that faith? For shame, Christians! Shall it be said that you cannot afford to be as just as the Atheist? Do you think it just and noble to crush a man, through your press and through your representatives in Parliament, who has for more than a quarter of a century written and spoken for juster laws for your country—a man who has denounced his own Government for wrongs inflicted upon your people? If you answer that you do not desire his advocacy; that you will not accept his labors and his pleadings for your welfare; that you prefer his silence; then I reply, Be silent yourselves; do not go out of your way to injure a man whose services you cannot accept. If you cannot reward his services, at least do not be base enough to punish him for them. If you cannot conscientiously ask your representatives to speak and vote for his admission to that seat which is his by right, have the justice—I will not say the charity—to demand that they be silent. If you may not bid them raise their voices for constitutional freedom, you have the right, as you ought to have the courage, to command their silence.

I would here point out the absurdity of refusing the admittance, upon religious grounds, of a so-called Atheist to take part in the legislation of his country, and at the same time of admitting Jews, who, you must as Christians and Catholics know, hold your Savior to have been a blasphemer and a criminal, and to have deserved the death to which he was put upon the cross. Do you really think a Jew more worthy of a seat by your side, and in your Council Chambers, than an Atheist? One says that the second person of your Godhead was a rank imposter; and the other, that the existence of your God, as defined by yourselves, is not proven. Sit down with the Jew by all means, take him to your bosoms if you will, and even allow him to help you make Christian laws. To me, his rights are as sacred as yours are, or as my own; but do not inconsistently close the doors against one who is in reality nearer to you than he is; whose right to be where you are is at least equal to that of either; and whose claim, by virtue of his unimpeached elections, is four-fold.

If you tell me that your bitter hostility towards Mr. Bradlaugh is not due to religious animosity or religious scruples, but that your vote is cast against him because his votes have been cast against you, I will, discarding the bitterly religious speeches and articles which have been levelled against him by your press and by your political leaders, answer you with his recorded votes and speeches, which give the lie direct to the charge. But first let me frankly state that I do not believe the people of Ireland, and the Irish people in England generally, really know what Mr. Bradlaugh has actually said and done upon questions affecting their country. I myself heard him deliver a discourse upon the wrongs of Ireland, and how best to redress them, as far back as 1866. I have no record of that lecture, but I know it equalled, if it did not exceed, in sympathy, in courage, in out-spokenness and honesty of purpose, any speech—and I have heard many—made by your present leaders. At any rate, if you take the time, the nationality of the lecturer, and the subjects dealt with, you must—prejudice notwithstanding—admit that he deserves something better at your hands than calumny and hard words. If you do not admit this, if you think otherwise, I can only reply that I am sorry for the depravity of your thinking.

I may add that the lecture to which I am referring was delivered in Dublin, and also that I am happy to be able to state that upon that occasion he was publicly thanked for his services to Ireland.

I only mention the above lecture and its incidents as a fact which comes to my mind as I write. Mr. Bradlaugh's vindication shall rest upon more substantial ground than my recollections. It shall rest, first, upon his votes and speeches whilst he sat in the House of Commons; and secondly, upon a few quotations from such of his utterances upon Irish questions as I happen to have at hand; and lastly and especially, upon a lecture which he delivered in America in the year 1873, and which I put before the Irish people with the greatest possible pleasure. Indeed, my intention originally was to put this particular lecture before them as a complete answer to the misrepresentations and slanders which are heaped upon him; because it is in the nature of a set and comparatively complete statement upon the Irish question in general.

It is, however, quite impossible that this lecture, able and generous as it is, shall satisfy everybody. It is possible that it will not satisfy those to whom I specially plead. I know it will not satisfy what is called the extreme party—the party who advocate complete separation. But then the Parnellite party, as I understand them, do not advocate the total separation of the two countries; if they do, it is done *sub rosa*. Short of complete separation, and giving Mr. Parnell credit for sincerity in that respect, I should say, judging by his public utterances and those of Mr. Bradlaugh, that the latter is prepared to go as far as the former in matters which can fairly be claimed to come under the head of self-government. Of course I give this as my opinion only, founded at the same time upon the public statements of both. But you must bear in mind that it is not really a question of who will go the farthest; nor even is it a question of whether Mr. Bradlaugh goes far enough. The real question at issue is, Do his words and actions entitle him to be regarded as your friend, or do they justify you in the bitter hostility you display towards him? But at the back of this question there is another, and perhaps a more serious one: suppose you do not agree with his principles, either political or otherwise, and, notwithstanding that his advocacy of your cause runs so nearly parallel with your own, you nevertheless feel justified in treating him as a political opponent, does that warrant you in straining the law and the usages of the House in order to deprive him of his political status? Most emphatically, No! He would strain the law—if at all—to give you greater freedom; or for mercy, as in the case of the political prisoners. But apart from that, can you injure, ignore, or stultify the vote of the people without directly injuring your own cause? Your cause, as I understand it, is the people's cause. You must not, then, strike a blow at their just and lawful power through their chosen representative because you dislike him, or disagree with him, or for God's sake, or for spite's sake, or for any other cause whatsoever. I blush to admit that in this matter you have almost the entire strength of one of the great English parties; but they would use their strength to crush your freedom, after they had used you to help crush the vote and freedom of the people of Northampton.

I am aware that your plan is to use, in so far as you can, both the English parties in the House, for your own purposes and advantage. But take care that those purposes are legitimate; in using your power be careful that you do not sacrifice the principle of right, and the sentiment of gratitude.

I am not now speaking of gratitude to England as a nation; but I am speaking of gratitude to one of that nation—one who has labored for many years in thought, word, and deed for the good of your country.

These things deserve your serious attention, although I will pursue them no further here, but will direct your attention to Mr. Bradlaugh's recorded actions in connexion with Irish questions.

I will take his votes and speeches in the House first, because they are more recent, and the events attending them may possibly be in the minds of many of you.

THE VOTES.

At the beginning of the Session of 1881, Mr. Bradlaugh was one amongst the very few English members WHO VOTED IN FAVOR OF AN AMENDMENT BROUGHT IN BY MR. PARNELL: "That the peace and tranquillity of Ireland cannot be promoted by suspending any of the constitutional rights of Irishmen". In return for this vote, Mr. Parnell and his party vote that the "constitutional rights" of Northampton shall be ignored.

On the 8th of February, 1881, Mr. Parnell was somewhat mysteriously absent from the House; and MR. BRADLAUGH ACTUALLY MOVED THE REJECTION OF THE COERCION BILL WHICH MR. FORSTER HAD BROUGHT IN. ON THE FOLLOWING NIGHT, HE VOTED AGAINST ITS SECOND READING, AND FURTHER VOTED AGAINST EACH CLAUSE, EXCEPT ON ONE DIVISION WHEN HE WAS IN BED AFTER AN ALL NIGHT SITTING. In return for these votes, one of Mr. Parnell's favored lieutenants is indecent enough to put in large type, in *United Ireland*, a recognised Parnellite organ, of which he (Mr. O'Brien, M.P.), is editor: "Bradlaugh bowled out by the Irish vote." "Bradlaugh scotched again." He does worse. In an editorial he actually lies, by stating, with a view to injure Mr. Bradlaugh, that Mr. Hopwood's amendment, upon which the voting took place, was that "the Atheist should be allowed to profane the oath". Mr. Hopwood's amendment, as he well knew, was to allow the option of affirmation.

Irishmen, are you aware of these things? I appeal to your honor and to your sense of justice, not to permit a man who has labored in your cause to be thus shamefully and ungratefully treated.

With regard to one or two votes which he gave in opposition to the Parnellite party, but, as he contends, in the true interests of the Irish people, I will allow Mr. Bradlaugh himself to speak, simply premising his words by stating that if he were wrong in these particular votes—which I deny—it would not justify the Irish party in the treatment to which they have subjected him. You must not damn a man because you cannot fully agree with his every act. I myself might not agree with all he has said upon this very question. I may think he has gone a little too far upon some points, and that he has not gone far enough upon others; but that does not blind me to his real merits; neither does it hide from me the gross injustice done him by those whom he has endeavored to serve. Indeed, I hope I may never use my disapproval of a man's views as a justification for doing him a

political or social wrong.

With regard to the votes in question, he says: "It is true that I voted against obstruction. I was sent to Parliament to promote legislation, and to me the essence of Parliamentary government is that, the minority being first fully heard, the majority shall then legislate. It is also true that I voted for the Anns Act. I am in favor of lawful agitation; I am against cowardly assassination. I am in favor of reform in Parliament; I am against placing arms in the hands of starving men."

Now I ask you, and you are bound to reply, Do you believe in obstruction as such? and if so, do you profess to believe in it? Are you against lawful agitation, and in favor of assassination? Are you against Parliamentary reform, and in favor of revolution? If you say No to these questions—and you can scarcely say Yes—I am entitled to ask why you have allowed, without protest or word of disapproval, the party which claims to represent you in Parliament and through the country to contemptibly strike down, in so far as it was able, the man who practically said No, as you must and do say? They have not only struck the blow, but have made merry with jibe and jeer (the miscalled *Freeman's Journal* to wit) over the injury done to him and to the constituency which he represents. They have treated in this way the man whose voice rang in earnest denunciation of their country's wrongs whilst many of them were yet babies, and whose cry, in spite of the injustice done him, is still "Justice for Ireland".

If it were even possible that the Parnellite party are not what they profess to be: if they are—what their newly-found friends and allies have often dubbed them—a revolutionary party in disguise, their action towards Mr. Bradlaugh must still remain mean and cowardly. Their deliberately adopted plan appears to be to misrepresent and belie him, in order to make such misrepresentation serve as an excuse for voting against him and otherwise injuring his prospects. If this were not so, how comes it that Mr. O'Connor, M.P. for Tipperary, another prominent and trusted leader in the Parnellite camp, in defiance of the truth, as proved by Mr. Bradlaugh's recorded votes against coercion, goes to the constituents of Finsbury and denounces him as "that arch-coercionist"?

There is a vague and undefined notion existing in the minds of perhaps the majority of the people in Ireland and the Irish people in England, that Mr. Bradlaugh has in some fashion or other acted or spoken ill of their country, and this they fancy justifies them in their hostility to his name. The origin of this totally false and erroneous impression is to be found in the untruthful articles and speeches written and spoken by those whom they trust, and in the almost total suppression of what he really does say by those whose duty and calling it is to make such matters truthfully known.

SPEECHES IN THE HOUSE.

I will now briefly deal with his speeches in the House, which, considering the very short period for which he sat, are numerous and important—mostly in the interests of the poorer and more oppressed classes, and always well-chosen and to the point. I should be within the truth if I said that he displayed a great knowledge of the subjects brought up for discussion, as well as the abilities of an old and practised debater of acknowledged power. I may also draw attention to the fact that he never upon one single occasion intruded his particular views upon theological and speculative subjects upon the House. But it is with his speeches upon Irish questions that we are principally concerned, and it is to them only that I shall here draw your special attention. They are speeches which *demand* serious attention from the Irish people, and this demand is rendered still more imperative from the fact of Mr. Bradlaugh having been so completely misrepresented by those who heard him utter them. Two of them are of considerable length, occupying some six columns each in the closely-printed pages of "Hansard". They are, I believe, the longest speeches he made in the House, and both were delivered in DIRECT OPPOSITION TO COERCION—one being in justification of the vote he gave against the Government when Mr. Forster introduced the Coercion Bill, and the other when he, IN MR. PARNELL'S ABSENCE, MOVED ITS REJECTION.

Mr. Bradlaugh's speeches in the House not only demand, but would well repay, the careful perusal of every Irishman who takes an interest in the political welfare of his country. They are particularly interesting as showing the general tenor of his mind and convictions upon questions as between Ireland and England. Undoubtedly there is through them a strongly marked desire that the law of the land should be obeyed both inside and outside the walls of Parliament. One of his great complaints is that the law should be suspended in dealing with Ireland. He complained that it was not just nor wise to deprive the people of that country of their constitutional freedom and guarantees, and that upon the evidence put before the House by Mr. Forster he had completely failed to make out a case for doing so.

His speeches show that while he, as a conscientious and law-abiding man, could not countenance obstruction pure and simple—obstruction which would render all law and law-making impossible—he would do all in his power to legally remove the cause of discontent; and that, while he consented to keeping arms out

of the hands of hungry and desperate men, he was anxious to place the means of contentment and prosperity within their reach. The great lesson which appears to run through all his speeches upon this subject is, that it would be more humane, more just, and more statesman-like to repeal, reform, and to make new laws in order to prevent crime, than to suspend the law in order to punish it. In reference to this idea he points out most forcibly, and in many ways, that the successive governments, in conjunction with what is now called "landlordism" (although he does not, I think, use the word), are largely responsible for the crime, to enable them to deal with which they were seeking to set aside the ordinary law of the land.

I do earnestly ask every Irishman who is interested in his vote to read Mr. Bradlaugh's speeches upon Irish questions whilst he sat in the House. They are to be found in "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates", from July, 1880 to the end of March, 1881, wherein you will find something so utterly different from coercion that you will be astounded to think that your trusted representatives could ever have made the charge. Here I can only give a few extracts. It would be altogether beyond the limits of this pamphlet to give them in full. But such as I do give will serve to show the general tone and character of the whole, and if they should induce Irishmen to see for themselves what he has said (in full), a great portion of the purpose for which they are quoted will have been served.

I would point out that these speeches are of peculiar value; first; because they are not mere hearsay, or somebody's rendering, but are the words actually uttered and taken down verbatim. Secondly, because they are not speeches made at the hustings, or at excited meetings, with a view of securing the popular favor, but are speeches made in the House with the knowledge that he was further estranging some whose favor it might have been to his immediate interest to obtain, and also with a full sense of the responsibility which attached to them, and to the votes which were to follow them, the votes in his case meaning the liability to pay a penalty of £500 for every one recorded. But outside all this there runs through them the warmest sympathy for Ireland, and a strong desire on the speaker's part to blot out the old and hard laws, and replace them with better and more humane ones: to remove the cause of crime rather than place the country under a ban in order to punish those who under a bad system had been led to commit it.

This, to my mind, is the great principle which pervades his speeches, and I cannot forbear asking, Was it for this he is called the "arch-coercionist"?

The following extract is taken from Mr. Bradlaugh's speech in the debate upon the Relief of Distress (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill. It was delivered on the 3rd July, 1880, and is to be found in full upon page 1,472, Vol. 253, of "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates". Strangely enough this was his first speech from his seat in House, and, as it shows, was delivered solely in the interests of the poor of Ireland.

"Now he thought it most unfortunate for the notion to get abroad as being the true one that the Government and the people of England and Scotland intended only to be generous so far as it involved them in no cost. . . . He appealed to the Government not to be generous with half-a-hand. The giving £200,000 for out-door relief took the matter out of any range of discussion that might be bounded by the hard and fast lines of political economy. On behalf of an English constituency, which consisted of a very large number of English working men, he thought he should only be doing his duty in asking the Government to allow some of the loss to fall upon them, rather than that measure should be misunderstood. It was possible that the day might come when England or Scotland might have to ask the same favor that Ireland now asked of us. If that unfortunate occasion should ever arise, and either of those countries should be so reduced as for deaths to result from famine, and appeals were made to Ireland, he had no doubt that she, in her turn, would be as generous to the people of Scotland or England as she now asked the Government in this case to be to her".

In the above speech we have the singular spectacle of a constituency pledging its willingness, through its members, to bear its part of the burthen of a larger relief to that country whose members—almost to a man—illegally vote away its existence!

On the 24th of January, 1881, the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, moved to bring in what was called the "Protection of Person and Property Bill". It is scarcely necessary for me to say that this was a "Coercion Bill". Dr. Lyons moved an amendment: "That remedial legislation should take precedence over the coercive measure brought in by Government." Mr. Bradlaugh delivered a powerful speech AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT, AND IN FAVOR OF THE AMENDMENT. If I remember rightly, this was his longest speech during the time he sat. I can here only give a few extracts which I take from "Hansard", beginning at p. 1260 of Vol. 257.

"He intended in the strongest manner to oppose the measure introduced by the Government, and to support the amendment of the hon. member for the City of Dublin (Dr. Lyons). . . . He could well understand the great reluctance with which a gentleman of the reputation of the Chief Secretary for Ireland had made the proposition which he had made; and if he (Mr. Bradlaugh) entered in the strongest terms his dissent from the course the Government had taken, and his desire to support the amendment, it was because he felt the occasion was one on which no one should remain silent when measures of coercion were proposed in the way they were proposed. He was warranted in supporting the amendment by no less an authority than the right hon.

gentleman (Mr. W. E. Forster) himself. If his memory did not deceive him, the right hon. gentleman, in the last session of Parliament, intimated that the Government would try and govern Ireland with the law as they found it; and he also intimated that if they found themselves unable to do that they should then suggest that it should be accompanied by some measure of remedial legislation. . . ."

Mr. Bradlaugh here goes on to argue that, as the Government had not done this, he was, upon Mr. Forster's own showing, justified in opposing them. He then goes on to say:

"He knew the Government had means of information which were not within his reach; but if their information only amounted to what the right hon. gentleman had told the House, he must say there was no case made out by the right hon. gentleman to entitle him to ask for measures of coercion for Ireland. . . . He believed that the Chief Secretary for Ireland had altogether failed to show that the ordinary law was not sufficient to put down the offences which he had mentioned in support of his case. . . . The Government, through the right hon. gentleman, said they could make no terms with lawlessness; that while in Ireland criminals were few, the sufferers were many. Were they sure that they were not about to make terms with fear and panic? Were they sure they were not making terms with the landed interest opposite, who preferred a policy of force to a policy of justice, and who made the misery of the people out of which the crime spoken of had grown?"

In speaking of the small amount of non-agrarian crime in Ireland, as compared with England, he says:

"Why was it that there was one class of crime sheltered by the people of Ireland? It was because the people had come by experience to think that the Government gave them no protection; and that the law afforded them no remedy for their grievances."

In speaking of the kind of evidence which would have to be relied upon under the Bill, he said:

"Neither the right hon. gentleman, nor the noble lord at the head of the Irish Government, could personally examine the details of every case. They must trust to others, and these in turn to others, until at last, perhaps, private malice might strike the one whom the House had stripped of his constitutional right."

After showing that it was the miserable condition of the people aggravated by the treatment received by them at the hands of the landlords, he said:

"It was not the Land League that built the wretched hovels in which the suffering people of Ireland dwelt; it was the misery and suffering which he saw in hundreds of Irish cabins last year, which had created that organ. The English people were determined to stand by the present Government thoroughly; but he asked what was the Government about to do to remedy the wrongs of the people, as well as to punish the criminals to be found amongst them?"

After an eloquent appeal for generosity to the Irish people he says:

"It was the duty of the Government, he strongly felt, to hold the sword in one hand, and the palm-branch in the other. But now they only held the sword in one hand, and nothing in the other. At the same time they told the people of Ireland that good should come some day; but, he asked, how were these unfortunate people to believe them, when they had last year beheld a small measure, which was brought forward as one of mercy and justice, mockingly kicked out in 'another place'."

To these extracts I will not add one single word, but will ask: Do they read like the language of a "coercionist"?

On Feb. 4th, 1881, Mr. Foster brought up the Coercion Bill for the second reading; and MR. BRADLAUGH, IN THE ABSENCE OF MR. PARNELL, MOVED ITS REJECTION. The following are extracts from the speech he delivered upon that occasion, which speech is to be found in "Hansard vol. 258, page 182.

"In rising to move as an amendment that this Bill be read this day six months, he did so with a full sense of the grave responsibility that devolved upon him. He did not intend, in what he had to say, to imply any kind of attack upon the Government, or upon the members composing the ministry. He believed that every member of her Majesty's Government produced the measure with reluctance and pain, and had only been brought to introduce it by a sense of what seemed to him to be the gravity of facts warranting its introduction. He hoped he should not be wrong in assuming that every member of the House—at least every member on that side—regretted that any Government, much less a Liberal Government, should have to make the humiliating avowal that the ordinary law was not enough; and that in order to govern, they were obliged to propose a resolution superseding the rights of the people, and abolishing their constitutional liberties. His first objection to the introduction of the Bill was, that no crime was shown to exist which the ordinary law was not equal to meet, and, in many cases, had succeeded in punishing. . . . Many members of this House were old enough to remember the time when the landlords, encumbered with debt, encouraged resistance to civil law when it was set in motion against themselves. These landlords, who to-day asked for extraordinary powers, had themselves left a bad example to the unfortunate and miserable men who to-day threatened and repeated the bad acts of their superiors. . . ."

He contended that

"the measure now brought forward would not insure that persons should prosecute, that witnesses should

testify, or juries convict. All it would do would be to give the Government or some unfortunate gentleman—and unfortunate indeed would be his position charged with this duty, who had the right of arresting—to give him the duty of superseding the conscience of the prosecutor, and the evidence of the witness; to take the place of all juries; and, on suspicion to have the power to imprison the person whom he arrested for eighteen months.He submitted to the House that, in threatening the liberties of its citizens, good intent was not enough; and, unless a case was overwhelmingly made out, they ought not to entrust to any government the right to supersede the law. . . . Would the House pardon him if he pointed out why the old secret societies existed? They existed because the landlords extorted unjust rents, and compelled their tenants to pay an enormous price for rooms—it was a shame to call them rooms, for he had seen hovels in which hon. members would not kennel their dogs, nor stable their horses—rent which was impossible to pay. These unfortunate people had no legal appeal to Parliament, for Parliament was deaf to their appeals. . . ."

Speaking of Mr. Gladstone's attempts to remedy this, he says:

"The Prime Minister had made several attempts to remedy this state of things, but the rights of land were valued in 'another place' at a higher rate than the rights of life, and therefore his efforts proved useless. . . ."

He then goes on:

"They were reduced to their present position because the habit of the country had been to allow demonstrations against the law to override the law, and also because of the frequent enactment of Peace Preservation Acts to suppress mischief, instead of remedial legislation to redress wrong. The hungry man could not reason, and did not reason: he struck. It was for the Government to step in with its Land Law Reform Bill, and say: 'You shall not starve long; we will give you the opportunity of living by the fruit of your labor as free citizens ought to live.'"

Referring to the argument which was put forward, that the Bill was only directed against those who had committed outrage, he said:

"But then it was under cover of pretensions like these that the liberties of the people had been stolen over and over again."

In speaking of the violent acts described by the Government—acts which he contended had grown out of the state of affairs which they should have remedied—he said:

"The right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government felt this, for, in words which would always be remembered, he had again and again admitted the wrong done to Ireland; but then no remedy was offered to them yet. It was true the Government said it intended to introduce one, and he fully believed their declaration. . . . But while he was quite certain that the coercive measure before the House would pass, he was equally sure that every step in the direction of making the Land Bill complete would secure the greatest opposition of the Conservative party."

After a long and earnest speech, Mr. Bradlaugh concluded by moving "that the Bill be read that day six months".

It is worthy of note that the Right Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill rose immediately in opposition to the amendment, and actually apologised for not having spoken upon the occasion of its introduction, "because he had not wished to appear even for a moment as delaying its introduction".

I want you to reflect that this same Churchill is one of the most active members of the National Tory Alliance combination, whose object it is to crush the man who had just spoken so earnestly for Ireland, and whose voice, raised against coercion, had scarcely ceased to vibrate.

This concludes the extracts which I am here able to give from Mr. Bradlaugh's speeches in the House. I can only again beg of every Irishman who has it in his power to peruse them in their entirety to do so.

In November of the year 1867, at a people's meeting on Clerkenwell Green, which was either convened by Mr. Bradlaugh or by his friends, we find him pleading for the lives of those unfortunate men now popularly known amongst their countrymen as the "Manchester Martyrs" in the following fashion:

This and the "Plea for Ireland" which follows it is taken from *Our Corner* for May, 1884, in which will be found a most graphic account of the occurrences attending the trial of these poor men.

"According to the evidence at the trial, Deasy and Kelly were illegally arrested. They had been arrested for vagrancy, of which no evidence was given, and apparently remanded for felony without a shadow of justification. He had yet to learn that in England the same state of things existed as in Ireland; he had yet to learn that an illegal arrest was sufficient ground to detain any of the citizens of any country in the prisons of this one. If he were illegally held, he was justified in using enough force to procure his release. "Wearing a policeman's coat gave no authority when the officer exceeded his jurisdiction. He had argued this before Lord Chief Justice Erle in the Court of Common Pleas, and that learned judge did not venture to contradict the argument which he submitted. There was another reason why they should spare these men, although he hardly expected the Government to listen, because the Government sent down one of the judges who was predetermined to convict the prisoners; it was that the offence was purely a political one. The death of Brett

was a sad mischance, but no one who read the evidence could regard the killing of Brett as an intentional murder. Legally, it was murder; morally, it was homicide in the rescue of a political captive. If it were a question of the rescue of the political captives at Varignano, or of political captives in Bourbon, Naples, or in Poland, or in Paris, even earls might be found so to argue. Wherein is our sister Ireland less than these? In executing these men, they would throw down the gauntlet for terrible reprisals. It was a grave and solemn question. It had been said by a previous speaker that they were prepared to go to any lengths to save these Irishmen. They were not. He wished they were. If they were, if the men of England from one end to another were prepared to say, "These men shall not be executed," they would not be. He was afraid they had not pluck enough for that. Their moral courage was not equal to their physical strength. Therefore he would not say they were prepared to do so. They must plead ad misericordiam. He appealed to the press, which represented the power of England—to that press which, in its panic-stricken moments, had done much harm, and which ought to save these four doomed men. If the press demanded it, no Government would be mad enough to resist. The memory of the blood which was shed in 1798 rose up like a bloody ghost against them to-day. He only feared that what they said upon the subject might do the poor men more harm than good. If it were not so, he would coin words that should speak in words of fire. As it was, he could only say to the Government: You are strong to-day; you hold these men's lives in your hands; but if you want to reconcile this country to you, if you want to win back Ireland, if you want to make her children love you—then do not embitter their hearts still more by taking the lives of these men. Temper your strength with mercy; do not use the sword of justice like one of vengeance, for the day may come when it shall be broken in your hands, and you yourselves brained by the hilt of the weapon you have so wickedly wielded."

It is really humiliating to have to ask, or continue to repeat, the same question, but nevertheless I do it. Has the above eloquent, though fruitless, appeal for the lives of these poor fellows, the ring of "the arch coercionist" about it? For shame, Mr. O'Connor, M.P., for Tipperary! Looked at to-day, in the light of some of the tragedies which have since been enacted, it reads more like a prophecy.

The following is taken from a plea for Ireland which he had printed some short time before he delivered the speech which we have given above:

"Where is our boasted English freedom when we cross to Kingstown pier? Where has it been for near two years? The Habeas Corpus Act suspended, the gaols crowded, the steamers searched, spies listening at shebeen shops for sedition, and the end of it a Fenian panic in England. Oh, before it be too late, before more blood shall stain the pages of our present history, before we exasperate and arouse bitter animosities, let us try and do justice to our sister land. Abolish once and for all the land laws, which in their iniquitous operation have ruined the peasantry. Sweep away the leech-like Church which has sucked her vitality, and has given her back no word even of comfort in her degradation. Turn her barracks into flax mills, encourage a spirit of independence in her citizens, restore to her people the protection of the law, so that they may speak without fear of arrest, and beg them to plainly and boldly state their grievances. Let a commission of the best and wisest amongst Irishmen, with some of our highest English judges added, sit solemnly to hear all complaints, and then let us honestly legislate, not for the punishment of the discontented, but to remove the causes of the discontent. It is not the Fenians who have depopulated Ireland's strength and increased her misery. It is not the Fenians who have evicted tenants by the score. It is not the Fenians who have checked cultivation. Those who have caused the wrong at least should frame the remedy."

This is certainly one of the most novel "coercionist" speeches which I, or anyone else, could possibly conceive! What think you, Irish people? Does it read like the words of a man who would injure your country? What think you, national Parliamentary party? Does it justify you, upon your own political lines, in blocking the way of such a friend? for friend he is, and co-worker—in spite of you—in your country's cause.

Irishmen, I implore you to ponder these matters well! They are true records of words, warm, generous, and bold, uttered nearly twenty years ago, at a time when few dared raise their voice in your behalf. Your National party as now existing was not so much as thought of; you had no Land Bill, no Tenant Eight, and the alien or "Garrison Church" was still triumphant; and shall it be said that the man who thus advocated all these things, and much more, is the man whom to-day your press and your representatives delight to insult and wrong? I appeal to you who are held to be proverbial for being a warm-hearted and grateful people, not to allow the stain of this injustice to rest longer upon you. There is a feeling of universal brotherhood understood by men of noble minds and high aspirations, which impels them to stretch the hand of friendship far and away beyond the narrow limits of mere sectarianism in order to grasp that of true worth and nobility wherever it may be found. I ask you in the name of our common humanity to put forth that hand, even though it be to grasp that of an Englishman who is not of your faith.

It is right that I should hero state—and I am happy to be able to do so—that, although the Irish vote has been cast almost solid against Mr. Bradlaugh, yet two prominent members of the Parnellite party publicly thanked him in the House for his votes and speeches on Ireland. For this they deserve the gratitude of all right

thinking men.

We will now turn to the lecture to which I have already alluded. It was delivered by Mr. Bradlaugh in America in the year 1873, and reported in full by the *New York Daily Tribune* of October 7th of that year. I will give the lecture word for word as it therein appeared; for the accuracy of the report I presume I need not vouch.

It is a lecture—oration, I think, would be the better word—which few of the Irish or English leaders of the present day could equal, and fewer still excel. It would do honor to the most gifted and warm-hearted amongst your own sons; but coming as it does from an Englishman, who thus had the courage to stand up in open condemnation of his own countrymen and government because he felt they were pursuing a wrong and cruel system of government towards your country, it deserves even more honor. And bear in mind, as I have before mentioned, the aspect of the Irish question has much changed during the last twelve or thirteen years. It was not then in the position it now occupies; and I claim for Charles Bradlaugh that he has done immense work in educating public opinion in the direction which will eventually make self-government in Ireland possible. At the time he delivered the lecture in question I will venture to say there lived not another Englishman who would have dared to make the same speech—by which I mean, tell the same unpleasant truths. Is it thus he has earned the contumely heaped upon him by most of your now leaders?—men, some of whom, at the time he was fighting your battle, were schoolboys. I am not twitting them on account of their youth. I think youth a glorious thing, and it is to the honor and credit of those who have come to the front so young. But let them not in their youth and power return evil for work done on their country's behalf before they were yet able to so much as think. Let them endeavor to be just, and to cast away that taint of religious bigotry which does so much harm and warps so many noble minds.

In claiming for Mr. Bradlaugh the just meed of credit for work done, I do not think I am robbing Mr. Parnell and his party—nor even Michael Davitt, the greatest man of them all—of the just merits of their labors. I but claim for him that honorable acknowledgment and fair treatment to which his labor entitles him.

There are many thousands of English people for whom, in purely political matters, Mr. Bradlaugh speaks, and who are willing and ready to hold out the hand of friendship, and to help you to redress what you believe and what they believe to be your wrongs; but if one of their honored leaders and their own political rights be simply jeered at, it will not be surprising if they should withdraw that friendship which they are now willing and anxious should exist. That the Irish party set some value upon the good will of the people of England, is evinced by their lectures and addresses in all parts of that country, lectures delivered with the avowed purpose of informing the English mind upon Irish subjects. But why estrange them by unjust treatment of perhaps the most friendly leader towards yourselves that they have? It does indeed seem strange that you should go so far out of your way to crush this particular man, who has gone so far out of his way to serve you!

Just one other word before we go to the lecture. Much is often made, and I admit with great reason, of the idea that nothing is got out of the English Government for Ireland's good, except through fear. Your motto is: Frighten the Government sufficiently, and it will "stand and deliver" well; but that cannot apply to Mr. Bradlaugh. Was it fear which took him to America and to Ireland to denounce his own government, and demand justice for you? Was it fear which induced him to raise his voice in Trafalgar Square and to ask for the liberation of the Fenian prisoners? or to go to Clerkenwell Green and plead for the lives of Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien? Was it fear which induced him to SPEAK AND VOTE AGAINST COERCION, whilst he sat in Parliament with a fine of £500 hanging over his head for every vote he gave? Let your better natures give reply to these questions.

The lecture is as follows; and if his case stood upon it alone, you should be moved to silence, if not to utter shame.

THE LECTURE.

MR. JOHN STUART MILL, in a treatise on Ireland, says "that once, at least, in every generation, the question, 'What shall be done for Ireland?' or 'What is to be done with Ireland?' rises again to trouble and perplex the councils and conscience of the British nation".

I cannot say that I should be quite inclined to word the question as Mr. Mill worded it. I believe it would be for the benefit of England, and for the benefit of Ireland, too, if the question became "What can Irishmen do for Ireland?" rather than "What shall Englishmen do with it?". And even here, Mr. Mill—whom I believe to have spoken most thoroughly and most honestly, and with the best intent and purpose, speaking as I myself shall speak from an Englishman's point of view—has allowed the prejudices of his position to influence his manner of dealing with it. I propose to-night to give you an Englishman's view of the Irish question. Naturally, one of the first queries arising was one answered by Charles James Fox more than ninety years ago. It is this: "Has England the right to rule Ireland, unless she can rule it with the free assent and the real content of the Irish people?" Charles James Fox answered that, and his answer as a statesman may perhaps be taken as less open to

rebuke than mine as a simple citizen. Fox said: "If we cannot hold Ireland by love; if we cannot rule her by our influence and our affection; we have no right to hold her by force." (Applause.) And that will be the view of the question which I shall maintain to-night. I am one of those who can see no difference between Poland and Ireland, between Hungary and Erin's green land. I think that the judgment which is applied to the one should be the judgment applied to the other also.

HELD BY FORCE, NOT LOVE.

I propose that you should look at the state of Ireland as it is at the moment. I shall trace it not very far back, as it is utterly needless to weary you with a long inquiry into the past, but shall trace a little way back the causes which seem to me to compel the state of things which is now existing—a very strange state. We hold Ireland not in any sort or fashion at the present moment by our love or by our affection. We hold her as a garrisoned country. Any one who will travel through Ireland and see our barracks; any one who will go into a great portion of Ireland, unless the telegraphic report has represented correctly a modification, will see a coercive law as onerous as the Curfew law prevailing at the present moment in that land. If you regard the fact that there are now in the gaols of Great Britain a number of men—I am not about to quarrel with their condemnation; they offended against the law and were committed to prison for it—when you know that Lord Granville in the House of Lords, and Mr. Gladstone in and out of the House of Commons, admitted that the acts of those men in gaol were the cause that led our Government to begin the reforms which should have been taken in hand some 30 or 40 years ago; when you have heard that Lord Granville, not a rabid speaker, not a hasty utterer of unweighed words, told his peers, sitting around him in the House of Lords, that they had been induced by the very movement for which these men have gone to gaol to take into consideration the grievances which otherwise would not have been dealt with at all; then I say that the strict letter of the law fairly closed the gaols on these men, and that the consciousness of the Government that it had done wrong to these men should have looked towards it for remedy and have opened the doors to them, at least as a testimony of its own shame and neglect in the matter. (Great applause.) There are some who say that Irishmen always will be dissatisfied; that whatever we may do for them we cannot satisfy them. Perhaps that might arise from our having done too much for them (laughter and applause) and they would have been better satisfied if we had done a little less (laughter). It is said, "You have got rid of the Irish Church now. The Irish Land Law was done away with by the Land Act of 1870; and what more do you want?" I propose with regard to the second point to urge upon you that, glorious as the land measure was on the part of Mr. Gladstone, it is yet incomplete and insufficient; that it does not remedy the real evil in the case that they want removed. I shall urge upon you further thoughts with reference to the movement now prevailing in Ireland—the movement known as "Home Rule"—the movement of to-day, which is a real movement there. Real? You may see that manifested by the enormous meetings held, not in Ireland alone, but in Glasgow, Birmingham, Liverpool, and London itself. (Applause.) It is not an invention of to-day, but the very movement which Daniel O'Connell advocated in words from one end of Ireland to the other, until the Government stopped their meetings and drove the people into a conspiracy. It is the same movement as then. I propose to deal with that, this evening, and to express my own views upon that point fully.

I feel that I may on this point have a double difficulty. There are Irishmen here present who may think I do not go far enough, and there are Englishmen here who think I may go too far; and there may be Americans who may doubt the wisdom of my intruding this matter upon them at all. I believe that I shall be able to satisfy the whole of you; I believe that, with reference to the Irishmen, if they will listen to my expression from an Englishman's point of view, I shall show them opinions worthy of consideration. With reference to the Englishman, I can have no hope for him unless already he has a consciousness of the wrong we have done to Ireland, which compels him to hear this subject honestly while he deals with it. (Applause.) And for Americans, I think I shall be able to justify my dealing on the subject before them now. I cannot pretend to have the scholarly attributes of Mr. Froude, and I dare not pretend to the fiery eloquence of Father Burke, but I may pretend to tell Irishmen that this voice which I have raised for them has been laughed at in England, and it would not have been silent even if my views of the question had been against them, if the need of the political condition required that I should utter them. (Applause.)

IRISH INDUSTRY UNDERMINED.

In order to examine the matter fairly I propose to review the land question and the religious question, and to deal with the Irish as a people. I am not going to back into a very long story extending from century to century, because if I were to do that the mere relation of our original crimes toward Ireland would affright anybody who was examining the record. And it is impossible ever to recall yesterday. It is utterly impossible. I am glad there

are some here—I hope they are Englishmen—who think this a fair matter for levity. I confess I do not. I confess to a state of dissatisfaction and discontent, to a state of misery and wrong, to a state of wretchedness and shame, in the circumstances of these people, brought out by the policy of extermination from year to year of its existence. I think that a country which has pursued that policy with the people of Ireland should at any rate not hesitate to grapple with the topic, and that more wrong has been done and more mischief through not thus exercising reparation and endeavoring to solve the question. (Applause.)

Ireland is purely an agricultural country, or nearly so; and this is from no special disposition of the Irish to occupy themselves solely with agricultural pursuits, but because England prevented Irishmen from following any trade requiring skilled artisanship at all. There is no trade, no measure of skilled handicraft to which the Irish have turned their hands that England has not legislated on, for the purpose of preventing it. You may tell me all these statutes are now repealed. That is perfectly true; but while you have repealed the statute, you cannot change the habits of life you have instilled into a people generation after generation. You check a particular kind of life and develop another particular kind of life, and it is impossible by the mere repeal of a statute to change the habits and thoughts of a nation and make them entirely different men by an enacting clause which you bring to bear upon them. (Applause.)

What was done in Ireland? When Irishmen fed cattle and sent them to England, the English farmers complained of the competition of Irish cattle, and they forbade their exportation from Irish shores. When the Irishmen killed their cattle at home and salted the meat, and the meat was exported from Ireland, that was entirely stopped. When they kept their live cattle at home and turned the hides into leather, then an edict went out from England restraining that: so this branch of trade was cut off. When they took to sheep-farming, the exportation of sheep into England was forbidden; and then they took to working their wool into cloth. You say that the Irish cannot be diligent, and cannot develop any great industries. I point you to the time, not so long ago in that land, when there were many woollen manufactories rising in Ireland; and I also point you to the statute which closed 20,000 manufactories, and turned the people adrift who were striving to earn an honest livelihood. I point you also to their silk and their cotton, their sugar, and their soap—everything except their linen was interfered with by the British Government. You will find that as fast as Irishmen turned their attention and ability to any one of the manufactures, there were immediately Acts of Parliament enacted preventing them from pursuing it. You tell me they are repealed. Yes, they are; but no sense of justice caused the repeal, nor did any feeling of humanity dictate it. I will tell you what did it.

IRELAND DID NOT BETRAY ENGLAND.

When England was in a shameful war—to which I need not further allude in this place—when England was weak, when there was no one to overawe the Irish in Ireland, two men sent a cry from Ireland in terms of fiery eloquence which Ireland's advocates from time to time used. One was Henry Flood, the other was Henry Grattan. (Applause.) Their voices, like the touch of the magician's wand, sprang from part to part of Ireland, and these men organised, in armed hands, at least 60,000 volunteers. Did they embrace that moment when we were weak to strike us to repay us for all the wrong we had done to them? Did they use that moment when we were down and they were strong? Did they use that moment to give us the meed of vengeance which we could hardly have resisted? No! They only asked some rights for themselves, some freedom, some liberty. Then they only spoke the words of hope, the words of power; and it was to these 60,000 volunteers that George III. conceded the repeal of these statutes, which the Irish took as a boon rather than a right. The words of eloquent Grattan speaking out for Ireland's eternal freedom were uttered in Stephen's Green, where I hope that Irishmen may have the opportunity again of legislating for their own wrongs and grievances. (Great applause.) With the words of Henry Grattan they were content. There was no sort of threat, no sort of menace, no sort of violence. When we were weak they were loyal, and when we left our side exposed, instead of taking advantage of the weak place to strike a blow, the very Irishmen who had been trampled upon guarded and shielded us with their arms. When we were again strong men we repaid them by breaking the bayonets which we had entrusted to them, and tried to take back from them the liberties which we had given and had always begrudged them. (Hisses.) Ireland being an agricultural country, naturally the land question is the question which meets one most especially; and Mr. Mill, in a speech made by him in the House of Commons on Mr. Chichester Fortescue's Land Bill, said:

"People often ask, and it has been asked this evening, Why should that which works well in England not work well in Ireland? or why should anything be needed in Ireland that is not needed in England? Whether Ireland was an exception to all the rest of mankind, that they cannot bear the institutions which reason and experience have taught are the best calculated to promote national prosperity? Sir, we were eloquently reminded the other night of that double ignorance against which a great philosopher warned his contemporaries—'ignorant of our being ignorant'; and when we insist on applying the same rules in respect to

Ireland and to England, we show another kind of double ignorance, and at the same time disregard the precept which was inscribed on the front of the temple of Delphi; not only we do not know what we undertake to govern, but we do not know ourselves. Irish circumstances and Irish ideas as to social and agricultural economy are the general ideas and the general circumstances of the human race. It is English circumstances and English ideas that are peculiar. Ireland is the main stream of human existence, and human feeling and human opinion; it is England that is one of the lateral channels. If any honorable gentleman doubts this, I ask, Is there any other country on the face of the earth in which, not merely as a national fact, but as a general rule, the land is owned in great estates by one class, and farmed by another class of capitalist farmers, and actually cultivated by laborers only, detached from the soil, and receiving only day wages? Ireland is like the rest of the world; England is the exceptional country."

THE LAND QUESTION UNSETTLED.

Now I propose to deal with the land question for a few moments. I do not propose to trouble you with the history of confiscation after confiscation—although this must not be overlooked in dealing with such questions, because these confiscations have left their bane behind them. Men who are grandsons have been told by their grandfathers of land of which they were wrongfully dispossessed, and it is utterly impossible to hope to blot out the feeling of discontent and dissatisfaction arising out of this. In fact, in any other country than Ireland we should think it a loyal feeling; we should call it a patriotic feeling. We have praised—and I have heard our statesmen praise—the Poles because they have dared to hope to recover that which was wrested from them not longer ago than this. I have heard our own leading statesman of to-day—and I honored him for the words I heard, as I honor him still for his genius, great as it is—I have heard him praise the Neapolitans for their effort to re-establish themselves, and encourage them in the effort they made. I have heard him speak of the right of the Italians in Milan to overthrow the yoke of the Austrians that then pressed upon them, and I confess that I cannot believe that politics change with the geography of the country, and that that which is virtue in Poland becomes vice in Ireland, or that that which is patriotism in Warsaw becomes treason in Dublin streets. (Great applause.) While it is true—and perfectly true—that these confiscations date some time back, I urge upon you that they have been brought down to this very day. What did that law mean, which was only repealed by mad George IV.—what did that law mean which prevented Catholics from holding land at all? I am not discussing the question from a religious point of view, but from a citizen's point of view—a citizen of a State which has men of all religions under its banner, and which has no right to inflict upon men of one religion a disability, and give to men of another religion a preference: which should hold the sword of justice evenly between them all. What did that disability mean? If you tell me that that disability has gone more than forty years, I say it is not true; I say it lived still longer, while Protestant landlords evicted Catholic tenants and gave preference to those who were not, and shut others out from their votes in direction after direction. If you tell me this is an exaggerated statement, I say unfortunately it is not. I can quote from one member of the English Parliament to another; I am not talking the language of Irish patriots; I am trying the question as an Englishman, by the admission of Englishmen speaking against Ireland more than for it, and out of their mouths I will take it, and by their evidence I will ask you to give your verdict to-night. (Applause.) You may tell me Mr. Froude has done all this. There are some men who paint, and some men who caricature; there are some men who intend to paint truly, but whose minds are so warped that the pencil, when it touches the canvas, makes a wry line despite themselves. While I admit Mr. Froude's genius, while I admit his scholarship, his culture, I do not admit the straightness of his look when he is looking at the Irish question; he looks warped and around the corner from an English point of view. (Laughter and applause.) Take this land matter, and take it fairly. What have you here? Landlords who have no interest whatever in tenants: who regard the tenants as so many sponges, out of whom gold and life-blood might be squeezed; agents who were not content to get a rent which was out of all proportion, which only the misery and certainty of death if they did not give it induced any to give it at all; and who actually tell a man where his child shall go to school, whom his daughter shall marry, whom his son shall marry, whom he shall have to live in the same house with him.

CRUELTY TO IRISH TENANTS.

Do you think these are exaggerations? Why, Mr. Morris, who was the London *Times* Commissioner—and the *Times* is not fond of encouraging Irish grievances—now, Mr. Morris, who was the *Times* Commissioner, tells a story of a widow who was evicted from her holding less than seven years ago, because her daughter had left her to get married and had gone to inhabit a different part of the country. The husband whom the daughter had married had died, and the agent of the cottage occupied by the widowed mother refused to allow the woman to receive her widowed daughter back to live with her. The only place that was open to her was the

London workhouse. Somebody says "Impossible": I will tell you something more "impossible", that should make your blood boil with shame if you don't know it. This is a little thing; I will tell you some bigger things, one of which happened upon the estate of the Marquis of Lansdowne, and was dealt with by the brilliant pen of my friend Linton, and is a matter of universal knowledge in England, except among those who are so wilfully blind upon all Irish questions that they make mischief by their wilfulness. I will tell you yet another, which happened within my own personal experience. The one which Linton tells of is a story of a boy who had no father and no mother living. His father and mother had occupied a cottage on the estate of my Lord Lansdowne. The boy was "a bad boy". His chief criminality was his poverty; that is a vice in the country I come from. But he had a worse vice than that: He neither starved nor went properly to the Board of Guardians to get into the workhouse, as any well-conducted boy ought to have done—he ran about the fields. His grandfather and grandmother were living, and he used sometimes to go to sleep at their house at night, and sometimes with an uncle, and sometimes with a cousin, all living on the same estate. On day this wicked boy—for he had carried his wickedness sometimes to the extent of sleeping in the fields at night, which is a crime in our country, that is if you are poor, but not if you are rich—I tell someone who shakes his head at it (referring to someone in the audience), if you are poor you are brought before the magistrate, who will send you to jail for twenty-one days as a rogue or a vagrant; but if you are rich, you are simply called perhaps a fool—that is the law of England, and there are a hundred people in jail, at least, for it at the present moment. The gentleman who shakes his head has nothing in the head or in the denial when he puts it. (Laughter and applause.) I never overstate my case; it is too strong to need overstating, and I have too much shame as an Englishman in the statement I have to make to you to want to color it. This boy sometimes slept in the fields at night—I don't say he slept there from choice; but the agent had forbidden his relatives to receive him, for he had given a proof of wickedness which was beyond all question: he one day had, being very hungry, killed a hare and sold it for a shilling; now, a boy who will kill a hare is beyond all hope of redemption. Pheasants figure higher than peasants, for, in the country I come from, hares and rabbits are far more important than human beings; they have made criminals of many a score, and even in England, saying nothing of Ireland, our country calendars are filled with more offences relating to game than any other offences. I ask the gentleman who thinks it is not so, when I sit down, to rise here, and I will quote to him from Blue Book after Blue Book, evidence before the House of Commons, until his utter ignorance shall rise in testimony against him. (Applause.) This boy used to sleep in the field sometimes. At last winter came, and frost came, and snow came—and winter's frosts and snow are hard upon poor boys, especially when their bellies are empty: this boy therefore begged his relations to give him shelter; as they were not uniformly inhuman they did; and the agent then served one with a notice to quit, and threatened another, and they were obliged to shut the boy out. At last one night there was bitter, bitter frost; the boy came, and being refused admittance he clambered at a back window and was turned out, for they were afraid to lose their holdings, it was all they had to live by. He tried to come in again, and was driven away with a pitchfork, and then, to prevent him from climbing up, his hands were tied, and he was turned away again. The boy went to sleep in the fields; it was bitter cold that night, and he slept a sleep which has never ended yet. I say the agent of the Marquis of Lansdowne was the murderer of that boy.

To those who say, "What does such a statement as that mean? what value has it?" I will read from the evidence—not of a rough speaker like myself; not of one used to exaggeration as I may be—but the words of a member of the House of Commons. He says, speaking of a village in Mayo, and two neighboring villages, that in midwinter fifty houses were levelled to the ground, and no less than 140 families turned out to go whithersoever they would. Did you ever see an eviction? I have.

EVICIONS DESCRIBED.

In my checkered life I have been a private soldier, and between 1849 and 1850, I was in the county Cork, stationed at Ballancholy. Those of you who are Irishmen will want no description of that beautiful valley of the Lee, which winds between the hills from Cork, and in summer seems like a very paradise, green grass growing to the water's side, and burnished with gold in the morning, and ruddy to the very crimson in the evening sunset. I went there on a November day. I was one of a troop to protect the law officers, who had come with the agent from Dublin to make an eviction a few miles from Inniscarra, where the river Bride joins the Lee. It was a miserable day—rain freezing into sleet as it fell—and the men beat down wretched dwelling after wretched dwelling—some 30 or 40 perhaps. They did not take much beating down; there was no flooring to take up, the walls were more mud than aught else, and there was but little trouble in the levelling of them to the ground. We had got our work about three parts done, when out of one of them a woman ran and flung herself on the ground, wet as it was, before the captain of the troop, and she asked that her house might be spared—not for long, but for a little while. She said her husband had been born in it; he was ill of the fever, but could not live long, and she asked that he might be permitted to die in it in peace. Our captain had no power; the law agent from Dublin

wanted to get back to Dublin—his time was of importance, and he would not wait—and that man was carried out while we were there—in front of us while the sleet was coming down—carried out on a wretched thing—you could not call it a bed—and he died there while we were there. And three nights afterwards, while I was sentry on the front gate at Ballancholy barracks, we heard a cry, and when the guard was turned out we found this poor woman there a raving maniac, with one dead babe in one arm, and another in the other, clinging to the cold nipple of her lifeless breast. And if you had been brothers to such a woman, sons of such a woman, fathers of such a woman, would not rebellion have seemed the holiest gospel you could hear preached? Two hundred and fifty thousand evictions took place in the twenty years preceding 1866. 250,000! Can you multiply the misery of that 250,000? Brother separated from sister, husband from wife, the union workhouse taking one, and the other going out trying to find life if he can. This system has gone on until it has made a misery so vast that it will require not one act of Parliament in favor of wisdom, not one statute in favor of justice, not one declaration in favor of humanity, but generations and generations of generous and kindly treatment, not to build up but in some degree to efface the bloody stain of iniquity we have made on the page of that history.

Do you want a specimen of a real English-Irish landlord? Take the late Marquis of Hertford. It was once the fortune of my life to have to meet my Lord Hertford in Paris, and he took great pains to impress upon me then his generosity. He told me he was always in the habit of assisting everybody. He had the means to assist every-body. He has died enormously rich. When he came into his property he met his tenants, and he made a pretty speech to them. He told them that it was the happiest day of his life—and I daresay it was, the coming into his property: I am not at all doubting the truthfulness of that—and he said how glad he would be to meet them again and again. He went from there to Paris, and with the exception of one visit—I think only one—that he paid to Ireland when he wanted the Order of the Garter—with that exception he never set foot on his estates again. He took from them like a cold-blooded leech, without any sort of sympathy except the swallowing of the blood he draws from it. Do not say I exaggerate. There has just been a trial in the Dublin courts in which John Stormis, the agent of the Marquis of Hertford, was defendant, and he admitted that when a man was disposed to vote as he thought wrongly he served him with a notice to quit, as an encouragement to him for his conceptions of political right and duty. And a little while ago, not going back a long time, when in Lisburn the people were famine-stricken, they sent letters to my Lord Hertford. He had hundreds of thousands in Spanish railways, hundreds of thousands in German funds, millions of francs in French securities. I am not exaggerating, because the inventory has been taken of them since he died. But he turned a deaf ear: he gave no reply. The people who had been working for his rent were allowed to starve, and would have starved if an American citizen had not sent a ship-load of food to relieve them.

And I urge that you want something more than this land measure of Mr. Gladstone's, with which I propose to deal. But permit me before I deal with it—for I want if I can to do fair justice to him—permit me to say one thing, which I say in no flattery to the Irish here, for I said it and printed it twelve years ago, to those who urge that the Irish are discontented and dissatisfied and lack love of country. I say it is not so. I say that if there is one thing which is shown more in the Irish character than another—so far as an Englishman can judge it: so far as Englishmen have had a fair opportunity to judge it—it is a disposition under fair conditions to do the best for the land of their birth that it is possible to do.

You ask me what evidence I have of it? I have a witness that cannot lie—a big witness—a witness called the Dublin Post-office, and the officers of that post-office will tell you that away from the western country, away from your Alleghany ranges, away from your Rocky Mountains, out of your busy streets of New York, men who have gone away from Ireland wretched and miserable and threadbare, with despair in their heart and hatred in their head for the Government that had oppressed them, have not forgotten those they have left behind, but have sent back in registered letters of their earnings here, to relieve those who were dragging down to the grave in famine, or to bring them to this land of promise.

THE LAND GRIEVANCE NOT CURED.

It is said the land grievance has been cured; that Mr. Gladstone's Bill has cured it. Now I deny that Mr. Gladstone's Bill has done anything of the kind. I do not say that it was not a grand step; I do not say that it was not a courageous march in advance. I believe it was. I do not deny the might of Mr. Gladstone's heroism in proposing such a measure as this; but what I say is this, that it would have been far better to have faced the difficulty thoroughly than to have made a compromise which neutralised the effect of the Bill he was bringing. I propose to show you what I think Mr. Gladstone should have done, what I think may yet be done, and what I think, if done, would do something to remedy existing evils. We have heard a great deal in our country of landed rights, but of all people Irish landlords ought to talk the least about them, for there is hardly a family that has held land for more than five or six generations but got it either by direct theft or indirect theft; by direct lying or indirect lying, sometimes accompanied by perjury, and sometimes—occasionally—varied with murder.

These have been the most legitimate ways in which large estates have been secured. Now for these people to talk of the rights of land is about as mild a thing in philosophy as anybody could possibly imagine. But let us examine the rights of land. I urge that in every country the rights of land are subordinate to the rights of life. I urge that when the rights of land conflict with the rights of life, landed rights must give way, and flesh and blood rights must assume their sway. (Motion of dissent by some one in the audience.) I can understand that gentlemen who never heard of flesh and blood rights, and who may have many parchment deeds, may think that this is a horrible doctrine. I am afraid that such gentlemen wrap their hearts in parchment, and forget the outside flesh and blood. But I am open to objection; I am open to answer; I shall be only too glad to hear that I have mistaken the matter that I am dealing with. I urge that in every country—I care not where—here as well as anywhere else, any holding of land must be subordinate to the welfare of the nation in which it is held. There can be no freehold right which conflicts with the welfare of the nation. There can be no man who by force of arms, or writ, or power of purchase by money, has the right to say that "this is my freehold, and although this freehold is destructive to the nation, I will hold it". I will say that here the welfare of the State becomes stronger than freehold right, and freehold right must give way to it.

You recognise it in your legislation. You do not permit poison manufactories in the midst of your cities. (Applause.) You say, "We won't permit you to store powder between two houses that may blow the inhabitants away". You have no right to say, "This is my freehold, I will do as I will with it". The rights of society, the rights of humanity, those you come in contact with, have claims upon you, and your power and your freehold right must give way to the public will.

DEFECTS OF MR. GLADSTONE'S BILL.

Now Mr. Gladstone's Land Bill failed in this, that it did not grapple enough with the question of rights of land. Mr. Gladstone did alleviate the condition of the tenant. The tenant had been evicted without any sort of claim for compensation at all, and he gave him some right to claim compensation. He had been evicted under most unjust circumstances without any remedy. He gave him some right to claim a remedy. But Mr. Gladstone, with the example of Prussia before him, might have gone a step further. He might have introduced either the Stein law, or some modification of it, by which peasant proprietorship in Ireland might have been created, by a grant to him of the opportunity of owning land if he chose. That would have been far better than driving the poor away from the land to this country, where hatred is made by misery under which they left their own land. It would be far better than oppressing them. True, it would destroy the right of property, I admit; but they have destroyed it in Prussia; in Russia they have destroyed it, and given the serfs a cottage and enough of land to grow vegetables.

HAVE YOUR IRISH LANDLORDS DONE THIS?

I regret if these examples have increased the disposition of my friend who disagrees with me to shake his head as to what I say. We labor under the disadvantage that both of us have learned the same history; but we have read it on different pages. He has read his in the margin, and taken Government notes in lieu of the real facts. It is true that in the Land Bill of Mr. Gladstone itself you will find clauses—42 to 46—which provide a means by which the peasant may become the proprietor of the land. Mr. Gladstone therefore thought there was a need for the peasant becoming a proprietor of the land, or he would not have made such legislation. The only thing Mr. Gladstone did not provide was the means of compelling the landlord to sell out. The landlord may reside in Paris, never see his land, and if he will not sell it then it may go out of cultivation, as land has done in Ireland in the last twenty years.

There is less corn grown in Ireland now than twenty years ago, less rye, less barley, and yet there is no more fruitful soil in all the British Islands than in Ireland. Why is it? Because the Irish land has only been the sponge from which the aristocracy have sucked the life-blood, giving nothing back for it in return. (Here a vigorous shaking of the head of a gentleman in the body of the hall was observed by the speaker). Our friend again disagrees with me, and I say the responsibility of expressing his disagreement is a grave responsibility, that rests upon him, and I challenge him to come on the platform and say in one word if I have made a mistake.

I urge that the British system should recognise the right of the tiller of the soil to some part in the crop he produces. I urge that the law of Baron Stein, which gave the man the hope that if he was industrious, if he was energetic, if he was economical, he should have for himself some of the land he tilled—I say that this is no wild idea. I say that if you want to give a people an interest for life in the land, let them feel that that which they tread on is theirs. Do not let them feel that that which they dig never can be theirs. To you, with your mighty acres stretched around, to you of America, it may seem nothing; but there are men here before me whose memories I would carry back to a little spot, perhaps in Clare, perhaps in Tipperary, perhaps in Cork, perhaps in

the North, perhaps in the South, a little spot with which your fathers were identified, and from which they have been driven away, and it has been their crowning ambition and hope that they should get back to win for themselves. I say a land bill might do this, and a real land bill would have done it, and nothing short of a real land bill will meet any of the difficulties here.

THE QUESTION OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

Before this land question, permit me to deal with the bearing of the religious question on it, too. It is perfectly true that religious grievances in Ireland have been annihilated in words, but they have hardly been so completely annihilated in fact, and certainly the wrong already existing has not been remedied.

Take the very passing of the Roman Catholic Disabilities Act. It was passed only on the pressure of the Duke of Wellington, on the pressure of war. The Conservatives were moved by no sense of justice. George, when he was Regent, George, when he was King, had mocked the Irish, sometimes with fine words, and, as he changed his mistresses, so he changed his policy towards them. George went to Ireland once, but did he in any sort of fashion think that any measure of justice was due to them? Read the inner records of his life, not the stories they print for children to read in our schools. Read the Duke of Buckingham's letters, read Lord Castlereagh's correspondence, read the letters of the Duke of Wellington which are published, the State papers which have come to light out of dead men's boxes since, but not what we give our children to teach them how good we have been; read where all our rascalities are printed in white pages. (Applause.) But even the Roman Catholic disabilities, although repealed in word are not repealed in reality. I ask anyone to look for twenty years after the repeal of the Roman Catholic Disabilities Bill, and tell me whether the Roman Catholic voters had a right to exercise their votes. Conviction followed conviction; notice to quit followed notice to quit. The bulk of the administrators of the law were Protestants. In dealing with these questions, I shall deal with them on the authority of the *Edinburgh Review*. I will not take the language of anyone who might mislead you. I will not take the language of an Irishman, or the statements of a patriot. I will not take even the evidence of a writer writing in passion. I will take the evidence of the cold and critical *Edinburgh Review*, which deals with the state of things down to 1851. This journal says that the Roman Catholic had no chance of justice before a Protestant legislature that dealt with him. Commissions have been issued and evidence has been accumulated on it, and so it has gone. Take the question of the tithe collection.

Our good and kind George collected the tithes at the point of the bayonet. Do you want the story of the widow's son, who tried to defend his mother's only cow, and with his life, from the church of love to which he or the people did not belong? Would you prefer to read the letters of King William, which are extant now, written to Lord Grey or to Lord Wellington, in which he expresses the hope that the Irish may be induced to resist the collection of the tithes by officers, so that there may be an excuse for using the army against them? I ask you, can you wonder at the very shame that stops my utterance when I, as an Englishman, plead all these things? Even the Irish Church Disestablishment—how shall I tell you? The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the House of Lords, had the audacity to say that he was there to plead against the proposition of religious equality, and the Bishop of Peterborough, with frankness and neatness, asked his fellow-bishops to throw out the Bill, "for it is self-preservation I am putting to you". (Laughter.)

When they suspected a man of being a United Irishman they hung him on his door to induce him to confess; if he did not confess they hung him until he died, and if he confessed he was hung too. (Laughter.) Read the *Courier*, the *Cambridge Intelligencer*—I do not ask you to read Irish papers, to read the speech of the Shearers, or the defence of Fitzgerald, the potent words of Curran, the fiery language of Grattan—I ask you to read the English journals, read the speeches of the House of Lords itself, and read the protest of eighteen Lords who admitted that we burned houses. There is a story that a militiamen came to arrest a man, and that, not finding him at home, he gave his wife notice that if he were not at home in three hours he would burn the house around her; and when the man came back he found his home in cinders, his wife dishonored, and the children dead. Why, I would have preached rebellion from one end of the country to the other, if I had been alive. (Great applause.) I have not time to deal with the question of the act of union; I am one who confesses that my respect for law does not extend to statutes; I draw a distinction between law and statute. There is many a statute passed that is not law. There is many a statute on our own Statute Book at home so illegal that public opinion stops in the way of its enforcement. How has agitation been met in Ireland? In England we have open agitation; in Ireland they are obliged to break out in revolt. Why, my own journal, which may be published in London, is not permitted to be published in Dublin. The very things which I say without fear of imprisonment or prosecution in London a man is arrested for if he says in Cork. Printing offices have been seized within the last three or four years in Ireland, and papers, too; and my own journal, which has printed things much stronger, is sold openly in the streets, and no one dares to prevent it, (Applause.) Why? Because I am in England, why should there be that difference? Does any peculiar virtue exist in a corporal of the guard that is not possessed by a private?

(Laughter.) Why, is not it this very distinction of corporal of the guard and private that made you thus act? Have not you always tried to make the Irish feel that they were inferior; that you should and would hold them? And yet, when the hour of danger has come, when England has been in despair, to whom has she appealed?—to those lusty arms to help her in her fight for her redemption.

In Hyde Park we hold a demonstration of thousands of people. The Government forbids it, but subsequently swallows their order to that effect. It has troops to prevent it, and actually marches them back again where they came from. But in Phoenix Park, in Dublin, it is a different matter. There they are dispersed by force, as I contend, illegally, and as the law justifies me in contending; i am against—utterly against—decidedly against the initiative by force of revolution, but I conceive it to be a duty of one's manhood if the rights of one's country be assailed, to defend them, even to the shedding of the last drop of blood of those who dared to wrest them from you. (Applause.) This is the doctrine Sidney taught, that Hampden fought for; this is the doctrine that Cromwell drew the sword to win, and I cannot understand how crossing the Irish Channel makes that wicked on the one side which on our side is chronicled as the highest virtue.

But how was that agitation met? No one can dare to say it was disorderly or violent. The very reporters who went there were accommodated with seats. There was no violence used against them, although the men were known to be men employed to give evidence of what they did. I believe the worst thing that Daniel O'Connell ever did was to make a speech in Irish, which the reporters did not understand. (Laughter.) I have read carefully the evidence taken in the trial of O'Connell and of those who stood at the bar with him. There is no pretence of saying that any violence was used at those meetings, but, because they were mighty demonstrations of the force of the nation, the men who took part in them were indicted for levying war against the Queen. We hear of similar meetings to compel the Reform Bill. Earl Granville admitted in the House of Lords that they had been compelled to pass it—to pass a measure they regarded as revolutionary, by reason of the pressure brought to bear from archbishops down to revenue gaugers. We bought and terrified. There was one voice of eloquent protest against it—even in the Dublin Parliament itself. It came late, but it was better late than never. It came from a dying man, but a man whose dying voice had more power and eloquence in it when he was dying than the mightiest roll of eloquence that could come from Mirabeau, Danton, or O'Connell, in the greatest force—a man who was not in Parliament when the debate began, whom the Government thought they could keep out. They sent the writ too late to bring him there, but the people had the returning-officer out in the night, and they had the election in a hurry, and they hurried to Dublin as fast as they could go. What did they carry? A man whose face was wan; whose blood was growing pale; death had commenced to drag him into the grave he soon fell into. But he was a mighty man, whatever faults he had; and when the history of Ireland's redemption by her own sons is written, as I believe one day it will and may, then, greater than many a man who fought with pike will come the man who fought with pen and tongue—Henry Grattan's name must find a place. (Tremendous applause.) He was carried into the House. He only arose to speak, and it was the consciousness of what he pleaded for that gave him force in speaking, and he pleaded against that union as against an unholy one. And so it was that he made the division wider, and kept us more apart. If I come to speak on this question now, it is because I speak here to Irishmen as well as to Americans. John Stuart Mill well said, when speaking upon Mr. Maguire's motion: "There are circumstances which make dissatisfaction more alarming now than in any period since the rebellion of '98. For the first time the discontent in Ireland rests on a background of several millions of Irish across the Atlantic." And it is because there are millions of Irish in America that I come here, not pretending to have any right to be heard at their hands, not pretending to have any claim to favor in their hearing, admitting that many a story might come against me, and that prejudice might be laid against me; I come to plead for them because I believe that in the future, which is very near, our cause is their cause and their cause is our cause; and that in uniting all together we shall get a deliverance which otherwise will be kept from us for many a day to come. I come here as an Englishman, and, if in what I say now Irishmen should disagree with me, I can only say to you as I did to the Englishman who disagreed with me before: "Here is the place to answer. Don't keep your doubt imprisoned in your own breast, but speak it out, so that I can hear it."

SEPARATION NOT THE POLICY.

When Daniel O'Connell was in the midst of his work, and the men were moving for the Charter in England, they crippled one another; they did not keep together. They were strong enough then to have conquered, if they had kept together, and they might have prevented 25 years of misery if they had done so.

Understand me clearly, I am against any separation of Ireland from England, I am against it as an Englishman; England is not strong enough to do without Ireland, and I do not believe, on the life of me, I do not believe that Ireland is strong enough to do without England. You are not as you were; nor are we: you are married to us, and we are married to you. Separation will not undo, will not wipe out, the past; for separation from England will not put you where you were before annexation. I would say, Let it bo, but it cannot be, and I

do not believe that separation will help the future. The tendency of modern policy is to make great States, not to create small ones; to join together, not to disunite; there is only a narrow channel which separates us from you, and I believe that there is a channel of warm blood and generous feeling which could bring us together again. The shame of the past is ours, but the generosity to forget it in the future is yours. The landed aristocracy that have seized our fields are the ones that hold yours, and the shame against which you war is that against which we struggle too. I am in favor of the duty of the Irish people to legislate for themselves; I know no reason why—just as the State of New York, and the State of Massachusetts, and the other States of this mighty federation have their legislation—I know no reason why Ireland should not also have hers, too, in that same fashion. I know no reason why if Hungary's people may have a Parliament, I know no reason why an analogous course might not be pursued. But I do not pretend to discuss details here. But I say let us deal with it not in a spirit of hatred, race to race; there are no such differences of race to-day. There were; but our people have intermarried with your people, and there is a blending of brotherhood and kinship between us that no separation can wipe out. It is not the old race with none of our blood or our thought. Your poets are ours and our literature is imbued with your spirit, and if you go back to the mythic days that your poets have described, I ask you to forget the mists of yesterday and to hope for the realities of to-morrow, when we may win our deliverance. I am against separation because you cannot win it peaceably. I do not say you cannot win it; I do not deny your valor; but you can only win it by the sword. (Interruption.) You have the right to reply when I sit down. I will not trespass upon your attention long, but listen to me until I finish. I tell you that if you are to win you must win by force, and then, deeply as I should regret it, sorry as I should be, I should feel that my course was not your course—that my hand could not be with your hand. I am English; it is not my crime, I was born so. You are Irish; it is not your virtue, you were born so. I did not make my misfortune, nor you your place. I ask you to recognise our common brotherhood. Do not talk a word of separation. Be men, and remember that it is federation, not separation, that should be the hope of the future. I would appeal to Irishmen, if I knew how, as Curran would have done, as Flood would have done, if he were out of his grave again. I would appeal to you as Irishmen as Curran would if here, as Flood would if here and out of his grave, as Grattan would if he could train my tongue, as O'Connell would if I had his force and energy. I would appeal to Irishmen, and say, "Do not think of that word 'separation'"; we have separated too long. Each separation is a weakness, for while we are separated the common enemy preys on us and drags us away. You can't win without us; we cannot without you. Were we separated they would set one to fight the other, and then mock us for our folly. Oh! if I could appeal to Irishmen I would appeal to them openly. Do not try to work in secret. I do not believe in secret conspiracy. It never did win; 1798 will tell you; the brothers Shearers on the gallows will tell you whether secret conspiracy could win; poor Fitzgerald dying in his bed would tell you; 1848 can tell; and Croydon and Massey's lying tongues would tell you what secret conspiracy would do. (Applause.) In England I am not afraid of anybody; the most daring things I say, and say openly, and although Scotland Yard has its men to watch me they get little for their pains, for all the world knows what I do. (Applause.) Besides, in secret you never can be strong. War openly, and war with us. I do not ask you to agree with us in everything, but tell us where you disagree. Do not keep apart. Do not cry separation in one corner. And to you Americans I offer no apology for speaking to you of Ireland, for you are sons of some, brothers of others, cousins, nephews, and nieces too. The language common to us, Englishmen and Irishmen, is common to you. Any pain to one or the other must be pain to you. We are as one human family, and I plead to you because, as I said when I stood in this hall before, there is a mightier force than king or throne, a mightier force than the sword or steel, than prison bars. It works silently, like a mighty oxide which corrodes iron; but it works surer, and it crumbles all it touches to the Ted dust. This mighty oxydising force is the force of public opinion, and to that I appeal—not to Americans, not as men and women of a different nation, but as members of a common family. (Great applause, during which the speaker retired.)

PROTESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE.

Mr. Bradlaugh: Will you permit me to say that any Englishman who thinks that I have gone too far, any Irishman who thinks I have not gone far enough, anyone who questions the truth of any one of my statements, has now not only the most perfect right but the most wholesome duty to rise and object. If he thinks I am not right, he either knows why or he does not know why. If he knows why, he should speak so as to testify that I am not deceiving others; if he does not know why, I shall be happy to explain. (Great cheering.) After the cheering had subsided, a gentleman in the centre of the hall addressed the speaker as follows: "As an Irishman I believe my first duty is to thank Mr. Bradlaugh for the able and eloquent manner in which he has treated the question of Irish rights, and also I must beg to differ from him on some points. I look at the connexions of Ireland with England for the last 700 years, and I see how they have been fraught with so much mischief and misery to Irishmen. I look on them as two partners, and after the continuation of the partnership one, being

more powerful, took advantage of its weaker partner and robbed him every day until he bled him of the last drop he had, and he then said: "I shall divide this establishment into three parts. I shall give you a third part, still holding control over you"; and that would be the consequence in any union that may continue between England and Ireland. I admit that England will be a Republic; but that Republic might act like many Republics which now exists. Behold bleeding Cuba! Cuba crushed by the Republic of Spain! I do not want any further connexion with England. I would like to see laws offensive and defensive existing between the two countries; but never, never again, I hope, will it be thought in the minds of Irishmen that they can get along with Englishmen as amicable partners. There must be a total separation of Ireland from England before an Irishman can be satisfied. No speech I have ever heard delivered has convinced me more of that fact, than the one I have heard to-night by one of the best English Republicans who ever appeared on the American platform. I am no stranger to Mr. Bradlaugh. I was fighting the battle of labor against capital; he also was fighting that right, against, probably, the mightiest power in Europe; and if there is any gentleman in England who has had my sympathy more than another it is Mr. Bradlaugh, for his boldness in daring the British Government at home. When the men of 1866-1867—whom some might call misguided—were breathing out their lives in British dungeons, and when Irish orators failed to interest themselves in their behalf, Mr. Bradlaugh called a meeting in Trafalgar Square for the purpose of speaking on injustice to Ireland and on the imprisonment of the Fenians; and the action of the meeting on that occasion helped the prisoners more than anything that had ever been done before. I hope Mr. Bradlaugh will get a warm reception from my countrymen throughout the length and breadth of America, and I hope that such a keen observer as he will be able to judge of the difference between the masses of the people here and in the old countries.

Mr. Bradlaugh: I shall most certainly fail in my effort to unite Irishmen and Englishmen, if all Irishmen conscientiously hold the view that our friend, who has spoken so kindly of me, has put forward. If separation is the only possibility, then I tell you, Irishmen, you could only win with the sword. There is no other way, and in that event I am afraid that I should conceive it to be my duty to be your enemy.

A voice: We thank you for your honorable declaration.

Mr. Bradlaugh continued to argue that separation could only be won by the sword at a time of England's weakness, and that would be a cowardly fashion.

Another gentleman questioned Mr. Bradlaugh's assertion that the man who fought for separation was not a patriot, and asked were Washington and the revolutionary heroes, and Emmet and the '98 men, heroes or murderers. There never could be a federation with England—there should be a total severance.

Mr. Bradlaugh replied that there was a distinction between Washington and his compatriots and the Irish heroes, inasmuch as the former fought against an infringement of their liberties, while the Irishmen fought for separation when they had no such excuse.

An English volunteer asked if it was believed that Mr. Froude, who had been so often alluded to, had come to America as an agent of the Government.

Mr. Bradlaugh answered: "Decidedly not". He believed that Mr. Froude had come on his own motion as much as he (Mr. Bradlaugh) had done.

An American asked why Ireland had not the same right to independence that America had. Mr. Bradlaugh said that he had never denied such right. But, first, the majority of Irishmen in Ireland did not wish for independence. The volunteer denied this, and said that we in this country have as correct sources of information as they had in England. Mr. Bradlaugh answered that more than 200,000 Irishmen had met in various parts of Ireland, and had given most decided expression to their opposition to an attempt to obtain independence.

The meeting closed.

There may be some difference of opinion honestly held, even amongst Irishmen, as to whether separation would be better for Ireland or not. Mr. Bradlaugh thought that it would not be for the better, and frankly said so. But whether or not, it will ever remain a black mark against the Irish party that they have, with few exceptions, spoken and voted against the man who had thus eloquently pleaded against the wrongs which they are sent to Parliament to redress. After such pleading, however, I think words of mine are simply out of place, and will therefore conclude by once more asking: Does it read like the utterance of an enemy of Ireland; and, does Charles Bradlaugh merit the treatment which he has received at the hands of the Irish National party?"

Instructions to Surveyors.

Tables of Freeboard.

Printed by Eyre and Spottis Woode, and Sold by J. D. Potter, London For her Majesty's Stationery Office, 31, Poultry, And E. Stafford, 55, Charing Cross. 1885

Price Sixpence.

Instructions to Surveyors.

Tables of Freeboard.

*Consecutive Office No. 275. Departmental 1031. Surveys 86. BOARD OF TRADE, Marine Department,
August 1885.*

The Board of Trade have received the Report of the Load Line Committee, and of the tables and rules annexed thereto.

The Board of Trade accept the conclusions of that Committee as to load lines as shown in the Report and in the tables and rules, and have furnished their Officers with copies. Copies can be obtained by the public at large from the agents for the sale of Stationery Office publications, and through any bookseller.

The Board of Trade do not propose that their Officers shall detain as overloaded any cargo ship on which the load line is marked so as to give the freeboard assigned to her by those rules and tables, and which is not loaded beyond the limits prescribed therein.

As proof that the load line on a ship is marked in accordance with these rules and tables, the Board's staff at the out ports will receive the certificate of Lloyd's Register Committee where a load line has been assigned by that Committee, or the certificate of the Board of Trade where a load line has been assigned by the Board of Trade. In future, the Board of Trade do not intend to assign a load line for any ship classed in Lloyd's Register Book. In the case of ships not classed, or classed elsewhere, the Board will continue for a time, as heretofore, to assign load lines on the application of the owner in due course and accompanied by full particulars of the ship.

The Board of Trade, in making this announcement, desire to point out, for the information of all persons having the command or management of ships, that those rules and tables give minimum freeboards applicable for ships of the highest class only, and that no ships other than ships of the highest class are to be loaded so deeply as those rules and tables admit.

Ships to which a freeboard has been assigned by the Committee of Lloyd's Register, or by the Board of Trade, will, like other ships, be liable to detention, if, having regard to the time of the year and the voyage, they are loaded more deeply than the rules and tables admit, and ships to which freeboards are not assigned will receive the particular notice of the staff so far as is possible.

Whilst the Board of Trade staff will by this arrangement be greatly relieved of the responsibility for the depth of loading of ships generally, it will be the duty of the Board itself in each case submitted to the Wreck Courts to instruct their solicitor to raise the question of loading whenever it may appear that deep loading may have contributed to the loss of the ship, and it will also be the duty of the Board of Trade if in any such case it should hereafter appear that a ship was loaded more deeply than the tables allow, looking to the age, character, class, and employment of the ship, to make the owner and the person responsible for the loading of the ship a party to the case, and to ask for the opinion of the court on his conduct.

T. H. Farrer,
Secretary.
Thomas Gray,
Assistant Secretary.

*Board of Trade,
Marine. Department.
M. 14241.*

1885.

LOAD LINE COMMITTEE.

To His Grace the DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, K.G., &c., President of the Board of Trade.

M 14284. MY LORD DUKE,

IN pursuance of the request of the late President of the Board of Trade (the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P.), we have given our most careful consideration to the following questions respecting the determination of the load lines of merchant ships, and have the honour to report thereon as follows:

The questions put to us were,—

- Whether it is now practicable to frame any general rules concerning freeboard which will prevent dangerous overloading without unduly interfering with trade.
- If so, whether any, and which of the existing tables, with any, and what alterations, or any other, and what tables should be adopted.
- How far any such tables can be adopted as fixed rules, and what amount of discretion must be left to the Officers who have to see that they are complied with."

Before replying to these questions we deemed it desirable (notwithstanding the close and technical acquaintance with merchant ships and with the conditions of safe loading which members of the Committee from their avocations necessarily possess) that we should together visit the principal mercantile ports, and there make joint observations of the load lines at present marked upon ships, and of the nature and extent of the actual loading practised. We also thought it well to avail ourselves of the opportunities thus afforded for conferring freely with shipowners, managers, masters, seamen, and others connected with the Mercantile Marine, and of receiving from them such evidence as they were willing to offer. We have likewise taken in London a considerable body of evidence. In order that your Grace may readily observe how numerous and how experienced have been the witnesses who have thus voluntarily contributed to the fulness of our information we append to this Report a list of their names.

Mr. Thomas Gray, C.B., and Sir Digby Murray, Bart., and likewise Mr. Benjamin Martell, and Mr. T. B. Hoyden have furnished all such information upon the subject as the large resources of the Board of Trade and of Lloyd's Register Office and of the Liverpool Registry respectively have enabled them to supply.

As the result of our prolonged consultations and labours we have unanimously arrived at the following replies to the questions before recited, viz.:

- We are of opinion that it is now practicable to frame general rules concerning freeboard which will prevent dangerous over-loading without unduly interfering with trade.
- We have the pleasure to submit herewith tables which we consider should be adopted.
- We are of opinion that these tables can be adopted, at least for all existing types of cargo vessels, and for some years to come, without the exercise of any other discretion on the part of the officers who have to see that they are complied with, than that which concerns the quality and condition of the ship. The freeboards assigned by the tables herewith are suitable for vessels of the highest class in Lloyd's Register or of strength equivalent thereto, and should be increased for ships of inferior strength.

To the responsible authorities a large discretion must be allowed, viz.: that of applying the tables themselves with reasonable modifications to any very exceptional vessels which may now exist or may hereafter be constructed.

For careful as we have been to give full consideration to all actual types and sizes of vessels, we cannot but admit that undue interference with trade might occasionally arise were the tables to be applied henceforth to all ships, present and future, without any exception whatever. We are well aware that the discretion which we thus regard as necessary is such as should be exercised with very great skill, care, and judgment, but we see no reason why those charged with the responsible duty of preventing the overloading of merchant ships should not have at their command all needful assistance.

The tables submitted herewith are of the same general form as those hitherto adopted by Lloyd's Register Office, and like them involve the reservation above water of a regulated minimum per-centile of the total buoyancy. At the same time these tables secure that a sufficient height of deck above water to which the Board of Trade advisers have justly attached much importance. The views of the Board of Trade advisers concerning the value of forecastles, poops, and like deck erections, and the necessity for a liberal amount of freeboard in flush-deck vessels which are deprived of such erections, have likewise received our careful attention, and have had their due influence upon the tables submitted herewith. The same may be said with reference to the freeboards assigned to vessels of extreme proportions and to vessels of very fine forms. The Board of Trade distinction between winter and summer freeboards has likewise, after the fullest consideration, been adopted.

The tables as now submitted involve only such limited modifications of the freeboards assigned by the latest tables of Lloyd's Register Office as Mr. Benjamin Martell is able to freely accept and cordially concur with. The same may be said of the extension of the tabular forms by the addition thereto of corrections for changes of length and for voyages in summer and in the North Atlantic in winter.

In the tables submitted the definitions of length, breadth, depth, sheer, round of beam, and freeboard have undergone revision.

The changes introduced have been made for the purpose of simplifying the assignment and marking of

freeboards, and although they modify in one or two points the directions of the fourth section of the Merchant Shipping Act of 1873, and may therefore render legislation necessary, the measure required would be of so brief, simple, and non-contentious a character as to render its passage easy.

It will be observed by the tables that they refer exclusively to cargo-carrying vessels. We have not considered it necessary to carry our investigations into the differences which may be made in the loading of passenger vessels. But it must be understood that under any circumstances those tables contain the maximum loading that should be permitted to any class of vessel.

In view of the unanimity with which we have arrived at our results it is deemed unnecessary to trouble your Grace with the evidence which has been taken, or with the information prepared and contributed by the various members of the Committee for its guidance from time to time.

In closing our labours which were commenced in January 1884, and have since proceeded continuously, we cannot but express our great satisfaction at the attainment of the unanimity just referred to. The subject placed before us by your Grace's predecessor was one of extreme complexity, and also one which had come to be regarded with much diversity of view (as was natural where the profit and loss of the largest commercial operations ever carried on upon the sea are involved), and therefore it would not have been surprising if we had failed to arrive at conclusions which we could all accept. But by thoroughly considering every important point as it has arisen, and by making reasonable concessions to each other on matters of opinion, we have succeeded in arriving unanimously at our results. As the Board of Trade, Lloyd's Register Office, and the Liverpool Registry are all represented upon this Committee the importance of this concurrence will be manifest. We have the honour to be, my Lord Duke, your Grace's obedient Servants, (Signed) E. J. REED, Chairman, W. DENNY, ROBT. DUNCAN, JAMES DUNN, FRANS. ELGAR, THOMAS GRAY, WILLIAM GRAY, JAMES LAING, B. MARTELL, DIGBY MURRAY, T. B. ROYDEN, THE. SUTHERLAND.

(Signed) REGINALD BINGHAM,
Secretary.

EXPLANATION of the following TABLES OF FREEBOARD for the various TYPES of STEAM and SAILING VESSELS.

In the following Tables the word Freeboard denotes the height of the side of a ship above the waterline at the middle of her length, measured from the top of the deck at the side, or, in cases where a waterway is fitted, from the curved line of the top of the deck continued through to the side. The freeboards and the corresponding percentages of reserve buoyancy necessary for flush-deck steamers not having spar or awning decks, for awning-deck steamers, and for flush-deck sailing vessels, are given in Tables A, C, and D for vessels of these classes and of various dimensions and proportions. The freeboards necessary for spar-deck steamers are given in Tables B. The latter are determined by considerations of structural strength, and they denote the limitations to depth of loading which are thereby imposed upon first class vessels of this type. The freeboards and percentages of reserve buoyancy thus obtained being in excess of what would otherwise be required, the amounts of such percentages are not given in Tables B.

The exact freeboard required for a given ship belonging to any of the classes comprised in Tables A, C, and D, may be calculated by constructing a displacement scale to the height of the deck to which the freeboard is measured, so as to give the whole external volume up to the upper surface of that deck. The percentage of the total volume which is given in the Tables as the reserve buoyancy for a vessel of given type and dimensions will be the amount of volume that must be left out of the water. If a water-line be drawn upon the displacement scale aforesaid to cut off the given percentage of total volume, the height of side above this line will be the freeboard required.

In order to simplify and reduce the work that would be involved by the above mode of determining the water line and the consequent freeboard, that correspond to a given percentage of reserve buoyancy, an approximate method is adopted in the following tables, which enables the freeboard of a vessel to be calculated with a sufficient degree of accuracy for all ordinary working purposes. The use of this method not only saves the time and labour that would be involved by making a complete displacement scale for the whole external volume of a ship, but, what is much more important, it makes the Tables easily and directly applicable in cases where such a displacement scale for a vessel is not at hand, or where the data requisite for constructing one is not procurable.

In this approximate method the form of the ship is taken into account by means of proportionate quantities, which are termed coefficients of fineness, instead of by the exact volumes that a displacement scale would give. It is found that the whole internal volume of a ship as measured for register tonnage divided by the product of the length, breadth, and depth, measured as described in the following clauses 1, 2, and 3, gives a fractional quantity or coefficient which bears a nearly constant relation to the quantity that would be obtained by dividing the whole external volume below the upper surface of the deck by the product of the length, breadth, and depth. This fractional quantity is called the "coefficient of fineness" for freeboard purposes; and it serves the same practical object, when combined with the dimensions of the ship in the manner explained in the Tables, as the volume itself would do.

In applying such an approximate method as the above, it is necessary to connect the coefficients of fineness given in the Tables with a standard sheer and round of beam. The standard scales for sheer and round of beam that have been adapted for this purpose are given in clauses 16 and 17 hereafter. Descriptions are also there given of the corrections that should be made for deviations from these standard amounts.

The freeboards given in the Tables are for flush-deck vessels in all cases. Such reductions in freeboard as may be allowed for deck-erections of various kinds and sizes in steamers not having spar or awning decks, and in sailing vessels, are described in paragraphs 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

No reduction of freeboard should be allowed on account of deck-erections in spar-deck and awning-deck steamers.

Tables A and D give the minimum freeboards for first class iron and steel vessels, the strength of which is at least equal to the requirements of the 100 A class in Lloyd's Register for three-deck and smaller vessels. The freeboard of all other iron and steel vessels, classed or unclassed, should be regulated by the same standard; the increase of freeboard required in each case being determined by the limit at which the stress per square inch upon the material of the hull amidships shall not exceed that of the standard class, of the same proportions, form, and moulded depth, when loaded to the freeboards required by Tables A and D. Tables B and C give the freeboards for vessels built in accordance with, or equal to the requirements of Lloyd's Register for the spar and awning deck classes; and are subject to the conditions just stated for any modifications of strength in excess or diminution of the requirements of their respective classes.

- *Length.*—The length of the vessel is measured on the load-line from the foreside of the stem to the aft side of the stern post in sailing vessels, and to the aft side of the after post in steamers.
- *Breadth.*—The breadth used in obtaining the coefficient of fineness is the extreme breadth measured to the outside of plank or plating as given in the Register Book, or on the Certificate of the Ship's Registry.
- *Depth of Hold.*—The depth used in obtaining the coefficient, of fineness is the depth of hold as given in the Register Book, or on the Certificate of the Ship's Registry. This dimension is subject to modification in determining the coefficient of fineness as explained in clause 4.
- *Coefficient of Fineness.*—The coefficient of fineness in one, two, and three-deck and spar-deck vessels, is found by dividing 100 times the gross registered tonnage of the vessel below the upper deck by the product of the length, breadth, and depth of hold. In awning-deck vessels the registered depth and tonnage are taken below the main deck.

It is of importance in the application of the rules and tables of freeboard that the coefficient of fineness deduced from the under-deck tonnage, and the principal dimensions should be a correct index to the vessel's relative fulness of form, and that a change in any of those elements which affect the coefficient, determined in accordance with the rule set forth should be considered, and the necessary correction, having regard to the special circumstances of the case, introduced. Among the cases that have from time to time come under notice are the following:—

¶ *Vessel having a cellular bottom, throughout, or floors of greater depth than those usually fitted.*—In such a case the coefficient as determined from the under-deck tonnage is in most instances slightly greater than it would be if the vessel were framed on the ordinary transverse system with floors of the usual depth. No general rule can be given for guidance, but it is not difficult, if the depth and slope of the top of the cellular bottom or floor be compared on the midship section with the depth and slope of an ordinary floor, to determine very closely the amount of the correction necessary.

¶ *Vessel constructed with floors of the ordinary kind, but until a cellular bottom for a part of the length amidships under the engines and boilers.*—In such a case the registered under-deck tonnage is smaller than it would be if the vessel were framed with ordinary floors throughout, the difference being the tonnage of the space between the top of the cellular bottom in the part amidships, and the level of the ordinary floor. The depth of hold is also measured by the customs officials to the top of the cellular bottom, and this depth is inserted in the register. Under such circumstances, in order to arrive at the coefficient of fineness the vessel would have if built on the ordinary system throughout, and for which the tables are framed, the tonnage of the volume between the top of the cellular bottom and the level of the

ordinary floor should be calculated and added to the registered under-deck tonnage. The tonnage so corrected used in conjunction with the depth of hold to the top of the ordinary floor, gives the coefficient to be used in the Tables.

Vessel constructed with a cellular bottom throughout the fore and after holds, but with floors of the ordinary kind fitted for a part of the length amidships under the engines and boilers.—In such a case the tonnage of the space between the top of the ordinary floors in the part amidships, and the top of the cellular bottom, if made continuous, should be estimated, and deducted from the registered under-deck tonnage, and the remainder employed in conjunction with the depth of hold to the top of the cellular bottom in determining the coefficient of fineness.

Other cases may in practice arise in which the registered under-deck tonnage, or the registered depth of hold, or both, require modification before being used in the determination of the coefficient of fineness, but little difficulty will be experienced in making the necessary correction, if it be remembered that the coefficient sought is the coefficient the vessel would have if framed on the ordinary transverse system.

- *Moulded Depth.*—The moulded depth of an iron or steel vessel, as given in the Tables, is the perpendicular depth taken from the top of the upper deck beam at side, at the middle of the length of the vessel, to the top of the keel and the bottom of the frame at the middle line, except in spar and awning deck vessels, in which the depth is measured from the top of the *main* deck beams. In wooden and composite vessels the moulded depth is taken to be the perpendicular depth from the top of the upper deck beam at the side of the vessel amidships to the lower edge of the rabbet of the keel.

The form at the lower part of the midship transverse section of many wooden and composite vessels being of a hollow character, as in cases where thick garboard strakes are fitted, the moulded depth in such instances should be measured from the point where the line of the flat of the bottom continued cuts the keel.

- *Freeboard.*—The moulded depth, taken as above described, is that used in the tables for ascertaining the amount of reserve buoyancy and corresponding freeboard in vessels having a wood deck, and the freeboard is measured from the top of the wood deck at side, at the middle of the length of the vessel. On the same principle, in *flush-deck* vessels, other than spar or awning decked, and in vessels fitted with short poop and forecastle, having an iron upper deck, not covered with wood, the usual thickness of a wood deck should be deducted from the moulded depth of the vessel measured as above, and the amount of reserve buoyancy and corresponding freeboard taken from the column in the tables corresponding with this diminished moulded depth: *Example*—In a steamer fitted with an iron upper deck, not covered with wood, and having a moulded depth of 19 ft. 10 ins., four inches, or the usual thickness of a wood deck, must be deducted from this, leaving a depth of 19 ft. 6 ins. The freeboard of such a vessel with a coefficient of fineness of 0.76, taken from the column under 19 ft. 6 ins., is 3 ft. 8½ ins., which should be measured from the top of the iron upper deck.

In spar-deck vessels having iron spar decks, and in awning-deck vessels having iron main decks, the freeboard required by the Tables should be measured as if those decks were wood covered. Also in vessels where 7/10 ths, or more, of the main deck is covered by substantial erections, the freeboard found from the Tables should be measured amidships from a wood deck, whether the deck be of wood or iron. In applying this principle to vessels having shorter lengths of substantial enclosed erections the reduction in freeboard in consideration of its being measured from the iron deck, is to be regulated in proportion to the length of the deck covered by such erections. Thus in a vessel having erections covering 6/10 ths of the length, the reduction is -6/10 ths of 3½ inches, or 2 inches.

- For vessels which trim very much by the stern, through the engines being fitted aft, the freeboard, as ascertained from the Tables if set off amidships would not cut off the amount of surplus buoyancy deemed necessary, and in such cases the suitable freeboard amidships could only be determined after full information is obtained regarding the vessel's trim.
- The following example will illustrate the *general* application of the Tables:—

In a steamer of the following dimensions, viz., length 204 ft.; breadth extreme, 29 ft.; depth of hold 16.0 ft.; registered tonnage under deck, 682 tons; and *moulded* depth, 17.0 ft., the under deck capacity in cubic feet is 68,200; by dividing this by 94,656, that is, the product of the length, breadth, and depth of hold, the quotient is 0.72, or the coefficient of fineness.

If we now refer to Table A at 17.0 ft. moulded depth, and trace the line opposite the coefficient 0.72 to the column corresponding with this depth, it is found that the winter freeboard given for a *first-class steam vessel without erections*, whose length is twelve times the moulded depth, is 2 ft. 11 ins., corresponding with a reserve buoyancy of 25 per cent, of the total bulk.

- *Vessels of Extreme Proportions.*—For vessels whose length is greater or less than that of the vessel of the same moulded depth for which the Tables are framed, the freeboard should be increased or diminished as

specified in the footnote to the Tables. Thus, if the vessel in the example clause 8 were 224 ft. long, the winter freeboard required would be 2 ft. 11 ins. plus 2 ins. or 3 ft. 1 in. For steam vessels with top-gallant forecastles, having long poops or raised quarter decks connected with bridge-houses, the whole extending over 6/10 ths, or more, of the length of the vessel, the correction for length should be one-half that specified in Tables A.

- *Breadth and Depth.*—In framing the Tables it has been assumed that the relation between the breadth and depth is such as to ensure safety at sea with the freeboard assigned when the vessel is laden with homogeneous cargo; for vessels of less relative breadth, the freeboard should be so increased as to provide a sufficient range of stability, or other means adopted to secure the same.
- *Erections on Deck.*—For steam vessels with topgallant forecastles having long poops, or raised quarter decks connected with bridge-houses, covering in the engine and boiler openings, the latter being entered from the top, and having an efficiently constructed iron bulkhead at the fore end, a deduction may be made from the reserve buoyancy given in the Tables, according to the following scale:—
 ¶When the combined length of the poop, or raised quarter-deck, bridge-house, and top-gallant forecastle is—
 9/10 ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 85 per cent, of the reduction in the reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck, or 85/100 ths of the difference between freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer), and Tables C.
 8/10 ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 75 per cent, of the reduction in the reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck, or 75/100 ths of the difference between freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer), and Tables C.
 7/10 ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 63 per cent, of the reduction in the reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck, or 63/100 ths of the difference between freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer), and Tables C.
 6/10 ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 50 per cent, of the reduction in the reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck, or 50/100 ths of the difference between freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer), and Tables C.

When the engine and boiler openings are protected only by a long raised quarter-deck, a less reduction in freeboard will be allowed.

- For intermediate lengths of erections the amount of the reduction in freeboard should be ascertained by interpolation.
- The above scale of allowance is prepared for vessels having long poops or raised quarter decks 4 ft. high or above. For raised quarter decks of less height, extending over four-tenths of the length, and forming an integral portion of the vessel, the amount of the allowance should be diminished, as shown in the following table:—

Moulded Depth of Vessel in Feet.		Height of raised Quarter Deck.		ft.		in.		ft.		in.		ft.		in.																							
10	0	12	0	14	0	16	0	18	0	20	0	22	0	ft.	in.	ins.	ins.	ins.	ins.	ins.	ins.	3	6	—	½	½	½	¾	¾	3	0	½	¾	1	1	1¼	1½
13¼	2	6	1	1¼	1½	1¾	2	2½	3	2	0	1½	1¾	2¼	2¾	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	6	2	2½	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		

- For shorter lengths of raised quarter-deck a proportionate increase should be made.
- It is to be understood in the application of this scale of allowance for erections on deck to vessels with long poops or with raised quarter-decks, and bridge-houses combined, that the deduction is a maximum deduction, applicable only to vessels of these types in which the erections are of a most substantial character, the deck openings most effectually protected, and the crew are either berthed in the bridge house, or the arrangements to enable them to get backwards and forwards from their quarters are of a satisfactory character. For other vessels of the same class the amount of the deduction should be fixed only after a careful survey. Also such vessels when employed in the Atlantic trade will require to have specially provided greater freeboard than that given in the Tables.
- A sufficient number of clearing ports, as large as practicable, and with shutters properly hung, should be formed in the bulwarks of these vessels, between the forecastle and the bridge-house for the purpose of speedily clearing this part of the deck of water.
- When the erections on a vessel consist of a top-gallant forecastle, a short poop having an efficient bulkhead, and bridge-house disconnected, the latter in steamers covering the engine and boiler openings, and being efficiently enclosed with an iron bulkhead at each end, a deduction may be made from the reserve buoyancy given in the Tables according to the following scale:—
 ¶When the combined length of the erections is—
 5/10ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 40 per cent, of the reduction in reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck or 2/5 th of the difference between the freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer and length) and Tables C (after correction for length).

- $\frac{4}{10}$ ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 33 per cent, of the reduction in reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck or $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of the difference between the freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer and length) and Tables C (after correction for length).
- When the erections on a vessel consist of a top-gallant forecastle and bridge-house only, the latter in steamers covering the engine and boiler openings, and being efficiently enclosed with an iron bulkhead at each end, a deduction may be made from the reserve buoyancy given in the Tables according to the following scale:—
 - When the combined length of the erections is—
 - $\frac{4}{10}$ ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 30 per cent, of the reduction in reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck or $\frac{3}{10}$ th of the difference between the freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer and length) and Tables C (after correction for length).
 - $\frac{3}{10}$ ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 25 per cent, of the reduction in reserve buoyancy allowed for a complete awning deck or th of the difference between the freeboards in Tables A (after correction for sheer and length) and Tables C (after correction for length).
 - When the erections on a vessel consist of a short poop and top-gallant forecastle only, the former enclosed at the fore-end with an efficient bulkhead, the deduction from the reserve buoyancy given in the tables should be according to the following scale:—
 - When the combined length of the erections is—
 - $\frac{3}{8}$ ths of the length of the vessel, deduct 8 per cent. of the reserve buoyancy or 10 per cent, of the freeboard required for the vessel flush decked after correction for length;
 - $\frac{2}{8}$ ths of the length of the vessel, deduct, 6 per cent, of the reserve buoyancy or 8 per cent, of the freeboard required for the vessel flush decked after correction for length; and so on in proportion.
 - When a vessel is fitted with a topgallant forecastle only, the reduction in reserve buoyancy should be one-half that prescribed by the previous paragraph for the case where, in addition to the forecastle, the vessel is fitted with a poop of the same length.
 - *Sheer.*—The Tables are framed for vessels having a mean sheer of deck *measured at the side*, as shown in the following Table.

Length over which Sheer is measured. ————100 150 200 250 300 350 400 Mean Sheer in Inches over the Length specified. Flush-deck vessels—Sheer to be measured abreast stem and stern post. 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 Vessels having short poops and forecastles.—Sheer to be measured at points distant $\frac{1}{8}$ th the length of the vessel from each end. 14 18 22 26 30 31 38 Vessels having short forecastles only.—Sheer to be measured abreast the stern post and at a point distant $\frac{1}{8}$ th the length from the stem. $14\frac{1}{2}$ $18\frac{1}{2}$ 23 27 31 $35\frac{1}{2}$ 40

- In flush - deck vessels and in vessels to which clauses 11 and 12 apply, when the sheer of deck is greater or less than the above, *and is of a gradual character*, divide the difference in inches between it and the mean sheer provided for by 4, and the result in inches is the amount by which the freeboard amidships should be diminished or increased according as the sheer is greater or less.
- In vessels having short poops and forecastles, and in those having short forecastles only, the freeboard should be corrected in respect of the excess of or deficiency in reserve buoyancy due to variations in sheer from the standard amount over the length uncovered by substantial erections, as provided in the above Table. One-fourth the difference between the mean sheer specified and that measured as described, is approximately the amount by which the freeboard should be modified in respect of sheer.
- The divisor 4 is to be used when the sheer is *of a gradual character*, and is not strictly applicable either to those cases in which the sheer is suddenly increased at the bow or stern, or to those in which it does not maintain its normal rate of increase to the ends of the vessel.
- In all cases the rise in sheer forward and aft is measured with reference to the deck at the middle of the length, and where the lowest point of the sheer is abaft the middle of the length, one-half of the difference between the sheer amidships and the lowest point, should be added to the freeboard specified in the Tables for flush-deck vessels, and for vessels having short poops and forecastles only.
- Where, as in some instances, vessels fitted with long poops or raised quarter decks connected with bridge houses have the deck line rising rapidly from amidships to the front of the bridge, and from that point onwards gradually approaching the normal sheer line, the freeboard may be slightly modified in consideration of the increase of height of deck in the "well."
- In flush-deck vessels and in vessels having short poops and forecastles the excess of sheer for which an allowance is made shall not exceed one-half the total standard mean sheer for the size of ship.
- No decrease should be made in the freeboard of spar and awning deck vessels, in respect of excess of sheer.
- *Round of Beam.*—In calculating the reserve of buoyancy, an allowance has been made of one-quarter of an inch for every foot of the length of the midship beam for the round up. When the round of the beam in

flush-decked vessels is greater or less than given by this rule, divide the difference in inches by 2, and diminish or increase the freeboard by this amount. For vessels with erections on deck the amount of the allowance should depend on the extent of the main deck uncovered. This rule for round of beam does not apply to spar or awning deck vessels.

- As a general illustration of the way in which the Tables should be used in modifying the freeboard on account of erections on deck, extreme proportions and variations in sheer, the following may be taken as an example.

A vessel is 234 ft. long, 29 ft. broad, and has a moulded depth of 17.0 ft., the coefficient of fineness being .72. Suppose the vessel to have a poop and bridge house of the united length of 121 ft., and a forecastle 20 ft. in length, and let the sheer forward, measured at the side, be 4ft. 6 ins., and aft 2 ft. 1 in.

The combined length of the erections is $14\frac{1}{2}$ ths or $\frac{6}{10}$ ths of the length of the vessel, and the allowance for erections under clause 11 will be therefore $\frac{5}{10}$ ths of 17 ins., or $8\frac{1}{2}$ ins.

That is $10\frac{1}{2}$ ins. to be deducted from 2 ft. 11 ins., leaving a winter freeboard of 2 ft. $0\frac{1}{2}$ in. Corresponding summer freeboard 1 ft. $10\frac{1}{2}$ in.

19. Vessels loaded in fresh water may have less freeboard than that given in the several Tables according to the following scale:—

Reduction in Freeboard.	Moulded Depth in Feet.	Vessels without erections on Deck.	Spar and Awning Deck Vessels.
ins. ins.	9 and under 11	---	2 — 11 and 13
		----	2½ — 13 and 16
		-----	3 ¾ 16 and 19
		-----	4 4½ 19 and 22
		-----	4½ 22 and 25
		-----	5 5½ 25 and 28
		-----	5½ 28 and 31
		-----	6 31 and 34
			6 ½

MEMO.—The weight of a cubic foot of salt water is taken, in the above Table, to be 64 lbs., and that of fresh water 62.5 lbs.

TABLES A. TABLES of FREEBOARD for FIRST-CLASS CARGO-CARRYING STEAM VESSELS not having SPAR or AWNING DECKS.

TABLE A. Cargo-Carrying Steam Vessels not Having Spar or Awning Decks.

(For allowances admitted in vessels having erections on deck, see "Explanation")

TABLE OF RESERVE BUOYANCY AND FREEBOARD FOR FIRST-CLASS SEAGOING IRON AND STEEL STEAM VESSELS. (In Salt Water.)

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.)	22.0	22.2	22.4	22.6	22.8
23.0	23.2	23.4	CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.)	Measured from Top of Deck at Side.	Moulded Depth and Length.
ft. in.	ft. in.	ft. in.	ft. in.	ft. in.	ft. in.
10	0	10	6	11	0
11	6	12	0	12	6
13	0	13	6	ft. ft.	ft. ft.
120	126	132	138	144	150
156	162	ft. in.	ft. in.	ft. in.	ft. in.
.68	1	4	1	5	1
6	7½	1	8½	1	9½
1	11	2	0	.70	1
4	1	5	1	6	1
7½	1	8½	1	9½	1
1	11	2	0½	.72	1
4½	1	5½	1	6½	1
8	1	9	1	10	1
11½	2	1	.74	1	4½
1	5½	1	6½	1	8
1	9	1	10	1	11½
2	1	.76	1	5	1
6	1	7	1	8½	1
9½	1	10½	2	0	2
1½	.78	1	5	1	6
1	6	1	7	1	8½
1	9½	1	11	2	0½
2	2	.80	1	5½	1
6½	1	7½	1	9	1
10	1	11½	2	1	2
2½	.82	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.84	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.86	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.88	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.90	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.92	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.94	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.96	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	.98	1	5½	1	6½
1	7½	1	9	1	10
1	11½	2	1	2	2½
2	1.00				

Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 1 1 1 1 1 1 1½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.) 23.6 23.8 24.0 24.2 24.5

24.7 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 14 0 14 6 15 0 15 6 16 0 16 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. 168 174 180 186 192 198 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 2 1½ 2 3 2 4 2 5½ 2 7 2 8½ .70 2 1½ 2 3 2 4½ 2 6 2 7½ 2 9 .72 2 2 2 3½ 2 5 2 6½ 2 8 2 9½ .74 2 2½ 2 4 2 5½ 2 7 2 8½ 2 10 .76 2 3 2 4½ 2 6 2 7½ 2 9 2 10½ .78 2 3 2 4½ 2 6 2 7½ 2 9 2 11 .80 2 3½ 2 5 2 6½ 2 8 2 9½ 2 11½ .82 2 4 2 5½ 2 7 2 8½ 2 10 3 0 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft in the length. } 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 1½ 1½ 1½ 1½ 1½ 2 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 3 3 3 3 3 3

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.) 25.0 25.2 25.5 25.7 26.0 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 17 0 17 6 18 0 18 6 19 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. 204 210 216 222 228 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 2 10 2 11½ 3 1 3 2½ 3 4 .70 2 10½ 3 0 3 1½ 3 3 3 4½ .72 2 11 3 0½ 3 2 3 3½ 3 5½ .74 2 11½ 3 1 3 2½ 3 4 3 6 .76 3 0 3 1½ 3 3 3 5 3 6½ .78 3 0½ 3 2 3 4 3 5½ 3 7½ .80 3 1 3 2½ 3 4½ 3 6 3 8 .82 3 1½ 3 3 3 5 3 6½ 3 8½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 2 2 2 2 2 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 3 3 3 3½ 3½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive.

PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.) 26.2 26.5 26.7 27.0 27.3 27.5 Coefficient CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) of Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Fineness. Moulded Depth and Length. ft in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 19 6 20 0 20 6 21 0 21 6 22 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. 234 240 246 252 258 264 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 3 5½ 3 7½ 3 9 3 11 4 0½ 4 2½ .70 3 6½ 3 8 3 10 3 11½ 4 1½ 4 3½ .72 3 7 3 8½ 3 10½ 4 0 4 2 4 4 .74 3 8 3 9½ 3 11½ 4 1 4 3 4 5 .76 3 8½ 3 10 4 0 4 1½ 4 3½ 4 5½ .78 3 9½ 3 11 4 1 4 2½ 4 4½ 4 6½ .80 3 10 3 11½ 4 1½ 4 3 4 5 4 7 .82 3 10½ 4 0 4 2 4 3½ 4 5½ 4 7½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.1 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 2½ 2½ 2½ 2½ 2½ 2½ Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 3½ 3½ 3½ 3½ 4 4

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.) 27.8 28.1 28.3 28.6 28.9 29.2 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 22 6 23 0 23 6 24 0 24 6 25 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. 270 276 282 288 294 300 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 4 4½ 4 6½ 4 8½ 4 10½ 5 1 5 3½ .70 4 5½ 4 7½ 4 9½ 4 11½ 5 1½ 5 4 .72 4 6 4 8 4 10 5 0 5 2½ 5 5 .74 4 7½ 4 9 4 11 5 1 5 3 5 5½ .76 4 7½ 4 9½ 4 11½ 5 1½ 5 4 5 6½ .78 4 8½ 4 10½ 5 0½ 5 2½ 5 4½ 5 7 .80 4 9 4 11 5 1 5 3 5 5½ 5 8 .82 4 9½ 4 11½ 5 2 5 4 5 6½ 5 9 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.2 1.2 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 3 3 3 3 3 3½ Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 4 4 4 4 4 4½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.) 29.5 29.8 30.1 30.4 30.8
 31.1 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Deck
 at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 25 6 26 0 26 6 27 0 27 6 28 0 ft. ft. ft.
 ft. ft. ft. 306 312 318 324 330 336 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 5 5½ 5 8 5 10 6 0½ 6 3 6 5½ .70 5 6
 5 8½ 5 10½ 6 1 6 3½ 6 6½ .72 5 7 5 9½ 5 11½ 6 2 6 4½ 6 7½ .74 5 7½ 5 10 6 0½ 6 3 6 5½ 6 8½ .76 5 8½ 5 11
 6 1½ 6 4 6 6½ 6 9½ .78 5 9 5 11½ 6 2 6 4½ 6 7 6 10 .80 5 10 6 0½ 6 3 6 5½ 6 8 6 11 .82 5 11 6 1½ 6 4 6 6½ 6
 9 7 0 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 Deduction in inches for
 Summer Voyages. } 3½ 3½ 3½ 4 4 4 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 4½ 4½ 4½ 4½ 4½ 5

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.) 31.5 31.8 32.2 32.5 32.8
 33.2 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Deck
 at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 28 6 29 0 29 6 30 0 30 6 31 0 ft. ft. ft.
 ft. ft. ft. 342 348 354 360 366 372 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 6 8 6 10½ 7 1 7 3½ 7 6½ 7 9 .70 6 9
 7 0 7 2½ 7 5 7 8 7 10½ .72 6 10 7 1 7 3½ 7 6 7 9 7 11½ .74 6 11 7 2 7 4½ 7 7 7 10 8 0½ .76 7 0 7 3 7 5½ 7 8 7
 11 8 1½ .78 7 1 7 4 7 7 7 9½ 8 0½ 8 3 .80 7 2 7 5 7 8 7 10½ 8 1½ 8 4 .82 7 3 7 6 7 9 7 11½ 8 2½ 8 5 Correction
 in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.6 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages.
 } 4 4½ 4½ 4½ 5 5 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 5 5 5 5 5½ 5½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognized summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY.—(Winter.) 33.5 33.8 34.1 34.4 34.7
 35.0 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Deck
 at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 31 6 32 0 32 6 33 0 33 6 34 0 ft. ft. ft.
 ft. ft. ft. 378 384 390 396 402 408 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 8 0 8 2½ 8 5 8 7½ 8 10½ 9 1 .70 8
 1½ 8 4 8 6½ 8 9 9 0 9 2½ .72 8 2½ 8 5 8 7½ 8 10 9 1 9 3½ .74 8 3½ 8 6 8 9 8 11½ 9 2½ 9 5 .76 8 4½ 8 7 8 10 9
 0½ 9 3½ 9 6 .78 8 6 8 8½ 8 11½ 9 2 9 5 9 7½ .80 8 7 8 9½ 9 0½ 9 3 9 6 9 8½ .82 8 8 8 10½ 9 1½ 9 4 9 7 9 10
 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.6 1.7 1.7 Deduction in inches for
 Summer Voyages. } 5 5 5½ 5½ 5½ 6 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 5½ 5½ 6 6 6 6

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognized summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

TABLES B. TABLES of FREEBOARD for FIRST-CLASS CARGO-CARRYING SPAR DECK VESSELS.

TABLE B. Cargo-Carrying Spar Deck Vessels.

TABLE OF FREEBOARD TO SPAR DECK FOR

LASS SEA-GOING SPAR DECK STEAM VESSELS. (In Salt Water.)

Coefficient of Fineness. HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.)* Measured from Top of Spar Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 16 0 16 6 17 0 17 6 18 0 18 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 276 282 288 294 300 306 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 5 11 6 0 6 1½ 6 2½ 6 4 6 5½ .70 5 11½ 6 0½ 6 2 6 3½ 6 5 6 6½ .72 6 0 6 1 6 2½ 6 4 6 5½ 6 7 .74 6 0½ 6 1½ 6 3 6 4½ 6 6 6 7½ .76 6 1 6 2 6 3½ 6 5 6 6½ 6 8 .78 6 1½ 6 2½ 6 4 6 5½ 6 7 6 8½ .80 6 2 6 3 6 4½ 6 6 6 7½ 6 9 .82 6 2½ 6 3½ 6 5 6 6½ 6 8 6 9½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 2½ 2½ 3 3 3 3 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 3½ 3½ 4 4 4 4 *

These tables apply to spar deck vessels in which the height at side between the main and spar decks is 7 ft. from top of beam to top of beam; when this height is greater or less than 7 ft. the freeboard to the spar deck will require modification.

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.)* Measured from Top of Spar Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 19 0 19 6 20 0 20 6 21 0 21 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 312 318 324 330 336 342 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 6 7½ 6 9 6 11 7 0½ 7 2½ 7 4½ .70 6 8½ 6 10 7 0 7 1½ 7 3½ 7 5½ .72 6 9 6 10½ 7 0½ 7 2 7 4 7 6 .74 6 9½ 6 11 7 1 7 3 7 5 7 7 .76 6 10 6 11½ 7 1½ 7 3½ 7 5½ 7 7½ .78 6 10½ 7 0 7 2 7 4 7 6 7 8 .80 6 11 7 0½ 7 2½ 7 4½ 7 6½ 7 8½ .82 6 11½ 7 1 7 3 7 5 7 7 7 9 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.2 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 3½ 3½ 3½ 4 4 4 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 4½ 4½ 4½ 4½ 5 5

Coefficient of Fineness. HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Spar Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 22 0 22 6 23 0 23 6 24 0 24 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 348 354 360 366 372 378 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 7 7 7 9 7 11½ 8 2 8 4½ 8 7 .70 7 8 7 10 8 0½ 8 3 8 5½ 8 8 .72 7 8½ 7 10½ 8 1 8 3½ 8 6 8 8½ .74 7 9½ 7 11½ 8 2 8 4½ 8 7 8 9½ .76 7 10 8 0 8 2½ 8 5 8 7½ 8 10 .78 7 10½ 8 0½ 8 3 8 5½ 8 8 8 11 .80 7 11 8 1 8 3½ 8 6 8 8½ 8 11½ .82 7 11½ 8 1½ 8 4 8 7 8 9½ 9 0½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.3 1.3 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 4½ 4½ 4½ 5 5 5 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 5 5 5 5½ 5½ 5½ * These tables apply to spar deck vessels in which the height at side between the main and spar decks is 7 ft. from top of beam to top of beam; when this height is greater or less than 7 ft. the freeboard to the spar deck will require modification.

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Spar Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 25 0 25 6 26 0 26 6 27 0 27 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 384 390 396 402 408 414 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. '68 8 9½ 9 0 9 2½ 9 5½ 9 8 9 11 .70 8 10½ 9 1 9 3½ 9 6½ 9 9 10 0 .72 8 11 9 2 9 4½ 9 7½ 9 10 10 1 .74 9 0 9 3 9 5½ 9 8½ 9 11 10 2 .76 9 0½ 9 3½ 9 6 9 9 10 0 10 3 .78 9 1½ 9 4½ 9 7 9 10 10 1 10 4 .80 9 2 9 5 9 7½ 9 10½ 10 1½ 10 4½ .82 9 3 9 6 9 8½ 9 11½ 10 2½ 10 5½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 5½ 5½ 5½ 5½ 6 6 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 5½ 5½ 6 6 6 6 * These tables apply to spar deck vessels in which the height at side between the main and spar decks is 7 ft. from top of beam to top of beam; when this height is greater or less than 7 ft. the freeboard to the spar deck will require modification.

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.)* Measured from Top of Spar Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 28 0 28 6 29 0 29 6 30 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. 420 426 432 438 444 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .68 10 2 10 5 10 8½ 10 11½ 11 3 .70 10 3 10 6 10 9½ 11 0½ 11 4 .72 10 4 10 7 10 10½ 11 1½ 11 5 .74 10 5 10 8 10 11½ 11 2½ 11 6 .76 10 6 10 9 11 0½ 11 3½ 11 7 .78 10 7 10 10 11 1½ 11 4½ 11 8 .80 10 7½ 10 10½ 11 2 11 5½ 11 9 .82 10 8½ 10 11½ 11 3 11 6½ 11 10 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. }1.4 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. }6 6 6½ 6½ 6½ Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. }6 6 6½ 6½ 6½ * These tables apply to spar deck vessels in which the height at side between the main and spar decks is 7 ft. from top of beam to top of beam; when this height is greater or less than 7 ft. the freeboard to the spar deck will require modification.

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

TABLES C. TABLES of FREEBOARD for FIRST-CLASS CARGO-CARRYING AWNING DECK VESSELS.

TABLE C. Cargo-Carrying Awning Deck Vessels.

TABLE OF RESERVE BUOYANCY AND FREEBOARD FOR FIRST-CLASS SEA-GOING AWNING DECK STEAM VESSELS. (In Salt Water.)

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY TO MAIN DECK.—(Winter.) 15.0 15.1 15.2 15.3 15.4 15.5 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured from Top of Main Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 14 0 14 6 15 0 15 6 16 0 16 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 168 174 180 186 192 198 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .66 1 0 1 0½ 1 1 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ .68 1 0 1 0½ 1 1 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ .70 1 0½ 1 1 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ 1 3 .72 1 0½ 1 1 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ 1 3 1 4 .74 1 1 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ 1 3 1 3½ .76 1 1 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ 1 3½ 1 4 .78 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ 1 3 1 4 1 4½ .80 1 1½ 1 2 1 2½ 1 3 1 4 1 4½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } .5 .5 .5 .5 .5 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 2 2 2 2 2 2½ Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 3 3 3 3 3 3½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognized summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States,

north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY TO MAIN DECK.—(Winter.) 15.7
15.8 16.0 16.2 16.4 16.7 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured
from Top of Main Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
in. 17 0 17 6 18 0 18 6 19 0 19 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 204 210 216 222 228 234 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
.66 1 3½ 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 7 1 8 .68 1 3½ 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 7 1 8 .70 1 4 1 4½ 1 5½ 1 6½ 1 7½ 1 8½ .72 1 4½ 1 5 1 6 1 7
1 8 1 9 .74 1 4½ 1 5 1 6 1 7 1 8½ 1 9 .76 1 5 1 1 6½ 1 ½ 1 8½ 1 9½ .78 1 5½ 1 6 1 7 1 8 1 9 1 10 .80 1 5½ 1 6 1
7 1 8 1 9 1 10 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } .5 .5 .6 .6 .6 Deduction in inches for
Summer Voyages. } 2½ 2½ 2½ 3 3 3 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 3½ 3½ 3½ 3½ 4 4

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognized summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY TO MAIN DECK.—(Winter.) 16.9
17.2 17.4 17.7 18.0 18.3 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured
from Top of Main Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
in. 20 0 20 6 21 0 21 6 22 0 22 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 240 246 252 258 264 270 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
.60 1 9 1 10½ 1 11½ 2 1 2 2 2 3½ .68 1 9 1 10½ 1 11½ 2 1 2 2½ 2 4 .70 1 9½ 1 11 2 0 2 1½ 2 3 2 4½ .72 1 10 1
11½ 2 0½ 2 2 2 3½ 2 5 .74 1 10 1 11½ 2 0½ 2 2 2 3½ 2 5 .76 1 10½ 2 0 2 1 2 2½ 2 4 2 5½ .78 1 11 2 0½ 2 1½
2 3 2 4½ 2 6 .80 1 11½ 2 1 2 2 2 3½ 2 5 2 6½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } .6 .6 .6
.6 .6 .6 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 3½ 3½ 3½ 3½ 4 4 Addition in inches for Winter. North
Atlantic. } 4 4 4 4½ 4½ 4½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognized summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY TO MAIN DECK.—(Winter.) 18.6
18.9 19.2 19.6 19.9 20.3 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured
from Top of Main Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
in. 23 0 23 6 24 0 24 6 25 0 25 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 276 282 288 294 300 306 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
.66 2 5 2 6½ 2 8 2 10 3 0 3 2 .68 2 5½ 2 7 2 8½ 2 10½ 3 0½ 3 2½ .70 2 6 2 7½ 2 9 2 11 3 1 3 3 ?72 2 6½ 2 8 2
9½ 2 11½ 3 1½ 3 3½ .74 2 6½ 2 8 2 10 3 0 3 2 3 4 .76 2 7 2 8½ 2 10½ 3 0½ 3 2½ 3 4½ .78 2 7½ 2 9 2 11 3 1 3
3 3 5 .80 2 8 2 9½ 2 11½ 3 1½ 3 3½ 3 5½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } .6 .6 .6 .7 .7
.7 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 4 4½ 4½ 4½ 5 5 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic.
} 4½ 4½ 5 5 5 5

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognized summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY TO MAIN DECK.—(Winter.) 20.6
21.0 21.4 21.9 22.3 22.8 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured
from Top of Main Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
in. 26 0 26 6 27 0 27 6 28 0 28 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 312 318 324 330 336 342 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
.66 3 4 3 6½ 3 9 3 11½ 4 2 4 4½ .68 3 4½ 3 7 3 9½ 4 0 4 2½ 4 5 .70 3 5 3 7½ 3 10 4 0½ 4 3 4 5½ .72 3 5½ 3 8
3 10½ 4 1 4 3½ 4 6½ .74 8 6 3 8½ 3 11 4 1½ 4 4 4 7 .76 3 7 3 9½ 4 0 4 2½ 4 5 4 7½ .78 3 7½ 3 10 4 0½ 4 3 4
5½ 4 8 .80 3 8 3 10½ 4 1 4 3½ 4 6 4 8½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } .7 .7 .7 .7 .7 .7
Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 5 5½ 5½ 5½ 6 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic.
} 5½ 5½ 5½ 5½ 5½ 6

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY TO MAIN DECK.—(Winter.) 23.3
23.8 24.3 24.7 25.2 25.6 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured
from Top of Main Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
in. 29 0 29 6 30 0 30 6 31 0 31 6 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 348 354 360 366 372 378 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in.
.66 4 7 4 9½ 5 0 5 2½ 5 5½ 5 8 .68 4 7½ 4 10 5 1 5 3½ 5 6½ 5 9 .70 4 8 4 10½ 5 1½ 5 4 5 7 5 9½ .72 4 9 4 11½
5 2½ 5 5 5 8 5 10½ .74 4 9½ 5 0 5 3 5 5½ 5 8½ 5 11 .76 4 10 5 1 5 4 5 6½ 5 9½ 6 0 .78 4 10½ 5 1½ 5 4½ 5 7 5
10 6 0½ .80 4 11 5 2 5 5 5 7½ 5 10½ 6 1 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } .7 .8 .8 .8 .8
.8 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 6 6 6 6 6 6½ Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 6 6
6 6 6 6½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY TO MAIN DECK.—(Winter.) 26.1
26.5 27.0 27.5 28.0 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS.—(Winter.) Measured
from Top of Main Deck at Side. Moulded Depth (to Main Deck) and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 32 0
32 6 33 0 33 6 34 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 384 390 396 402 408 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .66 5 11 6 1½ 6 4½ 6 7 6
10 .68 6 0 6 2½ 6 5½ 6 8 6 11 .70 6 0½ 6 3 6 6 6 8½ 6 11½ .72 6 1½ 6 4 6 7 6 9½ 7 0½ .74 6 2 6 4½ 6 7½ 6 10 7
1 .76 6 3 6 5½ 6 8½ 6 11 7 2 .78 6 3½ 6 6 6 9 6 11½ 7 2½ .80 6 4 6 7 6 9½ 7 0½ 7 3½ Correction in inches for a
change of 10 ft. in the length. } .8 .8 .8 .8 .8 Deduction in inches for Summer Voyages. } 6½ 6½ 6½ 6½ 6½
Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 6½ 6½ 6½ 6½ 6½

The above reduction in freeboard for summer voyages from European and Mediterranean Ports is to be made from April to September inclusive. In other parts of the world the reduced freeboard should be used during the corresponding or recognised summer months. The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean, or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive. Double the above reduction to be allowed for voyages in the fine season in the Indian seas, between the limits of Suez and Singapore.

TABLES, D. TABLES OF FREEBOARD for FIRST-CLASS IRON, STEEL, COMPOSITE, AND WOOD SAILING VESSELS.

TABLE D. Sailing Vessels.

TABLE OF RESERVE BUOYANCY AND FREEBOARD FOR FIRST-CLASS SEA. GOING IRON AND STEEL SAILING VESSELS AND COMPOSITE AND WOOD

ESSELS OF THE HIGHEST CLASS. (In Salt Water.)

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. (Iron Vessels.) 23.5 23.7 23.9 24.2 24.4
 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Moulded
 Depth and Length. Wood. Composite. Iron. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 10 0 10 6 11 0 11 6 12 0 ft. ft. ft. ft.
 ft. 100 105 110 115 120 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. — .64 1 5½ 1 6½ 1 7½ 1 9 1 10½ — .64 .66 1 5½ 1
 6½ 1 7½ 1 9 1 10½ — .66 68 1 6 1 7 1 8 1 9½ 1 11 .64 .68 .70 1 6 1 7 1 8½ 1 10 1 11½ .66 .70 .72 1 6½ 1 7½ 1
 9 1 10½ 2 0 .68 .72 .74 1 6½ 1 7½ 1 9 1 10½ 2 0 .70 .74 — 1 7 1 8 1 9½ 1 11 2 0½ .72 — 1 7 1 8½ 1 10 1
 11½ 2 1 Corrections in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } .9 .9 .9 1.0 1.0

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. (Iron Vessels.) 24.6 24.9 25.1v 25.3
 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Wood.
 Composite. Iron Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 12 6 13 0 13 6 14 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. 125 130
 135 140 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. — — .64 1 11½ 2 1 2 2½ 2 3½ — .64 .66 2 0 2 1½ 2 3 2 4 — .66 .68 2 0½ 2 2
 2 3½ 2 4½ .64 .68 .70 2 1 2 2½ 2 4 2 5 .66 .70 .72 2 1½ 2 3 2 4½ 2 5½ .68 .72 .74 2 1½ 2 3 2 4½ 2 6 .70 .74 —
 2 2 2 3½ 2 5 2 6½ .72 — — 2 2½ 2 4 2 5½ 2 7 Correction in inches for a Change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.0
 1.0 1.0 1.0

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. (Iron Vessels.) 25.5 25.7 26.0 26.2
 26.4 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side.
 Moulded Depth and Length. Wood. Composite. Iron. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 14 6 15 0 15 6 16 0 16 6 ft.
 ft. ft. ft. ft. 145 150 155 160 165 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. — — .64 2 5 2 6½ 2 8 2 9½ 2 11 .64 .66 2 5½ 2
 7 2 8½ 2 10 2 11½ — .66 .68 2 6 2 7½ 2 9 2 10½ 3 0 .64 .68 .70 2 6½ 2 8 2 9½ 2 11 3 0½ .66 .70 .72 2 7 2 8½
 2 10 2 11½ 3 1 .68 .72 .74 2 7½ 2 9 2 10½ 3 0 3 1½ .70 .74 — 2 8 2 9½ 2 11 3 0½ 3 2 .72 — — 2 8½ 2 10 2
 11½ 3 1 3 2½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 Addition in inches
 for Winter. North Atlantic. } 3 3 3 3 3

The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the
 Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North
 America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of, and including Baltimore, from October to March
 inclusive.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. (Iron Vessels.) 26.6 26.8 27.1 27.3
 27.5 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side.
 Wood. Composite. Iron. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 17 0 17 6 18 0 18 6 19 0 ft.
 ft. ft. ft. ft. 170 175 180 185 190 - - .64 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 3 0½ 3 2 3 3½ 3 5 3 6½ — .64 .66 3 1 3
 2½ 3 4 3 5½ 3 7 — .66 .68 3 1½ 3 3 3 4½ 3 6 3 7½ .64 .68 .70 3 2 3 3½ 3 5 3 6½ 3 8 .66 .70 .72 3 2½ 3 4 3 5½
 3 7½ 3 9 .68 .72 .74 3 3 3 4½ 3 6 3 8 3 9½ .70 .74 — 3 3½ 3 5 3 6½ 3 8½ 3 10 .72 — — 3 4 3 5½ 3 7 3 9 3
 10½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.2 Addition in inches for Winter.
 North Atlantic. } 3 3½ 3½ 3½ 3½

The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the
 Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North
 America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of, and including Baltimore, from October to March
 inclusive.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. (Iron Vessels.) 27.7 27.9 28.1 28.3
 28.5 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side.
 Moulded Depth and Length. Wood. Composite. Iron. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 19 6 20 0 20 6 21 0 21 6 ft.
 ft. ft. ft. ft. 195 200 205 210 215 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. — — .64 3 8 3 9½ 3 11½ 4 1 4 2½ — .64 .66 3
 8½ 3 10 4 0 4 1½ 4 3½ — .66 .68 3 9 3 11 4 0½ 4 2 4 4 .64 .68 .70 3 9½ 3 11½ 4 1 4 2½ 4 4½ .66 .70 .72 3
 10½ 4 0½ 4 2 4 3½ 4 5½ .68 .72 .74 3 11 4 1 4 2½ 4 4 4 6 .70 .74 — 3 11½ 4 1½ 4 3 4 5 4 6½ .72 — — 4 0 4 2
 4 3½ 4 5½ 4 7½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 Addition in inches
 for Winter. North Atlantic. } 4 4 4 4 4

The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the
 Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North
 America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of, and including Baltimore, from October to March
 inclusive.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. (Iron Vessels.) 28.7 28.9 29.1 29.3
 29.5 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side.
 Wood. Composite. Iron. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 22 0 22 6 23 0 23 6 24 0 ft.
 ft. ft. ft. ft. 220 225 230 235 240 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. — — .64 4 4 4 6 4 7½ 4 9½ 4 11½ — .64 .66 4

5 4 7 4 8½ 4 10 5 0 — .66 .68 4 5½ 4 7½ 4 9 4 11 5 1 .64 .68 .70 4 6 4 8 4 9½ 4 11½ 5 1½ .66 .70 .72 4 7 4 9 4 10½ 5 0½ 5 2½ .68 .72 .74 4 7½ 4 9½ 4 11 5 1 5 3 .70 .74 — 4 8½ 4 10½ 5 0 5 2 5 4 .72 — — 4 9 4 11 5 1 5 3 5 5 Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.2 1.2. 1.3 1.3 1.3 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 4½ 4½ 4½ 4½ 4½

The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of, and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. (Iron Vessels.) 29.7 29.9 30.1 30.3 30.5 30.7 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. Wood. Composite Iron. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 24 6 25 0 25 6 26 0 26 6 27 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. ft. 245 250 255 260 265 270 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. — — .64 5 1½ 5 3½ 5 5½ 5 7½ 5 9½ 5 11½ — .64 .66 5 2 5 4 5 6 5 8 5 10 6 0½ — .66 .68 5 3 5 5 5 7 5 9 5 11 6 1½ .64 .68 .70 5 3½ 5 5½ 5 7½ 5 9½ 5 11½ 6 2 .66 .70 .72 5 4½ 5 6½ 5 8½ 5 10½ 6 0½ 6 3 .68 .72 .74 5 5 5 7 5 9 5 11 6 1 6 3½ .70 .74 — 5 6 5 8 5 10 6 0 6 2 6 4½ .72 — — 5 7 5 9 5 11 6 1 6 3 6 5½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-4 Addition in inches for Winter, North Atlantic. } 5 5 5 5 5½

The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of, and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. 30.9 31.2 31.4 31.7 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. Iron. 27 6 28 0 28 6 29 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. 275 280 285 290 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .64 6 1½ 6 4 6 6 6 8 .66 6 2½ 6 5 6 7 6 9 .68 6 3½ 6 5½ 6 8 6 10 .70 6 4 6 6½ 6 8½ 6 11 .72 6 5 6 7½ 6 9½ 7 0 .74 6 5½ 6 8 6 10 7 0½ .76 6 6½ 6 9 6 11 7 1½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 5½ 5½ 5½ 5½

The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of, and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive.

Coefficient of Fineness. PERCENTAGE RESERVE BUOYANCY. 32.0 32.3 32.6 33.0 CORRESPONDING HEIGHT OF FREEBOARD AMIDSHIPS. Measured from Top of Deck at Side. Iron. Moulded Depth and Length. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. 29 6 80 0 30 6 31 0 ft. ft. ft. ft. 295 300 305 310 ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. ft. in. .64 6 10½ 7 0½ 7 3 7 5 .66 6 11½ 7 1½ 7 4 7 6 .68 7 0½ 7 2½ 7 5 7 7 .70 7 1 7 3½ 7 5½ 7 8 .72 7 2 7 4½ 7 6½ 7 9 .74 7 2½ 7 5 7 7 7 9½ .76 7 3½ 7 6 7 8 7 10½ Correction in inches for a change of 10 ft. in the length. } 1.4 1.5 1.5 1.5 Addition in inches for Winter. North Atlantic. } 6 6 6 6

The additional freeboard specified for the North Atlantic trades is to apply to vessels sailing to, or from, the Mediterranean or any British or European Port, and which may sail to, or from, or call at, Ports in British North America, or eastern Ports in the United States, north of, and including Baltimore, from October to March inclusive.

The following example illustrates the method by which the additional draught of water to which a vessel should be laden in water, partly salt, may be determined:—

A flush deck vessel of 20 feet moulded depth sails from Aberdeen Harbour. To what extent should she be laden beyond the load lino disc?

On referring to page 8 of the Freeboard Tables, it will be seen that this vessel should be laden deeper in *fresh* water than in *salt* to the extent of four inches. Also a cubic foot of fresh water weighs 1,000 ounces, while a cubic foot of the densest sea-water on the British Coast is found to weigh 1,025 ounces, the difference in weight being 25 ounces. The water in Aberdeen Harbour weighs 1,015 ounces per cubic foot, or 10 ounces less than salt water, and, as for a difference of 25 ounces in weight per cubic foot the increased immersion is 4 inches, it will be seen that the increased draught of water with which this vessel should leave Aberdeen Harbour is 10/25 ths of 4 inches, or about 1½ inches.

London: Printed by EYRE and SPOTTIS WOODS, Printers to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty. For Her Majesty's Stationery Office. [9191.—2000.—8/85.]
Annual Meeting of the Cobden Club,
Held at the National Liberal Club, Trafalgar Square, London,
On Saturday, June 27th, 1885.
Special Report for the Club.

Annual Meeting of the Cobden Club.

The annual general meeting of the Cobden Club was held on Saturday afternoon, June 27th, at the National Liberal Club, Trafalgar Square, London. Mr. Thomas Bayley Potter, M.P., honorary secretary, occupied the chair, and there were also present:—The Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P.; Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P.; Mr. William Woodall, M.P.; Mr. W. Summers, M.P.; Mr. John Barran, M.P.; Mr. P. T. Mappin, M.P.; Mr. T. W. Evans, M.P.; the Right Hon. A. S. Ayrton, Mr. J. W. Probyn (hon. treasurer), Mr. Robert C. Adams (Vice-President of the Montreal Free Trade Club), Mr. G. W. Medley, Mr. A. G. Henriques, Mr. C. S. Salmon (formerly President of the Island of St. Nevis), Lieut.-General Gloag, Mr. W. Wren, Mr. E. Oppenheim, Mr. Septimus Vaughan. Morgan, Mr. M. M. Monro, Mr. Edward J. Watherston, Captain W. J. Eastwick, Mr. W. Pirie Duff, Mr. Charles Hancock, Mr. H. M. Phillips, Mr. F. W. Chesson, Mr. William Digby, C.I.E., Mr. Frank Evans, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. Joseph Crooke Haslam, Mr. M. Makower, Mr. Richard Gowing (secretary), &c.

The CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said: The circumstances under which we meet to-day have a peculiar interest to members of the Cobden Club. We had a distinct warning early last Autumn that the great principles of Mr. Cobden, as regards the fiscal policy of the country, were threatened. I, myself, took the alarm when many of my friends thought it was needless; but I felt convinced of the reality of the opposition to Free Trade, and immediately acted on the policy of a determined resistance to any changes which might be intended by the Fair Traders—or Protectionists as they should rightly be called. (Hear, hear.) It was not surprising to me that a great effort should be made by the landed interest to re-impose taxes on food, considering the difficulties under which they have been labouring for some time. They did not take into account the fact that no Protection has been afforded to the suffering industries of commerce. They considered themselves within their right to try to bolster up their own interest without regard to the burdens which they were willing to place on the great masses of the people. In the month of November the Committee of the Cobden Club arrived at the conclusion that the best mode of reaching the masses was neither by speeches nor pamphlets, but by short, telling leaflets, which could be taken home and digested at leisure by the new voters and other electors. I wrote myself to a number of friends, asking them to help in this work, and my letters met with a hearty response, for they realised about £2,500 for the Special Publication Fund. This fund has been, I think, well expended, and nearly eight millions of leaflets have been circulated or are now in preparation. In order to carry out this work the Committee has appealed to new candidates for seats in Parliament, and others who may require a further supply of leaflets, to contribute to the necessary fund, either by purchase of the leaflets or by contributions direct towards the Special Fund. As the General Election is near at hand a further supply of money is absolutely needful. Alluding to the recent change of Government, it is well that the friends of Free Trade should note carefully that there are a great number of the new Ministers who are committed to the policy of interference with our present fiscal system. The names of the Protectionists in that list are ominous. Some may ask for inquiry; others have already demanded a tax on food; the special burdens on land and agriculture are urged by all; the just modification of the death duties was the main object of the attack on the Budget by which the Government was defeated; and practically the Cobden Club has now to meet a strong and determined effort to restore Protection in one form or another. The work of the Cobden Club is to develope, not to narrow, the Free Trade policy. We advocate Free Trade everywhere—at home, in the colonies and dependencies, as well as in foreign countries, when the taxpayers of those countries see their real interest in the question. As for our colonies and dependencies, the day is past when British interests alone are to be considered rather than the general welfare of the people of those distant lands. The efforts of the Club are now being directed specially to the Crown colonies, where our Government has a certain amount of control; and a second pamphlet, written for the Cobden Club by Mr. Salmon, will, I believe, greatly promote this object. At this juncture the Cobden Club must not lose sight of the fundamental rule on which it was established—"to encourage the growth and diffusion of those economical and *political* principles with which Mr. Cobden's name is associated." (Hear, hear.) The general politics of the day will afford plenty of work by which the Committee of the Club may uphold the great Liberal political principles which Mr. Cobden advocated. We advocate not merely Free Exchange of all commodities, but we advocate Free Trade in land—(hear, hear)—and every object which will secure civil and religious equality to all the people. (Applause.) I call upon the secretary to read the report for the past year.

The SECRETARY (Mr. Richard Gowing) then read the following report of the Committee for the year 1884-5:—

"This has been a year of more than ordinary interest and activity in connection with the work of the Cobden Club. On the 19th of July last, when your Committee presented their report for the year then past, the country

was in the midst of the excitement consequent upon the refusal of the House of Lords to proceed with the Franchise Bill in the absence of the Seats Bill; but there seemed to be no prospect whatever of a popular revival, in any shape, of the old controversy between Free Trade and Protection in this country; and your Committee had not the slightest reason to anticipate that in the course of four or five months they would find themselves face to face with a demand for the re-imposition of the Corn Laws. But early in the autumn, in the midst of the public satisfaction at the news of a good harvest, complaints of the low price of corn began to be heard, and an informal but wide-spread agitation was begun in the rural districts, whose purpose appeared to be to create a public feeling in favour of Protection. Before August was out Mr. Clare Sewell Read, M.P., at a meeting in Norfolk, referred to the low price of wheat as a great public question. In October, in the course of a contest for the re-representation of South Warwickshire, your Committee received information from all parts of that division to the effect that the question of a duty on corn was one of the chief elements in the contest; Mr. Sampson Lloyd, the Free Trade candidate, was returned by a large majority, and from communications which reached your Committee from the agricultural districts in many parts of the country your chairman, in addressing his constituents at Rochdale, in October, felt warranted in warning them that there was a distinct danger of the cry of taxes on food being raised by the political representatives of the landed interest on the plea of low and unremunerative prices. Your Committee took measures to obtain all possible information as to the strength and progress of this movement, they consulted the recognised representatives of the feeling of the masses of the people in the agricultural districts, and they were led to enter at once upon what has been called the 'leaflet campaign.' They had found reason to believe that the most effective way of spreading correct information and sound views on the Free Trade Question would be by the circulation, in vast numbers, of small leaflets of one, two, three, or four pages, exposing the fallacies of the Fair Traders and Protectionists, and explaining the real effects of Protective tariffs on the one hand and Free Trade on the other hand upon the condition of the country and the prosperity of the people. The Club had previously had three or four of such leaflets in circulation; for these there had been a very great demand; and your Committee proceeded to add largely to the list. Amongst the first of the new leaflets was a letter by the Right Honourable John Bright, M.P.; on 'Fair Trade,' which was succeeded by leaflets specially written for the Club, many of which have been extremely popular, by the Right Honourable W. E. Baxter, M.P., Mr. George W. Medley, Sir Bernard Samuelson, Bart., M.P., Mr. Arthur Arnold, M.P., Mr. Joseph Arch, Mr. George Jacob Holyoake, Mr. J. Hampden Jackson, Mr. Alfred Simmons, Mr. J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.P., Mr. Sydney C. Buxton, M.P., Mr. Edward North Buxton, Mr. Charles Whitehead, Mr. John Noble, and several others. The Committee began by printing these leaflets at the rate of fifty thousands of each, but they soon found it necessary to print a hundred thousands of each at a time; and on one or two occasions Messrs. Cassell and Company's machines have been set to work to print off sixteen hundred thousands of the leaflets at one working. Those printed and now in course of being printed, since the beginning of December, number more than eight millions, of which some seven millions have been circulated. Your Committee are happy to report that the circulation of these leaflets by the Club has been very much facilitated by the great readiness with which the local Liberal Associations, supplied by your Committee, have delivered them to the people in town and village all over the country, and the thanks of your Committee are due not only to the organised Liberal Societies but also to active representatives amongst the labourers and artisans themselves, who have entered enthusiastically into the spirit of this work, and who have continually made reports to the Committee of the great interest with which the leaflets are received and read by the people.

"It soon became evident to your Committee that this was a far greater and more expensive work than could be carried out by means of the ordinary resources of the Club; and the chairman of your Committee, Mr. Potter, encouraged by the manner in which former appeals had been responded to, made application to the members and friends of the Club for subscriptions to a Special Publication Fund to meet the emergency. Mr. Potter and your Committee are deeply sensible of the readiness and generosity of the response to this appeal. After writing a large number of private letters, and securing in reply some handsome subscriptions, Mr. Potter sent out a lithographed letter to every member and honorary member of the Club, and to many others interested in the cause, in the following form:—

"Reform Club Chambers, 105, Pall Mall, S.W.,

January 23th, 1885.

"My dear sir,—The Cobden Club Committee have decided to raise a fund for the purpose of publishing a large number of leaflets and pamphlets to educate the new voters, and to oppose the advocates of Fair Trade. It is not possible with the ordinary subscriptions to carry out the object successfully, so I have written to a few gentlemen who have given me their names as below for 'The Special Publication Fund.'

"Will you kindly contribute whatever sum you may think fit?—Yours, most truly,

(Signed)

"THOMAS BAYLEY POTTER.

"Subscriptions should be sent to the London and Westminster Bank, St. James's Square Branch, to be credited to the Cobden Club 'Special Publication Fund.'"

"The list of subscriptions was headed by a cheque from Mr. J. P. Thomasson, M.P., for £200; and amongst the earliest to respond to the appeal were Sir Thomas Brassey, K.C.B., M.P., £200; His Grace the Duke of Westminster, £100; Mr. Isaac Holden, M.P., £100; Sir Nathaniel M. de Rothschild, Bart., M.P., £100; Mr. John Corbett, M.P., £100; Mr. A. H. Brown, M.P., £100; Mr. William Birkmyre, £130; Lord Wolverton, £50; Sir Joseph W. Pease, Bart., M.P., £50; Sir Andrew Pairbairn, M.P., £50; Mr. George Palmer, M.P., £50; Mr. Hugh Mason, M.P., £50; Mr. Mitchell Henry, M.P., £50; Mr. Samuel Morley, M.P., £50; the Marquis of Ripon, K.G., £50; Mr. Hamar Bass, M.P., £50; Mr. C. Waring, £50; the Right Honourable H. Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., £25; Mr. W. Rathbone, M.P., £25; the Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone, M.P., £20; Mr. T. Ash ton, £20. Other subscribers to the Special Publication Fund are:—Mr. H. A. Brassey, M.P., £50; Mr. Edward North Buxton, £30; Mr. W. Westgarth, £25; Mr. P. T. Mappin, M.P., £25; Mr. J. P. Bryce, £25; Mr. J. J. Colman, M.P., £25; Mr. G. W. Medley, £20; Mr. J. T. Brunner, £20; Mr. John Rylands, £20; Mr. John Barran, M.P., £20; Mr. P. P. Arbutnot, £50; Col. D. Gamble, £25; Mr. John Bell, £20; Mr. James Worthington, £25; Mr. J. S. Kennedy (New York), £25; Mr. Thomas Watson, £20; Mr. Robert Jardine, M.P., £25; Mr. J. P. P. Grundy, £20; Mr. D. H. Macfarlane, M.P., Lord Northbrook, Mr. Joseph Craven, Mr. Lewis Pry, M.P., Mr. T. Clemens Watson, Mr. Andrew Johnston, Mr. George Dixon, Mr. T. W. Evans, M.P., Mr. A. Hubinet, Mr. Lawrence J. Baker, Mr. Frederick Pish, Mr. John Brinton, M.P., Mr. T. Rowley Hill, M.P., Mr. Charles Thomas, Mr. Sydney Woolf, Mr. T. C. Ryley, Mr. Thomas P. Warren, Mr. C. H. James, M.P., Mr. W. C. Plowden, Mr. R. C. Fisher, Mr. H. Yates Thompson, Mr. Vincent S. Lean, Mr. John Jupe, Mr. Anthony Rich, Sir Bernard Samuelson, Bart., M.P., Baron Northbourne, Mr. J. L. Nicholson, Mr. C. S. Hayne, Sir T. H. Farrer, Bart., Mr. William Hinners, Mr. Charles Green, Mr. W. H. Wills, M.P., Mr. Henry Wardle, Mr. William Brough (U.S. America), Mr. Richard Tangye, Mr. M. M. Monro, Mr. Lewis MacIver, M. Jean Dollfus (Prance), Mr. G. W. Palmer, Mr. J. M. Paulton, Mr. James Clifton Brown, Mr. H. R. Ladell, Mr. H. C. Beeton, Sir S. Morton Peto, Bart., Mr. William Crossfield, Sir James Ramsden, Mr. James Solly, Mr. Hugh P. Powell, Mr. T. R. Wilkinson, Mr. Horace Davey, Mr. P. N. Muller (Holland), Mr. R. B. Mackie, M.P., Sir J. B. Phear, M. Dreyfus (Prance), Mr. J. Pulley, M.P., Right Hon. Sir T. D. Acland, Bart., M.P., Mr. Charles Spink, Mr. J. P. B. Baert (Holland), Mr. William Shaen, Mr. Henry Peto, Mr. T. Holland (U.S. America), Mr. A. Gröning (Germany), &c. The Special Fund at the present date amounts to nearly £2,500. It is an incidental advantage of the dissemination of information by means of leaflets that a good deal of ground is covered with a comparatively small expenditure; but in view of the enlargement of the franchise and the coming General Election the demand for this form of literature is very great, and your Committee will be thankful for additional donations to the leaflet and Special Publication account. The numerous communications which they receive from the rural districts and from the centres of population enable them to offer the most confident assurances that this method of promoting the growth and diffusion of the principles of the Club is having a large and salutary influence.

"Your Committee have not, however, neglected the usual work of the Club at home and abroad. Last year in their report they gave a body of facts as to the evils of the elaborate systems of tariffs in the West India Islands. Shortly after the issue of that report Mr. C. S. Salmon, formerly President of the Island of St. Nevis, wrote for the Club a pamphlet on 'The Depression in the West Indies: Free Trade the only Remedy,' which has been very largely distributed in this country and in our colonies. In the course of its circulation your Committee were led to think that the time was not unfavourable for raising the whole question of the pernicious tariff system in operation in the British Colonies under the control of the Crown. They hope that public opinion may be so informed as to bring a pressure to bear upon the Government and upon the Colonial Office with a view to the abolition of Protective tariffs in the Crown Colonies; and, at the Committee's request, Mr. Salmon is preparing a pamphlet on the general question in relation to all these Colonies, for publication and distribution by the Club.

"The question of the government of India has happily attracted an increasing share of public attention of late, partly by reason of the highly liberal policy which has been pursued under the Viceroyalty of the Marquis of Ripon, one of the earliest members of your Club. Last year your Committee sought to assist in advancing public opinion in favour of the further opening up of India to the commerce of the world by the construction of railways into the interior; this year they have given circulation to a pamphlet by Mr. William Birkmyre, a member of the Club, on 'The India Council,' by way of raising the question whether the time is not drawing near for important reforms with respect to the Council.

"The speech of the Right Honourable Sir Charles Dilke, as chairman at the Club's dinner on the 13th inst.,

affords an interesting and eloquent review of the recognition and influence of the principles of Richard Cobden in the recent government of this country in relation to International Arbitration; to the policy of the neutralisation of Egypt; to remedial legislation in Ireland; to Single Member Constituencies and Electoral Districts in our representative system, and to prospective Reforms in our Land Laws. Summing up his remarks with reference to foreign affairs, and to the policy advocated by Richard Cobden, Sir Charles Dilke happily said: 'Thus, in my belief, by an application of Cobden's methods, we may see daylight, if the guidance of our affairs be wise, through troubles which otherwise might disturb the world.'

"The subject for the essay competition this year for the Cobden Club triennial prize of £60, offered at Victoria University, Manchester, is, 'The History of the Economic Theories of Rent.' The examiners are Mr. E. T. Cook, M.A., nominated by the Club, Mr. R. C. Christie, M.A., nominated by the Vice-Chancellor, and Professor Munro, ex-officio. The essays have been sent in, and your Committee expect that the award will be made known within the next few days. For the next triennial prize of £60 offered at Cambridge University, the subject is, 'A History and Explanations of the Fluctuations in the Commercial Prosperity of England during the last twenty-five years.' Sir Louis Mallet as kindly consented to act as adjudicator, appointed by the Club. The Cobden Medal for 1884, at the London International College, has been awarded to Mr. Percy Blackburn. The medal offered at Bombay University, in the same year, was won by Mr. Pestanji Jamasji Pādshāh, the brother of Mr. Barjorji Jamasji Pādshāh, to whom the medal was awarded in 1883. At Williams College, Massachusetts, your Committee have just learned the Cobden Medal for 1885 is awarded to Mr. George Weston Anderson, of Acworth, New Hampshire. Your Committee have renewed in the present year their accustomed offers of various small prizes for the encouragement of the study of Political Economy at the London International College, the Classes of the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching, &c.

"In giving a list of books, pamphlets, leaflets, &c., published or adopted for circulation by the Club, your Committee have great pleasure in stating that Sir Thomas Brassey has generously enabled your Club to print a much enlarged' and extensively revised Cobden Club edition of his popular and valuable book on 'Work and Wages,' which is nearly ready, and will be widely circulated among members of the Club and others. Early in the year your Committee thought it expedient to reprint, in separate form, and circulate 5,000 copies of Mr. Cobden's 'Three Panics.' Amongst the pamphlets circulated during the year which should be specially mentioned is an English edition of Mr. David A. Wells's 'Primer of Tariff Reform,' which has been praised in very high terms within the last few days in a letter written to your Committee by the Right Honourable Charles Villiers, M.P. The following is a complete list of the books, pamphlets, &c., which have been published or purchased by your Committee, or presented to the Club, for distribution since the presentation of the last annual report:—

"Depression in the West Indies: Free Trade the Only Remedy." Written for the Cobden Club by C. S. Salmon, formerly President of the Island of St. Nevis. (Cassell.) 10,000 Copies.

"The Three Panics; an Historical Episode." By Richard Cobden. (Cassell.) 5,000 copies.

"Our Land Laws of the Past." By the Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P. (Cassell.) 10,000 copies, in addition to 30,000 previously circulated.

"Free Trade and English Commerce." By Augustus Mongredien. (Cassell.) 10,000 copies, in addition to 78,500 copies previously circulated.

List of Members and Committee's Reports, 2,000 copies.

"Free Trade in Land." By F. F. Arbuthnot. (Cassell.) 50,100 copies.

"A Primer of Tariff Reform." By the Hon. David A. Wells, Norwich, Conn., U.S. America. (Cassell.) 10,000 copies.

"The History of Reform." By Alexander Paul. (Routledge.) 1,500 copies, in addition to 1,500 previously circulated.

"The Peers and the People." (Pall Mall Gazette.) 20,000 copies.

"The Use of a Vote." By C. T. D. Acland. M.P. 10,000 copies.

"Free Trade v. Fair Trade." By Sir T. H. Farrer, Bart. (Cassell.) 3,000 copies (revised and enlarged edition), in addition to 10,000 copies, previously circulated.

"The Public Letters of the Right Hon. John Bright." (Sampson Low.) 2,012 copies.

"What shall I do with my Vote?" By Ernest Parke. 5,000 copies.

"The Progress of the Working Classes during the last Half Century." By Robert Giffen, LL.D. (Bell & Sons.) 1,000 copies, in addition to 30,030 copies previously distributed.

"The Work of the Liberal Party during the last Fifty Years." A Letter addressed by the Right Hon. John Bright, M.P., to Mr. Townsend. (National Press Agency.) 10,000 copies.

"The House of Lords." Speech by the Right Hon. John Bright, in Bingley Hall, Birmingham. (National Liberal Federation.) 1,000 copies.

"History of the Free Trade Movement in England." By A. Mongredien. (Cassell.) 1,000 copies, in addition

to 7,000 previously circulated.

"*The Land Question.*" Lecture by Mr. Charles A. Fyffe, M.A., Liberal Candidate for the City of Oxford. 5,000 copies.

"*History of the Great Bread Riots, 1890.*" By S. L. Strachey. (Arrowsmith.) 2,100 copies.

"*The India Council.*" By William Birkmyre, of Calcutta and Port Glasgow. (Cassell.) 5,000 copies.

"*Free Trade in Land.*" By Joseph Kay. (Kegan Paul & Co.) 3,000 copies (with note by the Eight Hon. G. Osborne Morgan, M.P.), in addition to 720 copies previously circulated.

"*Six Centuries of Work and Wages.*" By J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.P. (Sonnenschein.) 100 copies of cheap edition.

"*A Short History of the English People.*" By J. R. Green. (Macmillan.) 50 copies, in addition to 250 previously circulated.

"*The Free Trade Speeches of the Right Hon. Charles Villiers.*" People's edition. (Kegan Paul & Co.) 50 copies, in addition to 100 previously circulated.

"*Wealth and Want: A Social Experiment made and described by H. Broadbent, Esq.*" Edited for the Press by the Rev. George Masterman. (Walter Scott.) 100 copies.

"*What Protection docs for the Farmer. A Chapter of Agricultural History.*" By J. S. Leadam, M.A. (National Press Agency.) 350 copies.

"*History of the Radical Party in Parliament.*" By William Harris. (Kegan Paul & Co.) 51 copies.

"*Cobden and Political Opinion.*" By J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.P. (Macmillan.) 150 copies, in addition to 921 previously circulated.

"*The Future Work of Free Trade in English Legislation.*" Oxford Prize Essay. By C. S. Troup. (Unwin.) 20 copies, in addition to 30 previously distributed.

"*The Distribution of Products.*" By Edward Atkinson, U.S. America. (Putnam.) 35 oopies.

"*The Transfer of Land by Registration.*" By Sir Robert Torrens, K.C.M.G. (Cassell.) 5,000 copies, in addition to 5,000 previously circulated.

"*Popular Fallacies regarding Free Trade and Foreign Duties.*" By Frédéric Bastiat. Adapted to the present time by Edward Robert Pearce-Edgcumbe. 5,000 copies of revised edition, in addition to 11,000 copies previously circulated.

Report of the Proceedings at the Annual General Meeting of Members of the Cobden Club, 1884. 25,000 copies.

Report of the Proceedings at the Colden Club Dinner, 1885. 50,000 copies.

"*Political Writings of Cobden.*" (Ridway). 20 copies, in addition to 732 previously circulated.

"*The Voice of India.*" 30 copies monthly for twelve months, commencing May, 1885.

"*Total number of Books and Pamphlets circulated (exclusive of leaflets) since the last General Meeting.* 252,998. The Cobden Club leaflets have been distributed as follows:—

No. 1.—"*The Dog and the Shadow.*" 200,000 copies, in addition to 150,000 previously circulated.

2.—"*What does Reciprocity-Protection propose to do?*" 200,000 copies, in addition to 150,000 previously circulated.

3.—"*The Results of Protection in Germany.*" 150,000 copies, in addition to 120,000 previously circulated.

4.—*The Right Hon. John Bright, M.P., on "Fair Trade."* 250,000 copies.

5.—*Mr. Arthur Arnold, M.P., on "Fair Trade."* 200,000 copies.

6.—"*Bread Tax Once More.*" From Punch. 200,000 copies.

7.—"*A Catechism for Fair Traders.*" By the Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P. 300,000 copies.

8.—"*Free Trade and the Working Men.*" By the Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P. 250,000 copies.

9.—"*Fair Trade and Free Trade.*" By Sir B. Samuelson, Bart., M.P. 250 000 copies.

10.—"*Free Trade: What it does for England, and How it does it.*" By George W. Medley. 250,000 copies.

11.—"*Facts for Artisans.*" By George W. Medley. 250,000 copies.

12.—*Mr. Cobden on "Redistribution of Seats."* 200,000 copies.

13.—"*Protection in France.*" 200,000 copies.

14.—"*Facts for Labourers.*" By George W. Medley. 300,000 copies.

15.—"*The Farmers and Protection.*" By Charles Whitehead. 200,000 copies.

16.—"*Facts for Farmers. No. 1.—Depression in Agriculture.*" By George W. Medley. 200,000 copies.

17.—"*The Effects of Protection in America.*" By Sir William Bower Forwood. 200,000 oopies.

18.—"*Would Protection remove the present Distress, and Benefit the Working Man?*" By Joseph Arch. 300,000 copies.

19.—"*4" The Newcastle Weekl Chronicle on the Cobden Club Leaflets."* 150,000 copies.

20.—"*Memorial Verses on Richard Cobden, 1865.*" 150,000 copies.

21.—"*Robbing a Thousand Peters to pay One Paul.*" By George Jacob Holyoake. 200,000 copies.

- 22.—"*Less Free Trade or more: Which Shall it Be?*" By J. Hampden Jackson. 200,000 copies.
- 23.—"*Facts for Farmers. No. II.—Depression in Agriculture.*" By George W. Medley. 200,000 copies.
- 24.—"*Fair Trade: its Impossibility.*" By Sydney Buxton, M.P. 100,000 copies.
- 25.—"*Reciprocity Explained.*" By George Jacob Holyoake. 150,000 copies.
- 26.—"*Words of "Warning to Agricultural Labourers and other Working Men."* By Alfred Simmons, the Leader of the Kent and Sussex Labourers. 300,000 copies.
- 27.—"*How they succeed in Canada.*" (*From the Agricultural Gazette, January 5th, 1885.*) 100,000 copies.
- 28.—"*Free Trade and Fair Trade: What do the Words mean?*" By James E. Thorold Rogers. 150,000 copies.
- 29.—"*Free Trade v. Protection (alias 'Reciprocity,' alias 'Fair Trade.')*" By John Noble. 100,000 copies.
- 30.—"*The British Peasant on the Right Hon. J. Lowther's Proposition—that ho should pay 'a farthing a week' on his Bread, to benefit the Landed Interest.*" 100,000 copies.
- 31.—"*The Farmer of Kent*" (*verses on Rent*). 100,000 copies.
- 32.—"*Will a Five Shilling Duty on Corn raise the Price of Bread or not?*" By Edward North Buxton. 100,000 copies.
- 33.—"*United States Protection v. British Free Trade.*" By the Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P. 200,000 copies.
- 34.—"*The Right Hon. John Bright, M.P., on the "Safety of the Ballot."* 200,000 copies.
- 35.—"*The Secrecy of the Ballot.*" 50,000 copies.
- 36.—"*Protection v. Work and Wages.*" By Edward North Buxton. 50,000 copies.
- 37.—"*One Sided Free Trade.*" By Edward North Buxton. 50,000 copies.

Total number of leaflets from the date of the last general meeting (19th July, 1884): 6,750,000.

Various newspapers, &c., about 8,000.

"A Club Dinner was held, as before mentioned, on the 13th of June, at the Ship Hotel, Greenwich, the Right Honourable Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M.P., in the chair. There was a large attendance, including many foreign members and guests. Pull reports of the valuable and interesting speeches made upon that occasion are in course of circulation.

"The following honorary members have been elected since the last annual meeting:—Mr. James L. Cowles, U.S. America; Mr. Michael J. Dee, U.S. America; Señor J. J. Rodrigues de Preitas Portugal; M. Ernest van Elewyck, Belgium; M. Gustave Jottrand, Belgium; the Hon. George A. Lloyd, New South Wales; Mr. David Peters, Germany; Mr. Carl C. Pope, U.S. America; Mr. W. E. Robinson, Cape Town; Mr. J. B. Sargent, U.S. America; Mr. Alfred Simmons; Mr. Prank W. Taussig, Ph. D., U.S. America.

"Your Committee regret to have to report the following members and honorary members deceased:—Mr. W. Earl Dodge, U.S. America; Mr. C. Ross Poord; Mr. J. W. Garrett, U.S. America; Mr. Charles Gosnell; Mr. Richard Hawley, U.S. America; Mr. William Hickman; Mr. R.B. Mackie, M.P.; Mr. W. C. Mees, Holland; Lord O'Hagau, K.P.; Mr. Royal Phelps, U.S. America; Mr. C. E. Rawlins; and Mr. W. E. Robinson, Cape Town.

"*The members of your Committee are nominated for re-election as follows:—Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P., Mr. W. C. Borlase, M.P., Mr. W. E. Briggs, M.P., Mr. Jacob Bright, M.P., Hon. George C. Brodrick, Mr. Alexander H. Brown, M.P., Sir James Caird, K.C.B., Right Hon. Sir C. W. Dilke, Bart., M.P., Right Hon. M. E. Grant Duff, Mr. Richard C. Pisher, Mr. Herbert J. Gladstoue, M.P., Lord Houghton, Mr. James Howard, M.P., Mr. Alfred Illingworth, M.P., Mr. Walter Henry James, M.P., Mr. Henry Reader Lack, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., M.P., Mr. E. A. Leatham, M.P., Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., Mr. John Gordon Mc. Minnies, M.P., Right Hon. Sir Louis Mallet, C.B., Mr. A. C. Humphreys Owen, Mr. T. Bay ley Potter, M.P., Hon. Sec., Mr. J. W. Probyn, Hon. Treasurer, Professor J. E. Thorold Rogers, M.P., Mr.. Albert Rutson, Mr. Peter Rylands, M.P., Mr. William Summers, M.P., Mr. J. P. Thomasson, M.P., Mr. J. J. Tylor.*"

The Right Hon. W. E. BAXTER said: I beg to move the adoption of the report which we have just heard read, and which sets forth so fully and clearly the work of the Club during the past year that it would be needless for me to go over the same ground. All Free Traders should be grateful to Mr. Potter and Mr. Probyn and the other gentlemen who have devoted so much time and attention to promote the spread of principles, which, despite the cavillers of the present day, are destined in the long run to be accepted by all nations. (Hear, hear.) You have no doubt observed that of late Jingoës and reactionaries, and certain newspaper writers who perhaps would repudiate either appellation, have been rather going out of their way to "damn with faint praise" the maxims and opinions of Mr. Cobden, and to sneer at the operations and publications of the Club which bears his name. If we were regarded by these gentlemen as merely well-meaning visionaries, upon whom they can look down from their "high empyrean" with a feeling of good natured contempt, surely it might occur to them that they are wasting time and throwing away powder and shot by devoting to us so much attention; but the fact, I believe to be, that the most shrewd amongst them feel that Free Trade views are slowly but surely

taking a firmer grasp of the public mind, and that the truth, being great, must prevail. (Applause.) Those who had the honour of Mr. Cobden's personal acquaintance know how strongly he advocated household suffrage and one-member constituencies when such reforms were regarded only as the day-dreams of fanatical Radicals. We have lived to see them part of the British constitution, and some of us will live to see other changes—(hear, hear)—which Whigs and Tories alike now consider Utopian, adopted without disturbance and with great benefit to the country. (Hear, hear.) The name of the distinguished statesman in whose honour this Club was founded is, however, more especially connected with three great questions. The first and foremost of these is Free Trade, and very shallow observers are those who fear that because foreign nations have not rapidly followed our example we are on the wrong track and will have to retrace our steps. (Hear, hear.) Old systems and prejudices and vested interests do not so easily give way before a sound political economy, and it may require even more potent illustration than the collapse of Protection in Germany, France, and the United States, to convince all men, or even most men, that tariffs designed and calculated to enrich the few at the expense of the many are not likely to endure forever in the good providence of God. Those of our friends who are inclined to be despondent in this matter seem to me to have expected too much, and if they would have a little more faith and patience they will soon find greater indications of a good coming time. There are others who tell us that there is no occasion for the work of this Club, that Free Trade was established as the unalterable policy of Great Britain, and that it is beating the air to defend it now. They forget that a generation has arisen "which knew not Joseph"—("hear" and laughter)—unacquainted with the arguments, the battles, and the final triumph of the Anti-Corn Law League, and that the electors, especially the newly enfranchised, ought to be thoroughly indoctrinated in the wisdom of a commercial system which has added so enormously to the wealth of the country and the comfort of the working classes. Turning to the second great question which occupied Mr. Cobden's mind we all know what were his views about land, and what remarkable progress those views have lately made. When I entered the House of Commons thirty years ago all Tories, and most Whigs, were against any material alteration of the laws of Primogeniture, Entail, Settlement, Registration—in fact of that system which prevents land being bought and sold as readily as any other commodity, and which is utterly unsuitable to the circumstances of the present day. Now all that is changed. We have Lord Cairns's Settled Estates Act, passed almost without debate; the Scotch Entail Act, with scarcely any opposition, and the whole Feudal System is tumbling to pieces so fast, without anyone to say a good word for it, that I believe the first or second session of the new Parliament will see us within measureable distance of such a radical alteration in the law as will, in the words of Mr. Bright, "give to every present generation an absolute control over the soil." (Applause.) Next to the two great questions adverted to, Mr. Cobden said most in favour of International Arbitration as opposed to the barbarous and bloody arbitrament of war. How he would have rejoiced to have witnessed the good effects on both sides of the Atlantic of the settlement of the Alabama difficulty, and how he would have hailed the arrangements lately made for referring a paltry dispute with Russia to a neutral power! (Applause.) Gentlemen, there will always be moments when the wave of peaceful progress and economical reforms seems to stop in its advance if not to recede, but those who have firm faith in the motto of this Club need never doubt that in the end the fertilising stream will find its way to every quarter of the world. (Applause.)

The Right Hon. A. S. AYRTON, in seconding the adoption of the report, said there were one or two considerations he should like to bring before the meeting in reference to the methods by which they could advance the principles of the Club. In England they always discussed Free Trade from an English point of view, but, unfortunately, the more they discussed it from that standpoint the more they strengthened the idea of the peoples of other great nations of the world that it was not to their interest to promote Free Trade, and that although somehow or other it might suit us it was adverse to their own interests. One of the most able treatises on the subject from a foreign point of view was one written by a German, asserting that the advocacy of Free Trade in England was based on principles which were hostile to the development of the industries and commerce of Germany. In England we laboured under a difficulty—which did not in the least detract from the great honour due to Cobden's memory—that our treaty with France did in fact recognise what was called well-regulated Protection as regarded that country. The Emperor of the French at the time had the sagacity to see that well-regulated Protection, which would admit large imports of our commodities loaded with a certain amount of duty, would be an ingenious method of increasing his revenue, because *apparently* the process did not add to the taxation of the French people, but only a little to that of the English. Taking that view the Emperor thought he had effected a master-stroke of international and fiscal policy. We in England could not help that; and we had succeeded in knocking down something that was still more odious to us—the principle of a prohibitive tariff. This principle of well-regulated Protection was rapidly seized hold off by other foreign governments, for they saw what a capital thing it would be if they could, to a certain extent, tax English productions and add to their resources without *appearing* to tax their own subjects. It would be unnecessary for him to enter into an elaborate argument to show that that idea was, as this meeting was well aware, a delusion.

But he thought it would be of great service if the Club could induce foreign essayists to write in the language of their countries showing that this well-regulated Protection was not in reality a benefit to them, but in the long-run became injurious to their real and permanent interests. (Hear, hear.) It was only, for instance, by publications in the German language, written in a style which commended itself to the German people, that Germans could be persuaded that Free Trade would be much better for them than any schemes of well-regulated Protection which they could go on inventing. The same applied to France. The moment we adopted something considered to be admirable for England it was regarded by Frenchmen as a cunning contrivance for injuring them. By addressing ourselves to the French mind in the French language, and with French ideas, converts might be made. This was a suggestion which might be worthy the attention of their Chairman, Mr. Potter. He would pass to another matter mentioned in the report, viz., the advocacy of Cobden's principles in regard to Free Trade in land. It was a very curious fact, and possibly no gentleman in that room was aware of it, that those people who were regarded as being generally unacquainted with the principles of law and jurisprudence, the Mahomedans, laid it down as a fundamental principle of their law that no man should make a transfer of landed property and at the same time impose upon it any restrictions as to the control over that property. The gift had to be absolute, and if any restrictions were imposed they became void, and the person who received the property was entirely freed from those restrictions. This principle was very simple in its enunciation, and comprehensive in its practice. It had this effect: a man was either an owner or he was not an owner. (Hear, hear.) He was never partially an owner, with a part interest, and the consequence was immense simplicity in the law. A man produced his transfer of land, and there was a complete transfer, without any conditions annexed; if he wanted to dispose of it he must dispense with it altogether. We should profit from wisdom wherever we found it, whether it came from Mahomedans or from anybody else. It was evidently a rule of law originally founded when there began to be regular written laws. This fundamental doctrine existed in the most primitive days of law of which we knew anything in this country, when the giving of a twig in the name of a whole farm constituted an act of transfer. The whole operation of transfer, or, as it was called, "seisin," consisted of a manual act in the presence of witnesses, and all that was done was to record the act. Afterwards came all sorts of complications, fostered in this country by the Court of Chancery, the object of which body was to get everything they could into Chancery, to keep it there as long as they could, and to make all proceedings as costly as they could. From the Chancellor downwards the lawyers got all they could out of the system, until the climax was reached by Lord Eldon, when fortunately Brougham came, whose broom swept the grosser abuses away. (Laughter and "hear, hear.") But although some of the enormities surrounding the court were swept away, there still existed great anomalies connected with the land system, and it would be a benefit if they could achieve something of the simplicity enjoyed by the Mahomedans. This question had the deepest relation to the permanent interests of the country. (Cheers.) There should be less of law. The complicated alterations made by Lord Cairns were a perfect mockery, for it was more difficult than ever now to prepare a deed relating to land. The whole base of the difficulty remained unchanged. Transfer of land ought to be complete and absolute, for if a man could not keep his property he should get rid of it absolutely to somebody else. If he died let him appoint an absolute heir, not an owner surrounded by all kinds of complications and conditions. This would not only effect a very needful reform in the land laws, it would improve the morality of the land and property owning classes of the country. The law unfortunately at present was such that a man who had neglected the training of his son, so that he became unfit for the inheritance of accumulated property, could yet so manage the property by legal documents that practically it would go in and remain in the possession of a person wholly unfit for it. If a son was not fit for the inheritance the property ought to pass to some other relation. Most people knew, within their own social circles, how many cases there were of persons receiving property without their own exertions, and who had never acquired 5s. by any effort of their own. The whole system was eminently unsatisfactory, and became in the end subversive of the real rights of property. Unfortunately some of the most distinguished men in law benefitted most by the complications and anomalies that existed. He hoped the matter would be seriously dealt with in the next Parliament. (Cheers.)

Mr. "WALTER WREN congratulated the Club on having lately broadened the scope of their propagandism. He noted with satisfaction that more than ever was being done by the Club in spreading Cobden's *political* as well as his economical teachings. Besides Free Trade in Land, which Mr. Ayrton had so ably referred to, Cobden was an advocate of the system of tenant right. Tenant right would be a cure for two of the most crying evils that existed—agricultural depression, and the horrible way the poor were housed. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. G. W. MEDLEY thought it would be interesting if he were to quote some passages in that week's *Economist*, showing that Protection was not doing very happy things for those who maintained the system on the Continent. (Hear, hear.) The first paragraph related to Protection in Belgium as follows: "A Committee of the Belgium Chamber of Deputies has recently voted a resolution in favour of a Parliamentary inquiry into the condition of industry and agriculture in Belgium. It is urged that the Protectionist policy now in force in France and Germany has affected prejudicially Belgian industry, which is suffering from depression resulting in the

lowering of prices and in reduction of wages. At the same time the value of land has decreased, owing to the fall in the value of agricultural produce and the large amount of foreign produce imported, which has increased 45 per cent, in the last five years. The committee did not adopt either proposals for a corn duty or for measures to equalise charges on different classes of property, but recommended a Parliamentary inquiry into the whole subject." This was certainly satisfactory, for the more they inquired in Belgium the more they would be likely to find out the cause of what was taking place. A correspondent at Vienna stated: "The trade inspector of Moravia and Silesia has just published an account which throws a curious light upon the conditions under which the workmen must live in these provinces, especially at Brunn. The working time in the weaving and spinning mills, which was fixed at 12½ hours before the new Act was issued, was sometimes prolonged to 16 and even 18 hours. In many manufactories workmen remain the whole week in the factory, sleeping on wool sacks, and working 96 hours from Monday morning until Saturday morning. The weekly wages fluctuate between 4 and 8 florins for men, and 1.20 and 4 florins for women; the wages by job between 7 to 18 florins for men, and 3 to 6.80 florins for women. The wages in the ready-made clothing manufactories are a little higher, amounting to about 11 florins for men by job. These low-wages barely keep the working people in lodgings and dry bread. The report complains further of the complete want of working men's houses at Brunn, so that the workmen are forced to pass the night in the factory because other lodgings are both bad and dear. Only a few of the employers have established special sleeping places." And further on the *Economist* said: "The raising of the import duty on corn in Germany has already resulted in an advance in the price of bread in comparison with other countries. The report of the Chamber of Commerce at Zittau also complains that German corn mills are suffering considerably, and that German wheat is not of the same quality as that of Austro-Hungary and Russia, to the use of which many German millers are habituated. Brewers complain that German barley is not so good as Austrian." When one read accounts of this kind the only question that arose was how long could such a state of things last? (Hear, hear.)

Mr. A. G. HENRIQUES observed, in reply to Mr. Ayrton's references to the attitude of lawyers towards land law reform, that two of his acquaintances, Mr. Horace Davey and Mr. Osborne Morgan—both members of Parliament and great lawyers—had been very energetic in the cause of improving the land laws. There were many distinguished lawyers who were ready to cooperate with the public in carrying out land law reform. He took this opportunity of congratulating the Club upon the good work they had done in circulating Mr. Kay's excellent book on land law reform. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. AYRTON reminded the last speaker that his (Mr. Ayrton's) contention was that the attitude adopted by most lawyers towards land reform was due to the circumstances under which they were brought up in their profession. Lord Brougham was the most distinguished exception, and he was universally hated in his lifetime by the lawyers. (Laughter and cheers.) "*Exceptio probat regulam.*" (Hear, hear.)

Mr. J. W. PROBYN (Hon. Treasurer to the Club) said he was sure the meeting would be glad to hear that the Committee had not lost sight of the condition of the Crown Colonies. They were aware that abundant opportunity was afforded of endeavouring to induce the British Government to adopt Cobden's principles with respect to the Crown Colonies. This matter had been by no means lost sight of by the Committee of the Club. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. W. MARTIN "WOOD said there still existed one great blot on the Free Trade escutcheon, and that was the continued imposition of an enormous duty upon silver and gold plate. The Club had rejoiced over the great fiscal reforms which had been carried out with regard to our trade with India, but there still existed this absolutely prohibitive duty upon silver plate, which operated very prejudicially upon what might be a very important industry in India. With regard to the antiquated "Hall-mark"—that was a matter with which the Committee of this Club could have no sympathy whatever. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. THOMAS BAYLEY POTTER, M.P., said, in reply to Mr. Ayrton's remarks in reference to the international work of the Club, that every effort had been made to enlist volunteers in the cause, and the Committee had been very glad to circulate the information they had. In many cases they had republished, in English, information which they had got from abroad, but during the last few years there had been a little jealousy exhibited on the part of foreigners on the subject. The Club had in some instances been almost told that they had better mind their own business, and they had, in consequence, not forced their publications promiscuously on foreigners, but had communicated more especially with their own foreign members. When the Club was asked for publications they sent them. In international work the Club had not been doing quite so much of late for the very reason that they thought they were not doing so much good as they had previously done in this respect. As regarded silver plate, there seemed to be no difficulty two or three years ago in taking off that duty, but a difficulty was found in valuing the amount which the silversmiths had in hand, and the drawback was so tremendous that they could not get over it. It was a question, he thought, more for the silversmiths than for the Government, for there was a perfect willingness on the part of the Legislature to act in the matter.

The motion for the adoption of the report was then agreed to, and, on the motion of Mr. T. W. EVANS,

, seconded by Mr. E. J. WATHBRSTON, the Committee of the Club was re-elected for the ensuing year.

Mr. AYRTON desired to move a vote of thanks to their chairman, Mr. Potter, who had so ably presided over the affairs of the Association. (Hear, hear.) He would explain that the object of his remarks on the international work of the Club was to point out the desirability of enlisting volunteers among foreigners, who would write original papers in their own language, through the channel of foreign ideas. Foreigners who showed a tendency to disbelieve what was written and said by this Club would be more likely to listen to men who were recognised in their own countries as working for the benefit of their fellow-citizens, and not for that of Englishmen.

The vote of thanks having been enthusiastically carried,

Mr. POTTER, in acknowledging the vote, said he was very much indebted to this meeting, and to all the members of the Club, for the support he had always received. He naturally felt a great interest in the Club, and all that he felt capable of doing he did. He intended carrying on the work of the Club as long as he was able, but as he was getting an old man he was beginning to anxiously look out for some younger man, an earnest and zealous worker, who would take his place when he should be able to work for the Club no longer. The Club could be very useful, not merely now but for many years to come, and he trusted to find some younger men who would take as much interest in the cause, and servo it as zealously, as he had done. (Cheers.)

The proceedings then terminated.

The Cobden Club Dinner,

Held at the Ship Hotel, Greenwich,

On the 13Th day of June, 1886.

Special Report for the Club.

Cobden Club Dinner.

The Cobden Club dinner for 1885 was held on Saturday, June 13th, in the large banquetting room overlooking the Thames, at the Ship Hotel, Greenwich. More than the usual interest attached to this event from the fact that the festival happened in the midst of the Ministerial crisis, the principal speakers—Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain—being distinguished as leaders of the advanced Liberal party in the out-going Government. The company assembled at the Speaker's Private Thames Stairs, in Palace Yard, soon after four o'clock. There was a great crowd of spectators on Westminster Bridge to watch the embarkation of the Chairman (the President of the Board of Trade), the Members of Parliament, and the distinguished guests of the Club on board the steamboat. It was a beautiful midsummer afternoon, and the run down the river to Greenwich was very pleasant. Of the party of about two hundred who were present at the dinner, there were not more than about a dozen who did not make the journey by the steamboat chartered by the Club for the occasion. Political matters of great interest were discussed on board the boat, more particularly in reference to telegraphic rumours to the effect that the Marquis of Salisbury, at Balmoral, had intimated to her Majesty his unwillingness to attempt to form an Administration. The tide was running down, and the trip was made in little more than half an hour. Before six o'clock almost every seat in the dining hall was filled. The room presented a handsome appearance. On the wall opposite the chairman's seat were hung two portraits of Richard Cobden, enlarged to almost life size, from a photograph by M. Adolphe Beau. The enlargement has been well effected by M. Beau himself, who kindly sent the portraits to be hung in the room, and has presented them to the Club. M. Beau gave away in the room some photographic copies of an autograph letter of Mr. Cobden's, dated Midhurst, 7th August, 1863, testifying to M. Beau that the photograph likenesses, of which copies had been sent to him, were considered by his family to be excellent. The dinner was generally pronounced, this year as last, to be one of the best in quality and in service of the public dinners of London during the season. The chair was occupied by the Right Honourable Sir Charles Dilke, Bart., M.P., President of the Local Government Board. On his right and left were his Excellency M. Mijatovich, Minister for Servia at the Court of St. James, and Mr. J. D. Fransen van de Putte, a distinguished politician and Free-Trader of Holland. The principal vice-chair was taken by Mr. Thomas Bay ley Potter, M.P., honorary secretary of the Club; there were also present:—The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., president of the Board of Trade; Lord Houghton, Baron Gustavus de Overbeck (Austro-Hungary), Mr. J. D. Fransen van de Putte (Holland), M. Adolphe le Hardy de Beaulieu (Belgium), His Excellency M. Mijatovich (Servian Minister in London), Mr. Cyrus W. Field (U.S. America), the Hon. George A. Lloyd (late Colonial Treasurer, New South Wales), Mr. Lalmohun Ghose (India), Senor Pablo Bosch (Spain), Mr. Mahlon Sands (U.S. America), Mr. Robert B. Minturn (U.S. America), Senor Don Arturo de Marcoartu (Spain), Mr. S. Constantine Burke (Jamaica), the Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P., Sir George Campbell, K.C.S.I., M.P., the Hon. George C. Brodrick, Mr. William Agnew, M.P., Mr. David Ainsworth, M.P., Mr. Benjamin Armitage, M.P., Mr. John Brinton, M.P., Mr. Henry Broadhurst, M.P., Mr. Sydney C. Buxton, M.P., Mr. Arthur Cohen, M.P., Mr. Joseph Dodds, M.P., Mr. J. F. B. Firth, M.P., Mr. Frank

Henderson, M.P., Mr. E. Johnson, M.P., Mr. Robert Leake, M.P., Mr. Henry Lee, M.P., Mr. R. B. Mackie, M.P., Mr. John Gordon Mc. Minnies, M.P., Mr. C. J. Monk, M.P., Captain W. H. O'Shea, M.P., Mr. John Dick Peddie, M.P., Mr. R.N. Philips, M.P., Mr. Joseph Pulley, M.P., Mr. William Rathbone, M.P., Mr. John Roberts, M.P., Mr. Thomas Roe, M.P., Mr. Thomas Shaw, M.P., Mr. W. P. Sinclair, M.P., Mr. Walter J. Stanton, M.P., Mr. William Summers, M.P., Dr. John Webster, M.P., Mr. Benjamin Whitworth, M.P., Mr. William Woodall, M.P., Mr. J. W. Probyn, (hon. treasurer of the club), Sir John Bennett, Mr. Augustus Mongredien, Mr. C. S. Salmon, Mr. George W. Medley, Mr. John Abbott, Mr. J. Alexander, Mr. J. F. Andrews, Mr. F. F. Arbutnot, Mr. William Baines, Mr. William B. Barbour, Mr. Edgar Barnes, Mr. Edward A. Baxter (son of the Right Hon. W. E. Baxter, M.P.), Mr. Moses Bayliss, M. Adolphe Beau, Mr. John Beauchamp, Mr. Henry Coppinger Beeton, Mr. Francis F. Belsey, Mr. Samuel Rowe Bennett, Dr. Karl Blind, Mr. Henry A. Blyth, Mr. James Blyth, Mr. J. E. C. Bodley (private secretary to Sir Charles Dilke), Mr. William Bohm, Mr. H. R. Fox Bourne, Mr. Charles Branch, Mr. Frederick E. Gordon Breton, Mr. L. M. Brousson, Mr. John Tomlinsoa Brunner, Mr. Thomas Bullock (Mayor of Newcastle-under-Lyme), Mr. N. A. Burt, Mr. Thomas Catling, Mr. David Chadwick, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (son of the President of the Board of Trade), Mr. W. E. Chapman, Mr. John Chappell, Mr. F. W. Chesson, Mr. Charles G. Clement, Mr. Henry Peyton Cobb, Mr. K. W. Cooke-Taylor, Mr. William Crosfield, Mr. J.P. Crowe, Mr. Leonidas J. Cuppa, Mr. R. H. Curtis, Mr. Cyrus Daniell, Mr. Edmund F. Davis, Mr. Frank Debenham, Mr. E. Maynard Denny, Mr. Wm. Digby, C.I.E., Mr. S. Digby, Mr. W. Pirie Duff, Mr. Richard Eve, Mr. Ernest Foster, Mr. D. Gamble, Lieut.-General A. R. Gloag, Mr. Henry Gold, Mr. F. R. Gossett (Assistant Sergeaut-at-Arms), Mr. Frederick Gould, Mr. Daniel Gow, Mr. Robert Kay Gray, Dr. Robert J. Griffiths, Mr. W. C. Gully, Q.C., Mr. Axel Gustafson, Mr. Hermann Gwinner, Mr. Henry John Hadrill, Mr. John Hamer, Mr. A. H. Hance, Mr. Charles Hancock, Mr. Edward Harris, Mr. J. C. Haslam, Mr. Mervyn L. Hawkes, Mr. Edward Nelson Haxell, Mr. George J. Henderson, Mr. James Henderson, Mr. Alfred G. Henriques, Mr. H. N. Hamilton Hoare, Mr. George J. Holyoake, Mr. William George Hopps, Mr. George Howell, Mr. Joshua Huggett, Mr. Charles W. C. Hutton, Mr. James Jump, Mr. John Jupe, Mr. John Kinnear, Mr. R. M. Knowles, Mr. H. R. Ladell, Mr. J. C. Lanyon, Mr. Harry L. W. Lawson, Mr. Vincent S. Lean, Mr. E. J. Leveson, Mr. B. S. Lloyd, Mr. Henry W. Lucy, Mr. Lewis Maclver, Mr. William S. Mackie, Mr. Alexander Macmillan, Mr. Maurice Makower, Mr. S. Syraons Martyn, Mr. A. W. Massingham, Major William Vaughan Morgan, Mr. Septimus Vaughan Morgan, Mr. Kenric B. Murray, Mr. E. K. Muspratt, Mr. Joshua Oldfield Nicholson, Mr. Henry Norman (U.S. America), Mr. S. Northcott, Mr. E. Oppenheim, Mr. Henry Page, Mr. Alexander Paul, Mr. Charles Payne, Mr. Joseph Hickman Pearson, Mr. J. T. Perring, Mr. Henry Peto, Mr. H. M. Phillips, Mr. J. Roland Phillips, J.P., Mr. Samuel Pope, Q.C., Mr. Paul Potter (U.S. America), Mr. Hugh P. Powell, Mr. C. Cholmeley Puller, Mr. Edward Rawlings, Mr. Wm. Reed, Mr. A. G. Renshaw, Mr. James Hall Renton, Mr. E. Routledge, Mr. F. A. A. Rowland, Mr. Edward R. Russell, Mr. Leopold Salomons, Mr. Isaac Seligman, Mr. Charles Sharpe, Mr. Alfred Waldron Smithers, Mr. Henry Tate, Mr. W. Tebb, Mr. Charles Thomas, Mr. Thomas Threlfall, Mr. James Todd, Mr. Thomas S. Townend, Mr. Charles Townsend, Mr. Wm. Vivian, Mr. James Walker, Mr. R. W. Wallace, Mr. Edward Warren, Mr. T. P. Warren, Mr. Aaron Watson, Mr. W. L. Watson, Mr. Edward J. Watherston, Mr. E. March Webb, Mr. Joseph D. Weston, Mr. Bailie Westwood, Mr. W. H. Willans, Mr. J. F. Wilson, Mr. W. Martin Wood, Mr. William Woodings (private secretary to Mr. Chamberlain), Mr. Sidney Woolf, Mr. Walter Wren, and Mr. Richard Gowing (secretary).

Besides Mr. T. B. Potter the following gentlemen occupied vice-chairs:—Mr William Agnew, M.P., Mr. Sydney C. Buxton, M.P., Mr. J. F. B. Firth, M.P., Mr. Henry Lee, M.P., Mr. George W. Medley, Mr. William Summers, M.P., Mr. Wm. Woodall, M.P.

The CHAIRMAN, who was very heartily received on rising, said: My Lord Houghton and gentlemen, I give you the toast of "The Queen." (Cheers.)

After the toast had been duly honoured,

The CHAIRMAN, again rising, said: I propose, gentlemen, the toast of the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the remaining members of the Royal Family. During the last year and a half I have myself been brought into rather close association with the Prince of Wales—(cheers)—by presiding over the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, of which his Royal Highness is an active member, and it naturally falls upon me, in proposing such a toast as this, to show you how sincerely desirous of working for the benefit of the country I, and the other members of the Commission, have always found the Prince to be. (Hear, hear.) He certainly has not only been constant in his attendance at the sittings of the Commission but has taken a great interest in the proceedings. I may say that the right hon. gentleman sitting next but one to me (Mr. Chamberlain) has also always found that the Duke of Edinburgh has been most assiduous in the service of the Royal Commission over which my right hon. friend has presided. (Cheers.) Without more ado, I ask you to drink the "Health of the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the rest of the Royal Family."

The toast having been heartily drunk,

The CHAIRMAN, who was greeted with loud cheering on rising, proposed the toast of the evening, "The

Memory of Richard Cobden, and Prosperity to the Cobden Club." After the applause had subsided, he said: Those of us who are original members, or very old members, of the Cobden Club, are able to congratulate ourselves upon this occasion on much advance made during the past year, as compared with previous years, towards the general adoption of Mr. Cobden's principles. In the foreign field we have seen the reference to the friendly judgment of an impartial arbitrator of a grave embarrassment, which in other days would not improbably have led to a lengthy and a bloody war, proposed by England and accepted by another of the great Powers. (Hear.) We have thus avoided by honourable means a war in which, whatever might have been the measure of our success, there would have been involved a third of the earth's surface, and probably more than a third of the human race. (Cheers.) In 1849, when Cobden proposed in Parliament a scheme of general arbitration, it failed to meet with universal acceptance, but in 1865, no less a master of statesmanship and of caution than Lord Clarendon gave in strong terms his adhesion to the principle as the "most honourable," as well as equitable solution of difficult and important questions. Party motives led the Tories now to cavil at the reference to arbitration; but they are silent as to Lord Clarendon's opinion, though often ready to claim him—as they claim all our great men of the past, and as their descendants will, I have no doubt, one day claim my right hon. friend by my side as having been virtually with them. (Laughter.) It suits the Tories now to represent these past statesmen as their own. and as the forerunners of Lord Beaconsfield, and to attack the patriotism of the Liberal statesmen of the day as compared with that not only of their opponents but of their former colleagues. What sort of words were used, however, by Mr. Disraeli himself even of Lord Palmerston, who, now that he has been long dead, has become the exemplar of the Primrose League, though assailed by repeated votes of censure by the Tories while alive! Why, these: "Our language contains no expression of scorn which has not been exhausted in the celebration of your character, there is no conceivable idea of degradation which has not been at some period or another associated with your career." Language of this kind is generally used by Tory speakers and writers of Liberal Ministers when the latter make application of those principles which unite us here. Such language has been used with regard to the Penjdeh arbitration, and as to Egyptian finance, and it is being hurled in advance against any arrangement on the lines of Earl Granville's circular as to the free navigation of the Suez Canal. In both these latter cases it is not in reality the supposed terms of the arrangement, but the making of any arrangement at all, that our opponents condemn. Yet the necessity of ultimately calling in the Powers to consult with regard to the Suez Canal and the finance of Egypt, and I would add, in the long run even as to the future of Egypt itself, has been constantly proclaimed by us without dissent in the past from the Conservative party. The Constantinople Conference ended with the solemn declaration "that an understanding exists between the European Cabinets that no definitive settlement of the Egyptian question is to take place without consultation with all the Powers." We ourselves soon afterwards declared that we should "invite the aid of the Powers to make provision for the future" of Egypt. On the 10th of August, 1882, we declared that "the result must be arrived at with the intervention, and under the authority of Europe, and cannot be adequately founded upon the simple conclusions of any single Power of Europe." Is it not obvious that this is both right and wise? (Hear.) Our sacrifices entitle us to a voice, an authority, and a consideration which, as a nation, we shall claim, and which will be allowed to us. (Cheers.) But what are our objects? Our main objects in regard to Egypt are security against foreign aggression, and security against internal trouble. These objects are not retarded but are promoted by consultation of the Powers. It is, in my opinion, worthy of consideration whether that consultation might not go further than it has gone at present, and whether before that evacuation of Egypt by the British troops which I do not believe even the Conservatives will prevent, this country should not obtain a perpetual guarantee of the neutrality of Egypt, to commence from the departure of our troops, similar to the perpetual separate guarantee of the neutrality of Belgium. What better security could we take than this against eventual foreign aggression? As regards security against internal troubles, we have already done much of late towards the formation of a small reliable Egyptian army, and if there were a guarantee the guaranteeing Powers could engage to consult together as the protecting Powers of Greece have done in the case of Greece, and to consult with the sovereign Power as to the need for interference and the measures to be taken. The undisputed and undoubted sovereignty of the Porte in Egypt is no obstacle to a guarantee. The sovereignty of Sardinia over the Chablais did not prevent a guarantee of the neutrality of the Chablais at Vienna, a neutrality transferred to and recognised by France when the territory was transferred to France after six-and-forty years, and lately shown to be still effective. Is it not possible when the security gained for the accomplishment of our objects allows us to leave Egypt that Cobden's principles could be then applied with the effect of causing its peaceable and orderly development in the future?—(Cheers.) Thus, in my belief, by an application of Cobden's methods, we may see day light, if the guidance of our affairs be wise, through troubles which might otherwise disturb the world. In home affairs we cannot fail to find in the Redistribution Bill of the present year a notable acceptance of Cobden's principles. It is a single member district Bill, and as regards the counties and the larger boroughs of England, and for the whole of Ireland, it is virtually an equal electoral district Bill. It concedes the whole of our principles, and it is capable of easy expansion and

improvement at any future time. Even those of us who ardently desired the adoption of the view which has prevailed had some doubts whether it would be accepted, and I may go so far as to reveal a secret, and tell you that while we knew it to be desirable we were astonished to find it also popular. Cobden's detailed scheme, which he described as a scheme for equal electoral districts, went about as far as that which we have carried. We proposed to keep county boundaries, and we have gone all but as near as possible to equal districts if county boundaries were to be preserved. Read Cobden's Reform Speech of 1848, and you will find that we have done all but exactly what he proposed. Cobden was just thirty-seven years in advance of the Tory party; to judge by recent speeches the Tory party of the future is not likely to toe more than from ten to fifteen years in the rear of the present company. While we have done a vast deal with regard to Redistribution, we have still in my belief a great deal to do before, in franchise matters, we have reached the point at which Air. Cobden would stand were he still with us at the present day. I am one of the fast growing party who are not in favour of resting the franchise upon the actual or constructive possession of property. I suppose that this is done from regard to the interests or feelings of the Tory party and of the Whigs, but the results are singular. The country, the localities, and individuals are involved in immense trouble and expence—trouble and expence through the technicality of our system. In the name of Conservatism we exclude from the franchise the most Conservative classes in the country. Why in the name of property should the Conservative party and the Whigs prevent Lord Cranborne from voting for Arlington-street or Hatfield, or Lord Hartington for Devonshire House? Another question concerning home affairs, in which Cobden's principles are making rapid progress, is that of land. (Hear, hear.) We have, I think, shown what Cobden called "a great feeling of surprise that the men who had abolished the Corn Laws had not also abolished the monopoly of land." We hear a good deal from the Tories in defence of huge properties on the ground of the national interest in producing the largest possible return from land. If the facts were as they state, then the argument would have weight with us here, because we are economists and followers of a man with whom such arguments had weight. But I should like to cross-examine some of these advocates of the present system about the effect of game preserving, for example. Look at the artificial keeping up of a splendid herd of field-mice by the destruction of small vermin for game-preserving purposes. Can anyone doubt that the battue system connected with the holding of large estates in various ways decreases the agricultural yield of the country? We must not forget, too, the questions which are above all economies. Can anyone maintain that we ought to rest satisfied with the present lot of the rural labourers of southern England? I would ask you to read for yourselves the evidence given by the agricultural labourers who appeared as witnesses before the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes. I think that Cobden, had he lived to old age, would have found us ready to co-operate with him in destroying the monopoly in laud. (Hear, hear.) Those who are interested in that monopoly will, even though abandoned by certain Democratic Tories, fight hard for its retention, as we may see by the opposition which was aroused by the proposal to apply equal treatment as between land and personalty in the collection of the Death Duties. Another subject, which is now fully before the country, in which we should have Cobden's sympathy, is that of Local Government Reform, especially as regards the application to Ireland of our principles. (Cheers.) How strongly and repeated were his appeals to the people of this country to try and understand what the Irish people want as the first step towards seeing whether we ought or ought not to give them what they ask for. These were some of his words, which he was forever repeating to the English nation:—"The strongest ground of grievance that we ever heard alleged against us by intelligent Irishmen unimbued with party feelings is, the total neglect and ignorance of their country that prevail among the people of England. To the middle classes of this country, as to an impartial tribunal, untainted by the venom of their political and religious factious, a large portion of the Irish people look for the probable regeneration of their unhappy country This patriotic party, including so much of the intelligence and industry of Ireland, claim from their fellow subjects on this side of the Channel (and they have a right to claim it) such a consideration of their country, its population and resources, its history, institutions, and geography—in fact just such a study of Ireland as shall give them a knowledge of its anomalous physical and moral state." (Cheers.) Cobden laboured hard to remove the ignorance of which he wrote: but it is still, I fear, very great. (Hear, hear.) What policy did he recommend? "Pass your measures for bringing Ireland into closer proximity with this country, for giving her our own institutions and a better representative system, and we shall do more to preserve order than if we were to send a dozen regiments to that country." We have now at last, 35 years later, given her a better representative system, for it was but very slightly tinkered in 1867, so far as imperial matters are concerned. But Ireland is still, to our weakness, a camp of British troops. Let us complete our work by giving her that better representation, too, in local matters, and Irish control of things of Irish concern, and then that standing army thus specially held in Ireland will, in my opinion, with general concurrence, and to the increase of the power of this country, safely be diminished or withdrawn. People in this country do not realise the present condition of the local government in Ireland. The Corporations of Belfast, and Cork, and Limerick have had repeatedly, by the necessary operation of the present law, to attend, at the cost of the local funds, the obliging Chairman of Ways and Means in London, Sir Arthur

Otway, with regard to unopposed private Bills. Do the people of this country understand the working of the grand jury system? Do they understand that the worst governed of the Irish towns, some of which have a death rate nearly three times as high as the average death rate, have an extraordinarily high qualification for members of the Corporation, retained by Parliament against the almost unanimous wish of the Irish people, and that the Corporation are elected by an extraordinarily limited electorate similarly maintained. (Hear, hear.) Waterford is a good example for those who believe in the virtues of the popular franchise. Waterford has less than 700 burgesses in a population of 30,000; only one in 42½ of the population are municipal voters, an extraordinarily low proportion. The qualification of voters is sadly high, but the qualification for membership of the Corporation is much higher, being a £25 rental, which means in Ireland a rental of £40 to £50 a year. Waterford, happening to have much ancient property, has never had to raise a borough rate: but the Corporation has never seen its way to spend much money in sanitation. The Corporation contains members who are interested in insanitary property. The sanitary accounts are the only accounts which are audited with publicity, but these are so small as not much to matter. As for the audit of the town accounts, so lax is that audit that the auditors a few years ago made a mistake of a thousand pounds, and certified a balance of £500 as due to the treasurer, which, as a fact, was due by the excellent treasurer, our old friend Mr. Delahunty, to the town. In whose interest have abuses of this kind been continued up to the present day? Who gains by them? How do they help the English connection, or the cause of good government or order? (Cheers.) Is it not time to try a new departure, and to see if the householders of Ireland are not as competent to rule themselves as are the householders of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) So much for the advance which Cobdenic views have made, or are making, in many departments of the State. The one point in which they are supposed not to be making way is that of Free Trade. As regards Free Trade abroad, I pointed out here the last time but one we met that there had been no general retrogression, but, on the whole, advancement, although advancement far smaller and less uniform than had been hoped. In England the opposition to Free Trade, which was becoming serious some three years ago, has declined during the last two years, in part owing to the action of the committee of the Club. (Cheers.) The absolute unity of the Conservative party, of which Lord Randolph Churchill spoke last week at the East End, is, indeed, illustrated, if not demonstrated, by the fact that some of them are in favour of taxing foreign imports all round; while the leader of the Tory party in the Commons protests in the strongest terms against a duty upon foreign wheat, and is in favour, as was Lord Beaconsfield when Prime Minister, of Free Trade. Those Conservatives who advise a course diametrically at variance with that recommended by Lord Beaconsfield are only reviving an agitation which has been attempted and had collapsed for a time before the general election of 1880. Mr. Chaplin, Mr. J. Lowther, and Mr. Cavendish-Bentinck had advocated this policy of having foreign imports all round, and the plan of cutting off our nose to spite our face was before the country at the last election. The country would not have it then, and the country will not have it now. (Hear, hear.) It is not only with regard to Free Trade and taxes upon goods that the Tories have their differences. Being aware that after the next election they will have for a long time no chance of power, they have tried for a few months of office by various votes of censure, and at last they appear to have succeeded. But on what principles are they to form their Government? Free Trade or Protection? Peace or war? Leaseholders' enfranchisement or rights of property? Lord Randolph Churchill and London Government Reform, or Mr. Smith and Vestrydom? (Laughter.) We have seen lists of the names of our successors and the offices they are to hold banded about by one or the other of them. They do not all agree, except that they all exclude or omit certain members of the Cabinet and Government before ours, who have been marked out for proscription. Lord Rockingham, however, once very wisely said, "I must confess that I do not think it an advisable measure first to attempt to form a Ministry by arrangement of office, and afterwards to decide upon what principles they are to act;" and that I think will be the judgment of the people of this country. We must in these days accept differences, both as to questions of the future and as to peace. I should never make it a ground of attack upon the Tory party that it is divided, as the Liberal party is divided, on woman's suffrage, for example, on which it is notorious that Lord Salisbury is as strong one way as Lord Randolph Churchill is strong the other. I would not even press too hard the fact of their divergence of opinion as to leaseholders' enfranchisement, or as to London government. In the Liberal party there must always be, and in the Tory party there will grow to be as it becomes more democratic, many differences. Especially with ourselves will there be, and ought there to be, honest differences among those who would go faster or less fast towards the one end. (Hear, hear.) We must in these days accept honest differences, and we may even be thankful for differences which imply thought and independence. But these are hardly of the same nature as the grave differences as to the principles of foreign policy which divide the Tory party, or the difference between Free Trade and a duty upon corn, as to which, before it asks the constituencies to trust it, that party would do well to try and make up its collective mind. I have seen to-night a telegram which states that Lord Salisbury has declined to form a Government. ("Hear, hear," laughter, and cries of "oh.") I cannot believe that statement, and I cannot accept it. (Cheers.) Is it creditable that gentlemen who night after night during the present Session have brought our people to the House by repeated votes of censure upon every

article of our policy, upon every portion of our programme; upon our conduct of home, upon our conduct of military affairs, and upon every foreign question that has arisen; upon our financial proposals, and upon everything we did or proposed, or that they thought we intended to do—can it be that these gentlemen, after moving these votes of censure with a rapidity which has never been equalled, and after declaring in their speeches in and out of the House and in their newspapers that we were the worst Government that ever ruled this country, and that there was not a day that we were not in every portion of the globe sacrificing our interests, when they have the chance of ridding the country of our presence that they should not be prepared to accept the responsibility of their acts. (Cheers.) I am bound to say myself that I did not expect that Lord Salisbury would shrink from the consequence of these acts, and after having given, as it was supposed, an impetus to this policy, and after, as it was rumoured, rejecting the policy of Sir Stafford Northcote as not being sufficiently active for them—for in one or two votes of censure the proposal was not considered sufficiently strongly worded—is it possible that he could not form a Government? I cannot and I do not believe it. (Cheers.) But there is one thing I do believe, whether the Conservative Government try to accept the responsibility of power, or whether they try to evade and escape it, in either case their conduct will make no difference to the effect of the general election that is coming upon us. (Cheers.) I am sure that, enormous as are the services of Mr. Gladstone to the country, the next election will not be fought only on his services and his name, but that the people of the country will give judgment, not only upon Mr. Gladstone's name and services, but also upon the principles of the Liberal party and those principles which were held, and in support of which we are gathered here to-night. (Cheers.) I believe that whatever course is taken by Lord Salisbury the judgment of the country will be conclusive in a degree which has never been known before. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) I beg to propose "The Memory of Richard Cobden and Prosperity to the Cobden Club," coupling with the toast the name of Mr. Probyn, our honorary treasurer, an old and honoured member of the Club. (Cheers.)

Mr. PROBYN, rising amid general cheering, said: Sir Charles Dilke, my lords and gentlemen. In rising to reply briefly, and it will be very briefly, to the telling and able speech of our honoured chairman, in proposing prosperity to the Cobden Club, I shall avail myself of the opportunity of placing before you one or two simple facts. During the last twelve months we have had the opportunity of distributing no less than a quarter of a million of the very able pamphlets which some of our best writers have written on the question of Free Trade and Protection, and also replies to those arguments, if so they can be called, of our fallacious Fair Trade friends. But this is not the only work in which we have been engaged, thanks to the efforts of the chairman of our committee, Mr. Potter. (Cheers.) We have been enabled to raise a special fund by which we have distributed since last December no less than six millions and a half of leaflets upon great and important questions connected with the name of Cobden. We have done this more especially with the object of enlightening the new electors, who have lately obtained the franchise, in those principles, and endeavouring to guide them aright in the selection of representatives which they will be called upon to make. Amongst the subjects dealt with a prominent place has been given to the ballot, which is so important in the rural districts. (Cheers.) We have endeavoured to emphasise and bring home to the minds of the people the fact that the ballot is a real protection to them, and that under that constitutional mode of procedure they need not fear the farmer, the landlord, or his agents. Those who like myself have been addressing rural constituencies lately will know that it is important to bring this fact home to them. We are receiving continually, from all parts of the country, and especially from the rural districts, assurances that these leaflets are doing very great work and great service in this respect. (Hear, hear.) I earnestly intreat all who are engaged in this work to use every means to spread these leaflets, and not to allow any rest or peace to our excellent secretary, Mr. Richard Gowing. (Cheers and laughter.) There is only one other matter upon which I should like to touch. That is the great satisfaction we feel that the important principle of arbitration has again been recognised. (Cheers.) Not only was Free Trade dear to the heart of Cobden but that great principle of arbitration by which the differences which arise from time to time between the nations of the world are likely to be settled by calm reason and judgment, by a fair tribunal instead of being determined by what I cannot help calling the insane and barbarous method of setting a large number of men to fight and destroy each other, the result of which proves nothing, but produces the greatest misery in the world. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, as in the case of our serious difficulty with our American cousins some years back, and in the present instance with Russia, so we may look forward in the future to the following of this principle in our dealings with other nations. We may trust that the great blessings of peace may be preserved to us by this means, and that we may be saved from the misery, waste, and wickedness of war. (Cheers.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, who met with a very enthusiastic reception, the cheering, which was accompanied by the waving of handkerchiefs, lasting for some time, rose and said: I am sure that you will agree with me in congratulating the committee of this Club upon the selection they have made for the chairman for this evening. (Cheers.) I don't refer solely to the admirable and eloquent speech to which we have just listened—(hear, hear)—but I base my opinion upon considerations arising out of the whole of the public life and work of my right hon. friend. (Cheers.) I venture to say that there is no one who is entitled to be considered a more faithful

exponent of Cobden's principles, perhaps, with one exception, than our president this evening. The exception I refer to is this, that I suppose that Mr. Cobden carried the doctrine of non-intervention rather further than my right honourable friend and many other Radicals and Liberals are prepared to go, though in all questions of commercial and domestic policy, and the spirit which ought to enter into our relations with foreign powers, I believe that Mr. Cobden never had a more orthodox disciple. You know that it fell to the lot of Sir Charles Dilke to represent this country in the negotiations which took place for the renewal of the French Treaty, and there are many in this room I believe who can bear testimony to the ability, tact, and knowledge which he brought to bear during the discussion. (Hear, hear.) Well, it is sometimes said that these negotiations were useless; but that is an entire mistake. (Hear, hear.) It is quite true, of course, that the treaty was not formally renewed; but, thanks to the operation of the most favoured nation clause, and the friendly action of the French Government in conceding to this country the benefits of the treaties which it made with the other Powers, at the present moment both nations enjoy more unrestricted intercourse than in any previous period in their commercial relations. At the same time I do not conceal from you that there is much still to be desired in connection with the commercial relations both with France and with other countries. (Hear, hear.) I am not aware that we can congratulate ourselves upon any great or remarkable recent conversions to the principles of Free Trade. But, as I have before said, this is regrettable more in the interests of Protectionist countries themselves, and in reference to the political relations which we may have with them, than it is in the interests of the United Kingdom, because the position of the country whose manufactures, like our own, are perfectly unshackled in competition with those whose industries are fettered with all kinds of restrictions, is an extremely favourable one, and one which we should be most disinterested in exchanging with any other. (Hear, hear.) I should like, as I think it appropriate to the occasion, to be permitted to give you one or two illustrations of this favourable position. We have been suffering, as you know, from a depression altogether exceptional in its duration and its extent, and yet I venture to say that the general trade of this country is now more prosperous than that of any other great country in the world. (Cheers.) Now, let us look for a moment at the condition of our kindred across the water. The United States think Protection to be a remedy for distress. Then, surely the contrast between the United States and this country ought to show at this time a remarkable balance in favour of the former nation. (Hear, hear.) But what is the state of the case? I have here an extract from a recent report by Mr. Mc. Culloch, the Secretary of the United States Treasury, and after dealing with the depression there, and the lack of employment, he says—"The all important question that presses itself upon public attention is—How shall the country be relieved from the plethora of manufactured goods, and how should that plethora hereafter be prevented. It is obvious that our power to produce is much in excess of the present or any probable demand for home consumption. The existing iron, cotton, and woollen mills, if employed at their full capacity, would meet in six months, and perhaps in a shorter time, the home demand for the year. It is certain, therefore, that unless the markets now practically closed against us are opened, unless we share in the trade which is monopolised by European nations, the depression, now so severe, will continue, and may become more disastrous." Then I look for another indication of the state of trade in America, in the list of bankruptcies. (Hear, hear.) While, as you know, the number of failures in this country has recently shown a most remarkable diminution, in the United States, on the contrary, they have reached a figure which they never reached before; and in the last year they were 12 per cent, more in number, and 37 per cent, more in the amount of the liabilities, than in the preceding year of 1883. There has been at the same time a general and extraordinary reduction in wages. In a commercial economical journal of great importance and ability, which is known as *Bradstreet's Journal*, I find that its conductors recently made an inquiry respecting the twenty-two northern States, and they found that the average reduction of wages throughout the district had been from 20 to 25 per cent. The reduction in the number of hands employed had been variously estimated, according to the trade and district, from 12 to 33 per cent. There were 363,000 operatives returned out of work—that is 13 per cent, of the whole of the number employed during the preceding year. I should like to carry this a little further and call your attention to one or two particular cases in which special industries have been practically ruined by the protective tariffs. I will not speak of the shipping trade, which has passed almost wholly into the hands of English shipowners owing to the restriction and trammels which the Americans have placed upon themselves. I will not speak of the iron trade—one of the most heavily protected industries, and in which 80,000 workmen are now out of work. I will call your attention to the case of the boot and shoe trade, which happens to be one of the most prosperous of our industries now, and which is continually increasing both in its production and, above all, in its exportation to foreign markets. This is a trade which has been created by our Free Trade system, and which depends upon the access which the manufacturers have to every market in the world for the supply of the raw material, while, at the same time, their great competitors in America and France load their traders with burdens upon imports, upon hide and leather, so that practically competition has become impossible, and English goods are driving the American and French goods out of all the neutral markets of the world. (Hear, hear.) Then there is the case of clocks. Since the time of Sam Slick, I thought that Yankee clocks

were the special production of the American soil, that they were indigenous, and that no foreigner could hope to transplant them. But, in consequence of the difficulties which have been placed in the way of American manufacturers by the tariff, at the present moment the export of clocks and watches from this country to the United States is nearly as great as the importation from that country to Great Britain, while in the colonies, and throughout the markets of the world, American manufactures are being rapidly pushed out by those of their English competitors. But perhaps the most striking of all the illustrations I have to give is that of the woollen trade. Why on earth should not the American people be successful competitors with the English? There is nothing but the tariff to account for it. I find that the number employed in the woollen industries in the United States has decreased by 34,000 since 1882, and the wages have fallen from 25 to 30 per cent., and the exports, which only attained the sum of £72,000 in 1879, have actually fallen in 1884 to £28,000. Now, compare this with the result of a totally unprotected and free industry—compare it with the woollen industry of Bradford. The exports from England to the United States alone of textile woollen fabrics have doubled in the period I have referred to, and now reach the gigantic amount of over £3,100,000. (Hear, hear.) Now, gentlemen, let us turn for a moment to the case of France, another great Protectionist country. We know on the authority—the eminent authority—of Mr. James Lowther and Mr. Chaplin—(laughter)—that all that is wanted in order to restore prosperity to British agriculture is a fixed duty of five shillings per quarter upon corn. But that specific has been tried, and it has failed. There is a duty on corn in France, and the French farmer has also a protective duty upon every other agricultural product. And what is the result? I have seen recently an official report addressed to the French Chamber, which states that the position of the farmer in France is everywhere precarious; that stock-breeding is becoming the only profitable branch of agriculture; that in one single Department there are 840 farms unlet, and in one single arrondissement there are 20,000 acres lying fallow. Would you not think that it was to an English county that these figures related? Meanwhile arable land has fallen 50 per cent, in value, and rents have diminished as much as from 12 to 33 per cent. It is not only, however, in farming that trade is bad in France, for it is universally depressed and has reached every industry. I have in my possession another official report of the Chamber, which was adopted with respect to the state of affairs in the Basin of the Loire, a manufacturing district. The manufactures consist of silk, velvet, ribbons, and also mining industries and metal industries, and the manufacture of glass and of arms, and in every one of those branches of industry there is the greatest possible destitution prevailing, and the population of St. Etienne has fallen off 25,000 in two years. Such a falling off cannot be shown in anyone city in the United Kingdom with anything like that population. Of 66,000 workmen who remain only 6,000 are in full labour. There are 10,000 out of work, and 50,000 are on short time, and meanwhile the wages have fallen until they are no longer able to provide sustenance for their families, and accordingly there are 30,000 persons said now to be dependent upon public or private charity. And why is this? This state of things with regard to one of the most important industries is due, and acknowledged to be due, entirely to the effects of the tariffs. It is a curious result of the mistaken endeavours to protect industries by means of fiscal regulations. (Cheers.) At the present time, what are called silk manufactures are based to a large extent on the use of silk waste and cotton yarns, and the raw material used is so heavily taxed in France that the manufacturers avow themselves destroyed by the competition of their neighbours in Switzerland and elsewhere; and at the present time the efforts of the French Government on behalf of the cotton spinners of France have resulted almost in the annihilation of one of the special industries of the country. The general conclusion I want you to bear in mind is this—that, although we cannot show any great change of opinion in foreign countries with regard to the extension of Free Trade, yet at least we can find in their experience conclusive evidence and proof of the soundness of Mr. Cobden's doctrines, and a great cause for congratulation to this country. (Hear, hear.) At all events, the depression which has prevailed here as elsewhere throughout the world has not been intensified and accentuated by all kinds of artificial restrictions and by unjust and injurious tariffs. (Cheers.) Now, I have referred to the table speech to which we have all listened, and I would venture to say that its importance lies in the plain perception which it shows of the fact that Mr. Cobden's fame does not rest alone upon the circumstance that he was the greatest and most successful of Free Traders, but more upon this—that he was also the most clear-sighted and the wisest of Liberal politicians. (Cheers.) And, gentlemen, the sanction and confirmation which in recent times have been given to his opinion throughout the whole range of domestic politics is the justification of the regard and reverence in which we hold him, and a great encouragement to all those who are endeavouring, however humbly, to tread in his steps. I agree with Sir Charles Dilke in attributing the utmost importance to the question of local government in the future. (Cheers.) I agree with him in the estimate which he has formed of the high place that question will occupy in the programme of the Liberal party. (Cheers.) Experience justifies us in the hope that the Reformed Parliament will do much in the direction of completing the work which previous Reformed Parliaments have commenced. What was the main and the material advantage which resulted from the Reform Bill of 1832? It was the concession of municipal government to our country towns—a concession which has been highly appreciated, and which has been widely used, and which has added most materially to

the comfort and the happiness of the populations concerned. (Hear, hear.) And what was the greatest result of the Reform of 1867? It was the extension of the functions of local government by the creation of a system of education, national in its scope, but locally administered. (Cheers.) And it remains for the Reformed Parliament which will meet in 1886 to complete this work—(cheers)—and to carry it further. I can conceive of no nobler and no more congenial task for those who represent the whole people than that of extending to the counties and to the metropolis and to the sister kingdom the liberties and the institutions which have conferred so great a benefit upon us in the provinces. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, local government is important altogether beyond its local usefulness. It is the best political education, and I am convinced that the welfare and the contentment of the whole population can only be secured in proportion as the whole population are called in to take a part and a share in the obligations and the responsibilities of government. But, the extension of municipal institutions is not all that we have to do in the way of local government. We have in the future to elevate our conception of the meaning of the word. It is not merely a parochial and municipal, it is not even merely a provincial question, it is a national question also. What are the great problems of the future? We have to deal with obstruction in the House of Commons. We have to deal with the system under which the greatest legislative assemblage in the world has begun to lose its usefulness, and in consequence lose its influence. And that result can never be accomplished so long as the Imperial Parliament is burdened with an ever increasing amount of petty detail with which it is incompetent to deal, and which ought to be referred to other bodies. (Hear, hear.) We have also to recognise and to satisfy the national sentiment, which is in itself a praiseworthy and a patriotic and an inspiring feeling, and which both in Scotland and Ireland has led to a demand for a local control of purely domestic affairs. (Cheers.) And these objects can only be secured, I believe, by some great measure of devolution, by which Imperial Parliament shall maintain its supremacy, but shall nevertheless relegate to subordinate authorities the control and administration of their local business. (Cheers.) I believe, gentlemen, that in this way only is there any chance of our being able to remove the deeply-rooted discontent which follows as a natural consequence from the attempt of one nation to control and interfere with the domestic and the social economy of another, whose genius it does not understand, whose pressing necessities it is not in a position to appreciate, whose business it has not time to attend to, and whose prejudices and whose preferences it is impossible, even with the very best intentions, to avoid sometimes ignoring or offending. I look forward with confidence to the opportunity which will be afforded in the new Parliament for the consideration of this most momentous question, and I believe that in the successful accomplishment of its solution lies the only hope of the pacification of Ireland—(cheers)—and of the maintenance of the strength and integrity of the empire, which are in danger, which are gravely compromised so long as an integral portion of Her Majesty's dominions can only be governed by exceptional legislation, and so long as it in consequence continues to be discontented and estranged. (Cheers.) I am very glad that there seems a prospect that in the interval which will elapse before the general election we shall have time and occasion to bring this matter to the attention of those whose interest it so deeply concerns, and I think it is a consolation to my right hon. friend as well as to myself for the defeat which we have sustained that our hands are free—(loud and long continued cheering)—that our voices may now be lifted up—(cheers)—in the cause of freedom and of justice. I have seen the extraordinary announcement in the telegram of tonight that Lord Salisbury will not assume the reins of office: but, gentlemen, I have received that statement as you have received it, with incredulous indignation. (Loud cheers.) Lord Salisbury and the Tory party must lie on the bed they have made for themselves; they cannot evade their responsibilities. (Cheers.) No doubt their situation is a very difficult one, but they should have thought of that before. (Cheers.) No doubt they find themselves now face to face with many inconvenient declarations. There are statements which we have been taught to describe as "commercial illustrations"—(cheers and laughter)—which will now have to be explained away. There are pledges which have been given, and the party, as a whole, are committed, if words mean anything, to an entire reversal of almost the whole of the policy of the last few years. (Hear, hear.) But, gentlemen, we are not alarmed. Those pledges were not made to be kept. They have served their purpose, and I look forward with interest to the spectacle which I believe will shortly be presented of a great party with indecent expedition hastening to divest itself of a whole wardrobe of pledges and professions which it has accumulated during the past few years, stripping off every rag of consistency, and standing up naked and not ashamed, in order that it may squeeze itself into office. (Cheers and great laughter.) That is the position, gentlemen. It is only upon those terms that what will be known in history as the "Stop-gap" Government can invite the toleration of its opponents. They must not undo our work. (Loud cheers.) They must not jeopardise the results already accomplished. They must continue on the main lines of the policy that they have so often and so vehemently condemned. But if they are willing to do that, for my part I see no reason why they should not remain as caretakers on the premises—(great laughter and cheering)—until the new tenants are ready in November for a prolonged—and, I hope, permanent—occupation. (Great cheering and laughter.) I feel that I ought to apologise to you for this digression—(cries of "no," and cheers)—but the circumstances under which we meet are so exceptional that I hope they will plead my excuse. It is now my pleasing duty to propose

the toast committed to my charge: "Our Foreign and Colonial Members and Guests." I am glad to find that we are honoured by the presence of distinguished visitors in such unusual numbers. From the United States we have Mr. Cyrus Field, whose name is a household word in this country, and whose friendship for England and personal relations with some of our most trusted statesmen will at all times secure him a hearty welcome. We have also Mr. Minturn and Mr. Mahlon Sands, both of them, I believe, convinced and most earnest Free Traders. From our colonies we have a representative in the person of Mr. Lloyd, who was formerly the treasurer of New South Wales, and who will be specially recommended to you by the fact that in 1873 he proposed and carried the Free Trade policy which distinguishes that colony, and which has added so much to its prosperity. (Cheers.) I don't feel that I can pass over the allusion to New South Wales without referring for a moment to the proof that has lately been given to us that the Government of that country feel that blood is thicker than water—(cheers)—for their action has afforded to us an assurance that in any time of danger or emergency the old country can count not merely upon the sympathy but also upon the active assistance of her sons throughout the whole world. (Cheers.) Then, gentlemen, our great dependency of India is represented by Mr. Lalmohun Ghose—(loud cheers)—and I am encouraged by your applause to assure him of our sympathy in the candidature which we know he is conducting for an English constituency. (Renewed cheers.) In your name I am sure we can express to him our hope that he will in the House of Commons contribute by his eloquence and ability to securing a full and instructed attention to Indian affairs. (Hear, hear.) From foreign countries we have Mr. Fransen van de Putte, representing practically, I believe, what is at the present time almost the only Free Trade nation of Europe. We have in him a distinguished visitor, who has already rendered great services to his own country, not the least of them, I believe, being his support of true and sound economic doctrines. From Belgium we have M. de Beaulieu, the late vice-president of the House of Commons for his country, and last I will name to you, his Excellency the Servian Minister, who will, I am sure, interest you greatly by any information he can give as to the progress and prosperity of a kingdom in whose independence and general welfare every Liberal has the deepest interest. Gentlemen, to one and all of these visitors I have named, and to others, whom want of time and not want of will prevents me from mentioning, I am sure this club will give a hearty welcome, and I cordially drink the toast which I have the honour to propose. (Loud cheers, during which Mr. Chamberlain resumed his seat.)

The CHAIRMAN: Our guest upon my left, the ex-Colonial Minister of Holland (Mr. Van de Putte), prefers not to address you, but he wishes to thank you for the kind way in which you have received his name, and he says his views will be expressed by the Servian Minister. (Hear, hear.)

M. ADOLPHE LE HARDY DE BEAULIEU: Gentlemen—I must ask you to excuse me trying to say a few words in a foreign language. It will be my maiden speech in English. We have for 37 years enjoyed free trade in food, and we had for 30 years before a system of high Protection. The result now is that since we have repealed our corn laws, according to Cobden's principles, property, and the rents on property, have advanced more than a hundred per cent. We have now a reaction, more political than economical. People do not remember the advantages which the adoption of Free Trade gave them. They are evidently not satisfied with plenty and abundance, they are annoyed by cheapness, and appear to be desirous of dearness, scarcity, and poverty. (Laughter and cheers.) But I hope we shall be successful in our endeavours to maintain Free Trade. I beg to thank you for the kind way in which you have received me here as a representative of Free Trade in Belgium. (Cheers.)

M. CHEDOMILLE MIJATOVICH (Serbia): Sir Charles Dilke; Gentlemen,—Allow me to say in the first place that I am really very sorry that you are condemned to listen to me, from courtesy—"No," laughter and cheers)—after the wonderful speech we had a few minutes ago from Mr. Chamberlain. I am very sensible of the honour which is conferred upon me by joining my name with those of the distinguished foreign guests here to-night, and I beg to return my hearty thanks. Among the many excellent gifts with which old England seems to be providentially blest, we foreigners naturally learn quickly to appreciate a special one. It is the gift to make foreigners in your midst cease to feel themselves foreign. Not only we very quickly come to the conclusion that your dinners are admirable, not only do we very soon succumb to the charms of your hospitality, but we, very soon indeed, get deeply interested in your interests. I am inclined to think that this is not only because the present generation exercises in a thorough refined style the traditional hospitality of the English people, but because the greatest interests of England have long ago ceased to be interests of mere local importance and have become the interests of all civilised people, the interests of humanity at large. (Cheers.) From the camp of the Protectionists we often hear the statement that Free Trade is nothing but a clever invention of the Manchester School to secure markets for Manchester goods. But with an impartial study of the facts I believe every enlightened man must come to the conclusion that if Free Trade is an English interest it is only because it is an universal interest, and that the Cobden Club, though carrying the banner of a famous Englishman, a man truly great and good, is fighting for the good of all nations. (Hear, hear.) If I may be allowed to say a few words about my own country—(hear, hear)—I must confess that we Serbs are in a peculiar position. Theoretically

Free Trade is losing ground amongst us, practically it is keeping it. With all my writings and lecturing about the soundness of Free Trade principles I have not succeeded to convince the majority of my countrymen. There is a great tendency to follow the example of America, Germany, and Russia, and by the next occasion to adopt a protective tariff. But practically we have had for these last 50 years, and have now, Free Trade—(hear, hear)—our highest import duties not surpassing 8 per cent. And what was the result of that system? Well, gentlemen, I can safely, and in all modesty, state that that result is worthy of study. Fifty years ago our country was very poor indeed and backward in everything, so poor that even the Turks thought it could not pay more than £20,000 yearly tribute. To-day we are capable to apply every year to our public wants nearly £2,000,000! To-day we may claim to be a cultured people, of which civilised Europe has no reason to be ashamed. We are to-day a people jealous of its independency and of its political and civil liberties, anxious to go on on the path of progress, in reality we have no poor, and on the whole and in short we are a happy and contented people. The rapidity of our progress is due in a great measure to the free schools and to Free Trade. Owing to Free Trade the commodities of the civilised life find easy access to the remotest districts of Servia, increasing the desire to enjoy the benefits of civilisation, and stimulating our people to greater production and to greater efforts in general. I hope this will be the case in a still greater measure henceforth, as we are, through railway connection with the seaboard and the continental railway net, bringing our country nearer to the great centres of industry and nearer to the great markets for our own produce. I cannot sit down on this occasion without referring, with the greatest gratitude, to the great interest which Mr. Cobden had felt in the prospects of liberty on the Balkan Peninsula. In the time when we were very little known here, and we had very few friends, he was our great and faithful friend. I regret extremely that I have not been able to obtain in time a copy of a letter which Mr. Cobden wrote to Prince Michael in 1864, a letter full of large-hearted and deep sympathy, full of wisdom, and almost prophetic foresight. In that letter Cobden demonstrated to us that love of earnest work, honesty and liberty, united with respect for law and order, can secure for us greater victories than arms can ever do. In that letter he preached to us a grand political sermon, having for his text, "Labour, liberty, and goodwill towards all men." I hope that our country will always bear in mind the wise teachings of Mr. Cobden and of this Club. (Cheers.)

The Hon. GEORGE A. LLOYD (late Colonial Treasurer, New South Wales): Mr. Chairman, my lords, and gentlemen; after the eloquent speech that we have heard from Sir Charles Dilke, and the equally able and enthusiastic speech that we have had from the right hon. gentleman who has proposed this toast, you can easily imagine that I stand before you with fear and trembling—(laughter)—coming as I do from the Antipodes. But my distinguished friend on my right, Mr. Cyrus Field, has reminded me that the most eloquent speeches on occasions like these are the shortest, and taking a hint from that suggestion you may depend upon it I shall not transgress. I can assure you that I feel very much obliged to Mr. Potter for the invitation he has sent me. I saw Mr. Potter when I was here a quarter of a century ago, and I am very glad indeed to find him in robust health, and still in the enjoyment of the confidence of this Club, which I hope he will retain till the end of this century. (Applause.) Sir, I represent a country, the largest island in the world, 2,500 miles in length by 2,000 miles in breadth. It does a trade with various countries, representing £115,000,000 sterling, and it takes £8 per head of British manufactures per annum, whilst France and the United States, which are Protectionist countries, only take 15s. per head. I have lived more than half a century in the colony of New South Wales, and I am old enough to remember when the whole produce of coal of that colony was 500 tons, when it was sent away in loads of 50 tons, being wheeled up a plank in barrows. I have lived to see the production of coal in that colony 2,000,000 tons per annum, and we can now load 16,000 tons per day. I have indeed to thank the Cobden Club for the education that I have experienced in regard to Free Trade principles. I have studied its publications from year to year, and I have to thank those publications for the information that I have obtained, and for the advantage that I have been able to take of that information. It was my distinguished honour, as a member of the Parkes' Administration in 1873, to introduce, as colonial treasurer, or as you would call it here, Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Free Trade tariff which now prevails in New South Wales. (Cheers.) A Protective tariff had been introduced some years before, but our revenue was increasing and I proposed to the Cabinet, of which I was a member, that we should abolish all the *ad valorem* duties, and a very large number of the specific duties, and that we should go in for Free Trade principles. The Cabinet consented to my proposal, and it was my distinguished honour to introduce the Bill and to carry it through all its stages, and that Bill has become the law of New South Wales and remains the law at the present moment. (Cheers.) As you know, we have close to us, with a very small line dividing, the important colony of Victoria, which is just as essentially Protectionist as New South Wales is Free Trade, and it is amusing sometimes to hear the discussions that go on in these two colonies as to which shall take the pre-eminence. Victoria claims to have the pre-eminence with regard to its Protectionist principles, and New South Wales claims to have the pre-eminence with regard to Free Trade, but facts are far more important than any arguments. Although I don't mean to trouble you with statistics, which I know are a nuisance at a meeting of this kind, yet I should like to give you a few striking facts. In Victoria, during the ten years from 1873 to 1883, the increase of exports was £1,096,409. The increase in New South

Wales during the same period was £10,498,145. (Cheers.) The increase in Victoria imports during the ten years was £1,209,990, and the increase in New South Wales was £10,488,674. The increase in the population of Victoria during that period was 159,731, and the increase of population in New South Wales was 309,035. These figures speak more eloquently than anything else I can say on the subject—(hear, hear)—and I will leave them with you as my contribution to the Cobden Club. (Cheers.)

Mr. LALMOHUN GHOSE (India): I hope you will not be alarmed, for I am not going to make a speech. I need scarcely say that I feel greatly honoured at finding my name associated with this toast. But at the same time it is impossible for me, after the exhaustive and eloquent speeches to which we have just listened from the eminent statesmen who have favoured us to-night with their company, to add anything that may be worthy of your attention. I need not tell you that I am a firm believer in Free Trade—(hear, hear)—and the other principles with which Mr. Cobden's name is associated. I am happy to be able to tell you that this is not the first time that I have had the honour of speaking here at Greenwich. (Hear, hear.) I cannot help thinking that our friends here have reason to be thankful to the Cobden Club for holding their annual dinner in this borough, for the present representatives in Parliament of this constituency are gentlemen whose views on the question of Free Trade are very far from being sound. ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) Though they do not venture openly to range themselves against Free Trade, yet they profess a considerable degree of sympathy with Protection under its new names of Fair Trade and Reciprocity. I believe, gentlemen, that the constituency of Greenwich is far too intelligent and enlightened to be taken in or to be deluded by any such shallow devices, as I hope and believe both Mr. Boord and Baron de Worms will find to their cost at the coming election. (Hear, hear.) Well, gentlemen, there is only one matter to which I wish to draw your attention to-night. I am as sensible as anybody else of the dangers and the perils of a change of administration at this critical period. But at the same time I cannot say that I am very sorry to find that the particular issue raised between the political parties is in connection with the revenue system of the country, and therefore likely to give a good deal of prominence to those principles of Free Trade in which this Club is so deeply interested. I myself take a special interest in that question, for I cannot help thinking that the alternative proposal of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, to tax tea in preference to beer, is a proposal that very closely affects and concerns the country whose interests I am here to serve. ("Hear, hear," and cheers.) The question that will have to be decided at the coming election by the constituencies, and their judgment upon which will be watched with eager interest by your fellow subjects in India, as well as by those foreign nations whom you are anxious to educate in the principles of Free Trade,—is this—whether you are going to tax an article of general consumption amongst the poorest classes of your people and at the same time to ruin a rising and important industry in India, for the purpose of pleasing and promoting the interests of a special class such as the brewers or licensed victuallers. (Hear, hear.) Well, gentlemen, when you consider the matter in that light you must come to the conclusion that if you wish to get foreign nations and other countries to believe in the sincerity of your faith in Free Trade, you must show that you have the courage of your opinions, and that you are really prepared in your own country to practise the doctrines that you preach. (Hear, hear.) Now, consider what would be the effect in India if they find that, while a five per cent, duty upon Lancashire goods, levied by the Indian Government was strongly denounced in every newspaper and every platform in this country, that at the same time you should apparently see nothing wrong, nothing inconsistent with the principles of Free Trade, in imposing a duty of not less than 50 per cent, upon Indian tea—(hear, hear)—and that some of the most prominent politicians about to take office should be actually advocating a further addition to the duty. Well, gentlemen, this is a question which I have ventured to bring to your notice in the hope that the Cobden Club will earnestly bestow their attention upon it, in order to strengthen the hands of the friends of Free Trade in foreign countries, and the hands of all those who, like myself, in India and in other parts of the British Empire, desire to see the complete triumph of those principles which are connected with the name of the illustrious statesman after whom this Club is named. Gentlemen, I beg to thank you once more for the honour you have done me. (Applause.)

Mr. THOMAS BAY LEY POTTER (Honorary Secretary of the Club) rose, and was heartily received. He said: I rise, gentlemen, to propose the health of our chairman—(cheers)—to thank him for the eloquent speech which he has made, and to thank his able colleague for the glorious speech which he has made—a speech which inspired this room, and will inspire the people through the country to do their duty in the coming election. (Cheers.) I have known Sir Charles Dilke, now, for many years. I may say I have known him since he was a boy, as I knew his father before him. I am proud to see him here to-night—(hear, hear)—and I hope and trust that the day may come when, if we need leaders in the cause of progress in this country, we may know that our faith in Sir Charles Dilke and in Mr. Chamberlain has been justified. (Cheers.) It is an immense satisfaction for an old Radical like me—(cheers)—whose day is nearly done, to know that there are men—and England never will want them in her time of need—men who will lead that cause after the manner of the chief under whom they have served, and will carry out the principles, not merely of Mr. Gladstone, but of my old friend, Mr. Cobden. (Cheers.) There are some men who think that the Cobden Club was formed alone to carry out Free

Trade principles—that it was a purely economical-Club. Now, I was in at the birth of this institution, and I have taken an active part in maintaining it. (Cheers.) If I live for another year, it will have reached twenty years of its life-time, though many thought and prophesied that it would not live half-a-dozen. But on what grounds was this Club formed? They ask me—What have you to do with general politics? I say—Look at the fundamental rules of the Cobden Club: "The Cobden Club was founded in 1866, with the object of encouraging the growth and diffusion of those economical and political—(hear, hear)—principles with which Mr. Cobden's name is associated." (Cheers.) I had the honour of knowing Cobden personally, and of knowing him very well. If ever there was a true Radical it was Richard Cobden—(cheers)—and the more his works are read, and the more his speeches are considered, the more does he appear not merely as a Free Trade advocate but as a great statesman. (Cheers.) I have faith in him—I have faith in the Club. Some think that the work of this Club is soon to be ended. Twenty years hence there will be a necessity for the Cobden Club. (Hear, hear.) I hope that there will be some one more able than I am—he cannot have more zeal for the cause—who will be enabled to lead it to victory. But what were Cobden's principles? They were the principles of political progress, the advancement of the people—(hear, hear)—the education of the people. (Hear, hear.) And as long as there is one vestige of privilege left, as long as there is anything which can affect the civil and religious equality of all the people of the land, so long will there be need of a Cobden Club. (Loud cheers.) I have great pleasure in proposing Sir Charles Dilke's health, and in thanking him for his speech; and let me thank Mr. Chamberlain for his speech also. (Prolonged applause.)

The CHAIRMAN, who was greeted with renewed cheering, said: My task in returning thanks to you for the kind manner in which you have received this toast—in returning thanks not only in my own name but in that of my friend and colleague who has been mentioned by my friend Mr. Potter—is a very light one. I have simply to assure you of the pleasure it has given me, as a very old member of the Club—a member from its first days, as Mr. Potter knows—to have been here to-night in the chair. I think I have never missed more than one of your former meetings in this room; and I was formerly, and as long as I had opportunity, a very active member of the committee. I am sorry that for some years past I have not had that opportunity of attending to the transaction of your business which I hope Lord Salisbury's courageous act may speedily give. (Hear, hear.) I hope, at all events in the short time during which "the Stop-gap Administration" may give the opportunity, that I shall again be able to give attention to your business. (Hear, hear.) For myself I will simply thank you. But there is a still more pleasing portion of the task for which I rose yet to be accomplished. I do not think that, although there is no other toast upon the list of toasts to-nights, you would think our proceedings are really completed and brought to a satisfactory end if we did not drink the health of the Honorary Secretary of the Club. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, I am sure that someone would have made that proposal if I had not made it myself. But if I had been in the least likely not to have done so, the excellent speech which Mr. Potter has made just now I think is a special reason for drinking to him tonight. (Hear, hear.) He placed concisely before us the programme of the Cobden Club; and he showed us how foolish are some remarks which have been made as to the alleged strictly economical character of the Club. I am sure that if Mr. Cobden had ever contemplated the formation of a club to bear his name, he would have been the last man in England to wish that the club should be a merely Free Trade club, composed mainly of economists. Cobden was, as Mr. Potter has said, before all things a general politician, a statesman of the widest stamp, a man who surveyed the whole of the affairs of mankind, and a man who would have been utterly unable to conceive of the possibility of contracting our ideas so as to be able to regard only one question at a time. Mr. Cobden was accustomed to survey the whole field of politics, and Free Trade was only a portion of the great body of questions in which he took interest. Mr. Potter has put that, now, in words so admirably chosen that they ought to form a text for all the future proceedings of the Club. (Hear, hear.) I ask you now to show in drinking this toast, not only your appreciation of the manner in which Mr. Potter has put our objects before us here to-night, but also your appreciation of the immense services which he has rendered to the Club, and to the principles of the Club, during the many years of his past connection with us.

A VOICE: Three cheers for Father Tom!

The toast was drunk amidst enthusiastic cheering.

Mr. POTTER, responding, said: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I thank you for the honour you have done me. I am pleased that you should recognise me in this manner; but you have pleased me far more by the meeting to-night. It is the cause that I care for. (Cheers.) It makes no matter whether it is the solitary hard work, the work with the secretary, or the work with two or three others in committee, it is the cause I care for—the progress of the cause. And I never feel disheartened. My faith is such that, as long as I have strength I shall do all in my power to promote the interests of the Club. (Applause.)

Shortly after ten o'clock the party broke up. Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Chamberlain returned to town by rail, but a large number of the members and guests joined Mr. Potter in the voyage back to Westminster by the boat. It was a soft picturesque summer's night on the Thames. From first to last the festival passed off in the

most gratifying manner, and the principal speeches were regarded as among the most interesting and memorable on the records of the Club.

The Book of Common Prayer,

And Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of God in New Zealand,

Being an Amendment of the Present Church of England Service.

Respectfully Suggested for the Use of all Men Who Desire to Worship God Side by Side in Brotherly Adoration.

Lyon & Blair, Printers Wellington, N.Z. Stationers, &c., Lambton Quay 1866

There is But one God. all Men are His sons and Prophets.

Preface.

THE accompanying Form of Prayer has been prepared principally for the purpose of preventing persons who profess Free thought doctrines from drifting into Atheism. The alterations in the Church of England Service are slight, but very important, fully as important as the alterations effected in Henry the VIII.'s time. Amendment being better than abolition, it has been thought better to amend than to abolish. The Lyceum Leaders and Guides published throughout Australasia offer no form of prayer; they are rather hymn books than prayer books. The accompanying amendment of the Church of England Service will allow all persons to worship God reverently side by side. This, I take it, is what most Colonists desire; thinking men being anxious to escape from the wretched differences of religious creed. A subsequent work will contain an adaptation of those glorious anthems and hymns used by all Churches in God's worship; but in this I hope to receive the aid of friends possessing musical ability. Music hath the power of softening the feelings of men worried by the cares of the world, and rendering them more ready to bow their heads to God. I would also gladly receive any suggestions towards correcting the accompanying drafts, which in two or three instances do not satisfy my mind. Especially would I ask Presbyterian and Wesleyan clergymen to take them into their consideration.

Certain portions of the Church of England Service have necessarily been omitted. Reference will be made to the reasons why this has been done when the Evening Service and the ordinary Prayers and Thanksgivings are submitted. There is nothing to prevent any minister of religion from using the present proposed form of worship, and preaching from any authority he pleases, or from which his congregation desires him specially to preach. Yet even this form of prayer contains many verses which I should like to omit, were it not that I fear to amend too much. A century hence these words may be omitted. Let that which has been done suffice for the present.

Gladly would I see a Church established in New Zealand to be called the Church of God, in which all men may worship the Great Maker and Ruler of this Universe's deity side by side. But this will be a work of time, and all who aid in the work must so expect it. Had it not been for the steady determination of Thomas Cromwell, Cecil, Walsingham, and other English statesmen at the time of the Reformation, we should never have had a Church of England Service at all. The prayers would still be read in Latin, and a multitude of humankind would be not entitled to our adoration. There is but one God, and all men are His one and the prophets of His wondrous laws. Truly, it is not for us to worship any man or woman who has lived upon this earth; for that is equivalent to the setting up a human idol in place of the old graven image. Thinking men of the present day will not tolerate idolatry of any kind, and soon women will follow their example. Earnestly do I ask my fellow colonists of the Roman Catholic Church to think carefully over what I say; to read such a work as Draper's Intellectual Development of Europe," and to make use of the wonderful organization, power, and beautiful musical service of their Church in causing men to combine in the simple worship of God. And, further, to remember what Plato taught, "the unity of God, and brotherly love," so that our children may be educated side by side, and grow into a united and happy people.

The congregation of any church edifice may, by using this form of prayer, and inviting to their pulpit any clergyman who will preach these broad religious views, greatly aid in establishing such a Church as most men wish to see established. School Committees can also have portions of the Prayer Book taught in the schools, so that our present system of education may no longer be termed a Godless one. I hope these Committees will not, upon any account whatever, allow the Bible to be read in the schools; for the reading of the Bible does not mean the worship of God, but rather the perpetuation in Australasia of all the miserable differences of religious creed. Parliament in its wisdom would do well to ordain that every schoolmaster in the Colony should daily open school by reading a portion of these prayers, thereby preventing the strife of religious creeds. And so, with God's good grace, I submit these pages, sincerely hoping that they may tend to bind men's minds to one another in brotherly regard upon earth, and cause them humbly, modestly, and reverently to worship the Father and Ruler of all things who is in Heaven.

Coleman Phillips.

Wellington,

June 1st, 1886.

At the beginning of Morning Prayer the Minister shall read with a loud voice some one or more of these sentences that follow:—

WHEN the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive.

I acknowledge my transgressions, and my sin is ever before me.

Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.

The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

Send your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God: for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil.

To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him: neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws which he set before us.

O Lord, correct me, but with judgment: not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing.

Repent ye: for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.

I will arise, and go to ray father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.

Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us: but, if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

EARLY beloved brethren, the Scripture moveth us in sundry places to acknowledge and confess our manifold sins and wickedness; and that we should not dissemble nor croke them before the face of A mighty God our heavenly Father; but confess them with a humble, lowly, penitent, and obedient heart; to the end that we may obtain forgiveness of the same, by His infinite goodness and mercy. And although we ought at all times humbly to acknowledge our sins before God; yet ought we most chiefly so to do, when we assemble and meet together to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at His hands, to set forth His most worthy praise, to hear His most holy Word, and to ask those things which are requisite and necessary, as well for the body as the soul Wherefore I pray and beseech you, as many as are here present, to accompany me with a pure heart, and humble voice, unto the throne of the heavenly grace, saving after me:

A General Confession, to be said by the whole Congregation after the Minister, all kneeling.

ALMIGHTY and most merciful Father; We have erred, and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep. We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts. We have effended against thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have on And we have done those things which we ought not to have done; And there is no hearth in us. But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare thou them, O God, who confess their faults. Restore the a theme that are penitent: And grant. O most merciful Father. That we may hereafter live a gedly, righteous, and sober life, To the glory of thy holy Name. Amen

The Absolution or Remission of Sins, to be pronounced by the Minister alone, standing; the people still kneeling.

ALMIGHTY God, desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn away from his wickedness and live; therefore I say unto you that God pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent an unfeignedly beliere in Him. Wherefore let us beseech Him to grant us true repentance, that these things may please him which we do at this present; and that the rest of our life hereafter be pure and holy.

The people shall answer here, and at the end of all other prayers, Amen.

UNIVERSAL Lord! who sceptre swayed,
Ere first, creation's wondrous form was framed:
When by Thy will divine all things were made;
Then King, Almighty, was Thy name proclaimed.
When all shall cease, and this world's system o'er,
Then He omnipotent alone shall reign;

Who was. Who is, and Who evermore
In most refulgent glory shall remain.
Sole God I unequalled and beyond compare,
Without division or associate;
Without commencement, date, or final year,
Omnipotence is Thine, and regal state.
Thou art my God, my living Redeemer,
My sheltering rock in painful hour.
My refuge, standard and protector.
My lot's disposer when I seek Thy power.
Into Thy hands my spirit I consign,
Whilst wrapt in sleep, and when again I wake;
And with my spirit my body I resign,
The Lord with me, no fear my soul can shake. Amen.

Then the Minister shall kneel, and say the Lord's Prayer with an audible voice; the people also kneeling, and repeating it with him, both here and wheresoever else it is used in Divine Service.

OUR Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, As it is in heaven Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses. As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, The power, and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

O Lord, open Thou our lips.

Ans. *And our mouth shall shew forth Thy praise.*

O God make speed to save us.

Ans. *O Lord, make haste to help us.*

¶ *Here all standing up, the Minister shall say,*

Glory be to God on High, the Ruler of the Universe.

Ans. *As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.*

Praise ye the Lord.

Ans. *The Lord's Name be praised*

Then shall be said, or sung, thin Psalm tallowing:—

Venite, exultemus Domino.

O COME, let us sing unto the Lord: let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation.

Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving: and shew ourselves glad in him with Psalms.

For the Lord is a great God: and a great King above ad gods.

In his hand are all the corners of the earth: and the strength of the hills is His also.

The sea is His, and he made it: and his hands prepared the dry land.

O come, let us worship, and fall down: and kneel before the Lord our Maker.

For he is the Lord our God: and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand.

To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts: as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness;

When your fathers tempted me: proved me, and saw my works.

Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said: It is a people that do err in their hearts, for they have not known my ways.

Unto whom I swear in my wrath: that they should not enter into my rest.

Glory be to God on High, the Ruler of the Universe.

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

Then shall follow the Psalms of David and Proverbs of Solomon in order as they are appointed. And at the end of every Psalm and Proverb throughout the year, and likewise at the end of Benedicite, Magnificat, and Nunc dimittis, shall be repeated:

Glory be to God on High, the Ruler of the Universe.

Ans—As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

Then shall be read distinctly, with an audible voice, the following Lesson by the Minister:—

INOT the hearts of men God uttered these words: I am the Lord thy God Thou shalt have no other god but me.

Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God. and visit the sins of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and show mercy unto thousands in them that love me, and keep my commandments.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his Name in vain.

Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all that thou hast to do; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt do no manner of work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.

Honour thy father and thy mother; that thy days may be long in the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

Thou shalt do no murder.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Thou shalt not steal.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his servant, nor his maid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his

Answer Lord, have mercy upon us, and write all these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech thee.

Te Neum Landamus.

WE praise thee. O God: we acknowledge thee to be the Lord.

All the earth doth worship thee: Father everlasting.

To thee all Angels cry aloud: the Heavens, and all the Powers therein.

To thee Cherubim and Seraphim: continually do cry:

Holy, Holy. Holy: Lord God of Sabbaoth.

Heaven and earth are full of the Majesty: of thy glory.

The goodly fellowship of the Prophets: praise thee.

The noble army of Martyrs: praise thee.

The holy Church throughout ail the world: doth acknowledge thee:

The Father: of an infinite Majesty.

O Lord, save thy people: and bless thine heritage.

Govern them: and lift them up for ever

Day by day we magnify thee;

And we worship thy Name: ever world without end.

Vouc safe, O Lord: to keep us this day without sin.

O Lord, have mercy upon us: have mercy upon us.

O Lord, let thy mercy lighten upon us: as our trust is in thee.

O Lord, in thee have I trusted: let me never be confounded.

Or this Canticle:

Benedicte, omnia Opera.

O ALL ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.

O ye Angels of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.

O ye Heavens bless ye the Lord: praise him. and magnify him forever.

O ye Waters that be above the firmament, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.

O all ye Powers of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.

O ye Sun, and Moon, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.

O ye Stars of Heaven, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.

O ye Showers, and Dew, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.

O ye Winds of God, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Fire and Heat, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Winter and Summer, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Dews, and Frosts, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Frost and Cold, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Ice and Snow, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Nights, and Days, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Light and Darkness, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Lightnings, and Clouds, bless ye the Lord: praise him and magnify him forever.
O let the Earth bless the Lord: yea, let it praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Mountains and Hills, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O all ye Green Things upon the Earth, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Wells, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Seas, and Floods, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Whales, and all that move in the Waters, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O all ye Fowls of the Air, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O all ye Beasts, and Cattle, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Children of Men, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him for ever
O let Israel bless the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Priests of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye Servants of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise him and magnify him forever.
O ye Spirits and Souls of the Righteous, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
O ye holy and humble Men of heart, bless ye the Lord: praise him, and magnify him forever.
Glory be to God on High, the Ruler of the Universe.

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

Then shall be read in like manner this Second Lesson.

BLESSED are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.

Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.

Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.

Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.

Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness sake: for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven.

Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely.

Rejoice and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets who were before you.

Ye are the salt of the earth; but if the salt hath lost its savour, wherewith shall it be salted: it is henceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid.

Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.

Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, 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.

For I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment:

But I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

Therefore, if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee:

Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.

Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him; lest at any time thy adversary

deliver thee to the Judge, and the Judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.

Verily I say unto thee. Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery;

But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

It hath been said. Whosoever shall put away his wife let him give her a writing of divorcement.

But I say unto you that whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

And if thy right eye offend thee pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

And if thy right hand offend thee cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:

But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne;

Nor by the earth, for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the Great King.

Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because you canst not make one hair white or black

But let your communication be Yea, yea; Nay, nay: for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth;

But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also.

And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.

And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.

Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away.

Ye have heard that it hath been said. Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.

But I say unto you Love your enemies bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despite fully use you and persecute you;

That ye may be the children of your Father who is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

For if ye love them who love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?

And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?

Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father who is in Heaven is perfect.

Glory be to God on High the Ruler of the Universe

As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end.

Amen.

Jubilate Dro.

OBE joyful in the Lord, all ye lands: serve the Lord with gladness, and come before his presence with a song.

Be ye sure that the Lord he is God: it is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture.

O go your way into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: be thankful unto Him, and speak good of his Name.

For the Lord is gracious, his mercy is everlasting: and His truth endureth from generation to generation.

Glory he to God on High, the Ruler of the Universe.

As it, was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

Then the Minister. Clerks, and People shall say the Lord's Prayer with a loud voice.

OUR Father who art in heaven. Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. They will be done in earth, As it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. Ami load us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil. Amen.

O Lord, show thy mercy upon us.

Ans. And grant us thy salvation.

O Lord, save the Queen.

Ans. And mercifully hear us when we call upon thee.

Endue thy ministers with righteousness.

Ans. *And make thy chosen people joyful,*

O Lord, save thy people.

Ans. *And bless thine inheritance.*

Give peace in our time, O Lord

Ans. *Because there is none other than fighteth for us, but only thou, O God.*

O God, make clean our hearts within us.

Ans. *And take not thy holy Spirit from us.*

Then shall follow these three Prayers or Collects, all kneeling. First Collect.

WE prostrate ourselves humbly before Thee, Oh Supreme King of Kings, Lords of Lords, who stretched out the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth. Thou art our god, and there is none other. As it is written, Know thyself this day, and reflect in thine heart, that the Lord he is God, in heaven above and on the earth beneath: there is none else. Amen.

The second Collect, for Peace.

OGOD, who are the author of peace and lover of concord, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, whose service is perfect freedom; Defend us Thy humble servants in all assaults of our enemies; that we, surely trusting in Thy defence, may not fear the power of any adversaries. Amen.

The third Collect, for Grace.

LORD our heavenly Father, Almighty and everlasting God, who has safely brought us to the beginning of this day; Defend us in the same with Thy mighty power; and grant that this day we fall into no sin, neither run into any kind of danger: but that all our doings may be ordered by Thy governance, to do always that is righteous in Thy sight. Amen.

In Quires or places where they sing, here followeth the Anthem. Then these four Prayers following are to be yeard:—

A Prayer for the Queen's Majesty.

OLORD, our heavenly Father, high and mighty, King of kings, Lord of lords, the only Ru who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth: Most heartily we be seech Thee with Thy favour to behold our most gracious Sovereign Lady, Queen *Victorla*; and so replenish her with the grace of Thy Holy pint, that she may alway incline to Thy will, and walk in Thy way: Endue her plenteousty with heavenly gifts; grant her in health and wealth long to live; strengthen her that she may vanquish and overcome all her enemies; and finally, after this life, she may attain everlasting joy and felicity. Amen.

A Prayer for the Royal Family.

ALMIGHTY God, the fountain of all goodness, we humbly beseech Thee to bless *A bert. Edward* Prince of *Wales*, the Princess of *Wales*, and all the Royal Family: Endue them with Thy Holy Spirit; enrich them with Thy heavenly grace; pepes them with ail happiness; and bring them to thine everlasting kingdom. Amen.

A Prayer for the Clergy and People.

ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, who alone workest great marvels; Send down upon our Ministers, and all Congregations committed to their charge, the healthful Spirit of Thy grace; and that they may truly please Thee, pour upon them the continual dew of Thy blessing. Fulfil now, O Lord, the desires and petitions of Thy servants, as may be most expedient for them; grunting us in this world knowledge of the truth, and in the world to come life everlasting. Amen.

The Grace.

THE grace of the Most High and Merciful God, and your humble reverence for His Holy Name, and your loving fellowship for each other upon earth, be with you all this day and evermore. Amen.

Here endeth the Order of Morning Prayer throughout the Year.

Imperial Strategic Communications with special reference to the Turko-Persic-Indian line and the Strategic Considerations influencing its alignment and defence.

"Ne tentes, aut perfice."

Preface.

THIS paper is written in continuation of that on 'Afghánistán as a theatre of operations and as a defence to India,' and should he read with it; for the principles upon which they are based are identical, and the arguments given in it are not repeated. It is written under the influence of the same hope, *viz.*, that it may lead to some

definite Imperial defensive policy, so that Imperial interests may cease to be the sport of party and of a selfish insular administration, a mere reed swayed by that specially fickle breeze which may for the time being happen to constitute 'the desire of the heart' of the ruling Cabinet; that they may be determined by the true requirements of our Eastern Empire and our Eastern neighbours bound up with it; and, once so determined and some finality arrived at, that we set ourselves to further them steadily and with a no wavering of purpose, by such means as we from time to time find opportunity to give effect to.

Our diplomacy fails, our military policy fails, we enter on campaigns only to withdraw from them, from change of policy, from want of confidence in ourselves, and for want of goals for our action. Let it not be said that our military policy can be best described as a succession of hysterical manoeuvres carried out at the cost of the soldier to meet party ends.

Imperial interests now require an Imperial war council to be composed of British, Colonial, and Indian statesmen and our most renowned and experienced Generals. Such men abound, and they are the nation's best advisers, because trained in the best schools of experience. Circumstances have shown that Imperial interests cannot now be satisfactorily safeguarded by a British Parliament alone, and that it requires the advice of such a war council; otherwise petty interests have a fictitious importance given to them and are all-powerful, whilst all-important Imperial ones are held to be of no moment. Ministers cannot look to mob meetings to guide them in their policy on Imperial questions. Here the Ministers of the Crown must clearly lead; for the responsibility of doing so is one imposed by office. This generation are the pioneers of the next, and must secure for it all that may be necessary to its Imperial existence.

No one desires war; and in the interests of peace we must place ourselves in a position to prevent it by knowing where and how to strike, and, by rendering action possible, make the power of menace a real power, and something more than an empty boast. At present action is impossible in many directions for want of communications suited to modern armies, which cannot now-a-days filter through 600 miles of difficult country by pack-roads to attack a first-class Power.

Nations are often called upon to make large sacrifices to gain even a sense of security. The reality of true security to be gained only by forethought at a comparatively infinitesimal cost is too often neglected, and a lavishly costly expedient indifferently able to supply its place is adopted in the end. Our history unfortunately abounds with instances of such. Let us try to become wiser in our mature age, and let us set ourselves to find out our Imperial needs. We shall have to battle for our Eastern Empire, and in this term are included the British Eastern Colonies. Let us, therefore, place ourselves in a position to do so to advantage:—*it will pay*.

It is pleasant to think of, and expatiate on, the possible future power of Great Britain; but we must bear in mind that her resources are yet undeveloped, and time is required to consolidate her. For these reasons, no vantage-ground should be lost sight of, no geographical district of Imperial importance overlooked, no nationalities ignored; and, foreseeing the consequences of allowing any Power other than their present possessors to occupy certain stretches of country, we are in duty bound to take measures to maintain the *status quo*, and to justify our action by exacting of their inhabitants obedience to our wishes in return for our protection, which need continue only to such time as they can protect and govern themselves.

United Service Club,

Simla,

September 7th, 1885.

M. S. B.

Imperial Strategic Communications with special reference to the Turko-Persic-Indian Line and the Strategic Considerations influencing its alignment.

AT the risk of incurring the charge of plagiarism, the question of Imperial strategic communications is taken up in this paper. But inasmuch as it is not meant within its short limits to consider the military, political,

and commercial values of one and all of the various sea and land highways to India and the Colonies, but to treat more fully of one, the Turko-Persian line, and to touch upon the others only to bring them to the mind of the reader, it is hoped that such a charge will be avoided.

IMPERIAL HIGHWAYS.

Considering the food and commercial highways radiating from Great Britain as a centre, westwards, round Imperial highways.

south and east, they are—

- —West-south-west, by sea, to Canada and the Eastern ports of the United States; across Canada to British Columbia by rail; and thence south-west and south-south-west to Australasia, China, and our extreme Eastern Colonies.
- —South-south-west, to the coast of South America and *viâ*, Cape Horn to Australasia and our extreme Eastern Colonies.
- —An intermediate line, south-west, to the West Indies, and eventually by the Panama Canal to Australasia and the Chinese Seas.
- —South-south-east and east to India, Australasia, and the Chinese Seas *viâ* the Cape of Good Hope.
- —*Viâ*, the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, and Red Sea to India, Australasia, and the Chinese Seas; and
- —The line, as yet unopened but of great Imperial importance, *uiâ* the Mediterranean Sea and Mesopotamia to Baghdad and the Persian Gulf, and from Baghdad through Mid-Persia to join on with the Indian rails extended to Sístán so as to envelop Baluchistan. The necessity of this route to India and the Australian and Chinese Seas forms the subject of this paper.

If the links in each one of the above chains of communication could be rendered so strong as to be invulnerable, the perfection of defence would have been reached. This may be too much to hope.

According to the power or powers with which Great Britain may be

It may be necessary to concentrate on one or more of these lines.

at war, it may become necessary to concentrate them, in order that commerce may not be crippled and Great Britain starved, and to enlist in its defence, not only our own flesh and blood, but that of our neighbours bound to us by community of interests.

A glance at the Map of the World will show that line No. VI, the Shortest line from Great Britain to India.

Mesopotamian line, with or without its extension through persia, is the shortest line from Great Britain to India. It will naturally be asked to what dangers is it exposed, and how can it be defended?

Each of these questions is considered in detail further on.

If it can be shown to be a secure line, or to be capable of being rendered secure, and, as well, capable of satisfying the requirements of provisioning Great Britain, it is elevated at once to the rank of a first-class commercial highway. If, also, it can be shown to be necessary to the integrity of the kingdoms of Turkey in Asia and Persia, and to be an absolute necessity in order to strengthen them, both materially and administratively, so as to render it possible that they should justify their very existences as units amongst the civilised nations now closing in on them, this commercial highway becomes an Imperial strategic one of the very greatest necessity, and one the development of which should not be delayed.

In the East the mind moves slowly, and the development of a country

To be developed in time, if to be of ultimate use.

by opening up communications is slower Time presses, and valuable years have already been lost. Fruit cannot be plucked from a seedling, nor can results be drawn from an undeveloped country under many years of slow growth.

Time was ripe for this work thirty years ago. There is such a thing as overripeness and its resulting decay and rottenness: cankers of various natures eat into the heart of a nation as well as into that of fruit, and not the least insidious are the unseen,—intrigue, discontent, disloyalty, &c. Finally, the worm alone remains, and its generator, the originator of intrigue and disloyalty, becomes its natural possessor.

Let not the history of the Mesopotamian Railway be that of the Suez Canal; where we feared to tread, eventually others walked fearlessly, with serious consequences to us, both past and to come. The consequences to the Empire, if supineness now still prevents action, will be infinitely more dire, and we may well then think that

"Quos Deus vult perdere, prius dementat."

The Turkish strategic highways are Imperial British highways, and must be constructed by British capital and worked by organised British and Turkish departments, all Christendom being allowed to participate equally in their commercial advantages.

This Turkish route (vi), together with (1), the Canadian route, represents

The route well supported at intervals by vest foot-producing countries to both East and West:

a body (Great Britain) with out-stretched arms, and constitutes a girdle round the earth strongly supported at short intervals by the vast continents of Canada, Turkey in Asia, India, and Australia, and the military positions of Gibraltar, Malta, and Cyprus. Of these main supports, Turkey in Asia alone is not bound to us by ties of blood; but our common interests are great; and should she not at first act in conformity with them, still, when the worst comes, and further misfortunes cause her clearly to discern them and to distinguish friends from foes, the instincts of self-preservation may cause to be placed in our hands the belt of country necessary for us to administer and defend to secure to Turkey a remnant of empire (see page 23), so that to prepare it during peace to meet our needs in time of war is no labour lost; but, inasmuch as it does not admit of through ship communication along it, but necessitates a break of bulk across Canada or Turkey in Asia, it can, to a maritime but bulk broken—there an auxiliary only to the Ocean lines.

nation such as England, be only regarded as an auxiliary to the Ocean lines (ii) and (iv), true channels for through goods, if it be possible to render them secure. Neither arm is dependent on the other for its safety.

Routes (iii) and (iv), *viâ* the Suez and Panama Canals, passing through

The canal routes insecure and badly supported.

canals which can be readily blocked and only with difficulty and time repaired, if damaged, are most insecure. A railway break is quickly repaired; a canal obstruction is only removed with time. Along them supporting points bound to us by ties of blood, loyalty or common interest are wanting. Each supporting point on the combined routes (1) and (vi) is capable of protecting the land line across it, and in a lesser degree those leading to and from it, except the youngest in point of age, Australia, and statistics show that in 20 years' time its development will be such that it, too, will be a source of Imperial strength; its present strength lies in its remote situation and distance from centres of strife: in the meantime the Empire must defend it, and it can best do so by removing

The Australasian Colonies to be defended by postponing possibility of their being attacked in force.

to a distance of time all possibility of a serious attack being mad upon it. The one immediate, great and increasing danger threatening our Eastern Empire of India, Australasia and in the Chinese Seas, is the southern expansion of Russia and her near approach to the shores of the Mediterranean Sea, Persian Gulf, and Japanese and Chinese Seas (see page 14). Another danger is the activity of France in the East; a chief cause of this activity is the dread that France has of Australasia becoming a great Eastern Power and of her acquiring territory between Burma and Cochin-China.

PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED.

The problem before us may then be stated to be—

- How best to strengthen Turkey in Asia, Persia and Afghánistán, so as to justify the aid given to enable them to continue units amongst nations.
- How best to aid these so-called powers to defend themselves, and in defending themselves to defend British Imperial interests, so that it may be impossible for Russia to absorb them and by so doing to become possessed of a line of communication of paramount British importance, and of seas and countries, which would place her in a position to dispute with Britain, with every chance of success, the Empire of the East.

NECESSITY OF STRENGTHENING OUR EASTERN NEIGHBOURS BY ADMINISTRATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS.

How to cheek this advance economically by peaceful and bloodless means (see page 5), and, should they fail, by force of arms, are here

Means of effecting this.

considered. Whether conviction will result in action is another matter. Volumes have without result been written to prove what is self-evident to all acquainted with the East. It seems that nothing but an immediate Imperial danger will cause the initiation of preventive means. The Christian British nation is but a selfish people hording accumulated wealth, and refusing to spend it on either insurance

Necessity for Great Britain to spend her wealth in works of insurance;

or philanthropy. The millions that would benefit by its wealth, laid up in a napkin, if it were but instead laid out remuneratively in communications necessary to its own Imperial existence, are not considered.

Notwithstanding that every pound so laid out would produce ten pounds, the nation acts as did the overcautious servant, and it will receive the same reward. A political earthquake will, it is sincerely hoped, arouse the Empire

to its Imperial duty, and that it will learn from it who are its Imperial neighbours. They are they whose fortunes are bound up with ours by the links of geographical

and the impossibility of her refusing to acknowledge the Eastern Powers as her neighbours. position and its enforced common interests—links that none can unrivet, and designed to draw together nationalities, and requiring of each that self-sacrifice necessary to every bond of union.

A present sacrifice of means, energy and talents is required of us, to construct strategic communications and public works in Turkey in Asia and Persia for their advancement and our own gain; thus leavening them and leading by means of them into a knowledge of just dealings; strengthening them by the development of (their vast latent mineral and agricultural resources, &c.; in a few words, to treat them as our weaker neighbours: they on their part must gradually sacrifice, to entitle them to exist as nations, oriental pride, apathy, rapine and unjust dealings, and allow themselves to be guided by the stronger will. No one unacquainted with the East knows how soon and readily the Eastern will bend to the Western and is benefited for good by it.

Let us see how we have treated one of our neighbours, Afghánistán,
Results of refusing to do so.

and with what results. We have been her acknowledged Mentor since the time of Dost Mahamad, and well have we acted the part of her evil genius: we have participated in the bloodshed caused by the rivalry of the Barakzai Sirdárs by neglecting to step in and forbid and prevent it. There are men who have a voice in the councils of the nation who still advocate that we allow the Afghans to stew in their own juice—surely a most impossible and reprehensible policy and sometime known as "masterly inactivity."

India now smarts for thus having refused to be her brother's keeper. Had we not neglected this duty the sweet fruits of rule and peace would now be falling into our lap. We did well till within 50 years and prospered; but of late timid councils have prevailed: we have neglected our civilising mission, and it is full time that we resumed it.

See what methods of over-caution and unneighbourliness have led to since the first Afghan war. They have led us into deep error; amongst others into believing that the Suleiman range, our frontier, was an impenetrable wail of hills and the Hindu Kush a most formidable barrier: they have led us into considering the heterogeneous Afghan nation to be uncontrollable. In former days we feared neither Afghan nor Turkoman, and sent emissaries under small escorts into the Hazáráját, Bukhárá, &c. These methods of non-intercourse and non-intervention can have no other reason assigned to them by an oriental than one of fear; they have gathered from them that we consider them redoubtable foes, to be dreaded, and now they despise us in proportion as we give way to their will in perpetuating a state of things that we ourselves inaugurated.

Since we became responsible for reform in Asiatic Turkey, a few consuls, scattered at wide distances, have protected Christians, and have done much good in the cause of justice: what good they have done shows what it is possible to effect; but in what is really wanted to develop the resources of the country, in constructing communications, renovating harbours and canals, we have done nothing, and yet precedent is not wanting in the case of the Imperial Chinese Customs Department to show what excellent results may arise from a little good administration. No more corrupt officialdom exists than that of China, and no other nation equals it in its hatred of all foreign control and interference.

Imperial

France's late unsuccessful war may go far to obliterate the good effected by the war of 1860, for no nation requires to be treated with greater firmness than China, the is oriental. All may have to be done over again.

British-Turko Customs and Public Works (Rail ways, Roads,

Inauguration of Imperial British-Turko Public Works and Customs Departments under International Treaty necessary.

and Canals) Departments, recruited in Great Britain and Turkey, would resuscitate its finance and develop its latent wealth, if the latter department be allowed to lay out 50 millions (see page 15). Without this help, Turkey in Asia must decay till she rots to pieces and becomes absorbed by others, and our present endeavours to aid her must be considered to be a mere mockery. We have lent Russia money to construct communications, whereby she has placed herself in a position to injure us. Let us now lend ourselves a little to be laid out in Turkey and Persia, &c., to be administered by ourselves, and not as heretofore by venal pashas, to counteract the harm we have done, in order to construct counter-communications. As above recommended, let Great Britain exact her full bond by spending it, administering it by her own sours, and drawing from it a dividend of 3 to 5 per cent., or more as earned.

The foregoing considerations are no mere denizens of a fantastic world, which has only a phantom existence, nor are they caused by dazzling dreams of Empire; they are founded on rocks of truths and not on the quicksands of fanciful opinion; they are the outcome of the workings of the instinct of self-preservation.

Whether war will be forced upon us within the next few years or

War only averted by its object being rendered unattainable.

months altogether depends to what account we turn them; war is only averted until the desire which instigates it is rendered unattainable. Treaties are for the weak only.

By turning the present to good account, by investing our accumulated wealth in works of insurance, in railways, harbours and canals in Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey in Asia, in opening up their neglected waterways, and in enforcing a just administration, war will be at first postponed, and eventually rendered impossible, and we shall have secured our Empire by a bloodless victory in a manner calculated to bring prosperity and happiness to millions, and credit and profit to ourselves.

It is to be remembered that, in forcing a just administration and

The East must be administered for the good of the many, and pressed by the few.

developing commerce, we have the bulk of the people with us. The Governments of the States concerned will, as in the case of China, reap such substantial advantages that they too, after a time, will be in our favour; the middlemen, governors and petty rulers, who alone benefit at present, will be against us.

It may or may not be malevolence on the part of Russia that causes

Russia's action a legitimate and right one;

her to absorb all oriental peoples with whom she comes in contact. She has done her civilising part well enough to make her welcome as a deliverer to the subject races of Afghanistan, Persia, and Turkey in Asia. Her advantage lies in that none of these nationalities are homogeneous. Afghanistan has her Hazards, Turkomans, Aimáks, Herátis, &c., longing to welcome the deliverer; Persia has her Kurds, Lurs, Arabs, &c.; Turkey in Asia has her Armenians, Kurds, Arabs, &c.—all, except those who live by rapine, discontented with present rule, all desirous of no matter what change so long as it offer a semblance of better things.

It therefore behoves Great Britain to beware how she lays down the

but must not encroach upon that of Great Britain by occupying one of her Imperial highways, unless she voluntarily resigns her duty.

rôle she has been elected to play in the world's history and to count the cost before she does so; to withdraw her hand from the task will be to give it over to others as distasteful to her, and her lot will be to die as surely as have died the nations who have before her educated the world so soon as the desire for peace and quiet, ease and luxury, overruled all other desires and led to weariness of the task. Material wealth and commercial greatness can, unfortunately, only be kept by fostering the military spirit.

By such means of strengthening influence as described can the kingdoms of Turkey and Persia be resuscitated, for they are the only means of raising them in the scale of nations, and making them law-abiding and commercial peoples.

Such works have ever been well received by those of our merchants who have understood their commercial importance; it is time now that our diplomatists and soldiers should throw their weight into the scale.

This diatribe may be considered to be out of place, to be somewhat

The British nation, as a nation, not aware of its responsibilities and the danger it incurs in neglecting them.

of a jeremiad—to partake of the nature of cant and the ravings of a theorist and unnecessary; but is not so. History teaches other-wise; it is all-important, for we have not yet as a nation awakened to the sense of our danger and responsibilities in the East and the ways in which it may react upon ourselves and the necessity of extending our Eastern administration and responsibilities so as to include more fully the nationalities lying between the borders of India and the Mediterranean Sea, and thus to meet the requirements of the advance of years.

It would be a good thing if some of our statesmen were to assume

These should be made known to her by her responsible advisers.

the *rôle* of political Jeremiahs and preach to the people concerning the events that may happen upon the earth in their age, and which will overwhelm them in its tide if it be not stemmed in time.

REQUIREMENTS OF A STRATEGIC HIGHWAY.

A strategic line of communication has a twofold aim,—a commercial

Requirements of a strategic line of communications.

as well as a military one: the latter, to enable military forces to occupy strategical vantage points from whence to prosecute a campaign with foregone chances of success; the former, so to run the line in subordination to the military aim that it shall tap the richest producing country in a military sense, *i.e.*, producing wood, grains, meat, fodder, &c., and the luxuries of life, *i.e.*, butter, cheese, milk, fruits, tobacco, &c.

The commercial and military aims do not clash.

and so enable the troops to be well supplied. These two aims are always attainable together, for both military and commercial success depend upon communications and centres of supply and organisation, and commerce has been instrumental in forming these. The best commercial highway is the best strategical line as a

rule (see page 16).

In such still primitive countries as Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey

Commercial highways take the best line of country afforded.

in Asia, roads are very much in the same condition as that in which the Flood left them, so far as man's exertions to improve them are concerned. Their alignment has been the result of the majority taking the easiest and best road, and those indicated by the natural topographical features of the country. Time has constituted these into highways, and their improvement has been due to the traffic of ages, which will wear its way into solid rock.

MESOPOTAMIAN HIGHWAYS.

Our first aim, therefore, in selecting a strategic and commercial communication to run through Turkey in Asia, Persia, and Baluchistán to India (i), is to determine the military points of advantage necessary for us to occupy for both attack and defence; (ii) to align it so as to pass, at a safe distance from the frontier, through or near them, and centres of supply, the richest pastures, the most wooded hills, luxuriant cornfields, &c.; and finally (iii), to arrange for its subsidiary supply lines both to the front and rear, so as to strengthen vulnerable points and give easy access to points of military and commercial importance.

Besides the construction of the grand trunk strategic highway, which will take the form of a railway, much has to be done in the way of improving

Subsidiary requirements.

feeding waterways and roads, and harbours, and no time is to be lost in their initiation.

To put off sowing the seed of prosperity and reform under the idea that when necessary we can plant the grown tree and at once reap its fruit, is a policy that will not bear a deep investigation (see page 2).

All are military requirements of defence as well as commercial public works of a highly remunerative nature, so on no higher grounds than these of self-interest they should be undertaken and secured by inter-government treaty.

At present the great natural highway from Europe to India through Mesopotamia lies untrodden. It is becoming daily of increasing political and commercial importance to the Empire.

To connect the Mediterranean Sea with

Projects for Mesopotamia railways.

the Persian Gulf, three chief railroad projects have been proposed:

I.—General Chesney's project, known as the Euphrates Valley scheme, and advocated by Sir W. P. Andrews as a sound commercial enterprise.—

The Euphrates Valley line.

The practicability of this scheme is undoubted; starting from Suedia th line would be carried up the Orontes valley and *viâ* Aleppo to Ja'ber Castle on the Euphrates, thence through the El Jazírah to Baghdad on the Tigris and Kurna at the confluence of the Tigris and Euphrates. Below Já'ber Castle the Euphrates is navigable to its mouth by light draught steamers (2# to 3#) of high horse-power, steaming 12 to 15 knots. The culturable area that this line taps is very large; and population, irrigation, good government, and an outlet for its produce, such as that offered by the railway, are alone required to transform it into a vast grain-growing and grazing country.

Strategically it is important as the shortest through line to India, and from its giving communication in the direction of Diarbekir to Ja'ber Castle. The line is estimated to cost 10 million sterling on the broad, and 5 millions on the narrow gauge.

Both strategically and commercially it is defective as a trunk line

Defective both strategically and commercially.

of railway; no near access is given by it to the important strategical centres of Diarbekir and Mozul and the rich districts and mining wealth lying south and north of the line Urfa, Diarbekir and Mozul, and those to the east of the Tigris are untouched by it.

It is well here to remark upon the fallacy of the generally conceived

Causes at work, to keep down cultivation and population in the East.

notions that no exports of wheat or other grains means no growth of them, and that poverty of population argues a poor and impoverished soil.

These two matters are so closely allied, that they are considered together.

Growth of grain depends upon population, soil, and irrigation. The valleys of the Euphrates, Tigris, Kárún and Hindiyán, &c., are amongst the richest alluvial valleys in the world: where corn and barley are grown, they rival our English grains. If one-half of Mesopotamia were put under cultivation, it is calculated that it would yield grain equal to the produce of the whole of France; and that, in the early spring, it could be Sold in London at a cheaper rate than that brought from Odessa. But

Insecurity of life and property.
insecurity of life and property have caused the canals to become dry and the ground to be tilled but here and there by a few wandering tribes. Good government would change this impossible state of things as if by a magic wand.

Fertility of soil is therefore no criterion of the amount of grain grown; it renders the growth possible only. No grain can be exported without communications, and no man will grow more than absolute want compels him to do, unless he is guaranteed the ownership of the surplus after paying a moderate portion of it as a tax. Without communications

and want of communications.

the bountiful yield of the soil supplies its fortunate cultivator with food at a nominal cost; but he remains poor and ill-clad, being unable to barter his wealth by carrying it to markets where it is required.

The area cultivated therefore depends upon the security as to ownership of the surplus cultivated and upon the means of transporting it. The simple fact of opening up communications enables a large additional population to be fed by rendering available the surplus grain of fertile localities which otherwise would go to waste.

To be ill-clad and fed is of comparatively little consequence in
cause national poverty.

the tropics; but in Persia, Afghánistán and Turkey in Asia, it means numerous early deaths and the survival of the strongest only.

Another cause of national poverty and paucity of population is

Bad government

bad government; public works, roads and bridges fall into ruins.

Canals cease to carry water, famines result; sanitation is neglected,

causes famines and pestilences,

pestilences follow. These two causes carry off thousands of people, whose lives are sacrifices to Sultáns, Páshás, Sháhás and Kháns and their satellites.

Bad government leads to oppression and oppression to emigration,

emigration, defective cultivation, and stagnation of all enterprise;

neglect and repression of cultivation. If a crop of corn or fruit or wool is large, the prince not only takes the lion's share but requires the young men and transport of the village to carry it to his headquarters; as a natural consequence but enough for the wants of the community is grown, and the fruit trees are cut down as a source of loss, and the cultivators are the gainers. The Khán takes a fancy to his retainer's colt, and it becomes his; naturally horse-breeding operations do not prosper: a man makes a fortune, not to enjoy it, but to hide his wealth, lest he be summoned to Tehrán, Isfahán, Kábal, or Constantinople to be 'squeezed,'

These are no fancy tales; they are facts. The nomad life is not
and renders a nomad life necessary.

preferred except by the lawless few; it is a necessity to enable the taxgatherer to be more readily eluded; fear of extortion and ruin prevents the peasants settling in villages. Reclamation from a nomadic to a village life would lead at once to the security of the roads, the settlement of the country, and the increase of trade. Poverty also keeps a man single.

Change the causes of poverty and depopulation, causes inseparable

Remedy for the evil.

from an oriental despotism, and the results are changed; increase of all kinds of produce and of population will result; famines will be less frequent and pestilences more under control.

The Sikh despotism in the Panjáb was a mild one compared to those of Afghánistán, Persia, and Turkey in Asia. Since its cessation the increase of produce, of population, and of material wealth has been considerable.

It rests with man, by the evil that lies in the lawless and unrestrained few, to make of a fertile soil an abomination of desolation or by the good that lies in the peace-loving many to create of it a garden.

When the world was young the valleys of the Tigris, Euphrates, and Kárún rivers were thickly populated and richly cultivated; it is a blot on modern civilisation that they are to-day practically depopulated wastes. The climate is more bearable than that of India, less heat and more cold, so well suited to an Indian constitution, that colonies of Indians could be planted there to the benefit of the race and the relief of many over-populated districts.

II.—A more perfect line than that just described (*I*), proposed by

The Aleppo-Mardni-Mozul line.

Mr. Latham and others, takes Alexandretta as a starting point, and runs via the Beilan Pass, Antioch, and Aleppo to Birejik on the Euphrates, and thence through Northern Mesopotamia, past Urfa, Mardin, Jazírah and Mozul to Baghdád, thus gaining at the cost of an increase in length of 200 miles great commercial and strategic

advantages; the centres of commercial and mineral wealth are tapped; it crosses the two main waterways of Superior commercially and strategically to the Euphrates Valley line.

the country, the Euphrates and Tigris, at points to which they can be navigated; it develops a greater area of alluvial soil, and, as well, passes through the great strategic centres necessary to the defence of the country.

In a military sense this line is based on both the Mediterranean Sea

Based on both the Mediterranean Sea and Persian Gulf.

and the Persian Gulf, on Great Britain and on India, To increase its strategic and commercial value a Black Sea base and outlet are required.

This is afforded by the line proposed by Sir M. Stephenson and the

A Black Sea base also necessary.

Stafford House Committee, running from Mardin *viâ* Diarbeker, Malatia, Sivas and

A defensive trunk line,

Tokat to Samsún. This line is essentially a defensive one. Offensive branches are required as below— with offensive branches.

(i) Sivas, Erzingham, Erzerum.

(ii) Kharput, Mush, Bitlis, Van, Kotour.

The main Mediterranean-Baghdad trunk line would cost to construct about 13 millions. The line leading to the Black Sea from Mardin and the Van and Erzerum branches would cost £1,200 to £15,000 per mile (see page 15).

III.—For both strategic and commercial reasons a Central Persian

Requires to be supplemented by an extension through Persia.

line is required, with Isfahán as an objective. This line best takes off from the Mozul-Baghdád line at the most convenient point from whence to cross the Zagros range, so as to reach Karmansháh and Burújird (see pages 14 and 19).

The Aleppo province has a trade of £2,200,000 per annum.

The population of Diarbekir is 40,000 (formerly 150,000); of Mozul (ancient Nineveh) 40,000; of Kharput 11,000; of Sivas 35,000, and of the Province 1,500,000; of Erzerum 40,000; of Bitlis 40,000 of Tocat 30,000; of Mush 15,000; of Van 30,000; of Homs 30,000; of Mardin 25,000; of Urfa 40,000; of Kármansháh 30,000; Hamadán 30,000; Isfahán 60,000; Karmán and Yazd 40,000 each, &c.

The construction of the line of railway would raise these towns into emporia of first class importance, and by sympathy with them its influence would extend more or less to all others even to the shores of the four seas.

Too much through traffic must not be expected on these lines. Local traffic will gradually develop and become great. Their chief value will be strategical and political, and in developing latent resources both agricultural and mineral. We look for too much at one time and to combine all advantages at all times, whereas we must be content to take each advantage in its due season.

A trunk line to India through Tehrán and Mashhad is quite out of the question, as it would be completely under Russian influence; it must be commanded from the Persian Gulf.

To explain the strategic necessity of the above lines to the defence of

Defence of Turkey in Asia.

Turkey in Asia and Persia, let us consider how these countries can be defended most readily and with the least expenditure of means.

First, consider the case of Turkey in Asia.

Russia, her natural enemy, is strong in the country bordering the

A probable Russian plan of campaign in Turkey in Asia.

Black Sea and the Caucasus; she is quick to strike and to take every advance of her apathetic enemy. This she did in 1877, and may be expected to do again.

Her aim will be a decisive result, and a rapid and thorough overwhelming of the Turkish army, for with it will fall Turkish dominion in Asia. Turkey is comparatively weak in the eastern parts of her Empire, adjoining Russia, and slow of action.

Russia, when she desires to pounce upon her prey, may be therefore assumed to mass her forces about Olti, Kars and Erivan, and to be ready to descend by land and sea on Erzerum, Van, Trebizond and Samsún.

If a naval and military power be allied with the Turks, it will be necessary

A defence to oppose it effectually

for her to command the sea and to aid to prevent the former. This she can conveniently do by advancing direct from Trebizond on Erzerum, and by taking up positions along the line Samsún, Tokat, Sivas, Malatia, Diarbekir, and advancing directly by prepared roads or railroads from Sivas on Erzerum and from Malatia on Van. For the rapid

requires railroad communi-cations.

success of these movements railroads are essential; no modern armies can operate with rapidity without them; they multiply men and means, and save life and money by prohibiting protracted operations and leading to decisive results.

Should the slow mobilisation of the Turks, want of military roads, backwardness of her allies, &c., so favour Russia that she capture Erzerum

Result of an ineffectual re-sistance from the outset

(at once the capital and key of Armenia) and Van, or invest and pass beyond them, her endeavour will be to occupy the fertile plains and valleys extending southwards to the Armenian Taurus or Kurdistan range of mountains, *i.e.*, to Mush, Khanus, Bitlis, &c., and westwards, to the neighbourhood of Erzingham and to occupy the eastern outlets of the roads leading through the hills stretching from Erzingham in a south-east direction to the south of lakes Van and Urmiah, *viâ* Hamadán to Shiráz (the Zagros), which outlets it may be confidently assumed will be then fortified and held in force. Under the most favourable circumstances, Russia cannot hope for more than this, and here at least let us hope the defenders will bar all further progress by the occupation of the hill passes

would be to lose a considerable area of fertile soil, and perhaps one or more strong places;

and such points as supports to them as Erzingham, Palu, Hasu, Hazru, Sart, Khizan, Bash Kal'a, &c., effectually hindering all advance on the main strategical points of Mozul, Diarbekir, Kharput, and Sivas.

To these points should gravitate the *Western allies*, troops, stores and transport, &c., required to the front.

To the west of the border the Russians would have roads only to operate by: these being indifferent and few the numbers that can

therefore timely action very important;

operate by them will be restricted. Time will be of the utmost importance, so that the initiative may be taken before the enemy shall have had time to mass in numbers, and to fortify himself and before Erzerum, if it hold out, shall have fallen. To enlist time on the side of the defence, as already stated, railways are required.

Judging from results, Turkish forts and entrenchment are not impregnable to Russian troops, and fall when scientifically assaulted with less than double numbers in a few weeks or even days.

An oriental work is never perfect. It is certain to fail in some essential defensive requirement, which a wary foe is not slow to turn to good effect.

A well concerted forward movement from the directions of Trebizond,

and would lead to the initiative being taken in the enemy's country under most favourable strategic conditions.

Erzingham, Bitlis and Van should carry the initiative by Olti, Zewin, and Alishgird into the enemy's country, for the strategic advantages of the defence are considerable; flanks, secure, resting on the sea and the Armenian Taurus; the right wing, in the

Right wing on the defensive capable of assuming the offensive.

firm occupation of most difficult mountains, their outlets and their exits, an advance can be made at will on the enemy's communications, or a pure defensive may be maintained with inferior forces, whilst the

Left wing acting vigorously on the offensive and an independent force landing or threatening a descent on Batoum.

bulk of the army pushes everything before it, and advances to hand over the border, and, aided by a descent on the coast at Batoum, carry war into the heart of the disaffected Caucasus, Russia's most vulnerable point, and where a reverse, if followed up, must lead to a retirement out of Turkistán.

The defensive zone, to the south-west of Van, so threatens the communications of an enemy advancing from the Caucasus on both Erzerum and Van, that it must of necessity be attacked in force or watched by a large force.

A descent on the coast at Batoum, unless made in great force, cannot be said to threaten a Russian advance on Erzerum, as it would probably be itself besieged; it is when the initiative is taken, and an advance in force made towards Kars, that its value will be felt.

In such a plan of campaign, Turkey being aided by a naval and military power, a Persian column would play a most important part.

Such a force based upon the area Karmansháh, Sahná, Burújird,

Advance of a force from the area Karmansháh, Sahná, Burújird and Haniadán based on the Persian Gulf, an important flank movement, and directly threatens the Caspian base of the Trans-Caspian region.

Hamadán, and advancing in the direction of Tabríz and Rasht, would completely prevent any Russian attempt to force the mountain roads south-east of Van, for it covers all their mouths, and, if necessary, can aid in the defence of Tehran.

Such a column would be based on the Tigris and Persian Gulf, Baghdad, and Muhammerah, by lines of communications (III, page 10), already referred to, and the Kárún (see page 14).

It is also capable of advancing into the Caucasus and of co-operating with the main advance from Erzerum. This Persian column is only necessary should Russia violate Persian territory and operate from Khoi, Tabríz, Souj-boulak or Sahná through

The Persian column only possible if Persia an ally, or her territory be violated by Russia.

the Kurdistán hills. Such operations it completely takes in flank; its own flank is only threatened from the direction of Rasht and Tehrán,—a threat which can be readily met by any reserve force occupying the quadrilateral base above mentioned.

If Persia is maintained neutral, and she herself is neutral, this column composed of Eastern allies could co-operate with the Turks and her Western allies in the general direction of Mozul, Van, Bayazid.

The above sketch of a plan of operations having for its object the

The railway lines (II) proposed meet the military requirements of defence and offence.

defence of Turkey in Asia against Russia goes to show that the strategic lines of communication already considered, from the Black Sea (Samsún), the Mediterranean (Sakandarun, or Suedia or Tripoli) and the Persian Gulf (Baghdád on the Tigris), assures it being effectually carried out.

These lines lie wholly within Turkish territory.

The question has been considered on its broad principles alone, and main points only have been mentioned; in each case, however, details have not been overlooked: to state them, however, would be but to confuse the subject and weary the reader.

The number of troops required for such a campaign must naturally

Troops required to defend Turkey in Asia and to take the initiative towards the Caucasus.

depend much on the nature of the theatre of war, which is hilly and traversed by few good communications. They may be estimated somewhat as below—

Such a force, so placed for mutual support, should render it impossible for superior numbers to cross the border, and would be in a position to take the initiative with 200 000 troops, and as many more as the country could afford to place in the field over 300 000 men.

The defence of Turkey in Asia is the defence of India and of the British Imperial strategic road across Mesopotamia and by the Persian Gulf, which, if in the hands of Russia, would place in serious jeopardy our Eastern Empire and compel it to keep up ruinous war establishments.

The part that a force of 50,000 landing on the coast about Batoum, so as to outflank a Russian advance, or further north, about Yenakali, to cut her communications, is no unimportant one if it take up a strong position securely based on the sea and entrench itself until it can advance to aid in raising the disaffected Caucasus.

To render effectual the co-operation of a force from the area

Communications required to render effectual the operations of the right Hanking column.

Karmansháh, Sahriá, Burújird, Hamadán, the inauguration of communications as below is required, viz.:—

- The extension of the Mesopotamian railway through the Zagros Gates to Karmansháh and Burújird.
- The opening of the navigation of the Kárún river to Shústár; the construction thence of a line of railway, 45 miles in length, to the foot of the hills, north of Dizfúl and of a cart- road over the Chul and Dálích passes, *viâ* Khoramábád to both Karmansháh and Burújird.
- Although it may be impossible to bring Karmansháh into navigable communication with the Gulf by the rivers Kárású, Kharkháh, and Kárún, yet it ought to be no difficult task to make this line of water communication suitable to rafts by improving the worst parts of its course, and to thus facilitate the evacuation of the army.
- The prolongation of the line of rails from Burújird to Isfahán, the capital of South Persia, and the centre of an agricultural and pastural district, presents no difficulties and follows as a matter of course. Nor does this line offer great difficulties between Burújird and Khoramábád and between the western foot of the Zagros range and Baghdad; the passage of the Zagros to reach the hilly plateau of Mid Persia (5,600# to 8,000#), a line of steep gradients and sharp curves, is a difficult engineering work.

Notwithstanding the difficulties of this section, and the fact that the Mid Persian plateau has in winter a severe climate, this military line, the direction of which is imposed by strategic necessities, is also the best commercial line; no other line would so directly tap such fertile districts, *i.e.*, those of Karmansháh, Hamadán, Burújird, Gulpaigán, Khonsár, Isfahan, &c., and those to their northward, nor draw towards it so effectually the products of North and South Persia—Opium, wool, corn, barley, carpets, ghi, &c. (see page 11).

Between Isfahán and Sistán, the connecting link to make complete

The Persic-Indian connecting link.

the overland rail route, the country presents no great engineering difficulties; the line passes through the fertile districts and towns of Yazd, Karman, &c., and follows the route taken by caravans.

Taking the line as a whole from Baghdád to Nushki, where it would

Total cost of strategic railways between the Mediterranean and India.

join on to the Indian lines, its length would be roughly 1,700 miles, and its cost 20 millions of pounds sterling.

The length of the Turkish lines would be roughly 1,600 miles, including the Erzerum and Van branches, and the cost another 20 millions. Thus, for the moderate capital outlay of 40 millions, the guaranteed outlay on which may be taken to require the imposition of an income-tax of one penny in the £ for the few years required to develop traffic, we would have done our utmost to render possible the placing ourselves in a position the best possible for the interests of our Empire, and eventually reap the benefit as well of adding to the markets and the productions of the world and of recouping our outlay.

Allowing another outlay of 10 million for the improvements of harbours, canals and roads, a total outlay of 50 millions on remunerative works, for which we may exact substantial guarantees by requiring certain territories along the lines of works to be given over to us to administer, one-half the cost of a war, only is required. Such an outlay, necessary as an Imperial insurance, is insignificant in comparison to the amount insured; the rumour of a war causes the principal stocks quoted in the London stock exchange to fall in value 100 millions. It is a work in which the Empire may well be called to assist, for Imperial defence is obligatory on us all. The sources of our greatness and prosperity should be preserved by Imperial loans, if, by them, they can be safeguarded.

Amongst colonists are some of the most vigorous of our race, who must be included in our war organisation and Imperial councils. The simple fact of a man being a colonist often stamps him as a man of purpose and determination. By sharing common responsibilities the race is ennobled and rendered one; honour and shame must be shared together, for our rise and fall must of necessity be one.

The Central Persian route is both commercially and strategically

The Central Persian trunk line better both commercially and strategically than lines to the south of the Zagros range.

superior to others put forward as feasible, *viz.*, that from Baghdad, *viâ* Shústar and Shiráz to Karmán and Sístán, keeping to the south of the Zagros range and its south-east continuations, the Bakhtíári hills, and that from Baghdád *viâ* Basra and Bushire and the shores of the Gulf. The latter line would meet with considerable difficulties from streams, floods, &c., would develop no traffic beyond that of the narrow strip of land between the Gulf and the barren difficult hills to its immediate north, and would carry only what filtrates through them into Muhammeruh, Bushire, Bandar Abbas, &c., and which is more cheaply conveyed by sea from these ports.

The line, *viâ* Shústar, Behbahán, and Shiráz, although cheaper to construct than that *viâ* Karmansháh and Burújird, is also defective as a trunk line; it would develop little country and take little traffic. Both are most defective strategically; not leading to any important military positions; not lessening the military difficulties of advancing into the country; not aiding in provisioning and supplying the troops so advancing to any sufficient extent; the coast line is indeed both commercially and strategically useless, and the Shústar-Shiráz line but a slight improvement upon it. A line to pay commercially and to be of military value should run to the north of the Zagros range and its south-east Bakhtíári continuations, so that it may tap the rich valleys found there, and that traffic may flow into it from either hand; it should, as the Baghdad, Karmansháh, Burújird, Isfahán line does, go direct to the sources of wealth, and put the hills difficult to traverse to its south. The iron road must overcome the difficulties of the passage of the Zagros, which occur everywhere between Karmansháh and Isfahán, and which the transport of the country wears itself to death in overcoming, and at the same time it must form the necessary secondary base, to the Persian Gulf and the Tigris as a first base, the breathing stage, for operations towards the Caucasus and the Caspian.

That a correct choice should be made of the best strategic line between

The great importance of the selection of the best commercial and strategic line in the first instance.

the Mediterranean Sea and India, so as to answer all the military requirements of defence and offence, is of the highest importance. A wrong choice cannot be rectified except by costly expedients, and may cripple military action or render it wholly

and the considerations that must influence its selection.

abortive; a strong line as to defence, well selected as to the offensive, must compel the enemy's movements to conform to your initiative. All the advantages are gained of a pre-arranged campaign on a definite plan. The best strategic lines of communication, even if the longest, will generally run through the most important provinces and the most flourishing towns; main communications and not bye-ways are most appropriately used for strategic purposes.

The large town of a district give the greatest assistance to an army; shelter for troops, safe storage for provisions and war materials; their civil workshops and tradesmen, &c., are of value; military establishments of many sorts are to be found in them; they are in fact essential to the organisation, administration and maintenance of an army.

Military bases depend for their fitness upon sources of supply and refitment, fortresses to store munitions of war, open towns for storage of provisions.

All the above considerations were carefully weighed before the overland strategic line to India now put forward as a possible and safe one, and one answering the purposes that it is required to fulfil, was finally decided upon; upon the manner in which it meets the requirements of a good line of commercial and military communication and of a secondary base to the Black and Mediterranean Seas and Persian Gulf, as primary bases, its merit must be decided; the best base and line of communication combined will also be the best commercial line.

The defence of this line is the defence of both Turkey in Asia and Persia (see pages 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21).

KURDISTÁN AND S. W. PERSIA, AS A BARRIER TO RUSSIAN ENCROACHMENTS.

It was shown on page 12 that before a good strategic and commercial communication could be aligned, it was necessary to lay down—

- the military positions to be occupied in case of Russia desiring by force to reach the Persian Gulf and Mediterranean Sea;
- a safe line, easily defended, enabling those positions to be readily reached and the troops in occupation to be quickly supplied with reinforcements, provisions and munitions of war.

Before (i) can be determined, it is necessary that we refer generally to the main military features of the country between the Black and Moditerranean Seas and India. The reader is supposed to be acquainted with its chief general characteristics.

In the belt of country stretching from the Black Sea between the ports,

Great strategic value of the belt of country running southeast from the line Samsún-Trebizond to the line Bushire-Shiráz.

Samsún, Trebizond, in a general south-east direction by Sivas-Erzerum, Kharput-Bitlis- Van, Mozul-Souj-boulak, Kerind-Hamadán, Dizful-Julpaigán to Bushire-Shiráz, it requires no great strategist to see a line of defence, which guarantees to its holder the possession of, in the case of an enemy, and the safety of, in the case of a friend, both Turkey in Asia and Persia.

It may be divided into a hilly and a

It constitutes an offensive-defensive theatre of operations.

mountainous region, the former its offensive, the latter its defensive zone.

From the sea coast to the line Kharput-Bitlis-Van, the belt, the

Offensive zone.

Armenian highlands, consists of grassy mountains and hills, fertile undulations and rich agricultural valleys, generally difficult for military operations, with a climate for four months in the year of a severity to almost prohibit them, and traversed by few and difficult roads.

Its plains, those of Erzerum, Pasin, Khanus, Boulanyk, Mush, Alisb-gird, &c., grow grains largely.

This constitutes its offensive zone.

The fighting strength of this zone is that of three-fourths the fighting

Its fighting strength.

strength of Turkey in Asia; one-fourth being required as a support to troops holding the defensive zone.

To its south-east, stretching to the Persian Gulf, is a mountainous

Defensive zone.

country, difficult to traverse except by hill paths suited to park transport only, and closed by snow for four or five months in the year, inhabited by unruly tribes, practically free of control, chiefly nomads and subservient only in name to either Turkey or Persia. Reference is made to the Kurds, Armenians, Kizilbash, the Turki-speaking tribes of the mountains of Kurdistan, of Luristan and of the Bakhtíári, the Kuhgehlu and the Kashkai.

In these mountains are the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates, watering the Mesopotamian plain, the Kárún, the Hindiyán, &c., fertilising the coast plains of Persia; the Aras and Kizil-Uzen flowing into the Caspian; the Yeshil Irmak, Kizil Irmak and Chorak flowing into the Black Sea; they therefore constitute the main watershed of both Persia and Armenia, for in them rise their greatest rivers.

These ranges constitute the defensive zone.

This is not the place in which to consider fully the fighting strength

Its fighting strength.

of this zone, *i.e.*, of Kurdistan and South-West Persia;

Sir H. Rawlinson writes—"The tribes indeed on the Western Frontier (Persia), those inhabiting the range which runs from Ararat to Shíráz, are the very beau-ideal of military material, the men being athletic, strong,

hardy and active."

suffice it to say that it is undeveloped, but no mean one if it receive the necessary training to give it confidence, and if it be backed by the nucleus of foreign troops necessary to give it cohesion.

In the offensive zone grains, fodder and

Supplies of food and transport.

water, transport and livestock (chiefly sheep) are plentiful; firewood, except in parts, is scarce. Trees are found in the coast ranges only.

In the defensive zone nothing is plentiful but fodder, livestock (chiefly sheep), transport animals, water, and in places, firewood (in the Central Kurdistán range).

In both cases transport will require time to collect, for it is found chiefly among the nomad tribes of Turkey and the Eliyát tribes of the Persian Zagros.

The belt, from the sea to the line Diarbekir, Bitlis, Van, is backed

Country between the belt described and the Mediterranean Sea and Persian Gulf.

by a hilly country similar to itself; to the south-east of this line lie, to the west of the mountains, fertile alluvial plains watered by the Tigris and Euphrates stretching to Arabia and the Syrian hills, across which are easy passes leading to Iskandarun, Suedia, Latikiyah, and Tripoli, &c., and the alluvial coast plains of Persia, capable of producing abundantly most excellent crops of wheat and barley, sugar, poppy, &c.

The alluvial plains are chiefly peopled by Arabs.

The primary bases to the left zone are the Black Sea and the Mediterranean

Its primary bases,

Sea, and to the right zone the Mediterranean Sea, for its north-west section to the line Mozul, Souj-boulak, and for its south-east section, the Persian Gulf.

Cyprus is capable of becoming the place-of-arms necessary to firmly

places-of-arms,

establish the Mediterranean base, and South West Persia that necessary to the Persian Gulf (see page 22); the one is complimentary to the other; the one as necessary as the other; the cultivation of both can be so improved as to support armies.

The secondary bases necessary for offensive and defensive military and secondary bases.

operations are, for the left zone, the line Samsún, Tokat, Sivas, Mardin, and for the latter the line—

COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRED IN THE DEFENSIVE ZONE.

The main points at which the defensive can be penetrated from the

Roads penetrating the defensive zone.

East are—In Turkey, *viâ* Palú, Hazru, Rah-wan, Khizan, Sart, Tchabchur, Amadie, Ro-wanduz, Suleimaniah, Karind and in Persia, *viâ* Dizfúl, Behbahán and Shiráz; all difficult hill roads, very defensible, very difficult to turn, and at present passable to pack transport only.

Unfortunately for Turkey the mouths of the passes leading into Persian territory are on the Persian side of the border, the frontier line having been drawn to the west of the watershed.

To block the above-enumerated roads through the defensive zone

How blocked.

main positions must be taken up at Van (better Khoi, but Khoi is Persian) in rear of Souj-boulak, Hamadán (if an advance is attempted by Sakyz and Sahná), Burújírd and Isfahán.

To block the exits of these roads concentration of troops is required at Diarbekir, Mozul, Baghdád, Shústár, and Behbahán.

These are all points of first-class strategical importance commanding knots of roads or long stretches of mountains.

The railway designed to meet the above-sketched military requirements

The Iskandarun-Isfahán trunk line meets all military require-ments in the defensive zone.

of the defence must therefore of necessity be based on both the Mediterranean Sea and the Persian Gulf. Its general run is indicated by the line below, determined by the military necessities already referred to on pages 10, 11, *viz.*,—

If the harbour of Tripoli is all that is desired, the preferable line is that of Tripoli-Homs-Aleppo.

The opening of river and cart-road communication from Muham-merah to Burújírd and Karmansháh, and from Shústár *viâ* Behbahán to Shiráz and *viâ* Ardal to Isfahán, is necessary to supplement the Persian section of the railway until such time as the country shall be ripe for the construction of a line of rails from Muhammerah, *viâ* Shústár, Dizfúl, Khoramábád to Burújírd, where it would join on to the main trunk line. The natural

commercial prolongation of this line is *viâ* Hamadán to Tehrán.

COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRED IN THE OFFENSIVE ZONE.

For the successful prosecution of operations in the left or offensive

For offensive operations, the Samsún-Mardin line and easterly branches are necessary.

zone it has been shown that Erzerum and Van must be held in force with outposts thrown out to Keretchli dágh, Zewin, Alashgird, Pergri and beyond, and that timely reinforcements of men and material must be pushed up from Trebizond and Samsún.

A good military road (requires repair) already exists from Trebizond, *viâ* Baibourt to Erzerum, and as the distance is only 120 miles, it need not be supplemented. From Samsún a railway is required, *viâ* Tokat, Sivas, a line grain-producing district, Kharput, mining district, and Diarbekir, commercial centre, to join in with the Mediterranean line at Mardin. The advantages afforded by the double base, Mardin to the Black Sea and Mardin to the Mediterranean Sea, are very great; the former answers a double purpose, as it forms the secondary base for operations eastwards.

The branch military lines required are (see page 10)—

- Sivas, Erzitigham, Erzerum,
- Kharput, Mush, Bitlis, Van.

GENERAL PLAN FOR THE DEFENCE OF TURKEY IN ASIA AND PERSIA.

It is assumed that, for the defence of the belt, three armies are required,

The forces advantageously subdivided into three or four armies.

which may be termed the Eastern, the Western, and the Southern. As already noted, the services of a fourth or Persian army is

Their various *râles* and bases.

desirable, but not necessary unless Persian territory be violated.

The Eastern and Western armies, operating in the offensive zone, would be based upon the lines Mardin to the Black Sea and Mardin to the Mediterranean Sea, and the southern or defensive army would be based on the line Mardin-Baghdád. The Persian army would be based on the lines Karmanshah, Baghdad and Burújird, Shústar, Muhammerah.

The eastern army should be pushed forward to fortify and hold the Eastern or advanced army.

passes blocking the roads leading from Ar-twin, Olti, Kars, Kachysman and Erivan and to occupy in strength the fortresses of Van and Erzerum, the former as well as positions about Melasgird and Pergri being converted into entrenched camps.

A mountainous district when properly held in a military sense (see Afghanistan as a theatre-of-war, page 2) is the best defensive barrier, if held by good troops and supported by a well-trained and disciplined field army, the place of which is supplied by the western army to be formed along the base, Samsún to Kharput.

The front held on the defensive is a strong one, and if bravely defended,

Western or reinforcing army.

ample time would be given for the western army to reinforce it from Trebizond, Sivas, Diarbekir, &c.

The southern army would have as the theatre of its operations the

Southern or defensive army.

defensive zone from the line Diarbekir-Van, south-east to the Persian frontier, occupying its passes, the junction of roads in the hills, with main concentrations at Diarbekir, Mozul and Baghdad. This defensive front is very strong: it would be much improved if the mouths of the passes were in Turkish instead of Persian hands, *i.e.*, if the line Karmansháh, Sahna, Tabríz were Turkish and not Persian.

It is inhabited by Armenians, wild Kurds, Yezidis, Kizilbash tribes,

Inhabitants of the defensive zone.

proud of their ancient descent; but lawless and valueless as soldiers, unable to intelligently co-operate in the defence of their hills, but nevertheless offering good raw material for troops.

The possibility of these tribes and of the discontented Armenians falling a prey to Russian intrigue is a contingency to be foreseen and carefully guarded against; distasteful neighbours as they are, they hold a belt of hills of great importance to the defence of the Persian Gulf and the coasts of Syria, and are bound to us by ties of common interest.

Any Eastern Power friendly to the Turks co-operating with them
Persian column.

could best do so by concentrating in the area Karmansháh, Sahná, Burújírd, Hamadán; such a force could move on Tabríz, Khoi, Ardabil, thus flanking all the passes through the Zagros or on the Caspian.

This force would be connected with its base, the Persian Gulf, by the lines given on page 19.

Co-operation between the four armies presents no difficulties; the bases from which they operate, being joined by railway, are practically one.

All the above considerations point to the important part that the

Importance of the area Kar-mansháh, Sahná, Burújírd, Ramadán in the defence of Turkey in Asia and Persia.

area Karmansháh, Sahná, Burújírd, Hamadán, is capable of playing in the defence of both Turkey in Asia and Persia and the Persian Gulf, and it is most necessary that ready access should be given to it from the Tigris at Baghdad, and thence by rail and by the Kárún river to Shúshtar, and thence by rail or road to Burújírd and Karmansháh (see page 14).

The area in question besides protecting the Eastern outlets of the passes across the Kurdistán hills to Van, also protects the whole of South-West Persia from the line Hamadán, Isfahán to the Gulf, and prevents all passage through the Lur, Bakhtíári and Kashgai hills.

A naval power, based on the Gulf, administering South-West

Defence of the route and of Persia.

Persia (from the line Hamadán, Isfahan, southward to the Gulf) with her advanced troops occupying the area designated, is in a position to watch over the integrity of Persia, to prevent what is vital to us being seized by another, and to safeguard the overland railway route to India. This overland route is essentially a British one; it is a link in a communication demanded by the interests of Greater Britain, and is one of her Imperial highways in which all the Eastern Colonies are interested.

Even supposing that the Turks, in a fit of madness caused by irritation consequent on our forcing upon them a better rule, turn against us, the subject Armenians, Kurds and Arabs, bordering on the line of railway, would be with us, and even should they (the Turks) join with Russia for a time, it would be but for a time, until their fit of madness passed and the power of self-interest and love of national existence re-asserted themselves with a double fervour, and in the meantime the Naval Power holding South-West Persia and the adjoining portion of Kurdistan, based on the sea and acting on the defensive, would occupy an impregnable position.

South-West Persia surrounded by the sea, lofty mountains and desert tracks, combines the advantages of a continental situation with practically those of an island. It is based on the sea, the best of Britain's bases, stocked with the most rapid and cheapest of all carriage, England's mercantile marine.

The military reasons for the railway taking the line Karmansháh, Isfahán, are now apparent; the commercial reasons have already been given (see pages 10, 11).

SUMMARY.

Let us make up our minds to the inevitable and acknowledge the actual.

Conclusion.

The actual is that lawlessness, oppression and venality are triumphant from the Mediterranean Sea to the borders of India: that oriental misrule can never right it; that the West must rule the East for the simple reason that the East is incapable of ruling itself, and the only gainers by the present state of things are the few, the rulers, whilst the many sigh for relief and will welcome whoever brings it, whether Britain or Russian; that a British administration would be as widely preferred to a Russian absorption as a traditional friend is esteemed above a deadly foe; and the inevitable is that one or other fate awaits these countries the integrity and strengthening of which by administration it is our interest to accomplish, for in them lie the keys to India and the Persian Gulf, which, if in the possession of Russia, would enable her to seriously cripple, and at all times to seriously endanger, if not to altogether break up, the Empire; for we must remember that fleets and battalions and enterprise can only be met by like and equal forces.

The force of circumstances has given us these disagreeable neighbours, and we must be prepared to treat them as such. We must either go further than we have done or be prepared to fight for our existence in the East under such unfavourable circumstances that we cannot hope for success.

If we refuse to see the necessity of guaranteeing, in a measure, the integrity of these decaying oriental powers, rapidly degenerating from bad to worse—powers the genius of whose religion and whose modes of life are suited only to a primitive civilisation—as an offset against the advantages of administering Kurdistán and South-West Persia, or if mutual conditional guarantees cannot be satisfactorily arranged, then the inevitable is that we must occupy ourselves or purchase the keys of our Empire that lie within their domains; occupying them, by permission, if Russia persistently advance so as to threaten to absorb them, and their lawful owners be unable to resist her—lest she gain vantage ground, from which it will be impossible to eject her, and they be

here forever.

To render the contingency of occupation possible and its possession effective, the strategical communications and works described are emphatically necessary.

The argument that no party Government will meet a possible danger of this nature, or endeavour to overcome the political difficulties in connection with it, is to argue that our patriotism is dead and our intellect dulled, and we a decaying, and no longer a progressive race. Any ministry undertaking it, if convinced of its necessity, may be assured of the support of every patriot.

By deed of gift, Turkey may, by stress of circumstances, make them over to us as already suggested (see pages 2, 3).

It is a most fortunate circumstance, and one that ought to be seriously considered, that the keys of Afghánistán, Persia, and Turkey in Asia are held by neither Afgháns, Persians or Turks but chiefly by aboriginal nationalities still but partially conquered, and from whom taxes are gathered by force only. Reference is made to the Kurds, Lurs, and other wild tribes inhabiting the Zagros range, and the Arab tribes to their west and south. They have the spirit of independence amongst them, a spirit allied to our own, that of freedom, and opposed to that of Russia, serfdom. Within and to the immediate rear of these hills, the plains stretching to the Gulf and the Euphrates, lie the keys to the Eastern Empire necessary to the security of the British Empire.

The administration of this belt from the line Van-Urfa in a south-east direction to the lines Muhammerah, Burújird and Bushire, Shiriz, together with the construction of the public works advocated, suffice to put us in the position required for our own safety, and, as well, that necessary to safeguard that of Turkey in Asia and Persia and keeps Russia for ever making, in her own words, 'earthen pots in Turkistán.'

Loss of territory, by giving up districts to be administered, need not mean loss of revenue to the giver, but the reverse; by sympathy it also necessitates the better government of the remainder: a well governed region will pay for the public works necessary to develop it, for the army necessary to ensure its tranquillity and leave a handsome surplus. Cyprus is an example of this. Indeed, so unable are Turkey and Persia to govern these districts that their alienation would be to them a source of strength and an infinite boon to their oppressed inhabitants.

In its various parts it is rich in the sinews of war, *i.e.*, men, transport animals, grain, fodder, butter, milk, firewood, &c. The Lurs and Kurds and certain Arab tribes are composed of men whose pastime till recent years has been war and plunder; they are good sportsmen, hardy and courageous. Luristán is the breeding ground of mules; donkeys abound; the Arab horse is reared in the Mesopotamian plains; the camel abounds; grain is abundant in all the valleys, those of the Tigris, Euphrates, Kárún, Hindiyán and lesser streams; the fodder in the Zagros hills is inexhaustible, and there sheep, cows, butter and milk are plentiful; oak and other trees are found in abundance in certain zones of the hills, &c. "The nature of the rivers and the lie of the country generally favour irrigation. Such a country is worth to a commercial company a thousand new Borneos, and is of equal value to a second India.

The men are of course valueless until trained, for each would eat more than his worth.

Both India and Afghánistán are secured by a position taken up about the bend of the Halmand connected by rail with India and the Gulf, and the strengthening of our secondary base Kábal, Kandahar, by rail to Kábal and Kandahar, the construction of the necessary entrenched camps to secure vital base centres and the stretching of the Indian limits to the Hindu Kush.

Afghánistán is the fulcrum of the lever by which General Hamley assumes that Russia will open her way to the Mediterranean. Thus secured, the lever cannot be worked.

The country lying between Sistán and South-West Persia is secured by the position which it is supposed has been taken up in Afghánistán and Baluchistán, and that in the belt of country which may be described as Kurdistán and South-West Persia, inhabited by Kurds, Lurs and Arabs and not by Turks or Persians.

Such positions are to us places-of-arms of Imperial importance, inasmuch as they overshadow those of Russia in the Caucasus and Trans-Caspia.

Their occupation renders it impossible that Persia shall fall as a ripe pear into Russia's lap by being pressed out of life between Afghanistan and the Caspian; they relieve Turkey in Asia of the fear of annexation and absorption, which must be her fate if the Persian Gulf and the Black Sea become Russian lakes. The importance of our well understanding their strategical and tactical value is great, and the necessity of arranging communications to suit our needs urgent.

If the belt is occupied by Russia, the doom of both Turkey and Persia, the Persian Gulf and the Dardanelles, is sealed, and she will have gained a position from which she cannot be ousted, strengthened as it would be by art and backed by a million of soldiers.

Occupied on the offensive-defensive principle as already suggested, it forms an impregnable position against which Russia would break her strength. The difficulties of ground if enlisted on the side of the

defensive multiply its strength; if given over to the offensive, defence is impossible except by prohibitive numbers.

A few years back the line of the Caucasus could have been held from sea to sea on the defensive and Turkey in Asia and Persia for ever protected; the opportunity was lost and the chief defence of these countries fell to Russia; but one more defensible belt is left; it is the last line of defence, and, if it be lost, the opportunity of protecting them has gone forever. If Russia be allowed to possess herself of the western outlets of the Kurdistán range leading into the plain of Mesopotamia, nothing can prevent her from overrunning them at will, and to thus obtain her greatest desires, a Mediterranean sea-board and the security, ever from menace, of her southern borders in the Black Sea.

Napoleon considered the valley of the Tigris to be the strategical key of the whole world. Such sayings are not unimportant, although the present generation may be unable to assign specific reasons for them. This paper has endeavoured to show that that nation which commands it is mistress of the destinies of the East. All Europe knows its value to us, and its security must form an integral part of any scheme for colonial defence, which is intimately bound up with the defence of India.

It may be said that this paper has left untouched the most difficult question in connection with the subject treated, *viz.*, that of diplomacy. Diplomacy has for its aim the gaining of the military end by peaceful means, if possible. What the military requirements are this paper has endeavoured to show; and in no other, except in this legitimate way, has the work of the diplomatist been trenchanted upon, because it would be impertinence to do so. It is when the eloquence of the tongue and the conceits of the brain fail that diplomacy calls to its aid the violence of military power, to gain by force what it has been unable to attain by other means.

The diplomatist has to be as much guided by common-sense views of geography, peoples, and Imperial requirements as others; the instinct of self-preservation and patriotism is as strong in him as in others, and the considerations set forth in this paper will, it is hoped, assist him in his difficult task.

With India, Afghánistán, and Baluchistan secured as recommended on page 24, the contest for Eastern empire between Russia and Great Britain must be fought in the regions where were enacted the opening scene of the world's history, Before and after the Flood; and fortunately no more favourable battlefield need be sought by us to witness its closing drama, if we but take ordinary precautions to prepare it to suit our needs.

It may be said that the necessity of the works proposed in this paper are apparent, but that to carry them out is impossible, because the nations through whose territories they run do not wish for them or the terms asked are prohibitive. Doubtless the difficulties in their initiation are enormous; but equally doubtless is it that, if guarantees are given by both sides, the difficulties will disappear. Boldness and decisive action will give us decided influence at Constantinople and Tehrán. We cannot expect valuable concessions for nothing, and must be prepared to pay a fair price, both in money and assumed responsibility, for security.

If this work of regeneration be undertaken, let it be carried out with a determined spirit. If it be set about in a half-hearted manner, with a thought of withdrawing from it in the face of the many difficulties which must confront it, it could be better not to attempt it at all.

Many have preached on the same text before. They were prophets in those days; for they began to prophesy when the shadows thrown were faint, and the light throwing them obscure—and they were not believed. The shadows now loom black and lowering; and the light casting them is as clear as the sun in the heavens at noonday. Let us hope that the coming of events foretold by them may be realised before the words "too late" must be uttered.

Mark S. Bell, *Lieut.-Colonel.*

Strategic Lines of Railway Through Turkey in Asia and Persia to India and Their Defence

Sir James Stephen's Vindication of sir Elijah Impey: "The Story of Nuncomar."

By H. Mortimer Franklyn.

Republished from the Victorian Review for October.

Printed at the Office of the Victorian Review Melbourne 9 Flinders Lane West.

Sir James Stephen's Vindication of sir Elijah Impey: the Story of Nuncomar.

IN his last literary production, Sir James Stephen has rendered a valuable service to every student of English jurisprudence. He has also brought within the pale of obligation those who are interested in

Anglo-Indian history and its literature. *The Story of Nuncomar* appeals with pertinent and vivid force to the whole legal profession; its claim upon the attention of the laity lies in the tremendous indictment it launches against one of England's most cherished reputations. It is difficult to determine which of the two conditions it partakes more largely—apotheosis or iconoclasm. If it be not the most remarkable and important work which has appeared during the latter half of this century, it is certainly *one* of the most remarkable. It completely vindicates the character of an English Chief Justice, the assumed infamy of whose judicial acts has preserved posterity's interest in him with a vernal freshness. It equally annihilates the historic authority of the most learned, the most distinguished, and the most brilliant English writer that adorns the domain of letters during the present century. Lord Macaulay has been justly regarded as the ablest exemplar of rhetoric and oratory of his time. Elijah Impey has been depicted as the most infamous tool that ever prostituted the sanctity of high office to selfish ends. It is impossible to think of Macaulay without summoning up a vision of the mantle of Impey, fringed with oppression, perforated with corruption, and drenched in blood. The genius with which the masterhand drew Impey's character was so subtle in its contour, so intense in its colouring, that it has outlived the plain truth for nearly fifty years. The ease and grace with which Macaulay allowed his talents to triumph over veracity in order to produce effect shows the irony of much that we call history.

No historian ever summarised the annals of his country with greater literary skill, with more consummate art. The purity of his style, the dazzling polish of his rhetoric, the trenchant quality of his satire, the vigour of his imagery, the incisiveness of his metaphors, have done more to exhibit the sublime flights to which the English language can soar than the writings of any other master of English prose. Under the touch of his magic hand men, as he elected, were either deified or damned. John Bunyan has never fallen from the high estate to which he was raised in that memorable essay on Southey's edition of the 'Pilgrim's Progress;' from Elijah Impey's name has never been effaced the stain of 'judicial murderer' cast upon him by the same master-hand. For half a century Lord Macaulay's verdicts on historical characters have been accepted with a reverence little short of absolute. Before time shall have completed the cycle of the twentieth century his greatest masterpieces will stand self-condemned by the glaring inaccuracies which disfigure them. The present generation is contesting the ground they cover inch by inch, with increasing discredit to the historian. The more they are submitted to the bistoury and scalpel of the literary surgeon, the more clearly they reveal that they are not what they affect to be—faithful literary portraits of historical characters. The irreverent scepticism of the present age compels us to submit the creations of our most beloved masters to a searching autopsy. If the parts emerge from the dissecting-room bearing the stamp of uniformity, then so much the better for the master-hand that moulded them. If, on the other hand, they exhibit the incorporation of foreign matter alien to their nature, and introduced for the sake of giving them an artistic exterior, then so much the worse for the artist whose name has given them place and position. Macaulay maintained his charge of 'infamy and corruption' against Impey with such logical force and subtle mastery of language that the imputation will never be completely overtaken. The injury the dead Chief Justice has sustained can never be wholly repaired. Sir James Stephen's researches certainly neutralise the most trenchant of Macaulay's charges. They are shown to have been constructed of the most flimsy materials. He proves, moreover, that Macaulay had not even partially studied the character of the man on whom he pours with lavish hand such scathing denunciation. The situation of Impey was dramatic, the colouring to be employed deep, which of all things suited Macaulay. Unfortunately for Impey, his condemnation was capable of being worked into a much more effective picture than his vindication. This, perhaps, settled his fate.

Sir James Stephen establishes beyond dispute that Macaulay paid more attention to effect than to facts. His strong nature compelled him to take up a side—generally that which he conceived to be the oppressed and weak. He could never remain colourless. When he went forth to battle for justice, he was a terrible antagonist. But, unquestionably, in many of his disquisitions dramatic effect filled a larger space in his eye than truthful narrative. Like Victor Hugo, his power to transport was superhuman; so that, right or wrong, he carried conviction to the mind of the reader. Even his editor's judgment melted under the dazzling splendour of his rhetoric. "The more I think," says Jeffrey, on reading his first contribution to the *Edinburgh*, "the less I can conceive where you picked up that style." Macaulay's great power was that of transmitting his own sensations. What he loved is an object of adoration with us; what he hated is hideous as black night. On this trait in his character Mr. Trevelyan throws some light in his *Life of Macaulay*.

'Life and Letters of Macaulay.' G.O.. Trevelyan. I., 129.

"Where he set his mark there was no need of a second impression. The unduly severe fate of those who crossed his path during the years when his blood was hot teaches us a serious lesson on the responsibilities of genius. Croker, and Sadler, and poor Robert Montgomery, and the other less eminent objects of his wrath, appear likely to enjoy just so much notoriety, and of such a nature, as he has thought fit to deal out to them in his pages; and it is possible that even Lord Ellenborough may be better known to our grandchildren by Macaulay's oration on the gates of Somnauth than by the noise of his own deeds, or the echo of his own

eloquence."

Where Macaulay was weak was in not sufficiently studying facts which did not appeal to his emotions. He never forgave anyone who presumed to know more than he did on subjects he considered his own. The 'French Revolution' was one of these; and John Wilson Croker carried the hatred of Macaulay to his grave for joining issue with the latter on the floor of the House of Commons with respect to the correctness of his facts concerning the causes of the French upheaval. The following observations to his sister shows his love for Croker in another field. He is anticipating reviewing Croker's edition of 'Boswell's Johnson.' "*See whether I don't dust that varlet's jacket for him in the next number of the Blue and Yellow. I detest him more than cold boiled veal.*" In another place he speaks of the work as "a worthless edition of Boswell's 'Life of Johnson,' *some sheets of which our readers have doubtless seen round parcels of better books.*" This reveals Macaulay as an exponent of good, healthy contempt. He did not, however, have it all his own way with Croker; and it will be instructive before going into Sir James Stephen's work to show how completely Croker smote him hip and thigh on a subject he deemed essentially his own.

As a Whig supporter of Lord Grey's Reform Bill of 1831 Macaulay painted in deep colours the misery and bloodshed in store for England if the House resisted this measure on which the country was bent. He likened the future of England to the sad fate through which France had passed in 1789, and vividly pictured a repetition of the scenes which took place at Versailles as occurring under the very eyes of the Commons. An extract from Croker's reply—spoken of as 'unanswerable and matchless' by Sir Robert Peel—is worth reproducing here:—

'The Croker Papers,' II., 131.

It were too much for me to venture to charge the learned gentleman with intentional misrepresentation of the transactions to which he thus solemnly refers; but I must say that he seems to me to labour under strange forgetfulness, or still stranger ignorance. He tells us that he was but young when these events happened; but there are some of us, not much older than he, who witnessed that period with a childish wonder, which ripened, as the tragedy proceeded, into astonishment and horror; and, after all, it requires no great depth of historical research to be acquainted with the prominent features of those interesting and instructive times. I am, therefore, I own, exceedingly surprised, not that the learned gentleman should have thought the illustration both just and striking, but that he should not have felt that the facts of the case would lead any reasonable and impartial mind to conclusions absolutely the reverse of those which he has deduced from them. He warns the Peers of England to beware of resisting the popular will, and he draws from the fate of the French nobility at the Revolution the example of the fact and the folly of a similar resistance. Good God! sir, where has the learned gentleman lived, what works must he have ready with what authors must he have communed, when he attributes the downfall of the French nobility to an injudicious and obstinate resistance to popular opinion? The direct reverse is the notorious fact, so notorious that it is one of the commonplaces of modern history Did the nobles, on that vital occasion, show that blind and inflexible obstinacy which the learned gentleman has attributed to them? Did they even display the decent dignity of a deliberative Council? Did they, indeed, exhibit a cold and contemptuous apathy to the feelings of the people, or did they not rather evince a morbid and dishonourable sensibility to every turn of the popular passion? Was it, sir, in fact their high and haughty resistance, or was it, alas! their deplorable pusillanimity that overthrew their unhappy country? No inconsiderable portion of the nobility joined the Tiers Etat at once, and with headlong and heedless alacrity—the rest delayed for a short interval—a few days only of doubt and dismay; and, after that short pause, those whom the learned gentleman called proud and obstinate bigots to privilege and power, abandoned their most undoubted privilege and most effective power, and were seen to march in melancholy procession to the funeral of the Constitution with a fallacious appearance of freedom, but bound in reality by the invisible shackles of intimidation, goaded by the invectives of a treasonable and rancorous press, and insulted, menaced, and all but driven by the bloody hands of an infuriated populace. The learned gentleman attributes to the obstinacy and bigotry of the French clergy the ruin of the Church. . . . Who was it that, in that portentous night, offered as he said, on the altar of his country, the sacrifice of the privileges of the nobility? A Montmorency! Who proposed the abolition of all feudal and seigniorial rights? A Noailles! And what followed? We turn over a page or two of this eventful history and we find the Montmorencies in exile, and the Noailles on the scaffold.

This blow was the first serious public reverse sustained by Macaulay. But the brilliant essayist had become such an idol in the minds of his countrymen, and such a power in the State, that it had little or no effect upon his reputation as an historian. From that time forth he grew, rather than declined, in his power and in the admiration of Englishmen. Indeed, it is questionable whether he does not stand on a higher column of fame to-day than ever he did, for his works form part of the curriculum in every English school. Still, efforts like those which Sir James Stephen has just accomplished must irresistibly weaken, if not utterly destroy, his authority as an historian.

Macaulay's works can never be wiped out of our literature; they may, however, inherit what the essayist

himself would have regarded as a worse fate—become relegated to the domain of fiction. Certainly the extravagance of his charge against Impey, and the proof of its being so wide of the truth, has been incontestably proved by Sir James Stephen. And the now famous essay on Warren Hastings will be regarded by posterity as a brilliant exhibition of invective, in which romance and a picturesque imagination play a much more important part than facts.

It is the intention of Sir James Stephen to investigate the whole of the proceedings incident to the 'Impeachment of Warren Hastings,' with a view of examining critically the whole legal procedure. It can be easily understood what a mass of evidence the critic would have to examine in order to exhibit to the lay mind a succinct and coherent narrative. The bulk of the evidence in this remarkable trial appears to have been studiously avoided by all previous writers who have attempted to treat the subject. No better reason for their unconscionable neglect appears than the sustained labour such an examination necessitated. The evidence brought to the light of day by Sir James Stephen was only to be obtained by a careful perusal of a mass of undigested matter, ill-recorded, ill-preserved, and almost inaccessible. The effect of writing history from unauthentic material is sufficiently shown in Lord Macaulay's 'Essay on Warren Hastings.' Sir James Stephen assumes that Macaulay imbibed his initial repugnance to Impey from the speeches of Sir Gilbert Eliot and Edmund Burke. Some of his principal impressions he obtained from an extremely rare, but equally unreliable, work called *Siyyar-ul-Muta-qherin*, by Syud Gholam Hussein Khan, a Mohammedan chronicler. This singular book was translated by a Frenchman, calling himself Mustapha. The amount of caution with which its claims to credibility should be accepted may be gauged by the translator's modest admission of his own incapacity, prefixed to the work itself. "That the man who has not the honour to be born an Englishman, and is far from being a Persian, who has never seen England, and never had any other masters in either language but himself, should attempt to translate from the Persian into English, and, moreover, to appear in print, is such a strange proceeding that the author, in short, must give an account of himself." But Macaulay is supposed to have relied principally on the charges put forth in Sir Gilbert Eliot's speech. This gentleman, who conducted the 'Impeachment' proceedings against Impey, was in turn inspired by Sir Philip Francis—Impey's bitter enemy. It is not difficult, therefore to trace to its source the vindictiveness which fed the minds of the Impeachment Managers with odious exaggerations, which developed with time and a fruitful soil into the terrible indictment against Impey. The chief source of supply emanated from one whom Macaulay designates as 'malevolent,' 'savagely cruel,' and 'in the highest degree arrogant and insolent.' To these accomplishments Sir James Stephen adds 'undying malignity,' 'ferocious cruelty,' 'falsehood,' 'treachery,' and 'calumny.' This is certainly a very handsome budget of attributes to be compressed into a single individual, especially one who is to become the fountain of information for the future historian. Sir Philip Francis is to be congratulated, if only on possessing more Machiavelian virtues than even were attributed by Macaulay to Impey. Macaulay's instinctive exaggeration on the side of the dramatic has already been shown. Sir James Stephen charges the great historian with a more reprehensible failing than dramatic exaggeration—he charges him with falsehood "Macaulay's account of the quarrel between the Court and the Council deserves to be carefully noticed. It supplies a strong instance of the danger of breaking down the boundary between history and romance The objection to it is that it is absolutely false from end to end, and in almost every particular, as the following instances will show." After dwelling upon the outrages to which the most distinguished families of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa were then exposed, Macaulay proceeds:—"The effect of the attempt which the Supreme Court made to extend its jurisdiction over the whole of the Company's territories was like an attempt in England to empower anyone, by merely swearing that a debt was due to him, to horsewhip a general officer, to put a bishop in the stocks, to treat ladies in the way which called forth the blow of Wat Tyler." This is only one of many illustrations presented by Sir James Stephen; others will receive attention later on in this paper. In the meantime it will be well to remind readers that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was extended in no such manner as is indicated by Macaulay. The charter under which Impey, Hyde, Le Maistre, and Chambers were appointed very distinctly set forth the districts in their jurisdiction. They never attempted to go beyond their territory. The main question was whether the Chief Justice had not exceeded his jurisdiction by trying Nuncomar for a capital offence when it should have been held to have been a civil one. The original suit had been commenced in the Civil Court; but, Mohun Persand—the prosecutor and attorney for Bollakey Doss—sought to remove it to the Supreme Court, laying the charge of 'forging and publishing' with intent to defraud. Nuncomar had all the privileges granted to a British subject. He challenged no less than eighteen of the Grand Jury, and must be held to have had a most impartial trial. Whatever differences of opinion may exist about the severity of the penalty he was called upon to pay for his crime, none can exist about the uprightness of Chief Justice Impey. No one, after reading Sir James Stephen's book, will believe that: "Impey sitting as a judge put a man unjustly to death to serve a political purpose."

Of examples in the Machiavelian art the machinations of Philip Francis supply most finished illustrations. Starting at corruption, they touch lightly upon every note in the gamut of crime until they reach murder. This is

beautifully shown in the different stages of development through which they pass from Sir Gilbert Eliot and Burke down to Macaulay. In Sir Gilbert Eliot's charges Impey's judgments were descanted upon as exhibiting in his summing up 'gross and scandalous partiality.' In Burke's accusation against Hastings he had become a fiend in human form, who, sitting as a judge, had put a man unjustly to death. In Macaulay's essay he had become more infamous than Hastings, and was positively branded as the tool of the greater man, and is called a judicial murderer.' The following extract from Sir Gilbert Eliot's speech reveals the charge against Impey in its early stage:—"Impey, instead of acting as counsel for the prisoner, became, in effect, the agent and advocate of the prosecutor, and pronounced a charge when he summed up the evidence in the said trial with the *most gross and scandalous partiality*, dwell-ling on all the points which appeared favourable to the prosecution, and *either omitting altogether or passing lightly over* such as were favourable to the prisoner, and manifesting throughout the whole proceeding an evident wish and determined *purpose to effect the ruin and death of the said Maharajah.*" With swift flights from one stage of atrocity to another, we find Impey's deafness to mercy and delay rapidly developing all the odious phases of cupidity and infamy until they overtake the ultimate ruin of his victim. This charge, which seemed strong enough at the time to make a fine peroration to the powerful speech of Sir Gilbert Eliot, had lost its point when it reached the master-hand of Macaulay. In order to figure as a critical essay in the 'Blue and Yellow,' imagination was called into play, and the case had to be stated with a vigour sufficiently strong to revive declining interest. 'Gross and scandalous partiality' were far too weak for Macaulay; Impey was nothing less than a 'judicial murderer.' His love for judicial pollution was so intense, his spirit longed so ardently to wallow in the abattoirs of corruption, that we find him, when called to another part of the Empire, reported as fleeing thither because 'there was something inexpressibly alluring, we must suppose, in the peculiar rankness of the infamy which was then to be got at Lucknow.' When again he was appointed to the judgeship of the Sudder Diwani Adalat (the Civil Court of Appeal), Impey, notwithstanding that he had appropriated none of the salary which the Governor-General had voted him (£6720 per annum) until he heard from the Lord Chancellor, was described by Macaulay as accepting the salary and settling down 'rich, quiet, and infamous.' At this point it will be instructive to hear what Sir James Stephen has to say of Macaulay's aspersions, and what he thinks of Sir Elijah Impey:—

If Macaulay's account of Impey is to be believed, he must have been one of the most odious and contemptible of human beings, committing the most abominable crimes from the basest of motives, or even without any motive at all. For, if this view is correct, he began by committing the most execrable of all murders—a judicial murder under the forms of law—simply out of gratuitous subserviency to Hastings, lie proceeded, for no obvious reason, to erect a system of tyranny and oppression all over Bengal, attempting with his colleagues to usurp "supreme authority through the whole of the vast territory, subject to the presidency of Fort William." He gave up this monstrous pretension in consideration of an enormous bribe, and he abetted, crimes said to have been perpetrated in Oudh, under the authority of Hastings, simply because 'there was something inexpressibly alluring, we must suppose, in the peculiar rankness of the infamy which was to be got at Lucknow.' In short, he was a fiend in human shape, and a very contemptible one. (P. 33, I.)

I have not, in my own experience of persons holding conspicuous positions in life, met with any of the fiends in human shape, or even with any of those parti-coloured monsters with characters like the pattern of a shepherd's plaid—half black, half white—which abound in Macaulay's histories, and form one of the principal defects in those delightful books. I have read everything I could find throwing light on Impey's character, and it appears to me that he was neither much blacker nor much whiter, in whole or in part, than his neighbours. He seems to me to have resembled closely many other judges whom I have known. He was by no means a specially interesting person, and was in all ways a far smaller man than Hastings. He seems to have had an excellent education, both legal and general, to have been a man of remarkable energy and courage, and a great deal of rather commonplace ability. I have read through all his letters and private papers, and I can discover in them no trace of corruption. Though he had a strong, avowed, and perfectly natural anxiety about his own interests, he seems to have had a considerable share of public spirit. He was obviously a zealous, warm-hearted man, much attached to his friends, but not the least likely to be a tool of, or subservient to, anyone, and certainly not to Hastings, with whom at one time he had a violent quarrel. There was nothing exceptionally great or good about him; but I see as little ground, from his general character and behaviour, to believe him guilty of the horrible crimes imputed to him as to suspect any of my own colleagues of such enormities.—(P. 35, I.)

When it is borne in mind that Sir James Stephen has left nothing undone, no papers unearthed, in order to arrive at this opinion, the weight clue to it will be universally conceded. The eminent Criminal Jurist has had to arrange and examine a mass of conflicting and undigested evidence which appears to have escaped the attention of every other writer on this singular and important historical event. Amongst other sources from which his information has been obtained, may be mentioned *The Bengal Consultations*, preserved at the India Office; *The Reports of the Parliamentary Committee on Indian Affairs*, published between 1772 and 1786; *The State Trials*, *Echoes of Old Calcutta*, *The Impeachment Charges* of Sir Gilbert Eliot, preferred in December 1787; and

Impey's Letters and Papers, deposited in the British Museum. In these papers, particularly in the *State Trials*, it is shown, beyond doubt, that Impey did not commit a 'judicial murder;' neither did he 'hang Nuncomar in order to serve a political end.' The charges of forging and uttering the bond purporting to have been executed by the native banker Bollakey Doss were laid as early as 1770—nearly five years before the Supreme Court arrived at Bengal. The proceedings at that time were confined to the Civil Court—Arlalat—to the maladministration of which was due the appointment of the Supreme Court, which latter, upon its arrival in Bengal, completely absorbed the criminal jurisdiction of the former. Judging from Macaulay's account of the trial, one would suppose that Sir Elijah Impey was the only judge who sat on the bench, since he has omitted all reference to the three Puisne judges who assisted him. Sir James Stephen shows that he sat in banco with Mr. Justice Hyde, Mr. Justice Le Maistre, and Mr. Justice Chambers. In the cross-examination, both Hyde and Le Maistre were much more active in putting damaging questions to the witnesses of the prisoner than the Chief Justice himself, and the most singular point revealed is, that Nuncomar brought about his own ruin by insisting upon the recall of his principal witness, Kissen Juan Doss, who, previous to his recall, had impressed the Chief Justice very favourably towards the prisoner. He was recalled to prove the existence of a Karar-nama—an agreement—between Bollakey Doss and Nuncomar. Had the existence of the Karar-nama been proved, Nuncomar must have been acquitted, because this instrument, if it proved anything at all, proved a monetary transaction between Nuncomar and Bollakey Doss. The witness, however, upon his second examination so hopelessly perjured himself that he must have completely paralyzed whatever good impression his evidence had made on the minds of the jury. Impey admits in his summing up to the jury that this witness had given his evidence so straightforwardly, that he intended to *direct an acquittal*; but since the whole point turned upon an agreement made with Bollakey Doss first well substantiated by Kissen Juan Doss, but afterwards completely repudiated by him, his evidence went for worse than nothing—for it was extremely damaging to Nuncomar. This witness moreover, was Nuncomar's principal prop in his defence. When, therefore, Kissen Juan Doss' testimony broke down, Nuncomar's case was virtually settled. Nothing which the Chief Justice could have stated from the bench would have changed the minds of the jurors so far as prejudicing them. Their conclusions were already formed from the evidence. Sir Gilbert Eliot, Burke, and Fox all charge Impey with having judicially murdered Nuncomar by the gross and scandalous partiality with which he summed up. It is singular that up till now no writer has ever taken the trouble to test this terrible charge by the light of the only evidence which could confirm or upset it, namely, an examination of the Chief Justice's summing up to the jury. With keen judicial acumen, Sir James Stephen has detected this unaccountable oversight, and supports the opinions he forms by quoting at great length from that famous charge, which will now be increased in value by reason of the complete vindication it furnishes of the Chief Justice's character.

The Chief Justice addressed the jury by stating:—

The prisoner stands indicted for forging a Persian bond, with an intent to defraud Bollakey Doss, and also for publishing the same knowing it to be forged. The offence is laid in several manners, by different counts in the indictment; sometimes calling it a 'writing obligatory,' and sometimes a 'promissory note,' and it is laid to be with an intent to defraud different people differently interested.

I shall lay out of the case all those counts to which I think no evidence can be applied, and shall only mention those to which it may, and shall point out those to which it most particularly applies

. . . The only counts to which any evidence, in my opinion, be applied are the first, fifth, ninth, and thirteenth, which charge this instrument to be forged with intent to defraud Bollakey Doss; the eighteenth, which charges it to be forced with intent to defraud Gungabissen and Hingoo Loll, nephews and trustees named in the will of Bollakey Doss; the nineteenth, to which the evidence most forcibly applies, for publishing the same knowing it to be forged, with intent to defraud Gungabissen and Hingoo Loll; the twentieth and twenty-first, which charge the forgery and publication to be with intent to defraud Gungabissen, the surviving executor.—P. 140, I,

Referring to some letters which, from the evidence they bore of recent execution, were likely to prejudice the prisoner's case, the Chief Justice remarked:—

You thought them an imposition; but as they were not given in evidence, I desired you would not suffer it to make any impression on you.—P. 144, I.

The following caution does not read very much like gross and scandalous partiality; nor does it breathe the spirit that a Jeffreys would have infused into it. On the contrary, it furnishes an opportunity to inveigh against the prisoner by which Jeffreys would have been swift to profit, but which Impey manifestly turned to the benefit of the accused:—

The witnesses are dead, the transaction is stale, and long since known to the prosecutor. These are objections of weight which you, gentlemen, ought carefully to attend to when you take the whole of the evidence into consideration for the purpose of forming the verdict; and I have no doubt you will attend to them.

In reading from the bench Sir. Farrer's—the prisoner's advocate—defence, the Chief Justice says:—"There is clearly no evidence of his actually having forged the seal." Jeffreys would have claimed that the presence of the seal was quite sufficient evidence that the prisoner had forged it.

In weighing Commaul O. Dien's evidence, which was most important against the prisoner, as it charged Nuncomar with having confessed the forgery to Commaul O. Dien in the following words:—"It is true I have fixed your seal, which was in my possession, to the bond of Bollakey Doss. Having sworn you will give evidence of this (meaning you will swear to this) before the gentlemen of the Adalat, I answered, 'How shall I be able to take false oath?' He answered, 'I had hopes in you' I answered, 'Men will give up their lives for their masters, but not their religion; have no hopes of me' He added, 'I then went and informed Coja Petruse and Munshi Sudder O. Dien of what had passed.'"—(P. 116,I.)

The Chief Justice remarks:—"It is highly proper you should take these things into consideration; you will consider on what terms they were at the time of these conversations. Confessions of this nature are undoubtedly suspicious, and to which, except there are matters to corroborate them, you should be very cautious in giving too much credit."—(P. 145, I.)

Certainly, there is not much gross and scandalous partiality exhibited in the above. And again:—

My residence in this country has been so short, and my experience so little, that I can form no judgment of the truth of this observation; it is an appeal to the notoriety of the disposition of the natives. You have been resident long in the country—some, I see, who were born here. You know how far it is true; therefore, I leave it entirely to you.—(P. 146, I.)

It certainly would have been as easy to have forged an absolute bond. But there is no evidence when the bond was forged, if it was forged; it might have been after the payment of the debt due to Bollakey Doss; it might be to give an air of probability to it. But this is matter proper for you to judge upon It is ingenious to turn this to the advantage of the prisoner. You will determine whether it can be so applied.—(P. 146, I.)

The evidence on the part of the Crown to support the actual forgery is that of Mohun Persand, who says that Maharajah Nuncomar declared that he had prepared, as drawn out, three papers, the amount of one of which was Rs. 48.021, which is the amount of the present bond, and is applied as a confession of the actual forging; but as the confession may bear a different interpretation, there being no distinction in general made in the interpretation of the evidence between writing or causing to be wrote, drawing or causing to be drawn, it may mean that he caused Bollakey Doss to draw or prepare the bond, and, therefore, I think the first would be a hard and rather a forced construction of his words; and, indeed, he did not specify this bond. Commaul O. Dien also gives evidence that will apply to the forgery. Maharajah Nuncomar told him that he had himself fixed Commaul O. Dien's seal to the bond, and he proves a requisition for Maharajah Nuncomar to give evidence that he was the witness to the bond, and makes him promises if he will. This is the evidence of the forgery; but I think it will be more necessary to attend to the evidence in support of those counts which I have said the evidence applied to, and which charge the publication with intent to defraud.—(P. 148, I.)

I must again caution you against receiving any impression unfavourable to the prisoner from the hesitation and doubts or exclamations of this witness, or from any other circumstances except what he actually deposed to.—(P. 148., I.)

On the other hand, if you believe the witnesses for the prisoner, a most complete answer is given to the charge.

There are no less than four witnesses present at the execution of the bond by Bollakey Doss, three of whom had been privy to a conversation at Maharajah Nuncomar's when the consideration of the bond was acknowledged by Bollakey Doss; the same persons prove the attestation of the bond by the three witnesses thereto, who are all dead. (P. 151, I.)

It is possible he (Bollakey Doss) might have spoken to the Moor before his coming into the room, which the other witnesses at this distance of time may have forgot.—(P. 153, I.)

Sir James Stephen adds in a footnote—

(This is a suggestion in favour of the prisoner which would not have occurred to me. If Impey had been on the watch for remarks against the prisoner (says Sir James Stephen) he would surely have observed here upon the unnatural agreement between the evidence of Joydeb Chowbee and that of Shaik Ear Mahomed,—156.

Sir James Stephen further shows that Impey permitted evidence to be given which might properly have been excluded. Amongst other things the entry in the books of Bollakey Doss made after his death by the order of Pudmohun Doss, and purporting to have been made in the lifetime of Bollakey Doss. "This passage," says Sir James Stephen, "and the matter which it relates, appear to me inconsistent with the notion that Nuncomar was judicially murdered by Impey. Impey had only to insist upon a rigid application of the rules of evidence, and he would have shut out the strongest part of Nuncomar's defence. According to the strict rules of evidence, the entry made by Kissen Juan Doss in Bollakey Doss' books after his death on the report of Pudmohun was no

evidence." (P. 158, I.) Impey, however, continues in his charge to the jury:—"I still leave it to you, and if you believe that such a paper ever existed, it would be the highest injustice not to acquit the prisoner."

"Attempts were made to bring this (the entry in the book) to the knowledge of Mohun Persand; and if it did exist, and was in the knowledge of Mohun Persand, this prosecution is most horrid and diabolical. Mohun Persand is guilty of a crime, in my apprehension, of a nature more horrid than murder."—159, I.

Fox took occasion to turn this sentence very adroitly against Impey in his speech on the impeachment. "In particular let the committee consider," said Fox, "the Chief Justice's artful declaration to the jury that the question before them was whether the prisoner was guilty of forgery, or his accusers guilty of a crime worse than murder. What was likely to be the effect of such an intimation? It would necessarily operate on the mildness natural to the human mind, and incline them, of course, to prefer the most lenient opinion, and think it was better to find the prisoner guilty of forgery than by his acquittal to pronounce his accusers guilty of a worse crime than murder." Commenting upon this, Sir James Stephen says:—"This remark seems to me shamefully unjust. I read Impey's observation simply as meaning what it says, namely, that if Mohun Persand, knowing of Nuncomar's innocence, prosecuted him, his prosecution was 'most horrid and diabolical,' as it certainly was." (P. 159, I.)

The Chief Justice continues to the jury:—

I must desire you to recollect, with regard to this observation, and every one that I submit to you, that you are to make no further use of them than as they coincide with your opinions and observations; and when they do not, you should reject them; for it is you, not I, that are to decide upon the evidence. (P. 163, I.)

There are many observations to be made in favour of the prisoner; and I am sure your humanity will prompt you to enforce them, as far as they will bear. (164, I.)

Speaking of Mohun Persand's (the prosecutor) evidence:—

. . . You must judge how far his credit has been shaken. Most of you know him; you must determine how far he deserves credit, and how probable it is that he would, through malice or any other corrupt motive, accuse an innocent person of a capital crime. If you think him capable of it, you should not give the least attention to his evidence. (P. 165, I.)

This amounts to gratuitously discrediting the evidence for the prosecution in favour of the defendant, which the Chief Justice, however much his impulses might incline him, was not called upon to weaken.

And again:—

He positively swore to the bond produced by Maharajah Nuncomar, and for which the Company's bonds were given, being the same bond that was produced in evidence; he said he knew it from circumstances, but did not explain what these circumstances were, (P. 165, I.)

. . . and if you think Mohun Persand had it in his power to carry on an effectual prosecution before he has, it is a great hardship to Maharajah Nuncomar, especially as the witnesses to the bond are all dead, and you ought to consider this among other circumstances which are in his favour. . . . (P. 166, I.)

There is certainly a great improbability that a man of Maharajah Nuncomar's rank and fortune should be guilty of so mean an offence for so small a sum of money. (P. 167, I.)

It is more improbable, as he is proved to have patronised and behaved with great kindness to Bollakey Doss in his lifetime, that he should immediately after his decease plunder the widow and relations of his friend. (P. 167, I.)

You will consider on which side the weight of evidence lies, always remembering that in criminal, and more especially in capital, cases you must not weigh the evidence in golden scales; there ought to be a great difference of weight in the opposite scale before you find the prisoner guilty. In cases of property the stake on each side is equal, and the least preponderance of evidence ought to turn the scale; but in a capital case, as there can be nothing of equal value to life, you should be thoroughly convinced that there does not remain a possibility of innocence before you give a verdict against the prisoner. (P. 169, I.)

. . . You will again and again consider the character of the prosecutor and his witnesses, the distance of the prosecution from the time the offence is supposed to be committed, the proof and nature of the confessions said to be made by the prisoner, his rank and fortune. These are all reasons to prevent your giving a hasty and precipitate belief to the charge brought against him; but if you believe the facts sworn against him to be true, they cannot alter the nature of the facts themselves. Your sense of justice and your feelings will not allow you to convict the prisoner unless your consciences are fully satisfied beyond all doubt of his guilt. If they are not, you will bring that verdict which from the dictates of humanity you will be inclined to give; but, should your consciences be convinced of his being guilty, no consideration, I am sure, will prevail on you not to give a verdict according to your oaths. (P. 169, I.)

The summing-up of the Chief Justice, so carefully reproduced from the original documents by Sir James Stephen, disposes effectually of the charge preferred by Sir Gilbert Eliot, and re-echoed by Burke and Fox, that he showed gross and scandalous partiality.

It will now be interesting to exhibit a few points in the evidence upon which the charge was proved against Nuncomar. The bond bore the attestations of Mahab Roy, Scilabut (the vakeel of Bollakey Doss), and Abdehoo Commaul Mahomed. It has already been stated that Commaul repudiated his seal as a forgery. The evidence as to Scilabut's attestation proved that Scilabut died before Bollakey Doss, so that he could not have attested the deed afterwards made by Nuncomar. Some very important evidence as to his signature was given by a (Coit) native gentleman of high standing, who knew his handwriting well. The Rajah Nobkissen was inter-rogated thus:—

Q.—Do you know Scilabut?

A.—Yes; he was a vakeel and moonshee of Bollakey Doss.

Q.—Are you acquainted with his handwriting?

A.—I am. I have seen him write many times. (Bond shown him.)

Q.—Is this the writing of Scilabut?

A.—The words Scilabut, Vakeel of Bollakey Doss, are not of his handwriting.

Q.—Can you take upon you to swear it is not his handwriting?

A.—Scilabut has wrote several letters to me and Lord Clive, and has wrote several things before me. This is not the kind of writing I have seen him write; but God knows whether it is bis handwriting or not.

It was also shown that the books of Bollakey Doss contained no record of the bond or the debt secured by it. Being a native banker of scrupulous integrity (as far as was known), it was supposed that Bollakey Doss' books would certainly have shown the indebtedness. Moreover, shortly before his death Bollakey Doss made a trip to Benares, and before bis departure, he executed a power of attorney to Mohun Persand. Attached to this was a complete statement of his debts due and payable. In this schedule Nuncomar's name appears first in the list of creditors for Rs. 10,000 Beyond this, Nuncomar's name was not mentioned, and the date of its execution was 1768. Sir James Stephen suggests that Nuncomar was scarcely the man to deposit this large amount of jewels with Bollakey Doss and leave them to his undisputed possession for a period of seven years *without taking a receipt*. In this manner two out of the three attestations to the bond were disposed of. Of the remaining testator to the bond. Matheb Roy—Mohun Persaud—the attorney of Bollakey Doss—swore he never knew, saw, or heard of him.

The defence tried to prove that the Commaul O. Dien who gave evidence for the prosecution was not the Commaul O. Dien who attested the bond. This clever subterfuge was sworn to by four different witnesses, who claimed to be present when the bond was executed. There is, however, a very important point in their evidence which Sir James Stephen detects, and which must discredit it in any rational mind, namely, its extraordinary and unnatural agreement. "The suspicious part of their evidence," says Sir James Stephen, "was their extraordinary and unnatural agreement in a number of matters of minute detail which they could have no special reason for remembering." In a foot-note, Sir James Stephen appends in parallel columns the evidence of Joydeb Chowbee and Shaik Ear Mahomed. The evidence is identical, almost verbatim; but Ear Mahomed, who was afterwards cross-examined on parts of his evidence, became confused. "If I begin at the beginning," said this cunning Hindoo, "I can tell. I cannot begin in the middle." On being told to begin again, he repeated word for word what he had stated before. These four witnesses, Joydeb Chowbee, Choyton Naut, Lollau Doman Singh, and Shaik Ear were all dependents of Nuncomar. Moreover, they were relying on his future reinstatement to obtain employment for themselves. With this the principal evidence terminates, and in a number of ways Sir James Stephen shows that Nuncomar had a thoroughly impartial trial, and was convicted as much on the perjury of his own witnesses as on the evidence of the prosecution.

Thoughtful men, jurists in particular, will discern in Sir James Stephen's valuable work a revelation which produces quite a turn of the historic tables. Elijah Impey is triumphantly vindicated from the charge of having murdered Nuncomar for political motives. The charge, nevertheless, remains, it has simply changed its venue. Instead of Impey being the culprit who should be covered with infamy, history will henceforth declare that Philip Francis and General Clavering, more particularly the former, were the mora assassins of the Maharajah Nuncomar.

Although the evidence of forgery was undoubtedly proved against Nuncomar, it would be absurd to claim that he should have paid the penalty of death for his act. Assuming even that the heinousness of the crime was as well understood in Bengal then—1770—as it was in England, which undoubtedly it was not, the Supreme Court had no right to exact so monstrous a penalty as death. Elijah Impey shows in his letter to Governor Johnstone that he was powerless to reverse the verdict in the then condition of Hindoo society. Whatever may be thought of his contentions, we are bound to give him the benefit of the doubt, seeing how fairly he conducted the case when it was quite within his power to prejudice it. In his letter to Governor Johnstone he says—"My wishes to have represented him as an object of mercy, and to have procured the extension of it to him, were, considering the heavy task I bad on my hands, give me leave to say, more strong than yours could possibly be; and I call God to witness to it was my firm intention so to do, in case he should have been

convicted, had not the conduct of that unhappy man, and of the gentlemen who possessed the powers of Government, in my opinion rendered it absolutely necessary, both in the support of the administration of justice and of my own honour, to pursue different measures. The fabrication of new forgeries, the most gross perjuries during the time of his confinement, and even during the course of the trial, was an atrocious aggravation of the original offence. The eyes of the whole country were drawn to it, it was attended by men of all ranks in the service, and the principal natives in and round Calcutta to a considerable distance flocked to it I leave it to your consideration the effect any of these considerations must have had on the institution of a new court of justice among inhabitants whom the weight and terrors of their oppression have so enslaved, bowed, and depraved that the most intolerable injuries cannot rouse them to sufficient confidence to look up to the purest and fairest tribunal to accuse their oppressors. This consideration had certainly great influence on my mind. . . Had this criminal escaped, no force of argument, no future experience, would have prevailed on a single native to believe that the judges had not weighed gold against justice, and that it would ever preponderate. They gave out (those distinguished personages who visited Nuncomar in jail) the judges dare not execute the sentence. The members of that Board—the Council—openly threatened to procure the dismissal of the judges if they did not relax the sentence. It was afterwards confidently asserted by one member, Clavering, that he had effected the dismissal of those judges who were most obnoxious to him, and that it would be brought out by the ships of this season. I am sure you will give me credit for sufficient common sense to prevent me from flattering myself that the measure was likely to be either popular or serviceable to me in England. I knew the relation of what passed here would be accompanied by partial representations, false colourings, and even false facts and direct accusations. A paper was introduced into the Council here intended to be recorded as an accusation against me personally; but the person who represented it, after a little consideration, did not dare to persist in his first intention. He changed it, and himself moved (Francis moved although Clavering introduced the paper) that it should be burnt by the hands of the hangman; and it was burnt accordingly. I knew the power and weight in England which that gentleman possessed, and I knew that perseverance was dangerous both to my fortune and character. I trust you will give equal credit to the acuteness of my sensations when I found myself inevitably urged to carry into execution a sentence against a prisoner whom, taking into consideration his original crime only, I most ardently desired to have saved, and would have done it, even under the aggravated circumstances, had it been reconcilable to the sense I had of the trust committed to my care. . . I had the dignity, integrity, independence, and utility of that Court to maintain, which I enthusiastically laboured to make a blessing to the country. . . . Every individual judge thought it necessary, and each of them was so clear in it that no proposition, hint, intimation, came from either of them which had the least tendency to suspend the sentence." (P. 260, I.)

So far Impey must be exonerated for not respiting Nuncomar.. But what shall be said of Francis and Clavering in the *rôles* they respectively played? Had Elijah Impey received a petition from the Council to respite Nuncomar, he would, as he says elsewhere, assuredly have respected it. Such a petition it was sought to obtain, through the instrumentality of Francis, who had shown all through the trial and afterwards an indecent sympathy with the prisoner. Nuncomar could not possibly approach the Council through the Governor-General, whom he regarded as his real prosecutor; but he sought its offices through one of its members, who affected to be his friend, at least who had encouraged him all through the early proceedings to make his charges against the Governor-General.

The following letter, strange to say, saw the light for the first time in 1868, although it was written on July 31, 1775. We are indebted to Mr. Merivale's 'Life of Francis' for its publication. It throws a stream of light on the darker incidents of this notorious tragedy. It exhibits the character of Francis in all those hideous aspects for which Macaulay and Sir James Stephen give him such abundant credit—malevolence, calumny, hatred, unmitigated lyings- undying malignity, ferocious cruelty, and treachery. Nothing can excuse or condone the treachery of this deep-dyed I ago. The sinister motives which prompted him are now made as clear to us as are Macaulay's exaggerations of Impey's guilt. After having spurred on Nuncomar to that dangerous climax which made the Governor- General his enemy for life, the Hindoo had no friends in the Council on whom he could rely but Francis Clavering and Monson. It is well known that the two latter members were simply the creatures of the unscrupulous Junius, and as such moved neither tongue nor limb without the consent of their infamous chief. On July 31, 1775—the day before the party at Lady Anne Monson's, and five days before Nuncomar's execution—Francis received a petition from the prisoner, declaring his innocence, and supplicating him to lay the same before the Council with a view to their petitioning the Supreme Court to respite him. The petition proceeds as follows:—Most Worshipful Sir,—In the perilous and unhappy circumstances I am now reduced to at present, I doubt not but what you are acquainted with. I am now thinking I have but a short time to live, for among the English gentry, Armenians, Moors, and Gentoos, few there is who is not against me; but those that are not for me is continually devising all the mischief they can imagine against me, the reason whereof is best known to your worship, for my real intention from the beginning tended that the revenues of the country might

have been brought into the honourable Company's treasury without embezzlement, for in former times, when I had the management of the business, I took great care that no part of the revenues were pilfered. And as you and the other two gentlemen are sent out from England with intent to promote the interest of the Company, the good of the country, and lastly to spread the fame and power of his British Majesty, and it was also my earnest wish to serve under you, and to have been an instrument towards this happiness to the natives. But, alas! my best endeavours in prosecuting the salutary means have only tended to entrap my life in this cause, of which I have very little hopes of saving it *unlets your worship will be graciously pleased to interpose in my behalf with the justices, and all my hopes under God Almighty is in you, therefore must humbly entreat in the name of God you will be pleased to intercede for me and procure a respite till his Most Gracious Majesty's pleasure is known As I entirely rely on your worship's endeavour to do me all the good you can, I shall not, according to the opinion of the Hindoos, accuse you on the day of judgment of neglecting to assist me in the extremity I am now in.*" (P 234,I.)

For odious and cold-blooded villainy, the suppression of this letter exhibits the character of Francis as transcending in perfidy that of any other public man of his time. Assuming for the sake of argument Hastings to be guilty of the charge preferred by Burke, of instigating Nuncomar's prosecution, and conspiring with the Chief Justice for his subsequent execution, he at least had very serious injuries to resent which had been inflicted upon him by the cunning Hindoo, in bringing him into contempt in the country over which he ruled, and annihilating his authority at the council table over which he presided. Again, assuming for argument's sake that Impey sitting as a judge put a man unjustly to death, in order to serve the Governor-General, heinous as the crime would be, the Chief Justice at least had the plea to urge that Nuncomar was upsetting the authority of the Governor-General, that he was encouraging the most dangerous of capital offences—forgery and perjury—and that his removal would be a public benefit, however severe it might be on the culprit himself. But Philip Francis, what shall we say of him, who, acting as his friend, decoyed this wretched Brahmin into the false step of making fraudulent accusations of bribery and corruption against the Governor-General? What shall we say of the man who makes this unfortunate Hindoo first his tool, afterwards his dupe, and finally his victim; who visits him in his cell, through his agents, in order to assure him that the judges dare not carry out their sentence; and who finally weaves the web of destruction so completely about him as to make himself the only agent to whom the condemned man can apply to stay his execution? How shall we describe the man who, for five consecutive nights, retires to rest with a dying man's petition for mercy in his pocket, with no more concern than if it were a reprimand from a cast-off mistress? By what precedent can we gauge the insidious quality of the refined infamy which, while ostentatiously parading itself as conscience, sacrifices its victim in order that his blood might furnish the real assassin with increased evidence of their guilt to be hereafter preferred against the apparent murderers—Hastings and Impey? These are some of the questions which students of Sir James Stephen's book will propound to themselves, and they will doubtless wait with increasing interest to see in what manner the eminent jurist will himself answer them, although it can be pretty well anticipated from the position he takes in this his first instalment to his larger work, the 'Impeachment of Warren Hastings.'

General Clavering comes in for a large share of condemnation, although, compared with Francis, his crime looks small. On the 14th of August, 1775—nine days after Nuncomar's execution,—Clavering informed the council that on August 4, the day before the execution:—"A person came to my house who called himself a servant of Nuncomar, who sent in an open paper to me; as I imagined that the paper might contain some request that I should take some steps to intercede for him, and being resolved not to make any application whatever in his favour, *I left the paper on my table till the 6th, which was the day after his execution, when I ordered it to be translated by my interpreter.*" Clavering, by his own admission, knew the paper contained a petition from the prisoner for a respite of his sentence. Yet this most Christian gentleman allowed the paper to remain untouched until after Nuncomar's execution. In the petition Nuncomar declared himself innocent of the forgery. Nuncomar also charged Impey and the other justices with having *taken evidence from his enemies in order to prove him guilty.* This portion of the petition was naturally very offensive to Hastings, who saw in it a serious accusation against the uprightness of the judges. On the 16th he moved that a copy of it should be sent to the judges. In this motion Barwell agreed; but Francis, Monson, and Clavering opposed it, Francis vehemently urging that such a course would give to the paper "much more weight than it deserves." Francis went on to say:—"I consider the insinuation contained in it against them as wholly unsupported and of a libellous nature, and, if I am not irregular, in this place I should move that orders should be given to the sheriff to cause the original *to be burned publicly by the hand of the common hangman.*" Francis afterwards moved that the same petition which was entered in the minutes of the company on the previous Monday—the 14th—should be expunged. The minutes were accordingly expunged and the original petition burnt.

The virtuous indignation exhibited by Francis appeared to the other members of the Council highly commendable. They did not know, nor could they imagine, how deep were the machinations then evolving

themselves out of these simple proceedings, and that under the guise of protecting the judges from an indignity Francis was forging links in a chain intended to ultimately drag them to discredit and ruin. Sir James Stephen shows very clearly that Francis real motive was a very sinister one. He knew that immediately the judges were informed of the accusation they would take steps to clear it away at once, and thus dispose forever of the calumny hinted in Nuncomar's petition. To preserve it in an atmosphere of mystery was to increase its weight in future evidence against the accused. Moreover, he had a very shrewd suspicion that the whole case would someday be laid before Parliament. When Impey, at the bar of the House of Commons, asked Francis how he could reconcile his former asseverations in the integrity of his judicial character with his present attitude, Francis declared to the House that he was actuated by a motive to save Clavering from danger, perhaps murder. "My secret predominant motive for proposing to destroy the original paper produced by General Clavering was to save *him*, and *him* alone, from the danger to which he had exposed himself by that rash inconsiderate action." Francis went on to say that at the Council table Monson observed that "if the judges get possession of the paper Clavering may be ruined by it." Upon this Francis observed, "Why, what can they do to him?" "I know not what they can do," said Monson; "but since they have dipped their hands in blood, what is there they will not do?" All this will be taken for what it is worth, a huge fabrication to delude the Committee who were trying Impey. Sir James Stephen observes that the true condition of their feelings—Francis, Clavering, and Monson—was simply that they cared nothing what became of Nuncomar, but sincerely hoped that the Court by hanging him would place themselves in a hateful light. This is proved by their allowing Nuncomar to be hanged without making the smallest effort to save him, and by their subsequently entering upon the minutes of the Consultations charges against the Chief Justice and his associates, which they had condemned as libels in Nuncomar's petition, a copy of which they were not aware had been handed to the Chief Justice. When, therefore, their minutes of September 15 were compared with their action of August 16, their inconsistency completely stultified the desired effect.

Francis made what he thought a very elaborate vindication of himself and a complete incrimination of Impey. He never supposed that such a passage as the following would be read by his countrymen together with the petition the unhappy Nuncomar sent him five days before his execution. But these circumstances serve to exhibit Francis as being a far viler and more odious human compound than even Impey was made to appear by Macaulay. "It is much more material," says Francis, "to his present vindication that he was well convinced his intercession would do mischief instead of good, and would rather hasten than retard the execution of Nun-comar." How it could hasten the execution when it was fixed for the 5th is not clear, nor what mischief it could do. Sir James Stephen makes the following comment:—"He and his friends saw the use which might be made, and which afterwards was made, of Nuncomar's execution, and they did not wish to save him. They had used him against Hastings as far as they could. He was of no further use, except as a sacrifice, and they rejoiced at his death on the gallows."

The Story of Nuncomar is unquestionably the most staggering blow that the authority of Macaulay has yet received. Macaulay made some very extraordinary blunders in his time, amongst which may be mentioned his account of the origin of the French Revolution and his attack on William Penn. But none of these exhibit such a distortion of facts, or such an exaggeration of circumstances, as the famous essay on Warren Hastings. This magnificent example of literary workmanship absolutely abounds in misstatements and exaggerations. Sir James Stephen has been unsparing in gibbeting them, not out of any want of love or reverence for Macaulay, whom he knew intimately, but because of the duty a high-minded and honourable student of literature—especially a judge—owes to posterity, namely, to help it to unravel the cause of truth. But the author, in taking his farewell, pays an affectionate tribute to the subject of his criticism in which we can all cordially concur. My censures are in themselves a tribute to Macaulay's genius, for if I had not felt him to be an extraordinary man I should not have cared to criticise him so minutely, or to contradict him so emphatically." Nevertheless, Macaulay's authority as an historian is irreparably shattered. The future critic will be discovering in other essays similar introductions of romance to the following:—"There were instances in which men of the most venerable dignity, persecuted without a cause by extortioners, died of rage and shame in the grip of the vile alguazils of Impey." There is scarcely an atom of truth in this accusation in the sense the words are meant to convey. The 'instances of men of the most venerable dignity' amounted to *one* man, the Cazi, who was found guilty by legal process of corruptly oppressing a helpless widow. He died while on his way to Calcutta to answer for the charge, not in the 'grip of the vile alguazils of Impey,' but under a guard of Sepoys put over him by the Dacca Council who had given bail for him. Moreover, the guard had instructions, and had every reason, to treat him kindly, which they did. It is unnecessary to multiply instances, of which Sir James Stephen gives so many, concerning Macaulay's great failing—erring on the side of romance. Posterity will always treat a man so learned, so distinguished, so brilliant as he was with the utmost reverence. And with some Sir James Stephen's revelation will tend to heighten their love rather than extinguish it, as it will open their eyes to Macaulay's stupendous imagination. But the most important effect the book will impress on the minds of students is the

position which future history will assign to Francis and Impey. The latter, who has borne the stain of judicial murder for 110 years, has shifted it on to the head of Philip Francis. Sir James Stephen has honourably vindicated Impey, and has clearly incriminated Francis. No explanation can lift from his hateful brow the gory cap which indicates him as the moral assassin of Nuncomar. To all the loathsome traits he exhibited in his Junian exploits must now be added the most diabolical and odious distinction to which a friend in human form could aspire—the abettor of a murder for the sole purpose of incriminating the innocent.

On the other hand, Impey comes forth triumphantly acquitted of all the most serious charges preferred by Macaulay. He did not enter into any conspiracy with Hastings; he did not, sitting as a judge, put a man unjustly to death; he was not deaf to mercy and pleadings for delay; he did not refuse to respite Nuncomar; he did not hurry across India because there was something inexpressibly alluring in the peculiar rankness which was to be got at Lucknow; he did not transcend in corruption the infamous Jeffreys who drank himself to death in the Tower; nor did he develop an outrageous lust for power and authority. These are just the things he did not do. What he did was at all times consistent with the dignity, honour, and conspicuous sense of justice of an upright judge, and just what Sir James Stephen declares that either himself or his colleagues would have done. The only flaw to which the censorious can point in his official career is the mistake he made in accepting the large salary from the East India Company for the judgeship of the Civil Court of Appeal. Had he waived the salary completely instead of accepting it—although he did not appropriate it—conditionally upon the Lord Chancellor's approval, which he never got, not a single shadow would have remained to darken his reputation. Sir James Stephen exonerates him from every charge bearing the colour of corruption. His conclusion is summed up as follows:—"Impey has owed his moral ruin to a literary murder, of which Macaulay probably thought but little when he committed it."

The PROPER FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNMENT,

And the Evils That Arise from Overstepping Them.

A Paper read Before the NELSON PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY,

On *Monday*; 14th Sept., 1885,

By John Meeson, B. A.,

Of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

R. Lucas and son, Printers, etc., Nelson Bridge-Street 1885.

Contents.

Errata.

On page 16. line 32, read *pomonella* for pomeonella.

On page 19. line 17. read *atrophy* for aslophy.

The Proper Functions of Government.

How far the Government should interfere in the social and industrial development of a people,—in other words what are the true functions of the State,—is shewn by the writings of political economists, and by the legislative history and present practice of different nations to be a very vexed question. Mr J. S. Mill says "At other times it has been a subject of controversy how governments should be constituted and according to what principles and rules they should exercise their authority; but it is now almost equally a question to what departments of human affairs that authority should extend." "No subject," he says, "has been more keenly contested in the present age," and he conceives that the question does not admit of any universal solution," though he attempts to afford aid in various matters of detail on the general principle of expediency. (Polit. Econ. Book V. Chaps. I and XI.) Mr Fawcett also considers that there is nothing whatever in the principles of economical science to lead to the establishment of any general conclusion with regard to the advantages or disadvantages of State interference." Notwithstanding such high authority to the contrary, I respectfully submit that although economists differ undoubtedly in the details of their conclusions as to the limits of State intervention, yet they *do* agree for the most part as to certain general principles.

Of course, a writer who, like Herbert Spencer, sketches the State action and organisation of a statical or Utopian condition of society must be expected to take a more extreme view than one who, like J. S. Mill, deals with human nature as it is, rather than as it *should be* and possibly *might be*. And a statesman like Fawcett,

living, moving, and having his being always in an old community in the highest state of development cannot be expected to see things in the same light as a Professor like Hearne who has spent the best years of his life in a colony which 50 years ago was a howling wilderness inhabited by barbarians. Again, a lawyer and philosopher like Bentham, who passed his life amidst the mercantile activity of England will be sure to differ somewhat in his views from a quondam-soldier, like Austin, who imbibed his principles of jurisprudence amid the militant life of Germany. Eliminating, however, all doubtful points and matters in which a difference of opinion actually does, and for various reasons may be expected to prevail, we get. I submit, certain underlying principles about which there appears to be tolerable unanimity.

Before, however, examining, corroborating and illustrating this any further, let me revert to the fact, if it be one, that the legislative history and present action of the leading Governments amongst civilized nations shew anything but the recognition of a uniform guiding principle as to intervention. In political matters, as in ethical and religious, the most contradictory and inconsistent opinions and fashions, if not at the same time, certainly at times not far distant from each other, have been in vogue. What is now most radical, eccentric, or tabooed may shortly be the accepted doctrine: whereas what is *here* most generally received and acted upon, may be *there* universally dis-carded. It would seem that no Government has ever had for any long time together any fixed rule of action. In no direction is it decided beforehand how far to go. An autocratic Government like that of Germany, acts according to the caprice of an individual. In a constitutional monarchy like England it is the whim of parliament or the popular will, which determines the direction or force of legislative intervention; and as to popular will, that, of course, has its incessant ebb and flow, Nowhere does there appear any fixity of principle. Everything is tentative and empirical like the science of medicine in the hands of many practitioners. It may be said that, as politics is not one of the exact sciences, it would be foolish to look therein for precision of conclusion or finality. Perhaps so; but without expecting any rigidity, should we not look for a greater amount of consistency than we at present see.—and the avoidance of which has been demonstrated by experience to be fatuous and injurious? In other words, do nations *profit* by their past errors or the lessons they learn from remote or contemporaneous history? Not by any means. It seems that every now and again, individually as well as nationally, we forget all that we have previously learned, and need to go to school again. And of course, we have to pay our school fees; for the highest kind of national education can never *free*, though it may be *compulsory*. It is said that a colony should profit largely by the experience of the parent—land. It sits, so to speak, on the shoulders of a giant, and therefore should have a wider field of observation, and be in a better position to choose a pleasant route and avoid a thorny one. But the benefit of such elevation is not so great as is generally supposed. A child could, if it chose, avoid the evil, and profit by the good teaching and example of its parent. It is wedded to no custom. It has youthful energy, virgin powers. It *should* choose the best. As a matter of fact, does it do so? No! It has in great part to learn for itself, and often enough it goes through the very same slough of mistake and failure and trouble, that its parent went through before it,—in order to gain even that modicum of wisdom which its father could easily have communicated.

But how little the wisdom is that even an old country like England can teach its children in reference to the matter we are now considering! Examine the Imperial Statute Book and see how full it is of slidings and backslidings. Look at the general policy and see how little there is in it of consistency. And as to legislation it has been computed recently that from the Stat. of Mortin, 20, Henry III., there have been put into force in England 18110 public acts, of which no less than 4-5ths are now repealed. In the years 1870-1872 alone there were practically or wholly repealed 3,532 acts on account of their being obsolete, needless, consolidated, or injurious. Nine-tenths of the whole of the past legislation consists of repeals and amendments, and whenever a fresh departure has taken place and new ground, so to speak, has been broken up there has sprung therefrom spontaneously a crop of worthless weeds in the shape of unexpected evils and further needful departures, rather than the beneficent results that were contemplated. At one time,—indeed for many centuries, as is well known, State interference with the life and work and conduct of the individual was oppressive in the extreme. Men lived altogether according to the lines prescribed by a paternal government. Their sports, their occupations, the prices at which they had to buy and sell, their religious views, their clothing, their very speech had to be regulated, according to laws which we now shudder to think of—though it is not so impossible as many of us suppose, that such or the like tyranny might obtain at some future time again—even under a democratic form of rule—unless men are on their guard against gradual but insidious encroachment. Buckle says as to Legislation in England "that with the exception of certain necessary enactments respecting the preservation of order and the punishment of crime, nearly everything which has been done, has been done amiss." And when we remember the frightful punishments which till quite recently were inflicted for trifling offences, we need not, I think, recognise the exceptions. Buckle continues, "To take only conspicuous facts all the most important interests have been grievously damaged by the attempts of legislators to aid them. Every European Government which has legislated much respecting trade has acted as if its main object were to suppress the trade and ruin the traders." Recent English commercial reforms (1840-1860) "have solely consisted in undoing this mischievous

and intrusive legislation" European commercial legislation at one time, indeed, presented every possible contrivance for hampering commercial energy; and Blanqui considers that but "for smuggling, trade could not have been conducted, but must have perished in consequence of this incessant interference." Duties on exportation and duties on importation, bounties and taxes, one branch forbidden, another branch encouraged, wages, prices, profits, interest, all regulated by law—a sliding scale of custom duties, tolls to quadruple cost of production,—markets, manufactures, shops,—all subject to interference; and most of this done by way of protection. "The moral effect of all this," Buckle concludes, "was worse than the economical," and the accusation that the historian is bound to bring against every government which has hitherto existed is that it has overstepped its proper functions and at each step done incalculable harm. To maintain order, to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, and to adopt certain precautions respecting the public health are the only services which any government can render to the interests of civilization." (His., Civ., Vol. 1, p 258.) A modern writer thinks it was the chronic warfare of mediæval days which led to such incessant government interference in agriculture, manufacture, trade, belief, dress, ornament, amusement, &c., but that the industrial activity and law of contract led to a change and the State began to recognise the right of citizens to uncontrolled liberty of action. The change came gradually but surely. Thanks to political events and wiser rulers, one by one the burdens were removed from the shoulders of the people. The greater part of legislative action soon came to be in the direction of repeal and this continued till quite recently. Now, however, for some time past, an unmistakable reaction has been setting in. Notwithstanding the loud ringing tones of an astute and alert watchman here and there, alarm is not taken, but Government aid is invoked at every turn. And herein lies the great difference between present legislative action and that of olden times. Once the laws were imposed upon the people without their being consulted—now the people themselves with like, or even more, disastrous effects however demand interference and ask for paternal legislation, and the *vox populi* in these days, notwithstanding the incongruity of a second chamber, is the *vox Dei*. Let trouble come as it may, Government is expected to step in and remove it. Hours of labor, Betting, Education, Charitable Aid, Life Insurance, &c.—it matters not what—the State is asked and is willing to forbid, to regulate, or to personally conduct it. Even Socialistic Associations are looking to bring about the adoption of their extreme views—nationalisation of land, e.g.—by State agency.

If we now look for a moment to other European nations, we shall see that while generally speaking the tendency in England has been from excessive intervention to normal non-intervention, the almost uniform rule elsewhere in Europe has been that the State should not only have to do with, but should actually entirely direct and regulate *a* every social and industrial movement. Perhaps to this circumstance more than to any other, is owing the greater degree of progress which England has made in the accumulation of wealth, the development of commerce, useful manufactures, invention, colonization. Every industrial movement, which in England through the energy, independence, and self-reliance of its people has thriven amazingly—on the Continent, though coddled by the Government and protected and regulated with every kind of mistaking forethought has either only enjoyed a sickly existence or has died a premature death. Generally speaking it may be said that England and the Continental nations in regard to every political and economical principle are on opposite sides—both in regard to theory and practice. And herein there is no reference to so backward a state as Russia, the Government of which you remember is defined as "Despotism tempered by assassination," but the shocking examples may be found among the most enlightened and advanced European nations. In France, e.g., the nearest to England in rank among civilized people, what do we see? Close centralisation even under a Republican form of rule. Our Gallic friends blazon la liberté, l'équité et la fraternité "upon every public building; but if they had more of these priceless blessings, they would not be so boastful about them. They have been so accustomed to Government corks underneath them whenever they have ventured into deep water, that they have never yet learned to swim by themselves. And that is why they are such bad colonists.

In regard to Germany the ubiquitous and omnipotent Bismarck spares people the trouble and anxiety of thinking for themselves regarding any political question and employs them so mercilessly in military training that they necessarily acquire from its *régime* their idea of political liberty. To throw light upon our problem we should not think of going to retrograde Spain or even rejuvenated Italy. Switzerland with its unique system of local self-government might be more instructive, and so undoubtedly would be the United States which would seem to be constituted on similar lines but of grander proportions. But we must narrow our enquiry, simply stating our conviction that a full investigation would show that upon the whole the examples of the most enlightened nations exhibit no fixed principle which has served as the web of legislative action, but that as a rule—except in the case of England during a part of her past history—systems have prevailed and do prevail which have not tended to the development of individual freedom or industrial prosperity, but have violated all the principles of political economy.

Let us then in the next place see what these principles are, and how far they are consistent with one another.

In the '*Wealth of Nations*' there is no special chapter on the functions of Government, but incidentally there

is much in the book to shew us what were the philosopher's opinions on the subject. In Book V. on the Revenue of the Sovereign or Commonwealth, he tells us that the Sovereign's Duties are (1st) To protect society from the violence or invasion of other independent societies; (2nd) To establish an exact administration of internal justice; 3rd. To erect and maintain those public institutions and other public works which, though in the highest degree advantageous to a great society, are, however, of such a nature that the profit could never repay the expense to any individual or small number of individuals, and which, therefore, it cannot be expected, that any individual or small number of individuals should erect or maintain. Under the latter head he provides for roads and bridges, and other things necessary for facilitating commerce in general, and also for public education and religious establishment, all of which he considers might be expected to defray their own expense, though, if this were not the case, he conceives that the cost might, with propriety, fall upon the whole community. In regard to education, however, he says the fee or honorary paid by or for the scholar to the Master naturally constitutes a revenue to meet the expense. In some supplementary remarks we find this pregnant sentence : "It is unjust that the whole Society should contribute towards an expense of which the benefit is confined to a portion of the Society." It is evident that Adam Smith did not devote as much consideration to the functions of Government as to the commercial or mercantile system and the other departments of his subject. Although no one would differ from him as to the first two duties of the Sovereign, there are many who would join issue with him as to the whole or some of the various heterogeneous matters comprised in the third.

However, let us pass on to another political economist, scarcely inferior to the old Kirkaldy writer in reputation—J. S. Mill,—who, on our immediate subject is far more explicit and outspoken. He conceives the necessary functions of Government to be not only the protection of the subject against force and fraud, but also the regulation of inheritance, the definition of property, the enforcing of contracts, care of infants, and lunatics, coining of money, prescribing standards of weights and measures, and the care of streets, harbors, and lighthouses. All these necessary functions involve taxation, laws on property and contracts, judicature and police. The following, protection to native industry, the regulation of the price of money and food, the granting of monopolies, suppression of trades unions, &c., he conceives to be mostly interferences and to rest on false theories. He recognises the difficulty of deciding as to whether the '*lamer faire*' doctrine of the Manchester School applies to questions like State education, hours of labor, public provision for poor, etc., and avows that there is no general principle to guide us. That intervention of Government which merely gives advice or information, or—while leaving freedom of action, establishes a side-by-side arrangement by way of securing a benefit,—he thinks not very objectionable, except in so far as it involves the expenditure of public money—which unfortunately it generally does. But authoritative intervention, interdicting certain things and prescribing others, or the manner of doing them, ought, he considers, to be very limited. He sees the great difficulty of drawing the line, but would certainly exclude from State control, everything which concerns only the life, inward and outward of the individual, and not affecting the interests of others or only affecting them by moral example. To be *prevented* from doing what one likes, he says, "is always irksome, tends, *pro tanto* to starve development and partakes of slavery." After examining the objections to intervention of public authority very fully he concludes that it should be restricted as much as possible, and that the doctrine of *laissez faire* should not be departed from except for some great good or such departure becomes a certain evil. It is evident therefore that Mill's doctrine is "*general expediency*" (Chap. I., Bk. V., "Polit. Econ.") Each case is to be considered on its separate merits. This is no solution of our difficulty, for as H. Spencer clearly shows, no term is more ambiguous than the word "expedient," except it be the term "happiness"—the uncertainty of whose signification prevents us from receiving much light from Bentham—when he says "the happiness of the individuals of which a community is composed, that is their pleasures and their security, is the sole end that the legislature ought to have in view, the sole standard with which each individual ought, as far as depends upon the legislature, to be made to fashion his behaviour." The definition of happiness herein attempted, involves the same uncertainty of meaning as the word defined, and the limitation,—"*as far as depends upon the legislature*"—leaves us as much in the dark as ever.

Similarly I find little or no help in a recent writer, quoted with apparent approval by the Hon. Mr. Stout in his late speech on public education. "The true function of the State is to make the most of the citizen. This is its only inexhaustible function." To make the most of the citizen!—how I Financially, intellectually, artistically, spiritually, or physically?—and for whom, for himself? or for the State *i* (Even Bastiat, in his Harmonies—never could quite see that the interest of the individual was identical with that of the State)—and for what I for time or for eternity I And with what means? with any (the end justifying the means) or with only certain ones? There is no instruction—to my mind—in indefinite language of this kind. It only serves to make darkness more Cimmerian.

Humboldt, in his writings on the "Sphere and Duties of Government," is referred to by Matthew Arnold in "Culture and Anarchy," as shewing that the operations of Government ought to be severely limited to what directly relates to the security of person and property. This is thoroughgoing enough; and we cannot help

marvelling therefore at the German Philosopher's inconsistency when we find him subsequently becoming Minister of Education in his native land and helping to transfer the management of all schools in Prussia to the State.

Now let us turn to Herbert Spencer. In "*Man v. the State*," a reprint of four remarkable articles which appeared last year in the "Contemporary," there is much that bears upon our subject. However, H. Spencer, as far as I know, never lived, perhaps never was in an Australasian Colony or examined the tendency of our N.Z. Legislation. If such had been the case, he would, I am persuaded, have lifted up his powerful voice more vehemently, more trenchantly than ever he has done in favor of the doctrine of non-intervention on the part of the State. For the revived tendency to intervention which has for some years been apparent at Home, is here intensified. Just as the old world flora and fauna when brought into the new world, flourish to a surprising degree and attain a greater average size than could have been expected—so physical and social and political diseases seem here, when they secure a footing to have a development that is always exceptional and sometimes extraordinary.

H. Spencer hesitates not to give us a general or first principle—although other economists assert that such a thing cannot be found. Substantially, this is what he says:—The laws of life which are at the bottom of social phenomena shadow forth the truth of which we are in quest. Liberty is essential to growth and life, and when individuals live in society, each is entitled to all liberty which is not inconsistent with the liberty of his fellows. What prompts men to live in society? Love of companionship and experience of the advantages to be got from co-operation. The condition of co-operation is *mutual advantage, division of prey, booty, &c.* To this end, as well as non-interference with action, there must be freedom of contract and enforcement thereof. The divine right of parliaments and of majorities is superstition. Subordination of the minority to the majority is only justifiable for the maintenance of the vital principle, *i.e.*, to preserve each citizen in the means of satisfying his desires and of getting further means without treading on the liberty of others.

So much for "*Man v. the State*." But it is not from this book that we get the most complete view of Spencer's theory of the functions of Government, but rather from his "*Social Statics*," which has now long been published. Some of the views therein expressed, particularly those relating to the liberty of women and children he has since qualified—in the main, however, his ideas seem to be unchanged. Those of us who know the book in question—and there are probably many such present—will remember that the author says if we are to get at a right principle at all it must be by assuming a perfect moral state. He scouts the idea of Bentham's Expediency or Mill's Utility being of any service, and advocates in lieu thereof, and as a first principle, this doctrine: God wills human happiness, *i.e.*, the gratification of the desires; *i.e.*, the exercise of the faculties. Therefore, man has a right to the liberty of employing all his faculties but with consideration for the like liberty of others. 'What concerns all should be approved of all.' Every man should be free to do what he will, provided he infringe not the equal freedom of others. From this he justifies *these rights* of man—life, liberty, free use of earth, right to acquire property in goods, ideas, and character, liberty of exchange, free speech. He quotes with approval *re* political rights the saying of Blackstone 'No human laws are of any validity if contrary to the laws of nature.' A state, he says, is a body of men voluntarily associated for mutual protection. Analogy leads us to assign only one function to one organ. The one function of the State is to secure to the subject the possession and use of his rights and to protect him from aggression by his fellow citizens or outsiders. The taking up of other duties is in itself aggressive. Such matters as regulation of commerce, religious establishment, poor laws, national education, government colonization, sanitary supervision, even currency and postal matters are not the business of Government, and should be left to be attended to by the parties principally interested. They would not be neglected if such a course were taken.

A more recent writer—Henry Fawcett, the late mentally-far-seeing but bodily-blind Postmaster—recognises that political economists and others interested in social subjects are divided, *re* State intervention, into two parties—the one intelligent, active, philanthropic, and sympathetic, would have Government to do much more than it has ever yet done; the other, smaller, more philosophic and thoughtful, says—no—much less. He opposes both schools, and thinks evil and confusion will result from adopting any general rule. Each case he would consider, like Mill, on its merits, and holds up those who would oppose compulsory State education as an instructive warning against becoming indoctrinated with *laissez-faire* principles. But he says that all admit that Government interference is not good in itself. "Probably the best measure that can be obtained of the welfare of a community is to ascertain to what extent each member of it can with advantage to all the rest be permitted to have freedom of action." *e.g.*, the extent to which the State interferes *re* education is a measure of popular ignorance and the extent to which it regulates the terms of labor of children measures the cupidity of employers and parents. So he concludes that Government interference should be regarded as a necessary but disagreeable remedy to cure social defects: like a strong medicine it leaves serious consequences and should therefore be given cautiously. Legislation is a perilous experiment which statesmen should use with circumspection. If they pass enactments for party purposes or to gain

immediate popularity, they may ruin their country.

Now this is one of the latest words on the subject, and truly I think one of the wisest. With Mr Fawcett's opinion, however, as to the inadequacy of political economy to furnish any general conclusion as to the advantages or disadvantages of State interference, I have said, that I don't agree—unless by general conclusion we must understand a hard-and-fast line to be universally drawn between such things as may be wisely legislated about and such things as may not. A rule which should fit all cases in a science so mixed and complicated as that of legislation need not be looked for; but I submit that the opinions of leading economists herein examined (even those of Mill and Fawcett themselves)—divergent and opposed as they are in some particulars nevertheless sufficiently bring into prominence certain leading principles which it would be well for our statesmen to thoroughly grasp and apply as far as possible in legislative work.

The first duty of the State is undoubtedly protection—the maintenance of the subject in his natural rights. Justice tempered by mercy if you like—but still justice should be the mortar or cement to bind together the different parts of the edifice of the State. Love takes its place in the household or family. A paternal Government which endeavours to combine State—with family—principles, justice with philanthropy or charity, is a hybrid affair that is likely to miss or mar the discharge of all its proper duties—a *mesalliance* that must result in unhappiness. Out of mistaking humanitarianism, it relieves the idle and worthless at the expense of the industrious and thrifty, the foolish at the cost of the wise, and thus wars against the law of the Survival of the Fittest, and becomes truly an impediment to progress instead of a help thereto. About this, although practically it may be ignored in many quarters most people are theoretically agreed. With a view to affording protection it is, of course, necessary for the State to make provision for defence against external enemies by establishing, equipping, and providing for naval and military forces, and constructing fortifications, etc.—as well as to secure the life and property of citizens against the carelessness, cupidity, or violence of one another, and so criminal and civil law and the administration of justice by judicial officers and police, are needed. Property has to be defined and the interests held therein. Modes of contract, the laws of inheritance, and of transmission of estates have to be provided. Bentham says: "In Legislation the most important object is security; secure to the cultivator the fruits of his labour, and you have probably done enough." As a matter of fact, however, no Government has ever limited itself to this work, nor does so now. The aggressive tyranny of the one, the few, or the many has made large inroads into human rights instead of securing them; and humanity has become so much accustomed to the present state of things—call it slavery or protection or what you will—that it must of necessity be now very difficult if not impossible to realize the consummation which is so devoutly to be wished. Anyhow we shall certainly not see it for some time, nor is it desirable that we should. Violent changes have always immediately, at all events, disastrous consequences. Whatever the surrounding circumstances may be and although they may be such as impede true progress, men grow accustomed to their environment, and after a fashion thrive. Renan on State action says, "A liberal believes in liberty and liberty signifies the non-intervention of the State. But such an ideal is still a long way from us, and the very means to remove it to an indefinite distance would be precisely the State withdrawing its action too soon." Slaves when freed invariably commit excesses. But the first step towards realizing a great good is truly to comprehend its nature—and the second is to conceive a strong desire for it; and I fear mankind, as a whole, have taken neither the first step nor the second as yet in the direction of diminished State intervention.

Now it being granted that the primary, if not the sole, duty of the State is to afford security—and as no State or people is satisfied with this ideal simplicity of function, we have still to enquire what are the common principles, if any, which really underlie all the apparently inconsistent theories of political economists as to the numerous other duties which Governments undertake. Mill's doctrine of general expediency, as the limit of State action, as we have said, is no solution of the difficulty, for it necessitates a definition of what is expedient. It is arguing in a circle. Bentham's greatest happiness of greatest number" is equally untrustworthy; for no two persons can agree probably as to wherein happiness consists. Besides even if the majority in a State do agree as to what is expedient, or as to what makes them happy, why should the minority be forced to accept the more-numerously subscribed definition? If there be any unwritten compact under which a society is formed after its constituent individuals have congregated by accident or for the sake of companionship together, it contains only two words "mutual protection." Now as Spencer says, if a company be formed for a specific object, it may fairly claim to legislate and act for the realisation of that object, and so far it has the authority of every individual member of that company, for what it does. But if it wander into other fields of action in order to achieve other objects perhaps not even collateral, it can scarcely plead the same authority for interfering with the liberties or wealth of its members, Therefore, as "mutual protection" is the one object, presumably, lying at the foundation of society—if the State enters upon any other work, it does so without the fully authority of its citizens. If this deduction be logically drawn, we *must* accept Herbert Spencer's first principle in legislation on matters outside of provision for security—modified, however, slightly, as society *is not* in a perfect or statical condition.

1. *"Every man should be free, AS FAR AS POSSIBLE UNDER EXISTING CIRCUMSTANCES, to do what he will, provided he in fringe not the equal freedom of any other man."*

This is a matter of justice; it is a positive principle, and it interdicts most certainly all interference with what constitutes the private life of man, and all interference with very much of that which is public. Then another principle about which nearly all economists are agreed is this:—

2. *"That the functions of the State outside of protection to life and property should be limited as much as possible."*

This is, I believe, another mode of expressing the same idea as that contained in the first principle but it has many more subscribers.

Then there is the principle which I quoted previously from Adam Smith, and as to which the best economists also agree.

3. *"It is unjust that the whole society should be required to contribute towards an expense of which the benefit is confined to a portion of the society only"*

In other words, general taxation should be only for matters of common benefit, and not for things of merely local interest. And this should be strictly construed, for otherwise it would be possible to make every merely local affair a matter of common interest, inasmuch as we are all parts of the same body politic—and, just as in the human body, the sympathy between the different parts is considerable, even so in any nation the weal or woe of a remote district in a less or greater degree affects the well-being of the whole. Fawcett says, "No demand is so insidious as those calling in central authority to benefit one section of the community by levying contributions upon the rest,"—and this is the strong argument against poor laws, free education, and such things.

I add another principle which appears to me equally founded with the preceding.

4. *"That the Government should undertake for the people no function that could be equally well discharged by the people for themselves."*

I am not sure that, carefully examined, these four canons would not turn out to be merely various modes of putting the same truth. Well, there must be something in a proposition which has so many facets of *vraisemblance* Mill, in his logic, says, "All propositions concerning the complex phenomena of social life must be hypothetical only and not facts. They must not assert that something will surely happen, but that such and such will be the effect of a given cause if it operates uncounteracted." It may be objected that these canons are chiefly negative. To my mind that is a decided advantage. Government learns readily enough *what to do*, but has considerable difficulty in ascertaining and determining, in the face of popular clamor *what not to do*.

Now, although these four principles—and two others which I should like to add:—

5. *"That we ought to look to the State for justice, but not for love (H. S.)"*

6. *"That every case of proposed State intervention ought to be considered on its own merits" (Fawcett and Mill)—can, as I have said, be really and readily found underlying or on the Surface of the opinions of the best economists, in actual political practice, we have so far departed from original virtue, if it ever existed, that they are practically never recognised. There are two reasons for this.*

The first is that even well-educated people, electors, members of Parliament, even Statesmen, have no faith whatever in the conclusions of political economy. These conclusions, they say, may be all very well in theory, but in practice we have and must have something quite different. It is pleaded that they have never yet anywhere been adopted as fixing the limits of legislative action; and thus the very existence and universality and permanence of evil and injustice and waste of force are made arguments for their continuance. It is useless in such a case to point out that what is true in theory must indicate what is just in practice; for to many minds it is plain that the theoretical conclusions themselves are not by any means so clear as could be wished; and perhaps not one of them is capable of such demonstration as would obtain in mathematics or physical science. That, however, arises from the nature of the subject-matter with which political economy has to deal. Factors must be weighed for which ordinary logical scales do not suffice. Every question is marvellously complicated and is found to have all sorts of unforeseen and unsuspected relations to other questions and conclusions, perhaps in themselves not well established but which we do not desire for various reasons to disturb. In the difficulty that thus arises and in the dread of interfering with existing related interests and prepossessions, guidance is sought for in the practice of older nations and prior times; and unfortunately, adherence to such simple general principles as those indicated is seen to have been in the past and to be in the present nowhere observed. And then the authorities who entertain a contrary opinion are called to mind—Carey or Wakefield, e.g., the latter of whom says that "without plenty of Government the settlement of a waste country is barbarous and miserable work," and that in fact, in a young colony the quantity of Government is more important than its quality. Thus political economy is regarded as speaking with an uncertain voice and as being untrustworthy. The relative weight of authority is never considered, and even if it be—while in the one scale we have the conclusions of the most profound thinkers—in the other we have the opinions of shallow but

ready writers and the practice of nations generally. Indolence and indisposition to work out for ourselves a hard problem, and fear of disturbing the existing and dread of a new *regime* are all thrown into the already descending scale and down it goes with a satisfactory bump. "Who fears new remedies, must abide old evils." All this is very pitiable and unfortunate and makes the fight against the prevailing tendency a very up-hill one. But it is none the less the duty of those who think they see matters a little more clearly, to speak out at opportune time and in suitable place—without fear of consequences,—if without much hope of the desired result.

So much for the first cause of the non-recognition of the conclusions of economists. It is, put otherwise, simply, *human ignorance*. The second cause is *human selfishness*—selfishness in those who having the reins of government in their hands, see that the more work they have to do the greater their influence and power will be, and selfishness in those who so to speak sit behind in the Government cars, urge on the drivers and without thought of others are only intent on arriving at their own objects with State assistance. To all such people what matters it that they are unjust to their fellow-subjects. If we don't rob the community, say they, others will. Our private share in the liabilities of the bankrupt state will be considerably less than what we shall secure for ourselves beforehand through *preference*—which though perhaps fraudulent can never be brought in as such, inasmuch as the State is above ordinary insolvent laws.

I said just now that it is our duty to speak plainly about these matters. It is especially desirable to speak out at this present time in the world's history because there is no doubt that there is now and has been for the past 50 years—ever since the reconstruction of the British Electorate by the passage of the Reform Bill in 1832—a growing disposition on the part of the people and therefore of the Government of nearly every nation to extend in almost every direction the sphere of the State's operations. The dicta of political economists are occasionally referred to by public writers or speakers, but no real influence results from such spasmodic utterances. An honorable member of an independent turn of mind now and then raises his voice against this or that measure as being outside the proper functions of the State. A conscientious Minister of the Crown perhaps is loud in his complaints that the addition of this or that duty to the already overworked staff of his department is clogging the wheels of Government machinery, and interfering with proper social development. But both the one and the other are impotent to stem the advancing tide, and, stifling their honest consciences they bow to necessity. A short but able article in the "Ency. Brit." shows that while in recent times there has been a further and further restriction of State action as to two things—religion and limitation of contract—there has been in reference to almost everything else undoubtedly a great increase. Education, the regulation of labor in the case of women and children, dangerous employments, sanitary matters, public convenience, professional qualifications, coercion for moral purposes, wages, lotteries, sale of liquors, amusements. &c., are the subject matter of multitudinous enactments and are far more under the control of the Government than ever they were before. The whole business has a natural tendency to increase, not in arithmetical but in geometrical progression. What is very properly called *political momentum* is enormous. A course of legislative action is begun and its indirect results *are not*, perhaps *cannot be*, estimated. Soon it is seen that further enactments are rendered necessary unless the first is to become null and void. And then come repeals of the whole or portions of previous acts, amendments, amendments of amendments, and when the law on any particular branch becomes so complicated by all this as to become ridiculous and unworkable, we have consolidations, in which, however, there is no finality, but simply a new starting-point for the same miserable rigmarole.

This was not, however, Sir Thos. More's ideal. He says in Utopia "They have but few lawes; for to people so instructe and institute very few do suffice. Yet this thing they chiefly reprove among other nations, that innumerable bookes of lawes and expositions upon the same be not sufficient. But they think it against all right and justice that men should be bound to those lawes which either be in number more than be able to be read or els blinder or darker than that anye man can well understand them. Furthermore they utterlie exclude and banishe all attornies, proctours, and sergeaunts at the lawe, which craftelye handele matters and subteley dispute of the lawes. For they think it moste meete that every man should pleade his own matter and tell the same tale before the judge that he wold tell to his man of lawe. So shall there be less circumstance of words and the trueth shall soner come to light whiles the judge with a discrete judgment do the weigh the words of him whom no lawyer hath instructe with deceit. This is hard to be observed in other countries in so infinite a number of blinde and intricate lawes."

Again, in Utopia, I read. The chiefe and almoste the onlye offyce of the Syphograuntes (or Magistrates elected by the people) is to see and take hede that no manne sit idle; but that every one applye his owne craft with earnest diligence, and yet for all that not to be wearied from earlie in the morninge to late in the eveninge with continuale worke like labouringe and toy linge beastes." Happy Utopia! For, industry being secured, there would be absent a host of temptations that frail humanity now succumbs to. Private energy and co-operation would meet all human necessities and satisfy all mortal wants. With a people thoroughly industrious and not jaded with work even the necessary administration of criminal and civil law would be less frequently called into

requisition; for as the Spaniards say, "While the Devil tempts most men, the idle man tempts the Devil," and soon finds himself either breaking contracts, or committing torts or crimes. But there is no direct steam communication with Utopia, indeed its whereabouts, however much we might desire to emigrate there, would be very difficult to find. Instead of confining Government action to any one function, now the tendency is to make it discharge every individual duty, every social obligation. Whenever anything goes wrong we have acquired the habit of thinking that the State alone can and that the State alone must, step in and put matters right. Once, individual energy aided by the mighty lever of co-operation would have endeavored to remove the obstruction. Now great Jove is appealed to in the shape of the Minister of Public Works or the Treasurer. It matters not whether the thing to be done be great or small. Is it a railway that needs to be constructed to open up a piece of country or join two commercial centres? The State must do the work, although already it is overburdened with debt—and although the direct benefit from the line, if any result at all, will be chiefly, if not entirely, local. Is it the Codling Moth that has made its appearance in our orchards! We let the pest so firmly establish itself that perhaps no remedy short of the entire destruction of apple crop of a season can be of any avail, and then the Government, in response to representation made as to the magnitude of the evil, passes an act to stop the importation of suspected fruit, and "to provide measures for the destruction of the insect known as *Carpocapsapomeonella*"—which measures, as it rests with the inhabitants of any locality to bring them into operation, are simply inoperative. Seeing this to be the case Parliament appoints subsequently a Committee of Enquiry, consisting of members who know nothing about the matter and care less, and so perform their duties of collecting information and reporting thereupon in a manner essentially perfunctory. Eventually, perhaps, an Act will be passed, which, indirectly, will do far more harm than directly it will do good, inasmuch as it will probably subject the good and industrious husbandman to vexatious and intolerable surveillance, weaken his sense of responsibility, and make him smart under a feeling of injustice, because he is made to suffer for the neglect and indolence of his neighbor. *Would it not be easy to multiply examples of this kind of thing in every direction?*

What M. Arnold says of the British nation is very true of this portion of it:—"We show laudable energy and persistence in walking according to the best light we have, but are not quite careful enough to see that our light be not darkness."

It will be said by some that State action is, after all, only cooperation on a large scale—on such a scale indeed as is needful to the realisation of the full advantage that is aspired to. In some cases this is certainly true—*i.e.* where the evil to be removed or the benefit to be gained affects all the subjects of the State alike. Here, State action is really not substitutive, but direct action by the individuals interested—whose ministers or servants, in such a case, the statesmen in office and the executive departments, undoubtedly are. It is the recognition of the desirability of such State-action as this, that led me to modify H. Spencer's first principle before accepting it. Such matters as currency and postal work, I conceive to be legitimately within the functions of the State according to the 3rd principle above given—*i.e.* because they affect all subjects of the State. When we find Herbert Spencer therefore relegating them to private control, we cannot help thinking that for the sake of an ideal simplicity of philosophy—the theorist pushes his biological analogy—one organ, one function—to a foolish extreme. We see the same tendency in our author as to the liberties of women and children. When we find so much in him with which it is impossible not to agree,—it gives us almost a shock to find that the guide, who helps us on our way by the light of his wide information and genius, must not be followed implicitly, lest in avoiding Charybdis we fall into Scylla. However, to return, when State-action is regarded as co-operation on an extensive scale, let it be observed that in ordinary industrial co-operation there is none of that compulsion which the State brings forward to diminish personal liberty and private wealth. If a man conscientiously holds himself aloof from a co-operative movement in his neighborhood, however desirable it may be, he will not be subject to much of a penalty for his churlishness. Possibly he may socially be ostracised and being of an independent and cynical turn—rather enjoy his isolation than otherwise. In other respects he will be *in statu quo*. But in reference to State action, a man cannot retain his domicile and at the same time hold aloof. To withdraw himself from the operation of an Act of Parliament which he regards as obnoxious, he must emigrate to another country where probably he will be subject to some exaction or interference, equally, or more vexatious. Besides this, all movements are accompanied by friction and loss. And further, it may be that what the State proposes to remedy presses upon a man personally, but he has a private means of removing or enduring the weight—if, however the State comes upon him with its legislation, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, he must adopt the remedy prescribed and none other.

1.—Yet even with their eyes open to all these arguments, there are those who justify the enlargement of State action, because they suppose that Government can do better work than private effort. It is simply notorious that, for very sufficient reasons, whatever the State does, costs far more and as a rule achieves far less of the direct and intended results than would be the case if the work were in private hands, or under the control of an ordinary commercial company. As to the cost, Fawcett says, "Avidity is shown in getting as much as

possible locally out of the State coffers, but it is forgotten that each Is in the national treasury represents more than Is taken out of the taxpayer's pocket." There is no doubt whatever that the large and rapidly-increasing indebtedness of modern nations and colonies, especially some of them, and *notably our own*, arises largely from this unnatural usurpation of ordinary social functions. Professor Newman says "until centralisation is admitted permanent debt is not incurred," (lecture on Reorganisation of English Institutions) and of course the more intense the centralisation becomes, the greater is the tendency to the accumulation of debt. State money is never so economically or wisely spent as that raised locally or personally. It is one of the arguments against the carrying on of business by Co-operative Companies, that the paid manager cannot have that zeal in his work which he would have if the enterprise and its gains and losses were his own. In the case of an enormous company like the State the sense of individual risk and interest is proportionately diminished. Civil Servants sometimes say that the public is the worst master in the world because it is never pleased or even satisfied with the work done. This may be so; but in another sense the public is the most indulgent and easily-satisfied of masters, for its united voice as expressed through Parliament is the only voice which is listened to or cared for, and that voice it is very difficult for the dissatisfied individual or individuals to raise. Consequently there cannot in the nature of things be the same ardour and anxiety to please on the part of the public servant with an income fixed or increasing progressively and independently of the public favor, as there is on the part of him who offers his services in the open market and receives patronage and income proportionate to the success with which he manages the business concern entrusted to him. This implies no reflection on Civil Servants individually nor indeed upon any one body of them collectively. Any others in their position would do just the same. It is only natural that it should be so. And this gives us one reason why Government work is costly, but there are others scarcely inferior in importance. There is greater carelessness in the expenditure of public money—less circumspection and greater chicanery in accepting contracts—less judgment and care in entering on enterprises. No one feels himself personally responsible. A private individual knows that a foolish enterprise, if the operations be large, means ruin to him. A nation cannot be ruined in the same sense, for the public purse besides being deep, is constantly being replenished by continuous or increased taxation. The bankruptcy of this nation no one would feel to be so disgraceful to him as the bankruptcy of himself. Hence, in spite of Parliamentary espionage and press criticism and public dissatisfaction, departmental expenditure is always more lavish and unproductive than private outlay, and all the little economies which collectively amount up to so large a sum are disregarded. *Would it be difficult in this Colony to point out where public money has been recklessly squandered, where public works have been shamefully mismanaged, where work has been begun and left after a time in such an unfinished state that even that achieved is comparatively useless and unprofitable?*

And what does it all result in? A property tax of one penny in the and 20 per cent, import duties, and even then deficient revenue! We pay heavy taxes now in New Zealand, but we pay them grudgingly. With lower prices for produce—or perhaps I ought rather to say with continuously low prices, and therefore times more depressed—we shall not be content to pay such taxes at all. Before '89 in France we know that oppressive taxation in various objectionable forms—*la corvee, la taille du roi, la subvention, la vingtième, la gabelle, etc., etc.*—was the main cause of that misery and discontent which, ignited by an accidental spark, burst into the flames of revolution. Such a thing, I presume, *could* take place under a democratical as well as under a monarchical tyranny.

2.—But besides being more costly—even where carried through—Government work is far less efficient than private enterprise. Does anyone believe that the Union Company's steamers would have been so successfully managed if the Government had had them in hand? When the State manages matters, things are allowed to drift that ought to receive immediate attention. There is no stitch in time. An honest and good servant, when found, is not sufficiently appreciated. Those without the requisite knowledge and experience through nepotism command positions of responsibility. Would it be difficult to find in connection with our railway lines in this Colony, instances where the comfort and convenience of travellers are never studied, where rolling stock is altogether inadequate to occasional requirements, where the element of danger is largely increased through neglect in ballasting, where the lines have been made exactly across the hills which they should have circumvented, where the speed and time-table are so adjusted that coaches have to run for 30 miles alongside of the lines in order to keep regular appointments? To make a thing pay a private company would make it efficient and indispensable to the public. Government cares to do neither the one thing nor the other and so has to work its business at a loss.

3.—And there are several other evil results, besides cost and inefficiency of work, that flow directly or indirectly from excessive State interference. One is that, co-operation, which should be the remedy for many of the evils of humanity is decidedly checked, and again the sense of personal and individual responsibility and self-reliance are much weakened. Whereas, if the State had not undertaken so many duties for us, we should, whenever difficulty assailed us, or a pressing want arose, bestir ourselves to supply the one and remove the

other—now that a fatherly Government has us in hand, our energies lie dormant, and we selfishly decline to make any personal sacrifice, however needful, until the law compels us. And whereas if the initiative had come from ourselves we should probably continue, by persistent effort, to try to further the desired end, now that the initiative proceeds from the State, we render no more assistance than we possibly can help. And so personal character is deteriorated. It is a well-recognised law in Biology that parasitism or semi-parasitism leads to degeneration and atrophy of the organs. And what is true of animal and vegetable life is equally true of Social. Here is a spiritual principle given by a recent able writer—Henry Drummond, "Any principle which secures the safety of the individual without personal effort or the vital exercise of faculty is disastrous to moral character." How profoundly true this is of the State, by whose excessive parental care, earnestness, independence, self-reliance, inventiveness, mutual confidence, enterprise, industry are all checked, and in place thereof we develop child-like indifference, and submissiveness, and helplessness unworthy of true men!

4.—Besides we must remember that the evil will and must of necessity grow. Periodical visits of the Dentist are now made to at least one of the elementary schools of England at a cost of £60 per annum to the School Board fund; and free breakfasts and dinners are not unfrequently supplied. In this Colony, it has already been contended that it is more necessary for the State to look after secondary education than primary, and worse still, the proposition has been seriously made, that the State shall build houses for poor workmen. With houses built for as by the Government, what should hinder us from becoming as degenerate as Hermit crabs.—As greater and more pressing political questions get themselves resolved—and even before this happens—the ceaseless activity of Ministers and Members, who apparently think that they are to be judged by Wakefield's standard—the quantity rather than the quality of their work—will find other subject-matter about which to legislate. "L'appetit vient en mangeant." Personal conduct and private life will be interfered with. The regulation of the hours of labor of the employed and their holidays—the appointment of a public trustee, and institution of Government Insurance to weaken our confidence in one another—proposals for making advances to settlers at less rates than those which are produced by the operation of the ordinary laws of supply and demand—gaming and lotteries acts and other similar attempts to produce statutory morality which is no morality at all—the undertaking occasionally to find work for the clamorous unemployed, while the more deserving, but less impudent, are never thought of—all such things as these are the thin end of the wedge. We shall soon be surrounded with so many petty but irritating regulations that life will not be worth living, and true liberty will become a thing of the past. For, different sections of the community, each with its own peculiar craze, will demand legislation in that particular social or moral direction which it affects. Henry George's followers will demand the nationalization of land—protectionists and fair traders will require a departure from the principles which have mainly produced the present commercial supremacy of the British Empire—rigid Sabbatarians will ask for further restrictions *re* the day of rest—the Blue Ribbonites and Teetotallers will make it, if possible, more difficult for the moderate, that is truly sober man to get his glass of beer by way of refreshment—the old ladies of both sexes will check the progress of experimental and illustrative science by demanding laws against vivisection—those intent on the moral improvement of mankind will move heaven and earth to bring in their codes of regulations as drastic as the laws of early New England. In addition to all the class legislation that will thus arise, precedent, Government by party, the need to supplement defective measures, the growing faith in Government omnipotence, the strange aspiration of young men for Government service, though it is well known to be the grave of hope, of energy and of genius—the *vis inertiae* of all exerting forces—everything will tend to increase the Government monopoly and influence and to extend the sphere of State legislation and action.

There is in fact some danger that the whole business will break down of its own weight—sooner or later. Perhaps from our point of view we ought to call this thought a source of comfort rather than of insecurity—and to say, let it be sooner rather than later. There is more than one State just now with its hands too full of work altogether—more than one colony of which the Government departments are overburdened with business, while stagnation prevails in remote districts. This is a most unhealthy condition of society. Just as in the human body, excessive absorption of nutriment by one limb or organ will develop local disease, an excrescence or a monstrosity—but general atrophy—so in the body politic, absorption by Government of too much money and too many duties implies that the central public departments will be congested with work, while the general community will have too little civil occupation. The remedy for this is more and more local Government on discreet lines. Why should Government be an exception to the general economic law of differentiation of function—which has mainly contributed to produce in industrial occupations, excellence of work and cheapness of price? It may be said that multiplication of departments sufficiently complies with the principle of differentiation. But this is not so. So long as the State makes itself responsible for the whole—and for the *final* result—this is not social or economic differentiation at all but only a mere make-believe.

5.—If the happiness of an individual consists as we are told it does in the full employment of all the faculties—presumably the well-being of a nation is capable of similar definition, and consequently in so far as a

Government usurps the functions of its people and throws their energies out of employment and their capital out of its natural channels, it was really against their happiness under the pretence of serving them. If the Government does for the people on a large scale that which each section of the people should do for itself on a small scale, a vast amount of talent and capacity that would otherwise find scope, will be thrown out of action and from desuetude will dwindle away, and the pleasure which arises from local and personal interest in the success of local and personal matters will never be excited. With Railways, Telegraphs, Telephones, Insurance business, Forestry, Banking work, Public Trustee's Office, &c., &c., &c., all in the hands of Government—there will soon be no room, no occupation at all in our community that I know of, for a private individual of an independent turn of mind. *We shall each of us have to become a wheel, or a window, or a plank, or a peg in the great National Car of Juggernaut, or we shall be crushed to atoms underneath it!*

6.—And there is another aspect of the matter well-deserving of the attention which it has, even so early, received. We are tending to absolute uniformity of character and type.

*"Ground in yonder social mill
We rub each other's angles down,
And merge . . . in form and gloss
The picturesque of man and man."*

As long as the State leaves to Society its multifarious avocations and strictly limits its own operations to functions that undoubtedly belong to it, each individual has abundant choice as to how he shall employ his energies, how educate himself; and there will be an individuality generally speaking about each social atom, while the whole social body will display a pleasing and useful variety of character and attainments, the different mutually-beneficial idiosyncrasies being blended together in a many-hued whole. Very SOOR. what with our uniform system of education, and the ponderous weight of uniform laws, and the monopoly of many different kinds of work by the State, we shall become like the Chinese in monotonous sameness and indistinctness of outline, and like them we shall be stationary, whereas in the past we have been progressive and inventive. Our individuality will be lost altogether and though in conformity with Nature's "carefulness of the type but carelessness of the single life," the law that

*"The individual shall perish,"
That the world be more and more"*

maybe all very well as a philosophical and abstract conception, yet it is not one which we can personally and individually regard with much satisfaction.

7.—Again not the least of the evils resulting from the Government adopting the paternal character and holding itself ready to legislate in any direction, and so undertake any kind of work, is that representatives of necessity become mere delegates, rather than statesmen. Each electoral district has or thinks it has some pressing want or wants and only that candidate who pledges himself to do his best to gain the desired object has the slightest chance of being elected. There is no thought of the rest of the community or of the general requirements and policy of the nation—no remembrance of the fact that "self-denial is the corner-stone of religious and political economy," (Lecky. His. Rat. Vol. II. page, 400)—no scruple about taxing the whole community for the benefit of a small part thereof. We are taxed for the benefit of other places, let other places therefore pay for our requirements! And we are not going to keep or abide by a mere business-like debtor and creditor account either! Let us get as much as we can! We may trust other districts to do likewise! Hence demoralization in electors and elected. Hence log-rolling in the House with all its vicious consequences. All of which would be avoided if the State kept more closely to the fundamental principles of wise and just legislation and action.

8.—And consider how incomplete and inconsistent State inter-vention—however energetic and conscientious—must be. This arises not alone from the magnitude of the work undertaken but from the various interests involved and the complicated character of State machinery. Take an example. Why should doctors, and lawyers, and schoolmasters be required to legally qualify themselves for their professional work, while at the same time Members of Parliament have no such ordeal to pass through, and need not, and I fear I must say oftentimes do not, possess even the elements of a polite education? Can it be said that the work of the legislator is less important than that of the surgeon or solicitor! Surely it is far more important; for a Parliament by its Ministers may declare a disastrous war, and by the making of laws masses of people actually living and yet to be born will be directly or indirectly affected; whereas the ordinary professional man has a very limited sphere

of action. Your doctor's remedies if disliked or found ineffective may be thrown into the gutter and a rival may be called in. But the medicines that the Legislature prescribes must be taken, however much you may doubt their efficacy, or loathe them. Perhaps you think that the election campaign is the ordeal that a member has had to pass in lieu of entrance examination. He has certainly had to respond from the public platform to multitudinous pertinent or impertinent questions. But who and what are the examiners? Do they themselves know the principles of statesmanship? Are their questions calculated to test the candidate's fitness or unfitness for the important role he proposes to play? And is a ready repartee, or a shuffling evasion, or a piece of brazen impudence never successfully resorted to by the examinee as a means of getting out of a difficulty? Yet what Government ever dare to propose to put elected members through an examination in the principles of statesmanship, legislation, general history, social and industrial development, before admitting them to seats in the House? The howl of indignation which would fill our House of Representatives if such a thing were proposed can be more easily imagined than described. Yet both for consistency's sake and in order to secure something like statesmanship in our National Councils it would be well perhaps if we had such a scheme. But, say some, we don't want learned men in the House, such men as would succeed in passing examinations, but practical common-sense men. What nonsense! Because, forsooth you meet occasionally with a man who has book-learning but no world-knowledge, you would conclude that the two things are necessarily divorced and antagonistic? Does not the history of almost every civilized nation show a long roll of able statesmen who at the same time have been men of letters and otherwise conspicuously eminent? Your merely practical common-sense man is very likely to make blunders, when he is not in his usual groove, from the limited range of his vision and from that difficulty in calculating indirect results and pursuing long chains of reasoning which all men must feel who have not had a certain amount of logical training. The merely practical man might suffice for a Read Board, but he will need to be something more before he can become a statesman.

Some people say—I have seen it stated recently in a Nelson Daily—that for the work of the State in a colony we do not need Statesmen, but only such men as would be suitable for Road Boards. And perhaps there may be a scintilla of truth in this. Let us examine the matter closely. Even political economists like Mill have exceptional clauses—which, by the way, have incidentally done much harm—but in which they admit that in colonial social and political development the general principles of their science may be departed from to some extent. The famous saving clause *re* protection, out of which so much capital was made by disingenuous politicians in a neighbouring colony some years ago, is a case in point; and Prof. Hearn in "Pluto-logy" has, in treating of the functions of government, given many departments of work to a young colony which an old State would not be called upon to attend *to*. The administration and settlement of waste lands, and the mode of dealing with the aboriginal inhabitants, readily occur to one as examples. The rudest governments must have the most multifarious duties. The whole department of public works must, for a time at least, in a young and remote colony like this, be more important than that which has to do with our foreign relations; and it must, either from the central or local government, receive a large amount of attention. Now, if the whole question be begged, and it be decided at once that what we have been in the habit of doing is the right thing to do, viz., to look to Government for everything, to let Government have the raising of all moneys and the spending of them all—well then, by all means let us send such men to the House of Representatives as we would send to the Road Board if we cannot get men who combine culture and learning with practical ability. But our whole contention has been that the State everywhere at present undertakes far too much in almost every department, and that a vast amount of what is squabbled over in Parliament ought to be relegated to local discussion, consideration, and execution. Such being the case, the argument for sending to a colonial legislature a different, I will not say an inferior, class of representatives, than would be desirable and usual in an older nation, falls to the ground, or at all events has less weight than might be supposed.

9.—But this is somewhat of a digression. Reference has been made to the necessary inconsistency of the State if it amplifies so largely its field of operations. For what is a Government? A reed shaken by the wind of popular sentiment—the mere expression of popular and sometimes momentary feeling. How can there be stability, consistency, or even coherency in a tiling of this kind? If its shorter existence be taken into account, the Statute Book of New Zealand will be found to stultify itself with repeals and amendments and amendments of amendments far more than the Statute Book of the Imperial Parliament. Of course you may say that this is inevitable, and that it is quite right that changes should be made in the law as often as they are seen to be desirable. But is this so! Was there no wisdom in that solemn oath by which Lycurgus is said to have bound the Spartans neither to alter nor abolish the laws which he had established until an event took place which he determined never should occur?

Every alteration in the law results in the disturbance of social forces and adjustments, and specially interferes with industrial development. Look how a new tariff disturbs trade. So great is the amount of legislation here, partly consisting of adoption and adaptation of English Statutes, partly of original Acts—so lengthy are some of the enactments, and so numerous are the changes made in the law, that it is difficult even

for a lawyer to keep himself posted up in the legislation of the colony, although legal practitioners will be, for evident reasons, the last to complain of extra work put upon them in this respect. For the more laws there are, and the more carelessly they are framed, the greater will be the professional profits arising therefrom. But alteration in, and modification of, the laws of a country are certainly a great evil. They occasion general uncertainty, legal blunders, and untrustworthy counsel, and then again endless litigation, which is not the least of the troubles of humanity.

10.—And let those who dread Socialistic advances discourage as much as possible constant appeals to the State. Socialistic despotism is looming in the future big, black, and ugly. Already the advanced thinkers—the Uhlans and sharpshooters—are conceiving the idea of achieving their ends by State machinery. The International Association is most extreme in its demands for State intervention, asking for nationalisation of land, legal short hours of labor, free education, State-founded Co-operative Associations to take the place of the present industrial system, and property-taxes for all this on a graduated scale. Government, by party, will bid for popular favor by granting all these sooner or later. Just now the popular creed is, "Government of the people, by the people, for the people"; but the movement is not likely to stop there. Democracy has gained, and is gaining, its triumphs by formal legislation. Socialism, ready to trip it up, follows behind it, and will seek to gain a footing by similar means. Henry George's principles already have supporters in high places, so has property-tax on a sliding scale, and free education has been ours for some time. Especially do the colonies need to be on their guard against Socialistic advances through and by means of legislation, for in them Government plays a more important part than in older nations. The development in a young State has been so very different from what it has been in an old one. Whereas in olden times the first settlers on a spot—the germs of the future nation—were mostly barbarous or semi-barbarous hordes, hunters and fishermen, without aspiration for immediate progress and advancement, now the first settlers in a colony are civilised to begin with, and have the ideal of an improved home civilization always before them. To this they aspire, and for it they are not content long to wait. So, feeling themselves individually powerless to realise their ideal, they naturally look to united effort—that is to Government—for the required assistance. An article in a recent number of the "Quarterly Review" gives expression to the opinion that the prevailing dullness of life increases the appetite for legislative change. If this be true of the old world, the monotonous hard work, together with the absence of healthy amusement and excitement, in the colonies may have something to do with the inordinate passion for new laws. However, from whatever cause the phenomenon arises, there are proportionately larger demands for the extension of the sphere of State operations in the colonies than in the Home country, and therefore the dangers which are incidental to that extension call for closer consideration, and necessitate stronger and more careful guard. "On peut être opprimé par un seul tyran, mais on peut l'être tout autant et aussi injustement par une multitude" (Turgot). Indeed, I think the tyranny of the many is more to be dreaded than that of the individual—for it is Argus-eyed and almost omnipotent.

11.—Now the evils of excessive State intervention might be illustrated very variously in concrete cases as well as expounded generally in the abstract. But one example only shall be given, and that shall be one not by any means the most favorable to the views which I have endeavored to unfold. It is questionable whether any act in this Colony is upon the whole so popular, and I will say, notwithstanding loud protests in certain quarters to the contrary perhaps so deservedly popular—as the Education Act. Anyone who ventures to say a word against our school system, on a public platform may expect to have a warm reception. But with my eyes wide open to this fact—and without any sectarian bias—and as I have intimated without wishing to say that the Act is not in many respects a very good one, I intend to show that it is not such an unmixed good as it is mostly assumed to be, and shall thus illustrate the fact that State-intervention outside of providing for public security—does, even when at its best, incidentally much harm. Of course universally diffused education is a good thing—the growls of those who cannot secure domestic servants notwithstanding. A little learning need not disqualify for menial work, and would not do so if it were communicated along with the teaching that all honest work is honorable—and everybody, whatever his trade or occupation, should be both better and happier for possessing the power to share great thoughts with the illustrious departed, and throw himself out of his own, perhaps, ignoble surroundings into the midst of a noble field of action in the past. Neither to be really valuable universally, need the education be restricted. Rather will the learning be less dangerous the wider and more thorough it is. Then by all means let us advocate the diffusion of knowledge and—better still—of wisdom, as much as possible. But in all things we must consider the cost, not merely the cash price, though that is important, but the cost otherwise. And while practising generosity, let us not forget justice. However good and desirable popular education may be, we may, as a nation, buy it too dearly, and certainly do so if in order to achieve our endive sacrifice justice, interfere unreasonably with personal liberty, weaken the sense of self-reliance, deaden or destroy the love of learning among the people, and instead of a many-hued diversity of tastes and attainments, bring about a sombre and uninteresting mental uniformity. All this, if I mistake not, we are doing by our present system.

To say nothing of the necessary cost of it, which is becoming crushing and will have sooner or later to be diminished, although the diminution entail inferior work and impaired efficiency, and to say nothing of many minor points on which the Act and the recent speech thereupon by Mr. Stout invite criticism, let us consider its three leading features. It is free, secular, and (under certain conditions) compulsory. That any education provided by the State *must* be secular, unless provision is made for training each child in that religious system which its parents and guardians prefer, is self-evident on principles of common justice. But it is pretty certain nevertheless that a religious body, which objects to a purely secular system of education as a godless one, has good ground for complaining that its honest convictions are disregarded and that although it may not choose to avail itself of the Education provided by the State, it must nevertheless contribute to support the system of which it does not approve. If this be not injustice and interference with the liberty of the subject, I don't see what is. Again, if the State Education be made compulsory we positively bring pressure to bear upon the subject in the training of the mind, while we leave the training of the body and of the the spiritual faculties almost or entirely to chance. Will it be contended that the mind is more important than the body 'Probably not, but this will most likely be said:—The mind is more likely than the body to be neglected. But is it? The mind of a living human being *must* get a certain kind of training—not perhaps within the limits of the three R's—but that is not of vital consequence. And besides, as regards even school education, what sacrifices, what strenuous efforts were made by parents in past time to give their children the rudiments. And *then*, to gain education, was much more difficult than it would be now, even if State-education were done away with. The long continued operation of the ordinary laws of supply and demand makes the satisfaction of every human want more Cerent and cheaper now than ever it was formerly. Perhaps State aid has demoralised people, and though I agree with Malthus "That there is a moral obligation on every man, imposed by the commands of God and Nature to support his own children" and if to support presumably to educate them,—and consequently think that parents would eventually recognise this obligation, they might not at first, on the withdrawal of the present free system, make very strenuous efforts to gain education for their offspring. And because they might not do so we further diminish personal liberty and say education shall be compulsory, although there are several peculiar and strong reasons why it should not be so. Notably there is this—that what people are forced to do, they seldom either enjoy or see the advantage of, doing. Human nature resists compulsion of every kind except by the brute forces of nature and the law of association will bring about dislike for that which is the subject-matter of compulsion.

Well then! to sugar-coat the pill, or to provide against other injustice—although the law insists on taxes being paid without helping those to pay them who have not the money—and as if compulsion did not diminish the desire for and delight in education sufficiently—we say the education shall be *free*: though here in New Zealand the education is, as a matter of fact, really free and *not* compulsory, which is worse than all. Now I do not believe it is possible to lower the value of aught, so readily in any way, as by making it cost nothing. Of that which is very cheap you naturally suspect the quality. You are apt even to value a man according to the estimation in which he holds himself. Make education absolutely free and you lower its value at once for the foolish majority, as you certainly lower its commercial value by spreading it so widely. Now mark the bad effect of this. In order that food shall be properly assimilated and nourish the body, not only must wholesome viands be provided but a healthy appetite must exist. The greatest scholars, the wisest men, have been, for the most part, those who have got their mental training by personal effort in the face of difficulty. "Slow rises merit when by poverty depressed," is only a half-truth. The energy, the eagerness, begotten by difficulty are often enough the real secrets of success. Now-a-days everything is made too easy for the scholar. Splendid text-books, well-trained masters, comfortable schools, interdiction of the rod are all very well, but they mean a weak-kneed race, general deterioration, less courage, no self-denial, none of the excitement and love for learning begotten by difficulty overcome and effort successfully made. Well then, I contend our boasted educational system which costs us nearly half a million yearly out of a total revenue of four or five millions, and to which all have to contribute—whether childless or quiver full, whether availing themselves of the benefits thereof or not—is, even in its much-vaunted leading features, not such a very satisfactory thing after all, and I contend that it should teach us to look with suspicion upon all State intervention and examine the grounds of our faith therein.

12.—There are, however, some who cannot divest their minds of the idea that the State, as a State, possesses a certain property, power, or virtue which would be lost to the community if the principles which I have been advocating were more closely adhered to. They argue that, by the imposition of a very small burden upon each individual, the State can get into its hands a mighty lever—in the shape of enormous revenue—which it can use for promoting the well-being of society, and therefore it may fairly be questioned whether the State should not exercise the power which it undoubtedly possesses in order that it may gain the advantages which it proposes. Now, an argument like this is simply a re-statement, in other words, of the entire problem which I am to-night trying to solve. Of course the many *do* possess the power to take upon themselves and impose upon dissentients amongst their number almost any conditions of existence that they fancy. They

have, in times past, exercised this power, as we have shewn, in every variety of way, and are disposed to exercise it, as time rolls on, more and more. But it is not a *small* burden which is thus made to fall upon the individual: eventually it becomes a large and oppressive one, for "mony a mickle makes a muckle"; and although the State *could* use the power thus acquired to promote the well-being of society, I have contended and do contend that *it does not do so*, or, at all events, that it does not do so when it extends its functions beyond the most moderate limits. If there be anything in the argument at all, it arises from the assumption that the State—the multitude—possesses wisdom which in individuals does not exist in the community. I take exception to this assumption altogether. The wisdom of the State is a compromise between the wit of the wisest and the folly of the most foolish, and unfortunately it is a compromise in which most has to be given up by the former. Granted that, upon the whole, public opinion regulates State action—what regulates public opinion? Blatant ignorance—a time-serving press—political charlatans who appeal to human selfishness and rouse human passions for their own purposes; and so the State is steered, like a fish, by its unworthy cacidal appendage. Individual folly is seldom so insensate or so ridiculous as that of the multitude.

You may reasonably ask to what practical issue does all this faultfinding point? Are we to advocate the doctrine that the State should at once renounce the various functions that it has improperly assumed—all other than protection and administration of justice? Not by any means. As has been already said—the surest way to bring about wide-spread disaster, would be to make such a sweeping change at one fell swoop. In several departments—which I could specify, were it desirable—a withdrawal could be and should be made at once—though I think there will have to be many such utterances as mine and much more powerful ones before public opinion is converted to the requisite views. In reference to new legislation, briefly, I would suggest that every measure proposed should be examined in the light of the principles hereinbefore enunciated. Would it, if passed, interfere too much with personal liberty? Would it tax the whole community merely for a local benefit? Could the people do the thing proposed equally well for themselves? Even if not, would the Act proposed tend to the people's demoralisation? If the answers to these and such questions would be in the affirmative, let the measure be at once shelved. But I am not going to touch individual cases. I have sought to-night to keep along the highway of general principles, rather than wander after what I seek in a labyrinth of details. Even as it is the way, though the shortest one I know of, has been a long one. I would have put what I have said more shortly if I could have done so, for I remember what Southey says, "It is with words as with sunbeams, the more they are condensed the more they burn."

13.—Chiefly I ask for a recognition of the fact that Government action is gradually but surely undermining our liberties, and demoralising us. (1) The State work and influence are becoming far too great to be consistent with civil freedom. "If roads, railways, banks, insurance offices, great joint stock companies, universities and public charities," says Mill in his noble essay on Liberty, "are all of them branches of Government—if the employees of all these different enterprises are appointed and paid by Government, and look to Government for every rise in life—not all the freedom of the Press and popular constitution of the legislature would make this or any other country free otherwise than in name." True Liberalism ought to mean individual liberty just as Toryism should mean State power. But if the almighty will of the people is to give the tone and direction to liberal principles, that will mean individual slavery.

A few years ago I was walking with a member of a late New Zealand Ministry through a Maori encampment at Upokognaro, in the North Island. The semi-nude natives were in the bright sunshine and amid all the beauties of Nature, variously occupied, sleeping, cooking, eating, drinking, smoking, laughing, chattering—all however apparently happy, but in diverse ways. I made some remark about this to my companion, who replied, "Yes! I would rather be an average Maori than an average European." It is not difficult to see why he said so. Even to those of us who most appreciate the advantages of settled Society and advanced civilization, the necessary sacrifices are at times keenly felt. The legal restraints, the petty exactions, the social conventionalities, provoke us, and uncertain and heavy taxation oppresses us. As the Burgher says in Goethe's Faust, "*Gehorchen soll mann mehr als tmmer, Und zahlen mehr als je vorher.*" One has continually to give more obedience, and to pay more taxes. Some of us would not very much object to a return to the liberty and simplicity of savage life, if along with the plain living we could have also a little high thinking—although we find even *that* at times a source of keenest discomfort. But we need not return to savage life in order to get rid of social and political evils. What we have individually to do is to open our eyes to them and not be afraid of speaking about them. We here in New Zealand have special occasion to be on the alert. We are apparently taking France and not England as our model *re* State action. Our bright Colony is in a fair way to be ruined by excessive legislation and consequent oppressive taxation. We do not expect our Government or any Government to conform to the ideal standard indicated in the four principles here in before mentioned. But those principles are altogether too largely departed from. "The aim of practical politics should be," says Mill, "to surround any given society with the greatest number of circumstances, of which the tendencies are beneficial, and to remove and "counteract, as far as practicable, those of which the tendencies are "injurious."

(Logic II., p. 482). This principle is practically ignored. Our State undertakes too much for the people that they are able to do and would be the better for doing themselves. It burdens the whole community incessantly for matters of merely local interest. Instead of limiting its functions as much as possible after securing to all of us as much liberty as is consistent with the liberty of others, it seeks to gain popularity by entering first upon one duty and then upon another, until very soon, as I have said, it appears as if there would be no room for independent individual action at all. What is it all going to end in?—except it be that history is going to repeat itself and New Zealand is to have in the future a scheme of public polity corresponding to that of the Incas in Peru—with these differences, however, that we shall have many laws instead of few, and the many-headed monster Socialism as a Ruler instead of a reigning family of priests and nobles. But let us hope that it will not come to this—rather let us believe with Bastiat that the social body, like the human, has a *vis medicatrix* or curative force, in virtue of which it will eventually throw off its diseases and right itself. The probability is, as I have said, that the whole present system will break down of its own inherent ponderosity. If we wish for gradual development rather than violent change let us open our eyes to the course we are following and the rocks ahead. Should the majority insist upon keeping the present course, let the prudent minority do its best to moderate the speed. In time better counsels may prevail. To this end I have spoken, and to this end anyone who wishes well to the people amongst whom he lives *should speak* as he has the opportunity; for "The highest truth, a wise man sees, he will fearlessly utter, knowing that he is thus playing his right part in the world." (Spencer, First Principles, p. 123).

Vignette

R. Lucas & Son, Printers, &c, "Evening Mail" Office, Bridge-street, Nelson.

ART. VI.—*The Maori Language, with Remarks on the Reform of English Spelling.*

BY JAMES COUTTS CRAWFORD, F.G.S.

Read before the Wellington Philosophical Society, 21st October, 1885.

Prefatory.

I USE, for illustration, the vowels as generally pronounced in Italian, German, Spanish, excluding the French modifications. In a reform of the English alphabet it is difficult to say how to express the sound of the English *e*, the Continental *i*. This latter vowel is so much used in English, in such words as *tin*, *sin*, &c., that it would be difficult to establish as *e*, and therefore, perhaps, the German *ie* will be preferable for the purpose.

I use the German diphthongs *au*, *ai*, *ei*, *iu*. Italian, I think, has no diphthongs, the vowels in that language are all pronounced separately. I have used *ae* to represent the English *a*, as in *fate*. This is perhaps non-phonetic, but it is in accordance with Teutonic usage; *a* has always the broad sound, as in *man*.

I have used *ao* to represent the English *aw*, as in *law*, but I am inclined to think that it would be better to adopt for this purpose what appears to be the Dutch plan, viz., *aa*.

It is sometimes inconvenient to use the German *ie* to represent the English *e*, as for instance, in Scripture names. In those cases I have retained *i* alone.

It is a matter for congratulation that, whoever reduced the Maori tongue into a written language, has avoided the absurd attempt to adopt it to English vowel sounds, and has adopted the Continental vowel system and pronunciation. The Maori language has, in consequence, assumed a form and appearance of structure and of culture which would have been lost had the English system prevailed, and the result is, that the moment a word in the language is seen, its pronunciation is at once apparent.

If we compare this system with that which was formerly in vogue when English orthography was applied to the names of persons and places in India, native names in Australia, and also in America, we may perceive at a glance the advantages gained by the practice adopted with reference to the Maori language.

In reading most books upon India, it is almost impossible for a person uninitiated in the native tongues to tell the sounds of the native names and designations. Thus we find the two chief tribes of Afghanistan described as the Barukzye and the Sud-dozye. When spelt Barukzai and Suddozai the pronunciation is obvious, but as they stand in the previous orthography there is an uncertainty about the sound, inasmuch as the letter *y* is pronounced in English in several different ways. The name of the kingdom of Oude is almost invariably pronounced wrongly by outsiders, as the spelling and the pronunciation are so inconsistent. One of the most irritating words, to my mind, in this orthography is *sepoy*, which is a barbarous corruption of *sipahi*, a foot soldier. In the English form the word has a ludicrous appearance.

A corrected official orthography for India has been issued, but many do not use it,

The other day, in an Indian work of merit, I came across the words *eui hye*; now who can tell, except he is

told by an expert, what to make of this? Pronounce the words to a Maori, and he would at once write down *kuai hai*, about the sound of which there would be no mistake, *Brandee pawnee low*, a sentence which formerly was much heard in India, looks barbarous enough; a Maori would put it down as *Parani paoni law*, which looks civilized.

The orthography of native names in Australia has similar defects to those above described in India, chiefly caused by making the letter *i* stand for the diphthong *ai*. Thus we find *Koraio* spelt *Corio*; *Bulai*, *Bulli*; *Molonyulai*, *Molonyulli*; *Merai*, *Merri*. This blunder is not constant, however, for we find *Gun-dagai* spelt correctly.

In Fiji, and at the Cape of Good Hope, we find fanciful spelling. In the former we find *c* represents *th*, and *o* stands for *om*. Thus *Thakombau* is spelt *Cacobau*. In South Africa we find *Ketchwayo* spelt *Cetewayo*; *Etchowe*, *Ekowe*. This style is provoking, as apparently meant to puzzle people, without sense or reason. The result is that these names are generally pronounced wrongly.

One peculiarity the English have is in vulgarizing names. The King *Kaofi Kalkali*, of Ashanti, is reduced to *Coffee Calcalee*, although his name has doubtless nothing to do with coffee; the corn fodder of South Africa is spelt *mealies*, although not ground into meal, and *milis* would be the correct term. Various plants pass under the name of *tea tree*, including the *ti* (*Cortylina australis*) of New Zealand. The name of the old town of Aymouth is changed to Eyemouth, and *Tung* we find as *Tongue*. The euphonious name of the Pass of Branda is changed into *Brander*, giving one a suspicion of cooking. The names of the Irish towns, *Tallogh* and *Mallogh*, are changed into *Tallow* and *Mallow* from the dropping of the guttural; but why not *Tallo* and *Mallo*. The *w* is of no use, but vulgarises the names by suggesting common articles. In Stanley's work, "How I found Livingstone," I find the word *Seedy* for *Sidi*, the name of a very useful tribe of negroes, many of the race being employed as firemen in the P. and O. steamers. There is no reason to suppose that they are of drunken habits, but the English spelling conveys that idea.

It was curious at the time of the war in Afghanistan to see the puzzle of the London newspapers, as to the spelling the name of the ruler of that State. His right name being *Shir Ali*, had been Frenchified into *Shere Ali*; and when a fort had to be named after him, instead of reverting to the correct name of *Shir*, they made the name *Sherpur*, "the town or fort of Shir Ali." A man must be very vowel deaf indeed who cannot see that this must alter the whole sound of the word.

Various attempts are now being made to reform the orthography of the English language by the Americans, and by the Spelling Reform Association and others in England.

In neither case are the results scientific or satisfactory.

The Americans seem to think that the main point to be attained lies in shortening the words, by omitting unnecessary consonants; the English by stereotyping existing sounds.

The English and American ears have become in a manner deaf to the true value of the vowel sounds, and require preliminary instruction before undertaking the reform.

Thus, by the American plan, by leaving out one *l* in such words as *spelling*, *shilling*, *willing*, &c., we should soon, with the defective ear, get to the following changes in pronunciation, viz:—*speleng*, *spieleng*; *shilling*, *shailing*; *willing*, *nailling*. Another American change is spelling *plough* as *plow*, which is non-phonetic and objectionable; *ow* is a barbarous way of rendering what can be better done by *au*; besides which it is discredited for the purpose, as we have *bow* = *ban* and *bo*; *row* = *rau* and *ro*; *stow* = *sto*, &c.

So much for American innovations. The English idea seems to be to stereotype all the defective sounds at present existing, and apparently in the interests of the South of England and the Cockney dialect, ignoring the North. Thus we should soon lose the broad *a* and the sound of the letter *r*. A notable instance of the latter is the proposal to render *father* and *farther* equally by *fadha*.

The most provoking thing in the interests of spelling reform is that men of the highest education in England are as unconscious of the defects in scientific orthography as the most ignorant of the people. Until they awake to a sense of the incongruity there is little hope of a reform in the right direction. Thus we hear *Ismailia*, *Port Said*, &c., pronounced in the French fashion, which is altogether wrong, either with reference to the diphthong or to the Arabic name. We have *Aeden* for *Aden*, *Gaol* for *Point-de-Galle*, *Aethos* for *Athos*. We may hear *Mehemet Ali* called *Mihimet Aelai*; although, strange to say, *Pacha* is not yet converted into *Paechne*. We find *Lima* called *Laima*; *Rio*, *Raio*; and even *Panama*, *Paenaema*. Lately I heard a learned archdeacon, who had travelled in the East, talk of *Baeaelbec*, unconscious that the double *a* should give an extra breadth to the sound.

At the time of the Crimean war, we used to hear of *Bisaika Bay* for *Besika Bay*, *Skiuterai* for *Scutari*, &c. On one occasion on returning from Lake Taupo, a well-known New Zealand statesman, an M.A. of Oxon, in a conversation we had together respecting the interior of the island, insisted on giving the French sound to the word *Taupo*, as if *an* represented the same sound as *awe* in English. I objected. He said, "I pronounce it as spelt, and I object to the foreign spelling of the Maori language." I replied, "How then would you spell *Taupo* in English fashion?" He said "*Towpo*." My reply was, "That would in English make the word sound *Topo*,

although a Scotchman might probably hit upon the correct pronunciation."

A Saturday Reviewer lately objected to the spelling of *Hawaii*, preferring Captain Cook's orthography of *Owhyhee*. There is no accounting for taste; but the Hawaiian language has been brought into a phonetic orthography, and Hawaii is the name of the island, and of the kingdom, which Owhyhee as usually pronounced is not; but if we accent Owhyhee thus, we arrive very nearly at the sound of Hawaii.

The reasons why English orthography is so irregular are sufficiently obvious:—

- The peculiar sounds given to the vowels in the English alphabet.
- The adoption of a peculiar mode of pronouncing Latin, and also of Scripture names.
- The introduction of a number of French words into the language, which are sometimes pronounced in French, in others in English, fashion.
- The small attention which is paid in England to the study of other foreign languages than French.

The first-named reason has probably been the cause of all the rest. The child is taught that *a = ae*; no broad *a* is taught. *e = i*, or German *ie*.

i is a diphthong = *ai*.

o, as in other European languages; but in practice has several sounds.

it, also a diphthong = *iu*.

y = uai.

Thus we find three diphthongs represented by *i*, *u*, and *y* three diphthongs in six letters. No other European language, that I know of, represents diphthongs by vowels. It is unfortunate that the broad *a* is not represented in the English alphabet, the child being taught that *a = ae*; the consequence is that in these days of education *ae* is rapidly taking the place of *a*. I lately heard a newsboy in London calling "*Staendard*." I find *bass* (fish), in the West of England called *baess*. At a meeting of a scientific society, I heard *basalt* called *baesaolt*. I was almost tempted to ask whether the lecturer was talking about bay-salt. It is a curious fact that when the letter *a* appears twice in an English word it is rarely pronounced the same way in both instances. One letter is *a*, the other *ae*: as in *passage*, *passaenge*; *facilitate*, *facilitaete*. Often the change goes in the other direction. Thus we hear *Garibaldi* called *Garibaoldi*; *Gibraltar*, *Gibraoltar*; *Malta*, *Maolta*: *malt*, *maolt*; *halt*, *haolt*.

The introduction of French sounds into a Teutonic language has made great mischief. These in question are non-phonetic, and unsuited to the character of the English language. Thus, in French we have *mais = mes*, *tais = tes*; and we have introduced the same sound into English, as in *tail*, which to adapt to Teutonic spelling we should write *tael*; *tailor*, *taelor*; *nail*, *nael*; *sail*, *sael*.

Then *au* in French is sometimes equal to *o*, and at others to *ao*: as *Pan = Po*, *maurais = move*, *maure = maor*. We find the latter sound in English in *Paul*, *maul*, *haul*, &c.; whereas, phonetically, we ought to employ *an* to stand for such words as *ow* in *how*. and so accommodate to Teutonic spelling.

On the other hand, we have such French words as *invite*, *divide*, to which we have given English sounds. How to deal with them is one of the most puzzling things in spelling reform. If the spelling is altered phonetically, it takes the word away from its derivation; and the question is, whether a change back to the French sound can be brought about.

Then we have from the French the words ending in *turn*, such as *attention*, *promotion*. The French sound of *tion* is peculiar, something between *sion* and *siong*. The English shorten this into *shun*, which hideous termination the spelling reformers propose to adopt. I am inclined to say with Lord Melbourne, "Can't you let it alone;" but if a change is to be made, I would suggest *stow*. The admixture of French words has been most damaging to the reform of English orthography.

The English mode of pronouncing Scriptural names no doubt has come about from the mode of pronouncing Latin. It is melancholy to see the loss of euphony which is brought about by this plan. I call to mind the archdeacon, with *ore rotundo* giving out the text from *Aisaiah*, without the smallest conception that *i* and *ai* should have a different sound. When I hear Hebrew words pronounced from the pulpit in English style the effect on my mind is neither sacred nor solemn, but, on the contrary, ludicrous. When I hear Sinai called *Sainaeai*, the effect passes the ludicrous, and the speaker seems silly. It is surely too bad to burlesque sacred things from the pulpit. There would really be no difficulty in bringing about a correct pronunciation of Scripture names. Forty years ago everyone in church responded *Aemen*. The High Church decided upon *Amen*, and it has carried the day.

The spelling reformers would retain the present absurd pronunciation of Scripture names and alter the spelling. Thus Isaac is to be changed to *Eisak*; it should more properly be *Aisak*. Abraham is to become *Aebraham*.

If anyone cannot see the loss of force and of cadence which the English pronunciation of Scripture names involves, he must be very deficient in perception.

It is astonishing what small attention is given in England to the study of the Teutonic languages in comparison with that devoted to French. No doubt more attention has of late been given to the study of

German, but few know anything of Dutch or Danish, languages closely related to English. I do not remember ever meeting an Englishman who spoke Dutch, except my own father, and he learnt it almost accidentally when commanding a frigate for several years off Java and in the Eastern Archipelago. I would strongly recommend every spelling reformer to read up Dutch and Danish, as well as German, and then he would see the correct lines to go upon.

I think it was Huxley who told the parsons to read up biology before he would take the trouble to argue with them. An English spelling reformer must remain thoroughly incompetent until he has obtained some knowledge of the other Teutonic languages.

Great uncertainty of pronunciation is caused by the use of the letter *y*, it having in English two different sounds. In the Scandinavian languages it seems to represent the sound of the English *e*, the *y* grec, and therefore we get an idea of how Danish names in England such as Whitby, Appleby, &c., should be pronounced. As pronounced in English there is a loss of euphony. Thus if we take the name of an island in the Eastern Archipelago commonly spelt by the English *Rally*, and substitute for this *Bali*, we gain much in euphony. We might apply this to *Balinihon* for *Ballymahon*, *Balishannon* for *Bally-shannon*, &c. The use of *y* as representing the diphthong *ai* or *uai* ought to be abolished.

The change to a correct pronunciation of Latin is sometimes opposed, because people cannot decide upon the Latin pronunciation of the consonants, cannot settle whether or not *Cicero* is to be called *Sisero* or *Kikero*, *Cesar* or *Kaisar*. Probably, like the Italians, the Romans pronounced *c* soft before *e* and *i*, and hard before the other vowels. Thus *Kaisar* would be correct, and *Kikero* wrong. Now this is matter of comparatively little consequence, and might be left alone; but no doubt the English do make a mess of the consonants as well as of the vowels. Thus, in German we hear them call *Schwalbach*, *Swalback*, *Schlangen-bad*, *Slangenbad*: and when the tourists go to the Highlands in autumn what a burlesque they make of the Celtic names !

The effect of the degradation of the letter *a* to the inferior sound of *ae* is to eliminate the basso sounds from the language, and the result is similar to that which would be produced in an opera if all the basso sounds were omitted.

The tendency also to reduce the sound of *r* to a minimum, particularly in the South of England, diminishes the force of the language. Thus, what must a Roman think when an Englishman calls him a *womaeno*, with a faint approach to a roll in the middle of the *w*? Or imagine an Englishman in the days of Lord Palmerston proclaiming himself, in the English fashion, "*Saivis womaenus sum.*" The force of the expression has evaporated in the feeble and effeminate pronunciation.

For the sake of force, also, it may be regretted that the English have dropped all the strong gutturals, as in such words as *light*, *might*, which still retain their old sounds in broad Scotch. With regard to the word *height*, the Americans give us an excellent illustration of a step in the wrong direction by changing the spelling to *hight*, thereby converting a diphthong into a vowel. Instead of this they ought to change *might*, *right*, &c., into *meight*, *reight*. The *gh* in these words are now of no use, but they do no harm, and serve to show where the gutturals once existed.

I must confess to a liking for strong gutturals. What force there is in such words as *Junta*, *Xeres*, *Ojos*, in Spanish, where the *j* and the *x* have the sound of the Scotch or German *ch*: or, in Arabic, of *Hassan*, *Achmet*, *Bahr*, *Mahmoud*, wherein the *h* is pronounced as a very deep guttural. How much force Spanish gains over its sister language, Italian, from which gutturals have been entirely eliminated.

Many tourists may remember John Campbell, who drove the coach from Loch Goil Head to St. Catherine's, in Loch Fyne, and who kept his passengers in roars of laughter during the journey, chiefly from imitations of Cockney tourists. One of his stories was of a Cockney, in affected tones, asking: "Coachman, which is the way to *Straechur*?" the *ch* pronounced soft; "*Strach#rr*, Sir, I suppose you mean."

When an Englishman is remonstrated with on his pronunciation of the name of a foreign place, he is apt to say, "Would you pronounce such names as Paris and Calais as the French do?" This shows a want of appreciation of the point. Pronouncing the *s* in Paris and Calais is quite legitimate, as bringing the names into reasonable accord with English; but if we should say *Paeris* or *Paeris*, or *Caelais*, in accordance with what is often done, the damage is evident. A single vowel ought never to be employed to express a diphthongal sound. We must not have *i* to represent *ai*, nor *u*, *iu*. In English *ew* is used to represent *iu* in *mew*, *pew*, *stew*, *new*: consequently we find this clumsy arrangement applied to *Tewfik*, which ought to be spelt *Tiufik*.

One may hear educated Englishmen say that every nation has its own way of pronouncing Latin. This, as an excuse for English pronunciation of that language, is nonsense. Each foreign nation makes some slight variation, but each has fixity within its own lines. Thus we know how an Italian pronounces *u*, and how a Frenchman modifies the sound; but it is not varied within the nation. In English Latin no one can tell how *u* or any other vowel, is to be pronounced. The English are generally supposed to be sensitive to a sense of the ridiculous; but how an educated Englishman can venture to quote Latin in the presence of a foreigner baffles comprehension. The effect must be inexpressibly ludicrous, on the supposition that the foreigner can

comprehend the utterance. Possibly he takes it for some unintelligible gibberish. The difficulty of teaching a correct pronunciation of Latin lies with the masters. I remember the attempt being made at a New Zealand College, but the false system had become so engrained in the masters that they seemed incapable of throwing it off. One of them, a graduate of Cambridge, told me that they had improved *ego* into *eggo!* Out of the frying-pan into the fire. If the masters once learnt their business there would be no difficulty with the pupils.

The Latin of any Continental nation is understood by the scholars of any other: that of the English is intelligible to none.

One point in the reform of English spelling is very important, and would tend to obviate many changes. This is, instead of altering the spelling, to revert to a correct pronunciation. Apart from such matters as the pronunciation of Scripture names, I would instance such words as *natal*, *fatal*. Instead of altering the spelling to *naetal*, *foetal*, would it not be much better to pronounce them correctly, with the broad *a*. It is only a question of teaching the teachers. The mind of the child is a blank board, ready to take in whichever sound is given; and if the teachers knew their business, there would be no difficulty with the children.

It is much to be desired that the Americans should go hand-in-hand with the English in a reform of the spelling of the language. It will be a misfortune if the two nations diverge in their orthography. The English are more in contact with foreign nations, and therefore, in this respect, more favourably placed for effecting a reform. On the other hand the Americans have a large German population; and if they would humble themselves to admit the defect in ear, which they have in common with the English, and call in some Germans to their help, they might lead the way, and the English would be obliged to follow. They have also got Mark Twain, and if he took the matter up he would carry it to successful issue. His observations on the defects of German grammar show that he would be equally alive to those of English orthography. In the meantime the American attempts at reform are possibly mischievous, and certainly useless, and as much may be said of many of the English propositions. I would advise the Americans to spell *Ohio* and *Iowa*, as *Ohaio* and *Aiowa*. This would point to the direction in which reform should go.

The objects that should be aimed at are:—

- The language should be thrown into gear with those of Northern, Central, and Southern Europe.
- English, being a Teutonic language, should, as far as possible, be brought into accord with German and Dutch, as also Scandinavian.
- As a preliminary step in the reform, the classical languages, particularly Latin, should be pronounced as in German and Italian, &c.
- Scriptural names should be pronounced as on the Continent, and the spelling left unchanged.

And now a few remarks with regard to the deterioration of the Maori language may not be amiss. This language has been reduced to a correct orthography; but emigrants arrive from England who know nothing of it, and who have been taught Latin in the English style. They at once begin to spoil the names of places. Thus *Ti nui*, the big *ti* or cabbage tree, becomes *Tenui*, literally *the big*, which is senseless. *Pitone*, or *Pita-one*, the end of the beach, becomes *Petone*, without meaning. *Titahi*, bay, becomes *Tetai*, *Taitai*, sometimes *Teti*. *Ohiro* becomes *Ohairo*, and so on.

Apart from mispronunciation or mis-spelling of Maori, the English dialect that is developing in Australasia is not satisfactory. The tendency is to a modification of Cockney. Thus we generally hear "*I seen him*" for "*I saw him*," which is certainly queer grammar; but sometimes this is diversified by "*I saur 'im*." As expletives, "*My word*" and "*No fear*" are favourites, both drawn out as long as possible. The letter *h* is frequently treated in Cockney fashion, *i.e.*, omitted where it should be pronounced, and put in where not wanted.

I have often observed in London Colonial newspapers complaints of the use of Maori names, as being unpronounceable, &c. Considering that the Maori language is softer than Italian, this shows how much the writers know of what they are writing about. I should strongly object to displace the soft, easily pronounced, and generally descriptive Maori names, by the Belle-vues, Mounts Brown, or Smith, or Jones, or other names showing the poverty of the English language for nomenclature. Compare the Spanish language for this purpose. *Masafuero*, the name of a small island outside Juan Fernandez, means literally *more far*, or *farther off*. Expressed in English the name would never do, whereas in Spanish it is sonorous and euphonious. Similarly *Cape Cow's Tongue* will not answer, whereas *Cabo Lengua de Vaea* is euphonious and appropriate. Even in Great Britain the old Celtic names are generally the best, and have more poetic meanings than the more homely names of the Sassenach, such as Pitmuis, "the field of blood," Kilkiaran or Kilkerran, "the cell of Kiaran," &c.

The sound of the letter *s* has been very often changed in English to that of *z*, as in *is*, *iz*; *was*, *waz*. The spelling reformers would change all these into *z*. Cannot the original sound be reverted to? In phonetic printing the frequent occurrence of *z* looks hideous, almost as bad as *shun*.

Some persons may say, Why should we object to the French sounds in the language and prefer the Teutonic? The reply is easy: English is a Teutonic language, and although it has borrowed many words from French, it can under no circumstances be converted into a Romance language; besides the French sounds are

non-phonetic—as such they do not do the same mischief in French as in English, because in the former language the sound is nearly constant, whereas in the latter it is arbitrary and variable.

Certainly the pronunciation of French words is peculiar. We find *eau, eaux, au, aux*, all = *o*; *beau = bo, peau, pô = po, maux = mo, faux = fo, chateau, chato*. We adopt some of these words into English and call *beau, bo*; but *beauté* we call *biuty*. *Beatily* (firth), we call *Biuly*. Then the French call *comment, commong; vraiment, vramong; appartient, appartieng; proportion, proporshiong; maison, maesong; bon, bong; mauvais, movae; suis, sui; es and est, ae; sommes, som; êtes, net; sont, song*. This is not the language on which English orthography should be reformed. It is essentially a Latin *patois*, the rule being to cut off the final syllable of Latin, thus: *Rome* for *Roma*; *bon* for *bonus*.

French is the foreign language which is most taught in England. The consequence is that Englishmen suppose there is no such thing as a phonetic language. If German, Italian, and Spanish were more taught they would learn to understand the subject.

A few more peculiarities of English present themselves. *Cacao* we spell *cocoa*, and pronounce *coco*. *Bilbao* used to be, and often is still, spelt *Bilboa*. *Kakutua* we spell and pronounce *cockatoo*. The name has nothing to do with a cock; the bird may be a hen. *Kaka* is the generic name for parrot among many languages of the East, and *kakutua* is that of the par-ticular family.

Chinchona we spell *cinchona*, and generally pronounce as if it were an Italian word. The name, if Spanish, was derived from that of the Countess Chinchon, wife of the Captain-General of Peru, and *ch* in Spanish is always soft, as it is generally in English. There is, no doubt, the authority of Linnaeus for *cinchona*, but he evidently made a mistake in this name.

In the first attempt of a child to speak he says *ba*, and this whether he is of English or any other race. When the child grows up and goes to school we tell him that *a = ae*, and therefore that *ba* ought to be *bae*. Luckily he knows better, he has found out by instinct that *ba* is *ba*, and not *bae*. Afterwards he learns to say *papa* and *mamma*, and notwithstanding the teachings of his alphabet, he does not call them *paepae* and *maemae*. Advancing in age he speaks of his *father*, not *faether*; although, strange to say, the Scotch adopt the latter sound, contrary to their usual habit of broadening the vowel *a*.

In these days of æstheticism it is utterly impossible that the orthography of the English language can remain long in its present barbarous and almost ludicrous state, but the change to a more correct system must be brought about by real linguists and men of taste, men who thoroughly underhand the Teutonic languages—not only German, but Dutch, Flemish, and the allied Scandinavian tongues. Until some result is arrived at by men of the above-named qualifications, it would be much better for both English and Americans to desist from any premature changes.

It appears to me to be a misfortune that the Teutonic name *berg*, mountain, should have been lost to the English language, except in *iceberg*, and the Romance names *mount, mountain*, substituted. *Mount* may generally be considered as a diminutive of *mountain*, but we find it applied to mountains of the greatest elevation. Thus we find in Mount Cook, Mount Everest, and other mountains of the first class, the name *mount* filling the position which it does in the Mounts Pleasant, or Brown, or other small elevations in the vicinity of English towns. Cook berg and Everest berg would be infinitely better. In New Zealand we have the relative height of elevations well defined in *maunga*, mountain; *puke*, hill. Suppose we convert Mount Cook into Maungakuku, this would be much more euphonious than Mount Cook, and serve as well the purpose of commemorating the name of the great discoverer.

Mount, as a rule, is applied to a hillock; when exceptionally used to denote the highest mountains in the world the effect is feeble.

To return to a few more illustrations. The German name for *ice* is the same as our own, but they spell the word *eis*. Anyone can see that the German spelling is phonetic, but what shall we say to the English *ice*. The *i* is made into the diph-thong *ei*, the *c* into *s*, and the *e* is mute and useless. In the same category we have *nice, twice, rice, spice, mice, &c*. The mute *e*, at the end of words, ought to be abolished.

What must a foreigner think when he hears an educated Englishman talk of *Demostheniez* and *Perieliez*. This pronunciation has a thoroughly illiterate effect, something similar to the crier in Court calling out, "*Oyiez, Oyiez*," or of a lawyer talking about *laechiez*, or of *Naisai Praisus*. The pronunciation is not even according to English custom, for we do not say *Ayniez, businiez, Totniez, prickliez, wrinkliez*. When an Englishman is asked why he does not pronounce names correctly, he says that it would look like affectation to do so, whereas the affectation is all the other way.

A few illustrations will show in what a curious way the letter *o* is treated in English. We find its different and varying sounds in *tome, tom, one, come, cooper, coffee*. There may possibly be more variations. I have picked out the above at random.

Now all these various defects in English orthography have a strong bearing upon the future of the Maori language. That language has been brought into a phonetic orthography, and many of the European settlers

understand this: but every day fresh arrivals come from England who know nothing of the subject, and who proceed to damage the Maori tongue. The culprits are to be found in the Post Office Department; as compositors in newspaper offices; as officials in the Land Office, and in the public generally. Thus we find the native names mis-spelt and made ridiculous. I have already mentioned the cases of *Petone*, for *Pito-one*, *Tenui* for *Tinui*. I may add *Kaiwarra* for *Kaiwharawhara*, *Manyahao* for *Mang#hoa*. When I traversed the Forty-mile Bush, some twenty-four years ago, I put this name down as *Mang#wha*, which is practically the same as *Mang#hoa*. *Mangahao* does not give the sound at all.

Pauatahanui is converted into *Pahautanui*. *Ohiro* is not mis-spelt, but is pronounced *Ohairo*, and so on. One could find many similar examples. But what can be expected when the English alphabet is treated in the way in practice: when the child is taught that *a = ae*, and no symbol is given for the broad *a*; that *i = ai*; that *u = in*, &c. Let the reform begin at the fountain head, by a re-arrangement of the alphabet.

One or two Scotch names give good examples of the difficulties in spelling brought about by the want of system in English orthography. Let us take the name MacNeil. We find this variously spelt McNeil and McNeal. Although apparently a Celtic name, I suspect that it came from Scandinavia, where we have to this day the frequent Christian name of *Nil*, *Nils*. The French could make nothing of Neil, so changed the spelling to Niel, in the case of the celebrated marshal. The McNeils and Neals should do the same, and the name would then be written phonetically.

We find the name Mackay spelt the same, whether the owner of it comes from the Highlands or from Galloway; but the pronunciation is different. In the former case it is *Mackai*, in the latter *M#ckae*; and at San Francisco I found another variation, viz., *Mack#e*, the accent being on the last syllable.

In looking up the Scandinavian languages, I have been struck with the similarity in some respects to broad Scotch, and I suspect that the language of the old kingdom of Northumbria, extending from the Humber to the Forth, has been more influenced by Scandinavian immigrants than is generally supposed. Such words as *bard* for *baird* are suggestive; and in Norwegian I found a sentence, viz.: "*Qua sue?*" meaning "What do you say?" which one may hear any day in the streets of Edinburgh or Glasgow.

ART. VII.—*The Son-Euclidian Geometry Vindicated: a Reply to Mr. Skey.*

BY F. W. FRANKLAND F.I.A.

[Read before the Wellington Philosophical Society, 13th February, 1884.]

THE following observations are an abridgment of a series of letters addressed to Mr. Skey, the author of the paper entitled "Notes upon Mr. Frankland's Paper 'On the Simplest Continuous Manifoldness of two Dimensions and of Finite Extent,'" read before the Wellington Philosophical Society on 26th June, 1880, and contained on pages 100-109 of the thirteenth volume of the Transactions of the New Zealand Institute. By Mr. Skey's kindness and courtesy these letters were made available to me for the preparation of a printed reply to his criticisms. I make no apology for the form in which this reply appears. I have taken, *seriatim*, the main points which Mr. Skey raised, and replied to each of his contentions in detail. Mr. Skey's own words are in each case placed at the commencement of the paragraph, and the number of the page from which the quotation is made is indicated. It seemed to me that in this way only could a searching and exhaustive refutation of his arguments be given.

1. What is meant by the assertion that "the axioms of geo-metry may be only approximately true"? (p. 100) It means that the actual physical constitution of the space in which we live may be different from the space treated of in works on solid geometry, but that it must be *so nearly* the same that we cannot detect the difference by the most delicate experimental methods at our command.

2. "The author then adverts to 'the existence' of a particular manifoldness, which has been treated by Professor Clifford in a lecture on the postulates of space" (p. 101). I mean it *exists* in the sense of being logically constructible, not in the sense that any surface in the space in which we live possesses such properties. It *may* be that planes (or *flattest surfaces*, if the expression be preferred,) in the space in which we live possess the properties of this "manifoldness." We cannot know whether they do or not. If they do, at any rate their total areas must be immensely large.

Perhaps it may be said that any absurd scheme of pseudo-geometry is "logically constructible." But this is not the case. It is not possible, for instance, to construct a scheme of geometry in which two shortest lines enclose a space (all shortest lines being supposed congruent), and in which the three angles of a triangle are always less than two right angles. Such a scheme would be logically self-contradictory. For it is logically involved in the assertion that two shortest lines may meet twice, assuming all Euclid's other axioms to be true,

that the three angles of a triangle are always *greater* than two right angles. They *cannot*, under such circumstances be either equal to 180° or less than 180° .

3. "Then he describes how this space is analytically conceived, with the object of putting us in a position to apprehend certain discoveries of his own, which relate to its very singular properties" (p. 101). The manifold This term is now generally used instead of the more cumbrous "manifoldness."

I described in my paper is not a *space*. It is a manifold of *two* dimensions, not of *three*. It may be described as an unimaginable but logically constructible *surface*.

4. It is not accurate to say that Professor Clifford "imputes finiteness "to the universe or to space. He says, in common with most living mathematicians who have studied this question, that space *may* be finite—not that it *is* finite. It's possible finiteness is spoken of, not in the sense of its having a *boundary*, which would be unmeaning, but as implying that space may return into itself, so to speak, just as the surface of a sphere and the circumference of a circle return into themselves. In other words, the totality of space may have a finite volume, just as the surface of a sphere has a finite area, and the circumference of a circle a finite length. As far as pure mathematics go, we cannot decide whether space is infinite or finite. *Experience* alone can decide; or, rather, although we cannot imagine any experience sufficiently extensive to prove the infinitude of space, experience may possibly some day prove its finiteness.

5. "The prime object" of the paper "is to spread and support the views of the metaphysical school." "This view is supported by the fact, that just recently this gentleman has read before us a very able and profound paper, entitled, 'Mind Stuff,' and which is evidently of a highly metaphysical character" (p. 101). The allegation here quoted is so far from being correct, that I claim for my paper on "Mind Stuff" the character of complete consistency with the experiential philosophy. It endeavours to show that the only things of which we have any direct knowledge are the feelings we ourselves experience. By a legitimate inference from experience we conclude that there is a world outside us which causes these feelings, and this world I infer to be composed of stuff' (" mind stuff," Professor Clifford called it,) remotely similar to our own feelings, but not worked up into so complex a structure. If by the "metaphysical school" be meant the school which holds that we can discover truth otherwise than by experiment and observation, then it is precisely the school which the non-Euclidian geometry has done more than! anything else to confute. The geometry of Euclid has hitherto been their stronghold: "Here, at least," they have hitherto said, "the human mind can, without any appeal to experiment, evolve, from its own structure, truths which hold good with absolute exactness, throughout immensity and eternity." Now, since the researches of Lobatchowsky and Gauss this can no longer be said. They and their successors have conclusively shown that, as far as logical consistency is concerned, there are an infinite number of alternative geometries, and that experience alone can decide which of these is physically true.

6. To the expression "geometers of the Euclidian school" (p. 101) I take exception, believing that none such are left in the sense in which Mr. Skey uses the word. The triumph of the non-Euclidian geometry, or, I will say, the "general" geometry, has been complete. I can safely appeal, on this point, to any distinguished member of any Mathematical Society in Europe or America.

7. "It is not this equivalent which Lobatchewsky is supposed to use in his attempt at demonstrating the truth of his assumption" (p. 102). Neither Lobatchewsky nor anyone else has attempted to demonstrate the *truth* of the assumption, but only to demonstrate *that no one else can demonstrate its falsity*. In other words, he has attempted to demonstrate (and that he has completely succeeded all modern mathematicians allow) that the truth of Euclid's 12th axiom can by no possible succession of syllogisms be deduced from the other axioms and the definitions of the straight line, plane, parallels, &c. Innumerable attempts had been made to do this—*i.e.*, to put the 12th axiom on the same logical footing as, for instance, the 5th proposition of the First Book. All the attempts had failed. Lobatchewsky proved, once for all, that they must necessarily fail, by constructing an unimaginable but perfectly self-consistent scheme of geometry, in which all the other axioms were assumed to be true, and all the definitions remain the same, but in which this one axiom (the 12th) was assumed to be false. The equivalents of Euclid's axiom which I have mentioned are really exact logical equivalents. If one is true, all are true. If one is false, all are false. In Euclid's space all are true: in Lobatchewsky's, all are false.

8. I propose now to establish the exact logical equivalence of the three forms of the parallel-axiom mentioned in my paper.

Form (a), (Euclid's) is:—"If a straight line meets two straight lines, so as to make the two interior angles on the same side of it taken together less than two right angles, these straight lines being continually produced shall at length meet upon that side on which are the angles which are less than two right angles." In other words, if the angle $C A B + \text{the angle } A B D < 180^\circ$, then $A C$ and $B D$ will at length meet.

Mathematical diagram

This is Euclid's axiom, and it is to my mind just as good as any of its modern substitutes.

I now propose to deduce from this axiom the usual modern substitute:—"It is impossible to draw more than

one straight line parallel to a given straight line (*i.e.*, lying in the same I plane with it, but not intersecting it) through a given point outside it." Let $\angle QPA + \angle PAB = 180^\circ$. Then, by a proposition of Euclid which does *not*, directly or indirectly, rest on the 12th axiom, PQ can never intersect AB .

Mathematical diagram

Draw any straight line PR within QPA . Then,

Since $\angle QPA + \angle PAB$ —two right angles

$\angle RPA + \angle PAB <$ two right angles.

PR will eventually meet AB (Euclid's 12th axiom), *i.e.*, PR cannot be parallel to AB . Hence no line within QPA and passing through P can be parallel to AB .

Similarly, no line through P and passing outside QPA can be parallel to AB , for the continuation of it would fall within the angle $Q'PA$. Hence only one straight line can be drawn through P parallel to AB , viz: PQ . *Q.E.D.*

I have thus shown that if Euclid's axiom is true, then the modern substitute is true. To establish the exact logical equivalence of the two axioms, I should have to prove the converse formally, viz.: that if the modern substitute is true, then Euclid's axiom is true. But I assume it will be conceded that the above reasoning can quite well be put in the converse form. I now pass to the third equivalent, which is alleged by Mr. Skye not to be a real equivalent of the other two. If it be borne in mind that the word *parallel* in the second equivalent means *not* equidistance along the whole length of two lines; but *lying in the same plane, plus non-intersection however far produced* (see Euclid's definition)—if it be borne in mind that I define parallelism in this way, I think it will be recognised at once that the second and third forms of the axiom are merely two different ways of saying the same thing.

However, as truth and falsehood in nature can never be dependent on the signification of *words*, I may as well say how the axiom would be worded if we define two straight lines to be parallel when they are equidistant along their whole length. (I vastly prefer this definition, though it is not the usual one.) Taking this as the definition of parallelism, Euclid's axiom may be stated thus:—"Two straight lines lying in the same plane, and not being parallel, (*i.e.*, not equidistant along their whole length,) must ultimately intersect if sufficiently produced in both directions."

In Lobatchewsky's geometry, on the other hand, straight lines in a plane need not intersect though they are *not* equidistant along their whole length. They may approach each other for awhile, reach a minimum mutual distance, and then recede more and more continually. Also in Lobatchewsky's geometry *no* two straight lines can be parallel, in the sense of being equidistant along their whole length. If two lines are parallel (*i.e.*, equidistant along their whole length), they cannot both be straight. One, at least, must be a *curved* line, *i.e.*, a longer line than some other which could be drawn through any two of its points.

9. "Nothing is said as to the distance away from this line at which the point is to be placed" (page 103). (This quotation refers to the point outside the first line through which the second line is drawn.) The distance of the point from the line may be as short as possible, and still (if Euclid's 12th axiom is untrue) there will be a finite angle through which the rotating line can be turned without *ever* intersecting the fixed line: the magnitude of this angle depending partly on the distance of the point and partly on the nature of the space under consideration (*i.e.*, on the degree to which the space deviates from the properties of the ideal space of Euclid). For there are spaces *and* spaces which satisfy Lobatchewsky's conditions. There is only one space which satisfies Euclid's conditions, but there is an infinite number satisfying Lobatchewsky's. They vary through infinite gradations, from one which has such feeble "negative curvature" that it can hardly be distinguished from Euclidian space, to one which has such strong "negative curvature" that even PQ (in the annexed figure) would not meet AB , but would rapidly come to its point of minimum distance (MN), and would then recede for ever from AB .

Mathematical diagram

Now, in regard to the space we actually live in, we ought, in my opinion, to say this: "It may be Euclidian, or it may have negative curvature: but if it has negative curvature, that curvature must be excessively weak, though not *infinitely* weak, as is suggested." Professor Clifford puts the case very well in his lecture on "The Aims and Instruments of Scientific Thought." He says: "Suppose that three points are taken in space, distant from one another as far as the sun is from α Centauri, and that the shortest distances between these points are drawn so as to form a triangle, and suppose the angles of this triangle to be very accurately measured and added together: this can at present be done so accurately that the error shall certainly be less than one minute, less therefore than the five-thousandth part of a right angle. Then I do not know that this sum would differ at all from two right angles; *but also I do not know that the difference would be less than ten degrees, or the ninth part of a right angle. And I have reasons for not knowing.*"

Clifford introduces this example by saying, what requires to be much insisted on, that these speculations on non-Euclidian space are not merely questions of words, as many people imagine, but that the issue involved is

"a very distinct and simple question of fact." In plain language, geometry is a *physical* and *experimental* science, just as much as optics or physiology; and the properties of space cannot be evolved from man's inner consciousness, but must be determined by *experiment* and *observation*. There was as much justification, before the curvature of the earth was known, for erecting into an axiom the proposition that all verticals are parallel—(For myself, I cannot, even now, *imagine* its falsehood, although I of course *know* it to be false)—as there is now for the statement, *a priori*, that two shortest lines cannot enclose a space, or that the three angles of a triangle are exactly equal to two right angles.

10. ". . . it appears to me that even if the angle of convergence is infinitely small the lines would intersect, but not, of course, at any determinable or conceivable distance" (p. 103). This is beside the question. The true question is, whether they will necessarily intersect if the angle is, for instance, one decillionth of a degree. Those who regard the Euclidian geometry as absolutely true, must hold that they will. Modern mathematicians, on the other hand, say that we do not know whether they will or not. Who can prove that they will? Euclid frankly admitted that he could not, by *assuming* the alleged fact as his twelfth axiom. Since Euclid's time, scores of mathematicians have tried to prove it, but all their attempted proofs are justly regarded by their fellow-mathematicians as simply inconclusive. It *cannot* be proved. Experiment cannot prove it; reasoning has failed to prove it: our intuitions—if, as disciples of the experiential school of philosophy, we believe they have been produced by the experience of our ancestors through millions of years in the portion of space passed through by our solar system in that time—cannot be trusted as infallible, and, therefore, cannot prove it. Lastly, it will not be contended that any supernatural revelation has been vouchsafed on this point.

11. "None of the evidence of Lobatchewsky in favour of this is given by Mr. Frankland" (p. 104). It did not fall within my province to give this evidence. It is to be found in Lobatchewsky's works. The evidence is admitted, and has long been admitted, to be conclusive by all mathematicians who have studied the question. Also, I think I may fairly add that the burden of proof lies with those who say that an intersection must and will take place, not with those who say that it may or may not take place.

12. "It appears to me that at any finite angle of convergence of CD to AB they will intersect at some determinable part of the line AB , for a finite angle can only mean an angle of such a size that it can be measured or conceived of." Just so: it can be measured by the ratio of a finite arc (subtended by the angle) to the radius of the same circle. But this does not prove that it must be measured by a portion of the straight line AB . How, then, does it follow as a "necessary corollary" that "there is a point along AB which the line P will pass through?" (p. 104.) It will hardly be considered a proof to say that "It seems that the completion of the ideal construction thus begun demands this intersection" (p. 103). If this can be proved, the most remarkable advance in geometry since the time of Euclid himself will have been made. A whole literature has grown up in the attempt to furnish this proof. Its growth has been arrested by the discoveries of Lobatchewsky and Gauss, and I feel very sure that the desired proof will never be forthcoming.

13. Mr. Frankland (p. 106, *note*) "gravely informs us here, that the finishing point or goal for a geodesic line in process of construction is to be the length of such a line away from the starting point of that line. The two points are to be apart, yet coincide!" Where is the contradiction? In the manifold I describe, as on the surface of a sphere, a geodesic starting from any point leads back eventually to that point. So far, my manifold and the surface of a sphere resemble one another. The difference is this: If two persons on the surface of a sphere (say the earth) were to start from the same place, and travel along geodesic lines, they would cross each other's paths at a half-way house (on the other side of the sphere), and then again at the starting point. But on the manifold I have investigated they would, after travelling a certain distance, get back to the starting point, *but without ever having crossed each other's paths in the meanwhile*. On a Euclidian plane, on the other hand, they would obviously never either cross each other's paths or get back to the starting point at all.

14. "Geodesic lines, then, proceeding from some common point of a surface, are to diverge somehow from the polar of that point" (p. 106). I do not know what Mr. Skey means by the "polar of that point," unless, indeed, it be the *opposite* point. If so, I reply that in my manifold, which for the future we may for convenience call the "finite plane,"

The manifold in question possesses the same properties as the "plane at infinity," well known to students of solid geometry.

a point has not *one* opposite only (like a point on a sphere), but a whole row of opposite points: that is to say, an opposite *line*. The geodesic lines proceeding from a common point cut this "opposite line" (which I have called the polar) in *separate points*, each of which is equally "opposite" to the common centre of radiation.

15. "He is assuming a uniformly curved surface of immense size" (p. 106). By no means. The manifold may be of any size, large or small. Its total area may be less than the decillionth part of a square inch—yet it will have its complete and thoroughly self-consistent, though, I admit, quite unimaginable, geometry. What I do say is that, if any surface *constructible in the space in which we live* possesses the properties of a "finite plane," then that surface must be of immense size, for we can prove by experiment that no closed surface of *moderate*

area constructible in our space does possess these properties.

16. "It is manifest that the analytical conception of two geo-desic lines refusing to intersect each other more than once, and so enclosing but one space, is founded upon Lobatchewsky's con-ception of what parallel straight lines are capable of" (p. 106). This is not so. It is founded on just the opposite conception. Lobatchewsky's conception is that of two geodesic lines which, even though converging at first, do not ultimately intersect; mine is that of two geodesic lines which ultimately intersect, even though divergent at first. In Lobatchewsky's space the three angles of a triangle are always together less than two right angles: in the "finite plane" (and also in the corresponding space of three dimensions,) they are always greater than two right angles, just as the angles of a spherical triangle are. In Lobatchewsky's space, figures have their edges and corners sharpened when their linear dimensions are proportionately increased: in the "finite plane" they have their angles blunted on being magnified, (like the figures on a sphere,) and in the corresponding space of three dimensions solid figures would also have their edges and corners blunted on being magnified.

17. "It is, I think, abundantly evident that the analytical conception of a surface such as the one which has been worked upon for the discoveries communicated in his (Mr. Frankland's) paper, is not, in reality, valid, and that though possibly not self-contradictory, as he urges, it requires premises which *are* of this nature"—*i.e.* self-contradictory (p. 107). Not so. The premises are not self-contradictory, but only contradictory to some of our strongest and firmest intuitions—*viz.*, our space-intuitions. But so is the convergence of verticals, already alluded to, and yet it is an unquestionable fact. Believing, as I do, that our space-intuitions are derived simply from ancestral experience, aided by natural selection (which must always have tended to eliminate those in whom such intuitions were relatively weak), I can only admit that they are reliable enough *for practical purposes*; not that they are exactly true through all space and time. The parallelism of verticals was an intuition, (a sort of dynamical intuition,) ingrained in our mental constitution by ancestral experience through innumerable generations. Were we blind, and confined (say by surrounding climates of excessive rigour) to a very limited area of the earth's surface, I think it very likely that this conception would to this day seem to us self-evidently true. It would seem as certain that two verticals must have the same direction as it now does that two shortest lines cannot enclose a space. A Skey, in such a world, might even have argued that to construct a system of cosmography in which two verticals should not have the same direction would be, "though possibly not self-contradictory," to assume "premises which are of that nature." In any case, I do not think that any self-contradiction can be shown to be involved in the proposition that two geodesic lines, though finite in length, intersect only once.

18. "Referring to the idea that the universe is of finite extent," . . . the Professor "argues that 'in this case the universe is again a valid conception . . . for the extent of space is a finite number of cubic miles'" (p. 107). In this quotation from Professor Clifford, two important words are omitted. The original reads thus:—"In this case the universe, *as known*, is again a valid conception," &c. Professor Clifford very clearly explains what he means by this, in an earlier part of the lecture from which I quoted. Referring to the state of science before Lobatchewsky he says, ". . . the laws of space and motion that we are presently going to examine, implied an infinite space and an infinite duration, about whose properties as space and time everything was accurately known. The very constitution of those parts of it which are at an infinite distance from us, 'geometry upon the plane at infinity,' is just as well known, if the Euclidian assumptions are true, as the geometry of any portion of this room. In this infinite and thoroughly well-known space the universe is situated during at least some portion of an infinite and thoroughly well-known time. So that here we have real knowledge of something at least that concerns the cosmos; something that is true throughout the immensities and eternities. That something Lobatchewsky and his successors have taken away. The geometer of to-day knows nothing about the nature of actually existing space at an infinite distance: he knows nothing about the properties of this present space in a past or a future eternity. He knows, indeed, that the laws assumed by Euclid are true with an accuracy that no direct experiment can approach, not only in this place where we are, but at places at a distance from us which no astronomer has conceived: but he knows this as of here, and now; beyond his range is a there, and a then, of which he knows nothing at present, but may ultimately come to know more. So, you see, there is a real parallel between the work of Copernicus and his successors on the one hand, and the work of Lobatchewsky and his successors on the other. In both of these the knowledge of immensity and eternity is replaced by knowledge of here and now. And in virtue of these two revolutions the idea of the universe, the macrocosm, the all, as a subject of human knowledge, and therefore of human interest, has fallen to pieces."

Well, then: If space should turn out to be of finite extent, the idea of the universe (the universe of *matter* at any rate) would be reinstated, as in a certain measure an object of knowledge throughout its entire extent, as it was supposed to be before Lobatchewsky arose, when Euclidian geometers could tell us the exact constitution of the whole of space.

19. "To make the conclusion agree with the premises, it should have gone no further than to affirm that the universe may not differ *sensibly* from an infinite one" (p. 108). By no means: The surface of a sheet of still

water does not differ sensibly from a Euclidian plane, but the surface of the Pacific Ocean, even if perfectly calm, differs very sensibly from a plane. The imperceptible divergence of small portions from the ideal standard is *cumulative*, and when we take very large portions the divergence accumulates to a very perceptible amount. The difference between the geometry of a cubic mile, if Euclid's assumptions are true, and the geometry of a cubic mile if they are false, we know, by experiment, to be quite insensible: yet by the accumulation of excessively small (though not infinitely small) divergences, it comes about that the geometry of a decillion cubic miles (*i.e.*, 10^{10} cubic miles) may be so different on the two hypotheses, that while, if Euclid's assumptions are true the decillion cubic miles are but an infinitesimal portion of entire space, if his assumptions are false, all space may actually not hold so large a number of cubic miles.

20. "The Professor, having perchance, after all, some doubts as to the validity of this deduction, or possibly forgetting he has *proved* it, essays to prove it again; he says, 'and this (finiteness of the universe) comes about in a very curious way' " (p. 108). I can assure my critic that Professor Clifford had no such doubts. If the universe is such that two shortest lines may enclose a space, and if, nevertheless, all the other assumptions of Euclid are true, then the extent of space is *certainly* a finite number of cubic miles. The one statement is logically involved in the other, though it may require a long and intricate process of reasoning to prove it so.

21. "The qualification put upon straight lines, '*straight according to Leibnitz,*' put, no doubt, all in good faith, as explan-ative of straight lines, it does still, I feel assured, confer upon them properties which straight lines have not" (p. 108). It undoubtedly confers upon them properties which Euclidian straight lines have not; but the lines in question, though not Euclidian straight lines—and if you will, not *straight* lines at all, for the quarrel need not be over a word when the issue is one of fact—may nevertheless be the straightest lines that can possibly be constructed (even ideally) in the space in which we actually live. In other words, space may be so constituted that what Euclid calls straight lines cannot possibly be constructed in it, any more than a straight line can be constructed on the surface of a sphere. Nevertheless the straightest lines constructible may be of the same shape all along *and on all sides*, which great circles of a sphere are not: for thought of the same shape all along, they are concave on the one side and convex on the other, also they may be shortest lines, which the great circles of a sphere are not, relatively to solid space. The quarrel about the definition of a straight line does not affect the issue in the smallest degree.

22. "I blame making so much, in this way, of the gap 'in the chain of reasoning,' by which the truths of geometry should be logically connected and represented " (p. 109). They *cannot* all be logically connected. Not one, but several, unproved assumptions must be made before a definite geometry can be constructed. The difficulty does not arise from shortcomings in the definitions, though these are undoubtedly defective. Frame what definitions we please, we must still assume certain *matters of fact*, or *alleged* matters of fact (call them axioms or call them postulates), before we can logically raise the superstructure of the Euclidian geometry. Even if we define straight lines and planes as such lines and surfaces that the propositions of Euclid respecting straight lines and planes shall be true respecting them, even by this extreme procedure we get no nearer the desired goal: for it then remains to be proved that straight lines, planes, parallels, &c., *exist in the space in which we live*. To assume that they do is to assume a whole congeries of axioms. A writer named Thomson once wrote a book called "Geometry without Axioms, 'which was certainly a desperate effort to get rid of unproved assumptions. The attempted proof of the redoubtable 12th axiom was a perfect labyrinth of intricate propositions; but, like all similar efforts, like any efforts which may be hereafter made to ground geometry on definitions and dispense with axioms, it was but "as the helpless waves that break upon the iron rocks of doom."

The science of the space in which we live is a *physical* and *experimental* science, and, unlike arithmetic, algebra, and all the branches of mathematical analysis (the general theory of manifolds among them), cannot be evolved out of man's inner consciousness.

Why is the Bulk of the Ocean Retained in the Southern Hemisphere?

or the Scientific Meaning of The Symbols and Measures of the Great Pyramid of Egypt,

Given in the terms of the Inch in the terms of #.

A Reply to Piazzzi Smyth's Questions Re Symbols, etc.

By John Leith.

Printed by Wilsons and Horton, New Zealand Queen Street, Auckland. 1885

An Answer Professor Piazzzi Smyth's Questions as to the Meaning of the Symbols of the Great Pyramid of Egypt.

In my next Pamphlet I will give you the Theory and prove that the Great Pyramid gives the mean distance of the Sun = 93500000 miles.

John Leith.

Printed by Wilsons and Horton, New Zealand Queen Street, Auckland. 1885

The Thickness of the Masonry Courses of the Great Pyramid of Egypt.

PROFESSOR PIAZZI SMYTH tells us that the lower course of masonry is equal to 50 inches, then the thickness of each course as they ascend decreases till the 35th course is only equal to 27 inches in depth, while the 36th course suddenly increases to 50 inches, and that this thick 36th course of masonry is conspicuous on every side of the Great Pyramid. He then asks, what then was the extraordinarily important thing completed in these first 35 courses that the builders crowned them so majestically, honoured them, in fact, with a diadem of stone, whose 50-inch escarpment shines afar on every side, and marked them to all future time by the weight and size of the 36th, 37th, and other higher courses of extra thick masonry immediately above them?

I WILL ANSWER THIS IMPORTANT QUESTION.

In the first place, there can be no doubt that this difference in the thickness of the masonry courses was continued in the outer casing stones, because the 50-inch white escarpment of the 36th course of masonry, which is visible to the naked eye so far off all round was Designed and left as a "Hailing sign," calling the attention of passersby to a Continually Increasing Deficiency during a certain period of time.

This period of time is equal to 10,482 years, equal to the Period of a "Zone of Water," which travels from one hemisphere into the other periodically, crossing the Equator once every 10,482 years, equal to half the period of the perihelion, which is equal to 20,964 solar years, each year composed of 365-24 days; then, $365-24 \times 10 \div \# = 1162\#6$, equal to the height of the 35th course above the basal plane.

The "Problem" of the Great Pyramid is built up in the terms of the inch—in the terms of, as the diameter is to the circumference of the circle, then $25827-20964 = 4863$, and $36 \div (4863 \div 1000) \times \# \div 2 \times 10 = 1162.6$, equal to the height of the 35th course of masonry above the basal plane.

And 1162.6×10 equals EE, equals the diameter, of the circle, as shown in the Figure, because, the vertical height of the Great Pyramid, is as the radius of that circle—equal to $11626 \div 2 = 5813$ inches.

Then, the height of the 35th course of masonry above the basal plane, is in the terms of the circle, then it is in the terms of the "Zone of water," whose period is equal to half that circle—equal to 10,482 years.

It was as far back as 1873, when I had roughly traced out the astronomical and physical cause of the existence of this "Zone of water," and a certain Deficiency, which was created during that period by the continued action of the Centrifugal force.

Therefore this remarkable difference in the thickness of the masonry courses was the first symbol that attracted my attention when I set myself to work to try to read the meaning of the Symbology of the Great Pyramid in 1879.

What made this symbol particularly attract my attention was the fact that, I was aware of a cause for a Deficiency which went on increasing during a certain period of time in one Hemisphere, while this "Zone of water" was retained in the opposite during 10,482 years by the Sun's force of attraction.

The position in latitude of the apex of this "Zone of water" governs the obliquity of the ecliptic; but the position in latitude of the apex is governed by the position of the perihelion point of the earth's orbit, because the sun will exert its maximum of force when, the earth is nearest the sun, *i.e.*, in the perihelion of its orbit.

Consequently, the vertical height of the Great Pyramid is built up in the terms of the Lesser distance of the Sun. Therefore, twice the vertical height of the Great Pyramid, represents the Lesser distance of the sun from the earth, in the terms of the breadth of the earth from pole to pole—not the mean distance as supposed. Therefore, 91,840,000 miles will represent the Lesser distance of the Sun \pm .

I will now test the 35th and 36th courses of masonry in the terms of the deficiency, in the terms of the inch, in the terms of #.

The deficiency caused by the action of the centrifugal force, according to the Theory, is equal to 0 5003 inches annually at the pole of that hemisphere which is free from the zone of water during 10,482 years.

$0.5003 \text{ inches} \times 10,482 \div 12 = 437 \text{ feet}$
 $0.5003 \times 10 \times 1000 = 5003 \text{ inches}$. Then— $5003 = 3.699231$
 $437 \div 10 = 43.7 = 1.640481$
 $2.058750 \# = 0.497149$
 $3) 359.66 = 2.555899$
 $119.886 = 2.078760 \# = 0.497149$
 $376.61 = 2.575909$ and $376.61 + 1369.5 = 1746.1$

equals the arc Aa + arc AE (as shown in the Figure) = $1744.5 \pm$ equals $652 + 1092.5 \dots \dots \dots = 1744.5 \pm 5003 = 3.699231$
35th Course = 27 = 1.431364
 $2.267867 \# = 0.497149$
 $582.18 = 2.765016$
 $3 1746.54 = 1746.54$

and 27 inches is equal to the thickness of the 35th course of masonry, and the decreasing thickness of the courses symbolises this deficiency at the end of the period; and the end of the period was to happen 1746 years

± after the foundation was laid, because the perihelion would then have arrived in the equinox and the apex at the equator.

I will now divide 5003 by the 35th and 36th courses— $5003 = 3.699231$ 35th Course = 35 = 1.544068 2.142928 # = 0.497149 449.07 = 2.652312 3592.56 × 10 = 35926 ± The first five figures of the mass of the sun as used in the Theory is = 35926 5003 = 3.699231 36th Course = 36 = 1.556303 2.142928 # = 0.497149 436.59 = 2.640077 and $436.59 \div 10 = 43.7$ (inch feet)

Equal to the width of the stones in the ceiling of the Grand Gallery. The difference in the width of this chamber as it ascends symbolises this increasing deficiency, and $43.7 \times 10 = 437$, and $437 \times 5 = 2185$ equal to the height of the apex of the "zone of water," as required by the Theory. Then, $2185 \div 2 = 1092.5$ equals the whole length of the entrance passage; then, the height of the entrance above the pavement equals 652 and $652 + 1092.5 = 1744.5$ equals the date in inch years.

$$5003 \div (5813 \div 10) \times \# = 27.031$$

$$18225 \div \# \div 3 \times \div 4 \div 3 = 27.00$$

Equal to the thickness of the 35th course of masonry, 20964 years-2739 = 18225 years.

35926 is equal to the first five figures of the mass of the sun, as used in the calculation of the sun's force.

$$35926 = 4.555407 \quad 20964 \div (1322.1 \times ?) = 4.98107 = 0.697323 \quad 3.858084 \# = 0.497149 \quad 22658 = 4.355233 \quad 9 \quad 2)203922 \quad 3)101961 \quad 33987 \div 100 \dots = 339.87$$

And $95000000 \div 92000000 \times \# \div 3 \times 100 = 108.133 \times \# = 339.71$ These are the greater and the lesser distances or the sun, and they have given the same, in the terms of #.

$$339.3 \div 47.067 \times \# \times 9 \div 2 \div 3 \times 10 \dots = 339 \quad 666 \quad \text{And } 47.067 = \text{the angle in the figure. Then,}$$

$5276 \div (9200.0000 \div ?) \times \# \times 6 \times 10 \dots = 339.71$ And 5276 is equal to the first four figures of the mass of the moon as used in the theory.

$$\text{Then, } 5276 = 3.722305 \quad 20964 \div (1322.1 \div ?) = 0.697323 \quad 3.024982 \# = 0.497149 \quad 2249.3 = 3.522131 \quad 4 \quad 3)8997.2 \quad 2999.066 \div 100 = 29.99066 = 29^\circ 59' 26.4''$$

NOTE.—20964 years less 7743 = 13221 years.

equals the latitude or the Great Pyramid ± in the terms of the inch in the terms of #,

and the latitude, by observation, is equal to $29^\circ 58' 51''$

The next Symbol which attracted my attention was the Displacement of the Entrance and the Difference in the Height of the two Wainscots in the Ante-chamber.

The Displacement of the Entrance is equal to 295.7, or $296 \pm$ inches.

The annual motion of the perihelion is equal to $11\# .63 + 50'' .2 = 61\# .83$. Then,

$$5813 \div 61.83 \times \# \dots = 295 \quad 36\text{in.} \quad 7391.5 \div (20964 \div 100) \times 26.302 \dots = 295.26\text{in.} \\ 8687.87 \div 9 \times \# \div 10 \dots = 295.3\text{in.} \quad 237000 \div 4 \div 2 \div 1000 \dots = 295.25\text{in.} \quad 882000 \\ \div (7743 \div 27.5) \times \# \times 3 \div 10 \dots = 295.257\text{in.}$$

The length of the floor of the entrance passage is equal to 985 inches.

$$985 = 2.993436 \quad 25827 \div (7743 \div ?) = 10.4711 = 1.020314 \quad 1.973122 \# = 0.497149 \quad 295.31 = 2.470271 \dots = \\ 295.31 \text{ in. The Height of the Entrance } \dots = 652\text{in.} \pm 26^\circ 18' 43.2'' = 26.3125 \times 4 \div 100 \times 4 \div \# \times 486.3 = 652 \\ \text{and the difference of the periods equals } 4863 \text{ years } 25827 - 20964 = 4863 \text{ years } 296 \div 273.9 \times \# \times 3 \div \# \times 15 \dots \\ \dots = 4863 \quad 4863 \div 15 \times \# \div 3 \div \# \times 273.9 \dots = 296$$

And the thickness of the granite leaf, north and south, is equal to 15 inches.

Having given you proof that my reading of the meaning of the difference in the thickness of the masonry courses was the correct one, you must bear in mind that I am writing this in the fourth month of the year 1885, and that it was in 1879 when I first read that symbol. These proofs are the result of six years' close study and testing of all the measures of this ancient monument. It was not till after more than four years' work that it occurred to me to set out the accompanying figure; the doing so necessitated the putting on one side all former work and commencing upon one uniform method—using the log. 0.497149 as a constant log. in all cases—and as I had to test the measures of the Great Pyramid inside and out, great and small, coffer included, not only by all the astronomical quantities used in the Theory; but by the arcs of time as shown in the figure, and the angles, which are subtended by those arcs of time and the complements of those angles and the complements of the arcs of time; also by the periods of the equinox, the period of the perihelion, and by the difference of these two periods; by the height of the "apex" of the "zone of water," and its period, etc., and by the annual motions of these two periods, and by the sum of these two annual motions, etc.

This will give you some idea of the labour I have bestowed upon the reading of the symbols and measures of this Prehistoric Monument,

In my earlier attempts at reading the meaning of the symbols I could not grasp the meaning of all, but since then more of them have revealed themselves as I proceeded with the investigation.

I will now give you a brief account of the

MEANING OF THE SYMBOLS.

In the first place, the Great Pyramid of Egypt is a Prehistoric Monument, designed and erected by the people of a former period, and left by them as a "Scientific" record, or "Book of Stone," to make known to us (a people of a distant posterity, of another and later period), their knowledge of the existence of a "Zone of water," its period, arcs of time, etc. The Problem is written in the language of symbols and numbers, in the terms of the inch, in the terms of #, so that the people of the next period should be able to read it, as soon as they understood the "reason why" the bulk of the ocean was retained in the Southern Hemisphere at the present day, and they knew the value of

The builders knew there was no problem in "physical" science so important for us to know as the problem built up there, because it gives the astronomical and physical forces which govern the obliquity of the ecliptic, and reveals to us some of the lost pages of the true history of the past, prior to the Deluge of our history.

This ancient monument, then, is erected on a parallel of latitude which marks the boundary of the "Zone of water," during their period of repose, when this "Zone of water" was in the Northern Hemisphere, as it is now in the South. For we are passing through Our Period of Repose at this time. In fact, we are more than half-way through our period of repose "without knowing anything about it."

NOTE.—The perihelion point of the earth's orbit is now about 10 degrees past the solstice \pm on its way towards the opposite equinoctial point.

[If we did there would be less talk of the end of the world every few years.]

The period of this "Zone of water" is equal to 10,482 years from the time it crosses the equator, till its return to the equator again.

During each period it is in motion 2739 years, and stationary during 7743 years, its apex is equal to 2185 feet, and it extends on either side over $1304 \pm$ miles of latitude. Then, it follows that as the Great Pyramid marks the parallel of latitude, of the boundary, of this "Zone of water" during their period of repose, when it (the "zone of water") was in the Northern Hemisphere, it becomes evident that it was physically necessary that the foundation should be laid, and the building complete before the "zone of water" began its return journey to the south, because if it was not, the site would be under water.

Now, I have abundant evidence to prove that the foundation was laid 375 years \pm before the end of that former period of repose.—*See figure.*

$A a = 375 \pm$ and $A a + A E = 1744.5 = \text{date} = 375 \text{ years} + 1369.5 \text{ years} = 1744.5 \text{ years}$, then, by the symbology. It symbolises that, 652 years after the foundation was laid, the apex of the "Zone of water" would be symbolically at the entrance.

You notice those Inclined Stones above the entrance, revealed now the outer stones are removed.

NOTE.—See plates in Piazzzi Smyth's work.

They were placed within the interior of the building for preservation, so that in future time, when we should be able to read this Book of Stone, we would understand that these Inclined Stones symbolised the apex, as being then symbolically at the entrance 652 years after the foundation was laid.

One of the acute angles of these stones is equal to 51° , then in the terms of the inch, in the terms of #

$51 \div (652 \div 100) \times \# \times 7 \div 100 = 1.72018 \text{ I} - 1.7203 \times (365.24 \div ?) \} = 652 \text{ ins. II} - \text{One of the obtuse angles of these stones is equal to } 128^\circ$, Then, $1284 \div (652 \div 10) \times \# \div 7 \times 10 = 11.92143 \text{ I} - 11.9223 \times 7 \div 2 \div \# \times (5276 \div 100) \} = 652 \text{ in.}$

NOTE.—5,276 is equal to the first four figures of the mass of the moon as used in the calculation, and 652 inches is equal to the height of the entrance.

And by the symbology 1,092.5 years after the apex has arrived at the entrance it was to be at the equator, symbolised by the junction of the passages, then 652 + the whole length of the entrance passage is equal to 1,744.5 \pm , because the whole length of the entrance passage is equal to $(2,185 \div 2 = 1,092.5 \text{ inches } \pm)$ equal the half of the height, of the apex of the "zone of water" in the terms of the inch (*See figure*). If we call the Circle a representation of the Earth, then E E E represents the Equator and E will represent the equinoctial point, and the perihelion point of the earth's orbit was to be in the equinox 1,744.5 years after the foundation was laid.

Then, the Ascending and Descending passages symbolise the two hemispheres.

The apex is symbolically at the equator, then its arm (as I call it) would reach 1,302 miles across the equator into the opposite hemisphere, and the arm would then come under the influence of the Deficiency.

This is clearly symbolised by the symbology of the Horizontal Passage.

I will again refer you to the figure. You see those two square blocks of stone above the entrance passage; they are 100 inches by 100. Now, the line of intersection of these two stones, if extended each way, would connect the Horizontal Passage and the outer face of the Great Pyramid; and the distance from the horizontal passage to the outer face is equal to 2185 \pm , and from the point of intersection of this extended line with the

outer face, down along the inclined face, is equal to half, equal $1092.5 \pm$. Then these two blocks of stone symbolise the two hemispheres, the line of intersection the equator, and they symbolise to us that in 1092.5 years \pm the apex of the "Zone of water" would be at the equator, and that the Horizontal Passage symbolises the Arm of the "Zone of water," reaching the Deficiency. This Deficiency is symbolised by the floor, by that portion which you see is deficient in height, and the length of this low portion deducted from the whole length of the floor is equal to $1302 \pm$ equals the length of the arm of the "Zone of water."

We have arrived then, symbolically, at the end of that former period, or any period, because we have arrived at the end of the 1744.5 years \pm , and, after the 375 years had elapsed, the perihelion would then be within $23\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ of the equinox E' or E, and it is during those years when the perihelion point of the earth's orbit is within $23\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ of the equinox, that this "Zone of water" is in motion. Then, it follows that, during the 1369.5 years of the last arc of time of that former period, as this "Zone of water" advances from the north to the south, as it approaches the equator, the change of position of this body of water must effect the "centre of gravity of the earth," consequently the obliquity of the ecliptic would decrease till, at the end of the period, it would be reduced to "zero," because the apex, being then at the equator, neither pole would gravitate towards the sun when the earth arrives in the perihelion. This is symbolised in the horizontal floor of the King and Queen's Chambers. This would be the period known in geology as the carboniferous period, when ice and snow have been comparatively unknown at the poles.

The apex is now, symbolically, at the equator. The arm has reached the deficiency, consequently, currents would be set in motion (for this force would be stronger than the force of the sun for the time being), and these currents would increase in volume and velocity, and carry this "Zone of water" into the opposite hemisphere and submerge it, as is symbolised by the subterranean chamber, with its up and down and apparently unfinished floor, which symbolises to us the ceasing of all human undertakings, when the ocean breaks its bounds and causes universal destruction, and the death of all science for ages and ages after.

Here, we arrive at the cause of the drift period, and the knowledge of this will open to our contemplation some of the lost pages of the true history of the past—prior, to the deluge of our history—and enable us to trace out some near approach to the history of the many ruins of antiquity, of which, at present, we know nothing.

Then, when we arrive at the junction of the passages, we have arrived at the end of the one period and at the beginning of the new.

The Ascending Passage symbolises the first arc of time of a new period; its Portcullis entrance symbolises the serious difficulties and obstructions which will check the advance of the descendants of the remnants of the people during the first centuries of the new period, for no sooner do they overcome one difficulty than another presents itself equally formidable, and the more hard to bear because "Hope deferred makes the heart grow sick." But necessity has no law, and the force of circumstances compel them to proceed so that as time rolls on, obstacle after obstacle is removed till at length the end of this first arc of time is reached—the first 1369.5 years has passed.

The height of the south end of this passage is $= 43.6$ inches \pm , and $1369.5 \div \# = 435.934 \div 10 = 43.6 =$ the height of the south end of this passage and $1369.5 \div 435.936 = \#$.

The length, of this Ascending Passage along the floor, is equal to $1,542$ inches, the $\#$ angle at the base of the Great Pyramid is equal to $51^\circ 51\# 14\# = 51.8504$; the height of the apex of the "zone of water" equals $2,185$, then,

$2185 \div 51.8504 \times \# \div 2 \div 6 = 11.0525$ } ... = 1542 in. $11.0525 \times 8 \div 100 \times 4 \div \# \times 1369.5$ } equals the length of this passage. $1302.983 \times 3 \times 2 \div 100 \div \# \times 61.83$ = 1542 in. and $2739 \div 1542 \times \# \times 7 \div 3 \times 100$ = 1302.07 equals the length of the arm \pm , as is symbolised by the Horizontal Passage floor.

THE TRANSVERSE PLATES.

These plates have the passage cut through them—they form roof, sides, and floor—they symbolise the "Zone of water." they surround the passage as this "Zone of water" surrounds the earth, and the position of each is in the terms of the Problem, in the terms of the inch, etc., which will be too long to treat of here.

Then, when we have arrived at the south end of this passage, we have arrived, symbolically, at the commencement of the Period of Repose, when the "Zone of water" will remain at rest during all these 7743 years. I will ask you to refer to the figure. You see the arc EB equals 1369.5 years, equals half of AB, and when the perihelion is distant more than $23\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ from the equinox, the obliquity of the ecliptic has reached its maximum of inclination \pm , and during the 7743 years the perihelion is travelling from B round past the solstice S, to the point C, or within $23\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ of the opposite equinox, the "Zone of water" remains stationary.

This is symbolised by the Ramps, because the Ramps symbolise the Periods of Repose which occur in each hemisphere, and the space between them symbolises the arc AB = $2,739$ years the space is equal to 42 inches, then, $42 \times (1304 \div 10 \div 2) = 2739$; this, $\div 2 = 1369.5 =$ the arc EA $\times 2 =$ the arc AB, etc.

THE GRAND GALLERY

Symbolises the two periods, equal to 20,964 years, and the high steps at the south end symbolise the "Zone of water" passing from one hemisphere into the other, as from A towards B, or *vice versa*, as the case may be.

The vertical height of the Grand Gallery varies from $339.05 \pm$ to $339.8 \pm$; the mean is given as equal to $339.3 \pm$.

The distance of the moon, as used in the Theory, is equal to 237,000 miles.

$237,000 \text{ in.} \div 365.24 \times \# 6 \times 100 \dots = 339.758$ Then, the greater and lesser distances of the sun are equal to 95,000,000 and 92,000,000 miles \pm , and $95000000 \div 92,000,000 \times \# \div 3 \times 100 \times \# = 339.71$ and $92000000 \div 882000 \div 3 \times 10 \dots = 339.7761$ The cubic diagonal of the coffer is equal to $87.13 \text{ in.} \pm$ $87.13 \div (7743 \div 1000) \times \# \times 3 \times \# \dots = 339.36$ and $2160 \div 2 \div 10 \times \# \dots = 339.3$ The length of the Grand Gallery above the Ramps is equal to 1881.6 inches, width at ceiling is equal to 43.7 inches; then, $5003 \div 43.7 \times \# \div 3 \times \# = 376.65$ $376.62 \div 3 \div \# \times 47.067 \} = 1881.6$ equals the length of the Grand Gallery above the Ramps, and 47.067 is equal to $47^\circ 4\#$, equals the angle A EE, etc., and $26^\circ 18\# = 26.3 \div 4.863 \times \# \times 8 \div 4 \times 10 = 339.8$ then $10482 - 7743 = 2739$, this $\div (1304 \div 10 \times 2) = 42$ equals the spaces between the Ramps; then, $92000000 \div 339.3 \times \# \times 2 \div 1000 = 1701.66 = 1702$ equals the height of the floor of the King's Chamber above the basal plane; and $93500000 \div 2739 \div 2 \dots = 1702.95$ $95000000 \div 132.934 \times 3 \dots = 1703.01$ $237000 \div 8687.87 \times \# \div 4 \times 100 = 1701.85 = 1702.0$ The difference of the periods equals 4863. $4863 \div 339.3 \times \# 3 \div 3 \times 10 = 50.0026$ $4863 \div 304.4 \times \# \dots = 50.189 = 50.2$ $25327 - 20964 = 4863$ $1701.72 \div 9 \div \# \times 83.13 = 5003 \div 10 \div 100 = 0.5003$ equals the annual deficiency. Then, $5003 \div 1702 \times \# \times 5 \times 10 \dots = 461.17 \text{ in.}$ and the diagonal of the floor of the King's chamber = 461.19 in.

The Grand Gallery symbolises the whole period of the perihelion, and the two hemispheres in the terms of the figure. Let A D and B C represent the Ramps on either side; make the spaces DC, A B = 42; then you have the floor of the Grand Gallery. Call the length equal to 1881.6 \pm ; then,

$20964 \div 1881.6 \times \# \times 2 \div 10 = 7.0026 = 7 =$ the number of overlapping stones on either side; then, one of the heights of the Ramps equals 20.07, and

$7 \times 3 \times 10 \times 5 \div \# \times 9 = 3008 \} 3007.8 \div 9 \div \# \times 20.07^* \} \dots = 2185$ equals the height of the apex of the "Zone of water" and the Ramps symbolises the "Zone of water," and $1744.5 + 1263.3$ years $\dots = 3007.8$ years and 3007.8 years $\times 61.83\# \div 60 \div 60 \dots = 51^\circ 39\# 48\#$ equals the latitude of the apex of the "Zone of water" during the period of repose \pm . Then, $2739 \div 20.07 \times \# = 428.4 \} 428.4 \times 7 \div 100 = 29.938 \} \dots = 29^\circ 59\# 16\#$ equals the latitude of the boundary; if you add the length of the arm, equal 1304 miles of latitude $\dots = 21^\circ 42\# 00\#$ then, $29^\circ 59\# 16\# + 21^\circ 42\# 00\# \dots = 51^\circ 41\# 16\# \pm$ The other height of the Ramps is equal to 20.96in.; then, $92000000 \div 7391.5 \times \# \div 3 \div 10 = 1309.3 \} 1309.26 \div 10 \times 3 \times 8 \div \# \times 20.96 \} \dots = 20964$ $20964 \div 5813 \times \# \times 10 = 113.3 \times 3 = 339.9 \} 339.91 \div 2 \div \# \times 304.4 \} \dots = 20964$ equals the whole period of the perihelion, and 304.4 is equal to the transverse height of the Grand Gallery; then, $20964 \div 339.8 \times \# \times 3 \times 3 \dots = 1744.38$ $2185 \div 111.8 \times \# \times 3 \times 10 \dots = 1745.34$ is equal to the date of laying the foundation, equal to the Arc, $aA + AE = 375 \div 1369.5$ years = $1744.5 \pm$, as shown in the figure. The latitude by obs. = $29^\circ 58\# 51\# = 29\ 981 \times 10 = 299.81$. $299.81 = 2.476846\ 7 = 0.845098\ 1.631748\ \# = 0.497149\ 1.134599$ The obtuse angle of the Inclined } Stones = $128^\circ \} = 128 = 2.107210$ $1744.28 = 3.241809 = 1744.28$

NOTE.—One of the measures of the Transverse Plates is equal to 1212; then, $7743 \div 1212 \times \# = 20.07$.

$2185 \div 128 \times \# = 53.628 \times 7 = 375.396 + 1369.5 = 1744.896$ $5003 \div 9 \times \# \dots = 1746.4$ $2185 \div 111.8 \times \# \times 3 \times 10 \dots = 1745.34$ and $11.63 + 50.2 = 61.83\#$. Then, 1744.5 years $\times 61.83\# \div 60 \div 60$ is = $29^\circ 58\# 9\#$.

When we reach the South end of the Grand Gallery we have symbolically reached the end of the Period of Repose, and are about entering upon the last 1369.5 years of the period when the "Zone of water" will be approaching the equator and the obliquity of the ecliptic decreasing, till, at the end of the period, the angle will be reduced to zero, symbolised by the horizontal stone (which is called the High Step), because the motion of this "Zone of water" north or south must affect the centre of gravity of the earth. This centre is symbolised by the Boss on the Granite Leaf, and motion is symbolised by all the grooves. For instance, the distance of the centre of the Boss from the west wall face is equal to 19.5 inches, then the groove in the wall of the Grand Gallery is = 1878.24

$5003 \div 1878.24 \times \# \times 7 \div 3 \dots = 19.502 \text{ in.}$

This directs your attention to the Boss by the measure. There are 28 square holes in the Ramps, then,

$2185 \div 28 \times \# \times 7 \div 100 \dots = 17.1612$ and the grooves of the granite leaf is $\dots = 17.16 \text{ in.}$ and $12913.26 \div 237000 \times \# = 17.153 \dots = 17.16 \text{ in.} \pm$ and the diagonal of the Base is $\dots = 12913.26 \text{ in.}$

This High Step extends back equal to 61 inches, and

$$2185 \div 9 \times \# = 762.7 \times 8 \dots \dots \dots = 61.016$$

equals the measure of this stone which symbolises the "Zone of water." The distance from the groove end of the Granite Leaf in the Ante-chamber is equal to 3.25 inches,

$$2185 \div 3.25 \times \# \div 4 \div 10 \dots \dots \dots = 51.6625 = 51^\circ 39\# 45\# 12913.26 \times 4 \div 1000 \dots \dots \dots = 51.65304 = 51^\circ 39\# 10.8\#$$

and the latitude $29^\circ 58\# 51\# + 21^\circ 42\# 0\# \dots \dots \dots = 51^\circ 40\# 51\#$ equals the latitude of the apex \pm and $1302 \text{ miles} \div 60 = 21^\circ 42\#$ as used above. The Granite Leaf symbolises the Flood Gates of the oceans. There is a stone on which it rests; this stone is equal to 43.7; this $\times 10 \times 5 = 2185$ equals the height of the "Zone of water," which is symbolically passing the Flood Gates, at the end of the period.

The height of the floor of the King's Chamber above the basal plane is 1702 inches, and the diagonal of the floor is 461.19; then,

$$5003 \div 1702 \times \# \times 5 \times 10 \dots \dots \dots = 461.17 \text{ and } 29.9826 \times 2 \times 100 \div 9 \div 4 \div \# \times 412.13 \dots \dots \dots = 2185 \text{ then } 2185 \div 235.5 \times \# \times 7 \div 2 \div 2 \div 10 = 51.00375 = 51^\circ 00\# 13\#$$

equals the acute angles of the Inclined Stone above the Entrance Passage } = $51^\circ 00' 00'' 5003 \div 230.47 \times \# \div 3 \div 10 = 2.27433$ } $13221 \div 2.2744$ } ... = 5813

The Deficiency, so distinctly pointed out by the Difference in the thickness of the masonry courses, is also symbolised by the difference in the height of the Two Wainscots in the Ante-chamber; they also symbolise the "Zone of water" in one hemisphere. Then,

$$5003 = 3.699231 \text{ West Wainscot} = 111.8 = 2.071882 \text{ } 1.627349 \# = 0.497149 \text{ } 2)133.2 = 2.124490 \text{ } 66.6 = 1.823472 \# = 0.497149 \text{ } 1.326323 \text{ East Wainscot} = 103.1 = 2.013259 \text{ } 2185.4 = 3.339582 = 2185.4$$

equals the Height of the Apex of the "Zone of water"; and $2185.4 \div 5 = 437$, equals the deficiency at the end of the 10,842 years (in inch feet); and $437 \div 10 = 43.7$, equals the width of the stones in the ceiling of the Grand Gallery, equals the depth of the stone under the Granite Leaf, and $43.7 \times 10 \times 5 = 2185$, and the stone under the Granite Leaf symbolises the "Zone of water" passing the Flood Gates of the Ocean, which open at the end of the period; for then the Ocean breaks its bounds, and causes universal destruction and the "Death of all Science "for ages after.

The three cylindrical hollows on the top of the West Wainscot are cut down equal to 8.5 inches.

$$50030 \div 7391.5 \times \# \times 4 \div 10 \dots \dots \dots = 8.50568 \text{ } 882000 \div (412.13 \times ?) \times \# \div 2 \div 100 \dots \dots \dots = 8.5 \text{ } 4863 \div 359.26 \times \# \times 2 \div 10 \dots \dots \dots = 8.505 \text{ } 237000 \div 7743 \div 6 \div 3 \times 10 \div 2 \dots \dots \dots = 8.50005 \text{ } 111.8 - 103.1 = 8.7. \text{ The whole length of the Horizontal Passage is equal to } 1517.9 \text{ inches, this } \div 273.9 \times \# \div 2 \dots \dots \dots = 8.7 \text{ } 3393 \div (50.034 \div ?) \times \# \times 4 \div 3 \div 10 \dots \dots \dots = 8.7215 \text{ } 2739 \div 989 \times \# \dots \dots \dots = 8.7005 \text{ } 5276 \div [20964 \div (7743 \div ?)] \times \# \div 2 \div 10 \dots \dots \dots = 8.72$$

$$\text{and } 92000000 \div (109.25 \times ?) \times \# \div 10 \dots \dots \dots = 8.5 \text{ } 20964 \div 12913.26 \times \# \div 3 \div 2 \times 10 \dots \dots \dots = 8.5003 \text{ then } 2185 \div 8.7 \times \# \div 3 \div 10 = 26.3063 \dots \dots \dots = 26^\circ 18\# 22\# \text{ equals the angle of the passages } \pm. \text{ } 35926 \div 412.13 \times \# = 273.86 \times 10 \dots \dots \dots = 2739 \pm 35926 \div 206.06 \times \# \div 4 = 136.9325 \times 10 \dots \dots \dots = 1369.5 \text{ } 5276 \div 10 \div \# \times (61.83 \times 4 \div ?) \dots \dots \dots = 13221 \text{ equals } 20964 \text{ years, less } 7743 \text{ years... } \dots \dots \dots = 13221 \text{ years } 237000 \div 48.9 \times \# = 15.22 \times 2 \times 10 \dots \dots \dots = 304.4 \text{ equals the transverse height of the Grand Gallery. } 2739 \div 9 = 304.333$$

The King's Chamber symbolises the end of the period. The apex of the "Zone of water" has then arrived back at the equator; this is symbolised by the floor rising up on the lower course of stones equal to 5 03, because $235.5 - 230.47 = 5.03$. Then the Arm is equal to $1303.2 \pm$; this $\div 3 = 434.4$ and $434.4 \times 5.03 = 2185$ equals the height of the apex; and $1302.1 \div 100 \div \# \times 515.16$ equals 2185, and 515.16 is equal to the cubic or solid diagonal of the King's Chamber; and,

$$5003 \div 412.13 \times \# \times 7 \div 4 = 66.7397 \text{ } 66.73 \times 100 \times \# = 20964 \div 2 \text{ } \dots \dots \dots = 10,482$$

equals the period of the "Zone of water," and $1369.5 \text{ years} + 7743 + 1369.5 = 10,482 \text{ years}$, equal to the Half of the Circle as shown in the figure; then,

$$2185 \div 412.13 \times \# \times 4 \times 9 \div 100 \div 2 = 29.9826 = 29^\circ 58\# 57\# \text{ } 2185 \div 309.15 \times \# \times 3 \times 9 \div 10 \div 2 = 29.97945 = 29^\circ 58\# 46\#$$

and 412.13 is equal to the length, while 309.15 is equal to the diagonal of one of the walls of the King's Chamber; and,

$$5003 \div 18 \times \# \times 2 \dots \dots \dots = 1746.36 \text{ equals the Date } 20964 \div 339.3 \times \# \times 3 \times 3 \dots \dots \dots = 1746.9 \text{ equals the Date and the Foundation was laid } \dots \dots \dots 1744.5 \text{ or } 1746.5 \text{ BF and } aA + AE = 375 + 1369.5 \text{ (in inch years)} = 1744.5 \pm \text{ BF (in inch years).}$$

When we arrived at the Junction of the Passages, we symbolically commenced a new period. We have now arrived in the King's Chamber, and at the end of the second period, and $10,482 \times 2 = 20964 \text{ years}$ equals the whole circle.

I have told you that the tranverse plates symbolise the "Zone of water."

One of the distances of these plates is ... =799in. The length of the King's Chamber is ... =412.13in. $412.13 \div 2 = 206.065$, this $\times 4 = 82.428$ in.

Then, $82.428 = 1.916075 \# = 0.497149 \ 1.418926$ Measure of Transverse Plate = $799 = 2.902547 \ 2)20964 = 4.321473 \ 10482$ = 10,482 equals Half the Circle as shown in the Figure; and $206.06 \div 10 \div \# \times (132.934 \div 10)$ = 87.19in. equals the greater cubic diagonal of the Coffin in the King's Chamber.

And the angle *BEC* is equal to $132^\circ 56\# = 132.934$ as used above. The annual Deficiency is equal to 0.5003in. at the pole.

$.5003 \times 10 \times 1000 = 5003$ in. $\div 1702 \times \# \times 5 = 461.17$

and the diagonal of the floor of the King's Chamber = 461.19 ±

Are these proofs? I ask; or, can former writers prove their assertions by the same scientific method? It is *Truth* we want, not *assertion*.

In the calculation of the Sun's force you see I use the Sun's diameter as equal to 882,000 miles, the Sun's lesser distance as equal to 92,000,000 miles. Then, in the terms of the Inch, etc.,

$92000000 \div 882000 \div 5 = 39.97766 \ 1 \}$ = $26^\circ 18\# 00\#$ $39.98 \times 4 \div 8 \div \# \times 4.863 = 26.3$ } equals the mean angle of the Passages ±. $26.3 \div 4.863 \times \# \times 8 \div 4 \div \# \div \# \times \}$ = $132^\circ 56\# 05\#$ $38.61 = 132.934$ } equals the angle *B E C*, as shown in the Figure; and $132.934 \div 60 \div 60 \times 61.83\#$ = 7743 years equals the arc *B s C*, which subtends the above angle, as shown in the Figure: and

$10482 \text{ years} - 7743 = 2739$. This divided by 2 = 1369.5 years. $10482 \times 2 = 20964 =$ the Circle

and the 38.61 used above is equal to the mean external breadth of the Coffin in the King's Chamber; and $26.301 \div 2 \times 10 \times 3 \times 237000$ = 93500000

NOTE.—($11025.3 \div 10 \div 3 = 387.51$. This $\times 237,000 = 91,840,000$).

equals the mean distance of the Sun (in inch miles), and 237000 is equal to the distance of the Moon as used in the calculation.

You will notice above that I have found the angle *B E C* equal $132^\circ 56\#$ and the arc subtending it. I will now find the angle *A E B* and are subtending it, as follows:—

The inner depth of the Coffin is equal to 34.31in. ±, and the width of the Grand Gallery above the Ramps is equal to 82.2in. ±, then $34.305 \times 10 \div 3 \div \# \times 82.2 = 2992$ $2992 \div 34.31 \times \# = 27.396 \times 100 = 2739.6$ equals the arc *AB = AE + EB = 1369.5 \times 2 = 2739.0*

as shown in the Figure; then,

$2739 \text{ years} \times 61.83\# \div 60 \div 60 = 47.067 \pm = 47^\circ 4\# 0\#$ equals the angle *AEB*, as shown in the Figure.

The thickness of the walls of the Coffin is equal to 5.99; then again,

$2992 \div 5.99 \times \# \times 3 = 4707 \div 100 = 47.7 = 47^\circ 4\# 12\#$ and $2739 + 7743 = 10482$ years equals the period of the "Zone of water" equals Half the Circle.

The mean inner length of the Coffin is equal to 77.85in.

$2992 \div 77.85 \times \# \times 4 = 483.0 \div 100 = 4.830$

equals the mean rise of the daily tide, equals 4.837 ± as used in the calculation. Then the cubic diagonal of the Coffin is equal to 87.15 ±, and,

$2992 \div 87.15 \times \# = 109.25$. This $\times 10 \times 2 = 2185$

equals the height of the Apex of the "Zone of water," equals the Force of the Sun as compared to that of the Moon, according to their mass and distance equals as $2185 : : 4.837$.

$5003 \div 461.19 \times \# \times 2 \times 9 \div 10 \div 2 = 30.030$ $30.033 \times 100 \times 6 \div \# \times 4 = 18225$

equals $20964 \text{ years} - 2739 \text{ years} = 18225 \text{ years}$

In the following calculation of the Sun's force, etc., as you see, I use the following numbers, and I will test each as I give them to you. Then, in the terms of the Inch, in the terms of #—

$92000000 \div \# \times 7 \times 94 \div 4 \ 4 \div 1000 = 461.2275$ in.

the diagonal of the floor of the King's Chamber = 461.19in.

then, 237.000 in. $\times \# \times 7 \div 4 = 1302.73$ in.

the low portion of Horizontal Passage floor deducted from the whole length = 1302.0in.

and $882.000 \times \# \times 3 \div 100 = 83.1255$ in.

the diagonal of inner west wall of the Coffin = 83.13in.

then $2160 \times \# \div 2 \div 10 = 339.29$ in.

the mean vertical height of the Grand Gallery = 339.3in.

and $359.26 \times \# \times 7 \div 3 \div 10 = 26.3293 = 26^\circ 19\# 47.48\#$

equals the angle of the Passages ± = $26^\circ 18\# 00\#$

then $5276 \times \# \times 7 \div 3 \div 1000 = 38.677$ in.

the mean outside breadth of the Coffin = 38.61 in.

$4.837 \times \# \times 7 \div 2 = 53.186 = 53.2$ in.

the height of the north end of the Ascending Passage = 53.2 in.

$$2185 \times \# = 6834 \div 2 \div 100 = 34.32\text{in.}$$

the mean internal depth of the Coffin = 34.31 in.

If a sphere of the mass of the Moon at her distance has a force of attraction acting upon the waters of the ocean sufficient to cause a mean rise of tide equal to 4.837ft., what should be the force of attraction of a sphere of the mass of the Sun at its distance (when the Earth is in the perihelion of its orbit) in those parallels of latitude where it exerts its greatest force throughout the period of 10,482 years?

The Moon's diameter ... = 2160 = 10.003362 .5236 = -1.719000 5276, etc., etc. ... = 9.722362 The Sun's distance ... = 92000000 = 15.927576 25.649938 The Sun's diameter ... = 882000# = 17.836407 .5236 = -1.719000 35926. etc., etc. ... = 17.555407 The Moon's distance ... = 2370002 = 10.749400 28.304807 Mean rise of daily tide... = 4.837 = 0.684576 28.989383 25.649938 2185ft = 3.339445 The Sun's force: the Moon's force: 2185ft. : : 4 837ft.

The parallel of latitude where this force of the Sun will be exerted is governed by the position of the perihelion point—as it is near or distant from the equinoctial point on either side.

In the Figure, the Circle represents the period of the perihelion equal to 20,964 years from the time it leaves one equinoctial point till its return to the same again; its annual motion is equal to $11.63\# + 50.2\# = 61.83\#$.

Because the motion of the perihelion and the precession move in opposite directions, therefore I use the sum of these two motions equal 61.83#.

And it is during those years when the perihelion point of the Earth's orbit is within $23\frac{1}{2}^\circ$ of the Equinox on either side, or between A and B, or C and D, as shown in the Figure, that this "Zone of water" is in motion, moving to the north or south as the case may be.

In the calculation, the distance of the Sun from the Earth is equal to 92,000,000 miles equal the lesser distance, because it is when the Earth is in the perihelion of its orbit that the Sun will Note.— $93500000 \div 35926 \div 2 = 1301.3$. Then $92000000 \div 296 \times \# \times 4 \div 3 \times 10 = 1301.026$ } $1301.0 \div 100 \times 3 \div \# \times 7391.5$ } = 91840.000 91840 $\times 1000 = 91840000$ equals the lesser distance of the Sun \pm in Inch miles. exert its greatest force upon the waters under its influence during the period.

Then the obliquity of the ecliptic will be governed by the position in latitude of the apex of this "Zone of water," and the position in latitude of the apex will be governed by the position of the perihelion point of the Earth's orbit.

Therefore the Sun exerts its greatest force upon the waters of the ocean, first in one hemisphere, then in the other, according to the position of the perihelion point. And, as the perihelion passes the equinox once every 10,482 years, the apex of this "Zone of water" will be at the equator once every 10,482 years.

The Deficiency is caused by the continued action of the centrifugal force (during the 10,482 years) where the waters of that hemisphere which is free from the "Zone of water" during the above number of years. It is well known that the tendency of the centrifugal force is to urge the waters to recede from the axis and flow towards the equator and there heap themselves up.

The effect of the centrifugal force upon the other hemisphere is counteracted by the presence of the "Zone of water" during the 10,482 years.

The existence of this "Zone of water" acts as a counteracting force to the continued action of the centrifugal force.

If this "Zone of water" did not exist, the bulk of the ocean would be heaped up at the equator at the present day.

It has been the motion of this "Zone of water" periodically from one hemisphere into the other which has caused all the great changes of climate, etc., which have occurred in remote periods.

And the deposition of the various layers of sedimentary strata geologically proves it, because the material of each successive layer has been brought from a distance.

All this evidence proves that the annual precession of the equinox goes on uninterruptedly independent of the change which takes place in the obliquity of the ecliptic. As this "Zone of water" moves from one hemisphere into the other periodically, the motion of the poles of the Earth in their curvilinear path will be found to be the result, and not the cause, of the precession.

This will make it almost certain that the motion of the pole will be caused by magnetic influences which will not allow the pole to remain outside the tangent of the radius when the Earth arrives in the equinox—the Earth and the Sun being each magnets.

Any of you who are acquainted with the use of the globes will find that the precession can be accounted for independent of the angle of the ecliptic (by the use of *two* globes).

If they will set out the Earth's orbit, place the one representing the Earth in its orbit, the other to represent the Sun, you will soon see that by the use of one globe only the cause of the precession is lost sight of, because you cannot move one equinoctial point without moving its opposite an equal arc, and with the globe (representing the Earth) in its orbit you will see that the Earth must arrive annually in the equinox before it has

completed a sidereal revolution by an arc, equal the arc of precession; in fact, the Earth is annually behind an arc, equal the precession. This retreat of the Earth does not affect the sidereal year. But to arrive at how much the Earth is behind in any number of years, you have to multiply the annual precession by the number of years elapsed

That the Great Pyramid treats of the obliquity of the ecliptic I have hundreds of proofs. I can find you seven, or more, for every mile of change of angle, and each of these seven shall be within twenty seconds of arc of each other, and each a separate problem in the terms of the Inch, in the terms of π , in the terms of the Figure. This prehistoric monument is one of the grandest studies on the face of the earth. It is a Book of Stone, written in the language of symbols and numbers, in the terms of the Inch, in the terms of π . If you heed it not now, future ages will find Truth written there on every line.

In support of what I have said respecting the obliquity of the ecliptic, notice the following evidence:—
 $20964 \div \# \div 296 \times \# \div 3 \dots = 23.6066 = 23^\circ 36\#24\#$
 $8687.87 \div 7743 \times \div \# \div 2 \dots = 23.611 = 23^\circ 36\# 39.6\#$
 $365.24 \div 182.25 \times \# \times 3 \div 4 \times 10 \div 2 = 23.609625 = 23^\circ 36\# 34.6\#$
 $51.8504^* \div 9.2 \times \# \times 4 \div 3 \dots = 23.606 = 23^\circ 36\# 21.6\#$
 $132.934 \div (309.6 \div 10) \times \# \times 7 \div 2 \div 2 = 23.605975 = 23^\circ 36\# 21\#$
 $7743 \div (10303.3 \div 10) \times \# \dots = 23.609 = 23^\circ 36\# 32\#$
 $71317 \div \# \div 3000 \times \# \div 4 \div 2 \times 10 = 23.6025 = 23^\circ 36\# 9\#$
 then $23.6022 \times 3 \times 3 \div 2 = 107.71$. This $\times 882000 = 95000000$ equals the greater distance of the Sun (in inch miles); and $95000.000 \div 51.8504^* \times \# \times 4 \div 1000 = 23.024 = 23^\circ 1\# 26\#$
 $92000.000 \div 47.067 \times \# \times 3 \div 4 \div 2 \div 100 = 23.028375 = 23^\circ 1\# 42\#$
 $2160 \div 442 \times \# \div 4 \times 6 \dots \dots = 23.0295 = 23^\circ 1\# 44\#$
 $50.03 \div \# \div 6.52 \times \# \times 3 \dots \dots = 23.0211 = 23^\circ 1\# 15\#$
 $92000000 \div 91840000 \times 7 \times 10 \div 3 = 23.03033 = 23^\circ 1\# 49.2\#$
 then $5276 \div 51.8504 \times \# \times 3 \div 4 \div 10 = 23.97225 = 23^\circ 58\# 20\#$
 $35926 \div [5813 \div (7743 \div \#)] \times \# \div 2 \div 100 = 23.975 = 23^\circ 58\# 30\#$
 $20964 \div 10303.3 \times \# \times 3 \div 4 \div 2 \times 10 = 23.9704 = 23^\circ 58\# 13\#$ etc., etc.

NOTE.— $51^\circ 51\# 14\#$. equals the $\#$ angle of the casing stones.

I could give you, as I said before, hundreds of proofs like these; in fact, I have in manuscript, proofs in the like manner for every answer I have given in these few pages.

What is the boasted date, given by the author of our inheritance, in comparison to the evidence of the date which is given here? I can give you a hundred proofs of the date, and it is an astronomical date, not a theological one.

The Great Pyramid is a scientific record, designed and erected by the people of a former period to symbolise to us a most interesting problem in physical science, which all people should know, for it explains the mode of operation of those Divine laws which govern the whole universe, and these laws are the laws ordained by the Great Architect of the universe.

But this prehistoric monument tells you nothing about the Christian dispensation; all that has been said to that effect is merely emotional assumption, arising from ignorance of the real meaning of the symbols and admiration of the grandeur of the whole structure. All people are apt to attribute to Divine agency great works which they cannot read the real meaning of.

Let us hope that those who have endeavoured to prove the truth of their assertions will, in honour of the builders, in honour of the Great Architect of the universe, now endeavour to make known the true reading of the symbols and measures of this ancient monument, free from all fallacy; that all nations may understand the astronomical and physical forces which govern the position of this "Zone of water," its period and its motions, and thus learn something of the true history of the past prior to the Deluge of our history.

John Leith,
 Manukau South Head,

Auckland, N.Z.

April 16th, 1885.

P.S.—To enable me to publish the Theory, and the meaning of all the Symbols in full, I must ask those who wish for more information to send in their names as willing to subscribe for it.

J. L.

WILSONS & HORTON, PRINTERS, QUEEN AND WYNDHAM STREETS.

THE PROBLEM OF THE GREAT PYRAMID OF EGYPT

Is built up in the terms of the Inch, in the terms of $\#$. In the Figure, the Circle represents the Period of the Perihelion, equal to 20,964 solar years, each year equal to 365.24 days. Its annual motion is equal to $11.63\# + 50.2\#$ equals $61.83\#$.

365.24 + &c × 2 : : 1 : #.

Mathematical diagram

Arc AB is equal to 2739 years. Then, $2739 \times 61.83 \div 60 \div 60 = 47.067?$ equals Angle A E B = 47° 4# 0#.

Arc BC is equal to 7743 years. $7743 \times 61.83 \div 60 \div 60 = 132.934^\circ$ equals Angle B E C = 132° 56# 0#.

$25,827 \div 7391.5 \times 1000 = 3494 \times 6 = 20,964 \div 2 = 10,482 =$ the Period of the "Zone of water."

$10,482 - 2739 = 7743$. This, divided by $365.24 \times \# \times 9 \div 2 \div 10 = 29.9706$ equals 29° 58# 14# = the Latitude of the Great Pyramid in the terms of the Inch, in the terms of #.

= Log. 0.497149, &c.

$5813 \times 2 = 11626 =$ the diameter of the Circle (as shown in the Figure) equals E E.

$9131 \text{ in.} \times 4 \div 100 = 365.24$.

In the Figure, aA = 375 years; add AE, 1369.5 years = 1744.5. This, multiplied by $61.83 \div 60 \div 60 = 29^\circ 58\# 9.44\#$. Latitude, by observation, equals 29° 58# 51# N.

The Foundation was laid 1744.5 years ± BF.

The Vertical height is in the terms of the Lesser distance of the Sun; therefore, 91,840,000 is equal to the Lesser distance ± (in inch miles).

$51^\circ 51\# 14\# = 51.8504 + (61.83 \times 4) \times \# \times 4 \div \# \times 625 = 20964 =$ the Circle.

NOTE.—The answers are to be read "symbolically" as equal to (in the terms of the Inch).

Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Royal Society.

"On the Total Solar Eclipse of September 9, 1885 (in a Letter to Professor STOKES, Sec. R.S.)." By JAMES HECTOR, M.D., F.R.S., Director of the Geological Survey, New Zealand. Received October 22, 1885.

[From *the* PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY, No. 240, 1886.]

Wellington,

September 12, 1885.

DEAR SIR,

On the 5th instant I duly received your note of the 15th July, enclosing instructions drawn up by the Committee for observing the solar eclipse which took place here on the 9th.

The instructions were circulated in all quarters where they were likely to be of use. You will observe from the enclosures that unfortunately both the parties equipped by Government, in their anxiety to get as near the line of centrality as possible, encountered bad weather, so that no observations were made which can be considered to have scientific exactitude. The eclipse, however, was very distinctly seen at Wellington, and I have been able, with the assistance of friends and the accounts in the newspapers, to obtain the following information concerning it.

Scarlet prominences were only moderately developed, and were clustered chiefly at the equatorial and polar regions of the sun. The best observers agree that the corona had a very irregular outline, and was most continuous and vivid close to the sun's limb, having the longest expansion reaching to nearly two diameters from the western equatorial region. This large expansion appears to have had a strongly marked spirally twisted structure, while all the other appendages consisted of radiating pyramids. No laminated structures appear to have been observed in any part of the corona.

Most observers agree in describing an intensely brilliant flash or meteor, lasting for two seconds, at the commencement of totality on the eastern side of the sun, and exactly over the position of a large sun-spot that was just coming into view at a few degrees south of the sun's equator. This flash is described as having looked like a large electric lamp suspended at a little distance from the moon's edge. At the close of totality another flash, similarly bright, but not so large and pointed, was seen on the western limb of the sun in a position corresponding with a large sun-spot that was within 1' of arc of passing over the sun's edge.

The following is a list of the enclosures:—

- Notification of the Committee's instructions.
- Charts of shadow path showing the position of Dreyertown and Otahao.
- General time plan of eclipse by Mr. Arthur Beverly.
- Silver print of totality by M. Cazneau, Wellington.
- Enlarged drawing from a negative 1/8# in diameter of the totality, photographed by Mr. Gell, Wellington.
- Sketch by Mr. J. Buchanan, F.L.S.
- Three sketches taken during totality at Wellington by Mr. T. W. Kirk. These were taken in succession as marked 1, 2, 3, the sun being intersected by a plumb-line, and disclose the remarkable feature that the N.W. extension of the corona shifted its position with reference to the prominence.
- Generalised sketch from various sources, showing the outline of the corona, the position and shape of the prominences, and the positions, marked by red crosses, where vivid flashes of light were seen at the moment of beginning and end of totality. All agree that these flashes were like electric lights, and quite dazzling, the first being large and round, while the last seen was small and pointed.
- Sketch of the large spirally twisted flame of the corona over the N.W. quadrant, as sketched by Mr. H. P. Higginson, C.E., with a binocular glass. As Mr. Higginson observed and sketched the great eclipses of 1869 and 1870 in India, and is an accomplished draughtsman, he had previous experience to assist him.
- Complete sketch by Mr. Higginson of the total eclipse finished from a drawing made with a binocular.
- Sketch with the naked eye, by Mr. Alfred de Bathe Brandon, junr., which also shows the twisted character of the large coronal appendage.
- Sketch showing the position of the sun-spots that were visible at the time of the eclipse, (*a*) being a very large spot that was just passing off, (*b*) a spot not visible before the eclipse, which has since developed into an intensely black sharply defined spot of moderate size.
- Extracts from newspapers.

In conclusion, it is hardly necessary for me to state how much I regret that I am unable to give you fuller and more precise information founded on my own observation.

(Signed) J. HECTOR.

[The publication of a selection of the illustrations is deferred until some additional drawings or photographs expected from New Zealand shall have arrived. Enclosure No. 1, giving an account of a lecture delivered by Dr. Hector before the eclipse, is subjoined, with the omission of a portion at the beginning, the interest of which has now passed away.]

(Extract from Enclosure No. 1.)

The chief interest of the eclipse will lie in the observation of the scarlet prominences and of the silvery light of the corona or halo that surrounds the sun during the period of total darkness. The prominences may be expected to have great brilliancy, as for some weeks past the spots on the sun have shown that its surface is in a state of violent activity, and one of such unusual size as to be almost visible to the naked eye, will have reached such a position that it will coincide with the left hand edge of the sun at the time of the eclipse, and from this point unusually large flames should be looked for; for observing these flames it is necessary, in order to intensify their light, to use a fragment of rose-tinted glass. On the other hand, to observe the light of the corona to perfection, a very pale blue-tinted glass is necessary, so as to cut off the red light and intensify the pale silvery light of the corona. A telescope of high power is quite un-suitable to the observer, but a wide field opera glass will be useful. Instructions have been received from the Committee of the Royal Society, which relate partly to the taking of a photographic, spectroscopic, and other observations that require special instruments, but the following extracts may be of use to most observers:—Drawings of the corona have only seldom proved to be of great utility. If such drawings are attempted on the present occasion, observers ought to pay attention to the general outline of the corona rather than to points of detail. A plumb line ought to be suspended, if possible, between the observer and the sun, so as to fix the position of the corona in the sky as accurately as possible. The vertical line ought to be indicated on the drawing. Observers will find it useful to draw the black disk of the sun and the vertical line before the beginning of totality. . . . Observers unpractised in accurate drawing will obtain more useful results by paying attention to certain features of the corona than by attempting what can only be a very rough and inaccurate sketch of the corona. Definite answers as to the following questions, for instance, would be of great value:—(*a*) To what distance from the sun, estimated in solar diameters, can you trace the corona? (*b*) Does it extend further in some directions than in others, and what are the directions of greatest and least extent? (*c*) Is there a line of approximate symmetry in the corona, and what is the direction of that line? The answers to the last two questions ought, if possible, to be given in angles from the vertical line, or from some definite great circle.

HARRISON AND SONS, PRINTERS IN ORDINARY TO HER MAJESTY, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.