

# State Education. A Paper Read Before the Otago Schoolmasters' Association.

By Mr. Robert Stout.

Mr PRESIDENT,—When, four weeks ago, I consented to introduce for discussion at this meeting, the subject of Free and Compulsory Education, I stated that I had not prepared any paper on the subject, and that my other engagements would preclude me, from giving it that time, and consideration, which it deserved. I have found, the more I studied the subject, that I had underrated the difficulties I laboured under, in making remarks on a topic of such magnitude and importance. It appeared to me, however, that there lay at the root of Free and Compulsory Education, the broad question of the duty of the State to educate; and that until this question had been disposed of, there could be little hope of any debate, of much usefulness, for there would be a perpetual recurrence and reference to this question of State Education. I have, therefore, preferred to ask you to discuss this question of State Education, or the duty of the State to educate, before the details of the amount of the State Grant, or the right of compulsion be considered. I may grant at once, what cannot, I think, be denied, namely, if it be the duty of the State to educate gratuitously, the youth in its domains, it is bound to compel attendance at its schools. It is, I know, urged, that it is the duty of the State to compel attendance at school, or as it has been put by Mr Mill, to require a certain proficiency in knowledge from the citizens, not with standing that the State does not educate; to this question, however, I shall allude towards the close of my paper.

Before I begin, let me once, and for all, state that I am greatly indebted to the writings of Mr Herbert Spencer for many of my arguments, and that I have consulted several works on Political Economy, History, &c. I make this statement, so that I may not be accused of borrowing other people's ideas without due recognition.

In determining whether it is the duty of the State to educate, the question arises—What is the duty of the State? What limits ought to be set to Governmental interference? Humboldt, in his 'Sphere and Duties of Government,' has answered "security and protection;" while Spencer, echoing his ideas in his work 'Social Statics,' has carried this statement to its legitimate issue. I thoroughly believe in this definition of a State's function, and indeed, in theory, it is one that is generally granted to be right. In practice, however, the philosophers of expediency set right and justice aside, following Burke in his statement, that "politics ought to be adjusted, not to human reasoning, but to human nature; of which the reason is but a part, and by no means the greatest part," and as the same great orator said in his speech on American Taxation "I am not here going into the distinction of rights, nor attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions." But what is a State? Is it not a voluntary political association, for mutual protection? Of course individualism must to a certain extent be sacrificed, but sacrificed only to this extent, that the rights of all shall be respected. And the State, by assuming functions, which really are not necessary for the protection of the life and property of the citizens, ceases to be a protector, and becomes a tyrant; and the form of government, under which this wrong is committed, by whatever name it is called, is, so far, despotic and unjust. The surrender of the rights of the individual is often greatly exaggerated, and as has been remarked by an able writer, the more liberty an individual acquires in a State, so much the more is there liberty in that State. We must admit, and keep in remembrance during this discussion, that there is a moral law binding on the State to the individual, as much as one binding on the latter to the former. I speak then not of mere legal rights, or of the social rules which at present guide us, but I base my assertion of State duties on what ought to be—on what is morally and theoretically just. I appeal to the higher law of justice and right.

But to come to the question to be discussed, and not forgetting the definition of a State's duty I have adopted, I ask what is education? For the onus of proving that state education is proper—is right—lies not on the opponents of State education, but on its supporters. Suppose, as an opponent of State education I ask—What is it? Where is the line to be drawn—in age, in learning? How old should a person be before being relieved from the watchful eye of the State educator? How large should be his acquirement? Where between a dame school, and the most comprehensive University curriculum, is the line to be drawn? At the three R's, answer you? Spencer, using the Socratic method, at once says—"What peculiar quality is there in reading, writing, and arithmetic which gives the embryo citizen a right to have them imparted to him, but which quality is not shared in geography, and history, and drawing, and the natural sciences? Must calculation be taught because it is useful? Why, so is geometry, as the carpenter and mason will tell you; so is chemistry, as we may gather from dyers and bleachers; so is physiology, as is abundantly proved by the ill-health written on so many faces. . . . Where is the unit of measure, by which we may determine the respective values of different kinds of

knowledge?" The three R's are not education; nay, the sciences I have enumerated do not constitute a sound education. If the State were simply to teach even what is termed a *sound English education* (whatever that signifies) is its work accomplished? Mazzini states—"You know how to read. What avails this knowledge, if you are unfit to judge between the books containing error, and those containing truth? You have learned to communicate your thoughts to your fellow men in writing. What avails this knowledge if your thoughts are the mere reflex of your own egotism?" So far, then, it seems as there is a difficulty, I had almost said an impossibility, in determining what is this education the State ought to provide. And the question of age will just be as difficult. At what age ought the State schoolmaster to give up his (charge? Suppose a man ignorant of political economy, and called upon, not only to exercise the franchise, but to fulfil the honorable duties of a legislator for this State, ought he not, at the expense of the State, to be made acquainted with his duties? nay, to be compelled to study what are the elements of his profession—what are the three R's of a political education? Where are you, I ask, to draw the line? Then again, we witness often in a community agitations arising, demanding laws founded on theories long ago exploded, is it not the duty of the State to step in here, and with judicious instruction, train its citizens in the way they should walk?

But granting that we have determined what this education is, which the State should furnish, and the class to whom it should be given, we may be met by this query: You State educators, who are carefully tending the minds of the embryonic citizens, what about their bodies? Is physical health of such small importance that you pass it by as unworthy of notice? Here are citizens poorly clad, poorly fed; citizens who pay no attention to regimen, who, careless of the change of the seasons, lay themselves open to attacks of many diseases, in spite of your physiological tuition. For instance, I read in a report by Dr Simon, the following:—"Let any person devote an hour to visiting some very poor neighborhood in the metropolis, or in almost any of our large towns. Let him breathe its air, taste its water, eat its bread. Let him think of human life struggling there for years. Let him fancy what it would be to himself to live there in that beastly degradation of stink, fed with such bread, drinking such water. Let him enter some house there at hazard, and, heeding where he treads, follow the guidance of his outraged nose to the yard (if there be one) or the cellar. Let him talk to the inmates; let him hear what is thought of the bone boiler next door, or the slaughterhouse behind; what of the sewer grating before the door; what of the Irish basket-makers up-stairs, twelve in a room, who came in after the hopping, and got fever; what of the artisan's dead body, stretched on his widow's one bed beside her living children." And I might quote other dreadful details, but I forbear. I ask then, why are you to stop at education? Is the body not to be cared for? Ought the State not to physic its citizens at fitting periods? nay, and when they are no more, prepare their bodies for the "city of the silent," and carry out the function laid down by an enthusiast, give every man a decent Christian burial.

But here I may be met by the assertion, education will right all these things. Knowledge is power, say some. It will fit all of us, for our duties to the State, and this is the proper sphere of State Education. Its aim is to make us fit for our social duties, and thus greater security will be given to liberty, and hence the State, by educating, is fulfilling its duty as protector of life and property. Well, what pray is a "good citizen," what is your ideal person fit for social duties and liberties? And who, pray, is to decide what a "good citizen" is? The State, say you. What? The Government to decide on a good citizen, and train all the embryos after this "golden calf"—using its own discretion first as to what a good citizen is, and also as to its method of training. This moulding must, I suppose, admit of no tampering. Ruthlessly must the State wield its power. Liberty of thought, or of action must be silenced. Private schools, except duly licensed, and inspected, will be unknown, as in Holland. Every teacher will be watched, and *quis custodiet custodias*? Books, except up to the regulation standard, will be banished, and who the Commission are to be, who are to frame the "index expurgatorius," I know not. Nay, we will have, as in China, the most minute regulations. The rules of propriety will be rigidly enforced. The "good citizen" will be guided by rules of sitting, talking, walking, bowing, reading, eating, dressing, etc., as in the Celestial Empire. And what amusements will be permitted, will also have to be decided. I may, however, be charged with exaggeration. Some may still say, dare you deny that education does not fit us for our social duties? I reply not necessarily. Lieber, whom none can accuse of being an anti-State educationalist, says, in his work on Civil Liberty, "Education is not liberty itself, nor does it necessarily lead to it. Prussia is one of the best educated countries (written in 1853), but liberty has not yet found a dwelling place there. The Chinese Government is avowedly based upon general education, and democratic equality in the hierarchy of officers, but China has never made a step in the path of liberty. Education is almost like the alphabet it teaches—it depends upon what we use it for. Many despotic Governments have found it their interest to promote popular education, and the schoolmaster cannot establish or maintain liberty." Must it not be granted that there is an education of the faculties, which neither books nor schools can impart to a people, but which is necessary for the fulfillment of social duties? And then Mill, who is in favor of free and compulsory education, has to admit that this theory of a model citizen is utterly untenable. He says: "The objections which are urged with reason against State education do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, *but to*

*the State's taking upon itself to direct that education*—mark that—which is a totally different thing. That the whole, or any large part, of the education of the people should be in the State's hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity of opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people *to be exactly like one another*; and, as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the Government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation; *in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by a natural tendency to one over the body.*" So much for the good model citizen, trained to his social duties, such moulding being necessary for liberty.

It may, however, be said by some, as it has been said by Mill, "In the matter of education, the intervention of government is justifiable, because the case is one in which the interest and judgment of the consumer, are not sufficient security for the goodness of the commodity." Now, why should education be alone singled out as a subject in which the interest and judgment of the consumer, independent of the State's interference, shall not be the proper test? If *this assertion* be sufficient to insure the State's interference, clearly the State will be bound in other matters to see that "the interest and judgment of the consumer" are sufficient guides to the citizen. What we eat, do our interest and judgment always lead us to a sound decision? Do we always drink what is good for our health? Are there none in a community ruined by intemperance, and by want of using proper means of sustaining health? On such an assumption, Henry VIII's Statute declaring it penal to sell any pins but such as are "double-headed, and have their head soldered fast to the shank, and well smoothed; the shank well shaven, the point well and round filed, and sharpened;" and the regulation of James I. fixing the quantity of ale to be sold for a penny, were perhaps justified by the lack of "interest and judgment" in the consumer. This argument, as is well known, is the stock one in favour of State Religion—the masses are not fit to distinguish true from false religion. Indeed, this theory carried out strictly in practice, would justify all the oppression, and all the governmental interference that has disgraced our historic annals. For instance, a Mr Rugg, (M.R.C.S.,) has published "a pamphlet to point out the injury inflicted upon poor ignorant householders by the adulteration of milk," and proposing as a remedy that there shall be government officers to test the milk, and confiscate it when not sound, inspect cow-sheds, &c, &c. And I read in a Melbourne paper, of the 16th of April, an article urging the Parliament of Victoria, to pass a statute (o compel all householders to ventilate their buildings according to Mr Arnott's plan, viz., inserting near the ceiling, a valve to open in the chimney flue, when the fires are not lighted: also, see 'Lancet,' October 1868, p. 531, as to State medicine. As to its being said education is peculiar, it is something not so tangible as milk, medicine, &c, it may be answered that every meddling, by a government, has the same excuse to back it. And were I even to admit that the consumer is not a proper judge, government interference would not be justifiable for two reasons, 1st. That the race is progressive, and that every gratuitous aid stops progress, *e.g.*, There is a great amount of bad farming in this Province, would the government be justified in superintending all the farms and dictating to the tillers of the soil, what crops to sow, and when? Can we not see we are gradually learning experience, and no forcing process will do us good. No pupil will ever learn to write if the teacher always holds his pen. No, the best teacher will allow the pupil to make mistakes, and blots innumerable, he well knowing that though at first the writing is not good, yet that his pupil will grow in knowledge. And so ought we to allow the masses, if they be incompetent to judge what is good education and what is not, to grow out of their imperfections and incompetency. But, 2nd. It is assumed that the government is a sufficient judge of the "goodness of the commodity." It is asserted that the interest and judgment of the government are sufficient security. Is this so? To whose judgment must we bow? To an intellectual priesthood, the dream of the Positivists? Not so in a democracy, for there the mass govern. And who is the mass? Is it not for its guidance that this interference is deemed necessary? Some one may say, but when a Government is what it should be, then.—True; but this is just the reason why interference is demanded, it is because people are not what they should be. No, as I said before, the world cannot be reformed in a day. We must allow for its growth—for the gradual evolution that often, despite our efforts to delay progress, is gradually raising humanity. Spencer has illustrated this idea very happily. "Did the reader ever watch a boy in the first heat of a gardening fit? The sight is an amusing, and not reconstructive one. Probably a slice of border—some couple of square yards or so—has been made over to him for his exclusive use. No small accession of dignity, and not a little pride of proprietorship, does he exhibit. So long as the enthusiasm lasts, he never tires of contemplating his territory; and every companion, and every visitor with whom the liberty can be taken, is pretty sure to be met with the request, 'Come and see my garden.' Note chiefly, however, with what anxiety the growth of a few scrubby plants is regarded. Three or four times a day will the little urchin rush out to look at them. How provokingly slow their progress seems to him. Each morning, on getting up, he hopes to find some marked change; and lo, every thing appears just as it did before. When *will* the blossoms come out? For nearly a week has some forward bud been flourishing with the triumph of a first flower, and still it remains closed. Surely there must be something wrong! Perhaps the leaves have stuck fast. Ah! that is the reason, no

doubt. And so ten to one you shall some day catch our young florist very busily engaged in pulling open the calyx, and, it may be, trying to unfold a few of the petals." Somewhat like this childish impatience is the feeling exhibited by not a few State educationists.

The convenient assumption, that the Government, in education, as was once believed to be the case in religion, is an infallible judge, is the basis of their interference. But one quotation, and I am done on this head; it is to show that the interference does not lead to the results anticipated,—and from Buckle : He says, speaking of the influence of religion, literature, and government:—"The German intellect, stimulated by the French into a sudden growth, has been irregularly developed, and thus hurried into an activity greater than the average civilisation of the country requires. The consequence is, that, there is no nation in Europe in which we find so wide an interval between the highest and the lowest minds. The German philosophers possess a learning, and a reach of thought, which places them at the head of the civilised world. The German people are more superstitious, more prejudiced, and, notwithstanding the care which the Government takes of their education, more really ignorant, and more unfit to guide themselves, than are the inhabitants of either France or England." And, in a note, he adds—two points I will refer to:—"1st. The notorious fact, that the German people, notwithstanding their so-called education, are unfit to take any share in political matters, and have no aptitude for the practical and administrative parts of Government. 2nd. The fact, equally notorious to those who have studied the subject, that there are more popular superstitions in Prussia, the most educated part of Germany, than there are in England; and that the tenacity with which men cling to them is greater in Prussia than in England. For illustration of the practical working in individual cases of compulsory education, and of the hardship it causes, see a scandalous occurrence related in Laing's Notes of a Traveller; and as to the physical evils produced by German education, see Phillips on Scrofula." So much for State efforts and the results.

One of the greatest—indeed, it has been termed the greatest—argument for State education is, that it prevents crime. Now, I hold this has not been proved. Remember I am keeping to the basis of what is termed "a sound English education." If we were to confine our attention solely to the statistics of the number of ignorant criminals to be found in the goals, in comparison with the number of educated, and to this *alone*, it could not be proved; but even granting, which need not be granted, that the number of ignorant prisoners exceeds that of educated ones, does that prove that education prevents, and ignorance causes crime? It is, surely, quite possible for ignorance and crime to coexist, and yet the one not be the cause of the other. There is no need that ignorance be the cause and crime the effect. Burke asks, in one of his speeches, "May not a man have enjoyed better health during the time that he walked with an oaken stick, than afterward, when he changed it for a cane, without supposing, like the Druids, that there are occult virtues in oak, and that the stick and health were cause and effect." I fear there has been a too great tendency to overlook the difference between co-existence and cause and effect. Spencer, on this point, states, "Before any inference can be drawn, it must be shown that these instructed and uninstructed convicts come from the *equal* sections of society—alike in *all other respects* but that of knowledge; similar in rank, occupation, having similar advantages, laboring under similar temptations. \* \* \* The many ignorant criminals belong to a class most unfavorably circumstanced; whilst the few educated ones are from a class comparatively favored." To attribute crime to ignorance is about as wise, and as near the truth, as to blame, as some doctors have done, bad ventilation and want of cleanliness as the cause of theft. I do not intend to quote statistics. I may refer to Mr Somerville's Physical Geography, in which it is slated that education prevents crime, and statistics are given to prove such an assertion; but they utterly fail to do so. I may mention, however, the testimony of the author of London Labor and London Poor, and that of Mr Fletcher, an Inspector of Schools. The latter sums up his experience thus:—"Down to this period, therefore, the comparison of the criminal and educational returns of this, any more than of any other country of Europe, has afforded no sound statistical evidence in favor, and as little against, the moral effects associated with instruction as actually disseminated among the people." To which may be added the evidence of Messrs Guirea and Dupin, who have shown that the most highly educated districts in France are the most criminal.

Coleridge has termed a knave, a fool with a circumbendibus. Well, education only widens the circumbendibus; it does not make the knave honest. If education prevented crime, then all educated men would be honest, and all uneducated dishonest. Bacon and Napoleon would have been shining moral lights, while some of earth's greatest heroes would have, had they got their merits, ended their days in goal. What is this education supposed to give us, that it will hinder from crime?—a knowledge of the consequences of crime? Why what drunkard does not know his doom? What convict—once imprisoned—knows not what he has to expect on a repetition of his offence? What dissolute physician knows not that he is hastening his ruin? And, to tread on what is considered more sacred ground, how is it that all those, who have become members of a Christian Church, do not follow the great injunction—Sin no more? Education alone prevents crime? Why has not a priesthood, armed with the terrors of the Church, not stamped out immorality? backed, as it was, with a Superstitious regard, which has existed until the present day. No, crime must be cured, not by State interference alone; there must be an adaptability of the man to the social state: without this, crime will continue; and though

among the educated it *may* assume a different phase—though forgery may take the place of robbery, yet it will exist.

But I shall now turn to some objections which may be urged against education by the State. And 1st. I hold that the State is violating its functions by becoming the educator. I have stated that the sphere and duty of a State are security and protection. And, keeping to this definition, I shall again make a quotation from Spencer, to prove my contention, because he has illustrated the subject in a more forcible manner than I can do:—

*"Your taxes are heavier this year than last," complains a citizen to the Government. 'How is it ?'*

*'The sums for these new school-houses, and for the salaries of the masters and mistresses, have increased the draught upon our Exchequer,' replies the Government.*

*'School-houses, masters, and mistresses—what have I to do with these? You are not charging me with the cost of them, are you ?'*

*'Yes.'*

*'Why I never authorised you to do so.'*

*'True; but Parliament, or in other words, the majority of the nation, has decided that the education of the young shall be entrusted to us, and has authorised us to raise such funds as may be necessary for fulfilling this trust.'*

*'But suppose I wish to superintend the education of my children myself?'*

*'You may do as you please [but this would not be granted by Mill, etc.,]; but you must pay for the privilege we offer, whether you avail yourself of it or not. Even if you have no children you must still pay.'*

*'And what if I refuse ?'*

*'Why, were we to act up to old precedents, we should punish you; but as things now stand, we shall content ourselves with giving notice that you have outlawed yourself.'*

*'Now, I have no wish to do that. I cannot at present dispense with your protection.'*

*'Very well, then, you must agree to our terms, and pay your share of the new tax.'*

*'See, now, what a dilemma you place me in. As I dare not relinquish the protection I entered into political combination to obtain, I must either give you a part of my property for nothing, or, should I make a point of having some equivalent, I must cease to do that which my natural affections prompt. Will you answer me a few questions.'*

*'Certainly.'*

*'What is it that you, as a natural executive, have been appointed for ? Is it not to maintain the rights of those who employ you; or, in other words, to guarantee to each the fullest freedom for the exercise of his faculties, compatible with the equal freedom of all others ?'*

*'It has been so decided.'*

*'And it has been also decided that you are justified in diminishing this freedom, only to such extent, as may be needful for preserving the remainder, has it not ?'*

*'That is evidently a corollary.'*

*'Exactly. And now, let me ask, what is this property, this money, of which, in the shape of taxes, you are demanding from me, an additional amount? Is it not that which enables me to get food clothing, and better recreation; or, to repeat the original expression, that on which I depend for the exercise of most of my faculties ?'*

*'It is.'*

*'Therefore to decrease my property, is to decrease my freedom to exercise my faculties, is it not ?'*

*'Clearly.'*

*'Then this new impost of yours will practically decrease my freedom to exercise my faculties ?'*

*'Yes.'*

*'Well, do you not now perceive the contradiction ? Instead of acting the part of a protector, you are acting the part of an aggressor. What you were appointed to guarantee me and others, you are now taking away. To see that the liberty of each man to pursue the objects of his desires unrestricted, save of the like liberty of all, is your special function. To diminish this liberty by means of taxes, or civil restraint, more than is absolutely needful for performing such function, is wrong, because adverse to the function itself. Now your new impost does so diminish this liberty more than is absolutely needful, and it is, consequently, unjustifiable.'"*

I do not think I need say any more on this head.

The next objection I urge against State education is, that it tends to destroy parental influence and responsibility, and, therefore, uneducated as much, if not more, than it educates. Before, however, I offer arguments in proof of this assertion, it will be necessary to take up what I promised to do at the commencement, namely, the argument that it may be the duty of the State to compel a certain acquirement in knowledge by each citizen. J. S. Mill defends this in his Essay on Liberty. "Consider, for example," says Mill, "the case of Education. Is it not almost a self-evident axiom, the State should require and compel the education

*up to a certain standard* [the model citizen which he himself condemns] of every human being who is born its citizen"? Yet who is there that is not afraid to recognize and assert this truth? Hardly anyone, indeed, will deny that it is one of the most sacred duties of the parents (or, as law and usage now stand, the father,) after summoning a human being into the world, to give to that being an education fitting him to perform his part well in life towards others and towards himself. But while this is unanimously declared to be the father's duty, scarcely anybody, in this country, will hear to hear of obliging him to perform it. Instead of his being required to make any exertion or sacrifice for securing this education to his child, it is left to his choice to accept it or not, when it is provided gratis ! It still remains unrecognized, that *to bring a child into existence, without a fair prospect of being able, not only to provide food for its body, but instruction and training for its mind, is a moral crime, both against, the unfortunate offspring and against society; and that, if the parent does not fulfil the Obligation, the State ought to see it fulfilled at the charge, as far as possible, of the parent.*" Now, most heartily as I agree with the spirit of benevolence in this argument of Mill's, I believe, that had he his idea carried out, it would be productive of far more evil than good. The doctrine at the root of Mill's argument is, that the rights of children are involved as well as the rights of the State. Now I deny that the rights of the child are violated by a denial of education. Education does not prevent the fullest exercise of faculties, it does not diminish liberty. The child is at liberty to do whatsoever it wills in the best way it can, and this is all that can be demanded. "Every aggression, be it remembered," to again quote, "every infraction of rights is necessarily *active*; whilst every neglect, carelessness, omission, is as necessarily passive. Consequently, however wrong the non-performance of a parental duty may be,—however much it is condemned by the morality of beneficence—it does not amount to a breach of the law of equal freedom, and cannot, therefore, be taken cognizance of by the State." And Mill's argument, if at all pushed, would lead the State into interference as absurd as that of States in days gone by, to guard the citizens in all their dealings.

But I go farther and say, that even were it the duty of the State to interfere on behalf of children, Mill's theory would work more evil than good. It tends to destroy parental influence and responsibility, and hence uneducated. If any person is trained up in the belief, that the State is to have a fostering care of himself and offspring, he will lose that stimulus to self-restraint and self-denial, which he would otherwise acquire. And to this want of self-restraint is nine-tenths of the evil, that afflicts this world to be attributed. If there were no improvidence, there would be little poverty and less crime. And how is this self-restraint to be encouraged ? Must not experience and pain alone work a cure. Nothing but knowing, and feeling, that a wrong done brings punishment—aye, and without State interference—will improve the man of improvident habits and desires. Why to some men to this day, notwithstanding the knowledge diffused abroad by Combe's Constitution of Man, and kindred works, pain seems an evil instead of a good. Some are so philanthropic that to save an improvident man from punishment, they will place him in artificial and false circumstances. What, I ask, is a greater incentive to self-restraint than parental responsibility,—and if we diminish the one, we will assuredly diminish the other. If we train up men in the belief that a Government will feed and educate their children, and will, in old age, when they are unable to work, and, through their improvidence, they have no resources, give them a place of refuge—a workhouse for an asylum—Can we wonder at the carelessness and improvidence we see in the world ? Is it not a fact that the more the State undertakes for the family, the greater becomes the temptation to marry ? And hence the greater becomes the number of those moral crimes Mr Mill so much deploras.

Therefore, I hold State Education is educating one class at the expense of another. It confers knowledge at the expense of character. "It retards the development of a quality universally needed—one, in the absence of which, poverty, and restlessness, and crime, must ever continue; and all that it may give a smattering of information." Nay, it makes men forget their duties; it deadens that parental feeling for progeny, which nature has implanted in the bosom." What are we ? What is the State that we should improve on nature ? Throughout the universe offspring is cared for and tended. How rarely do parents neglect to feed their children! and these instances do not happen were it not for social laws. Assuredly nature is a better judge than we, and the less we interfere with nature's processes the better.

But I must not detain you longer. There is only one argument to which I shall yet allude. It is one that I know is sure to be used, and it is this—All nations find it expedient to aid education, or have some sort of a national system, and if this has been found necessary in the past, and in the present state of intellectual enlightenment, surely we are justified in following so many precedents. I do not think such a statement of much value : were I to apply it in discussing "State Churches," it would, I presume, be equally valid; and I hardly know of any nation that, fifty years ago, held other than the most strong protectionist ideas. But who dare say that Turgot and Adam Smith were wrong ? In like manner we may say of State Education that, granting that it may, as State Churches and protectionist theories are said to have done, aided progress in the state of society which has been in the past, it is no argument for its future continuance.

In conclusion, and to sum up my arguments, I started with showing the proper function of a State "security and protection" to life and property. I then showed that before the State could be called on to educate, it was the

duty of those in favour of State Education to tell me what it is, and when it is to begin and when to cease. This difficulty, nay impossibility, I have pointed out. I have asserted that once admit this doctrine of State care of minds, and State care of bodies must be enforced, and other absurdities will follow in their train. I stated that the argument that it was for the interest of the State to educate, so as to get good citizens, was utterly untenable. I have proved also that the State cannot interfere on the pretext that the people are not judges of what education is or ought to be, nor, on the other assumption that it makes crime cease. I have, I think, proved that State Education is a violation of the social compact, and unjust. I then showed that the State could not interfere on the plea of doing justice to the young. I have pointed out the evils of State Education by destroying parental responsibility, and uneducating those who need education most. Lastly, I have alluded to the fact, that the universality of a doctrine was no proof of its soundness. So far, my task is accomplished. Let me only beseech you not to found your opposition to me on such a shallow ground as that of expediency. It is never expedient to be "unjust;" and the assertion that it is so has caused many of the evils under which this world of ours has laboured and still labours. Might I also express a hope that, independent of the results that may follow our ideas, we will fearlessly discuss this subject, and that that bogie which sometimes affects some amongst us "the fear of meddling with politics," will for once be kept out of sight. May we conceive it to be our duty to fearlessly utter the highest truths conceivable by us, and endeavour to get embodied in fact our purest idealism, knowing that by these means, and by these only, are we playing our appointed part in this world.

Dunedin: Mills, Dick & Co., General Printers, Stafford Street, November 7, 1870.

By Major Richardson,

*Late Postmaster-General.*

AS the dissolution of the House of Representatives will shortly take place,

Written before the receipt of the Gazette dissolving the House of Representatives.

and thus my connection with the Electors of Dunedin and Suburbs North will be severed, I take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded me of expressing my views on the various topics which have lately occupied and still engross the public attention; and I do so the more readily because my opinions have been misconceived and my actions misrepresented, and not the less readily because the conclusions at which I have arrived, after mature reflection and careful observation, run counter to the opinions which find favour in Otago at the present moment. To state these conclusions unconnected with the past would place me in a false position, because it is their being the legitimate deductions from controlling circumstances of an inflexible nature, that have led to their adoption. It will be necessary, therefore, to sketch rapidly the past history of the Colony since 1860; its position when the City of Dunedin first honoured me with its confidence as one of its Representatives in 1862, and subsequently, where on my resignation after a division of the Electoral District, you elected me as one of your Representatives. It would be as impossible to arrive at a just judgment of what the country requires by confining the view to what may be at first sight desirable, as it would be to depict a broad landscape by restricting the vision to one isolated spot: and it would be doing me an injustice, which I am sure you would not willingly do, were you not to bear with me while I throw a retrospective glance on the past. Time will doubtless dissipate those baseless tales which have been so industriously circulated of late, and to it, as to a sure interpreter of the character of men's actions, I leave them. I am not, however, unreasonably anxious that, now our connection is about finally to close, you should have the opportunity of estimating aright the various phases through which the Colony has lately passed; and I have a strong conviction that, on an impartial review, you will acknowledge that the trust you confided to me has been fairly and honestly executed to the best of my judgment and ability. It has been said of me, both publicly and privately, that since I joined the Weld Ministry I had forgotten that I was a Representative of the Province of Otago, and that in fact I sacrificed the interests of the Province to the interests of the General Government. I demur altogether to this statement, for it has no foundation in fact. But it appears to me that the prevailing views of the duties of a Representative to the General Assembly are very erroneous. I have always held, and still hold, "that Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests, which interests each must maintain, as an agent and advocate against other agents and advocates; but Parliament is a *deliberative* assembly of one nation, with one interest, that of the whole,—where not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good, resulting from the general reason of the whole." "You choose a member indeed, said Burke, who represented the City of Bristol, but when you have chosen him, he is not member for Bristol, but he is a member of Parliament." It is the duty of a representative to live in the most unreserved communication with his constituents—it is his duty to prefer their interest to his own; but "his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to any man;" "he owes you not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion." But to whom have I been said to have sacrificed the interests of the Province? To the General Government? But, what is that but the embodiment of the central authority working for the general good: a body susceptible of constant change, as nearly every Session proves, and entirely subordinate to Provincial authority? Clothe it with what amount of

power you may, that power can be revoked; supply it with unlimited funds, those funds may from time to time be appropriated as the Provinces list. Let the Provincial constituencies send men to represent them in the General Assembly whose views are in harmony with their own, and the General Government will prove but an idea : if it is the Provincial wish that it should be strong, it can be clothed with strength; if but a name, it can divest it of all power. The Minister of to-day may be a private member to-morrow, and unconnected with the Legislature a few weeks after. I at present merely touch upon these general principles. The supposed examples of defection on my part will be noted in due course.

I will now proceed to give a faint outline of the past, and we shall find that the principal difficulty then, as now, was that connected with the aboriginal race, whose political status had never been accurately defined. Governor Browne, as may be seen in his letter of the 14th October, 1858, stated, with reference to Imperial matters, especially those dealing with the Natives, and negotiating for the purchase of native lands, that "he always desired the advice of Ministers—but would act on his own responsibility; and that this arrangement had been approved of by H. M.'s Government and accepted by the Assembly"; and, on the 30th of July, 1860, he asserts, when addressing the Houses of the Legislature, "the necessity of upholding Her Majesty's supremacy by force of arms," and the "preservation of the rights of the proprietors of land." In order that there may be no misapprehension on this important subject, I give extracts from a despatch of Lord Caernarvon, of the 18th May, 1859 :—"Circumstances do not yet justify the Imperial Government in abdicating the responsibilities which at present rest on it, with regard to this remarkable race."—"And while Her Majesty's Government feel themselves constrained to justify to Parliament the large expense which every year is incurred for the maintenance of a military force in New Zealand, for the defence of the Colony, and for the better control and regulation of the native race, they must retain in their hands the administration of these affairs, which at any moment may involve the employment of these troops, and the consequences of an expensive conflict. So long as the Colony for this purpose enjoys the advantage of military and naval protection, Her Majesty's Government cannot consent to yield a point, which, in their opinion, is so intimately connected with the security of the Colony, the justice due to native claims, and the issues of peace or war itself." The Colonial Office thus clearly announced their intention not to abdicate their responsibility unless the Colony were prepared for an "expensive conflict." On the meeting of the General Assembly, in 1861, (Messrs Stafford and Weld, with Mr., now Mr. Justice, Richmond, being in the Ministry) His Excellency's address, of the 4th June, stated "that the terms offered to the Taranaki and Ngatiruanui will be laid before you. Their aggravated offences can only be pardoned on their giving such tangible proofs of submission as will at once afford a means of reparation for their unprovoked aggressions, and be a memorial to themselves of the punishment due to lawless violence." The reply to the address echoing the same sentiments, was moved by Mr Jo lie, of Canterbury, and seconded by Mr O'Neil, of Auckland. Subsequently his Excellency requiring more explicit information as to the amount of assistance likely to be expected from the Colony, Mr. Stafford moved, while asserting that the maintenance of H. M.'s sovereignty was a matter of Imperial concern, and that the Colony had a vital interest in the firm establishment of peace and the security of life and property, that "the cost of the necessary measures for the attainment of this great end must be to us, at the present juncture, a secondary consideration, To the extent of the limited resources of the Colony, this House (as far as in it lies) both as regards men and money is willing cordially to co-operate with the Imperial Government."

## 1861.

In July, 1861, the Richmond-Stafford Ministry were replaced by one of which Mr. Fox was the leader; and, subsequently, a new Governor had succeeded Col. Gore Browne, and a new policy was to be instituted and experimented on, but the Natives could not be cajoled into submission. They had become imbued with the impression that a crisis in their national history had arrived—that now, or never, they must withstand the inroads of colonization before they were weakened by the evident decrease of their race, and they refused to listen to the words of peace. On the 30th November, 1861, Sir George Grey, in a letter to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, recommended the transference of the management of the Natives to the Assembly, and urges it by the following reasons :—

*"Another disadvantage of the system of making the Governor chiefly responsible for Native affairs, is, that it will be thought that the wars which may arise under it, have sprung whether rightly or wrongly, from the acts of the Representative of the British Government, over whose proceedings the Colonial Legislature but very imperfect control; so that it would seem difficult to call upon that body to find the means of defraying the cost of a war, for the origin, continuance, or conduct of which it was only in an indirect manner responsible."*

It was now evident that the suppression of the rebellion was becoming serious, and that in the dim vista of futurity were to be seen cropping out the rapidly accumulating liabilities which were necessarily involved in the

charge of the Native race.

Great hopes were entertained from the mission of Sir George Grey. The Colonial Office entertained an idea that the submission of the rebels was at hand; and consequently His [*unclear*: Grace] the Duke of Newcastle, on the 5th June, 1861, says, in reference to the men who could "scarcely be looked upon as subjects in rebellion," that it would be better even to prolong the war with all its evils, than to end it without producing in the Native mind such a conviction of our strength as may render peace, not temporary and precarious, but well grounded and lasting."

It was not to be supposed that such gilded arguments as those which the Governor brought forward could possibly be resisted. There was an apparent solution of a great and increasing Imperial difficulty, and His Grace, unmindful of the "justice due to Native claims," and of "the responsibilities which rested on the Government with regard to this remarkable race," is evidently prepared to abdicate all power, and to accept the position in which Sir George, acting on the recommendation above noted, had placed him; but, before deciding, it was necessary to be informed as to the willingness and power of the Colonists to meet their engagements under the newly arranged plan of ministerial responsibility. The Duke of Newcastle accordingly writes, on the 25th February, 1862:—

*"You inform me that you are conducting Native affairs, not as heretofore, through a Native Department, exclusively responsible in the first place to the Governor, and through him to the Home Government, but through and with the advice of a responsible Ministry, You You acquaint me with certain plans of improvement which you have proposed to your Government, involving the remission on the part of the Imperial Treasury of a sum probably amounting to about £25,000, from the contribution of £5 per head, which the Colony is bound to make to the expenses of British troops now in the Island.*

*"But while you thus inform me of the concession which you hope from Her Majesty's Government, you do not tell me by what sacrifices the Colonists are prepared to meet these concessions. I do not understand, for example, to what extent they are willing either to impose on themselves additional taxation, or to appropriate existing taxes to the improvement of the Maoris, or the support of any future war, or the liquidating the expenses of that which I hope is now concluded. Nor do you indicate the amount of personal effort which the Colonists are prepared to make in their own defence, and by which they may be enabled to dispense with military assistance, hitherto afforded them at the expense of Great Britain."*

There were, however, two other parties to this transaction. It was well enough for the Governor to recommend, the Ministry conditionally to accept, but there was still required the endorsement of the Legislature; and if the "remarkable race" were not to be considered merely as human chattel to go with the property, there was still needed the acceptance by the aboriginal race who had binding engagements with the British Government, under the Treaty of Waitangi; or, if this be a mere sham, who were an independent race inhabiting with us these islands. To this hour the Maoris have been treated as a thing of bought; they have never been consulted, and they have never agreed to the proposed change.

## 1862

On the 7th July, 1862; Sir George Grey met the General Assembly for the first time since his return to the country, and the House received him in a spirit of the utmost frankness. Old wounds, connected with the introduction of the constitution, were forgotten, and there appeared a general disposition to allow His Excellency sufficient means to test his plans for the restoration of peace and good will, though the position of the Taranaki Province was nevertheless not lost sight of. On the 23rd July, I moved for information respecting present and prospective military operations against the Taranaki and Ngatiruanui tribes, with reference to the murders committed and the plunder removed by them; and I also moved, on the same day, for information respecting the restoration of the Settlers to their homes in the Tataraimaka block, and both these motions were affirmed by the House.

On the 25th July, Mr Fox, the Colonial Secretary, moved a resolution on the subject of ministerial responsibility in Native affairs, which the House, not exactly approving of, and yet unwilling to reject, shelved, by passing to the "previous question." The votes being 22 on either side, the Speaker voted with the noes, thus leaving the subject an open one. This decision of the House led to the resignation of the Fox Ministry, and the acceptance of office by Mr. Domett, aided by Mr. Dillon Bell and others; and, on the 19th of August, Mr. Domett gave notice of a resolution on the same subject, by which the decision in all Native matters was left with the Governor, while the Ministry would, at his request, advise and administer, the Colony remaining free from any liability past or future. This resolution was carried by a majority of nine. The question, however, received a final decision when, on the 13th day of September, Mr. Domett moved, and the House adopted, an address to Her Majesty, in reply to a letter from His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, of the 26th May, 1862,

intimating that Her Majesty's Government recognizing "that the endeavour to keep the management of the Natives under their control had failed," had resolved to sanction the important step taken by His Excellency in placing the management of the Natives under the control of the General Assembly, subject to certain specified conditions. It may be sufficient to quote from this masterly remonstrance the following passage, as indicative of the position of the Colony:—"In respectfully declining, therefore, to accept the proposal of your Majesty's Government, we do so, not as shrinking from labours and burthens which we ought rightly to undertake, but, because, along with a desire on the part of your Majesty's Government to confer an apparent political boon on the Colony, we seem to discover in the despatches to which we have referred, the intention to withdraw from engagements to which the British nation is honorably bound, and to transfer to the Colony liabilities and burdens which belong to the Empire."

Thus stood the question at the close of the Session of 1862. But, while declining the task assigned us, the Legislature evinced its deep interest in the Natives by passing an Act which secured to them "the practical advantages of ownership in their lands," and gave them "titles which are recognised by our laws." "The Native Lands Bill" was a step in the right direction. By it the preemptive right of the Crown was waived, which had hitherto been jealously guarded, and through the instrumentality of which the price of land, from want of competitors, was kept low, while the difference between the buying and soiling price furnished a very needful supply to the Provincial Governments of the Northern Island for the purposes of government and colonization. On the important question of Ministerial responsibility in Native affairs, I protested against the power of the Crown to abdicate "its responsibilities without the consent of the Natives;" I strongly recommended "the avoidance of obligations which there was no power to fulfil," and I "earnestly entreated the House to pause before it saddled posterity with a debt which would crush it to the earth." I felt it to be my duty to vote against Mr. Fitzgerald's motion for the introduction of Her Majesty's Native subjects into the Executive and Legislative bodies, as I foresaw certain practical difficulties which appeared at the time insuperable. The motion was lost on a division of seventeen to twenty.

While appreciating at its full value the importance of the route to England *viâ* Panama, I was compelled to vote against the annual appropriation of £30,000 as a contribution to the service, endeavouring to restrict the duty of the Colony to assisting and encouraging the movement at a time when it was engaged in a contest needing all its energies and absorbing all its revenues. Mr. Dick's motion for the removal of the Seat of Government to the shores of Cook's Straits, which was lost on a division of 23 to 22, received my hearty co-operation. I scarcely need remind you that I opposed the "Otago and Southland Boundary Bill," which, if passed, would have abstracted a large portion of the Otago territory bordering on the Gold-fields and the Mataura; while the "Miners' Representation Bill" and the Representation Bill peculiarly affecting Otago had my support. Owing to the division of the Electoral District in consequence of the passing of this last-mentioned Act, I considered it my duty to resign my seat, and my resignation was intimated to the House of Representatives on the 12th September—at the close of the Session.

## 1863.

The Session of 1863, which commenced on the 19th of October, ushered in a new Ministry, of which it is no detraction to say that it was essentially an Auckland Ministry; for, though Mr. Fox of Wellington had been commissioned by his Excellency to reconstitute the Government, he assumed only the leadership of the House of Representatives and the office of Colonial Secretary, leaving the chief place in the new\* Executive to Mr. Whitaker of Auckland, the new Attorney-General, who, with Mr. Reader Wood as Treasurer, and Mr. Russell as Defence Minister—both of Auckland—formed a majority of the Ministry, the only other member being Mr. Gillies of Otago, the new Postmaster-General. The Native difficulty continued to assume a prominent feature in the Legislature, and the Session may be characterized as having given birth to three important measures in connection with the Native race—viz., "The New Zealand Loan Act" for £3,000,000; "The Suppression of Rebellion Act;" and "The New Zealand Settlements Act." Of the two latter, I will only say that, amid much anxious debating and much serious misgiving, they became law; for there were elements in them which savoured much of the darkest periods of English legislation; but, there being a very general opinion that large powers should be entrusted to the Government of the day to enable it effectually to grapple with an evil which was sapping the foundations of the prosperity of the Colony, the doubtful supporters of the Ministry gave a hesitating and timid adhesion to the Bills. These measures were accompanied by a gigantic scheme of colonization, which by the rapidity of its operation and the judicious selection of its self-supporting settlements was intended to prevent the possibility at any future time of the Natives again rising in insurrection against us. It was not to be expected that such vast results were to be obtained without an enormous expenditure; but in the eyes of the Legislature the magnitude of the expense was dwarfed in comparison with the expected solidity of

the results. The Colonial Treasurer, in the financial statement on the 9th of November, unfolded to the Committee of the House of Representatives the event of his extraordinary demands. He proposed the raising of a loan of no less a sum than three millions of money—at four per cent, if the Imperial guarantee could be obtained, or at five per cent., with a one per cent, sinking fund, should it not be obtained. The allocation of this sum was to be as follows :—War Expenditure, £1,000,000; Immigration to the North Island of from 15,000 to 20,000 people, £300,000; Public Works, such as roads, bridges, rendering rivers navigable, surveys, and general expenses of the location of settlers, £900,000; Arms, £100,000; Electric Telegraph in the Southern Island, £150,000; Light-houses, £50,000; and £500,000 for purposes specified in the Loan Act. The system of immigration was to commence when "the war was over, or driven far from our doors." Serious, however, as the prospective burthens on the Colony were, there were gleams of hope visible on the distant horizon; for, though "the interest and sinking fund of this loan will be," says the Colonial Treasurer, in the first instance, of course, charged upon the general revenue of the whole Colony; but when the lands in rebel districts are taken and sold, the loan itself will be a first charge upon the proceeds of the sale thereof:" and then, after estimating a clear balance of something closely approaching to two millions of acres of the confiscated lands of rebel Natives "in the Thames and Waikato, at Taranaki and at Wanganui," after the location of the settlers; still, he observed that, "although it will be impossible to realize upon that all at once, yet before very long the proceeds of those sales will repay the whole of this expenditure." In fully estimating the position of the Colony at the time that this proposal was enunciated, it will be necessary to mention that the estimated revenue for the year was £641,600—leaving after Landing over to the Provinces three-eighths of the Customs' Revenue, a balance of £21,096, divisible among the different Provincial Governments. Alluring as this new solution of the Native difficulty; was, there were those who even then were startled at its magnitude and sceptical as to its results. They were not desirous of interposing any serious objection to the nature of the experiment, but only to restrict the extent of its operation; and with this object Mr. Mantell submitted the following resolution to the House on the 17th November, which was negatived, on a division of 33 to 11, by a majority of 22. My vote went with the minority, in which there was not one Auckland member.

The Hon. Mr. Mantell moved that the question be amended by the omission of all the words after the word "That," with a view to insert the following in lieu thereof :—

*"1st. This House will make liberal provision, out of monies raised by loan secured on the revenues of the whole Colony, for enabling the Government to raise such forces as may be necessary, in co-operation with her Majesty's troops, to bring the present insurrection to a speedy and successful termination and this House will for that purpose sanction the settlement of Military Settlers on the terms under which the Waikato Regiments have been enrolled, or under similar terms, to a number not exceeding 5,000 men.*

*"2nd. That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to defer any further measures for the permanent colonization of those. Districts of the Northern Island in which the Native Tribes are in arms against her Majesty's sovereignty, until the insurrection now unhappily existing shall have been finally quelled."*

It will not be necessary to dwell at present at any greater length on this colonization scheme, because its development belongs to a future Session, and we are still bleeding at every pore from the liabilities then incurred.

Another step was taken by the Assembly of paramount influence on the future of New Zealand. In his memorable despatch of the 26th February, 1863, the Duke of Newcastle intimates to the Governor "that Her Majesty has not commanded me to recall the decision communicated to you in my despatch of the 26th May, with respect to the administration of Native affairs." It would be idle to recall the various arguments adduced by His Grace, and the substantial refutations with which they were met. The Colonial Government were made responsible for every act, while a power was reserved to the Governor to negative "any steps which invaded Imperial rights, or was at variance with the pledges on the faith of which Her Majesty's Government acquired the sovereignty of New Zealand, or in any other way marked by evident injustice towards Her Majesty's subjects of the Native race." With the Governor it rested to decide as to the justice and propriety of employing, and the best mode of employing Her Majesty's forces and a kind of suggestion is thrown out that "the willingness of Great Britain to continue assisting" would be materially affected by the disposition of the Colonists to adopt such measures as, in the Governor's opinion, would be "calculated to remove immediate difficulties, and to place the future relations of the races on a sound basis." In other words, the responsibility was to rest with the Colony, but the real power with the Imperial authorities, But what could be done ? The assertion by force of arms of the Queen's sovereignty had plunged us into a war, from the responsibility of which Great Britain retires—and leaves the Colony fettered in the hands of the Governor. This was the time, if ever, when the Parliament of Great Britain should have been respectfully but firmly informed that the Colony declined to act under such an autocratic form of Government; but, believing that, it was useless to contest the point any further—anticipating that liberality and justice would characterise the future action of the British Government,—the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Fox, moved, and the House affirmed, the following resolution :—

*The Honorable Mr, Fox moved, and the question was proposed, That this House having had under consideration the despatch of Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated the 26th February, 1863, conveying the fixed determination of Her Majesty's Imperial Government to revoke the arrangement of 1856, and for the future to require the Colonists to undertake the responsibility of the management of Native Affairs, recognises with the deepest gratitude the great, interest which Her Most "Gracious Majesty has always taken in the welfare of all races of her Colonial subjects and the thoroughly efficient and which Her Majesty's Imperial Government is now affording for the suppression of the rebellion unhappily existing, and the establishment of law and order in the Colony. And relying on the cordial co-operation of the Imperial Government for the future, cheerfully accepts the responsibility thus placed upon the Colonists, and at the same time records its firm determination to use its best endeavours to secure a sound and lasting peace; to do justice impartially to both races of Her Majesty's subjects, and to promote the civilisation and welfare of all classes of the inhabitants of these Islands."*

The sad sequel to this acquiescence is to be found in the Blue Book of the following Session.

During this session there was another important measure adopted by a majority of 13, viz., the proposal to remove the Seat of Government from Auckland, its temporary residence, to a permanent position at some place on the shores of Cook's Straits, leaving the selection of the site to an impartial tribunal, constituted by certain of the Governors of the Australian Colonies, This proposal was adopted by the House, Messrs Reynolds, Paterson, Wayne, and myself voting with the majority of seven; subsequently the sum of £50,000 was granted for effectuating this resolution.

An attempt was made to increase the representation of the Province of Otago by the addition of six-members, but owing to the lateness of the period in the Session in which it was moved and other circumstances connected with a readjustment of the representation of other Provinces, it was not successful. The Bill had been referred to a Select Committee, and I brought up the report on the 18th of September, which embodied, for the first time, a partial recognition of the right of the Native race to be represented by apportioning two members to Native districts. In closing the record of this Session I may mention that the House resolved, on my motion, that "the provisions of the Militia Act should be strictly carried out in the Middle Island until such time as the whole male population, between the ages of 16 and 55, with the exception of that portion which is exempted by law, are sufficiently organized and drilled to take an effectual part in the defence of the Colony," and also that the chief ports of the Colony should be prepared for defence against external aggression.

## 1864.

The Session of 1864 was opened by His Excellency on 24th December. Public rumours had for some considerable period been loud in declaring that irreconcilable differences had arisen between the Governor and his Ministers; and, when the correspondence was laid before the Legislature, it was a subject of universal regret that it had been characterised by such bitterness of spirit. Ministers deeming it impossible to hold office any longer, because the policy that the House had endorsed was not supported by the Imperial authorities, had tendered their resignation, and Mr, Weld was commissioned to form a Cabinet, and he undertook the duty on certain specified conditions. On the 28th of November the reply to the Address was passed. It embraced the following points: That prompt and energetic measures are necessary, with a view to place the settlement of Taranakion a firm and secure footing, and of restoring order in that Province arid the Ngatiruanui District; it declared that the construction of roads to be a powerful pacificator to this end; and it further recorded the approval of the House to an immediate removal of the Seat Government. No less important was the declared intention of the new Ministry to request the removal of Her Majesty's troops, in order to secure the full benefits of Ministerial responsibility, to avoid all differences with the Colonial Office and the Governor, to effect a saving in the military expenditure, and to promote the efficiency of the means adopted to suppress the rebellion. Independently of these considerations, Mr. Weld's Government considered it utterly impossible to meet the peremptory demands of the imperial Government for £40 for every soldier remaining in New Zealand. It was also the resolution of the Ministry faithfully to carry out the Panama Contract, after certain modifications had been made. It was one of the chief points of the policy of the Government that the Waikato Regiments should be placed on their land, and struck off pay as early as possible, consistently with existing arrangements, and that the immigration to Auckland should cease at once, for, not only was the scheme a failure, but the means for carrying it out and providing for accru- ing necessities were wanting. In order to meet the inevitable expenditure which loomed largely in the distance, the Ministry introduced a new tariff and took power to dispose of eight per cent, bills in lieu of the six per cent, debentures which were hanging very heavily on the markets, indeed, not saleable except at a fearful sacrifice. The Government succeeded to an empty Treasury, a

large balance on the wrong side, unsaleable debentures, and the most pressing demands for money to meet liabilities which their predecessors had incurred and transmitted to them; while irreconcilable differences existed between the imperial and the Colonial authorities, and the scarcely frigid courtesy which characterised the communications between the Governor and the local Government paralysed all Executive action. Their position was a most unenviable one, and still more oppressive from the difficulty of ascertaining the precise state of the accounts. One of the first acts in the recess was to re-organize, or resuscitate, the 'treasury Department, in order to make it efficient; and universal testimony tells of the success which has attended the Treasurer's never-ceasing labours. All arrears were ascertained, and, as far as possible, paid. The demand of the Imperial Government, according to the Commissary-General's account after the necessary deductions were made, so far as the outstanding liabilities were ascertained, have been satisfied by a remittance of debentures to the amount of £500,000; and, moreover, trust funds, which had been merged into the general account, were restored, and placed to a separate credit. An ample control is now kept over all the Sub-Treasuries, and the books are balanced and accounts rendered within, judging from past experience, what might be termed almost an impossible period.

The system of solely employing Colonial forces and Native levies has worked so admirably that at no period during the whole of the rebellion did appearances indicate the probability of so early a termination to it. Wherever the rebels and our forces have come into collision the result has been the same—one of success. The capture of Wereroa Pah, under the almost immediate personal direction of His Excellency the Governor, gave the impetus to those brilliant successes which we now expect as a matter of course. Pahs and rifle-pitted defences are no longer the bugbears they were, and are stormed or outflanked without hesitation. No longer does the Commander of H.M.'s Forces deem it prudent to avoid these native fortifications, and leave the bush country to be a haunt and a refuge for the rebel, but adapting the Colonial tactics he tells us in those practical lessons, which are easily learned, that the rebellion in the whole country between Wanganui and Taranaki might have been put down with a high hand had General Cameron pursued the strategy of General Chute. It was always a matter of deep regret to Mr. Weld's Ministry that they felt compelled to resent General Cameron's unjust aspersions, and to decline the co-operation of H.M.'s forces during their short stay in New Zealand, pending the receipt of instructions from Great Britain for their removal. They felt that it would be wise to avoid a correspondence likely to be interminable, and possibly tending to be acrimonious. They, therefore, simply confined themselves to their own resources for the repression of outrages, as was practically illustrated by the expedition to Opotiki, the scene of a most villainous and barbarous murder, to supporting our allies, and to securing our frontier.

## 1865.

The Session of 1865 commenced on the 26th of July, at Wellington, the new Seat of Government, the necessary arrangements having been made since the previous December for bringing down the whole of the Government Staff and records, and preparing suitable accommodation for both Houses of the Legislature. The Reply to the Address, which after a few amendments was adopted without a division, refers with satisfaction to the partial establishment of peace; intimates, among other subjects, the determination of the House to repress outrages; endorses the necessity of establishing her Majesty's authority in the Taranaki and Wanganui country, by opening roads, and by the formation of self-defending settlements; and thanks his excellency for the promise to despatch five Regiments to England at once, to be quickly followed by the remainder of the Imperial troops. It was to be expected that such questions as the imposition of a Stamp Duty to provide for the extraordinary expenditure caused by the rebellion, and that an alteration affecting the portion of the Customs' Revenue allotted to the Provinces, should create some dissatisfaction. The Loan of three millions, too hastily granted, was rapidly passing away, while the liabilities incurred under the arrangements of 1863, and which there was not any possibility of honourably evading, were absorbing the balance, while at the same time the admirable Treasury arrangements initiated and carried out by Mr. Fitzherbert at a period of great anxiety and press of duty, brought, for the first time, palpably before the House, and to the latest date, the real financial condition of the country. It was when the burthen—the natural sequence of the policy—was about to be placed upon the shoulders; when the determination of the Government not to increase the indebtedness of the country became known, and the demand was made to meet existing and prospective liabilities by an increase of taxation,—that the self-reliant policy of Mr. Weld received its first rude shock, and a few of those who had previously given the Government of Mr. Weld an unfaltering support, became doubtful in their allegiance. The spirit thus evoked was not allowed to lie dormant; and local prejudices and local objects obscured those legitimate claims which, perhaps, in more favourable times, would have met with a more general advocacy. The first test-question of the Session was the Separation motion of Mr. Russell, who asked the House to affirm "that New Zealand should be

divided at Cook's Straits into separate Colonies;" and on an amendment being proposed by Government, a division took place, which rejected the original proposition by 31 to 17. Then followed the Dunedin Reserves resolutions, which decided a disputed question of title respecting a Reserve in Princes Street, vesting it "in the Superintendent of Otago, in trust for the Municipality of Dunedin as originally intended," and which was affirmed by a majority of 29 to 17,—all the members of Government voting against it, performing an amendment which referred the decision to the Supreme Court. This is one of the points in which it has been stated that I was unmindful that I was a representative from Otago; but it is well known to the House of Representatives, from papers laid before the Select Committee on the subject, that from the earliest period I took a most active part in all measures which tended to bring the case before a legal tribunal. I believed that it would be a bad precedent to leave to the decision of an Assembly, likely to be influenced by political combinations, any question bearing on the right to real estate. I held that the claim of Otago was indisputable on the grounds of equity, on which it should have been decided by the Court, and strong also in point of law : had I believed otherwise, I should have been equally opposed to the House deciding the point, though I was anxious that it should affirm the desirability of such an appeal, and remove the question from both Executive and Legislative action. With respect to the accumulated arrears of rent—amounting, I believe, to nearly £6,000—that sum, like all others for which the Treasurer was responsible, was brought into the Treasury instead of remaining at the credit of a subordinate officer. It was never used in any way, and there was not any intention of disposing of it until the Assembly had investigated the subject. I have since seen no reason to modify this opinion in the slightest degree. The "Representation Bill" was another vexed question. The principle of the Government Bill was that the number of members allotted to Auckland and Otago should be the same, and that there should be no reduction of numbers; and when it was proposed to alter this arrangement, I was in opposition,—as I was also to some of the members from Otago when I advocated the allocation of the four members for Dunedin and Suburbs to two for the City proper, and one for the North and one for the South Suburb. My reasons for such advocacy were that I was desirous that these populous Suburbs should be fairly represented, and that they should not be lost in the denser population of the City proper. It is a maxim universally admitted, that towns do not receive the same proportionate numerical representation as country districts, for in such a case London would have an equal representation with the whole of Scotland. I still adhere to the opinion I expressed in the House, for the reasons just adduced.

"The New Provinces' Bill," which transferred the power to constitute new Provinces from the Executive Government to the General Assembly received my opposition. "The New Provinces' Act," then in force, was, in the absence of other legislation in protection of outlying country districts, a necessary evil. Session after Session attempts were made to repeal it by the substitution of some such protective measures as those referred to, and such attempts I invariably supported. The present measure I regard as peculiarly obnoxious; as any political combination, while the House is in Session and while debate is hot, may be brought to bear to the injury of a Province whose members may be in opposition to the majority, or may be used as a means of intimidation. I regard the cause of rural districts to have suffered a great injury from the passing of this Bill, and the House of Representatives to have received a serious blow.

The attitude assumed by Government, in fixing the port of call for the Panama steamers at Wellington, was obnoxious to those who desired to make Auckland the port of call for the outward, and Otago for the homeward, voyage. I heartily supported the Government measure, and earnestly opposed the proposed change, believing the former to be not only the best for the whole Colony, for whom it was our duty to legislate, but also for Otago, which would suffer severely were the English letters to reach her *viâ* Auckland. My opinion on this point remains unchanged. The difficulties with the New Zealand and Panama Company were amicably arranged by the Government; and, through the invaluable agency of Dr. Featherstone with the Government of New South Wales, the entire service will be performed at an annual expense of £53,000 to the Treasury, and at an increased rate of traveling. It was designed to continue the proportionate payment for the Suez line after it was known that several of the Colonies of Australia had intimated their acceptance of the Imperial terms, unjust as they were; and, as a natural consequence, it was the intention to connect Melbourne with Otago, whether Victoria assisted or not. It was just possible, had some of the Australian Governments refused to accede, that New Zealand might have had the whole expense of the Panama scheme, and an inconvenient portion of the Suez route on its hands at one time if the Ministry had been precipitate.

Two measures introduced by the Government and passed—*viz.*, "The Distillation Prohibition Ordinance Amendment Bill," and the "Post Office Having bank Bill," will, I doubt not, be found to have a most favorable influence on the agricultural interests and the industrial classes.

The "Outlying Districts Police Bill," introduced by Mr. Fitzgerald, and passed, is a very valuable addition to the statute law of New Zealand, and it is intended to meet the cases of Native districts in which gross crimes are committed and the criminals are protected. The land of the protecting tribe will be confiscated, and form a general fund for the establishment of a police force, and thus diminish the expenditure from the Colonial

revenue for such purpose.

The "Native Lands Bill," also introduced by Mr. Fitzgerald, is another step in the right direction, and provides a means of investigating and deciding the title to land.

Still more important was the "Native Rights Bill," also introduced by Mr Fitzgerald and passed. It provides that all persons of the Maori race shall be deemed to be natural born subjects of Her Majesty, and declares that the jurisdiction of the Queen's Courts of Law extends over the persons and properties of all Her Majesty's subjects in the Colony, This Bill may be regarded as the sequel and complement of the "Native Lands Bill, 1862," and defines for the first time the status of the Maori race.

"The Comptrollers' Bill" drawn up by Mr Fitzherbert, provides a much needed and wholesome check on the issue of public money, and strange to say was introduced by a Ministry who had been accused of extravagance. The introduction of this Bill was enumerated as one of its most important measures when the Ministry were strong in the confidence and support of the House.

The Bill to repeal the Surplus Revenue Act was mainly designed to destroy that partnership system of account keeping which entailed very considerable delay in the preparation of accounts. Since the burthen of paying the interest of the three million loan had been imposed, there was no hope of the Provinces having anything beyond the three-eighths of the Customs' allocated to them except by increased taxation, and it was desired by creating a joint interest injudicious retrenchment by the system proposed, that the Provinces would not be deprived of the proportion of the Customs' hitherto available, less the Surplus. The existing system, by dividing a surplus before the liabilities of the year are known and met, is evidently an erroneous one.

Independently of the objection taken to the increase of taxation in any form, there was a special exception taken to the shape which it assumed as a Stamp duty. It was acknowledged by many that the duty sought to be imposed was a fair one, though some preferred an income tax; but it was very generally and confidently reported that the amount which it was estimated would be received was scarcely one-fourth of the sum which would come to the Treasury, and thus that the Government were drawing up a scale very much in excess of what they required. In vain it was replied that there was no experience in a new country to guide us—that we had followed the calculations of New South Wales, a Colony in a somewhat analogous position—and that whatever the proceeds were they could not be expended without appropriation Time has falsified the confident predictions of the objectors, for the Stamp Act in New South Wales has not even realised what was expected from it. Suppose, however, that the New Zealand Bill had provided more than the calculations and hopes of the Treasurer indicated, the excess would have been available as surplus revenue divisible among the Provinces, or subsequent legislation might have remodeled the Act.

There was a Bill introduced by government, during the Session which received the energetic opposition of the Auckland section of the House and their supporters. Its object was to constitute essentially Native districts. Ever since I took an interest in the general politics of the country, I have been of opinion that this was the true solution of the Native difficulty. On the 23rd July, 1862, when addressing the House of Representatives. I said—"I regard ministerial responsibility, in our present circumstances, as an impossibility." I then recommended that the best way to deal with the Natives would be "to create the territory embraced by the Maoris into a new Province, and to make the Maori King Superintendent."

Again I wrote at a later date, simultaneously with assuming an armed attitude of self-defence within the European settlements, the districts occupied by the Native population should be created into a separate Province, under a chief or chiefs of their own, the government of which should be administered in accordance with the terms of the treaty of Waitangi, which exists between Her Majesty and the aboriginal inhabitants of the Northern Island;" and I still believe that, now the Taranaki and Ngatiruanui Natives have been chastised, we should withdraw within our frontier, and confine ourselves to defending our territory and our Native allies.

It has been said that the ministry under Mr Weld commenced a new war, incurred fresh liabilities, and thus necessitated additional taxation; but we seek in vain for the evidence. The campaign on the northern shores of Cook's Straits has been pointed out as the locality. To this I would reply that the chastisement of these tribes was a part of the original design, (see the sketch in this address of the Session of 1861,) and was also contemplated by the Whittaker Ministry in 1863, where the confiscated lands of rebel Natives "in the Thames and Waikato, at Taranaki and at Wanganui," are referred to as part of the "three-million" scheme; and it was a prominent portion of the plan of the Wold Ministry, endorsed by the Assembly, and was practically indicated by the troops moving South for the campaign. How important, this campaign was may be judged from the Governor's despatch to the Secretary to the Colonies on the 6th February 1865, when he writes : "I believe that Colonel Greer most accurately represents the state of feeling amongst the Native population when he says : The fact is, the eyes of all Martyrdom are on Taranaki; there is the head-quarters of their Atua or god, and if he cannot drive the Pakehas into the sea, I think they will give up as a bad bargain all over their side of the island."

A main and most important feature of the polity of the Weld Government was the organisation of Native levies by my late gallant colleague Major Atkinson, the Defence Minister, ably advised and assisted by the

Superintendent of Hawke's Bay, Mr. Maclean, even though in delicate health. The East Coast levies and the Wanganui Contingent, whose laurels, gathered on the Wanganui River in defence of their European fellow-subjects, were fresh, and whose ardour was irresistible, gallantly accompanied by the Colonial European forces, did more in a few short weeks to stamp out the rebellion than had been done in years gone by. In addressing you as your representative, I think it right to remark that my sentiments have always been in accord with the late Government on this subject. You will pardon me for quoting, in support of this position, the following extract from a speech in the House of Representatives on December 6th, 1864:—"We have not done justice to our cause by not encouraging the loyal natives who have offered their services in defence of Her Majesty and their European fellow-subjects. I believe were this loyalty encouraged we should find that we were at length approaching the termination of the war. It is our duty to employ every lawful means in our power—it is our duty to evince our confidence in these gallant, true hearted natives, and we can do it by showing that we appreciate their services and reckon them among those whom we can trust. Let us do this, and I do not doubt that ere long we shall be successful."

Deserted by the Mother Country in the hour of sore trial, plunged by the action of the Imperial authority into an undertaking beyond her strength, if, even the nominal sovereignty of Her Majesty is to be asserted,—the Colony looks forward with much anxiety to the future, and seeks far and near for some prospect of relief. No wonder, then, that in her anxiety to be unburthened she grasps at intangible remedies. There is one which of late has pre-eminently obtained not a few advocates, because it appears so easy of attainment and so effective in operation. The extreme northern section of the Northern Island demands Separation, because she desires not to submit to Southern interference in Native affairs; and the extreme southern section of the Middle Island prefers a like request, because it, seeks to be relieved from prospective pecuniary liabilities. It is well known that Wellington, Taranaki, and Hawke's Bay are opposed to Separation; and it is abundantly evident, therefore, that, admitting for the sake of argument, we handed over the Native difficulty in the Auckland Province to Auckland, we should still retain a sufficiency of the evil in the remaining Provinces of the Northern Island. Suppose again, that, allured by the prospect of becoming the heir to the vast Native properties which, owing to the rapid decadence of the Native race, will at no distant date be disposable, these Provinces succumbed to the Separation epidemic, what would become of the Maori, subjected to the experimental legislation of four different Provinces ? And how would it be possible to prevent an injury to one of the interior Native tribes exasperating the whole ? A ruthless grasping for land in Auckland would vibrate through the Island, and would lead to brigandage in Cook's Straits or on the East Coast. But suppose for an instant that such a course were practicable, is it just; is it generous ? It needs not to turn over the page of Maori history to discover the friendliness with which the weak and dependent British settler was received by a race of the noblest savages on earth. Every Maori hut was an Englishman's home when he needed shelter, and the hospitality of the race was exhibited as well amid the forests of the interior as on the more accessible sea coast. And what has been the return that we have made and propose to make ? Cajoled to accept the position of British subjects under the stipulations of the treaty of Waitangi, we have denied them the exercise of the rights with which they were then invested. The land was theirs by inherent right or treaty, but we fettered its disposal with stipulations which we had no right to impose, and which we should have removed at an earlier period than we did; I acknowledge that the motive was one of protection; but when contact with civilization had taught the Natives the value of their estate, we should have removed the obstacles to its sale. The Maori, deserted by the British Government, which has handed over without his consent the power which it held, or assumed to hold, under treaty, feels that: the simplicity and generosity which characterised its earliest intercourse with civilisation has been shamefully imposed upon. He sees the most powerful nation, and said to be the most just one, hand over to the European settlers who, but as yesterday, were received hospitably on his shores, the power to deal with the lives and properties of his countrymen; and then, as if the bitter cup of humiliation and misery were not complete, he finds that the pecuniary reasons which benumbed the moral consciousness of the Imperial Government operating equally in a section of the community to whom the sacred untransferrable deposit has been in appearance transferred; and, who wish to follow the illustrious example set by Britain, and drop the burthen because it is too expensive to carry.

But, granted that this Native difficulty were overcome, are we, because Auckland demands Separation—which means, in case of a Native insurrection, dependence on Great Britain—are we to force the remaining Provinces of the Northern Island to unite with her Is Wellington, the Seat of the Central Government, and contemporaneous in settlement with Auckland, to be severed by force ?—is Taranaki, for whom we have suffered so much, to be cast loose from its union with the South, whether willing or unwilling?—and is Hawke's Bay, which but as yesterday was torn as a shred from Wellington to weaken her at the instigation of a rival, to be created into a member of the new Northern Colony ? When the 50,000 Maoris inhabiting the Northern Island, and when the settlers occupying the Provinces of Wellington, Taranaki, and Hawke's Bay come and seek for Separation, then, perhaps, the scheme might be deemed somewhat more practicable.

But it is vain to suppose, even then, that Great Britain would alienate for ever the Crown Lands of the Colony until she had secured what in moments of sensibility she terms the "rights of treaty to this remarkable race." Suppose she were to say—If all parties are agreed to separate, we will not oppose the movement—we will yield to the general wish; but we must secure the public credit by retaining a lien on the Crown Lands. When you were united, we handed them over to you to administer as you might fancy, subject to our interposition; but, now you desire to separate, we must see that the purchased lands of the Middle Island and the confiscated lands of the Northern Island are available to meet the liabilities already incurred, and those which are inseparable from the responsibilities you have assumed.—She might further say that while a single soldier remains in New Zealand we shall require an annual payment of £40 per man, and, to avoid the intricacies and unpleasantness of account-keeping, we will require half-yearly payments in advance. Something not unlike this has been shadowed forth in the English *Spectator*.

But we will suppose again that this difficulty were overcome; that the Natives were satisfied; that Wellington, Taranaki, and Hawke's Bay, had consented to become satellites to Auckland; and Nelson, Marlborough, and South land, to Otago or Canterbury, and we will suppose the British Government also satisfied. How are we to adjust the liabilities of the past? Are we to accept one of the Southern propositions, that the Middle Island undertake for three years to bear the entire cost of the interest and sinking fund of the three million loan, and that the Provinces of the Northern Island undertake to keep order in their respective Provinces, and be allowed to enjoy the proceeds of the confiscated lands? Are we prepared to pay out some three-quarters of a million, and to release Auckland from any payment? And what is to be done after the expiration of three years? Who is to pay then? If the British Government could not undertake to keep order in the Provinces—if the united Colony failed in such an undertaking—is there any reasonable prospect that Auckland alone, or Auckland, with its dependencies, would succeed? And if, like the three million loan colonization scheme, the experiment should explode, is there not a probability that, while the Northern Provinces were enjoying the proceeds of the confiscated land, the Middle Island might be called upon to sympathize practically with their Fellow colonists, who were unfortunate enough to be the materials of a bubble bursting experiment? Or shall we select, as our remedy, another Southern proposition, that the whole of the past liabilities of the Colony be a first charge upon the revenues of the Provinces of the Middle Island, till peace be firmly established and the Queen's writ can be freely enforced among the aboriginals? If we do select this remedy we shall enjoy the proceeds of our legislation for many a bitter day to come, for there is as much chance of such a writ running as there is of the promises of the mirage in the desert being realized.

But, supposing every difficulty overcome, and the advocates for Separation beginning to rebuild. One recommends a total separation of the two Islands, with or without the total destruction of the Provincial institutions; a second supports the consolidation of the Provincial Governments of each Island, with a federal union between the two; and a third propounds the absorption of Taranaki by Auckland, of South land by Otago, of Hawkes' Bay by Wellington, of Marlborough by Nelson, and then extending the power of Provincial Governments, and restricting that of the General Government. Or, in other words, it recommends undoing the legislation of the last few years, without remedying the evils which it was designed to counteract; and, in addition to this, the absorption of one of the oldest Provinces in New Zealand, because she has a hungry neighbour who longs for her rich confiscated lands, and also because she has been unwise enough to have been subject to long continued suffering, springing from the action of others. It suggests that all the evils of Provincialism be intensified, and the advantages of unity and a moderate centralism nullified.

I have no hesitation in affirming that I cannot accept any of these proposals. I am in favour of the destruction of the present Provincial system, and the establishment of counties and municipalities in its place, and the abolition of the power to legislate except on a few unimportant points; in fact, I regard the proposed confederation of the British North American Provinces as a model, in many respects, worthy of our adoption. By it large powers are entrusted to the General Government. The General Legislature consists of a Legislative Council and a House of Commons. The former appointed by the Crown—the latter by the people, population being the basis of representation. I do not understand by this universal suffrage, which I oppose on every ground. The Legislation is almost entirely confined to this Parliament; and thus the six confederate Provinces of British America could not present a similar absurd anomaly to that which the nine Provinces of New Zealand present, of multiplying the statutes of the land on every subject nine fold, and exhausting the resources of the country by an intricate and unnecessary machinery. The Confederation wisely proposes that the Provinces should retain "all lands, mines, minerals, and royalties vested in Her Majesty, subject to any trusts that may exist in respect to any such lands, or to any interest of other persons in respect of the same." By a continued unity in New Zealand, the Crown Lands would be for ever secured to each Province.

It may be mentioned, as a fact of great significance, that the value of Provincial securities immediately rose in consequence of this proposal. Is it, therefore, too much to expect, that were our Provincial distinctions merged into one strong General Government, the public confidence would be restored—and that we should no

longer hear of the depression which we now mourn ? It may be said that centralism would be injurious to the South, because it would have to share liabilities with which it had no direct interest; but it may be sufficient to say, in reply to such an objection, that of the seventy members of which the House of Representatives is composed, forty-one belong to the Middle Island, while only twenty-nine belong to the Northern. It is, therefore, evidently in *the power of the latter to restrict the expenditure of the public monies to whatever extent may be considered just and desirable*, and thus to meet and avert the evils which separation is professedly designed to remedy.

The question is very naturally asked,—How is it that a Government which was so strong on assuming office in November 1864, and which retained its popularity during the early part of the Session of 1865, should have collapsed so suddenly—some have ventured to say so pusillanimously—in July 1865 ? We need not go far for a reply : it collapsed because of the opposition which arose from its stern, unflinching determination to retrench the vast military expenditure at Auckland and elsewhere—its immovability on the question of the removal of the troops—its action in the transfer of the Seat of Government—its adherence to what the Colony required, in the establishment of the port of call for the Panama steamers at Wellington—and, above all, because of its unswerving resolution to avoid future loans, and to rely upon taxation to carry out the policy which Mr. Weld had enunciated, and which the Colony had in two Sessions deliberately affirmed, after the clearest explanations and the most deliberate debates. Mr. Weld held office for eleven months, of which nearly three and a-half were passed in Session, and he has the satisfaction of knowing that the little more than seven and a-half months of a recess will bear comparison with any preceding period in the history of New Zealand—and that, too, at a time when "the Government must be simply regarded as the assignees appointed to administer to an embarrassed estate," because the faith of the Colony had been pledged by a preceding Government. And what are the fruits of these eleven months administration ? An estranged Governor is converted into a cordial co-operator; a criminating public press in England ceases its vituperations and speaks approvingly; the tone of British statesmen is agreeably altered; the distinctly enunciated policy of the Parliament of New Zealand is promptly carried out by the removal of the Seat of Government; the removal of the troops is energetically and continually requested and urged; the honour of the Colony is vindicated by the fulfillment, of the engagement entered into with the Panama Company; a comparatively cheap and speedy postal service with England is established; rebel lands are confiscated and surveyed as rapidly as possible for the location of military and other settlers in the Auckland Province; never-ceasing measures to restrict the evil consequences of the colonization of 1863, are pursued; an uninterrupted series of military successes are obtained by Colonial troops and levies, European and Native, fixing the attention of England and restoring the prestige of the British name; various Departments of Government are entirely re-organized and remodelled, by which a more effective control over the public expenditure is established and enforced. These are some of the fruits of a policy which would have ripened into maturity had not the Representatives of New Zealand shrunk from the fulfilment of the engagements into which the Colony had entered. A dangerous friend has ascribed the retirement of Mr. Weld to an impossible finance, an impatience of retrenchment, a too great leniency to criminals. And where, I would ask, was the impossibility of its finance ? The policy to be carried out was not the policy of Mr. Weld, after the House had affirmed it in 1864, and re-affirmed it in 1865 : and if General Cameron had done in the commencement of 1865, with the large force at his disposal, what General Chute is now doing, the proposed 1,500 men of the Defence Minister would have dwindled down to 500, and eventually ceased altogether; but even had it not done so, the expense, tested by the results, would have borne a very gratifying comparison with the £40 per man or £400,000 annually demanded by the Imperial Government as a subsidy for the contingent of British troops. The urgent demands of the Colonial exchequer required immediate relief, and in the imposition of a stamp duty to meet that demand, Mr Weld acted wisely, and no less wisely when he resisted the attempt to appropriate any portion of the proceeds for Provincial purposes. And where are the grounds on which the charge of an impatience of retrenchment rests ? Was not the administration unceasingly occupied in legitimately restricting the paralysing expenditure at Auckland ? What could it do more than it had done? Take for instance the Loan expenditure from 1st of October, 1864, to 31st March, 1865, amounting to £570,485 8s 2d, published in the *Gazette*, and it will be found that nearly the whole expenditure is the result of the Colonization policy of 1863. The War expenditure alone, without reference to Imperial troops, amounting to £218,540 12s 10d, while more than £70,000 is incurred for settlement purposes; debenture charges and losses, £161,983 14s 1d; reinstatement of Taranaki, £88,337 12s 6d; for all of which, except the last item, the previous Government, and not the Weld Government, is responsible. From a paper laid upon the table of the House of Representatives it was made clear that at least £366,671 would be required before all the liabilities were discharged, and nearly the whole of this for the payment of forces, for which the Weld Ministry was irresponsible. Was there no departmental retrenchment ? Was the amount set down in the Native estimates which, for the first time, were brought down in detail for the examination of the House, a charge against Mr, Weld? Was it not distinctly stated by the Native Minister that this sum was placed there because the

expenditure was going on at that rate, but that he intended to make a very large reduction so soon as practicable? And, moreover, was this amount the result of Mr. Weld's administration? Far from being so; some judicious retrenchment had already been made on the establishment of the preceding Government and more was under arrangement. It was not to be expected that in the very crisis of a rebellion then: should be a sudden and organic change in a department having the particular charge of Native affairs. For those departments more especially under my charge as Postmaster-General and Commissioner of Customs, I can say that when I assumed office, in November, 1864, the rate of the Postal Departmental expenditure (and I copy from an official document) was £66,660, whereas on the estimates of 1865, it is only £57,451; and the Customs', with a large increase, of Revenue and extension of gold-fields, had only increased from £41,311, to £46,673, including the probable expenditure at the Grey, Hokitika, and Stewart's Island, and does not include considerable reductions which were made at Auckland after the Estimates were printed. The Postmaster-General's report strongly points out the lavish expenditure, and urges the paramount necessity of retrenchment. It is unfair to compare the Estimates of 1863 with those of 1865-6, because in the meantime the Departmental expenditure had largely grown under the previous administration.

Whether the proposed retrenchment of Mr. Stafford is real and effective I leave to the next Session of the Legislature to declare. I am firmly of opinion that little retrenchment can be judiciously made beyond what the Weld Government promised and proposed to make.

In addition to the charges of submitting an impossible finance—of avoiding retrenchment—the Ministry of Mr. Weld has been charged with too great leniency to criminals, referring more particularly to the amnesty proclaimed just before his retirement. It was said that murderers were pardoned by that proclamation who should have been brought to justice. I can venture to say that each individual case received at the hands of the Government, in several successive Cabinet meetings, the most anxious consideration, and that it was not without much painstaking inquiry that a decision was arrived at. I do not say that in every case we acted rightly, for it is very difficult exactly to define the boundaries between war and civil murder. But I know that we acted conscientiously, and to the best of our judgment, that we entertained no squeamish sentimentality, and that the hand of justice would not have fallen short of the criminal when the evidence clearly pointed him out.

The retirement of the Weld Ministry was chiefly to be ascribed to the fact that, owing to certain political combinations in the immediate prospect of a dissolution, it was found impracticable to carry out the policy which had been deliberately affirmed in 1864 and 1865—when the Colony was borrowing—but unsupported when it was called upon to raise taxes and not to overburthen posterity.

But, while many may be disposed to admit justness of the argument that we have obligations which we cannot ignore, and responsibilities which we cannot shake off—still there are some who ever revert with increasing pertinacity to the cry, but "what can we do? we cannot submit to have the revenues of the Middle Island expended for the benefit or relief of the North" In reply I would say that the Weld policy provided a remedy in the proceeds of the sale of confiscated lands, though not by an expensive colonization process; and, in addition, I may repeat what I have before expressed as my opinion, that we should retire within our defensible frontier, insist upon the European inhabitants defending themselves, aided by a fixed pecuniary assistance from the Colony; and as the Provinces of the Northern Island receive the whole of the Customs Revenue derived from the 50,000 Natives, and which may be estimated at the rate of about 15s a head, or rather more than £35,000, it is not unreasonable that this sum should be a *first charge against the Customs' Revenue of the Northern Island*, and be available for such defence, and assistance to our Native allies. The colonization of the North Island at the expense of the South has proved a costly and worthless experiment, ill devised and worse carried out. The pouring of vast hordes of defenceless and penniless families into Auckland, *before the war was finished*, and without the accompanying men of means, was the death blow to the scheme, which was doubtless much aggravated by the delay in obtaining possession of the rebel land on which to locate them, and which delay should have induced the Whittaker Ministry to have instantly stopped the immigration and the enlistment under the Loan Act of 1863. I have already referred to the glowing pictures which the Treasurer presented in 1863—how calmly he expatiated on the proceeds of the sale of the land covering all expenses, a declaration for which his colleagues of the Auckland Province are equally responsible—and what is the result?

The Minister of Defence in 1863 (Mr. Russell), now tells us "that after giving the best of the land to the military settlers, and also good land to friendly Natives,' after taking these lands out of the blocks, and then taking out the hills and swamps, there would be very little left to dispose of." The present Minister of Defence (Colonel Haultain of Auckland), regards the total confiscated acreage at about 1,200,000 acres, and that, as only 400,000 would be available at 10s. an acre, there would not be produced more than £200,000, against which there is to be deducted as compensation to Auckland settlers, £75,000; compensation to Natives, £15,000; cost of settlement, £35,000; leaving £75,000 to meet all other liabilities. Now, supposing that we have obtained only one-half of the land originally proposed to be confiscated, though that is the best, we have but a sorry realization of the picture which was so fondly held out to our view. The Auckland members managed vir-

to do away with the payment of half-a-crown an acre, which, in addition to all liabilities, was the demand of the Weld Ministry; but, as the Imperial Government have not given an unqualified sanction to the "Settlements Act," under which the land is confiscated, it is not improbable that there may be a veto to this uncalled-for sacrifice. If the Auckland papers speak truly, the land about Opotiki, which under the Act was forfeited to the Crown on account of the rebels not giving up to justice the murderers of the Rev. Mr. Volkner—this land, devoted to the creation of & police fund and charged with compensation to sufferers by the rebellion, has been handed over to Auckland on the sham principle above alluded to. Is it possible that the new Houses of Assembly will sanction this illegal transaction? is it probable that the Imperial Government will validate the transfer? After surrendering the confiscated lands to Auckland at a merely nominal price, can we in any justice refuse to hand over to Taranaki the rich domains which fall within her Province, and deal out, the same justice to Wellington?

*The fact is that the South has been bound over hand and foot to colonize Auckland; and the process of colonization is still going on, and Southern statesmen, in pursuing the phantom of an impossible separation, are withing parties to the act. They have the power to prevent the grievous sacrifice, but they prefer the modified Fenian cry of Separation to sitting down and by the legitimate means, which their legislative superiority confers, subduing the political paralysis. On them then be all the future consequences of a failure as certain as it will be expensive.*

I have now finished the duty which I assigned to myself, and I have endeavored to give a fair and can did statement, of all the more important circumstances preceding the formation, and during the administration of the Weld Ministry. I do not seek any judgment at present on the conduct of affairs by Mr Weld's Government; I would rather await the period when the light shed around it by the actors and legislation which may succeed, will conduce to a right reading of this short page of New Zealand history. But while patiently awaiting this decision I cannot abstain from beating testimony to the patriotic and unselfish character of the services of my noble heated chief, and my colleagues in the late ministry. It is, and always will be with us, a subject of bitter regret that when the self-reliant policy was about to receive the seal of the Colony's sincerity and faithfulness there was a moment's hesitation as to the direction in which the path of duty lay. We may still hope that there is only a looking back, not a retrogression; because, as Mr Stafford has adopted, nearly in every particular, the policy of Mr Weld, and has announced his intention to introduce an income tax and if necessary a stamp duty to carry it out,—we may still hope that our engagements will be fulfilled and our duties performed. It may be a matter of little account who may be the administrators, so that the administration preserves the unity and the honor of the Colony.

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

Notes on New Zealand Affairs: Comprising a Sketch of its Political History

IN REFERENCE ESPECIALLY TO

The Native Question;

ITS PRESENT POSITION—THE POLICY FOR THE FUTURE WITH A FEW GENERAL REMARKS UPON THE RELATIONS OF ENGLAND TO HER COLONIES.

BY FRED. A. WELD, ESQ.

Late Prime Minister Of That Colony.

Edward Stanford London: 6 & 7, Charing Cross, S.W. 1869.

"It is very desirable you should clearly understand, that no change of Ministry in New Zealand will affect the views of Her Majesty's Government in respect to the policy embodied in the resolutions of the Assembly of New Zealand in December, 1864" (Mr. Weld's). "Having accepted with entire satisfaction that policy, Her Majesty's Government intend to adhere to it, and to be guided by it."—*Extract from a despatch of H. M.'s Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Governor of New Zealand on Mr. Weld's resignation : dated Dec. 26, 1865.*

## Notes on New Zealand Affairs.

IN the present crisis of the affairs of New Zealand, it seems to me, that a few notes thrown together by one who has known the colony from its early days, who has taken part in the first struggles of colonial life, who has held the highest office that his fellow-colonists can bestow, and who throughout his career has to the best of his ability endeavoured to do justice alike to native and to colonist, may not be altogether without interest, or devoid of usefulness.

It is true, that under the present system of colonial self-government, English statesmen and political thinkers exercise little immediate influence upon the politics and destinies of the Colony, but nevertheless we are alike subjects of the Queen, the same blood flows in our veins, the same aspirations run in our minds and

quicken our pulses, and I trust that the day is yet far distant when Englishmen living or born in our colonial dependencies will cease to speak of the old country as "Home," or when Englishmen in these islands will have lost all sympathy for those who, to use Lord Bacon's well-known words, are engaged in "the heroic work of colonization"—a work still more difficult and still more heroic, when it is united, as in the case of New Zealand, with the attempt to civilize and to preserve a native race.

New Zealand indeed has offered a study not unworthy of the attention of the statesman, of the political economist, and of the philanthropist; it has afforded a field upon which problems involving great principles, worthy of any man's attention, have been, and are being worked out with more or less success; and it differs from other colonies, because they are being worked out in the presence of a native race who are at once warriors and diplomatists, and who, if at times they display the ferocity and fanaticism of the savage, are also not destitute of savage virtues, and even of higher qualities.

I propose to give a very slight sketch of the history of the Colony, and to add some geographical and statistical information—to touch upon its political position—to point out the nature and causes of the present insurrection—and to conclude by offering a few remarks and suggestions.

The sagacious eye of the great navigator Captain Cook, first pointed out New Zealand as a desirable field for colonization. Its wonderful natural riches, its climate, its future political importance as a naval station, and as a nursery of seamen, could not escape him; but still many years had elapsed before a few missionaries, whalers, runaway sailors, many of whom acquired tracts of land from the natives, settled upon the islands. The presence or ownership of a "pakeha" (European), now became almost an appanage of a chief of rank, and a brisk trade was carried on in gunpowder and guns. Cannibalism, immorality, and wars of the most cruel nature, of tribe against tribe, appear to have been long the normal state of the New Zealander; and many of his first visitors seem to have fallen into his habits, and adapted themselves to his morals, with remarkable facility. It is strange how soon a man may fall into barbarism; yet among these old "pakeha- Maories," I have met many, who joined to the savage vices, the savage virtues; brave as lions, open-handed and hospitable, the old whalers were feared, respected, and often loved, by the tribes on whose shores they placed their fisheries.

That terrible epoch passed away. Still the New Zealander was supreme in New Zealand—still the land was his own, but it was whitened with the bones of those slain in intertribal conflicts. The wars of Hongi in the North, who had obtained a present of guns on a visit to Europe, rolled a wave of conquest from tribe to tribe to the South—till it reached the Southern and larger island, whose inhabitants having but few fire-arms, were almost utterly exterminated. But even whilst this was going on, the natives, with that intelligence which distinguishes them, were beginning to know something of European civilization—they began to acknowledge the superiority of the European in mechanical arts, and to see the advantages of peace and religion. About this time the colonization of New Zealand commenced; England at first wished to make New Zealand an independent state, and even gave a flag to some of the chiefs, and sent a resident or representative to them, who was derided as "a man of war without guns,"—but in 1839 the New Zealand Company having been formed with a view to systematic colonization under the auspices of several distinguished men, the English Government, aware of a design to seize the islands on the part of the French, sent out Captain Hobson with a Governor's commission in his pocket; he arrived soon after the Company's settlers had landed and located themselves on land bought from the natives; he took possession of the Northern Island in virtue of a treaty with certain Chiefs, (the treaty of Waitangi); and of the Southern (or middle) Island by proclamation, only one day before the arrival of the French expedition to its shores.

The next fourteen years were marked by disputes between the New Zealand Company and the Government, between the settlers and the Company, by its dissolution, by the formation of several settlements in both islands—and by the introduction of a considerable body of immigrants—many of them men of education and family—whilst the bulk of the laboring class were selected, and of a superior character, commissions sat to decide on land claims; the relations between settlers and natives were on the whole not unsatisfactory, the two races formed ties of amity when brought together, they often fraternized and sometimes fought, but still the wonderful power of making to themselves friends, so remarkable in the native race, asserted itself, and it generally happened, as it does to this day, that the natives and the Europeans of any given settled district turned out together shoulder to shoulder against an attack. There were "wars" in this period, not however as a rule marked by bloodthirstiness or cruelty, there was the massacre of the Wairau, originating in a land question, when Captain Wakefield of the Royal Navy, and other gentlemen acting as they thought in support of law and order, mistaken, as I believe, as to the wisdom and even according to the native custom, correctness of their action, were defeated and afterwards barbarously tomahawked by a native chief who claimed certain lauds by right of conquest. Amongst them perished some of the best friends of the Maoris, and there fell too the prestige of invincibility which had hitherto attached to the European race. This outrage was condoned by the Government. Then came Heki's war in the North; he cut down the flagstaff at Kororarika, the symbol of the Queen's power, he complained of no special grievance but the collection of customs duties; I believe his real

desire was to exalt his name as a great chief, and to emulate the deeds of Hongi. He and Kawiti were defeated after a contest which convinced natives that soldiers were less formidable antagonists than they had anticipated, no punishment was inflicted upon the insurgents—the same may be said in regard to the "war" at the Hutt and Porirua, which arose from native claimants (and natives who were not claimants) having taken possession of lands which had been adjudicated upon and twice paid for, and to which the late native possessors maintained in arms the right of the Europeans—in this case too, no punishment was inflicted upon the insurgents. The Wanganui war was the last of this series, it arose from a pistol having accidentally gone off in the hands of a midshipman and wounded a chief. The chief was attended to and recovered, but two or three of his tribe committed an atrocious murder in revenge—they were taken and hung by the officer in command of the regiment stationed in the district, a war commenced and died out, through initiation, no punishment was inflicted on the insurgents. Several years of peace followed these disturbances, which were always local, and even during them, I, and many others were living in native districts surrounded by natives and isolated from all support. Political subjects now occupied the minds of the colonists, and a strong desire for self-government was manifested, for up to this time the government of the Colony had been virtually autocratic under the direction of the Colonial Office.

I now come to the third period, that of self-government in all but native affairs. In 1852 the Imperial Legislature passed the New Zealand Constitution Act. Of the merits and demerits of that Act I shall speak hereafter. It was received with great joy by the Colonists, and I think I am warranted in saying marked an era of progress. It was proclaimed by Governor Sir G. Grey, K.C.B. in 1853, but the first Session of the General Assembly or Parliament of New Zealand was not held till 1854. The Constitution Act established a general government and six provinces, with a common purse, and in many respects concurrent powers of legislation; the general design was good, and fitted to the requirements of the Colony; but the evils and conflicts likely to result from these two provisions, were at the time, forcibly pointed out by Mr. Gladstone. Unfortunately at this moment so pregnant with the future of New Zealand, Governor Sir George Grey, who had taken a prominent part in framing the Constitution Act, was appointed to the Cape; and unfortunately too, as I think, before leaving, he called into existence the provincial governments, without summoning the General Assembly. The officer commanding the troops now nominally assumed the reins of government, the Attorney-General, Mr. Swainson, a gentleman who is said to have declared that his great desire was "to avoid committing himself," was his adviser, and the result was, that the general government may be said to have ceased to exist. The provinces headed by active, earnest, and able men, legislated in different directions unchecked, and when at length the Parliament met, it found that they had dealt with questions of real property, of militia, of dower of married women, and others of a similar nature. Six independent states had arisen pulling different ways, whilst the government proposed no policy whatsoever, and not a single representative of the government appeared to speak its mind, or sat on the benches of the House. The members met and looked at one another, and recovering from their surprise, passed the following resolution on the 5th of June, 1854.

*"That amongst the objects which this House desires to see accomplished without delay, both as an essential means whereby the General Government may rightly exercise a due control over Provincial Governments, and as a no less indispensable means of obtaining for the General Government the confidence and attachment of the people, the most important is the establishment of ministerial responsibility in the conduct of the legislative and executive proceedings of the Governor."*

The old officials, however, refused, either to take seats with a view to carrying on the public business, or to resign without reference to the Home Government, and the result was that Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Sewell, Mr. Bartley, and myself, and for a time Mr. Dillon Bell, took seats with them in the executive, and carried on business as a temporary expedient without office or salary. We proposed measures for giving the old officials retiring pensions, also for defining the powers of the general and provincial governments; whilst the independence of the Supreme Court of Judicature—the control of the expenditure by an independent audit—and the conduct of native affairs, were subjects to which we anxiously devoted ourselves. We commanded a large majority in the legislature, but finding that instead of the "full and entire confidence" which had been promised to us, dispatches had been written to England without our knowledge, that our "old official" colleagues did not co-operate with us, and that the House was getting uneasy; we informed the acting Governor that either the "old officials" must retire on the receipt of their pensions—or that we must resign, promising if they would themselves conduct the business of the assembly, to give them the utmost support and assistance we consistently could: They declined either alternative—the acting Governor proposed at first to request them to tender their resignations, but on the advice of Mr. E. Gibbon Wakefield he decided on accepting ours. The House of Representatives passed necessary supplies and petitioned the Queen—the decision of the Queen's Government was in our favour—but another year was lost to New Zealand; a year at such a crisis most important in the life of a young Colony. I have dwelt at some length upon this episode, because I have always thought that a great part of the difficulties which have since embarrassed New Zealand, are distinctly traceable

to these delays, and to the fact that efforts made by a very able and a very honest Parliament to place the state engine on the right track were thwarted and the start so long delayed—and when at length these extraneous impediments were removed, parties had been formed and interests grown up, which presented difficulties and complications of no ordinary magnitude. Let me here too, note, that one of the points to which we especially adverted in our memorandum to the acting Governor before our resignation, as menacing the future of the Colony, was a little cloud, even then growing bigger and darker—native complications at Taranaki—that cloud to which we then pointed with a warning hand grew larger and larger, and as we shall see afterwards darkened the whole country.

On the 6th September, 1855, the new Governor, Colonel Gore Browne, C.B., announced his intention "to continue the policy hitherto adopted towards the aborigines in maintaining inviolate their right to their land, and securing to them an impartial administration of justice;" he also declared that he would carry out in its integrity the principle of ministerial responsibility; and he dissolved the Parliament. The new Parliament met on the 15th of April, 1856, and not till then could parliamentary government in New Zealand be said to have commenced. Native affairs were still reserved to the Crown, Ministers were to be consulted, but the entire responsibility of the conduct of native matters was still left in the hands of the Governor, who of course acted under instructions from the Ministers of the Crown in England. Governor Gore Browne was always consistent and firm upon that point. Various measures of colonial interest now occupied the mind of the assembly, parties *were* very nearly balanced, the provincialists and the centralist fought many a battle in the political arena; the ministry of Mr. Sewell was succeeded by that of Mr. Fox, and he in turn gave way to Mr. Stafford. Mr. Stafford's government was remarkable for containing in its ranks Mr. Christopher Richmond, (now Judge Richmond,) as native minister, a man of wide and philosophical views, a deep thinker, honest, able, and philanthropic. In a series of carefully considered bills, he brought down a policy for promoting the self-government, education, and advancement of the natives, for enabling them gradually to rise out of government tutelage, for giving them more extended powers to deal with their land restricted by the treaty of the Waitangi, and for individualizing and registering their titles to land. The Home Government however (see Lord Carnarvon's despatch of 28th May, 1859) preferred adhering to the old system under which the natives were allowed to sell land to the government only. All this time the little cloud at Taranaki was growing larger and larger, others were looming on the horizon, which shortly joined it, and hurst forth in the Taranaki war. Even before the departure of Sir G. Grey native affairs at Taranaki were in a most unsatisfactory state, rival tribes and families or subdivisions of tribes disputed lands, and ultimately murder and acts of war were committed, even on European land within the precincts of the settlement, between the natives themselves. The authorities were not sufficiently powerful to interfere, and dreaded a war. No European had however been touched. Such a state of things was fraught with danger and disgraceful to our government. It appeared to Governor Gore Browne that the best way to end it, was to buy the land, to define native reserves, and to settle the district. He went to Taranaki. He told the natives that he would allow no land to be bought without the consent of both claimants, should there be two claimants; that he would buy no land the ownership of which was disputed; that he would allow no man to interfere with an other's right of selling his own; and that he would repress murder and outrage. Soon after this the Waitara block was offered for sale by Teira. The chief commissioner of lands reported that he was the owner, and the land was bought; but a reservation was made to the effect that the rights of any native who might substantiate a claim to the land or any part of it, were saved, and would be respected. The chief, "William King," (not *'the King,'*) took armed possession by building a pah on the land. He was driven off, and the Waitara war commenced.

I must now pause to call attention to the attitude of the natives at this time; for Waitara was but the spark, other clouds, too, were charged with thunder. The natives had not originally, in my opinion, so to speak, feelings of nationality. They had strong feelings of tribal loyalty; the tribe was their nation, as the islands were their world. It could not have been otherwise. Many of them considered the Europeans settled side by side with them in the light of a portion of their tribe, or as an allied tribe. They consulted with them, and often made, as they do now, common cause with them as against a common enemy. When I lived in a native district, natives have come fifty miles to consult with me as to our action on such occasions. Many old settlers will remember the delight with which, on one occasion, old Te Puni rejoiced that the enemy had been defeated, "not by the soldiers," but by the settlers:—"By you, by you, my own white men." I have been told by New Zealand gold-diggers on their return from Australia that the Maori and the European New Zealander always held together in Australia. One man in particular told me that a Maori had walked a whole day to inform him of a rich find of gold. He said, "I wanted to find a European from the same place as myself; but, however, you also are from New Zealand." But side by side with this friendly and amicable feeling, and tending in an opposite direction, had grown up the sentiment of nationality. It manifested itself in two ways—in the King Movement and the Land League. The Land League was most powerful amongst tribes which had not sold land. They did not, as a rule, complain that land had been unfairly bought, but they felt that with the lands prestige and power

went, and that as Europeans increased in numbers the power of their race declined. Therefore, at a meeting at Manawapou, the representatives of the league decreed death to whosoever should sell his land or any part of it. The King movement was also distinctly a movement in favour of a separate nationality. "As there was a king in Israel, as there is a queen in England, as there are emperors in France and Russia," said Tamihana (Thompson). "so shall there be a king in New Zealand for the natives," The king was to have his tribute, his flag, his army; he was to be distinctly an independent sovereign. Such aspirations, founded on a sentiment common to all mankind, were not to be lightly treated; nay, they evoked sympathy, and amongst colonists Tamihana was spoken of with respect. But when overtures by the Governor, in the direction of local self-government, under the authority of the Crown, were rejected, as I have heard them made and rejected, it was impossible not to see that two governments in the same country could not go on long without a collision, and that the sentiment of nationality must lead to the injury, not the benefit, of the native race. And so it happened. The king sent his flag to Waitara with a contingent from Waikato. At the same time the Ngatiruanui tribe, always ready to plunder and murder, took the opportunity of attacking Taranaki from the south. The officer commanding Her Majesty's forces in the district ordered the settlers into the town, refused to allow them to protect their property, and the whole district was given up to plunder and ruin. Reinforcements were sent for, and after General Pratt, who arrived from Australia, had advanced by sap to within a hundred yards of what remained of Te Arei pah, a kind of pacification was agreed to. I was then Minister for native affairs, and I can state from my own personal knowledge that Governor Gore Browne, even then, offered William King (who must not be confounded with the native king) to return to him any portion of the Waitara block to which he could prove a claim. He made no reply, and drew his force off into the forests. Waiving the question of ownership, I think I have said enough to show that the issue in the Governor's mind was not a question of a paltry six hundred acres of land, but of permitting armed interference on the part of "William King"—of submitting to the forcible assertion of authority by the Maori king through his Waikato contingent. As to the Ngatiruanui horde, the same tribe that has since produced the prophets and the new fanaticism, I have never even heard the shadow of an excuse for their inroad into lands confessedly long the property of settlers. And so this war languished and died out, I may almost say. There was a kind of partial pacification; no punishment was inflicted upon the insurgents. Then came a short breathing time. General Cameron, who had arrived to take the command, was anxious at once to fall upon Waikato, the head-quarters of the native king; but Governor Browne very properly resolved to offer an ultimatum before permitting him to do so. Governor Gore Browne's term of office having expired, he was appointed to Tasmania, and Sir G. Grey, at the special request of the Home Government, "as a great Proconsul," proceeded to New Zealand from the Cape (Oct. 1861). If personal influence, zeal, experience, and knowledge of the native character could have averted war, we might then have hoped for peace. Mr. Fox had come into power, aided by Mr. Sewell, as a peace ministry; most earnest endeavours were made to induce the natives to accept a system of institutions, which many believed might occupy and civilize them; large sums were voted for native purposes; the Opposition determined to give Sir George Grey's policy a fair trial. Mr. Fox nevertheless resigned after a year's tenure of office (1863), on a question arising out of an offer made by the Duke of Newcastle, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, to give the management of native affairs to the colonists. Mr. Fox's resolution on this subject was opposed, as not going far enough, by those who objected to a divided responsibility, and who wished the entire and absolute management of native affairs to be entrusted to the colony; and, on the other hand, by those who desired to leave Sir G. Grey unfettered, or who thought that native affairs should remain in the hands of the Home Government, at all events till peace was restored and order established. The Opposition was led by the most prominent supporters of Governor Gore Browne's policy; but they did not take office themselves, fearing that to do so might embarrass the Governor, whom they regarded as a dictator sent out by England. They therefore placed in office Messrs. Domett and Dillon Bell, both men of great ability and knowledge of native affairs, both believed to be personally acceptable to his Excellency. They were supported on the express understanding that they were not to accept the responsibility of native policy. Scarcely had the new ministry been seated when a despatch from the Duke of Newcastle of the 26th May, 1862, was laid before the House, handing over the administration of native affairs to the colony, on the ground "that the endeavour to keep the management of the natives under the control of the Home Government had failed," and that it can "only be mischievous to retain the shadow of responsibility when the beneficial exercise of power has become impossible." Both Chambers of the Legislature in addresses to Her Majesty declined to accede to his Grace's views, and asked for an enquiry into the condition of the country, and the respective obligations of the mother country and the colony towards the native race.

When the Assembly next met in October, 1863, war had again commenced. Sir G. Grey had abandoned the Government claim to the Waitara block; but in attempting to reoccupy the settler's land to the south of Taranaki, which, as I before mentioned, had been seized by the Ngatiruanui plunderers, an escort of Her Majesty's troops had been cut off. In the Waikato, the seat of the native king, affairs had taken an unfavourable turn, which had been aggravated by the well-meant but indiscreet efforts of a stipendiary magistrate, Mr. Gorst,

which added to the irritation of the King party. War had commenced, and General Cameron, at the head of an imposing force, was marching into Waikato. At this juncture, a despatch from the Duke of Newcastle, of 26th February, 1863, was presented to the Assembly, in which he instructs the Governor as follows :—"Your constitutional position with regard to your advisers will (as desired by your late Ministry) be the same in regard to native as to ordinary colonial affairs; that is to "say, you will be generally bound to give effect to the policy which they recommend for your adoption, and for which, therefore, they will be responsible. To this the House of Representatives replied by passing, without a division, a resolution to the effect that, recognizing" the thoroughly efficient aid which Her Majesty's Government is now affording for the suppression of the rebellion" .... and relying upon the cordial cooperation of the Imperial Government for the future, the House cheerfully accepts the responsibility thus placed on the colonists." A similar resolution was passed in the Legislative Council or upper House.

Thus ended the second epoch of the colonial history of New Zealand in which the colonists had exercised the powers of self-government with the exception of the control of native policy; but this period cannot be disconnected with the succeeding one, because at that very moment a policy was being carried out, a war was raging, and a large imperial and colonial force under a British General was actually in the field.

A new ministry was now formed under Messrs. Whitaker and Fox, vigorously to prosecute the war—a three millions loan was authorized—most stringent measures passed—and the Colony flattered itself that by putting forth all its strength, with a force of some fifteen thousand men under a distinguished British General, and a little fleet of steamers and gunboats, backed by the presence of British ships-of-war—and by carrying out a system of military colonization upon lands to be confiscated from the insurgents, a short and decisive campaign or two would finish the war for ever. Alas these anticipations were doomed to be miserably disappointed difficulties and disputes arose, the war dragged its slow length along, a great part of the to us seemingly inexhaustible sum of three millions vanished into thin air; and when the Assembly met in November 1864, Ministers had resigned after an unseemly altercation with the Governor; the relations between the General commanding and Her Majesty's representative were on the worst possible footing. England was naturally dissatisfied at the lavish expenditure of blood and money. The natives were defeated in Waikato hut unsubdued; the settlement of Taranaki had not been restored; friendly or neutral natives were uneasy and alarmed—escaped prisoners occupied a fortified position within sight of the city of Auckland (the head-quarters of the Government and General). The colony had neither money nor credit, its debentures were unsaleable, its account largely overdrawn, large bodies of immigrants called from different parts of the world were encamped in tents in Auckland and its environs, and were receiving a pittance of government aid. The Southern island, free itself from native questions, having no selfish interest in common with the Northern one, supporting the war simply from a feeling of loyalty, but taking far less interest in it, than it would have done, in a war between England and Russia—the Southern island I say—naturally enough discontented at the loss of its money, at heavy taxation, and no prospect of finality, was tending towards a desire for separation. Parliament was disorganized by the retirement, before its meeting, of Ministers who had commanded a majority, and who in order to carry out a large scheme of military and agricultural colonization on confiscated lands with a view to ensuring a safe frontier to the threatened settlements (as originally suggested by the Domett government) had before their retirement introduced large bodies of immigrants and entered into enormous liabilities.

Public men naturally enough felt that to face such a complication of difficulties involved a loss of credit, that the safe side was to hang back, nor could any man be known to command a majority in the Assembly, the Ministry having resigned in the recess.

His Excellency the Governor sent for me, and asked me to undertake the formation of a Ministry—and as he said to assist him in saving the country under overwhelming difficulties. My health was not strong at the time, and I had other private and personal reasons which at any less urgent crisis would have led me to decline that "bad eminence." But I felt it to be my duty to go to work, and I did it. But before attempting to form a government I obtained from His Excellency a pledge that I should have his concurrence and support in carrying out my policy could I secure the approval of the Assembly; I determined to act strictly in accordance with the principles of responsible government, to take the full responsibility of every act, to consult with the Governor, to act loyally by him, but to resign without hesitation should I be prevented from carrying out my views.

I felt strongly that divided responsibility, or rather divided authority, (for all British subjects are responsible to the Queen and to our common country) was the root of half our misfortunes, political and military. More than that—as one who as a working colonist, as an explorer, as a traveller, as a frequent visitor to England, had still thought and studied colonial questions—who had enjoyed the friendship of John Robert Godley, a man too little known, hut second to none I am sure, in the minds and hearts of many of the leading men of England, a memory that must be as a light to guide the footsteps of colonial politicians at home and abroad, I could not have enjoyed these advantages, without having strong and formed opinions upon general colonial policy. I had foreshadowed them long before, here and there. I knew that far better men than myself in and out of the colony

were imbued with the same spirit, and had advocated the same principles far more ably than I could do, but now I felt that the time was come, when that true old English colonial policy of self-reliance might be put into force, face to face with the greatest difficulties. I knew that I should be called Quixotic, I knew that the timid would fear,—that the lovers of military routine would be shocked and scandalized—that the interested would cry out—self-reliance meant of course self-exertion and self-sacrifice; I knew what that is to a people accustomed, in a great degree, to rely on others. I did not expect to succeed at once, especially in the face of such difficulties, but I hoped to help to plant a seed of life in the hearts of the people of New Zealand, which might grow in despite of rebuffs and adversity. Mr. Sewell, Mr. FitzHerbert, Major Atkinson, Major Richardson, Mr. Mantell (and at a later period Mr. Fitz- Gerald and Mr. J. C. Richmond, brother of the judge,) came forward at my request, and a Ministry was constituted.

The original propositions made by me to the Governor, and to which the new cabinet adhered, were as follows:—

- *Mr. Weld having received the Governor's commands to undertake the formation of a Ministry, and having at an interview stated the grounds upon which alone he should feel justified in placing his services at the Governor's disposal, now submits in writing the following propositions for His Excellency's consideration.*
- *Mr. Weld is of opinion that the system of double government by Governor and Ministers, has resulted in evil to both races of Her Majesty's subjects in New Zealand;—he recognises the right of the Home Government to insist upon the maintenance of this system, so long as the Colony is receiving the aid of British troops for the suppression of internal disturbances : he is prepared to accept the alternative, and will recommend the Assembly to request the Home Government to withdraw the whole of its land force from the Colony, and to issue such instructions to the Governor as may enable him to be guided entirely by the recommendations of his constitutional Advisers, excepting only upon such matters as may directly concern Imperial interests and the prerogatives of the Crown.*
- *Mr. Weld is aware that the Governor, before taking action upon a proposition which would change the whole aspect of the relations between the Mother Country and the Colony, may probably feel it his duty to ascertain the views of Her Majesty's Home Government; he would, therefore, pending their decision, recommend to the Colonial Parliament that the Colony should undertake a reasonable liability for the services of troops actively engaged in the field, at the especial recommendation of His Excellency's Ministers, and for such troops only.*
- *Mr. Weld would recommend that a small standing Colonial Force be kept on foot, armed and trained with special reference to the nature of the services required.*
- *It would be his duty to advise that at least one strong Military Post should be occupied about the centre of the coast line of the Ngatiruanui country, with, such force as the Lieutenant-General may deem requisite; and that a road may be made from Wanganui to the Northern part of the Taranaki Province.*
- *The Colony having entered into arrangements with a large number of Military Settlers, Mr. Weld would propose that sufficient and, being part of the territory belonging to the insurgents and now in military occupation, should be taken to fulfil those engagements, and that the description of such confiscated lands, and proper plans thereof, should be made public without delay.*
- *In its last Session the General Assembly resolved that the Seat of Government should be removed to some place in Cook's Straits, to be determined by a Commission specially appointed for that purpose. In accordance with the recommendation of that Commission, Mr. Weld would propose that the Seat of the General Government be at once removed to Wellington.*
- *Mr. Weld thinks it right to state frankly that if the Governor should feel it his duty to differ on any material point with his Constitutional Advisers, Mr. Weld would, without hesitation, place his resignation in his Excellency's hands; he therefore considers it essential that in such a case, the Assembly should at once be called, or other advisers summoned.*
- *Should the Governor be pleased to concur in the above proposals, and authorise Mr. Weld to make that concurrence known, Mr. Weld would feel justified in attempting to fulfil the task imposed upon him by His Excellency.*

"(Signed.) FRED. A. WELD.

"Auckland,

November 22, 1864."

I will now sketch out as briefly as possible, the outline of the policy proposed by my Government.

1st. We believed that divided authority was ruinous, fully accepting the constitutional influence that the Governor might exercise on our counsels as Her Majesty's representative; we were of opinion that both the Duke of Newcastle's despatches, the state of public opinion in England, and the circumstances of the colony required a more complete adherence to the principle of responsible government than had hitherto existed, and we saw that whilst a large body of British troops were carrying on operations in the colony, it was ridiculous to suppose that the people of Great Britain would consent to give up a large control over colonial policy, a control which could be enforced by a sudden threat to withdraw the troops at a time of danger.

2nd. We believed that an army of troops trained especially for European warfare, acting in masses, with large trains of artillery, baggage, and supplies, and moved according to the requirements of war in settled countries as if against a similarly organised enemy, were not adapted for bush work against a foe, few in numbers, active and skilled in guerilla warfare. We had the greatest respect for the British army, we were proud of it as all Englishmen are and must be; we knew that it contained in its ranks the bravest hearts, and added to that, amongst its officers many of the ablest heads of any army in the world, but we could not expect it to be reorganized for a special service which might unfit it for its own work, and we could not suppose that its heart would be in a service for which it was not adapted by its very constitution; we did not suppose we could have any influence over it, for we had not, and necessarily could not have over it, the power of punishment or reward, and lastly it was a most expensive machine, costing us according to the demands of the British Government £160,000 a year, and we could not afford to pay for it.

3rd. Nor did we desire war. We believed that war might easily drift into a war of races, a war of extermination. Our desire was not to confiscate land if we could possibly help it, and I must say, that was the desire of the colonists generally, even on the lowest commercial grounds—to confiscate land did not pay, it was far cheaper to buy it. The colonists of the inferior class even, knew that war meant stoppage of immigration, taxation, stagnation and stoppage of influx of capital and consequently of progress. When they had supported war they had supported it (especially the Southern islanders) mainly on grounds of loyalty and sentiment, and with few exceptions those who could gain the least and were the least personally interested in the question were its most strenuous supporters. But our views were simply to repress outrages, and to give what protection we could to life and property, without undertaking great military operations; to make any operations we might be compelled to undertake, as local, and as much like police operations as possible. We trusted to time and to other means for the termination of our difficulties.

4th. We believed that a small force, especially trained for bush service, partaking of the nature of a constabulary force, would be the most efficient. In my Memorandum of the 20th March, 1865, I sketched out a rough plan for such a force, to consist of 1,500 men; I still am of opinion that a smaller force would have been sufficient. I should, had I remained in office, have gradually raised it as the military settlers were taken off pay and located on their land. I should have selected the best men, men accustomed to the bush, men confident in their own superiority in bush fighting over the Maories, men who could carry their own provisions (the best and most concentrated in form that could be obtained), who could but themselves quickly and comfortably, as any bushman can, men armed with the best and most perfect appliances for bush war. Such men properly led (and there were men to lead them) would have been invincible in the bush, and with the prestige of race, British determination and superiority of appliances they could have moved in very small bodies, and thus have neutralised the rapidity of motion, which is the natural advantage of the savage, and it must be remembered that the New Zealander is not like the Ghorka, or North American, a real bushman, he is a fisherman and an agriculturalist, and in the bush he seldom leaves the path. When I explored in places unvisited by natives, where there were no paths, I never took natives with me, I always relied on the superior pluck and the superior bushman ship of Europeans. It will be remembered by some old colonists that when I explored through the mountains from Nelson to Canterbury in 1855, I with one European succeeded, whilst a body of natives sent out by the Provincial Government on the same errand failed and returned, though accompanied by a very energetic European—but I have allowed myself to digress.

5th. We proposed to use natives in war, we did not propose (if it possibly could be helped) to set tribe against tribe, but we considered that using natives in conjunction with Europeans, as a native militia, fighting side by side with their neighbours in defence of their land, families, and property, would lessen the chances of a war of extermination, and would strengthen the good feeling between the races, besides being a great assistance to the colony.

6th. We did not rely upon measures of repression alone to solve the native question, there are other and higher duties than mere repression of revolt which devolve upon a Government. Under an Act passed by the Domett and Dillon Bell ministry we had the power of constituting land courts, consisting of a European judge and native assessors, constituted to try all land titles and cases of ownership by native custom, and to give individual, tribal, or family titles by grant or certificate from the Crown. We did not exclude from the benefits of the Court even natives who had been in insurrection, we hoped thereby to indulge the natives in their passion

for litigation, if we did not indulge them in war, we hoped not only to occupy their minds, but to give them real and substantial justice, by means of a Court in which they were to a great extent themselves the judges; and to give them the means of raising themselves above that communism which was weighing them down, to enable them to make themselves individual landowners, able to sell their lands in the open market at a fair price, or to let them, and thus to become rich, and interested in the maintenance of law and order. The Court has worked well, and to a great extent our hopes have been realized.

The first day I was in office, I waited upon a gentleman in every way qualified for the task, and said, "Native land courts are the last straw to save the drowning race, will you accept the office of chief "judge of that court ?" My next act was to abolish the old system of land purchases by the Government, formerly upheld by the Home Government, from good, but as I think mistaken motives; and thus the Government ceased to appear in the eyes of the natives as a land jobber, and stood in its proper colours as an impartial arbiter of justice. Other acts of justice to the natives were carried out; commissioners were sent to enquire into unfulfilled promises made to natives, and in the session of 1865, the Native Rights' Bill was introduced and carried by Mr. FitzGerald, a member of our ministry, and also a scheme was proposed for the establishment of native districts, which would have had, I believe, the effect of turning the minds of the natives to local self government under government auspices, and would ultimately have localised police charges and relieved the settlements and especially the Southern island from burdens of which they justly complained.

On the other hand we proceeded with measures of repression. To have retired from the Waikato which had been taken possession of, might have been followed by a general rising; we thought that the prestige of the King must be lowered, and we carried out the New Zealand Settlements Act, which had received the sanction of Her Majesty's representative and of the Home Government, by the confiscation of the conquered territory. All the rights of friendly natives were saved, and all hostile natives were invited to come in and receive grants of land for themselves and families, military settlers received land at various points. The conquered territory being in the form of a parallelogram, flanked on three sides by native territory, was not what we could have wished for defence, but we found it so, and had no alternative. The colony up to this date is out of pocket by this confiscation, politically however it has gained, for though many of the military settlers left for the gold fields, and want of means has crippled the colonization of the district, since that confiscation the Waikato king's prestige has diminished, and Waikato has been quiet. To replace the ruined settlement of Taranaki on a firm and secure foundation, was another main point of our native policy, but of this hereafter.

7th. Another cardinal point of our policy was road making, the precursor of immigration and civilization:—common sense and the lessons of history might teach us this; and as it happened, Sir George Grey in the first epoch of New Zealand colonization had proved its efficacy in that country. We passed an act enabling us on payment to take land for road making. We proposed gradually to carry roads through the country, not necessarily expensive highly-finished roads, but passable open tracks; we proposed if possible to encourage natives to make them, either by votes in aid, or by employing them as labourers by contract or otherwise; we intended gradually to push them through the country, avoiding collision with hostile tribes as much as possible, but intending to protect our road parties on emergency by force, in such few cases as might occur, such as between Wanganui and Taranaki (the Ngatiruanui country,) where a passable road was a political necessity. Want of money of course prevented our doing much in that way during our short tenure of office, but we did not leave office before the country was made passable through the above-mentioned district.

8th. I have alluded to the financial state of embarrassment in which we found the colony; it can hardly be exaggerated, it was only short of bankruptcy. In a colony numbering about 200,000 souls an annual war expenditure of close upon £700,000 was going on, to which should be added £160,000 a year claimed by the Home Government as a contribution towards the cost of the Imperial troops, besides heavy liabilities and contingent expenses. We set to work unsparingly to retrench, and as we felt the first thing to be done was to keep up our credit and meet our engagements, and as all retrenchments could not be effected in a day, we at once increased the taxation of a people, already more heavily taxed than England, by raising the customs duties to the utmost possible limit; and the next session we proposed a stamp duties tax. Had we remained in office we hoped to have completed the organization of our native force, and finished putting the military settlers on their and, out of a balance remaining of the loan, aided by a small vote on the estimates, and ultimately to have reduced the customs duties. We also passed an act confirming the contract for the Panama Mail Steam Company which completed the chain of steam communication round the globe; and though New Zealand was doubtless much benefited by this, we did so mainly on the ground that by former transactions we were bound in honour to do so, and that the credit of the colony was already pledged to it. The British Parliament had offered us a guaranteed loan for a million, but coupled it with conditions which interfered with our engagements and the security given to previous creditors. Tantalizing as was the offer of a million upon such terms to a starving exchequer—to a government that was hardly able to make its weekly payments, we refused it, in a memorandum dated January 3, 1865, rather than break faith. Nay further, on the 23rd March of the same year

we informed the Governor in another memorandum, that we had instructed the Crown agents to deliver to the Lords of the Treasury securities to the amount of £500,000, to which, for reasons stated in the memorandum, we considered England had an equitable claim—conduct which was no doubt, just, which raised the credit of the Colony, and which has since induced Her Majesty's Home Government, to meet us in regard to other claims and counter-claims in a spirit of liberality, but which nevertheless was censured as "Quixotic," and even damaging to the stability of our ministry.

I will not here refer to propositions for consolidating the colonial debts general and provincial, the moment was not favourable for them, and they were never formally brought forward by us. In a memorandum by the colonial treasurer, dated 23rd March, 1865, we asked the Imperial guarantee for the residue of our loan, which was refused. Before quitting office we ordered a submarine telegraph cable to unite the two islands, and turned our attention to other questions of improvement of local interest, and reform, such as the comptroller of revenues act, and other measures.

9th. A main feature of our policy was to preserve the unity of the Colony. The Southern Island, supplying the greater part of the revenue, and seeing that so large a part of it had been expended in apparently interminable war, talked of separation; Auckland, in the north, which had benefited commercially by the presence of the troops, and which had few sympathies in common with the south, was not altogether unwilling to place itself entirely in the hands of the Home Government, and, at all events, cried out for separation; but most of the leading and most thinking men of the Colony, irrespective of party, having regard to the future of New Zealand, feeling too, "that the division of the country into two or three small separate states would dwarf the political intellect of the Colony, confining it to the consideration of narrow and personal interests; whilst no slight security for the future of the native race is afforded in the fact that the questions affecting them and their relations with Europeans are influenced by men beyond the reach of local passions and interests" (words I take from my memorandum of 30th December, 1864)—opposed separation. With this view the Assembly had, in a previous session, moved the Governor to appoint a commission of gentlemen, selected by the Governors of the Australian Colonies, to decide on a more central site of government than Auckland. This commission had fixed upon Wellington, on Cook's Strait, which divides the island. In accordance with that decision we removed the seat of Government to Wellington.

10th. I must now turn to the subject of Taranaki and Wanganui. It was at Taranaki that the little cloud first rose. The settlement had almost been wiped off the map except as a military post, and every settler that remained was a volunteer or militiaman. Still they clung to their ruined homes and desolate fields with a tenacity very rare amongst new colonists, who are apt upon slight occasion to remove their household gods, and to seek elsewhere new hearths and homes. Not so the men of Taranaki. Sturdy west-countrymen as they were, they made it a point of honour to remain; they believed that if they had been allowed, unfettered by orders, to have defended themselves, that they could have held their own or regained it. We used to say, that they had imbibed something of the patriotic spirit of mountaineers from constantly looking at the snowy cone of Mount Egmont, which, rising to a height of over nine thousand feet, a solitary peak, towers in sublime beauty over their rich low lands and undulating forests, and is never mentioned by the New Plymouth" or Taranaki man but with reverence, and as "*the* mountain." Like the Greek islander who placed in the vale of Tempe, asked, "But where is the sea?" so you may place the Taranaki man where you like, his question will still be, "But the mountain, where is the mountain?" Be that as it may, the little settlement of Taranaki would not die; but the existence it led was a warning, a menace, and an incentive to attack. On its north was the Waitara, and here lately William King's" people had fired on some friendly native women and children gathering mussels, and committed other outrages. On its south lay the irrepressible Ngatiruanui, rejoicing in their plunder, already plotting new murders, steeped in the wildest and most diabolical fanaticism, under the leadership of the prophet Te Ua, carrying about with them the baked head of a British officer, performing hideous orgies round it, sending emissaries to other tribes inciting them to rise. Some of the upper Wanganui natives had already fraternized with them, and had attacked the friendly natives on that river. In the battle which had ensued victory at first inclined to the fanatics; the advanced party of the friendly natives was almost destroyed; amongst them perished brother Euloge, a French lay-brother, who was attending the wounded; but Haimona with the reserve restored the fight, and probably saved the Wanganui settlement from a great disaster.

At the time we came into office a road was being carried from Wanganui northwards in the direction of Taranaki, parallel with the sea coast. It was opposed by the fanatical party, who also gave refuge to criminals and committed several murders. It was quite clear that there could be no peace in the Colony as long as this plague-spot remained, with its propaganda of all that can be conceived most horrible against laws human and divine. Even the Maori king party, even natives in arms against us, spoke of the excesses of these fanatics with horror. But the fanaticism was spreading. The fascination such wild doctrines have over the savage and half-savage mind is not easily explained, but it is not the less certain. They appealed to the spirit of nationality; they appealed, too, to the most brutal passions—to gross immorality, to cannibalism, to the love of plunder, to

the love of murder, to the excitement of wild and horrible fanatic rites. They spread, and thousands of so-called Christian natives enrolled themselves under the prophet's flag. The missionary Volkner was murdered and butchered in cold blood by these men at the other end of the island; and to this day, under another prophet, the same unholy fire burns, and has led to new and still more horrible atrocities. It is not necessary to warn any well-informed New Zealand colonist, but it is necessary to warn English readers and writers, that the case of these plundering and fanatical tribes should be entirely disconnected with that of natives, loyal or disaffected, of the better class.

Now the centre of the fanatical propaganda, the root of the evil which was growing in all directions, was the country between Taranaki and Wanganui. We resolved to open the communication between these two settlements, to place them upon a sound footing. No punishment whatever had ever been inflicted upon the Ngatiruanui plunderers and murderers; we resolved to occupy a strong point or points on their coast, slightly to extend the Taranaki frontier, and place a military settlement on it. Every Governor, every government, and I may say, every commanding officer, who had gone before, had, I believe, held that the punishment of these tribes was a necessity for the future peace of the country; and the General had, before we came into office, contemplated such a campaign. If necessary before, it was doubly necessary now, that the new fanaticism was spreading from that source. We therefore recommended that action should be taken, and that pending the decision of the British government regarding our request for the removal of the troops, a part of them should be employed in the service; but we carefully guarded ourselves by saying, that should this service be considered likely to delay the departure of the troops, we were prepared to deal with the question ourselves, as our means would permit. Knowing however that the whole native force in the district could not exceed, as it never did exceed, eight hundred men, whilst there were nearly seven thousand armed men, chiefly British soldiers, in the Taranaki and Wanganui country; we reasonably supposed, that a sharp, quick, and decisive campaign, would finish every thing in a few weeks. In this, from causes which we could not have foreseen or controlled, we were miserably disappointed; the General did move slowly along the coast, and Te Ua the prophet, who had promised invincibility to his followers, made a song, in which he attributed this to the effect of his incantations. The result of these delays was most detrimental to our position; our financial difficulties were aggravated beyond measure by them; and the Southern Island was naturally uneasy, and feared a new war. Months elapsed, and still Weraroa pah, the stronghold of the fanatics, stood, the key to the Wanganui country, barring the progress of our road, and threatening the settlement itself and the friendly natives. The General with a large force had marched past it in the night, but had not thereby got into its proper rear, or cut off its supplies: pressed to attack it, he spoke of "more men from England." We replied, in our memorandum of 20th March, 1865, that we advised the Governor to oppose any such demand, refused to recommend "any operations to be undertaken which might involve the retention of Imperial forces in the Colony;" and submitted "our opinion that a Colonial force of bush rangers and cavalry, united with the loyal natives, whose interests are identified with those of the colonists," would "be sufficient to under-take and execute all operations that are requisite." In this and many other memoranda we adhered steadily to our programme, and pressed the removal of the Imperial force on general grounds of policy, in reference to the hostile attitude assumed by the General towards the Governor and Ministry, on grounds of justice to the British taxpayer, and of expense to the Colony. I refrain from entering into controversial matter. The Colonial Government for sufficient reasons decided upon carrying on all future operations with its own force. In the absence of the Governor at Auckland, I planned an attack on Weraroa pah with colonial forces. It was frustrated at the moment the garrison had offered to capitulate, by the action of the Lieut-Colonel commanding the district, who was also at the time agent for the Colonial Government; he was a zealous and good officer, and no doubt had done his duty, acting as he did under two masters; but I felt it my duty to accept the resignation of his post under the Colonial Government. At that time Sir G. Grey the Governor arrived from Auckland. He proceeded to the spot, and executed a masterly movement with colonial troops, which put us in the possession of the stronghold of the enemy. I should say that previously Piperiki, a post up the Wanganui river, had been occupied by colonial troops under the direction of Major Atkinson, the Defence Minister, with the concurrence of Sir G. Grey, which had, to use the natives' own word?, "shut the back door of Weraroa."

At this time an outbreak, taking the form of an attack upon friendly natives, occurred on the east coast, in connection with the west coast or Ngatiruanui fanaticism. I objected to the employment of Imperial troops. It was in many respects a most formidable insurrection in regard to numbers, to the nature of the country, to the possible results. It was completely and thoroughly defeated, and the insurgents were followed into their fastnesses by an inferior number of men, and pursued day and night, till a large number surrendered, by Captain Biggs, with a small party of the colonial force. The defeat of this, and a later inroad, is chiefly due to the exertions and gallantry of Mr. McLean, the government agent, of Major Frazer, Major Whitmore, and Major Biggs, and the native chief Morgan." The closing scene of these events did not take place till after our government had retired from office. At this time the London *Times* was able to write in a leading article, that

"the volunteers were taking pah after pah, and making short work of the war;" and to advocate some honorary reward, (which they would have prized beyond anything,) being given to them.

The Assembly met in July 1865. We were able to congratulate the country upon a brighter state of affairs, upon a very great reduction of expenditure, upon the improved position of the settlement of Taranaki, for which we were mainly indebted to the zeal and ability of Colonel Warre, C.B., who commanded the troops and acted as government agent in that district, upon the successes which had crowned our efforts in the field, upon the restoration of our credit in the money market, upon the improved tone of public feeling in England towards us, recognizing as it did, not only in both Houses of the British Parliament, but in the public press that we were helping ourselves and doing our duty. We the government, at least, felt, that the clouds had broken and that the way now lay clear before us—the country generally I believe felt the same—one effort more and the haven of rest was gained. We were so confident in our position as regards the native question that we thought the time was come to issue a proclamation of peace and amnesty, and His Excellency the Governor accordingly did so, on the 25th of September, 1865; we felt however that no half measures would do with the fanatical tribes between Wanganui and Taranaki. We confiscated that territory, intending to put self-defending settlements upon it, and to induce as many as possible of the former owners to settle down between them on grants of land with individualized titles. We sent Mr. Parris, a gentleman distinguished by his love for, and his knowledge of the native race, to negotiate with them to this effect; we had reason to anticipate success from his efforts—though the worst section of the fanatics treacherously murdered envoys bearing the proclamation of amnesty sent to them by General Waddy.

The Assembly was still sitting; we fought through the session almost to its close, but political combinations were working against us: we defeated the separationists, we carried several important measures, especially the Native Rights Bill, an act calculated to benefit the native race in several ways, more especially by removing certain legal difficulties which barred their ready access to the Supreme Court in questions of land title. The Outlying-Districts Police Act, and an amendment of the Native Land Courts Act, were also carried. Still the waves were closing round us; my own health had broken down; abler men than myself sat on the ministerial benches, but still only the head of a government can hold all the strings in his hands. I was latterly seldom able to be in my place. Again, as sunshine came forth, with it came forth too all the old provincial jealousies; and all those springs of action were set to work, which, as I shall explain hereafter, must necessarily in such a constitution as that of New Zealand render it almost impossible for any government to remain in office, except by means to which it ought not to stoop. On the question of the Otago Native Reserves Bill (which I opposed as unfair to a small tribe of natives on the Southern Island) I lost for ever, as I was forewarned I should lose, several of my former supporters, and when; on a question of raising additional revenue by stamp duties, which was needed to provide for the defence of the Colony, and to maintain its credit and fulfil liabilities incurred by my predecessors, I warned my party, that I called on them for support or would resign; I was only saved from actual defeat by the casting vote of the Speaker, and I resigned accordingly; satisfied that by such resignation I should best act in accordance with the spirit of constitutional government, and best ultimately secure the triumph of those principles I had advocated.

My successor, Mr. Stafford, took office on the ground that he could carry out my views with slight modifications, in a more economical manner than I was doing; he was strongly backed by the leaders of the provincial party. I assume, therefore, that it was expected that he would devote larger sums of money to provincial purposes, than I was prepared to do, consistently with my ideas of what was required for the defence of the country; he also advocated an income tax rather than stamp duties—a form of taxation, in my opinion, unfitted for a new country, as costly in collection, uncertain in such a country in its operation, very liable to be evaded, and which cannot induce to economy, as the incidence of taxation in a purely democratic community does not lie on the voters. This is a mere matter of opinion. Mr. Stafford, himself one of the most distinguished of our public men, took no other leading men into office with him. His Defence (or war office) minister was Colonel Haultain, a gentleman remarkable for his consistent opposition to the policy of self reliance. Still Mr. Stafford never in any way reversed my policy regarding the removal of the British troops. I understand that he differed from the ministry he succeeded in not actually pressing for their removal, and that he did not advise, as far as I am aware, in any way regarding them. A main point of difference was that he did not provide an efficient substitute for them. The mistaken ideas of short-sighted economy that prevailed, would not, perhaps, have allowed him to remain in office if he had carried out a sound policy in that respect.

Just before I embarked for England, on account of my health, I spoke to a public meeting at Christ Church as follows :—" I believe that this country may rise, and will rise, to greatness and prosperity; and there are two ways in which it may do so—it may rise through the gate of adversity, and it may rise through the gate of honour, by which we would have led it . . . . . I dare say many gentlemen will say, this is all fine talk; but I ask you to remember my words in years to come, I ask you, if you should find that instead of reduction of taxation, by a false economy your taxation is doubled, and you come to prosperity, as I am sure from the race

from which you spring, you will ultimately), by the gate of misfortune, ruin almost, and adversity, then you will remember my words, and if you do not now, then do justice to the motives under which I am speaking." These were my last words spoken in public to the colonists of New Zealand, recent events will tell whether they were prophetic or not.

The first event of importance under Mr. Stafford's ministry, was the campaign of General Chute. Mr. Stafford has stated in the House of Representatives that he did not advise that campaign: I should have resigned rather than permitted it. It was quite true, that it was necessary to punish the treachery of those, who had almost within sight of General Waddy's camp, murdered his messengers, the bearers of the peace proclamation. As he did not attempt it, it should have been done with a bush force, and before leaving office we advised the Governor accordingly, and objected to a campaign with troops. General Chute, however, made a most gallant and dashing campaign, marching victoriously from one end of the district to the other; he entirely re-established the prestige of British troops if you will, but also entirely upset all Mr. Parris's negotiations with the natives, destroyed at least one friendly village by mistake, shot a prisoner against the protest of the only colonial authorities present; and though his success in a military point of view was complete, nothing could possibly have been more unfortunate for the prospects of peace. Not that we could ever have expected much from the Ngatiruanui tribes, but there was a hope regarding many of them, and that hope was destroyed. In the session of 1866, in a newly elected parliament, Mr. Stafford's ministry was defeated by an overwhelming majority, A new ministry was constituted, Mr. Stafford's official knowledge, administrative ability and standing, once more placed him at the head of the Government, and he was joined by several able and conscientious men who had formerly supported me; they considered that the circumstances of the Colony required a united government to work for it, and they wisely or unwisely, but certainly from the highest motives, formed what I must consider a coalition government, seeing that Colonel Haultain, the consistent opponent of the self-defence policy, retained his seat, and still retains it, as Minister for defence. That ministry remains in office. A Stamp Duties bill, similar to ours, was proposed and carried, the income-tax was not brought forward, separation resolutions were defeated. In the session of 1867 the Public Revenues Act was passed, and the Loans Consolidation Act, the latter a measure, which though right in its general aim, was, I think, liable to grave objections; the scheme agreed upon by the Colony, has however been most ably and successfully carried out by Mr. FitzHerbert, who was sent to England for that purpose. Measures having for their object to carry out the promotion of local self-government, and opposed (apparently) to the present provincial system, have also been proposed and carried, their success is a disputed point in the Colony. Parties appear very evenly balanced, or rather there seems to be a want of confidence in any leader, and the ministry appear to have been frequently obliged to withdraw their political measures, and I may almost say to accept measures rather than to initiate them.

We now come to the period of the present outbreak, which took place after Sir G. Grey had been relieved by Sir G. Bowen as Governor. At present it is not a rising of the Maori race; once more the fanatics have risen at the bid of a prophet; the escape of the Chatham Island prisoners, and the unsuccessful attempts to recapture them on the East coast, unfortunately were coincident with the West coast rising. There had, after General Chute's campaign, been an attack by the fanatical party on Poverty Bay, but it had been suppressed by Colonel Macdonnell with colonial troops and the Arawa tribe; then the colonial force had been allowed to dwindle away, and some of its best officers had been neglected, and had taken to other pursuits. The esprit de corps was not kept up, and the prestige of its victories had been allowed to die out. When the prisoners escaped from the Chatham Islands, and Tito ko warn, the second prophet, again called the fanatics to arms, the insurgents were very few in number, and had the Government had even a small thoroughly efficient force, at once to have taken the field, there is no doubt whatsoever that the fire might have been at once stamped out; but a narrow economy had prevailed, reliance on chance had taken the place of self-reliance and self-exertion. Yet New Zealand is not the only country where, in times of peace, readiness for war is neglected, and the lesson then learnt will not I trust be readily forgotten. The defeat of Colonel Macdonnell at the head of a body of raw and undisciplined recruits is not to be wondered at; a braver and more determined man than Colonel Macdonnell does not exist, and this was the first time in a long series of gallant exploits that he had been unsuccessful; poor Von Tempsky, one of our most gallant officers fell heroically in this affair, the day before his death he wrote to me discussing the state into which the colonial force had been allowed to fall, and concluded by saying, "but I am a man and a Christian, and accept cheerfully what God sends me." The same mail brought me intelligence of his death. A kind of panic seems to have ensued, most important posts were abandoned by order of the Defence minister, amongst them Weraroa pah; the prophet of course gained fresh confidence, and advanced into the settled country with greatly augmented forces. Colonel Whitmore, now a settler in New Zealand, formerly an officer in Her Majesty's service, is now in command; from my personal knowledge of him. I have every confidence that he will do all that man can do with the means at his disposal, if he is left with full powers to act, and is properly supported, which there is no reason I hope to doubt. However up to the present moment, no marked success has been gained on the West coast, and the prophet still ravages the country and threatens the settlers and friendly

natives of Wanganui.

I will say but little of the horrible massacre which has taken place at Poverty Bay on the East coast; it too is the act of the fanatical party, the chief actors were the escaped Chatham Island prisoners. Atrocities were committed equalling in horror the tales of the Indian mutiny. Major Biggs, one of the very best of our colonial officers, was amongst the slain; his poor young wife refused to fly, and witnessed his death, she had often said before that she would die with him; she was held by the natives whilst they killed her baby and threw it into her lap, her maid having refused to leave her mistress, perished with her. The last mail from New Zealand brought news that these murderers, whose numbers had swelled to a formidable force, had been several times defeated with loss by friendly natives, and were being followed up by a still larger body of natives and Europeans.

I have now finished my rough and rapid historical sketch, many incidents of interest have necessarily been omitted, and I have confined myself almost entirely to matters bearing on the native question. I have desired not so much to express my own opinions, as to give data upon which opinions may be formed by others; I have endeavored too to mark the distinction between those natives (the minority) who are plunderers and murderers, and those who have fought against us from motives of sentiment or policy, and those again who have identified their interests with ours. If I have given prominence to an explanation of the policy which has been known by my name, it is because I am constantly questioned about it, and also because I believe it to be the true policy for the future, as whilst it was fairly tried, it proved itself successful in the past. And now I will proceed to touch upon the present position of New Zealand, as a prelude to a few remarks upon the present crisis and suggestions for the future.

New Zealand is divided into two principal islands, the Northern, which comprises the provinces of Auckland, Taranaki, Hawkes Bay, and Wellington; and the Southern (or middle) island, separated from it by Cook's straits, which is divided into the provinces of Nelson, Marlborough, Canterbury, Otago, South land, and the county of Westland.

The Northern island contains a native population of about 37,000; of this population fully 8 or 10,000 inhabit the district north of the city of Auckland. That city is situated upon a narrow isthmus, and consequently may be said to cut off the northern tribes from the rest of New Zealand. These northern tribes have European settlements amongst them; they have never risen since Heki's war in the early days of the colonization of New Zealand; they are generally loyal, and as a last resource part of them might be brought down in arms against other tribes. South of the Auckland isthmus the island assumes a rounder shape. The Taupe plains and lake occupy the centre; they are in turn (I am speaking very generally to convey a general idea) surrounded by difficult mountain and forest country; the Waikato river and country (the King's country) runs from the centre to the north, in the direction of Auckland; its upper part still occupied by the King's adherents, the lower part now in the occupation of settlers and friendly natives; on its left flank at Coromandel and the Thames lie the new Auckland gold diggings, with a considerable and increasing population. A zone of rough forest country runs from Wanganui and Taranaki on the west coast, through the centre to the East Cape on the east, and this will explain how the fanatics keep up so frequent and easy a communication from one side of the island to the other. The European settlements lie scattered round the circumference: the tribes living; near them are generally friendly, which in itself disproves the assertion that it is European wrongs that have disposed the natives to war. The disaffected natives acting from a centre, of course have the advantage of being able to bring down a concentrated force, at any given moment, on any weak point; and can fall back on their fastnesses in case of defeat.

The European population of the Northern island is about 79,900, or 36.55 per cent on the whole European population.

The Southern (or Middle) island, contains a native population of about 1500 only, chiefly the remnants of numerous tribes, destroyed by their Northern island countrymen before the advent of the Europeans,—they live peaceably and on good terms with their neighbors.

The European population of the Southern island amounts to about 138,500, or 63.37 per cent, on the whole European population.

These statistics are the latest which have been received, of the year 1867; since then the European population has doubtless increased.

The native population is decreasing—not as may be supposed to any extent on account of wars, though they doubtless have some effect, but owing to the infecundity of the race, the disparity of the sexes, and the immorality which has prevailed for centuries, and which the present fanaticism exalts into a system; but the decrease of the native population has, if any thing, been checked since the advent of the Europeans. Infanticide is less common; immorality perhaps less gross; and wars certainly less frequent and bloody; whilst on the other hand a passion for drink, in spite of the efforts of legislation, is now gaining ground rapidly amongst the natives.

The European population on the other hand rapidly increases, and now probably amounts to 250,000 souls.

I am often asked why, if the European population of the Northern Island alone is 79,000, and that of the natives about 37,000, whilst half the natives or more are neutral or friendly, there can be any difficulty in repressing outrages. I confess there ought not to be, and will not be, with proper self-reliance and self-exertion; but yet there are several compensating circumstances which make the balance hang more evenly than at first sight would appear probable. In the first place, every native male is a born warrior; he loves excitement, and does not think about death; their women are often as fond of fighting as their men, and are great aids to them in war, carrying their provisions, cooking for them, making their huts, and in a thousand different ways. Then it must be remembered that an immensely larger proportion of the Europeans are women and children, (who are of no service of course in war,) than is the case amongst natives. Again, as I have said, the native is acting from the centre of a circle, and can suddenly come down in force upon any point of the circumference.

It must be also remembered, that the British immigrant does not go out to the Colony with the intention of fighting. Should there be an attack on his district, I have always found him to be a brave man, and he doesn't mind a fight, but he hates being called out, except on an emergency. He hates being taken from his farm to drill; his cows go dry, his crops are not put in, he is no coward, but he says, "I'll be off to the next colony or to the diggings." And if he does that, or even if he is kept long from his work, the revenue receipts fall off, and the real difficulty of the Colony is money: but the early American colonists didn't do this; no, but then the early American colonists had no next Colony to go to, and they had no diggings, and those colonies after all advanced very slowly indeed. Yes, there is something to be said on both sides.

I am often asked questions as to the relative bravery of the New Zealanders and our own countrymen. The New Zealander, I need not say, is a finished skirmisher, besides being a good tactician, with a keen eye to country, and skilled in throwing up such defensive works as best suit half-savage warfare. He is a brave man, a very brave man, but his is not the determined, steady bravery, under difficulties and discouragement, of our own countrymen. Amongst the whalers, boats manned by natives were never considered to be so well-handled in danger as those manned by Europeans, though they were perfect boatmen and swimmers. No doubt the frenzy of the war dance, or the rush of a body of naked and excited savages, has its effect upon men unaccustomed to such sights. I have heard it gravely asserted that a thousand disciplined Maoris would meet and scatter a thousand Europeans in the open with the bayonet. I do not believe it for an instant. Were it possible once, it would never be possible again. The rush of the Highland clans in 1745, anew and unaccustomed and terrible onset, cowed the brave hearts of men who had fought at Fontenay. It did not last: but the Maoris are not what the Highlanders were, at least not in my estimation. Many of the old settlers who lived amongst them in the early times looked with something like contempt at a savage, working himself up into a frenzy and brandishing his tomahawk, "bouncing," as they called it. The native was generally struck by the coolness of his antagonist; his eye wandered, a sudden move generally resulted in his discomfiture and the capture of his tomahawk. A stout little Devonshire wrestler at Taranaki was famous for such exploits; they were not uncommon. On such occasions the natives (being the aggressors) bore no malice. Old Wairarapa settlers will remember, some twenty years ago, when two of their number were attacked in the middle of a path on the Ruamahunga, one of them, to save his friend's life severely wounded the chief on the head with a heavy stick—(a chief's head and a chief's blood are sacred). They were armed, they set their backs to a precipice, they were surrounded by twenty or thirty natives with axes and tomahawks. Each side had one gun; the native was told he would be shot if he raised his—a hunting-knife kept off the rest. Though urged on by the chief, no native dared be the first to advance. At the end of half an hour the chief, sick and faint, retired to his hut; many of the natives, cowed and ashamed of themselves, sat down; the victorious Europeans moved off slowly, taunting them with treachery, wrong, and cowardice. The slightest sign of fear would have been fatal. Public opinion among the Maoris afterwards ran strongly in favor of these Europeans. Some five years afterwards one of them, travelling through a forest with a native, seeing a pigeon on a tree, remarked, "I wish I had a gun." "Why not break his head?" was the reply. "What, do you know that old 'story?'" said the Englishman. "Oh!" cried his friend, with great glee, "why, I saw it. I was one who hemmed you in, I and my axe. You struck a very strong blow. You were very strong. We would have killed you—blood for blood—or at least taken some blood for satisfaction, and sent you tied hand and foot on a rail, like a pig, up the country. But you were too strong; and you were quite right. Ours was the evil deed. But the chief has been a good man ever since; he wears a long lock of hair in memory of that blow, and he will be very glad indeed to see you—great indeed is his love for you."

Such a race is evidently amenable to high and generous impulses. In my intercourse with them I found that by being always just to them, taking a friendly interest in them, and being always firm and unwavering, a great ascendancy over them was not difficult to obtain. And many years after I had quitted the native district in which I once lived, I went to it on the part of the Government, to settle a land question of the most serious nature. They refused to have anything to do with interpreters, or officials of any kind. They said they were my tribe; we sat and smoked together in the bush. I gave them my decision in a few words. On a young chief rising to speak,

he was at once put down by an older one, who said: "You are young; you "don't know our old friend that he is a man who "never can be moved from his first word." By 12 o'clock the next day, the time appointed by me, they returned. They received the compensation I had adjudged them for a grievance, real indeed, but originating in a mistake, and they gave up to a number of small farmers lands, with the crops upon them, which they had seized and long held by force. Both parties were perfectly satisfied.

I mention this as a case in point, as illustrative of the character of the larger part of the native tribes. I need not say that there are many men with infinitely more knowledge of the natives than myself, and whose influence among them is proportionately greater; mine was local, and for many years I have been chiefly a resident in the Southern Island, whence, however, the native question may perhaps be most dispassionately studied.

It may not be amiss here to say, as I have got into the subject of illustrations of native character, that the New Zealander is not treacherous. In times of peace you may travel alone from one end of the native districts to another in perfect safety. Greedy as they are for money, you may lie down at night in a native village with a bag of gold by your side; no one would touch it. It would be at least as safe as in an English country village.

The most remarkable thing, to my mind, about the New Zealander is his shrewd worldliness; he always has an eye to the main chance. He looks, not only on European arts and customs, but even on religion, mainly as a means of worldly advancement. And this accounts for the readiness with which thousands of natives, outwardly Christians (some of them Scripture readers by occupation), suddenly adopted the tenets of the prophet, in which they saw a new interest and the prospect of a more sudden gain. They have a wonderful insight into character. They soon find out people's weak points and work upon them with great art and deep diplomacy. This very tact makes them pleasant fellows. Capital companions for a bush journey, they are fond of a joke, and delight in gossip and in narratives. On the whole, I think the New Zealander, intellectually and physically, is deserving of the high character that is usually given him. It is strange, however, that he has less idea of political organization than other very inferior races. Still, it is a noble race, and one in which (in spite of those horrible excesses which are natural to the savage when in his worst mood) it is impossible not to feel a great interest, especially when we remember what a large portion of that race are now standing shoulder to shoulder by our countrymen, and fighting by them, alike with them, for property, for family, for life and religion.

After these remarks regarding the geographical divisions of the Colony, and the characteristics of its inhabitants, I must say a few words upon its political constitution. The Governor represents the Crown—Ministers hold their offices on the same tenure, and subject to the same practice as in England. The General Assembly or Parliament is composed of two houses: the Upper, which is called the Legislative Council, is composed of members nominated for life by the Crown under advice of Ministers; and the Lower House, or House of Representatives, is chosen by a constituency which is little removed from Universal Suffrage, the limit being a £5 Household Suffrage. The Upper House originally had very little influence, but successive Ministries have given it new blood and strengthened it, and I think it has gained of late years relatively to the House of Representatives. My own idea has long been that the best way to constitute an Upper House for a country in which no hereditary members exist, or from the nature of things can exist on any real basis, would be to give to persons who have held certain high offices, to ex-governors, ex-premiers, or other members of the executive, ex-judges, and others, the right to be called to the Upper House for life. This appears to me the only way by which in a Colony an Upper House can be placed in its proper position as a check to hasty legislation—by such a plan it would be largely composed of independent men, who at one time or other, must be presumed to have enjoyed the confidence and respect of at least a large portion of the public, who would naturally represent different views, who would perpetuate a tradition of politics, and so dovetail the past into the present and future—who would bear known names—who would certainly be above the average in intellect. I know of no better plan, and am surprised that this or some similar one has never yet been proposed or attempted as far as I am aware. A property test in a new country is almost valueless in my opinion. The constitution of the House of Representatives could not, I think, be altered for the better, a new country must be necessarily democratic, and any restriction of the franchise would have been building on a false basis. The House of Representatives is of course the more powerful one, and contains as a rule, most of the leading men—its debates have generally been well conducted and marked by earnestness and ability, but it is said that at the present moment, it is hardly equal to its former reputation.

The Provinces have also their elected chiefs (called Superintendents) and their miniature parliaments, and at one time assumed the character almost of independent states—a very expensive cumbrous and complex machinery for so small a country, and productive of many evils. At the same time, it cannot be denied, that they have given a great amount of political intelligence to the people, that at one time they were safeguards against undue centralization, and that they have done much to develop the resources of the country and to colonize it: there was so little communication originally between the various settlements, and their character and requirements were so different, that exceptionally large local powers were necessary. The misfortune was that

the Constitution Act did not sufficiently define those powers, and in giving a general power to make laws "for the peace, order, and good government" of the Provinces, the exceptions and reservations were not defined sufficiently in detail—but the great blot, a blot which the Stafford government is I believe taking steps to remove, and has palliated by the Public Revenues Act 1867, is the existence of a common purse, if I may so speak. The taxation raised by the General Assembly is dealt with in this fashion: the General Assembly appropriates a certain portion to the uses of the Colony generally, and the residue becomes the property of the Provinces. The consequence is that the Provincial governments as a rule, do very little of the unpopular work of taxation, they get that done for them. Members come up to the General Assembly, not as much as members, as bands of provincial delegates. They will consent to a tax, but only on condition that so much of it is to go home to their Provinces. The result of this is, that a Colonial Ministry does not so much stand or fall by its general policy—that may be excellent, but the question is—what are you going to give us to take home to our province? Hence all kinds of combinations, of "logrolling," and political corruption; I say strictly political corruption, arising necessarily out of a vicious system which engenders it. Personal corruption I believe to be as rare in the New Zealand Assembly as in any body of men in any country: our leading men have as a rule impaired their fortunes rather than augmented them, and salaries of Ministers do not anything like pay their simplest expenses if they have families, or if not, can they be said to compensate for the neglect of private affairs and absence from homes distant, and often not readily accessible.

It will be at once perceived, that it becomes the direct interest of members, if they would stand well with their respective provinces, to starve the general Government; local improvements are always locally of more interest than general necessities,—and so the dish of meat of the general Government is often devoured before its eyes. This will throw some light upon the causes of my resignation, it will show why the Government, except at moments of imminent public danger or great excitement, will be in fact sold to the highest bidder, and can only be held by sacrificing everything to the necessity of making terms with the provinces. This accounts for the non-existence of any efficient force at the moment of the present outbreak, and to this may be fairly attributed the bloodshed and the enormous expenditure, now rendered necessary, and at present going on.

I will now conclude, by a few remarks and suggestions. The latest advices from New Zealand, informed us, that the prophet Tito ko warn, at the head of a force flushed with success, amounting probably to about 800 men, was meaning Wanganui on the West coast, and ravaging the country. And that a large number of settlers had been ruined. Major Whitmore, with a force of Europeans and some Wanganui natives was opposing him, but as yet had not achieved any marked success, probably his force is not yet thoroughly organized—the militia was called out throughout the island—recruiting was being rapidly proceeded with. On the East coast the friendly natives appear to have outnumbered the fanatics, who had, after committing the massacre of Poverty Bay, marched in force towards the South-east, in the direction of the Bay of Plenty and Hawkes Bay: they had been already defeated, and as a European force was about to join the friendliness, it was hoped that they might even be surrounded and cut off. Te Kooti, their leader had been wounded or killed. The Maori King had not yet thrown his tomahawk into the scale; it was hoped that he would not. The fear of further confiscation, and the fact that he probably is jealous of the prophet, and that he does not sympathize with the murderers, perhaps deters him: did he give the signal for a general rising, the most dreadful consequences might be anticipated. The most serious item in the late intelligence is the enormous expenditure which is going on, and the consequent political attitude of the Southern island; the war expenditure is stated to be at the rate of £250,000 a year, that is at least at the rate of £1 per head upon the entire population of New Zealand, and cannot be provided for out of the revenue. The revenue is falling off; at present it is I believe something over a million annually, besides local imposts;—the taxation therefore will be seen to be enormously heavy for so small a country; and it has reached that limit, when smuggling begins to pay, when property is depreciated in value, and commercial enterprise is paralyzed, by that and other causes. A check in a new country stops the influx of capital and of immigration which is life-blood—these are serious and grave considerations. And I feel that I am warranted in saying that England, which supplies nearly five million worth annually of goods to us, and takes in return almost the same amount in wool, gold, and other produce, is also interested in the fate of a Colony, which, in proportion to its population, is one of her best customers. The New Zealand trade occupies a fleet of her ships, our wool helps to fill her warehouses and factories; many a workshop is kept busy in supplying our market, and we have sent from our shores no less a sum than sixteen millions of pounds worth of gold. I assume that in the last resource, England would not permit, either from motives of self-interest, or from a sense of honors, the destruction of the Northern Island as a colony. I do not, however, in the least anticipate such a contingency; but I do consider it possible, that the European and loyal natives of the North Island, embarrassed by want of money, (should further disasters and further risings take place) might be forced into one of those desultory irregular wars, which are horrible for their ferocity, and in which all the most terrible passions are evoked. Assist them to prevent this, by assisting them by an Imperial guarantee, to raise a loan, to be applied to the organization of a sufficient force to suppress this, and to prevent future risings, and which would allow the Southern Island to see the end

of the repeated calls upon its purse. Such a step on the part of England would cost her absolutely nothing. It was proposed by Mr. Cardwell, when Secretary of State for the Colonies, but his proposal could not be accepted for reasons I have before stated. It must be allowed that the origin of these native wars took place under English rule and under Imperial policy, and that England suddenly handed over to the Colony obligations she had undertaken with regard to the native race. It would be a boon which England has not hesitated to confer upon other countries in less urgent circumstances. I believe the Southern Island of New Zealand would, were such an offer made, join with the North in accepting it, under proper conditions; for the Southern Island, though quite uninterested in the case, did, from motives of loyalty, support Governor Gore Browne and Sir G. Grey in war; and the Southern Island is at least as responsible as the Northern one, for the narrow economic policy which has led to these disasters and expenses, and which overthrew measures which ere this would have placed the Northern Island in safety, and relieved herself from heavy and intolerable burthens.

What more? Again, I say, fall back upon the self-reliant policy—go back to the policy of 1864-5. I do not withdraw from a single item of that policy. Had it been carried out, it is, I firmly believe, impossible that recent events could have happened, even if an outbreak had not been altogether averted. Not 1500, but 500, thoroughly armed, trained, and efficient Bushmen *disposable* at the first would have crushed the evil in the bud. Poor Von Tempsky's opinion on that subject I know; and could I, I would confidently appeal to Whitmore, McLean, Macdonnell, and Frazer on that point. No, I say; send no troops from England, they have not been asked for by the Government of New Zealand as far as I am aware; my private letters, which are numerous, do not ask for them. A public meeting at Wellington has decided on not asking for them.—Their employment would be only a signal for a long and expensive war, expensive to England, unjust to the British taxpayer, because unnecessary, ruinous financially to New Zealand, destructive to the spirit of self-reliance in the Colony, and productive of all the old evils of divided command and distracted councils. Do not send troops, I repeat—The Colony has learnt much under this disaster, it will not forget the success of its forces in 1865, and I doubt not that we shall soon hear that those successes have been renewed. I would not say, that the few soldiers who are now occupying" the stockades in Wanganui town, should be removed at this instant in the face of the enemy; such a step might be considered as a sign that the Queen had withdrawn her protection from the settlers, and might encourage the fanatics: but I would withdraw that one regiment at the earliest practicable moment. I say this on grounds which must be apparent to any reader of these pages. It is not, but that I hope, that the red coat, which I cherish from old friendships, old associations, and as a symbol of union with England, may be yet seen and welcomed on the New Zealand shores, but that it should be seen and welcomed, under different circumstances, and for different, purposes than the present. Any measures which may lead a party amongst the colonists to believe that England will always send her troops if the Colony cries out for them, weakens the hands of any colonial ministry which may take its stand on self-reliance and self-exertion; my ministry would have remained in office, measures of native policy and defense measures would have been carried out, and the present disasters averted, had the British troops been removed when first I requested it; the delay encouraged those, who from timidity, policy, or interest; desired the retention of the troops, and the opposition was proportionately strengthened, I may almost say that in this respect, I was unwittingly sacrificed by the Imperial Government, though I was carrying out a policy which they thoroughly approved and wished to see put into effect. Let the colonists accept self-government, if they are to have self-government, with its duties as well as its rights; thus only will they grow into a nation, with national virtues all the more strongly developed and firmly rooted, because they will have grown amidst storm and adversity. The first and immediate duty of the Colonial Government is now to repress and sternly punish murder and outrage; they must form and keep up a defensive corps of both races; it will not do to rely on one race alone. They are now making great efforts in this respect, the Government is straining' every nerve. I hope they will not err on the other hand by keeping up an army, when a constabulary force, not disciplined according to the tactics of regular war, but a small force especially trained to individual and independent action in the bush, is the thing required. If millions of money were at their command, and it was desirable or necessary, suddenly to attempt the absolute subjugation of the island, and of the Kinoparty; I should say, place a very strong self-sup- porting military settlement at Taupo in the centre of the island, and garrison it with a sufficient force, to enable its commander to direct a body of men on the rear of any insurgents who might make an attack upon the settlements, which lie, as I have said, round the circumference of a rough circle. But I do not advocate this—it is quite beyond the means of the Colony, it would inevitably lead to a general war, in which neutrals would become our enemies, and it would destroy hopes which still exist, of saving' a large portion of the native race. I should, on the contrary, hold myself ready to punish outrages with severity, I should treat them as locally as possible, I should make my operations as much like police operations as possible; I should gradually endeavor, by encouraging the natives without regard to their being friendly, neutral, or ill-disposed, to have recourse to the land courts, to individualize their titles to land, and to raise themselves out of communism : and by the establishment of native districts, with local self-government, local armed police, local revenues, and localized government properties, to interest

themselves in the maintenance of law and order; I should avoid any crusade against the King party, by these means, by promoting immigration, and by judicious treatment of the friendly natives, to whom we owe so much, I believe that not many years would elapse, before a happier state of things might be hoped for, and the Southern island would cease to be called upon for war subsidies. I have spoken of punishment being inflicted for outrages; I do not advocate large or indiscriminate confiscation, it should be resorted to as little as possible; the policy of confiscation requires a very large outlay on the part of the Colonial Government, it does not pay, and is unpopular in the Colony, and difficult properly to carry out: in England, more especially, it is looked upon as the origin of the present disasters; but all the wars which have afflicted New Zealand from the beginning to the great Waikato war, took place before a single acre of land had been taken from the natives against their will. The Domett and the Whitaker-Fox Ministries proposed confiscation, not from any desire to obtain land,—land could have been bought for a twentieth part of the outlay, but because up to that date, no punishment whatsoever had been inflicted for insurrection. To anyone who has read the preceding narrative of the wars of New Zealand it will be obvious, that the love of war, the love of excitement, the love of distinction, is inherent in the New Zealander; the further back you go in his history, the more evident this fact becomes; it was argued that we encouraged this passion by letting him make peace and war as he liked and when he liked, that he must be taught that something was to be lost by war, that after war the European settlements ought to be strengthened, that a loss of prestige to the attacking party ought to be the result; and as in their own native wars no defeat was acknowledged unless the defeated party lost their land, and as insurgent natives constantly themselves declared, "If we defeat you we will take your land, if you defeat us, ours shall become your prize;" the attention of the Government was turned to the subject. It was never proposed to drive the natives off confiscated land—it was proposed to plant self-defending settlements on it; to restore, under Crown grant and in individualized title, ample for the wants of the defeated natives and of their families—it was expected that they would settle down with an increased value given to their properties by roads, individual title, and the proximity of Europeans—it was believed, that such natives would shortly become friendly and loyal, and be among the richest natives in the country. Want of money and other causes have no doubt neutralized many of the benefits to be derived from this scheme, and prevented its full development; it was supposed too by the Whitaker-Fox Government, that the confiscated lands would pay their own expenses, by the sale of part of them, and even some of the expenses of war. I was never sanguine on that point, and it has proved entirely abortive. Still the fact remains, that the prestige of tribes that have lost land by confiscation, has been diminished, and that of friendly tribes proportionately increased. Mr. Cardwell, it will be remembered, instructed the Governor, that his "concurrence" in confiscation would be necessary, "not merely as a Ministerial Act, but as evidencing his own personal satisfaction with the arrangement," also, in his dispatch of the 24th April, 1864, he leaves in the Governor's own hands "ample power of doing substantial justice to every class of claimants for restitution or compensation." Thus the Crown, though unwillingly perhaps, immediately and directly, accepted the responsibility of the Act and its consequences. As a matter of fact, every Government has since then to some extent made use of this power—that it has been always wisely exercised I will not say, a closer study of each individual case than the means at my present disposal permit, would be requisite to give an opinion. All Governments are liable to error, and faults of administration are not uncommon, nor will they as long as man is man; but if I am asked, whether in my opinion, the present outbreak would have occurred had there been no confiscation, I reply, undoubtedly it would. The first prophet arose before confiscation, all the greatest wars in New Zealand occurred before confiscation, and there is no reason to suppose that the present fanatical outbreak would have arrived at the dignity of a "war" at all, had the Government been prepared for it. The fanatics, many of whom have lost no lands, are not fighting for the possession of any particular land, they are fighting, because their oracles tell them to drive the Europeans and peaceful natives into the sea. The constitutional changes that I should wish to see carried into effect in New Zealand, I have already indicated, and will only say, that they lie in the direction of an extension of the principle of local self-government for purely local purposes, of a more accurate definition of local and general powers. I think that taxation should be raised by the same power that expends it, and that the machinery of government should be simplified.

I have now nearly completed the task I have imposed upon myself; I have declared myself to be, as all my life I have been, a firm adherent of the old colonial policy; self-government, self-exertion, self-reliance. But let it not be thought, that I wish to loosen the tie that binds the Colonies to England; for from it; I know, that not only on theoretical and political grounds, but also from a consideration of the state of public opinion in England, and in the Colonies, that that policy is the only possible policy; but I should all the more desire to strengthen, (and I believe that policy properly carried out, may tend to strengthen.) the moral tie, which binds the Colonies to the Throne and to the Mother country. It is not natural to our race to be governed from a distance; mistakes must occur, jealousies, divided authority, bickering, and recriminations. Remove the occasion of these—I go so far as to say deliberately, that I very much prefer, should occasion require it, the suspension of a constitution, when a Colony cannot govern itself and maintain internal order; to any division of

authority, any sham constitutionalism.

Virtually at present, the Colonies are perfectly free, the late Sir George Cornwall Lewis, in his work on Dependencies, says, that no dependency can be considered perfectly free; he says, if I mistake not, that their legislatures can always be legitimately coerced by the Imperial legislature; I venture to differ from him; I do not of course refer to a resort to force—but I am of opinion that the power of stopping supplies, does really, put the winning card in the hand of the dependency; be that as it may, there is no likelihood in the present day that England will attempt to coerce any Colony, there is more fear perhaps, that she will give them too little sympathy, in return for their love and loyalty. I cannot help feeling that England without her Colonies, would be a "Niobe of Nations;" "Ships, Colonies and Commerce" have done much to make her what she is—and I should be sorry to see the day, when it could be no longer said that the sun did not set upon her dominions. I believe too that that day would add greatly to the misery of her overcrowded population. I cannot but think that if some of our English public men and writers felt this more strongly, the bond that unites the Colonies to Great Britain would be infinitely strengthened. The Colonies are very sensitive to English public opinion, but that sensitiveness is diminished and dies out, when English public opinion is hasty and formed upon insufficient grounds. A part of the public press is fond, I think unreasonably fond, of taunting Colonists with supposed deficiencies instead of criti- cising in a friendly spirit. How many articles have we seen upon the incapacity of Australian politicians, and vet, of the two or three Australian statesmen who have turned their attention to English politics, one is at present Chancellor of the Exchequer, and another holds the high office of First Lord of the Admiralty—and so in regard to New Zealand affairs; Colonists who have for years devoted their minds to an honest endeavor to solve the great problem of civilizing and saving the native race, though they may be aware that in this very difficult task, mistakes may have been made and no complete success attained, may fairly ask, that their critics should treat them with some consideration, should weigh the difficulties they have had to encounter, should remember that England herself undertook the task and retired from it—and at least, should make themselves thoroughly acquainted with what has been actually done and what left undone. It is the fashion with some writers to generalize from what has happened in other countries, and to suppose all Colonists must be greedy, graspers of other men's land, cruel, and blood-thirsty. In times of great excitement, men suffering under loss of property, in the presence of sudden danger, their friends and relatives murdered, may occasionally speak in no measured tone—but in New Zealand there have been no Jamaica floggings or hangings. After poor Volkner the missionary, whose last word was a prayer for his enemies, was murdered in cold blood with attendant circumstances of unheard of atrocity and cannibalism, I sent an expedition which captured some of the murderers—they were found guilty by court martial, and still, to secure a greater certainty of fairness, they were forwarded for further trial by my successors to Auckland and tried by the Supreme Court. A friend of mine, a gentleman of position and influence in New Zealand, from whose letter I extracted the details I have given of the murder of Mrs. Briggs and her child, goes on to say, "and yet if these wretches are taken, it will be "difficult to get evidence for a conviction." This does not look like any ferocious setting aside of the principles of justice, and I may fearlessly, in spite of party speeches and party articles, which abound in the Colony, (as they must in every free country) assert, that no man can study the speeches, the course of legislation, and look at the large annual grants of money for native purposes, made in the New Zealand Parliament, without coming to the conclusion that the settlers as a body, in spite of many failures, have earnestly and honestly wished to do their duty by the natives.

Closely akin to this topic, is that of the protection of the character of public men in the Colonies by the Home Government? I allude especially to the underhand accusations made against a most distinguished public servant not long ago. It appears to method it is the true interest of England, to protect, not only the character of those who represent the Crown in the Colonies, but also of Colonial Ministers, from secret and calumnious attacks; they should be made to feel that their honors is cared for. That their interests and their success, not only evokes local but Imperial sympathy; thus may interests strictly Imperial have due weight in their counsels and influence their policy, a policy, especially in commercial matters, not unimportant to England. There are matters too of growing importance, in which the time is coming, if it be not already come, when England and her Colonies must act together; emigration appears to me to be one of these. Immigration is the life blood of a Colony, if it stops stagnation ensues; in immigration lies the basis of the financial credit of new Colonies : they need not be afraid to borrow, especially for reproductive work, if they can by a constant influx of new tax-payers, annually reduce their debt<sup>3</sup> by multiplying the shoulders that are to bear the burthen. Nor is the question less important to England, Scotland and Ireland, with an increasing population of men and women, struggling for life itself, and sinking into deeper and deeper moral and physical degradation Legislation cannot cure that sore, which assumes a magnitude that threatens to infect the whole body politic, and which may even become all the more dangerous, as our institutions are placed on a broader basis—yet it is undeniable that each one of these men and women, removed to a Colony, would not only improve their own circumstances, bring up their families in rude plenty, but actually become consumers of British produce, and employers of British

labour. I think a great national scheme of emigration is looming in the future, and if so, will it not be advisable, nay necessary, to cultivate the sympathies, and to secure the cordial co-operation of the leaders of Colonial policy.

The defence of the outlying parts of the Empire in case of war is another matter of joint interest. I need not ask what would be the effect on England if her supplies of gold, of wool, and of other colonial produce, were suddenly cut off. At the end of the last Russian war it became known that a powerful expedition was fitting out in the Amoor river, which, traversing the Pacific, was destined to pounce upon the Australian colonies. We had no force to cope with it. True, the issue of a war would probably be decided in European waters; but that might be too late to avert the disarrangement of trade, the distress, and consequent discontent, of the labouring population at home; and should any Colony fall into the hands of an enemy, doubtless in the consideration of terms of peace such a hold would not be to our advantage. Nor can it be forgotten that Colonies are involved in such wars through no act of their own or of their representatives. That is the price they pay for the honors and advantage of forming part of a great Empire. Should they find that they are unprotected and uncared for, even their loyalty might break down, and they might seek protection by forming alliances and making commercial regulations to the advantage of Foreign powers. This is not impossible at some future day, and is so obvious a danger that I may confidently presume that it has not escaped the attention of British statesmen, and that they will be prepared to consider, as occasion may arise, the great question of external defense in a spirit of reciprocal liberality; in this too they will need, and they may fairly expect, the hearty support of the colonists.

A federation of the Australian Colonies, including New Zealand, is another question for the future.

In these and all other matters, colonists look to England for counsel, for sympathy, and for support. I feel sure that they will not be disappointed, and that England, whose envoys represent the Crown in those distant regions, will still exercise a large and legitimate influence over them—an influence, affecting as it does the future of nations yet in their infancy, not lightly to be neglected or thrown away. On its wise use what destinies may hang, what great portions of the globe may they not hereafter sway !

If, in writing these few pages, I have at all contributed, either to the better understanding of the Native question of New Zealand, or succeeded, however imperfectly, in my endeavor to afford some food for thought upon general questions of Colonial policy, my end will have been attained. We who have grown up with Colonies may be pardoned if we look fondly forward to their days to come; and not the least great in those days will those Colonies be, that have had the rudest and hardest early training. I do not for a moment doubt the ultimate prosperity of New Zealand. She has every possible gift of nature, and men, who will, I trust, prove themselves not unworthy of their race. I once left her shores, and as I looked back on them, over a sunny sea, my eye dwelt lingeringly on peaks and glaciers gleaming in a cloudless sky, and I hailed the omen of a prosperous voyage. Last time I staggered on deck for a parting look, and, over the tumbling waves, saw afar off, the last blue promontory; low down, half hid in mist and storm; but the latter voyage was better than the first. From darkness comes oft-times light, and out of danger peace and security—so may it be with New Zealand.

Fred. A. Weld.

*Rotherwas, near Hereford,*

*Feb. 9, 1869.*

**The Permissive Bill. A Lecture**

*Delivered at the Hall of the Congregational Church, Moray Place, Dunedin,*

In Connection with the

"Dunedin Abstainers' Union,"

On

Wednesday, October 18<sup>TH</sup>, 1871,

By the

REV. Thomas Roseby, M.A., LL.B.

MR. A. Rennie, *President of the Society,*

In this Chair

G. Watson, Printer Dunedin: Maclaggan Street. MDCCCLXXI.

*Price Sixpence.*

# Introduction.

IN consenting to the publication of this Lecture by the Society in connection with which it was delivered, I feel that my only claim to the consideration of the public is, that my subject is one which I have not lightly treated; one to which I have given much earnest thought and attention which I have chiefly studied in the pages of those who have argued on "the other side" one on which my views have not been hastily formed, nor will he found, I hope, to be extreme; and one of so great importance, that if" any thoughtful man believes he can advance anything which may assist the public in coming to a just conclusion in regard to it, he stands in no need of apology for for doing so.

With which preface I commend this brief contribution to the controversy to the candour of my fellow-colonists.

T. R.

## The Permissive Bill.

OF all the subjects which have engaged, or can engage, the attention of the parliament of this colony (and some of them have made stir enough in this community, and have been deemed worthy of some very fine declamation) I know of none that can be compared in importance with the Permissive Bill.

It is strange, and it is sad as strange, that, while any startling and unusual form of evil excites our alarm, and prompts us by its threatening aspect, to take vigorous measures for its suppression, the very gravest evils, if they be but common, come in course of time to be regarded with all but absolute indifference.

The whole world has been stunned with the thunders of ft great European War, with the downfall of a dynasty, which seemed to have rendered itself impregnable, if not in the affections, at least in the fears of the people; the wide-spread desolations of the sword, whet with the revengefulness and hatred of national, religions, and traditional hostility; and the still more horrible desolations of a people's suicide, the sword of a nation drunk with her own children's blood. We have heard this tidings, and it has made our ears to tingle.

We have heard of the famine in Persia, of the starvation of thousands and tens of thousands; we have read the sickening recital of enforced cannibalism, a terrible illustration which afresh that word of the ancient Hebrew seer has received:—"The tender and delicate woman among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness, her eye shall be evil toward the husband of her bosom, and toward her son, and toward her daughter, and toward her children that she shall bear." And our hearts have been wrung at the thought of wretchedness which we were powerless to relieve.

It is not wonderful that these things should fill our hearts with sorrow, and kindle in our breasts the flame of sympathy in human woe; but surely it *is* wonderful that there should be existing in the midst of our modern civilization an evil of ten-fold greater magnitude than these, and that we should regard it with comparative unconcern.

War may have slain its thousands, but intemperance its tens of thou sands. War is an evil of but occasional occurrence; from the ravages of intemperance we are never free. *That* is a calamity which thrift and industry on the part of the people, and wisdom and energy on the part of the government, can generally in time repair; which touches but a man's circumstances, his property, and at worst, hut his life; *this* is an evil whose night of guilt and sadness is unrelieved by any streak of dawn. Like the deadly upas tree, which tempts the wayfarer to relax his limbs under its cooling shade, it creates an atmosphere which lulls the unheeding sleeper into a sleep deeper and more deadly than even that of death. And by what restorative can he be recovered? "Who can redeem from the slavery of intemperance the hapless victim, who is the mere plaything of temptation, the *ludibrium* of a tyrant that "shuts the gates of mercy on mankind?" "What power can restore to fallen woman-hood her virtue? Who shall summon from dishonoured graves those over whom have been shed those bitter tears of" sorrow without hope?" Who can restore the happiness of by-gone better days, or, since this is impossible, who can blot out their bitter remembrances from a memory that refuses to forget ?

*"What skill can minister to a mind diseased—  
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow;  
Rase out the written troubles of the brain,  
And with some sweet oblivious antidote,  
Cleanse the foul bosom of that perilous stuff  
Which preys upon the heart?"*

We have nothing to say in mitigation of the horrors of war, pestilence and famine. But they are horrors to which we are in little danger of becoming insensible. I am to-night to speak of some means of suppressing an

evil, to whose horrors familiarity has rendered us all but indifferent, and which is far more wide-spread, and far *deeper* in its effects; more constant in its pressure; more destructive to the fortune, the health, the reputation, the character, the life, the soul; in one word, more damnable in its power, for time and for eternity, than any of the evils which an Inscrutable Providence has permitted to desolate and curse our world.

It will (I trust) be in a spirit of becoming earnestness that we shall enter upon the consideration of the means of its suppression.

DEFINITION.—The first question that offers itself for our consideration is : What is the PERMISSIVE BILL? The question admits of an easy, clear, and speedy reply.

It is a bill to enable" the electors or ratepayers within certain defined districts to prevent the common sale of intoxicating liquors within their districts.

It provides for a vote being taken of the electors or ratepayers in a defined district, say an electoral district, or a town, or a municipality, whether this act shall come into operation within their district or not. It shall only do so when a clear majority of two-thirds of the electors vote for its adoption.

Should the act be adopted in any such district, no license whatever shall thereafter be granted or renewed for the sale of alcoholic liquor within such district.

It is hardly necessary to add anything in explanation. The measure is perfectly simple, and is easily understood. We may however just call attention to one or two of the main features of the Bill. It will be observed, that it does not propose any *regulation* of the liquor traffic. It does not provide that the voters shall determine *how many* public-houses shall be permitted within their district: it simply gives them the power of saying whether or not they will have any at all.

It will also be observed that all vested interests are sufficiently protected. The publican's is an annual license. Its renewal is never a matter of right, His vested interest legally and righteously does not exceed the period of his current license. That Vested interest is respected. The license will be allowed to run out its full term. It only will not be renewed. I am aware that some will be disposed to regard this as insufficient. They will tell us that the publicans vested interest amounts to more than we have named. No doubt, in a sense, it does. His interest is to keep things just as they are. Every drunkard who is rescued from the brink of perdition diminishes the profits of his trade. He has a vested interest in his damnation. He has a vested interest in the poverty and destitution of his family. Every shilling that is spent on bread for them, is kept out of his till. When will our moral sense be sufficiently strong to enable us to see that no vested interest in a people's degradation, vice and misery, has any righteous claim upon our consideration !

Lastly, the bill provides that not less than two-thirds of the electors must be in favour of the measure before it can come into operation.

Having thus briefly explained what the Permissive Bill is, let us proceed to a discussion of its merits. In doing so I shall lay down this as my first proposition—

I. *That the evils of the traffic in intoxicating liquors are so great, so wide-spread, and so intolerable, as urgently to demand some legislative measure which shall, as far as possible, effectually suppress them.*

I shall not waste any time in needless declamation upon the evils of intemperance. These evils are acknowledged, People do not so much need to be convinced of their existence, as to be made to feel how great is the responsibility involved in their toleration. It really amazes one in moments of calm reflection, that the sober, the philanthropic, the Christian part of the community, can take the matter sit coolly as it does. A slight act of injustice suffices to arouse our indignation, yet the most atrocious and cruel imposture that can be conceived, is regarded with the profoundest indifference. A ghastly murder, a determined suicide, a frightful accident, a railway misadventure, a steamboat collision, the upsetting of a stage coach, these are things which send a thrill either of shuddering horror, or of sympathetic grief throughout the land, but the ten thousand evils which follow in the wake of the demon Intemperance, a hardening familiarity has enabled us to behold with unconcern.

It is not my intention to enter at any length upon the subject of the evil effects of the traffic. And, in fact, it is unnecessary. The Traffic speaks for itself. We need no ghost come from the grave to tell us what is patent to our daily observation. There is no argument like the stern logic of facts. No one can deny that the prevalence of intemperance is the curse of our land. That it is the fruitful source of every form of disease, hastening the decrepitude of age, and stunting the development of youth. That in the retinue of the Great Destroyer are to be seen all the plagues which can embitter human existence—paroxysms, apoplexies, paralysis, idiotcy, madness, delirium tremens, and death. That it is the feeder and sustainer of every form of vice. That it beclouds the intellect, warps the judgment, silences the conscience, hardens the heart, embrutalises the soul. That it enfolds in its ghastly ceremonies of death the young man in all the pride of his manliness and power. That it robs woman of her virtue, and then despoils her even of her shame. That it fosters and irritates all the foulest passions of the human heart.

We know that its consequences to the national welfare are, the whole-sale destruction of grain, converted

by distillation into poison, and the loss of Productive Labour in every department of occupation. That to it is to be attributed the greatest part of that ever-increasing poverty, beggary, and pauperism which are the subject of such alarm to Political Economists. That to it is to be attributed the greatest part of the prostitution which fills our streets with outcast victims of debauchery, and of the crime which fills our gaols with unhappy and demoralised inmates. "Who slew all these?" I do not speak of an evil, the antiquity of whose existence may give scope for historical exaggeration. The ghastly and sickening spectacle is presented to our gaze even today. As in the vision of the Hebrew prophet, we look out upon a valley of carriage and blood, a valley white with the bones of an army of the dead!

Now we say that such an evil as this loudly calls for the interference of the Government—that an urgent necessity exists for some measure which shall effectually deal with an evil whose effects are so wide-spread and devastating.

The objection at once arises : "Why look for the remedy at the hands of the Government? People cannot be made moral by Act of Parliament. If you wish to reform the drunkard, do not attempt it by the coercion of a legal prohibition, but by the cogency of your argument, the persuasiveness of your appeals."

The reply is obvious. What is the use of argument and persuasion in the case of a man, whose judgment is already convinced, who admits the full force of your appeals, but who is not his own master ? Why pour vinegar upon nitre by proving to the slave that his condition is one of degradation, and by urging him, while the chain is clanking on his limbs, to arise and walk forth in freedom? We demand the interference of Government on behalf of men, who are no more guided by the voice of Reason, who can no more be entreated, than the merest madman? We demand the interference of Government on behalf of multitudes, chafing in the thralldom of a habit which they cannot put off, helpless under the bad spell of an enchantment which they cannot break.

But, it is said; "for those in whom habits of intemperance are confirmed, legal restraint is powerless; men cannot be made sober by act of parliament." We boldly answer, an act of parliament may remove those frequent sources of temptation, which overpower the feeble resolution of the drunkard struggling with his great enemy. But we may turn the tables. We may well ask, if an act of parliament cannot make men sober (and no one contends that it can do this except approximately) does it therefore follow that acts of parliament should be tolerated which encourage and seduce men to get drunk? If the passing of a Permissive Bill will not ensure the sobriety of every confirmed inebriate, are we to remain satisfied with legislation, which, by facilitating the multiplication of public-houses, drags into the ranks of drunkenness those many hundreds annually, who perpetuate the ghastly succession of its victims ? Men may be made *drunken* by act of parliament. And by an act of parliament more wisely, more justly, more humanely conceived, men may be kept sober.

II. My second proposition is one on which I will waste no argument. It is this : *That any attempt to Regulate the Traffic, will, by permitting its continuance, its shown by the history of past Legislation to be ineffectual and unsatisfactory.*

The wisdom of our Law-makers, perplexed and exasperated by the constantly-increasing character of this evil, has for ages been directed to its Regulation. And, we ask, with what result? What is the final issue of all those bulky statutes and ponderous blue-books extending over the history of the last 1500 years? Where has the matured wisdom of the ages landed us ? The question needs no reply. The Giant Evil still stalks forth with more than the strength and fatness of its youth? Its victims are numbered by annually increasing thousands. Nor need we wonder : Who shall give law to the very fountain of lawlessness ? How is it possible to regulate a system whose bare existence means disorder, whose breath is pestilence, whose shade is death? It is not making men pay £50 or £500 for a license, nor providing that the house in which the traffic is earned on shall have six rooms or sixteen; that will extirpate, or even mitigate, so stubborn an evil. It is no pet lamb to be tethered by a silken cord of regulation. There is no remedy but the sharp remedy of the knife. The evil demands excision. Nothing will serve but a provision for its absolute prohibition. This brings me to my third proposition, which is this—

III. *That to effectually remedy and remove, this great evil, what is imperatively demanded is, A PERMISSIVE BILL.*

We reserve our discussion of the question of its justice, and its constitutional character. Let us at present enquire: WHAT ADVANTAGES WOULD SUCH A MEASURE SECURE? Of course the benefits of the measure would be confined to those localities where a majority of two-thirds of the electors had voted for its adoption. And so long as adjoining districts retained their public-house, there can be no doubt that the beneficial effects of the measure would be but imperfectly realised, even in those districts in which the Bill was adopted. There would still be thirsty souls, whom no journey, however long, would deter from getting their accustomed grog. And having obtained it, they would return to their own neighbourhood, carrying the effects of their over-imbibing with them. But we have no hesitation in saying that in these localities in which the Act would be adopted, the Permissive Bill would secure:—

1. *The Suppression of Intemperance.* There would be no distilleries, no breweries, no public-houses. There would be no alcoholic liquors bought or sold. Heavy penalties of fine or imprisonment, or both, would secure

obedience to the law. Drunkards would either have to gratify their depraved appetites by taking a wholesome "constitutional" of two or three miles journey, or they would have to remove to some neighbourhood in which drunkenness was legalised; thus causing so large an influx of such characters into such neighbourhoods as would, let us hope, lead *their* inhabitants also to long for the protection of the Permissive Bill, to save them from such a rugged and disreputable immigration.

One might have thought it would scarcely be necessary to show that the abolition of public-houses would result in the abolition of intemperance. One would have thought the statement almost self-evident.

*"How often the sight of means to do ill deeds  
Makes ill deeds done."*

Remove the cause, and the effect will disappear. This, however, has been strongly denied. The effect, it is said, would be, not to diminish drunkenness, but to call into existence such a system of sly going selling as would turn us into a community of knaves, and cowardly sneaks—our great concern being "not to leave undone, but keep unknown."

My first reply to the objection is, *If this be so*, surely the necessity for prohibition of the traffic: is even greater than it appeared. If, as a community, we are so enslaved to this accursed thing, that, even when the people in any district, by a majority of two to one, have *themselves* closed the public-houses, they yet cannot abide by the consequences of their own act, if the people will thus seek to obtain clandestinely what they have by their own act excluded themselves from obtaining honestly and openly, the people would really seem to be in a state of deeper degradation and more abject enslavement than we imagined. *If it be so*, how necessary must that, legal restraint be, which, even when severest, proves to be barely effectual. If even prohibition itself will not suppress intemperance, how vain are any expedients which fall short of prohibition. If even the bridge can hardly be attempted with safety, what madness to plunge into the surging tide.

*But we deny the statement.* We fearlessly take the position that the removal of the public-houses would be the "end of drunkenness. It so happens that the evidence upon this point is so ample as even to make selection a matter of difficulty

One of the most striking proofs of our proposition is a Report to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, presented some years ago. From this it appears :—

- That the *absence* of public-houses in a district is accompanied by an almost total *absence* of drinking.
- That the presence of *many* public-house is attended by *much* drinking.
- That the *increase* of public-houses is followed by a proportionate *increase* of drunkenness and debauchery.
- That the suppression or decrease of public-house or dram-shops is followed by corresponding improvement in the drinking habits of the people.

This report expresses the substance of returns from nearly five hundred parishes of Scotland.

The next proof to which I shall call your attention is this:—Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, having determined to obtain reliable evidence on the question of the drink traffic a committee was appointed which arranged and forwarded certain forms of enquiry throughout England and Wales, not only to the heads of the church and parochial clergy, but to the magistrates, heads of goals, chaplains, the constabulary force, masters of workhouses, and lunatic asylums; in fact, to every person who it was imagined could supply any information on the subject. These forms of enquiry were sent through twenty-one dioceses, embracing thirty-two counties, with 14,000,000 inhabitants. The result of this vast amount of labour has been the production of one of the most valuable documents ever possessed by the British people, shewing as it does, the real weakness of the nation, and the means of remedying the same. On this document, the committee drew up a report urging the adoption of the following clauses :—

*"Firstly, The repeal of the Beer Act of the year 1830; and the total suppression of beer-houses throughout the country.*

*"Secondly, A great reduction in the number of public-houses throughout the kingdom, it being in evidence that the number already licensed far exceeds any real demand, and that in proportion as facilities for drinking are reduced, intemperance with its manifold evils is restrained.*

*"Lastly, That as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors is to supply a supposed public; want without detriment to the public welfare, a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licenses should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected, namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system. Such a power would, in effect, secure to the districts willing to exercise it, the advantages now enjoyed by the numerous parishes in the province of Canterbury, where according to reports furnished to the*

*committee, owing to the influence of the landowner, no sale of intoxicating liquors is licensed."*

A few specimens of the evidence on which the Report was based may be cited out of about as many hundred similar ones.

*"(1) You have been rightly informed that there are no public-houses or beershops here. The village is orderly and quiet, and only once during my incumbency of six years have I seen a drunken parishioner. Indeed drunkenness is hardly known. The labourer is too tired of an evening to go two miles in quest of beer . . . This sobriety has a great effect upon the harmony and comforts of home. Every labourer is able to keep a pig, and several have cows. They are able to keep their children at school longer than usual. They belong, as a rule, both men and women, to some friendly society."*

*"(2.) The public-house was done away with about eleven years ago, shortly before I became incumbent. I am assured that when there was a public-house it was the occasion of much intemperance, of much riot and disorder, and of much poverty and distress. From the experience of ten years' intercourse with the people and residence among them, I believe I may confidently say that we have no habitual drunkard. I do not remember to have seen a parishioner in a state of intoxication more than once or twice, and the freedom of the village from those riots and disorder which are, perhaps, inseparable from a public-house is very observable, and often spoken of with satisfaction."*

*"(3) The influence has been for good. I consider this as one of the reasons why the people here are so sober and well conducted. There is only one drunkard amongst us; he is an old Waterloo man. But he would get much worse if he had not to walk two or three miles for beer."*

In addition to the cases named in this Report, take the following culled from the pages of Dr. Lee's "Condensed Argument for the Legislative Prohibition of the Liquor Traffic." In these cases, the districts named had no public-houses, in consequence of the several landlords refusing to allow them to be established.

1 JOHNSTONE, in Dumfries-shire, with a population of 1230. There are three public schools in the parish. Then; are no persons above six years of age who cannot both read and write.

The report adds : "WE HAVE NEITHER PUBLIC-HOUSE, *nor resident surgeon, nor prison, nor lawyer, nor beggar.*"

SALTAIRE: near Bradford, in Yorkshire. *Area* : About a square mile.

*Population* : About 3000. *Habits of the people* : Honest, industrious sober. *Drunkenness rarely seen. Crime very rare. Pauperism almost unknown.* This has been the case for about *ten years.*

3. SCORTON, near Lancaster. As the village was not *wholly* in the hands of Mr. Fishwick, *two attempts were made to establish a public-house. But the people would neither go, nor send to it:* so it was soon closed, and the village is free from the nuisance to this day. Now, what is the state of this village? *Pauperism is almost unknown. There has only been one case of crime before the magistrates for twenty years,* and then the whole village felt itself disgraced, through the breaker of the law was a stranger among them. *If a policeman happens to pass through the village, the: children run out to look at him as a curiosity.*

*What Scorton is, without a public-house, thousands of villages might soon become if we had a Permissive Bill.*

Now it is upon this evidence that we take our stand, and fearlessly assert, that, though the Permissive Bill cannot be expected to afford any exception to the universal character of human legislation, though it will in many respects, no doubt, disappoint the expectations of the more sanguine, it will have the general effect of doing what no regulation of the abominable system has ever done yet, or ever can do; it will suppress intemperance.

2. *It will be a preventive as well as a remedial measure.* It will enable the people in a quiet, sober, and respectable neighbourhood to protect themselves from some low blackguard, some pimp or prize-fighter, who would endeavour to break in upon their prosperity, and with Bacchanalian orgies to destroy their peace.

I am not yet sufficiently acquainted with this province to be able to take an illustration of this statement from any locality here, but I can do so by citing a locality close to the parish in New South Wales which I have left. It is a part of the municipal borough of Marrickville.

The inhabitants consist of some few persons having their business in the city, but chiefly of market gardeners. These market gardeners are a remarkably sober, industrious, self-respectful class. There is no public-house in the neighbourhood, and the little community is a perfect model of sobriety, industry, and domestic and social happiness. But where is their security. Some wretched character might establish a public-house, set up a dancing saloon, and entice the young people into his den, tomorrow; and that in spite of their protestations. Give these people a Permissive Bill, and those sober gardeners would soon settle the question whether they would have any public-houses or not. They would exercise their right to self-protection.

3. A further advantage of the passing of a Permissive Bill is that it would secure the ground already won by the Temperance Reformers. The hundreds of children now enrolled in connection with juvenile temperance associations, and the hundreds more whose names are enrolled in connection with our bands of hope, we should

keep them. No multiplied temptations would seduce them to the formation of a clinging habit, a hellishly consuming last. The uncontaminated taste would be maintained. What attractions for *me* has the seducing wine cup? Being "simple concerning the evil," having been mercifully preserved from even tasting of the inebriate's cup, I can smile at the magician's rod which has no spell of enchantment for me. And as with myself, so with those thousands of uncontaminated children. A Permissive Bill would keep them so.

But why do I speak of these. Look at that large, that frightfully large class of inebriates whom no moral force seems efficacious to preserve. Look at those hapless drunkards who have signed the pledge and broken the pledge of abstinence, till men begin to say it is impossible to save them. Look at those poor slaves of the bottle, whose, constant failures are the occasion of such frequent and anxious discussions in the several Divisions of our Souse of Temperance. As it is, it is almost *impossible* to save them. Who can resist a temptation urged by all the ingenuity of selfishness, on the part of the tempter, and backed by all the power of the habit of a lifetime in the victim? The passing of a Permissive Bill would enable us to keep them. Those wretched harpies, who stand at the doors of those hells of demoralisation to lure the shackled slave to his destruction, (I speak only of course of those to whom such a description will apply) those spiders who now stretch their web, and lie in wait for the unheeding fly—*there would be an end of them*. The poor wretch would have a chance. There would be no bend in human form to knock him down as soon as he got upon his legs : there would be some hope of his salvation.

"By my troth," you may say, "these are bitter words." Bitter!—how should they not be bitter, when the occasion of them is so bitter! I envy not the retailer of ardent spirits the fortune which hardheartedness and cupidity have enabled him to acquire. It smells of blood. In the strains of the grand piano which this blood-money has purchased methinks I hear a wail deeper than that of any Æolian harp—the wail of starving children, the bitter wail of woman's love despised. The dazzling array of the Bacchanalian palace will not blind me to the view of that home, whose hearthstone is cheerless and bare, where sits the victim of a too-confiding trust, and the neglected children of want and of despair. In the words of a great American preacher, "I had rather inherit the bowels of Vesuvius and make my bed in Etna than own those estates which have been scalped off from human beings as a hunter strips a beaver of its fur."

But I am digressing. I was remarking that the third advantage of a Permissive Bill was that it would secure the ground already won, by Temperance Reformers. There would no longer be the sickening discouragement of having the same thing to do over and over again. We should no longer have to inquire three weeks after the poor drunkard had signed the pledge, "Is Jones keeping steady yet?" We should no longer be confronted at the Secretary's table with the familiar faces of the same old drunkards, whose promises, like piecrusts, are made but to be broken. The multiplied temptations would be removed, there would be hope of their stability. On this point I have just one other illustration to allege.

Wherever this measure is adopted, its beneficial effects would so speedily become manifest, that each new district, which adopted it would furnish an additional argument for its wider extension. The people of Tokomairiro would be beginning to ask "If the Taieri guts on so well after putting an arrow through its "Baldfaced Stag," why should not we put a bullet into our "Tied Lion?" If Dunedin dismissed her publicans and found herself waxing more and more prosperous in her buxom youth by sticking to the teapot, surely port Chalmers would soon be following in her wake, and even Invercargill might not be far behind.

The last advantage of this measure which I shall mention is, *that it would remove the great hinderance to the progress of human society*.

A horrible pestilence would no longer rob the strong and vigorous of health, and decimate society by its poisonous breath. The wealth of society would no longer be wasted upon what is worse than useless. We should no longer spend tens of thousands of pounds in order to turn ourselves into boasts and madmen—a sum of money equal to the amount required to support in comfort, a large percentage of our entire population.

The productive labour of our people, and the produce of the land would no longer be wasted in the manufacture of a worse than useless product, but would be used to maintain and feed our population.

Our rising generation would not be suffered to grow up in sottish ignorance, but would be educated for the right discharge of their duties of manhood and citizenship.

Above all, religion would not have to hang her sacred head in bitter lamentation over the sins and sorrows of a drunken community, but would rejoice in the ever-widening conquests of the Gospel of Christ. The song of the heavenly host would seem already to have found in part its blessed fulfilment: "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and good will towards men."

IV. The concluding section of this lecture I had intended to devote to *the consideration of objections*. But of these, in addition to such as have been already noticed, only one is deserving of any serious attention. *I shall not insult the moral sense of this audience by even discussing the question of the, loss of Revenue*. We will not consent to make the question of the destruction of thousands of our fellow men a question of money. The soul of a drunkard is worth more than the fraction which the state makes out of the transaction when he sells himself

to the Devil. I therefore pass at once to the consideration of the one great objection to the Permissive Bill—The Objection to it as Unjust and Tyrannical. Let us then ask :

*Is the Permissive Bill a Just and reasonable measure?* Does it come fairly within the province of government to deprive a minority of a source of enjoyment, whose evil effects are considered by a majority to warrant such a deprivation ? What are the limits to the authority of society over the individual? The battle-ground of this controversy is John Stuart Mill's Essay on "Liberty." It is there that the principles of those who differ from us find their strongest, most cogent, and best expression. Let us consider them.

Mr. Mill says, "Neither one person, nor any number of persons is warranted in saying to another human creature of ripe years, that he shall not do with his life for his own benefit what he chooses to do with it. . . . The interest which society has in him individually (except as to his conduct to others) is fractional, and altogether indirect. . . . In this department, therefore, of human affairs, Individuality has its proper field of action."

*"There are many who consider as an injury to themselves any conduct which they have a distaste for, and resent it as an outrage to their feelings. . . . But there is no parity between the feeling of a person for his own opinion and the feeling of another who is offended at his holding it; no more than there is between the desire of a thief to take a purse, and the desire of the right owner to keep it. And a person's taste is as much his own peculiar concern as his opinion or his purse."*

Finally, passing some strictures on what we cannot but regard as a most lame and impotent justification of the principles of the "United Kingdom Alliance" by its Secretary, he says: "Here is a theory of 'Social Rights,' the like of which probably never before found its way into distinct language : being nothing short of this—that it is the absolute social right of every individual, that every other individual shall act in every respect as he ought: that whosoever fails thereof in the smallest particular, violates my social right, and entitles me to demand from the legislature the removal of the grievance. . . . The doctrine ascribes to all mankind a vested interest in each other's moral, intellectual, and even physical perfection, to be defined by each claimant according to his own standard."

I have purposely selected these—the strongest passages which occur in his essay—because, dear as are to me the interests of this great movement, the interests of truth are higher; and I am anxious to be fair.

Mr. Mill's jealousy of the interference of government with individual action is highly commendable. The quotation which he makes from Baron von Humboldt is, I think, an expression of the profoundest wisdom: "The object towards which every human being must ceaselessly direct his efforts, and on which especially those who design to influence their fellow men must ever keep their eyes, is the individuality of power and development, with its requisites—freedom and variety of situations,—whence arises individual vigour and manifold diversity."

But Mr. Mill himself acknowledges that this Individuality has its limits; and, indeed, he makes such ample concessions to the other side, that it may even be possible to show, that, on his own principles he need not offer any opposition to a Permissive Bill. Those concessions we shall have occasion to notice immediately.

The great difficulty in the settlement of such questions as these is to determine the limits of the province of government. What course is the government to steer so as to avoid upon the one hand the Scylla of neglect of the public: well-being, and upon the other, the Charybdis of undue interference with private liberty? Undoubtedly the Government has no right to interfere with freedom of thought and discussion. Undoubtedly the Government has no right to interfere with the private conduct of any man, so long as that conduct does no direct and consider able mischief to the community. If a man chooses to get drunk every day in the privacy of his own home, he should be free to do so. The *Times* is, I think, quite right in saying, "It is the inalienable birthright of every Briton to make a fool or a beast of himself as much as he pleases, so long as he does this without interfering with the safety, comfort, and morals of others." Government has no business to prevent him. But the case is very different when the conduct of a man exercises a pernicious influence upon society. To use Mr. Mill's own words: "*As soon as any part of a person's conduct affects prejudicially the interests of others, society has jurisdiction over it; and the question whether the general welfare will not be promoted by interfering with it becomes open to discussion.*"

The circle of a man's private and exclusively personal conduct should be sacred. But Mr. Mill again acknowledges : "It is far otherwise if he has infringed the rules necessary for the protection of his fellow-creatures, individually or collectively. *The evil consequences of his acts do not then fall on himself, hut on other; and society, as the protector of all its members, must retaliate upon him.*"

Now we take these admissions of Mr. Mill, and, if we mistake not, a very slight extension of them will suffice to justify the principle of a Permissive Bill.

It is quite true that, such a measure would diminish the facilities for obtaining intoxicating liquor, as well in the case of the moderate drinker, as in that of the drunkard. This would so far be a curtailment of the personal liberty of many a temperate and respectable man. *Such a curtailment of personal liberty we deeply regret.* But

we maintain that the necessities of the case are so urgent as to leave us no other alternative. We would gladly leave the moderate drinker to the fullest means of gratifying his private taste, if we could do so, and yet stamp out this abomination of Intemperance. But we cannot do it. If we are to tolerate houses for the public sale of intoxicating drinks, we cannot say that only temperate people shall frequent them. We cannot even ensure that they shall not be made centres of public demoralisation. The thing has been tried—it cannot be done. And, therefore, we must get rid of these pests at any sacrifice. We regret the interference (*so far as it is such*) with a *private taste*, but we cannot consent to endure any longer *this public mischief Salus populi supreme lex*. "The safety of the people is the highest law."

We should not have to be very fastidious about curtailing personal liberty if an invading fleet were at Port Chalmers, and we cannot afford to be too fastidious about it while a still more destructive intestine foe is in our very midst. In the presence of an invading army citizens must be willing to forego the freedom of action, which under other circumstances, we would most strongly claim for them—nor does it make any difference whether the invading army be an army of Russians or of licensed victuallers.

We may well ask: Is it to be tolerated that the wealth, the health, the productive labour, the vital energies of this community, shall be wasted upon what it would be a public blessing to pour into the sea as soon as made, except perhaps that it might injure the fishery trade? Is it to be tolerated that a wretched and ragged regiment of degraded drunkards shall be allowed daily to recruit itself out of the finest of our sons? Is it to be tolerated that children shall be allowed to grow up in ignorance and vice—that (to quote words familiar to some of us) "the tenderest ties of social life" shall be torn asunder, that "the sweet endearments of home" shall be exiled, our "earth shorn of its loveliness," and our people, of their strength?

Are these abominable dens of infamy (I do not speak of *all* under that designation, but I speak unhesitatingly and sadly of *many* under that designation) these pests of society, these drinking hells, to be allowed to rise one after another in our midst, to sap the foundations of our prosperity and demoralise our land?

Is it to be tolerated that crime shall continue to send her hundreds of guilty children to our prisons, the hulks, and the gallows?—that lunacy shall snatch her victims, one by one, into her "land of darkness as darkness itself, and of the shadow of death without any order, and where the light is as darkness:" Shall famine lead forth her gaunt, and ghastly train, whose pallid faces and hollow sunken eyes utter their mute prayer for the death that stays too long?

Shall the glare of our midnight gaslight still reveal to the eye of philanthropy, dimmed with the tears of sadness, these creatures of sorrow and shame, whose hollow laugh of affected unconcern has in it the very echo of perdition's wail?

Must all this be tolerated in order that there may be no diminution of the moderate drinker's present facilities for obtaining his bottle? That he may be put to no inconvenience in the indulgence of that luxurious sipping of the port, and stirring of the toddy. Personal liberty, the liberty to do what one likes—the liberty to buy and sell what one likes, *when and how* one likes, may be a *thing most precious, but even gold may be bought too dear*.

We need not call your attention to the numerous instances in which *government has already recognized the necessity of a similar interference*.

The restraint upon the liberty of the crew and passengers of a ship detained in quarantine in consequence of a single case of cholera, the shutting up of unwholesome graveyards, the removal of nauseous kerosene works, the suppression of lotteries, cock-pits, gambling-houses, prize-fighting, and of obscene print-shops—all these furnish examples of the exercise of this power of interference with personal liberty on the part of the Government. Yet none of them can present so forcible a case for such interference as does the traffic in intoxicating liquor.

But, in fact, *the law has already virtually recognized this principle in the present Licensing System*. The purpose of that system is to prevent drunkenness. All its restraints are framed with that, end in view. Now, if it be right to interfere with the traffic at all with the view of preventing drunkenness, it is right *effectually* to interfere, and if there can be no effectual interference except by providing, with the people's consent, for its abolition, then such provision for its abolition should be made.

We conclude, therefore, that the *Permissive Bill is a fair, just, reasonable and constitutional measure*. We have already shown *the urgent necessity* that exists for such a measure, and have pointed out *how effectually it may be expected to fulfil the end* which we are all so anxious to secure.

We rejoice in the agitation that is now being made to get the measure passed by the Parliament of this country. I rejoice to find that there has been sent into Parliament such a petition in its favour as has never yet been laid upon the table of the House. The ladies of the colony, mothers and daughters, have joined your ranks, in holy rivalry with yourselves.

Let us address ourselves to this work with hallowed enterprise and enthusiasm. Let us seek to strike from our fair escutcheon the foul blot of intemperance, to purge this land from this wide-spread, and deeply festering

plague. The blessing of him that is ready to perish will come upon us. The slave of the demon drink, redeemed from his bitter and galling bondage, shall walk forth in the freedom of his new recovered manhood; the sister rescued from the paths of vice and sin shall sing her song of gratitude. Children shall find a new world opening around them in the strong guidance of a father's wisdom, in the newly found tenderness of a mother's love. And this land shall arise from the dust, gird herself with the strength of dauntless enterprise, stretch forth her hand of diligence and power, uplift her brow of intelligence and wisdom, and realise more than the proudest of her sons has dared to hope:—A Greater Britain in another world.

G. Watson, Printer, Maclaggan Street, Dunedin.

## Spiritualism.

Price 3d. Second Edition

"Everywhere theories,—surmises,—conjectures; On what would I not give to *know* something of the life to come—if life to come there be!".—*Sforza*

Magna Est Veritas, Et Prævalebit.

*"All newly-discovered truths have, at first, the lot of struggling against old beliefs but in the end, they are victorious."*

—*J. M. Fichte.*

*"Then the forms of the departed,  
Enter at the open door,  
The beloved, the true-hearted,  
Come to visit me once more,"*

—*Longfellow.*

*"Dare I say  
No spirit ever brake the band,  
That stays him from his native land,  
Where first he walked when clasped in clay."*

—*Tennyson.*

## **To the Reverend the Synod of the (Presbyterian Church of Otago and Southland—**

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR REVEREND SYNOD—

*I have taken the liberty of Dedicating this short pamphlet to you.*

*First,—Because some of your number are enquiring after the subject of Spiritualism, and have thought it expedient to give public lectures thereon, and write essays in a publication entitled The Evangelist.*

*Second,—Because as teachers of religion, it is part of your duty to carefully study all that relates to man's immortal part, and a future state of existence.*

*Third,—Because many of your number, in common with the leaders of oilier religious sects, are, fair, lamentably ignorant of the whole subject.*

*Hoping your Reverend Synod will look upon this Dedication with favour,*

*I subscribe myself, your most obedient servant.*

*A Spiritualist.*

*Dunedin,*

11th January, 1870.

"All who have been seriously following up the subject [Spiritualism] and have been gradually coming into communication with their departed friends, have bit by bit, lost the fear of death. Many indeed look forward to it as to a promotion.—*Varley*.

"Before you condemn Spiritualism, or any other novelty, sit *flown* live minutes, and ask yourself what you know about it? As yet, no man of standing has thoroughly examined the matter for the purpose of exposing it, but has been convinced of its truth."

"History offers no example of a religious belief which, in less than 22 years has attracted such a large body of Disciples.

"The proportion of the sex among the followers of the faith may be stated as 70 per cent. of men, and 30 per cent of women.

"The majority of Spiritualists consists not of ignorant, but of educated and intelligent persons. Everywhere it has spread from the higher to the lower ranks of society, and has never taken an opposite direction.

"Spiritualism is more readily adopted by Sceptics in religion, than by those possessing [*unclear*: a rigid]

ONE of the questions agitating the minds of the thinkers of the day is—What is Spiritualism? Is it a science? Or is it legerdemain? Is it animism? Or has it any affinity to electricity or to odic force? are ever and anon asked and answered, as was to be expected, in many ways. Spiritualists assert the existence of certain phenomena, and state theories for their appearance, while the non or anti-spiritualists, are divided in their opinions. It may be well to shortly state what Spiritualism, as understood by Spiritualists' really is, and then examine some of the objections which have been urged against the spiritual theory.

The philosophy of Spiritualism may be summed up in the following assertions:—

- First, That man is endowed with an immortal spirit.
- Second, That after the death of the body this "spirit" finds itself in a new phase of existence.
- Third, That in this state of existence, spirits manifest themselves to, and hold communications with, mankind, and thus demonstrate reality of the immortality of the soul.
- Fourth, That in spirit life there is progression as infinite as knowledge.
- To sum up, there is—First, Man's immortality. Second, Spirit communications. Third, Progression in spirit life.

The proof of these statements rests not on argument, nor on theory. The Spiritualists point to "facts," though declaring at the same time, that their "creed" can stand the most minute scrutiny, as being both logical and consistent. Some of the greatest men of the day are predated as witnesses to the following, among if other facts namely:—(1) That matter, such as tables, chairs, &c., are moved by unseen influences. (2). That intelligent communications are received to answers put, without human agency, in a manner yet unexplained by any known laws. (3) That voices are heard which do not appertain to anyone in the flesh, and that substances are seen, called spirits. The names of gentlemen of eminence who have identified themselves with Spiritualism are sufficient to prove that, whatever it may be, it demands investigation. When such men as Whately, Hewitt, Lyndhurst, Dr. Elliotson, Dr. Asburner, Victor Hugo, Robert Chambers, Alfred Wallace, Gerald Massey, Professors De Morgan and Varley, Robert Buchanan, Tennyson, Garrison, Professor Hare, Denton, Mapes, and Judge Edmonds, besides many eminent Continental scientists, have said they are Spiritualists, it will not do to try and explain the phenomena, except on some rational basis. And when Spiritualists assert, that their creed is not new, that the wise in all ages have expressed their belief in, at all events, some of their tenets, that with Milton, many have stated that—

*"Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth  
Unseen, both when we wake, and when we sleep,"*

Spiritualism assumes an importance which neither ridicule nor denunciation can get rid of. Moreover, the appeal is not to a system, or to a book however revered. It is to phenomena—to fact. Spiritualists do not say, "Believe. To all they say, "Come and see." "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." Moreover, Spiritualism is not confined to a sect, nor to a race. Its creed is universal. In all nations, and among all religions it has its disciples. Believers in Spiritualism may differ in many respects, and hold various belief, but in the cardinal points of "Immortality," "Progression," and "Communication," they are united.

The phenomena which all acknowledge, have been already stated: and as when the objections are considered, they will be more fully referred to, it will now be necessary to state how these facts are met. There is no unanimity in the objectors' camp. There is one class who deny the phenomena, another who partially admit it; while some are even to be found who admit the facts to the full, and offer various theories in

explanation. Those who emphatically deny the existence of the most usual phenomena, such as table rapping, knocking writing, music, instrumental playing and inspirational speaking, will not be convinced by argument. They will admit nothing except that which is tangible to their senses. They must "feel the nail prints" and convince themselves by touch. To such it is useless to treat of the subject before they have experienced the phenomena. To tell them that there are thousands of facts that can only be proved by the testimony of others, is of no avail. "Let us see," is their retort. They imagine that the many learned men who have examined the subject have not their penetration; some "mesmeric sleep" must have blunted their senses. Let these clever people appear, and spiritualism will be exposed and "found out." Those savans have an opportunity of proving their sincerity in their own ability.—Signor Damiani, an Italian of distinction, has recently published the following offers:—

*"I challenge you, or either of you, [George Henry Lewes and Professor Tyndall] or any of the public, who, like you, disbelieve in the genuine character of spiritualistic phenomena, to deposit in the hands of any well known London banker, whom you or they may name, the sum of five hundred guineas, and I pledge myself, to immediately deposit in the same bank a like amount—the ownership of such sum of one thousand guineas, to depend upon my proving by evidence sufficient to establish any fact in history, or in a criminal or civil court of justice—*

- *"First—That intelligent communications and answers to questions put, proceed from dead and inert matter, in a manner inexplicable by any generally recognised law of nature.*
- *"Secondly—That dead and inert matter does move without the aid of any mechanical, or known chemical agency, and in defiance of all the admitted laws of gravitation.*
- *"Thirdly—That voices appertaining to no one in the flesh are heard to speak, and hold rational converse with men.*

"A jury of twenty-four gentlemen, twelve to be chosen by each party, (such jury to consist exclusively of members of the learned professions and literary men); to decide whether or not, the facts contained in the above propositions are conclusively proved *per testes*, i.e., by witnesses of established character. A majority of the twenty-four to decide. If the verdict be, that these facts have *not* been Established, the thousand guineas are to belong to the party accepting this challenge : if the verdict be, that these facts are established, the thousand guineas to be mine.

"Secondly—Immediately upon the above wager being decided either way, I offer a like challenge of five hundred guineas, 'to be met on the other side as above)—the ownership of this second sum of one thousand guineas to depend upon the establishment of the facts contained in the propositions already given, *by experiments conducted in the actual presence* of the twenty-four gentlemen who have decided the previous wager: the verdict of the majority to decide in this case likewise. In either case, the *seances* are to be conducted in any public or private building, which the jury may select, and which may be available for it the purpose. The result of these challenges (if accepted and decided) to be advertised by the victorious party at the expense of the defeated party in all the London daily papers." Here is an opportunity for those who talk of "jugglery," "chicanery," and "humbug," distinguishing themselves! Moreover, there are many mediums now, to whom they can go, and test the matter for themselves, and perhaps this is the proper mode of investigation.

There is, however, another class of objectors who do not use argument but rest their main stay on ridicule. To them it is a subject of inextinguishable laughter. They, as a class, have always flourished in the world. There has never been a discovery, never an invention, but what these extraordinary wise people were there to ridicule. As Galvani has said, so may the Spiritualist repeat—"I am attacked by two very opposite (?) sects, the scientists and the know-nothings. Both laugh at me, calling me 'the frogs' 'dancing-master.' Yet I know I have discovered one of the greatest forces in nature." But "ridicule" never yet proved a theorem or solved a problem. Laughter is the last resource of small minds, and used when a subject is hated to them that they cannot comprehend. What better than to exercise the risible faculties when their minds get bewildered—what an air of self-importance it gives?—Every quack knows the potency of ridicule, but when it is the mainstay of the anti-spiritualists, most, educated people will be inclined to question its power and influence. Besides these two classes, there is yet another who make vast assertions. A pamphlet recently published in Melbourne by a Mr. Turner, is a sample of the "logic" of this class. Mr. Turner makes the following [bar statements :—" (1) That the belief in such a power is not warranted by the results. (2) That the nature of the testimony on which it relies for support is eminently unsatisfactory. (3) That its teachings are vague, contradictory, often mercenary, and inextricably confounded with fraud and chicanery. (i) That its acceptance as an article of belief can only be accomplished by an entire surrender of our reasoning and enquiring faculties, and a practical denial of those fundamental cosmic laws, on which alone true science can rest." Now, would it be believed, that Mr. Turner begins to prove his case by denying the existence of nine-tenths of the phenomena which he pretends to explain? His explanations to get rid of the facts are, "stupefaction caused by a phase of hypnotism!" and "It has been justly said, that the very disposition to look for something out of the ordinary course of nature, makes one incapable for the time of

distinguishing what actually happens, from what is expected to happen." So that Mr. Turner, who has never witnessed any of the higher phenomena, while admitting the lower, has to talk of "stupefaction" and "hypnotism," and to explain the lower, uses animal magnetism, mesmerism, od force, "or, whatever we call these mysterious phenomena which have been almost reduced to a science by Reichenbach, &c." In fact, anything sooner than admit the spirit theory. As for Mr. Turner's fourth ground, that Spiritualism is against cosmic laws—this means that Mr Turner understands all the cosmic laws, and is as valuable an argument as has been urged against these very mysterious (!) forces he hesitates how to designate. There is nothing new but what the would-be scientific men, meet by saying, "But if this were true, a great many of our theories would be upset, and sooner than allow that, why not state it is against the *fundamental* cosmic laws on which alone true science can rest. It is the old story of the Paduan professor of philosophy and Galileo. Look through the telescope—of course, not. It is against cosmic laws, and would be a surrender of "our reasoning and enquiring faculties."

There are, however, other objections offered, and theories attempted to be made out by scientific men; some say: (1) Spiritualism is od force, &c. (2) Animism. (3) The development of an intelligence by emanation from our bodies who without our knowing anything about, it, form themselves into a distinct personality that raps, writes, and carries on general conversation, makes witty and moral observations—but thinks profoundly.

(1) Spiritualism cannot be od force. Od force has no intelligence. It at best is simply matter; it has no life, has no knowledge; and wanting these, the phenomena are inexplicable on such a theory. It is somewhat strange, that Reichenbach and Dr. Ashburner who have done so much to acquaint the public with the existence of "odyle," should, "should have confessed themselves Spiritualists. Neither can electricity aid the anti-spirituals. The most noted electrician in Britain is an avowed Spiritualist. How can electricity act? It must be set in motion. If a telegraphic communication is received, it is not *caused* by electricity, the electricity, fluid is only the medium, there must be the operator. But neither electricity, nor od force, nor any of these "mysterious(?) forces" can explain one tithe of the occurrences at the seances. A musical instrument played by unseen operators, or ponderous bodies moved without touch, seem strange things for a mere force to perform.

(2) Then there is animism, or mind acting on mind. "While granting that the action of "mind on mind," is but imperfectly understood, and that there exists a kind of brain telegraphy, that our savans are, as yet, totally ignorant of; yet till brain theory cannot account for one hundredth part of the phenomena nightly witnessed at spiritual seances. This theory at once fails if a communication is received, in answer to a mental question, of a nature which the questioner did not understand. To be of any avail in accounting for Spiritualism, it must be shown that the answer given to the verbal question, was known to the questioner. There are thousands of instance on record, in which the questioner was totally ignorant of the answer received. To take an example from Owen's "Footfalls": The wife of Captain Wheatcroft, residing, residing in Cambridge, dreamed she saw her husband, (then in India.) She immediately awoke, find looking up, she perceived the same figure standing by her bedside. He appeared in his uniform, &c. She did not sleep that night. . . . . In due course, a telegram arrived, stating that Capt. Wheatcroft had been killed before Lucknow, on the 15th November. A certificate was obtained from the War Office to the same effect. Mr. Wilkinson being informed of the incident visited a friend, whose wife has all her life had perceptions of apparitions. He related to them the vision, when Mrs. N. suddenly said, "That must be the very person I saw on the evening we were talking of India." In answer to Mr. Wilkinson's questions, she stated, she learned he had been killed in India, about nine o'clock in the evening by a wound in the breast She did not recollect the date, but on enquiry she remembered she had paid a tradesman's bill on the same evening, and on bringing it to Mr. Wilkinson for inspection, the receipt *bore date the 14th November*. Three months afterwards a letter was received from a friend of Capt. Wheatcroft's roll's, Capt. G. C. wherein it was stated that the Captain had been killed on *the 14th, not on the 15th* and that Sir Colin Campbell's despatches were so far incorrect. The War Office corrected the mistake, and a new certificate was issued. Now this incident is of itself sufficient to show, that animism cannot explain the phenomena. The "unreason" of this explanation is only on a par with others which anti-spiritualists are in the habit of adducing.

(3.) The last theory offered by scientific men which will at present be noticed, is one which does not require much argument to dispose of. It is nothing more nor less, than an attempt to make out that "emanations" from a certain number of living persons, become created into a distinct personality, endowed with human powers. The very fact that a "personality" must be created for such seance, and that when the "emanations" cease, this newly created "individuality" must cease also, proves that some people will go any length to explain away Spiritualism sooner than admit its theory. When however, it is remembered that the same "spirit" is present at different seances, and shows that it possesses "a memory," and relates incidents known only to a few, and not to those present, the absurdity of this last explanation becomes more plain. So much for the "explanations" offered by those who term themselves scientific men.

There are yet two objections urged against Spiritualism. (1.) That it is unscriptural, and from the Evil One. (2.) Granting that it is all that it pretends to be, What good is it? or the *cui bono* argument? It is unwise to use

this argument of being contrary to the Bible, nay, when it is remembered how this same objection has been brought forward against almost all new discoveries of God's laws, it is dangerous. There was hardly ever a discovery or a reformation, but what was contrary to Scripture, or instigated by, what is termed, the Devil. Astronomy, chemistry, magnetism, all had to meet these objections; and even Christ's teaching was of Beelzebub. But Spiritualists are not afraid to meet those who urge such arguments. They assert that in all religions are to be found facts witnessing the truth of their creed, and that the Bible is a vast record of Spiritual manifestations. They point to the Urim and Thummim, to the interruption of Balaam on his way to bless Balak (Numb. xxii. 24, 25), to the release of Samson (Judg. xv. 14, &c.), to what happened to Daniel (Dan. x. 10), to that writing on the wall in Belshazzar's feast, which so amazed his gay company (Dun. v.), to the taking of Ezekiel by a lock of his hair, and the lifting of him up between the earth and the heavens' (Ezek. viii. 13), as all evidences of Spiritualism. And when one remembers the thousands of incidents in the Old and New Testaments, and the admission by those who term themselves Christians, of the reality of all these phenomena, one is lost in amazement at the denial of the existence of Spirit Communion by those very persons. Was it not an angel that spoke to Hagar in the desert, and showed her where to quench her thirst? And what of angels visiting Abraham, Lot, Elijah, Jacob, Moses, Zachariah, and almost all the patriarchs and prophets? Some may say, but angels and spirits are not identical. The Hebrew word "angel" is used in identically the same way as our word "spirit." And it is worthy of notice, that the angels that were seen, as recorded in the Bible, appeared as men, and were addressed and replied to the questions put to them, as men. Moses and Elias, men well known in Jewish history, were seen by Jesus and his disciples. The angel that appeared to John, as stated in the Revelations, declared himself to be "of thy brethren the prophets." Both of these facts evidencing that Spirit Communication was then possible.

The new Testament incidents ought also to be noticed, did space allow. The announcement of the births of John and Jesus, the appearance of angels to the shepherds, and to Joseph, the release of Peter from prison, are all proofs of the reality of Spirit existence and Spirit communication. Indeed Jesus statement, that the angels take an interest in the reformation of the erring, (Luke xvi. and Mat. xviii.) is abundantly proved by the daily occurrences at the seances, held all over the world. Those, who wish to decry Spiritualism as being unscriptural, should be very chary of this appeal, "to the law and to the Testimony," for they are witnesses against them. See Acts v., vii., x Acts xii. xvi., etc. Romans i., etc., etc.

The other statement made is, "but they are not good spirits." Says one very intelligent writer, "We know the wicked have neither 'peace' nor 'rest.' (Isaiah xlvi. 22, and lvii. 21); but, on the other hand we have no ground for supposing God permits His saved ones to hold like intercourse. The tenor of Scripture would render such an idea untenable—they sleep—rest in Jesus Christ." Hence, Moses and Elias, and all the spirits that have in ancient and modern times appeared were wicked! The only answer that ought to be given to such assertions, is the one Jesus used, when accused of being aided and inspired by this "Evil One," who, by the by, is ultimately, according to popular orthodox notions, to be more successful than God—"Can a kingdom divided against itself stand." Moreover does it not seem strange that "wicked spirits alone know and take an interest in what is transpiring in the world?—The communications received are of a nature which precludes the very idea of wicked, or evil spirits alone having the power of communicating. If all the spirits are wicked. Hades cannot be the very bad place which some folks paint it. There is an intimate acquaintance shown with the world, and interest taken in rescuing erring mortals from evil courses, which are very creditable indeed to those whom some people imagine are "sweltering in fiery torments." Assertions like these are happily now-a-days not treated with much respect". The idea of an "Evil One" ruling over an infernal world, and sending forth millions of fiends to seduce and destroy men, *and being successful*, is now recognised by most sensible people, as exploded. If God is good and almighty, it is monstrous to believe in such a creed. In fact, this habit of attributing, what cannot be clearly understood without patient investigation, to evil spirits, is a very old one, and one that has been much used by the popular religious teachers of the period. Let the old test of "By their fruits ye shall know them," be applied to Spiritualism, and it will be found that the so-called "Evil spirits inculcate principles and practices indicating no internal purpose, but rather missions of mercy, purity, justice, benevolence, humanity."

The last objection which will be noticed, is the question often put by those who are unable to deny the evidences of Spiritualism; who have to confess it is not mesmerism, galvanism, od force, or any mere "mysterious forces in nature;" who are not afraid to say, (for this age is not in love with martyrdom) that the "Biblical" and "Devil" argument is also untenable, but, What good will it do to humanity? Everything, say these philosophers, must be judged by an utilitarian standard, and Spiritualism—*cui bono?* If Spiritualism did no more good than prove man's immortality, that of itself would be a great boon. What is the basis of all religion? Is it not man's immortality? And what proof have we of it by reason alone? Examine the ponderous tomes which have been published to prove it, and what do they continually have to fall back upon—man's consciousness. And if Feuerbach's argument be noticed in connection therewith, how weak a one it is, most will

confess. If Spiritualism is true, then the immortality of the soul requires no further proof—and this of itself entitles it to the respect of all. But Spiritualism stops not here; it is not content with the proof of such a fact however desirable. It aims at reconciling Science with Religion, now so unhappily divorced: and as an American paper has said—"As a theory of religion, the development of these ideas will prove, without question, the most revolutionary movement which ecclesiasticism has confronted since the Reformation." Spiritualism asserts that Christianity has become in many places a white-washed paganism, that under the guise of Christ's teachings, practical atheism and materialism lie hid, and ever and anon come to the surface. What a spectacle does Christian Europe, may, Christian Great Britain and Ireland present? Are Jesus teachings of much avail? Spiritualism comes not with "thirty-nine" or even nine articles of faith. It has very few. "God the Father," man's immortality and progression and spirit communion, are the articles of its creed. As such, it is pure Christianity, the doctrines which Christ taught his disciples. William Howitt, whom none can accuse of being antichristian or infidel, has said, "The best that can be said of modern theology, as sold and taught by the clergy, who purchase the right to sell it, is, that it is an Enormous Humbug, and a most scandalous libel on the name of Christ, which is thus impudently assumed by a public which serves Mammon with all its heart, and lives in 'the poms and vanities of tins wicked world,' which their daring sponsors have sworn that they shall renounce." Such is William Hewitt's opinion, and is there not some truth in his strictures? Spiritualism aims at reformation, and it is this aim which has allured to its ranks, men tinged with Materialism, men who with fear were looking for a "desolate perhaps." Let those, then, who, as yet, know nothing of Spiritualism, investigate the subject, and before hand be prepared, if need be, to relinquish part of their former beliefs. Let them be prepared to hear the oft repealed assertion, "As the tree falleth so shall it lie," contradicted—prepared to hear that in a future life there is progression as infinite as knowledge. "To go on teaching that a sinner confessing the error of his ways, will ascend at once to the presence of God, and that all others will descend to the Prince of darkness; that by some heavenly hocus-pocus, sinners leprous with sin to the very soul's core, will be miraculously converted into saints, and made fitting denizens of the higher of the only two regions of the invisible world is," says William Howitt, "a process unfounded as any Scriptural assurance, as it is in open contradiction to the whole analogy of Gods economy, which is one gradual change from good to evil and evil to good."

In conclusion,—There are no doubt many objections urged against Spiritualism which have not been noticed, such as darkness at seances, etc. The works published on Spiritualism are so numerous, that any one wishing to see both sides of the subject, has ample opportunities; the design of this short pamphlet was more to call attention to the subject, than anything else. As for darkness being necessary at some of the seances, it may be stated that darkness is necessary for the production or manifestation of many forces in nature and inquirers are referred to the numerous books (upwards of 400 vols) published by J. Burns, Southampton-row, Holborn, London, W.C., and others for full explanation. Spiritualists are at present placed in no enviable position. As Mons. Pierart has said, "As for us, we are poor fools, ridiculous creatures, imbeciles, and that because we have the candour to avow that we examined! studied, experimented, felt, bundled, and hare determined the evidences of facts, whilst you have seen nothing, know nothing, and who, notwithstanding deny hardily, are sages, people of sense, oracles perfectly infallible." This is, no doubt, the cause of the number of Nieodemans to be found in the Spiritualists ranks.

That in New Zealand—in every province—there are vast numbers of Spiri tualists, is well known, but as yet there is no sufficient organisation. It is hoped, however, the time is not far distant, when the example of other places will be emulated, and progressive lyceums, &c., be founded. With a spiritual creed of "One God, one belief in immortality, and one common destiny, in the great *To Come*," there is not much fear of progress.

That there will be "buffeting," "ridicule," and "nonsensical reasoning," to endure, is well known, but as A. J. Davis has said, "The commandments of truth are high and imperious; and her true disciples never hesitate to follow whithersoever she leads. Any theory, hypothesis, sect, creed, or institution that fears investigation, openly manifests its own error." And therefore notwithstanding the cries that will be raised of "Our craft is in danger," and "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," the words of M. Pierart may be quoted :—"To you, Spiritualists, will belong the glory to have been the first to clear this great consolatory way, to have prepared a new era. Have faith, then, combine your efforts, associate your intelligence—your exertions—propagate the *Truth*. It is given to you to prove the existence of the benefits which How from the Divine inspiration, and which are diffused through all nature, till we learn to understand and to avail ourselves of them."

## —Addenda.—

A friend, who has looked over the proof, suggests that some mention should be made of the wonderful cures effected by Spiritual Mediums by the laying on of bands, etc. Space will not allow a lengthened notice; it may, however, be stated that the Zouave, M. Jacob, at Paris, and Dr. J. K. Newton, of Bloomer House, Buffalo,

New York, U. S., and the Rev. Mr. Young, Church of England clergyman, of Wiltshire, are three noted healing mediums, and that at their command the paralytic walk—the blind see—the deaf hear, and diseases of long standing are removed. In the "Banner of Light" for October 21, 1869, names of persons, well known in America, are given, who have been cured by Dr. Newton, and if there were any quackery in the cures, the 4000 journals in America would surely have exposed it, Hundreds visit healing mediums, and many cures as wonderful as those performed by Christ and His Apostles, are effected, thus evidencing that the miracles performed by Christ were not myths, nor confined to one age.

The Moderator of the Presbyterian Synod, who has just retired, stated in his sermon, that Spiritualism, or rather as be termed it "a new infidelity," had made astonishing progress throughout the civilised world, and seemed destined to spread still further. Apparently he imagines the vitality of the orthodox faith has received a rude shock which the clergy will need at once to see to. So impressed indeed are some of the clergy with this idea, that the opening address of the newly-elected moderator, was a jeremiade over the non-success of the Church it is well to see that same, at all events, of the clergy are a live to the "Signs of the Times." Might it not be suggested that Spiritualism, considering the manner in which it has been received—its success being without parallel—is destined to be a "Faith" to the multitudes who are crying after some help to get rid of the cold materialism which stares them in the face? And may not God our Father by thus blessing this new philosophy, be teaching [*unclear*: His people]

**The Law and the Liquor Traffic. A Lecture**

Delivered by the Rev. William Gillies,

Of West Taieri,

Morington Total Abstinence Society, in the Hall of the Wesleyan Church, Dunedin, on *Friday, 11th November, 1870.*

Now Published at their Request.

PUBLISHED BY Reith & Wilkie Dunedin Princes Street. G. Watson, Printer, Maclaggan Street, Dunedin  
*Price Six Pence.*

## The Law and the Liquor Traffic

THE subject which I am to bring under your notice this evening is one which I am happy to say, is attracting, considerable attention both in the Home country hopeful sign and the friends of Temperance should greatly rejoice in the discussion which are going on in the press and the parliament, and from the platform, for this is a cause which, the more it is discussed, must gain over to its ranks men of influence and of principle, who have the well-being of their fellows and the prosperity of their country at heart. It is now being taken up by the leading statesmen of England heart. It is now being taken up by the leading statesmen of England as a question of the very gravest importance, which the Government cannot longer refuse or delay to deal with, it being pressed upon them not merely by zealous Teetotalers, but by facts to which they cannot shut their eyes in the immense amount of panperism and crime, and stagnation in trade, which are the direct and undeniable result of Intemperance, and under the burden of which the good ship of the State is beginning to roll uneasily, as if over freighted, and in danger of foundering. A very marked change has taken place within the last few years in the tone of public opinion as to the right and propriety, and necessity of further legislative interference with the liquor traffic, so as if not altogether to prohibit it, yet still to impose much greater restrictions upon it that at present is the case; and I am confident that the more attention our statesmen give to this matter, in the light of the well-being of the State, the more will they be inclined and fell themselves compelled to make use of the strong arm of the law toward suppressing a traffic which has done so much to deluge the land—I might say the world—with papuerism, and blood. It is now only about seventeen years since the first movement was set on foot in Britain to obtain legislative prohibition of the trade in intoxicating drink. At first, the United Kingdom Alliance sought to tread in the foot steps of the Maine-law-leaguers, but finding the there was no hope of succeeding with that programme, they have latterly contented themselves with the more moderate scheme of the Permissive Bill, by which they propose that Parliament should enact that wherever in any parish three-fourths of the ratepayers shall so decide, there there shall be no public-houses allowed. After being sometimes ignominiously kicked out, and at other times politely bowed out of Court the promoters of Temperance legislation have at length secured a patient hearing, and from the Gladstone Ministry, obtained a promise a promise that the subject will receive the earnest consideration of the Government, and a Bill be introduced next session embodying the views of the Government upon the matter; which of course, it is not expected will go the length of the Permissive Bill, but from what has been already said will certainly propose important modification, and much greater restriction on the traffic than at present exist; and I do not know anything more likely to indues to the triumph of thoroughgoing Temperance legislation than the introduction of

a half measure by the Government, as then the thoroughgoing Temperance party will have an opportunity of attacking and exposing the weaknesses of such a course, instead of, as hitherto, being at the disadvantage of having their proposed measures attacked, and the weak points in them exposed. Having at length succeeded in forcing their opponents to fall back from the former do-nothing position, they will have much less difficulty in driving them from any half-way ground they may take up, and urging upon them a complete surrender. In Britain, the evil results of the foolish and suicidal policy which has been so long pursued in regard to this traffic are now become so apparent that it is impossible for even the most prejudiced to shut their eyes any longer to these evils and their cause; and the magnitude which they have assumed is now so threatening, that on all hands the necessity of something being done is acknowledged, though, of course, it cannot be expected that all at once those who have so long argued, for what they have magniloquently termed the liberty of the subject, and so forth, in the matter, should come round to the opposite ranks, and go in for wholesale suppression, or even, at first, any very great limitation. In this colony, the same suicidal policy has been pursued, though the evils resulting therefrom have not yet assumed so great a magnitude as in the Home country. Yet still we are beginning to feel pretty smartly the first pinching of the iron shoe, not only in the matter of our prisons and police, and officers of justice generally, but also in our Hospitals, our Lunatic Asylums, our Benevolent Institutions, our Reformatories, and the numerous cases of distress which are ever cropping up and calling for relief. And it is time that the community were rousing to take steps for reducing or uprooting the parent sources of evil and distress which fill to overflowing these public institutions, or soon it will find the burden of results greater than it can bear. Prevention is at all times better than cure; and if it can be shown that the traffic in intoxicating liquors is chargeable with a large proportion of the crime and pauperism, and misery, which abound in the State, it surely becomes the duty of statesmen to consider this matter, and to wield the power of the law to mitigate, if it cannot altogether prevent, these evils, by legislative interference with their cause. It is a fact which is admitted on all hands, that intoxicating drink has, in one way or another, to do with the great proportion of pauperism, destitution, crime, and misery which are to be met with everywhere, and if only we could sweep drink out of existence, one great cause of human misery would be gone, and the sum of man's happiness greatly increased. Not one whit too strongly have the terrible evils produced by intoxicating drink been pictured in the following lines:—

*"Oh ! what hath this benighted land  
O'erwhelmed as with a flood.  
And made this world a golgotha—  
A place of skulls and blood?  
What hath the scowling gibbet reared  
And forged the felon's chain?  
'Tis writ in characters of blood,  
The cup which drunkards drain,"*

One of the most recent and most emphatic testimonies on this point is borne by Dr. Temple, the lately-appointed Bishop of Exeter, himself not a total abstainer, and therefore it may be presumed free from that exaggeration which is sometimes charged against the statements of zealous abstainers, and by which charge the edge of these statements is adroitly blunted. He says, in the course of his address at the last annual meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance—"I do not think that it can be for one moment denied that there is no other evil at the present moment in this country so deadly in its operation as the drunkenness that prevails amongst us. Even those who altogether oppose all that you are doing and all that I should wish to do, are not prepared to deny what indeed the plainest of all facts, that far the largest part of all the evil from which men suffer now that can be at all prevented by human means comes out of the indulgence of this one fearful sin. I do not think that I am at all overstating when I say that this one cause of unhappiness and crime is equal in its bad effects to all the other causes put together."

The London *Times*, in commenting upon this speech of Br Temple's, and arguing against the principles and the legislative action proposed by the United Kingdom Alliance, is at the same time forced to make this admission, which may be taken, therefore, as the evidence of another independent, unprejudiced witness; or rather, I should say, of an opponent of the proposed legislative interference with the traffic. It says, in the leading article referred to—

*"There can be no question that the abuse of strong drink induces an excitement and disorganisation of the faculties, particularly of the moral qualities, which utterly incapacitate men from the patience and self-denial more necessary among the poor than among any other class. As we read the law reports it is difficult not to conclude that it is the most fertile cause of crimes of violence. If some controlling power could but enforce*

temperance, not to speak of total abstinence, the wealth and happiness of our people would perhaps be doubled at once." Similar testimony has been borne by many judges from the Bench, of which I will quote a few to show you the perfect unanimity on this point:—(Quoted from pamphlet on "Pauperism and Poor Laws," by Councillor Campbell, of Greenock, 1869). "Sheriff Alison states, "upwards of two-thirds of the whole of the boys in the Glasgow House of Refuge have been precipitated into crime through the habits of intoxication of one or both of their parents." Judge Coleridge states "there is scarcely a crime comes before me that is not directly or indirectly caused by strong drink." Judge Guruey, "every crime has its origin more or less in drunkenness," Judge Alderson, "drunkenness is the most fertile source of crime, and, if it could be removed, the assizes of the country would be rendered mere nullities." Judge Patterson, "If it were not for this drinking you (the jury) and I would have nothing to do." Judge Weightman, "I find in every calendar that comes before me one unfailing" source, directly or indirectly, of most of the crimes that are committed-intemperance." Lord Chief Justice Bovil, "I have no hesitation in stating that in the north of England and in most of the large manufacturing and mining districts, intemperance is directly or indirectly the cause of by far the largest proportion of crimes that have come under my observation. The cost to the country for the maintenance of the prisoners and their families likewise becomes a matter of very serious importance; and, looking also to the wholesale misery that is brought upon the working classes by their indulgence in intoxication, at first unfitting them for their ordinary occupations and then rapidly causing disease and want—too frequently insanity and death—and "bringing distress upon their families ; and considering the amount of pauperism as well as crime which, is thus occasioned, it would seem to be the imperative duty as well as the interest of the State to endeavour to provide some remedy which will check so frightful an evil." That is a pretty formidable array of judicial evidence upon the point of the large connection between crime and intoxicating drink. Now let us listen to the evidence of a few witnessed upon the large connection between pauperism and intoxicating drink. The following testimonies are taken from the appendix to the report on Temperance presented to the Convocation of Canterbury, England, last year, and are the testimonies of governors of workhouses and other officials. One says, "I believe pauperism would be unknown here if it was not for drunkenness, and rates would be lowered. Another says, "This union has to support eighty pauper lunatics at a cost of £20 per annum. About two-thirds of three cases have been traced to drink." Another, "without hesitation I should say that seventy or eighty per cent. of the paupers came to that state through drink." Another, "I have been able to glean from our inmates that about eighty per cent. of them have been the victims of intemperance." Another, "from my own experience in a workhouse of more than thirty years, I consider that fully one-half of the adult inmates are there from their own intemperate habits, which appears as strong as ever if an opportunity offers One-fourth consists of those connected with the intemperance of others, and one-fourth from other causes." Again, another says "independent of lunatics, I have twenty-nine men in this house, and all, with the exception of three, are thorough drunkards. Of women I have twenty-three; three of these I may call idiotic, one old woman of good character, the rest drunkards and prostitutes. Three-fourths of the children are left to the care of the union through the drunken and dissolute habits of their parents." And yet another, "from thirty-one years experience in union workhouses, I have observed that a large number of inmates and out-door recipients of relief are chargeable in consequence generally of the intemperance of the head of the family, viz., the father." One quotation more from the Report referred to, it is as follows, "a careful estimation of the mortality occasioned by intemperance in the United Kingdom, including the lives of innocent persons cut short by the drunkenness of others, places the mighty sacrifice at 50,000 persons every year." Do not such statements as these make one's ears tingle and their blood run cold. Has not drink been well styled the great British Juggernaut—a Juggernaut whose bloody festival comes round not once a year merely, but goes on from year's end to year's end, and that under sanction and protection of the law in a so-called Christian land. To the foregoing testimonies I will simply add that of one of Scotland's greatest, divines, and Britain's noblest philanthropists, the late Dr. Chalmers. He says, "the public-house is the most deleterious and by far the most abundant source of pauperism." American statistics are to the same effect as the British, thus I quote from a little tract by Rev. A. Barnes. He says, "the pauperism and crime of this land grow out of this vice as an overflowing fountain. Three-fourths of the taxes for prisons houses of refuge, and almshouses would be cut off but for this traffic and other attendant vices. Nine-tenths of the crimes of this country and of the expenses of litigation for crime would be prevented by suppressing it. Of 653 who were in the year committed to the House of Correction in Boston, 453 were drunkards, Of 5,000 admitted to the workhouse in Salem, Massachussets 2,900 were brought there directly or indirectly by intemperance. Of 592 male adults in the almshouses in New York, not twenty, Says the Superintendent, can be called sober; and of 601 women not as many as fifty. This is the legitimate regular effect of the business. It tends to poverty, crime, and vice, and greatly to increase the taxes and burdens of the community." Thus testimony upon testimony from every quarter might be heaped together to show the fearful amount of crime, pauperism, and misery, everywhere cause by tins traffic; but I will turn from this point with the following anecdote, which once appeared in the British Workman, and which I am sure tells too true a tale.

*The writer of it said, "some time ago, when in conversation with an intelligent soldier who had passed many years in India, and who had seen not a few fearful applications of the cat-o'-nine-tails, I enquired, 'How many of these cases of flogging had to do with drink?' The soldier, with a smile, replied, " Oh, with every case, sir. I think I never knew a soldier flogged except through drink in Some way or other, or for stealing so as to get drink. Many a time have I had to or other, or for stealing so us to get drink. Many a time have I had to roll barrels of grog up the hill to one of the canteens in India, and it was a common joke to say "Bill, I wonder how many courts-martial there are inside here !"*

I have now done with the, proof of my indictment against intoxicating drink as the great producing cause of pauperism and crime and general misery; and, you as the jury, must, I am sure, award me a verdict of 'fully proven.' Such, then, being the case, as against intoxicating drinks, and the charge being admitted on all hands, does it not seem of any country taking the most stringent measures for the limitation and even total suppression of the traffic in an article which is the cause of so much misery and brings some, very serious burdens on the state? I quite reciprocate the feeling of astonishment expressed in the following extract from a speech of the late Mr. Wakely, a member of Parliament, and a coroner of a district in England, as also the opinion expressed as to the duty of the Slate to legislate most stringently upon this matter. He said "since I have been corner I have seen so many murders by poison, by drowning, by hanging, by cutting the throat, in consequence of drinking ardent spirits, that I am astonished the legislature does not interfere. The gin-seller should be mad as responsible as the chemist and druggist." The legislature of most if not all countries has admitted and asserted to a certain extent both its right and the necessity for exercising that right, to interface with the sale of intoxicating Liquors, and has so far placed it under restriction that there must be a license obtained by the seller, without which he cannot legally carry on the traffic. This, however, is a very partial restriction, as it is only in exceptional cases that the license is refused. But it is an admission or at least a usurpation of the right of control, and it may be fairly argued that the position taken up by many against any further or any very stringent restrictions of the traffic should compel them not merely to oppose further restrictions but to seek the repeal of those already in force. Thus, when it is argued in high-sounding phrase, and with great apparent force of reason and patriotism, that for the legislature, to interfere and narrow down and suppress this traffic would be a dangerous infringement of the liberty of the subject; that argument, if it has any force in it at all, should lead those who make use of it to set free the traffic from all restrictions, for the liberty of the subject is already infringed, inasmuch as only certain licensed individuals can carry on the trade, and that only in houses of a certain character and at certain hours. Is that no infringement of the liberty of the subject? But if it is right for the state to infringe so far upon the individual liberty of the subject for the good of the whole state; then clearly it is right for it to interfere still further even to total suppression of the traffic, if the good of the state demanded it. And that a strong Case may be made out on that score we have already shown. The cry against the infringement of the liberty of the subject involved in the legislative suppression of the traffic certainly sounds well, catching readily the ear, swaying the judgment, and exciting the prejudices of many against legislative action in this matter: So you will hear good men sometimes say "we do not care for the traffic, we would be glad if it were done away, but it must be by moral means, for the law to step in and attempt to do so violates the sacred and important principle of the liberty of the subject; for the traffic therefore we do not plead, but because of the principle involved we cannot go in with the legislative restriction or suppression you propose." This, as I have said, certainly sounds well, but it is all rhetoric and not reason, concerning which we may quote the lines of the poet

Like quicksilver, the rhetoric they display  
Shines as it runs, but grasp'd at, slips away.

The doctrine of the liberty of the subject can surely never be regarded as covering a right to do that which is detrimental to the interests of the state, sapping the foundations of its virtue and stability, and burdening it with an overwhelming weight of crime and pauperism. Is this the sort of liberty which is to be accorded to the subject and with which it is wrong to interfere ? If a subject starts a manufacture in the neighbourhood of a number or even of one of his fellow subjects which involves the destruction of the purity of the atmosphere around, and thereby endangers the health of his fellows or even the health of their plants, the law interferes, and no one-pleads that the liberty of the subject should protect him from being proceeded against as committing a nuisance and being compelled to close his establishment. But here is a traffic which, by overwhelming statistics, is proved to be the greatest nuisance and the most destructive of human life and happiness which is carried on in the whole world, and yet the plea of the liberty of the subject is advanced as shielding it from the interference of the law to put it down. Surely men do not think when they advance such a plea as that to bar stringent legislation in regard to this matter. The liberty of the subject is interfered with in the case of the chemist and druggist, who is placed under the most stringent restrictions as to the sale of [*unclear*: arsenic] and

other articles of his trade, and to a certain extent made responsible for the results of selling these articles. Even the kerosene oil dealer is placed under stringent restrictions as to the quantity to be kept at any time on his premises, yea, the private citizen dare not keep more than a very limited quantity of that household necessary in his private residence", and is not that an interference with the liberty of the subject? And yet it is acknowledged to be perfectly right and reasonable, because the safety of the community demands it, it being held as an equally sacred doctrine in morals and in legislation as that of the liberty of the subject, that no man has a right to injure or endanger the life or property of his fellows. But is not the life and property of the community at large far more endangered and injured by the traffic in intoxicating drink, and the liberty accorded of opening houses for its sale at every corner, fitted up with every facility and attraction to tempt men to turn aside and drink ? And yet forsooth, it is urged that the sacred liberty of the subject prevents the suppression of this traffic by the strong arm of the law! But let us just listen for a moment to the limping argument on this point advanced by the leading English journal, the London *Times*, in an article commenting upon the action proposed and advocated by the United Kingdom Alliance in regard to the Permissive Bill, as this, more than anything else, will show the weakness of the plea, and may be taken as a fair specimen of what moulds and guides the opinion of those opposed to legislative suppression. It says, "What the thorough-going Alliance man denounces is the 'legalized system of traffic in intoxicating liquors.' This phrase, we must be permitted to say, is perfectly unmeaning. The law in no way creates the right to sell alcoholic liquors. The right is a natural one, and the law has to show good reasons before it ventures on restraint." Was there ever a more miserable shuffle than this? If the law does not create the right to sell alcoholic liquors, it certainly has claimed and asserted the authority to control the right which the *Times* says is a natural one, and exercising its control, it says to all, you will not be allowed to exercise your natural right, but you may acquire a legal right by submitting to such conditions as the state imposes. It, therefore, virtually takes from all what is their natural right according to the *Times*. Why is the *Times* not up in arms against that infringement of the natural rights and liberties of the subject ? And then it bestows on some parties who comply with its conditions, chief of which is payment of a certain sum of money, a legal right to sell these liquors. No man dare exercise what the *Times* calls his natural right; he must acquire a legal right, and hence the present system under which the traffic is carried on "is a legalized system of traffic in intoxicating liquors." The phrase is not an unmeaning but a most expressive one, and it is because of its forcibleness that it is so much disliked by the opponents to the legislative suppression of the traffic as at present carried on.

But what does the same writer say a little further on ? "The liberty to buy alcohol is no doubt a liberty to do wrong; but it is in an equal degree a liberty to do right, and it would be impossible to extinguish a legitimate liberty simply because it involves responsibility and dangers." The liberty to buy alcohol, the writer then admits, is a liberty to do wrong, and the only apology in defence he can offer for not at once calling in the aid of the civil power to prevent men exercising this liberty to do wrong is, that it is equally a liberty to do right. What can be made of such miserable arguing as that ? It surely cannot be a liberty to do right and to do wrong at one and the same time ; and if in any circumstances it is a liberty to do right, surely that can be no reason for not restraining and preventing its exercise when it is a liberty to do wrong. It may be a liberty to do right when it is bought under medical prescription and for medicinal purposes; let the law permit that as it permits the buying and selling of arsenic or prussic acid, and such like articles. But when it is a liberty to do wrong—as certainly it is, when the money which should be spent on food or clothes for a hungry wife or family is squandered in that—let the law then step in and say to the seller, You shall not sell in such circumstances; and to the buyer, You shall not buy. And does not this involve the wholesale suppression of the present legalised system of traffic in intoxicating liquors? But further, suppose we admit in all the force which he intended it to have, that the right to sell alcoholic liquors is a natural one, then he himself admitted that the law might place restraint upon the exercise of this right, if only it showed good reason for doing it. And are there not 50,000 good reasons for doing it in the 50,000 lives annually sacrificed in Britain by drink ? And are there not thousands upon thousands more of good reasons in the thousands upon thousands of pounds of taxation indicted upon the well-doing, by reason of abounding intemperance and its results." And are there not millions of good reasons more, in the myriad inmates of work-houses and asylums, and starving men and women, and desolate, destitute homes throughout the land? And all the result of this exercise of the sacred natural right to sell and buy intoxicating drink which the *Times* defends. Such a defence is unworthy the columns of the leading English journal, but yet such is the style of writing and argument which moulds, to a large extent public opinion and the opinion of legislators in this matter. It casts a cloak of patriotism over a most ignoble cause, and some are misled thereby, whilst others gladly hide their real motives under that specious appearance. It was humourously, yet with a telling truthfulness, remarked by Erasmus, to the Elector of Saxony, in regard to Luther—" Luther sinned in two things, because he touched the crown of the Pope and the bellies of the monks," slyly insinuating that the latter was of equal if not of more unpardonable guilt than the other. And so I think we might venture to say that much of this opposition on the part of such writers as those in the *Times* which I have

quoted, and the legislators and public whom they represent, to the measures proposed by total abstainers in regard to the suppression of the liquor traffic, arises from the fact of such measures, sinning in two respects—they touch the liberty of the subject and the bellies of the opposers; which of the two is the most unpardonable sin in the quarter referred to I will leave you to decide. Dr. Temple, in the address from which I have already quoted, turns aside the plea of the liberty of the subject in another way, which his *Times* reviewer, however, when again advancing that plea, and founding upon it his opposition to the legislative restriction proposed by the Alliance, takes no notice of. He says—"I am only putting it for the sake of argument; but let it be granted that it would be something quite wrong altogether to stop the traffic in liquor; let it be granted that liberty is of so much importance that we cannot sacrifice even such a liberty as this, although it is so plainly a liberty to do wrong; let it be granted that even to the last we must not so far interfere with our fellow-subjects as to say that there shall be a hindrance upon any man obtaining that wherewith he may ruin body and soul—still even those who may claim this cannot deny that at present it is not a question merely of suppressing the traffic in liquor. It is the question whether or not we shall make some determined and united effort to remove out of the way of the working classes a temptation which seems to pursue them through their lives, and from which it is almost impossible for them to escape. If it be held that still there ought to be the means of obtaining intoxicating liquors if a man chooses to get them, it does not follow from that that he should always have that temptation, as it were, thrust in his very face. It does not follow that he shall hardly be able to go to his work, or to come back from his work without finding the public-house inviting him to his own mischief. It does not follow that he should find that, go where he will, he cannot escape from the allurements, and, at any rate, we ought, if we can do no more, very largely to diminish the number of public-houses and beer-shops in this country, until it may be fairly said, in answer to our efforts, that the number is so few that the temptation is gone." With this view of the matter, and its disarming of his grand plea of the liberty of the subject, the *Times* reviewer does not venture to deal, doubtless feeling that discretion is the better part of valour, and that, therefore, his best course is to shut his eyes and leave its argument alone.

But there is another general high-sounding argument, if argument it can be called, which is frequently advanced by the opponents of legislative suppression of the present system of public-house liquor traffic, and I deal with it the more because it is a stock argument with many against all restrictive legislation which bears on certain questions of public morality. It is to the effect that "you can never make men moral by Act of Parliament." Now that is a truism which all must admit, but still it is possible, and it is right as well as possible to protect morality by Acts of Parliament and to prevent the open practice of immorality. Indeed, what is the object of a great portion of existing Acts of Parliament if it is not that? And this is what we ask the legislature to do, by its strong arm to prevent and to suppress open immorality, to remove the causes of and the temptations to public immorality which everywhere abound; to say, "we will not give our sanction to but on the opposite we will use our power and authority against a traffic which is deluging the land with immorality and so weakening and burdening the state." We do not expect an Act of Parliament to change the hearts and dispositions of men and make them moral in that sense, but it certainly can control their public acts, and can prevent to a great extent their indulgence in immorality, by removing the opportunities of indulgence. And is not the individual man and the community as a whole benefitted thereby? But because, forsooth, you cannot by Acts of Parliament, make men moral in the sense of changing their nature or hearts, is that any reason why what can be done by an Act of Parliament in the direction of controlling their conduct and preventing them being immoral in that or demoralizing others thereby, should not be done? But this is just another example of the plausible sophistries which so often mould and sway public opinion and state legislature.

But again there are some who are opposed to any stringent legislation in this matter on the ground that it will accomplish comparatively little good in the way of putting a stop to intemperance and its evils. 'They say if you restrict the number of public-houses you will not diminish drinking but only increase the gains of those houses you leave, or if you suppress public-houses altogether, then you will just have as many shebeens and sly grog shops springing up all over the country. Now, perhaps my individual opinion would be considered little worth on the question of the amount of good which might be done by further legislative interference with this traffic, and I will therefore; quote to you the, opinion of one who is ever listened to with respect on questions of this nature. Mr. D. Hill, the late Recorder of Birmingham, being asked to give his evidence last year before the Committee of Parliament on the Sunday Liquors Bill, and not being able to attend personally, sent a letter to Sir James Ferguson, Chairman of the Committee, from which I quote the following. He says, "It was not until after many years of observation and thought on the subject that my mind was brought to the belief that any good could be effected by the interposition of the law to which I have ever felt great reluctance to resort without the pressure of overwhelming necessity. But having spent much time for more than forty years of my life in criminal courts, partly as counsel and partly as a judicial officer, sad experience has forced upon me the conviction that drinking habits are by far the most fertile causes of crime; and that when the best law that can be passed has done its utmost much will remain to be effected by moral influences. Yet I have arrived at a very

decided opinion that the arm of the law will be found much more efficient than I had in my earlier years believed possible. I am under the deep impression that restriction has done good service, and that it has not yet been carried to the limit, at which its action ceases to be beneficial to the community. I have sedulously watched the progress of public opinion on this momentous subject both abroad and at home, and I am persuaded that an amount of restriction which would have incited some years ago an opposition so strong as to paralyse the operation of any statute in which it was incorporated would now be received as a boon by the majority of the nation." That is the matured opinion of one well capable of giving a sound opinion and well-entitled to express it. He distinctly says that the arm of the law may be wielded to great advantage and to the accomplishment of much good by placing much greater restrictions on the liquor traffic than at present exist. In the close of the extract from his letter which I have given above, he refers to a point of some importance in legislation, viz., that the measure of success which will attend any enactment, however beneficial it may be in itself, is greatly dependent on the state of public opinion generally. And so he says, a measure of restriction which a few years ago it would have been useless to enact so far as any beneficial results are concerned, may now be enacted and carried into effect. It is of the utmost importance", therefore, that along with appeals to the Legislature for the putting forth of its authority, the public mind should be enlightened and educated upon the subject, and therefore as friends of the cause we must get up and keep up a Temperance Agitation as well as a cry for Temperance Legislation. And I rejoice greatly that the Temperance movement is taking such a firm and general hold upon the community throughout our province. Dunedin, I am sorry to say, which ought to be foremost, shows the greatest apathy in the matter, if not absolute hostility. But soon, I trust, this reproach will be wiped away, and we, poor benighted dwellers in the country, "country clods" as you city people often complimentarily style us, and more frequently regard us, who have hitherto been plodding away in our own Scotch navigation style of doing things, will have the benefit of your superior enlightenment and wisdom, as well as influence and example to guide and stimulate us in this movement; for, of course, rustics naturally and necessarily look up to dwellers in the city with all-becoming reverence as clods to crows. But, lest you should begin to think that our late floods had left us more chaff than corn to dispose of when we come to your market, I had better return to the point of my subject from which I drifted, viz., the good that is to be done by restrictive legislation of the liquor traffic. I have already cited the opinion of one in every way entitled to a respectful hearing, now let me cite the experience of the magistrates and police of Liverpool. At one time, the Justices there took up the opinion that the number of public houses had nothing to do with the extent of intemperance and its evils, and that there would be just as much drunkenness though the opportunities and facilities of obtaining drink were greatly lessened. Accordingly, they for awhile licensed almost every one who applied, and in this way public-houses became greatly multiplied. But they soon found to their sorrow and cost that just as the public-houses increased so did the public intemperance and its evils, and they were glad to revert to the old plan of requiring some sort of a plausible case to be made out before a license would be granted, and just as the public-houses diminished so again did the intemperance. It is strange that this point should ever be disputed, that along with increased facilities for obtaining drink intemperance and its consequent evils are sure to increase. But it has been disputed, and some here may still have doubts upon it. I will, therefore, cite a few testimonies of Police Superintendents and others, extracted from the return already referred to, as printed in the appendix to the last Temperance Report submitted to the Convocation of Canterbury, England. The testimonies given there, I may state, on the various points, are very numerous, so that they present a wide field of induction. One says "intemperance has increased here with the number of beer-shops. The increase is owing in this parish to the fact of one public-house and two beershops having been opened since 1854." Another says, "Intemperance had considerably decreased until the opening of three new public-houses." Another says, "Undoubtedly the spread of intemperance increases with the number of public-houses or drinking-shops which points necessarily to some very severe examination as to the wants of the neighbourhood requiring it before a public-house or drinking-shop is licensed." And again, another says, "I enclose a return from which it will be seen that there is least crime in the parishes in which public-houses are fewest." The return referred to was drawn up in 1842 by the Inspector-General of Police for the central division of England including 25 counties, and from it I just cite the two following particulars, viz., "Where the number of public-houses or beershops was under 6 to the 1,000 of population, the number of persons proceeded against for drunkenness was at the rate of 2.73 per 1,000 ; and just as the ratio of public houses increased so did the ratio of drunken persons, until at the ratio of 12 and under 14 public-houses to the 1,000 of population—about the ratio of Otago—the ratio of drunken persons was 12.61 to the 1,000 of population." Thus the difference shown by these carefully compiled statistics is that when the public-houses were double in number to what they were in other places to the proportion of population, the drunkenness was not simply twice as great but nearly six times greater. A most appalling proof that just as facilities for drinking are multiplied so intemperance and its consequent train of evils increase with fearful rapidity. And yet some of our statesmen (?) will argue that the number of public-houses has nothing to do with the amount of drunkenness, and that as the revenue is benefitted by the

increase of licensed houses, then let all who will thus contribute to the revenue do so. With this question of revenue I will afterwards deal, but meanwhile I stick to the first point of their argument, that drunkenness does not increase with the number of public-houses and consequent facilities for obtaining drink. The returns quoted above prove *that* so far as England is concerned.

Now, let me quote to you a sad confirmation of this fact from the history of another country. Sir Archibald Alison, in his history of Europe, says of Sweden, "Brave, kind-hearted, and hospitable, sincere in their devotion, enlightened when duly instructed in their intellect, gentle in their dispositions, the Swedish peasantry exhibit as fine a specimen of rural civilization as is to be met with in the whole domain of the family of Japhet. But one fatal indulgence has well-nigh obliterated all these advantages and let in upon this simple kind-hearted people the whole catalogue of human sins. Drinking is universal. The liberty of distilling in every house on paying a trilling duty to Government for the right to use a still has from time immemorial been established among the whole peasantry of the country. The consequences of this calamitous facility in producing and obtaining spirituous liquors have been to the last degree disastrous. Notwithstanding the small number of manufactures which are established in the country, the general simplicity of rural life, the absence of great towns, and the moderate size of its capital (which contains only 80,000 inhabitants), the average amount of crime over all Sweden equals that of the most depraved cities of Great Britain." Facts and testimonies like these should surely open the eyes of our legislators to the fact that increased facilities for drinking necessarily and inevitably increase drunkenness and its constant attendants, crimes and pauperism ; and if they would successfully deal with these evils they must go to their root and legislate for the restriction and suppression of the liquor traffic. But it is amazing what a morbid dread and dislike to this legislative restriction or suppression of the traffic haunts the public mind and finds expression in high quarters and leading journals in the most Utopian and Quixotic suggestion of *other means* of combatting the giant evil. One of the most curious developments of this dislike which I have met with appeared in October last, in an article in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, a paper which now ranks as one of the leading London journals. The writer of the article admitted that things had come to such a pass in Britain that something must be done, and argued in favour of such a change in the licensing system as would place it more directly under the control of the ratepayers of each district, though he did not give his support to the Permissive Bill and its proposals. His plan would be to take the licensing out of the hands of the justices and place it in a board elected by the ratepayers "representing their knowledge as well as their ideas." Not a bad idea that as an improvement upon the present system, and which I am sure would come pretty near if not altogether in many instances virtually to legislative suppression of the traffic. But he goes on to put forth "this bright idea, which I am sure you will all say he deserves special credit for, viz., (I quote his words,) "These local authorities would feel their way and gradually acquire a large amount of practical understanding of the subject and its difficulties which would direct us in any further legislation. *It is possible that under their guidance we might even be able to enlist the public-house keepers themselves in the number of those who would discourage rather than encourage the consumption of drink.*" This is certainly a brilliant idea, and would be a wonderful feat something like enlisting the cat to teach the mice to keep out of its way, or training the spider to drive away the silly Hies that would come too near his entangling web, until we should have to change the old nursery and school rhyme, and make it run something in this style,

O do not, walk into my parlour said the spider to the fly,  
For though 'tis the prettiest little parlour that ever you did spy,  
Yet still it is a wicked parlor you had better not come nigh,  
For if once you come within its walls you are pretty sure to die;  
Therefore take the warning of its keeper, you silly little fly,  
And never come within my house, nor that of any such as I.

The change thus produced would be a very emphatic illustration of the lion changed into a lamb. But let me go on to read to you the writer's account of the source whence he gets the inspiration for this bright idea of enlisting public-house keepers themselves in the great cause of discouraging drinking. He says "An association in Sweden has been formed with the object of supplying liquor to the public without profit to the retailers, and under this system it is obvious that the retailers, being mere servants, have no interest in forcing the sale." But after being indebted to these patriotic Swedes for his grand notion of converting public-house keepers into the friends, conservators and promoters of temperance, he is ungenerous enough to turn round and add, "We mention this, not to recommend the idea." yet he has an important use for it against *legislative restriction*, viz., (I still quote his words) "to illustrate how many ways then: are in which the mischief may be combatted." Is it not pitiable to see such an important question as this discussed in such a limping way by leading organs of British public opinion? But "facts are chiefls that winna ding," and what fine spun theories and objections can

stand for one moment the blow of facts wielded after the following fashion. "If we can enforce restrictions," says a certain Tom Brown, not of Oxford, but of Montreal, "if we can enforce restrictions in the freedom of trade in gunpowder which has only killed one man in Montreal in 30 years, may We not impose restrictions on the trade in alcohol which is killing its dozens every week." But I have more facts to prove to you the benefit of restrictive legislation on this matter. In the reign of George II., in the year 1758, a petition was presented to the House of Commons, signed by the mayor, magistrates, merchants, and inhabitants of Liverpool, complaining of the high price of wheat, and praying in consequence that among other measures the distillation of spirits might be totally prohibited. This met with the favourable consideration of the Commons and a Bill was accordingly enacted prohibiting distillation for that year. Next session petitions were presented from the cities of Liverpool, Bath, Bristol, and New Sarum, representing that "since the laws prohibiting distillation had been enacted the people had appeared more sober, healthy, and industrious, that evil consequences would be sure to flow from a repeal of these laws," and therefore praying for their continuance. The London distillers, of course, raised a loud remonstrance against this interference with the liberty of the subject and the freedom of trade, and proclaimed the benefits of a "wee drappy" to preserve field labourers from agues and other distempers when working in the cold and in wet and marshy places, and all the other manifold blessings conferred on humanity by a temperate use of malt liquors, whilst the loss of revenue and all other evils attendant upon restriction were as loudly proclaimed. But notwithstanding of their fierce opposition to the measure it was continued in force another year. And in regard to the beneficial results to the nation of this continued prohibition of distillation, the historian Smollett, after giving a very full and complete summary of the arguments on both sides, adds, "After all, it must be owned that the good and salutary effects of the prohibition were visible in every part of the kingdom, and no evil consequence ensued except a diminution of the revenue in this article; a consideration (as he wisely adds) a consideration which at all times ought to be sacrificed to the health and morals of the people." In the following session the subject of course came up for discussion and many petitions were presented on both sides. A committee was appointed to investigate the matter and notwithstanding that one of their four resolutions declared "That the present high price of spirituous liquors is a principal cause of the diminution in the home consumption, and hath greatly contributed to the health, sobriety and industry of the common people;" yet evidently looking to and being swayed by the consideration of revenue, recommended that distillation be allowed, but only that a large additional duty should be laid upon all spirituous liquors. When the recommendations of the Committee came before the House several petitions were again sent up against any relaxation of the law, prohibiting distillation, all taking the broad ground of the public weal. Notable amongst these was that from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of London, which set forth that the petitioners "had with great pleasure observed the happy consequences produced upon the morals, behaviour, industry, and health of the lower class of people since the prohibition of the malt distilling, that observing a bill was brought in to allow the distilling of spirits from corn they were apprehensive that the encouragement given to the distillers thereof would prove detrimental to the commercial interests of the nation ; they expressed their fears that should such a Bill pass into a law the excessive use of spirituous liquors would not only debilitate and enervate the labourers, manufacturers, sailors, soldiers, and all the lower class of people, and thereby extinguish industry, and that remarkable intrepidity which had lately so eminently appeared in the British nation, which must always depend upon the vigour and industry of its people; but also its liberty and happiness, which cannot be supported without temperance and morality, would run the utmost risk of being destroyed." This remonstrance, so noble and so forcible, was corroborated by another to the same purpose from several merchants, manufacturers, and traders in and near the City of London. And happy would it have been for Britain if it had been listened to, but the bands were relaxed a little, and ever since the traffic has been gradually extending and extending, and at the same time doing its deadly work, till now in the course of a century, the evils feared by these wise magistrates and councillors of London have become so terrific and so rampant that the strong arm of the law must be raised to strike a blow at their cause, hut alas the arm is raised somewhat tremblingly and falteringly, and amid a loud wail and cry from multitudes who surely know not what they do. "Strike softly, smite, but do not kill, curb but do not bind." Let all who love their fellows and their land raise loud the country cry and urge our statesmen to an unsparing and decisive blow. And happy will it be for the nation when the counsels of 1758 and 1759 are gone back upon, and the law declare there shall no longer be any league of friendship or toleration between it and the liquor traffic. I will, therefore, trouble you to listen to a little more evidence upon the beneficial results of suppression of the public-house system, in order, if possible, to enlist you all on the side of this consummation so devoutly to be wished for. According to a statement made within a year or two ago—the exact date I cannot just give—in the Edinburgh Town Council, by one of its members, there were at that time 3-4 parishes of Scotland where there were no public-houses, and in these parishes there was not a penny of poor rates. In some parishes where twenty years before there was no public-houses, the poor rates, now that public-houses were introduced, had increased from 10d. to 2s. in the £. From such facts can be gathered the easing of public burdens which would result from the limitation, or better

still, the total suppression of the liquor traffic. But still, further, I will ask you now to visit two towns, one in Ireland and one in England, where there are no public-houses and note the result. Near Newry, in old Ireland, there has sprung up the town of Bessbrook, around large mills erected there by a Mr. Richardson, a quaker. In these mills there are now about 3,000 hands employed, and most of these live in the town of Bessbrook. The founder and proprietor has not permitted a public-house to be opened, and the consequence is that not a single policeman is needed to keep the peace. The Bobby is an unknown animal in Bessbrook, whereas in every other Irish town half-a-dozen at least of these conservators of the peace are required to check those strange exhibitions of affection when "friend meets friend and for love knocks him down with his sprig of shillelagh and shamrock so green ;" and should some unlucky specimen of that peculiar biped (Policemen X) stray into Bessbrook, I fear he would run a bad chance of being captured and put in a glass case and consigned to the museum. And should all towns become Bessbrooks in respect of having no public-house, I fear poor Bobby's bones would become as precious as those of the moa for museum specimens of an extinct race. Another individual unknown in Bessbrook, is "my uncle of the three golden balls." His benevolent services, always so accommodatingly rendered to the poor and needy, being found altogether unnecessary. Just as a reclaimed drunkard in Kent once said to an acquaintance, "You complain of my taking the pledge! Strong drink occasioned me to have more to do with pledging than over teetotalism had. When I was a consumer of strong drink I pledged my coat, I pledged my bed, I pledged in short everything that was pledgable, and was losing every hope and blessing, when a temperance friend met me, and convinced me of my folly. Then I pledged myself, and by so doing soon got my other things out of pledge, and got more than my former property about me." And thus it is that sobriety, good order, and comfort reign in Bessbrook; but how long will it be so if even one public-house was admitted, let alone the usual number of 6 or 8 to the 1,000 of population, or about a score or two dozen to Bessbrook.

The other town I wish you to visit is that of Saltaire in England, also a manufacturing town of about 3,000 inhabitants. It owes its origin to the same cause as Bessbrook. A wealthy manufacturer, Titus Salt, Esq., first built large mills there, and then grouped around them houses for the operatives. In the town thus erected no public-house is permitted, and I will just quote Dr. Blakie's description of it. "Saltaire, I need hardly say, is free from all traces of the filth and darkness, and squalid misery so common in manufacturing towns and districts. From the surgeon I learned that the infant mortality, which in Bradford is frightfully high, is not nearly so great. Crimes of all kinds is extremely rare, and there are hardly any illegitimate births. The absence of all temptation to drunkenness has much to do with this. If the gin palace were to be seen at every corner, the houses would not present that appearance of comfort and even elegance which so strikes a stranger." Such examples as these, are just specimens of what every town and community would become if the public-houses were banished from them, and is it not a consummation most devoutly to be wished.

But as I wish to anticipate and dispel the main objections which may be urged against reducing or suppressing regularly licensed public-houses, I must now deal with the assertion, that if you reduce licensed houses you will only increase the number of unlicensed ones, and thus in curing one evil you will only create another and a greater. That assumes that the unlicensed or sly-grog selling, shebeen-keeping as it was called in Scotland, cannot also be put down by the strong arm of the law. Now, there is one most obvious way to stop both evils, viz, cut off the supplies, by doing as was done in 1758, prohibiting distillation and importation. But apart from that, sly grog selling can easily be put down if there is a harmonious desire to do so upon the part of the authorities. The mischief has always been that either the police were remiss in taking up the matter, or the bench, animated by a most re-markable zeal, I am sorry I cannot say always a most praiseworthy one, to do nothing beyond the strict letter of the law, have demanded the nicest and most exact legal proof before they would convict, and the consequence has been, that aided by crafty lawyers, flaws and deficiencies of the most microscopic kind in the proof have been detected, and on the most trumpety quibbles, parties of whose guilt there could be no possible doubt in the mind of any man out of Bedlam, have been allowed to go Scot free and break the law with impunity, and thus a premium has been given by the Bench to law-breakers, and an inducement to Others to do the same.

Thus I remember a case where the evidence for the prosecution was broken down ill somewhat of this way: Lawyer to witness, "You swear that you saw a glass, with liquor, handed by the defendant, to another party, and money handed back in return?" Witness: "I do." Lawyer: "But, come, now, Mr. Cute, how do you know it was spirituous liquor?" Witness: "I saw it." Lawyer: "O! you only saw it: but are there not a great many other liquors besides spirituous liquors put into glasses; and will you swear that it was not one of these." Witness: "I am sure it was not any of these." Lawyer: "It is all very well for you to believe and say that; but what evidence can you give of it. Did you taste the liquor?" Witness: "I did not." Lawyer: "Did you smell it then?" Witness: "No, I was not near enough for that." The lawyer then, with an air of triumph, as if he had succeeded in rescuing an innocent man from a diabolic plot to injure his character and property, turns to the judge with the most impudent effrontery, saying, "You sec, my bird, this witness's evidence has thoroughly broken down; he

cannot swear but what it might have been a glass of bitters or some other tonic or unspirituous beverage which the defendant gave, and, on such evidence as that, I confidently appeal to you for a verdict in favour of my client." The judge, looking very wise, and, as if actuated with the most conscientious and praiseworthy desire to be just, says, "I agree with you, Mr. Quibble, the evidence is not sufficient to sustain a legal conviction. The defendant must be acquitted." This is just a specimen of how magistrates strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. But it must be said for many of them that I believe they feel that they would not be supported by public opinion if they were to convict without the most exact legal proof, and therefore they give a great deal more weight to these obvious quibbles than they would otherwise do; and so, in reality, it is the public and not the magistrates that are most to blame. Let public opinion be brought to bear on the bench, and you will soon find magistrates giving decisions of a very different kind, and convicting upon sufficient circumstantial evidence. As a further illustration of the kind of interpretation which is sometimes put upon the wording of the law in regard to unlicensed selling of drink, I will just refer to another case which occurred within the limits of the Province of Otago. The charge was having liquor *exposed* for sale in an ordinary store. Decision, of course, tinned upon what is meant by the word *exposed*. The magistrate held that, to be exposed for sale it was necessary that the bottles be visible, or in a position in the store where they could at once be seen by a person entering the premises to buy goods; and, because this was not the case, though the policeman swore he could see the heads of two bottles, the charge was dismissed. Now, though this has at first sight an appearance of fairness, yet, just apply it to other tilings in the store. The sugar is in bags below the counter, or, as in many retail shops, in closed drawers in the counter. It cannot be seen on entering the store, is it not therefore exposed for sale? Then there are frequently a range of drawers on the wall in which packets of maizena, black-lead, mustard, pepper, Starch, &c., are stored away; these articles cannot be seen, but are they therefore not exposed for sale in that place of business? If such is to be held as the meaning of this word in the Act, then all that any storekeeper wishing to evade the law has to do is, to put up a simple screen of cloth or of board in front of one of his shelves, and behind that he may have a hundred bottles if he pleases, but they are not exposed for sale; he can even leave the capsule-covered head and neck of two gentlemen peeping out behind their screens to advertise the presence of a strong reserve, but that is not exposing them for sale! I have referred to this case as one in point to show that a common sense and somewhat liberal, not merely literal, interpretation must be put upon the Acts of the Legislature, which aim at the detection and putting down of this pernicious evil, or else it will never be done. No law can possibly be framed but what such evasions of it may be discovered. The administrators of our laws must therefore co-operate with the makers of our laws, and, without the slightest risk of ever doing an injustice to an innocent person, they can together easily enough put down this sly grog selling. Other forms of crime can be put down, and why not this?

But I am glad to be able to put a most important witness into the box on this point, whose evidence is thoroughly reliable, and of great value. I refer to Captain Smart, Superintendent of the Glasgow Police. In one of his reports, he says—"The traffic in spirits, in shebeens, or unlicensed premises, was nearly put an end to by the vigorous application of Forbes Mackenzie's Act. This satisfactory result was brought about by the magistrates, under the advice of the Town Clerk, having convicted on circumstantial evidence, instead of, as formerly, making it imperative on the prosecutor to prove a sale in each case." Now, if that could be done in a place like Glasgow, where might it not be done? A few effective police detectives told off to that particular business, backed by the Bench convicting on good circumstantial evidence, would soon stamp out this illicit traffic, or reduce it to very narrow limits indeed. To show still further the power of the magistrates, and the influence of their action in carrying out or in defeating any legislation, however strict, and however beneficial, I will just quote to you a short paragraph from the Report of the Royal Commission appointed in 1859, to enquire into the working of the Forbes Mackenzies Act in Scotland. They say—"The beneficial effect of this Act is proved by the evidence which we received as to the diminution of crime, and the change for the better in the habits of the people immediately after the passing of this Act, when its provisions were strictly enforced, and by the tendency in an opposite direction which in some places has followed its less rigorous enforcement during the last two years. In some towns there has been, on the part of the magistrates, great remissness in administering the law. The result seems to have been, if not an increase of crime in these places, at least the absence of the improvement witnessed elsewhere." The foregoing extract points out very strongly that a great deal of the success of any legislative measures passed with a view to the restriction or suppression of the many evils connected with the liquor traffic depends upon the manner in which they are administered by the magistrates, or others upon whom the administration devolves. The object and intention of the very best, framed law may be utterly defeated by a hostile, or careless and unfriendly administration, whilst a comparatively bad law may be often worked or administered so as to do a great amount of good. I have no fear, therefore, but that with a harmonious desire on the part of the Legislature, and those to whom they must entrust the administration of their laws, sly-grog-selling and shebeen-keeping may be easily and promptly put down, so that the bugbear of its increase, as an argument against the restriction or suppression of duly licensed houses,

has no force at all. If it is an evil which will certainly arise out of the restriction of the number of licensed houses, it is an evil which can be met and cured by the strong arm of the law. But it is rather a strange mode of argument, to plead for the continuance of one evil, lest its cure should produce another, when both may be cured, and the body politic invigorated in health and strength by the eradication of both.

I come now to deal with the last point, which weighs more strongly, perhaps, with legislators than any other, viz., the question of revenue. Indeed, I saw it stated lately in an article in an Auckland paper that, "that is the nut which teetotallers have to crack." Well, then, let us put our teeth on it, and see how much force there is in any objection on this score. The revenue, which the state derives from the duty upon spirituous liquors, and the license for selling them, is very great, and it is urged that the necessities of the state require all the money which can be raised, and that one of the fairest and best ways in which the public purse can be replenished, is by taxation upon articles of luxury or mere indulgence, such as spirituous liquors. Then, it is added, if you restrict the trade in these liquors or suppress it altogether, to a proportionate extent the revenue will suffer, and how is the deficit to be made up? First of all I would premise that it is surely unsound in principle, as it must be pernicious in practice, to let a mere money consideration weigh as against the far higher moral and social interests and well-being of the community. If the restriction and suppression of this traffic is to benefit the public health and morals so largely as it has been shown it would do, then, supposing there should be a loss to the public purse, surely that should never weigh against the oilier higher consideration. But I boldly assert that the revenue would not ultimately suffer in reality but only in appearance. The public revenue might certainly, for a time, be greatly reduced, but then, would not the public expenditure be also greatly reduced? Most certainly it would. I have already proved to you the large connection between the liquor traffic and pauperism and crime. These two evils, pauperism and crime, are anion" the greatest burdens upon a state and causes of its greatest expenditure', costing us in Otago something like £50,000 per annum out of the public treasury. If, therefore, you remove the producing cause of these, and so reduce the expenditure of the slate on account thereof, the state is no loser, though deprived of that part of its revenue which is at present derived from the great cause of its expenditure. If you reduce revenue and expenditure together, and by the one Act, then there is no actual loss. But it must be taken into account that along with the very great reduction in the expenditure of the State by suppression of the Liquor Traffic, there would be a large amount of money left in the hands of the people, which is now squandered in drink, amounting, for example, in Otago alone to something like £300,000 per annum, and in Britain to the enormous sum of about 100 millions, and which would be invested in industries and expended in works of permanent advantage to the state, which would in a variety of ways tend to increase its revenue in other directions. And thus the state would really be in a very short time, the gainer in respect of revenue by the suppression of this traffic.

Take for instance the gain to the public revenue of our province from the liquor traffic at something like. £60,000 per annum. If the traffic was suppressed then of course that amount would be lost to the public treasury. But then a considerable part of the expenditure of £50,000, caused by crime and pauperism, would be cut off also; and, without question, a large portion of the £300,000 now squandered in drink, would be invested in purchase of land, and thus increase largely the revenue flowing into the public treasury from that source. Of course the gain in these respects would not be to the full extent all at once evident immediately upon the suppression of the traffic, as we have an inheritance of pauperism and crime from the past, which could not at once be thrown off, but which must remain for years a serious burden. To illustrate and enforce still further this part of my argument as to the stimulus which the suppression of the liquor traffic would give to other useful industries, the extension and improvement in which would again tend to replenish the public revenue, let me cite to you the following statement made in a pamphlet, published last year in England, entitled "An inquiry into the causes of the long continued depression in the cotton trade, by a Cotton Manufacturer." He shows that the trade with other countries has not fallen off, and that the depression is not the result of free trade, but, that the decline in the consumption of cotton is entirely at home and nowhere else, from this he argues as follows: "A moment's reflection will make it, char to the thoughtful mind that the reduced home demand for cotton goods must arise from one or two causes—either we, as a nation, spend our money on other things, or we are become poorer and have not the money to spend. We are the richest nation in the world, and yet a great portion of our population are in rags. Why is this? Is it because they get insufficient wages and are therefore poor? No: it is because they squander their earnings in intoxicating drinks. Let us look how far this assertion is borne out by facts. During the years 1859-60-61, the money spent upon intoxicating drinks in the United Kingdom was as follows: 1859, £86,686,366; 1860, £79,541,290; 1861, £85,989,468. Total, £252,117,124. For the three years ending with 1868, the expenditure upon intoxicating drinks in the United Kingdom was as follows: 1866, £101,252,551; 1867, £99,900,502; 1868, £102,886,280. Total, £304,039,333. Being an increase on the former period of £51,822,209, or £17,274,069 per annum. Here is an a to tiding fact; in three years we spend on intoxicating drinks, £304,039,333, and yet upon cotton goods, our staple production, we spend only £28,858,000. Taking the population of the United Kingdom at thirty millions, it gives for each man, woman,

and child for the three years, £10 2s. 6d. for drink, and 19s. 6d. for cotton goods. Or, taking the year 1868, we get £3 8s. 7¾. per head for drink, and 4s. 7¼d. for cotton. Taking a family of live persons, we have £1 3s. 0¼d spent on cotton, and £17 3s. 2¾, on intoxicating liquor. Here is the great secret of our present bad trade ; people cannot pour the money down their throats and put it on their backs at the same time ; and so long as we spend seventeen times as much on drink as we do on cotton goods we can never long together have anything but stagnation in trade . . . . . The remedy, then, for our bad trade lies entirely with ourselves. If we think we can continue to squander one hundred millions yearly on drink, and by the spending thereof, increase very materially our local taxation and sap the foundations of industry, virtue, and morality, we shall be greatly mistaken. We may have an abundant and profitable trade; we may have a contented, virtuous, and happy people; but, if we are ever to secure this, we must we must remove the temptations to intemperance which are planted broadcast over the land."

In this argument I have taken no account of the domestic, social, and moral evils which result from intemperance. I have written as a commercial man; and I appeal to the manufacturers of Lancashire, and of the United Kingdom generally, to consider the question thus imperfectly put before them, and if only a tithe of what I say be true, it will furnish abundant cause for immediate reform in a system so fraught with evil as the liquor traffic." The immense disproportion set forth in the foregoing extract between the amount spent annually in Great Britain on intoxicating liquors and that spent on cotton goods, is certainly very astounding—I might say appalling; and it cannot for a moment be doubted but that a large portion of the money squandered on the one ought to be usefully laid out on the other, and doubtless would be so laid out if the traffic in intoxicating drink was suppressed, or even greatly restricted. Other branches of trade and commerce would also receive a share of the now wasted 100 millions, and with the increase of trade and general comfort and prosperity thereby induced, an increase in the public revenues of the country would also take place through other channels to counterbalance, and in a very short time, I believe, to overbalance the drying up of the revenue at present derived from the liquor traffic. Permit me, in still further illustration of this point, to call your attention to the following curious and interesting calculation (which I believe first appeared some years ago in that most admirable paper devoted to the promotion of the cause of Total Abstinence, the *British Workman*) as to what might be done with the money now spent annually in Great Britain on intoxicating liquors. The calculation is based on the annual expenditure being only 60 millions, which, however, falls short of the expenditure of 1868 by nearly £43,000,000, but even at that smaller amount as the several items are read over, just think of the gain to the State, to trade, and to the domestic comfort of millions, by such an expenditure of the money. It would pay for—

Or in other words it would start two millions of married couples with a new rig out to each, and 2 pair of blankets, 10 chairs, 2 tables, a bookcase, 10 books, 2 clocks, and 2 bibles for each house—not a bad start for a young couple! But even that would not exhaust the 60 millions; it would leave 6 millions to meet the poor rates raised over the kingdom, and another 10 millions to be devoted, to what purpose think you?—to pension off at the rate of £100 per annum, and enable them to live like gentlemen for the rest of their days, each of the 100,000 sellers of grog, who would be thrown out of employment by the suppression of then-traffic! Besides which we have the extra 43 millions to lay out in providing better accommodation for the working classes, public parks, drinking fountains, and many other such like most desirable things. Surely, in the face of such facts as these this cry of loss to the revenue should never be mooted. It is a sad thing, indeed, if an apparent paltry loss to the revenue is to be allowed to stand in the way of a reform so fraught with untold blessings to millions of subjects and to the general welfare and happiness of the State as a whole. Cowper has, with most biting sarcasm, exposed and denounced this defence of the traffic on the ground of the revenue drawn from it, and with this quotation from him I will for the present take farewell of my subject, boiling that what I have laid before you to-night may possibly enlist some new friends into the cause, and help to inspire those already in the ranks with greater fervor in the good work of Temperance agitation and reform, and prepare you for going in with heart and soul to demand in one voice from our legislators a revision of the licensing system as at present existing among ourselves; and, if we cannot get them all at once to suppress it, we may get them to restrict within much narrower limits this most pernicious traffic. The passage from Cowper to which I have alluded is as follows :—

*"Pass where we may, through city or through town, village or hamlet of this merry land,  
Though lean and beggar'd, every twentieth pace, conducts the unguarded nose to such a whiff,  
Of stale debauch forth issuing from the styes that law has licensed as makes tempeperance reel.  
But———vain the attempt, to advertise in verse a public pest  
That like the filth with which the pleasant feeds his hungry acres, stinks and is of use.*

*The excise is fatten'd with the rich result of all this riot and ten thousand [unclear: casks]  
For ever dribbling out their base contents—touch'd by the Midas finger of the state.  
Bleed gold for ministers to sport away,. Drink, and be mad then! 'Tis your country bids.  
Gloriously drunk, obey the important call; her cause demands the assistance of your [throats,  
Ye all can swallow, and she asks no more."*

G. Watson, Printer, Maclaggan Strt., Dunedin.

## The Progress of Astronomy: a Lecture

Delivered in the Duke of Edinburgh Theatre, on the 25TH July, 1870,

By

R. L. J. Ellery, Esq.,

Government Astronomer.

THE Hon. Sir James M'Culloch presided, and introduced the Lecturer, who said:—

In the year 1676, Charles the Second appointed Flamsteed to be the "King's Astronomical Observer," at a salary of £100 per annum. The duties of the "Astronomical Observer" were thus set forth:—"He is to forthwith apply himself with the most exact care and diligence to the rectifying the tables of the motions of the heavens and the places of the fixed stars, so as to find out the so much desired longitude of places for the perfecting the art of navigation."

At this time the Greenwich Observatory had just been erected, and as the building of the observatory and the appointment of Flamsteed mark an epoch in the history of Astronomy, I propose to take this, one of the few good acts which embellished Charles the Second's reign, as the starting point in my lecture.

To give us a fair start, however, it will be well to briefly review the state of astronomical knowledge at this period, in order that "we may more readily estimate the progress subsequently achieved.

You will remember that, long before this, the older theories of the universe had been cast aside, and the solar system as we now know it firmly established. The rotation of the earth had been proved, though even at that time questioned by some philosophers. The planets Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn were well known, and Kepler had enunciated his three great laws of planetary motions, whose correctness Newton afterwards tested, proved, and from them deduced his theory of gravitation. These laws were—1st, That the planets move in ellipses, having the sun for one of the foci; 2nd, They describe equal areas in equal times; and 3rd, That the squares of their periodic times are proportional to the cubes of their mean distances from the sun.

The last law gives us the means for deducing the relative distances of the planets from the sun from the time they occupy in making a complete circuit of their orbits; for example—if the sun's distance from the earth be taken as the unit, that from Venus will be found to be seven-tenths of this unit, and Mars one and a-half times.

The four satellites of Jupiter had been discovered by Galileo, and one of Saturn by Cassini; Huygens had also discovered the ring surrounding Saturn; and it had been shown that Venus, Mars and Jupiter rotated on their axes. Telescopes had been invented since 1608; Gregory made his first reflecting one in 1663, and Newton his in 1669. Clocks and spring watches had also been introduced. Charts of the heavens had been constructed, as well as tables of the approximate motions of the moon and other heavenly bodies; and successful efforts had been made to determine with more precision than had before been attempted the figure and dimensions of the earth, by the measurement of certain lengths of meridians by Norwood, Picard and La Hire.

Before referring to the astronomical instruments in use at this time, it will be well to point out that they may be classed under three heads. First, those which enable us to bring distant objects near to us, so as to render their form, features, and peculiarities visible: second, instruments by which the angular separation of one body from another can be measured; and third, instruments by which time can be measured.

The first class simply comprises telescopes of various forms; the second class depends upon the subdivision of the circle into parts—into degrees, minutes, and seconds. One of the oldest astronomical instruments of this kind was the astrolabe, a divided circle, about whose centre revolved an arm, carrying sights or pins; its extremities pointing to different divisions on the circle, as the sights were pointed in different directions. The complete circle afterwards gave place to portions of a circle more accurately graduated, such as a fourth or sixth part of a circle called quadrants and sextants, forms of which have continued in use up to the present day. The third class, for measurement of time, you are familiar with in the form of the exquisite clocks and watches which are now so common. At the time I am now speaking of, however, although the old methods of measuring

time by clepsydras or water clocks, sand glass or "rush lights," had been entirely superseded for astronomical purposes, the clocks and watches were of a most homely description.

During the observatorship of our first Astronomer-Royal, Flamsteed, the instruments used consisted principally of large sextants and quadrants, which had already been greatly improved by the substitution of telescopes for the simple tubes and sights hitherto used, and by the more careful graduations of their circular arcs. These instruments were very large compared to those of the same class now in use, and frequently occupied the whole wall of a large room, or even the whole side of a large house—as in the case of Tycho Brahe's mural quadrant at Copenhagen—and it is somewhat amusing to compare these gigantic instruments with this small pocket sextant, more especially when we consider that this little apparatus is capable of giving better results than its big forefather at Copenhagen.

The reluctance exhibited by astronomers and navigators, at this time, to adopt new inventions, was remarkable. We find that the substitution of "optical glasses," or telescopes for *plain sights* in the large sextants and quadrants, was strongly opposed by some of the most celebrated observers. Hevelius, for instance, in writing concerning his astronomical observations, about this time, says:—"But this I am convinced of, that if I had undertaken the business by means of telescopic sights, I must not only have wasted many years in fruitless examinations, but I should doubtless have been disappointed of my hopes, and that on various occasions, not necessary here to mention."

It is worthy of note that, in the appointment of Flamsteed, he was directed "to set himself to the rectifying the motions of the heavens and the places of the fixed stars, so as to find out the so much desired longitude of places." One of the principal objects of the establishment of Greenwich Observatory was to facilitate navigation—an object that has been faithfully kept in view and assiduously followed up from the time of its foundation to the present day.

The progress of the art of navigation had for a long time been retarded, from the difficulty of determining the longitude at sea. Several methods had been propounded, but owing to the insufficient knowledge of the true places and motions of the heavenly bodies, and defective instruments, it had not yet been possible to put them in practice.

These methods resolved themselves into observations for determining the moon's motions with respect to the stars, or to transport of the true local time of the point of departure from place to place; the first requiring angle-measuring instruments and tables of the moon's place and motions, and the second accurate time-keepers or chronometers.

Longitude is, in fact, the difference of local times between any two places at the same moment; so that if we can carry a clock or watch set to, and keeping true Melbourne time, to Adelaide, we should find that it did not correspond to Adelaide time. "When the watch showed twelve o'clock, it would only be 11h. 34m. 27s. there. This difference is a measure of the difference of longitude; multiply it by 15, and it gives the difference in degrees, minutes and seconds. Melbourne time is faster than that at Adelaide, and therefore Melbourne is east of Adelaide  $6^{\circ} 23' 15''$ . If, instead of Adelaide, we took the watch to Sydney, we should find the difference to be 25 min. 56 sec., but the other way. Sydney time would be faster than Melbourne, showing Sydney to be east of Melbourne.

This will give you a notion of what is meant by longitude: every method for obtaining it resolves itself into ascertaining the difference between the times at the place whose longitude you wish to determine, and that at the standard or starting point, for which Greenwich is now almost universally used. The time at your starting point (or Greenwich) can be kept by means of good timekeepers, or it may be found by careful astronomical observation of the moon's place, and "comparing this with tables showing what her place will be at certain hours of time at the starting point; the local time is readily determined by observation and simple calculation—thus the differences of local times, and hence the longitude, can be found.

But, as I have already stated, neither the instruments available nor the knowledge of the moon's motion were sufficiently accurate to allow of these methods being satisfactorily practised in the year 1675; hence the great and principal object for the foundation of Greenwich Observatory—"the finding out the so much desired longitude of places."

The method of finding longitude by observing the moon's place, by getting her distance from known stars, was proposed many years before, but could not be carried into practice on account of the inaccurate lunar tables. The method of transport of time had already been tried by Huygens; and it was during his first trials to overcome the difficulty presented to the good going of his timekeepers by the violent motion of a ship at sea, that he fell upon the discovery of the isochronous spring, with which he made afterwards his pendulum watches, and which is the same that is now used in our watches and chronometers. Huygens partially succeeded, but found that to render his timekeepers sufficiently reliable, it would be necessary to devise some greatly improved mechanism by which the irregularities in them, brought about by changes of temperature, could be overcome.

It will be interesting to show with how much more precision the longitude could be determined with Huygen's primitive and uncompensated "pendulum watch" (as he styled it,) than by the methods already in use, and to do this I cannot do better than give you an abstract from a paper communicated to the Royal Society of London in the year 1665, by a Major Holmes. He states that in one of his voyages to Guinea, he had given into his care, by some of the grand promoters of navigation, two of M. Huygens' "pendulum watches,"—that after leaving the coast of Guinea, and "being come to the Isle of St. Thomas, under the line, he adjusted his watches, put to sea, and sailed westward seven or eight hundred leagues, without changing his course; after which, finding the wind favourable, he steered towards the coast of Africa N.N.E., but, having sailed upon that line about two or three hundred leagues, the masters of other ships under his conduct, apprehending that they should want water before they could reach that coast, did propose to him to steer their course to the Barbadoes, to supply themselves with water there. The Major having called the master and pilots together, and caused them to produce their journals and calculations, it was found that those pilots differed from the Major in their reckonings, one of them eighty leagues, another about a hundred, and the third more; but the Major judging by his pendulum watches that they were only some thirty leagues distant from the Isle of Fuego, which is one of the isles of Cape Verde, and that they might reach it next day, and having a great confidence in such watches, resolved to steer their course thither; and having given order so to do, they got, the very next day about noon, a sight of the said isle of Fuego, finding themselves to sail directly upon it, and so arrived at it that afternoon as he had said."

Another method for finding the longitude had also been proposed. Jupiter was known to have four satellites, and it had been observed that these were frequently eclipsed, disappearing suddenly by entering within the planet's shadow as they revolved around him. It was proposed that these occurrences, the times of which could be predicted with moderate precision, should be observed at sea, and the local time, compared with the predicted time at the starting point. To observe these eclipses a steadily supported and powerful telescope is required, and although this might be secured on land, it could not on shipboard—the method, therefore, was impracticable for use at sea.

I think I have now briefly touched upon the most important points in connection with the state of astronomy at the date I start from. But before we leave our first Astronomer-Royal Flamsteed, I will give you a rather amusing anecdote concerning him, taken from *Reliquæ Hearnianæ*, and given in *Chambers's Book of Days*:—"He was weakly and unhealthy in childhood. His father, a maltster at Derby, set him to carry out malt in a brewing pan, which he found a very tiresome way of effecting his object; so he set to and made a wheelbarrow to carry the malt. The father then gave him a larger quantity to carry, and young Flamsteed felt the disappointment so great that he never after could bear the thoughts of a wheelbarrow. Many years after, when he reigned as Astronomer-Royal in the Greenwich Observatory, he chanced once more to come into unpleasant relations with a *wheelbarrow*. Having one day spent some time in the Ship Tavern with two gentlemen artists of his acquaintance, he was taking a rather ceremonious leave of them at the door, when, stepping backwards, he plumped into a wheelbarrow. The vehicle immediately moved off down-hill with the philosopher in it; nor did it stop till it had reached the bottom, much to the amusement of the bystanders, but not less to the discomposure of the Astronomer-Royal."

Whilst our Royal Observator was "applying himself with exact care and diligence rectifying the places and motions of the heavenly bodies," and constructing his star catalogues and charts, the famous Halley took a voyage to St. Helena in order to obtain a catalogue of southern stars, which could not be seen by northern astronomers. It was he who, out of compliment to Charles II., formed a new constellation of some southern stars which he called *Robur Carolinum*, or Charles's Oak, in commemoration of the well-known tree in which the King (then Prince Charles) took refuge after the Rattle of Worcester.

Whilst at St. Helena. Halley witnessed the transit of Mercury across the sun's disc. You will remember that both Mercury and Venus are inferior planets, having their orbits between us and the sun; they are, therefore, liable in their orbital motion to pass between the earth and the sun, appearing to move across his disc like a small round black spot; and such occurrences are called transits.

That such phenomena did sometimes occur had long been known, and the times of some had even been predicted by Kepler—a transit of Mercury in 1631 for instance—which was the first really observed with certainty. A Parisian astronomer named Gassendi thus quaintly describes the event:—"The crafty god had thought to deceive astronomers by passing over the sun a little earlier than was expected, and had drawn a veil of dark clouds over the earth in order to make his escape more effectual. But Apollo, acquainted with his knavish tricks from his infancy, would not allow him to pass altogether unnoticed. To be brief, I have been more fortunate than those hunters after Mercury who have sought the cunning god in the sun; I found him out, and saw him where no one else had hitherto seen him."

The first time the transit of Venus was observed was in 1639 by Mr. Horrox, a clergyman in Lancashire. This is what he tells of it. He began his observations at sunrise, and continued them to the hour of church

service (it was Sunday.) As soon as he was again at leisure—that is to say, at 3.15 p.m.—he resumed his labours, and, to quote his own words:—"At this time an opening in the clouds, which rendered the sun distinctly visible, seemed as if Divine Providence encouraged my aspirations; when, O most gratifying spectacle, the object of so many earnest wishes, I perceived a new spot of unusual magnitude, and of a perfectly round form, that had just wholly entered upon the left limb of the sun, so that the margin of the sun and spot coincided with each other, forming the angle of contact."

The occurrence of the transit of Mercury, which he observed at St. Helena, suggested to Halley the possibility of using like occurrences for the solution of one of the greatest problems in astronomy, and the basis of all celestial measurements—the distance of the sun from the earth.

The means of ascertaining the relative distances of the planets from the sun had been given to astronomers by Kepler's Third Law, so if the absolute distance of any one could be found, the rest would follow. Halley perceived that the parallax of the planet might be found by the apparent alteration of the position of its path across the sun's disc, due to observers being placed at widely different parts of the earth's surface.

By the word parallax, I mean the angle that would be subtended, at the planet, by the earth's diameter. Determining the parallax is equivalent to finding the distance of an inaccessible object by means of a triangle, the base of which, in this case, is the earth's diameter, the two angles being obtained from observation. Now, Venus being nearer to the earth than Mercury, her parallax is greater, and consequently the separation of her apparent path across the sun would be greater in proportion. The transits of Venus, therefore, were considered by Halley to present far more favourable conditions for the desired determination than those of Mercury.

The transits of Mercury are comparatively frequent: for instance, there will be thirteen in the present century, while those of Venus occur very seldom—not more than twice in a century,—and Halley scarcely dared to hope he would live long enough to put his suggested method in practice, for it was then the year 1677, and there would be no transit of Venus till 1761, a space of eighty four years. He, however, addressed to future astronomers a most earnest exhortation that such "precious occasions should not pass unprofited," and urged them to unite all their efforts to deduce on this and similar occasions one of the most important elements of our system, the distance of the sun. How this request has been fulfilled, we shall presently see.

The determination of the parallax of Mars—the planet next to the earth in order of distance from the sun—has also been used for finding the sun's distance. This planet being "superior," never transits the sun; a different mode of observation is therefore necessary. *When in opposition, its position with reference to that of well-known fixed stars is measured at two widely different parts of the earth's surface.*

Halley was the first astronomer to actually compute the orbit of a comet, and predict its return—(the method for doing this had already been indicated by Newton, in 1680, after the appearance of the great comet of that year.) Among the orbits of about twenty-four comets, which he calculated, he found those of 1531, 1607, and 1682 so nearly alike—in each case the *inclination* to the ecliptic was about  $17^\circ$ , the perihelion distance about 48,000,000 of miles, and the motion retrograde, while the other elements were equally similar; and, moreover, just about seventy-five years had elapsed between each successive appearance—that he at once concluded they were one and the same comet returning periodically to perihelion. He felt so confident of this that he predicted it would return again in 1758. His age at this time—1705—was forty-nine; he did not expect to reach the age of one hundred and two years; he therefore appealed to posterity that if the comet should really return about that time, not to lose sight of the fact that the prediction of such a result was due to an Englishman. As the period drew nigh, astronomers throughout the civilised world were on the watch to test the value of his calculation and predictions.

On the 25th December, 1758, a farmer and amateur astronomer in Saxony, named Palitsch, discovers a comet; it was Halley's comet. It came back again in 1835 (and was the first comet I ever saw,) and will probably do so again in 1910. This fulfilled prediction marks another epoch in astronomy;

Halley died in 1742, and was succeeded as Astronomer-Royal by Bradley.

and, remembering Halley's appeal, posterity of all nations has not, and is not likely, to forget that this great triumph was Halley's, and that Halley was an Englishman.

We will now pass over the next fifty-eight years, which brings us to the year 1800. In these fifty-eight years astronomy had not slept. Flamsteed and his successors—Halley, Bradley, and Bliss,—as well as various celebrated Continental astronomers, had so faithfully attached themselves to the work for which the Greenwich Observatory was established, that the places and motions of the moon, stars, and planets, were now known with very considerable precision, and reliable tables of these were published. The art of navigation had therefore advanced considerably, and the great problem of obtaining the longitude at sea had been, to a great extent, solved. All these astronomers, however, had now gone to rest, and Maskelyne was "Royal Observer." The immortal Newton had closed his great career in 1727, and the glorious results of his labours placed Astronomy the highest anion" the exact sciences, and gave an impulse to it and other branches of Natural Philosophy which will never cease to be felt.

One of our greatest of the Greenwich, and of *all* astronomers, had come and gone in this interval. Bradley succeeded Halley in 1742, worked well for twenty years, and died in 1762. It was Bradley who discovered the aberration of light, and the nutation of the earth's axis—an example of the one being the amount by which the apparent position of a star differs from its real one, in consequence of the combined motion of the spectator (resulting from the earth's rotation), and of the light emanating from the star; and the other a small irregularity in the earth's motion, caused by lunar gravitation—both affecting the positions of heavenly bodies, as determined from observation, to an extent, if uneliminated, that would render them very inaccurate. Bradley also initiated and prosecuted a system of observation, which will compare in precision with that of the present day. With Bradley's observations commenced a new era in astronomy.

In this interval, too, Dollond invented the Achromatic Telescope, and Hadley the Nautical Quadrant. Harrison also gains the parliamentary reward for the perfection of his chronometer. The Nautical Almanac was first published in 1767. The transits of Venus, both of 1761 and 1769, were observed. Herschell (Sir W.) discovers the new planet Uranus, and erects his great forty-feet reflecting telescope at Slough, near Windsor. Large observatories had been erected at Berlin and St. Petersburg. Dollond's new invention of making telescopic object glasses achromatic, rapidly led to a very great improvement in all classes of astronomical instruments; and the old mural quadrants were replaced by transit telescopes and mural circles. Abbé La Caille had been to the Cape of Good Hope, measured an arc of the meridian there, observed and catalogued a large number of southern stars with great precision; and Sir William Herschell had discovered that the Milky Way was separable into stars.

I will now draw your particular attention to three of these "*signs of progress*," and in the first place show how Halley's suggestions with respect to the future transit of Venus were attended to.

The first transit after Halley's death was in 1761. To observe it, astronomers were sent out to different parts of the globe by the English, French, and other European Governments; and Maskelyne, who afterwards succeeded Bradley at Greenwich, went to St. Helena. With one exception, however, all these observers were unfortunately more or less disappointed; cloudy weather appeared to prevail at every one of the stations selected, except at the Cape of Good Hope, where Mr. Mason observed all the phases successfully. At Greenwich and several other places in England it was also satisfactorily observed. The parallax of the sun resulting from these observations was eight seconds and a half, which would give the sun's distance as about 96,000,000 miles.

The next transit took place in June, 1769; and it was on this occasion that George III. despatched, at his own expense, a well-equipped expedition to Tahiti, under the command of that celebrated navigator Captain Cook. The phenomenon was successfully observed in both hemispheres, and the parallax resulting was 8<sup>#</sup> 58—equivalent to a distance of 95,023,000 miles.

We find, therefore, that Halley's request was not forgotten, and that the results fully justified his anticipations. The great problem of the sun's distance was far nearer its solution than it ever had been; and this determination was accepted as perfectly trustworthy until later years, when circumstances arose indicating that it required even further correction. To this I shall presently refer.

The next transit of Venus will take place four years next December (December 1874,) which will be followed by another in 1882.

The improvements in the methods of obtaining the "*much desired longitude*" during the period under review are worthy of remark, and a few moments' attention: for on two or three of them depends, in a very great measure, the state of almost perfection to which the art of navigation has now arrived. I refer to the invention of Hadley's Quadrant (1731,) Harrison's Chronometer (1765) and the publication of the Nautical Almanac in 1767.

From what I have already told you concerning the methods of obtaining longitudes at sea, you will understand that at my last stage the great desiderata were—more accurate time-keepers, more convenient, and precise angle-measuring instruments for sea use, and more correct tables of the places and motions of the heavenly bodies, and especially of the moon.

The mode of determining the longitude by lunar distances had for a long time been advocated by the most eminent astronomers. The difficulties were the want of good instruments available at sea, and of tables of the moon, to obviate the necessity of mariners having to compute her place at each observation—a difficulty that put an almost insuperable bar to its adoption. The invention of Hadley supplied the first want admirably; and Maskelyne soon after met the other by inducing the Board of Longitude to publish annually a nautical ephemeris, containing the places of the sun and moon for every twelve hours, and the distance of the latter from the principal fixed stars. Hadley's quadrant, the ancestor of our present beautiful sextant, is an instrument with a graduated arc, as in the old quadrants, but which by means of one fixed and one movable mirror enables the observer to reflect the images of two stars or objects, so as to appear in coincidence. The movable mirror is attached to an arm that traverses the graduated arc, the amount of movement necessary to bring the object into coincidence measures their angular separation, and the angular distance between the moon and the sun or a

fixed star, when corrected by a careful calculation, gave, by the help of the lunar tables, the mean time at Greenwich; and this, compared with the local time at the place, at once furnished the desired longitude.

In the year 1714 the British Parliament passed an act holding out a great recompense to those who should contribute to the discovery of the longitude at sea—namely, £10,000 if the longitude were found within a degree, £15,000 if within forty minutes, and £20,000 if within half a degree. These magnificent rewards produced the desired effect. John Harrison, a man of humble origin but great genius, devoted a long and laborious life to the construction of clocks and watches for navigation. So numerous and important were his improvements that we may with justice consider him the inventor of the marine chronometer. It will, perhaps, give the best idea of his merits to say that he has done as much for this instrument as James Watt for the steam engine. In 1749 he obtained the Copley medal of the Royal Society, and in 1701 obtained from the Commissioners of the Board of Longitude a trial of his chronometer by a voyage to Jamaica. It was found at the end of sixty-one days that his chronometer gave the Longitude of Port Royal within five seconds of time; and on the return to England, after an absence of 101 days, the whole variation was only one minute five seconds. It was evident that the conditions of the Act of Parliament were satisfied, and Harrison received a payment, on account, of £5000; but the Commissioners decided that the remainder of the reward should not be paid till a second trial had taken place. This was executed in 1764, and crowned with complete success. It was decided unanimously by the Board of Longitude that the longitude of Barbadoes had been determined within the limits prescribed by the Act. £5000 was immediately granted to him, and £10,000 more when he had explained to Commissioners appointed for the purpose the details of his construction. This took place in 1765.

It is somewhat remarkable that an impression is still extant with some people that the reward above referred to has yet to be claimed. This country, like all others, has its inventors and men of one idea; and the amount of correspondence I have received during the last twelve or fifteen years from this class of individuals would scarcely be credited. Not a few among these correspondents are inventors of nautical instruments or new-methods of finding the longitude at sea, and until enlightened to the contrary have usually persevered in their frequently chimerical efforts, in the hopes of gaining the reward which was long ago given to Harrison.

The renowned name Herschell first appears upon the records of astronomical progress, in the period I am now referring to.

William Herschell (afterwards Sir William.) a self-taught but able astronomer, who had for a long time been engaged in constructing reflecting telescopes of great perfection and considerable dimensions, to enable him to pierce deeper into the mysteries of space, while engaged on the evening of the 13th March, 1781, in observing some stars in the constellation *Gemini*, noticed one that appeared different in character to the rest; the excellence of his telescope admitting of the use of eyepieces magnifying several hundred times, he found that the diameter of this object increased and assumed a well marked disc-like form, as he increased the power, while that of the fixed stars around it remained unaltered. At first he thought it was a comet, and communicated the discovery to Maskelyne and others, and in the course of two or three months it had been seen by nearly all the European astronomers; it was some time, however, before it could be decided whether it was a *comet* or *planet*, although its defined planetary appearance led most astronomers to believe it was the latter. Lexell was the first to show that its orbit about the sun was nearly circular, and it was therefore a *planet*, not a *comet*.

Herschell, the discoverer, named the planet *Georgium Sidus*, in honour of the King, George III., from whom he had received great and liberal encouragements; but this name did not meet with much favour among Continental astronomers. The famous Laplace suggested it should be called after Herschell himself, but the other planets having received mythological names, it was ultimately agreed to call it Uranus, which in the Greek fables is the name of the father of Saturn, as the latter is of Jupiter.

In 1787, Herschell completed his great forty-foot reflector, the first of Brobdignagian telescopes (the last is in Melbourne;) with it he discovered two satellites of Uranus—Oberon and Titania. In 1789 he discovers two more satellites of Saturn's system, Mimas and Euceladus: and also suspects the existence of two more satellites in the Uranian system; and in 1798 he announces the discovery that the satellites of this planet revolve around him in an opposite direction to that of the satellites to other planets.

While on the subject of this planet, I might mention that it has generally been accepted that Uranus has eight satellites, six of which were found by Herschell, but Mr. Lassels states emphatically, after a long series of observations with his grand reflector, that there are only four or if there are more they remain yet to be discovered. The revolution of Uranus about the sun occupies about eighty-four of our years. Its diameter is about 33,000 miles, and its distance from the sun about nineteen times that of the earth from the sun.

We will now put on our astronomical "seven-league boots," and pass on to the year of grace 1870, and look back on the results of astronomical research during the last seventy years. It is unfortunate, however, that as I come to the thickest of my work, I become sensible that I am approaching nearer and nearer to the end of your patience.

Towards the beginning of this period the first of a series of discoveries was made by Piazzi and Olbers,

which promises to be almost inexhaustible, so long as the perfection of telescopes increases in proportion. I refer to the planetoids. The first of these, Ceres, was discovered by Piazzi, in 1801; Pallas was discovered by Olbers in 1802; Juno in 1804, by Harding; Vesta in 1807, by Olbers; and so on, till these small members of the solar family number 109.

It had been long noted that there was a wide space between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter, and that there was a certain regular gradatory distance between the orbits of the other planets in some manner proportional to the distance from the sun. This regular order was, however, broken for want of a planet to fill this gap in the system, until the first planetoid Ceres was discovered.

The orbit of this body was found to very nearly coincide with the position required to complete the order of the distance from the sun—an order which is known as Bode's Law, by which it is assumed that the distances are as the numbers 4, 7, 10, 16, 28, 52, 100, 196, and 388; for the actual distances of the planets accord very closely to this; Neptune is, however, to some considerable extent an exception. The large numbers and minute dimensions of these bodies have led to the belief that they are fragments of some large planet which had in ages gone by been shattered to pieces. This supposition is rendered the more probable from the almost inexhaustible supply which seems to attend on each increase of the penetrating power of telescopes. The orbits of these little planets are so interlaced that we almost wonder that they do not stumble across one another in their circuits. If we were to represent the orbits, interlaced as they are in space, with rings, we could not lift one without lifting all the rest.

Numerous national observatories have been erected in this interval prominent among which are those at the Cape of Good Hope (1821,) at Parramatta, N.S.W. (1822, since dismantled,) Cambridge, in England (1823,) at Harvard College, U.S.A. (1840,) Washington (1842,) Williams-town, Victoria (1853,) Sydney (1858;) and so identified has astronomy become with national progress, that several large observatories have been established, and are maintained, by *municipalities*; instances of these are those of Manchester and Liverpool, while many of the highest class have been instituted in connection with colleges and universities for educational purposes.

The places and motions of the heavenly bodies are now known with great exactitude, and the charts, catalogues, and ephemerides of the moon, sun, stars, and planets are almost perfect; so precise, in fact, that the times of eclipses of the sun or moon, or of the forthcoming transits of Venus, can be predicted years beforehand, to commence at a certain time; and it shall be found that the times of prediction and occurrence tally within two seconds.

More giant telescopes had been constructed, both refractors and reflectors. Among the former I may instance the Dorpat and Pulkowa, one nine and a-half, the other sixteen, inches aperture; Cincinnati twelve, Harvard College fifteen, Greenwich twelve inches; and within the last year the largest refractor ever made has been completed. I refer to Mr. Newall's great twenty-five inch refractor, constructed by Cook and Son, of York.

Respecting the Pulkowa telescope, which was known as the "Great Pulkowa Refractor," Struve, the late Russian Imperial astronomer, said—"It might well be called the great refractor, as it broke the legs of himself and two of his assistants while they were erecting it."

There is one fact in connection with the splendid telescope at Harvard College which is worthy of notice—it was purchased with funds raised by subscription among the citizens of Boston, Salem, New Bedford, and Nantucket Mr. Bond says, in one of his reports—"It is worthy of note that no restriction or reservation was in any instance required (by the contributors) in regard to a right of visiting the observatory, or a control of its operations. This liberality on the part of the contributors has been productive of the most beneficial effects." The cost of the telescope and tower in which it is erected was about 15000, one thousand of which was contributed by President Quincy. The Cincinnati telescope is another instance of a similar kind, but in this case the contributions were not confined to money subscriptions; no inconsiderable portion of its cost was covered by donations in kind, of hams, preserves, and other produce, and a contribution of *caps* figures in the list.

Of large reflectors. Lord Rosse's giant of Parsonstown stands first; then there are those of Mr. Lassells, Mr. Warren De La Rue, Nasmyth, and lastly, the great Melbourne reflector. Besides these, numberless magnificent telescopes of both kinds, but of smaller dimensions, are now nightly scrutinising the skies in the hands, of both amateur observers and professional astronomers. In 1835 Sir John Herschell (the son of Sir William) commenced his famous series of observations of the southern nebulas and stars at the Cape of Good Hope, with his great reflector.—a task which occupied him five years. It is in following up and revising some of these observations that our great reflector is principally engaged. The results of Sir John Herschell's Cape observations are now published, and constitute the standard authority on the nebulae of the southern hemisphere.

At Greenwich, Pond succeeded Maskelyne in 1812, and next came Airy, the present Astronomer-Royal, who was appointed in 1835.

The first measurements of the distances of the fixed stars were made in 1838 and 1839. Bessel determined that of 61 Cygni, and Henderson that of  $\alpha$  Centauri. You will remember that the distance of the nearest of the fixed stars is immeasurably greater than that of the farthest planets, and that consequently the earth's diameter,

the base line used in determining the distance of the planets, becomes uselessly small when we come to deal with the stars; instead of the earth's diameter, therefore the diameter of her orbit about the sun is taken as the base line, which gives us a length twice the sun's distance, or about 183,000,000 miles. The process of finding the distance, which is known in astronomical language as determination of *annual parallax*, depends upon ascertaining whether a star's true position remains the same when observed while the earth is in any certain part of her orbit, and again when in another part six months distant, in which case there will be, roughly speaking, 183,000,000 miles between the two points of observation; if the star's position appears unaltered, then it is said *its parallax is insensible*, and its distance so great as to be immeasurable. If ever so small a difference of position, however, is discernible, the distance can be deduced.

In the case of the two stars mentioned, the annual parallax of  $\alpha$  Centauri was found to be 9-10ths of a second, which gives it a distance of 224,000 times the sun's distance; this star appears to be by far the nearest to us. The distance of  $\beta$  Cygni, the next nearest, is 366,000 times the sun's distance.

The fact that the solar system is actually moving through space, was by this time pretty well established; but there was considerable uncertainty as to the precise direction or rate of this movement. Sir John Herschell pointed out so long since as 1783 that the direction appeared to be towards a certain point in the constellation Hercules. Struve has now shown that this is actually the direction; and he says :—"The velocity of the motion is such that the sun, with the whole cortege of bodies depending on him, advances annually in the direction indicated at the rate of 154,000,000 miles per annum."

The greatest astronomical achievement during this period was, undoubtedly, the discovery of the planet Neptune—the last and most distant of the major planets now known.

The circumstances attending this discovery are, I have no doubt, well remembered by most of you. Two mathematicians were (independently and unknown to each other) engaged in investigating as to the cause of certain irregularities exhibited by Uranus in his orbital motion, which could only be accounted for by supposing the disturbing cause to be an unknown and large planet still more distant from the sun. Both these mathematicians (M. Le Verrier of Paris, and Mr. Adams of Cambridge) sent the results of their calculations to the principal European astronomers, indicating the position in the heavens in which the supposed planet might be found. A systematic search was commenced, and on September 23rd, 1845, M. Galle, an assistant in the Berlin Observatory, found the stranger close to the position indicated by Le Verrier and Adams.

This new planet has been called Neptune. The full significance of this discovery may not at first, perhaps, be so apparent to those unacquainted with the whole circumstances; but, when we come to consider that the actual position in space occupied by an unknown and invisible body, the only indication of whose existence was the disturbing effect on the motion of Uranus, was almost precisely pointed out by those mathematicians, after calculations involving the most difficult and complicated considerations, we shall be prepared to endorse the words of Mr. Hind who says :—

*"A most brilliant discovery,—the grandest of which Astronomy can boast,—and one that is destined to be a perpetual record in the annals of science—an astonishing proof of the power of the human intellect."*

In all other cases, the one who first *sees* has reaped the whole honour due; but here the mere finding falls far into the shade when compared with the intellectual skill that enabled Adams and Verrier to tell astronomers *where* to find it.

The dimensions of Neptune are not yet known with certainty, on account of his immense distance from us; his diameter is, however, estimated at about 37,000 miles. He occupies 164.6 years in his revolution about the sun, at a distance of about 274G millions of miles.

The origin and nature of meteors have long presented a fertile field for speculation and theorising. Within the last few years, however, our knowledge of these minute denizens of space has been very considerably increased, especially since the celebrated meteor shower of November, 1866. Long prior to this, however, it had been remarked that on certain occasions meteors had been seen in unusually large numbers, and Humboldt describes a grand shower of them he witnessed in 1799. Oldsted, in comparing this with former occurrences, adopted the theory that these meteoric storms are due to the progress of the earth through a mass of these atoms, which appear to be congregated into a ring which intersects the earth's orbit. Professor Newton, of America, and others, have still further investigated the matter, and their conclusions tend to establish Oldsted's theory; and it is now considered that ordinary shooting stars or meteors are minute particles of cosmical matter which revolve about the sun in an orbit or ring, like the planets; that they are chiefly congregated into two rings, one intersecting the plane of the earth's orbit in August with an inclination of  $79^{\circ}$ ; the other in November, with an inclination of  $17^{\circ}$ ; and also, that in some portions of these rings the meteors are more densely crowded than at others. They are called the November and August rings, from the fact that they intersect that part of the ecliptic occupied by the earth in those months. In these months, therefore, meteors are usually for more numerous than at others; but it is only when the crowded portions of the rings cross the earth's path at those months that we have those grand displays called meteor showers, the last of which was witnessed in Northern Europe in

November, 1866. Professor Newton shows that so far as the November ring is concerned, these showers occur every thirty-three years, although the grandest of them will come only at periods of about 133 years.

The motion of these minute bodies is contrary to that of the earth; we therefore meet them "*full tilt*." They all appear to come from one point in the heavens within the constellation Leo. Mr. Alexander Herschell, one of our highest authorities on this class of astronomy, states, as one of the results of his observations of the August fall of 1866, that not one in twenty of these bodies exceeds a pound in weight, most are very much smaller, and some cannot exceed a few grains. It appears pretty certain that these bodies become visible to us while yet at a distance of from seventy to fifty miles; and why such small masses at such a distance can produce the brilliant light with which they become visible is accounted for by the immense velocity (thirty miles a second) with which they approach us, becoming converted into heat immediately they enter our atmosphere.

Photography has of late years come into extensive use in astronomy. The first application of it in this direction is due to Dr. Draper, of New York, who obtained photographs of the moon in 1840. Mr. Bond, of Harvard College, seems to be the next to use it, in 1830, since which it has come into very general use; and in the hands of Mr. Warren De La Rue, Rutherford, Draper, and others, has now reached a very high state of perfection. The moon has naturally received the greatest attention from photographers, and some very magnificent pictures have been published from time to time. Photographs of the brighter planets, double stars, and star clusters, have also been successfully obtained; and at the Kew Observatory, pictures of the sun's surface are taken every clear day. In total eclipses of the sun, also, photography has proved eminently useful in securing for all time some of the strange and evanescent appearances witnessed on such occasions.

The application of the electric telegraph to observational astronomy belongs to the late portion of the period I am dealing with. It was first used by Dr. Locke, in America, in 1848, and the galvanic current has now become one of the essentials to a first-class observatory. The observer has no longer to listen painfully to the ticks of his clock or chronometer, as he watches the progress of the stars across his telescope, or the moments at which various phenomena occur: his undivided attention can now be devoted to the ocular part of his task. With a telegraphic key in his hand, he can at a touch send a signal to the chronograph, which records the desired instant with greater precision than could otherwise be obtained. The extended application of chronography by means of the galvanic current has opened up new modes for the solution of many very important astronomical problems.

So far as our knowledge of the condition and constitution of the heavenly bodies is concerned, there is no modern accessory in astronomy that has done so much as spectrum analysis. By its aid the constitution of the visible portion of the sun has been revealed to us with certainty as consisting of incandescent vapours, among which are the vapours of many of the substances and gases we know on the earth's surface, notably sodium, iron, nickel, magnesium, barium, calceum, and hydrogen. On the occasion of the last total eclipses visible in India and America, the spectroscope unravelled the mystery of those strange red prominences' which are seen to jut out from the sun's edge during the moments of totality. It showed them to be incandescent hydrogen gas—jets of flame projecting for tens of thousands—nay, almost a hundred thousand miles into space, of such gigantic dimensions that they would embrace dozens of such puny globes as ours in their fiery arms, like motes in a candle.

By an ingenious arrangement of spectroscope with the telescope, these red flames can now be witnessed at almost any time without an eclipse, with which they have nothing whatever to do, but which become the more readily visible on these occasions on account of the complete obscuration of the sun's direct glare. The spectroscope has also shown that the fixed stars are in all respects *suns*. Lines indicating the presence of many of the substances known in the earth, and in a state of vapour in the sun, are easily recognised on numbers of them. Hydrogen appears to be a common constituent among the stars, and in some the hydrogen spectrum becomes the most prominent. Some years ago a star, *T. Coronæ*, was observed to suddenly grow brighter: before the change it was so small as to be invisible to the unaided eye, but in a few days it became as brilliant as the brightest stars. The spectroscope told us that the sudden increased brilliancy was due to an outburst of hydrogen, far outvieing in magnitude the most stupendous flames that are ejected into space by our sun. This occurrence, with respect to *T. Coronæ*, has given rise to speculations, as our sun is continually vomiting forth these monster flames, whether there may not be occasions when some such terrific outbursts take place on it: but cases like *T. Coronæ*: are the very rare exception, and not the rule; and few instances of such rapid variability in the brightness of stars are on record.

Before concluding. I would like to refer to one item, and that not the least in the past seventy years of Astronomy: the establishment of an observatory in Victoria. Like Greenwich, it was established to facilitate navigation; that was, and still is, its prime object. Its beginnings took place in 1853, when I was invited to form and conduct an observatory at Williamstown, for the purpose of obtaining and maintaining accurate local time, and of giving public time signals to enable masters of ships to obtain errors and rates of their chronometers. By this time chronometers had been brought to such a state of perfection, that the method of obtaining longitude at

sea, by the transport of Greenwich time, was almost exclusively practised Chronometers, however, of the best construction are but machines liable to break down, stop, or go wrong: the Lunar distance method therefore affords a valuable stand-by in case of any such contingencies, and no good seaman is master of his art, or a safe navigator, unless he is up to "Lunars." That they are not always so, is unfortunately a fact, for which, perhaps, the excellence of chronometers is to blame. I recollect, some years ago, an excellent old salt whom I had known for several years, bringing his chronometers to the observatory on his arrival in port; one of them had gone wrong, and the other was not quite trustworthy: he had been in a quandary. I said to him, I suppose you made yourself safe by a few "Lunars." "Lunars !" he said, "No, sir. I only took two 'Lunars' since I was master of a ship: once I was about the meridian of Ascension, and my 'Lunar' put me about the middle of the desert of Sahara, and next I was near St. Paul's Island, and it put me pretty nigh-the meridian of Cape Leuwin, so I thought 'Lunars' were not much account, and never took any since. I knocked along this time with the log and my lame chronometer, and I guess I'm in port safe enough now."

Like Flamsteed. I commenced with indifferent instruments. For about twelve months a sextant and chronometer were the only ones of which our National Observatory could boast. Through the liberal support that has ever been accorded to science by our Governments and Legislature however, the Observatory in the course of a few years grew out of its swaddling clothes, and became a well-equipped establishment. After nine or ten years it was removed from Williamstown to its present site.

Our Observatory was one of those which undertook a series of observations for the determination of the parallax of Mars at its opposition in 1862 for a new measurement of the sun's distance; and the Williams-town series has been acknowledged to be the most successful obtained on that occasion. The sun's parallax derived from the combination of our with the Greenwich observations was  $8''.93$ , while that from the Pulkowa and Cape of Good Hope was  $8''.96$ —a very close coincidence. The most noteworthy fact connected with these results is that they agree so closely with the parallax assigned by Le Verrier and Foncault on other grounds.

Light had hitherto been assumed to travel at the rate of 192,000 miles a second. Foncault's beautiful experiments showed its speed to be only 185,170 miles a second. From eclipses and other phenomena we know light takes eight minutes eighteen seconds to come from the sun to us. A simple calculation, then, gives 92,000,000 as the distance and  $8''.86$  as the parallax. Le Verrier assigned a parallax of  $8''.95$ , which resulted from his investigations of the perturbations of some of the planets. The parallax resulting from the transit of Venus in 1769 was  $8''.58$ , equal to a distance of a little over 9,500,000 mile; that from the Mars observations gave a distance of 91,500,000 miles—a difference of three and a half millions miles. Were it not for the coincidence of the Mars results with those deduced by Foncault and Le Verrier, there might be some reason to doubt the results. Lately, however the Venus observations of 1709 have been re-discussed by Mr. Stone, of Greenwich, who finds that by applying some necessary corrections to the observations, which certain appearances on a late transit of Mercury had indicated to be requisite, the results coincide almost exactly with those obtained in 1862.

The astronomical work that has engaged our Observatory is, as at Greenwich, the Cape, and many other national observatories, confined almost exclusively to the utilitarian class. The maintenance of correct local time, and giving public time signals, to enable mariners to rate their chronometers correctly and with facility; the determination and correction of the places of the principal fixed stars; and a complete survey of certain portions of the southern heavens, for the formation of accurate star catalogues and charts of the southern hemisphere (a work that has been undertaken by this in co-operation with two other British observatories,) constitute the principal routine work. Since the erection of our great telescope, observation of and depicting the southern nebulae have been added to this. The Melbourne star catalogues of the southern heavens are now admitted to be the most valuable extant, and it appears they have become of special importance with reference to the forthcoming transit of Venus; so that whatever our colony may do on that occasion, she has already contributed a very honourable share in these star catalogues alone.

It is a very popular belief that practical Astronomy consists of star-gazing, looking at the moon, or searching for some unknown stars, planets or comets; and young ladies who come to the Observatory on fine, pleasant nights, to have a *keek* at the moon, say, "How delightful ! What a beautiful, romantic occupation !" and so it is for an hour or two, if it is not too cold; but long, weary hours of monotonous watching and recording at night, with the long, dreary calculations of to-morrow looming ahead, soon strip the delightful romance from the calling of the practical astronomer, and bring it down to the level of other bread and butter getting occupations. There is no such thing as *star-gazing* (as that term is generally understood) in a regular observatory;—every observation is for a particular purpose, and set out beforehand. The more popular branches of Astronomy, such as comet and planet seeking, investigations of the moon's surface, delineations of the features of the nearer planets, and such like, are, by general consent, left to amateurs and private individuals, many of whom are in possession of magnificent telescopes, well fitted for the work, and who yearly contribute very largely to our knowledge on these subjects. National institutions, however, have to grind away at the

harder stuff, which does not present enough excitement, or requires too much application, for those who follow up astronomy for amusement. This is how it is we nearly always hear of comets, and even planetoids, being discovered by such observers, and not by those who have to do the less genial but more utilitarian work.

The most important work in astronomy, as in other sciences, is that which appeals least to the uninitiated and the general public; hence the *cui bono* question so frequently advanced with respect to observatories and scientific institutions; and I recollect an occasion when an astronomer engaged upon some work of the highest, importance and real commercial value, was severely blamed in public print for allowing a zealous young amateur astronomer to discover a comet! Greenwich Observatory has been established nearly two centuries, yet neither a comet, planet or planetoid has ever been first discovered there. For all this, the basis of modern astronomy is admitted by all astronomers to rest on the Greenwich Observatory.

As an example of the value—the *commercial* value—of the simple maintenance of true time, one of the first objects of a national observatory, I may mention Mr. Warren De la Rue, the celebrated paper manufacturer, states that "he estimates the annual saving to his firm, by having exact time, and enforcing strict attendance on his work-people, at £300 per annum (besides some saving of gas and coals, not taken into account,) which is an amount that would otherwise be entirely lost; and of this he is able to make a return to his work-people in the way of additional privileges as respects holidays."

In conclusion, I believe I cannot do better than quote the words of Sir John Herschell, when speaking of the work of national observatories:—

*"If we ask to what end magnificent establishments are maintained by states and sovereigns, furnished with masterpieces of art, and placed under the direction of men of first-rate talent and high-minded enthusiasm, sought out for those qualities among the foremost in the ranks of science—if we demand, cui bono ? For what good a Bradley has toiled, or a Maskelyne or a Piazzini worn out his venerable age in watching? The answer is—not to settle mere speculative points in the doctrine of the universe; not to cater for the pride of man by refined inquiries into the remoter mysteries of nature; not to trace the path of our system through infinite space, or its history through past and future eternities. These indeed are noble ends, and which I am far from any thought of depreciating; the mind swells in their contemplation, and attains in their pursuit an expansion and a hardihood which fit it for the boldest enterprise : but the direct practical utility of such labours is fully worthy of their speculative grandeur. The stars are the land-marks of the universe; and amidst the endless and complicated fluctuations of our system, seem placed by its Creator as guides and records, not merely to elevate our minds by the contemplation of what is vast, but to teach us to direct our actions by reference to what is immutable in his works. It is indeed hardly possible to over-appreciate their value in this point of view. Every well-determined star, from the moment its place is registered, becomes to the astronomer, the geographer, the navigator, the surveyor, a point of departure which can never deceive or fail him—the same for ever and in all places; of a delicacy so extreme as to be a test for every instrument invented by man, yet equally adapted for the most ordinary purposes; as available for regulating a town clock as for conducting a navy to the Indies; as effective for mapping down the intricacies of a petty barony as for adjusting the boundaries of transatlantic empires. When once its place has been thoroughly ascertained and carefully recorded, the brazen circle with which that useful work was done may moulder—the marble pillar totter on its base—and the astronomer himself survive only in the gratitude of his posterity: but the record remains, and transfuses all its own exactness into every determination which takes it for a ground-work, giving to inferior instruments, nay even to temporary contrivances and to the observations of a few weeks or days, all the precision attained originally at the cost of so much time, labour and expense."*

Fergusson and Moore, Printers, 48 Flinders Lane East, Melbourne.

## Creation Versus Development: a Lecture

Delivered at the Duke of Edinburgh Theatre, on Monday, 8TH August, 1870,

By the

Rev. J. E. Bromby, D.D.,

Principal of the Church of England Grammar School.

THE Lecturer, who was introduced by the Chairman. E. P. S. Sturt, Esq., P.M., said :—

IN thus placing Creation and Development as if in direct opposition, I do not wish to be understood as asserting that they are necessarily antagonistic; for it is quite as possible for the Creator to work by development as it is for Him to work by any other way which may seem fit to His Divine wisdom. But the notion is very generally prevalent that such an opposition does exist; and this seems owing to the fact that some have atheistically argued that if things can be developed one out of another in endless series, there is no need of a personal Creator at all—that the very circumstance of there being an endless chain of causes renders the mere

idea of a Great First Cause a contradiction in terms.

The fact, however, really is that the finite mind of man cannot grasp the dimensions of infinity in any one of its phases. In his attempt to do so, he is always reasoning upon analogy and generalisation; and these he borrows from experiences most familiar to him, or from studies to which he has given a more profound attention. A good illustration of this is that very few minds find any difficulty in conceiving the idea of infinite time in advance of them, and yet they find it exceedingly difficult to conceive the idea of infinite time behind them—of time which never had a beginning: the reason being that it comes within their experience to have witnessed things going on without, having ever come to an end, but they never knew of anything which had not infinity *a parte, post*, as well as the infinity *a parte ante*—are equally incomprehensible; the one being only apparently more intelligible from our being able to lean upon an already-gathered experience.

Equally puzzling with infinity of time is infinity of space. Everybody has of course heard of the great statistician Malthus, and knows how urgent he was in restraining the philoprogenitiveness of man, arguing reasonably enough that if a people were to go on doubling every three or four centuries, not only would Great Britain be in time overpeopled, but the world itself, till there were not room enough for anybody to lie down. Now, could anything like this ever happen in the infinity of space? No: at least not in the abstract; because, when all conceivable space had become ever so thickly peopled, there would always be an infinity of space on every side. But then occurs the natural thought that, as there is no reason why one portion of space should be peopled any more than another, the whole of infinite space may be already as thickly peopled as is either comfortable or convenient—aye, though some parts are so distant from us that the news of them, flashing with fifty times the speed of lightning, could never reach us, though it were to travel towards us for ever and for ever. Such distance, even in one direction, is inconceivable; and there are, besides, an infinite number of directions.

The nearest approach, perhaps, which man can make to a notion of infinity is by aid of mathematical calculi; and hence it has happened that great mathematical geniuses, if they have devoted themselves exclusively to such studies, have generally had a strange tendency to atheism: for abstract mathematics give a very one-sided view of infinity. Mathematics have no personality, no volition, no affections, no object in life. So impersonal are they, that it is generally supposed that two and two would still make four, though no four things had ever been created to be counted, and no mind had ever been created to count them. And thus the mathematician's mind, leaning, as all minds do, upon analogy, acquires the habit of regarding the infinite as essentially devoid of personality, and therefore of will. Need I say that this tendency to atheism is greatly increased where men have unhappily blocked out the access of knowledge through other channels, having made shipwreck of all their finer sensibilities by indulgence in gross vice?

Now, if we pass from the abstract mathematician to the observer of concrete nature (and with the latter we have in this lecture more particularly to deal.) we might, at first sight, be disposed to say of him, "Surely this man is not under any danger of being betrayed by association of ideas into the belief that there is no will in the nature of things; when almost every insect he sees goes buzzing about with a will, and the very flea which bites his back gives token of being actuated by a very decided volition."

Well, this may be so in the first aspect of nature. The man who looks abroad upon nature for the first time is so far from being under the temptation of not believing in Divine personality, that he is rather disposed to believe in too many distinct personalities at work in the government of the world: and thus the earliest theology, which was the reflex of the philosophy of the time, was polytheistic in its character. According to heathen mythology, every operation in nature, every some time or other began. But in reality both these infinities—the unexplained cause, every striking phenomenon was the result of some distinct volition. "There were gods many and lords many. Good and evil genii, hamadryads, sylphs and fairies were allotted by the imaginative to their characteristic situations and elements wherever found, But very different does the case become after the laws of nature have been minutely investigated and carefully chronicled. No longer are the rumblings of a volcano conceived to be the rattle of cyclopean forge-hammers, nor the rainbow a bridge by which Iris might descend to earth. As wrote the Latin poet, Manilius, ages ago :—

"———*solvit miracula rerum,  
Eripuitque Jovi fulmen, vircsque tonantis.*"

*"Science, by solving creation's miracles, robs even Jupiter of his thunderbolt."*

The laws impressed upon the natural world are found to be universal and undeviating. All apparent departures are discovered, one after another, to be merely parts of some ulterior law, of some higher and more general principle which embraces all the lower.

Early philosophy might think it sufficient reason to assign for water rising in a pump, that "Nature abhors a

vacuum." That appeared at the time to be a great principle; and men, delighted to see how uniformly it applied, accepted the sage *dictum* with reverent submission. But when they found that water refused to go higher than thirty-three feet, they were not content to be told that nature abhors a vacuum up to thirty-three feet. They could see at once the incongruity between so large an expression as nature abhors, and the ridiculous limit of thirty-three feet. Nor was it long before Torricelli succeeded in proving that the rise of the water was due to one of the simplest of all principles—an equilibrium between two pressures. And thus it has been in hundreds of instances since; some significant fact has turned up which showed that, in the crudeness of hasty theory, man, though he might not have grouped his facts amiss, yet had reached to only proximate causes, other and far more important causes lying beyond which, till then, had eluded his observation. When this kind of thing was continually occurring, when every fresh investigation and every fresh discovery went to prove that simple principles of this kind prevailed everywhere, not only in inanimate nature, but through every department of animated nature—that the laws which govern the generation of plants and animals and the production of their varieties are all subject to certain primary laws—that the very instincts of animals are affected by external physical circumstances in a remarkable degree—then the notion arose that the principles of life are only a modification of the eternal principles of inanimate nature—that every existing thing has been developed out of some other thing, and that some other thing out of something else. And this brings us face to face with another aspect of infinity (which is as much beyond the grasp of human comprehension as any other,) and that is the; eternal chain of causes which begins we know not where, and will end we know not when. We sum up our incapacity to comprehend this phase of infinity by speaking of a Great First Cause. The Comtist laughs at us for so doing. He requires positive proof of everything; and, therefore, he denies the existence of Deity on the ground that there is no positive proof of his existence. To believe in anything of which there is no positive proof is as senseless a fatuity as that of the negro fetish worshipper, who believes in the divinity of a consecrated stick. How far nobler (he cries) than such blind belief to exercise reason, to separate truth from falsehood, to study the actualities of existence, to trace through its varying sinuosities the long; chain of cause and consequence, and so become a god unto yourself. Now, to show the fallacy of all this, we have but to employ our ordinary mode of reasoning on such a subject, and we are at once able to prove that we do not exist ourselves, and that all existence is an illusion. For in ordinary reasoning, no one would ever be found to admit that anything ever happened without a cause; if, therefore, nothing happens without a cause, and there never was a first cause, nothing could possibly ever have happened at all: therefore, those interesting events of our being born into this world never happened : therefore, we do not exist. Although, therefore, we do not profess to fathom the full meaning of our expression, The Great First Cause, yet we maintain we are quite entitled to use it as the synonym of Deity. It may be a contradiction in terms, but its very contradiction is only another proof of our inability to comprehend infinity. "I am He" (saith the Almighty, by the mouth of His prophet)—

*"Who frustrateth the prognostics of the impostors;  
 "Who maketh the diviners mad;  
 Who reverseth the devices of the sages;  
 And infatuateth their knowledge."*

—*Lowth's Translation.*

Taking now for granted that an infinite God is incomprehensible, and that yet it was his wish that his rational creatures should know something of him, what modes must he adopt to effect the communication of this knowledge ? We are cognisant of two. One is, the study of external creation by aid of the faculties with which he has endowed us : the other is direct inspiration on our own minds.

Let us look at each of these in turn.

In dealing with the first, let us begin with the Psalmist's exclamation, "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all." But what is the meaning of this word *wisdom*? Popularly we use the word in various senses: we sometimes mean by it *prudence*, sometimes *intelligence*, sometimes *profound knowledge*. But its proper signification appears to be the employing the best means to attain certain definite ends. It implies that a person has the wish to accomplish some object: and the way he sets about it may be wise, or for want of knowledge and experience it may be very foolish. Now creation, as the display of God's wisdom, is a series of ingenious contrivances for the accomplishment of obvious purposes. By way of being sufficiently precise, I will select one out of 10,000, and, following in the steps of old Paley, take the eye. What a convenient thing it is to be able to see! To know at a glance what is going on at some distant point without being at the trouble of going there, or even if an object be within reach, to be able to know almost everything about it without being under the necessity of feeling it all over. Well, then, the Creator in his goodness wished to give certain of His creatures the faculty of sight: and it is astonish- ing what a multitude of curious properties in

nature are ingeniously made to co-operate in bringing about this beautiful result. There is first the subtle luminiferous ether filling apparently all space, certainly extending to the most distant star. This ether, which is in some sort a solid and may be likened to an exceedingly attenuated jelly, has this property—when agitated by any luminary, whether that luminary be a blazing sun or a farthing rushlight, it conveys the agitation onwards by its successive waves, which follow each other with inconceivable rapidity : and the waves impinging on the eye excite the sensation which we call light.

We may well believe that the [*unclear*: pulses] a medium so thin would not make themselves perceptible except upon nerves of peculiar sensitiveness; and accordingly we find that a special reticulation of such nerves has been provided and placed at the back of the eye. Here they receive the impression of light, and instantly telegraph the circumstance to the brain. Yet if this were all the provision made, the result would merely be the consciousness of some blazing thing or other in front, without the power of discriminating accurately what it was. But there is another curious property of the waves of light which now comes into operation. It is this—their direction as they pass into a different medium is always slightly changed (refracted as it is called); and, therefore, by catching them on the curved surface of a denser substance, we may make all those portions of the wave which strike such surface converge to any point we please. This is what we do when we manufacture spectacles; and this is what the Great Creator did when he created an eye; and so nicely adjusted is the arrangement, that the foci to which the rays of light converge are upon the retina of the eye, which may be described as living drawing paper. The consequence of all this is not only that we are conscious of the presence of a luminous body, but that a perfect picture of the object is presented to the mind, with all its minuteness of outline, with all its variety of shade and colour, with all its linear and atmospheric perspective, and every little movement it may have. We may well imagine how delicate such an organ must be, and how liable to injury: and very remarkable indeed are the number of provisions made to guard so tender, yet so precious a gem. It is a remark as old as Socrates how that the projecting brow serves as a pent-house to its tenement : and how that the hairs which fringe the ridge of the brow divert the descending stream of perspiration: how that the eyelashes, like a cullender, arrest the access of irritating things which float in the air—flies and straws. And there are other contrivances still more peculiar which Socrates did not note—the iris, in front of the pupil, expanding and contracting with spontaneous precision, and so mitigating without thought or trouble on our part any excessive intensity of light. And there is The lining of black pigment coating all the interior of the eye, and thus suppressing any stray beams of light which would produce false images within the eye. Were it not so, ghosts would flutter there like that which has been for some time past haunting our great Cassegrain telescope at the Observatory, to the sore discomfort of its custodian. But even if after these precautions mischief should happen to the eye it is not necessarily fatal to vision. Should, for example, an accidental prick of thorn let out all the aqueous humour, the ensuing darkness would last only for a time, for fresh fluid of exactly the same character and consistency would soon be formed again, and the eye see as well as ever. But suppose the eye should be knocked out bodily. Well! has not a second eye been provided against such an unpleasant contingency? But now comes a difficulty:—What is to be done with this supernumerary eye till it is wanted? Some persons never get an eye knocked out; and anyhow it would be very inconvenient always seeing double till that happened. You must all of you have experienced the inconvenience of this double vision, when on becoming much exhausted and sleepy one eye will go wandering away from the other; and the same thing may happen after a little excess of conviviality; and if you try to read under these circumstances, the letters become all confused, in consequence of the two eyes seeing different, letters at the same time. Against this awkward consequence of having two eyes, a provision has been made, viz.:—that both eyes should have the faculty of superimposing the pictures one upon the other, so as to produce only one image on the mind—a very beautiful provision, and yet so recondite that no one seems able exactly to explain it. Equally conclusive with the foregoing as a proof of contrivance is the method devised for using the eye when we have got it,—*e. g.*, we can glance it rapidly from side to side without turning the head. Now, you are aware that all bodily movements are effected by means of muscles. Therefore, there are four such muscles pulling the eye right and left and up and down; but these being all located, for convenience, at the back of the eye, give the organ more or less a pull backwards. In order, therefore, to balance the strain, as well, also, as to add to the ease of movement, two other muscles are added to pull the eye forward, while at the same time they move it obliquely. But it is not easy to fix a muscle in front of the eye. What, then, has been done? For one of them, the lower one. Just room enough was found near the cheek-bone; it is a very short one, and hence called *brevissimus*. But for the upper one there was no room at all, so it had to be relegated to the back of the eye along with the first four. How, then was it to exert a forward pull if it is situated behind? Simply by having a long thread attached to it (this muscle is, therefore, called *longissimus*) which passes through a cartilaginous pulley fixed at the upper edge of the bony orbit of the eye, and then pulls forward upon exactly the same principle by which you raise a window-blind upwards, though you pull the cord downwards.

Then again there are contrivances for lubricating all this delicate machinery; and one for frequently

washing the transparent window out of which the eye looks; and as for this last work there is a copious supply of water, provision is made for carrying off the superfluity by a conduit pipe which is drilled right through the bone of the nose.

Then again, as the picture of an object formed in the eye falls differently, according as it comes from a near or distant point, and requires a corresponding adjustment of the lens, just as in a telescope we are obliged to shift the position of the glasses a little, so is the same provision made in the eye; and the more especially is this the case in such animals as vultures, which can see distinctly such incredible distances; whose eyes are furnished with a ring of imbricated plates with the especial object of readily altering the local distance.

Then again, as light, under the influence of refraction, resolves itself into distinct colours, as we see in the rainbow which property however beautiful in some of its phenomena, interferes greatly with distinct vision, by giving a coloured fringe to every object; this consequence is ingeniously provided against by the eye being made up of layers of different refracting power—a device so practical and artistic that the famous optician, Dollond, borrowed the hint in fabricating his well-known achromatic glasses.

So that although we have selected but a single organ of the body, yet this one presents us with a surprising number of ingenious provisions and contrivances (which we have not by any means exhausted,) and all with a definite and unmistakable object. Some of them, *e. g.*, that of the pulley and that of the conduit pipe are just such as would occur to the mind of an ordinary mechanic. Indeed, so *infra dig.*—so much beneath the majesty of regal state did this kind of creation appear to the Gnostics of old that they could not bear the notion of such handicraft business, aye, and such dirty business too, (for, confessedly, all animals at times are dirty) being the work of the great and only potentate, who is King of kings and Lord of lords; and, therefore, they imagined a distinct individual whom they called a Demiurgus—a factotum—who had created all things, and whom they aristocratically held in very marked contempt. This, however, is not a question we are now concerned with. Suffice it to quote the words of the prophet Isaiah—"My thoughts are not your thoughts, nor your ways my ways, saith the Lord." But that anyone should fail to see tokens of contrivance throughout the whole domain of nature, and marks of consummate wisdom is one of the greatest of existing marvels. What obstacle stands in the way? We cannot deny that there is such a thing as thought, and the faculty to design and contrive and to provide for future contingencies by the exercise of ingenuity, for we are conscious to ourselves of possessing such faculties. And though, to be sure, we cannot in the least degree explain or comprehend how the subtle adjustment of anything material or immaterial should produce the power to think, yet there is evidence enough that such a power does exist. Why then should we suppose that all power of this order is limited to our single selves? How preposterous, in face of such an enormous amount of cumulative evidence to deny the existence of a personal Designer, whose spirit planned these wondrous scenes in which we live, and by means of which we are enabled to conceive some idea, however inadequate, of his stupendous power and of his admirable wisdom.

How is it, then, we may well ask, that some persons draw from external creation conclusions the very reverse of this?—maintaining that the great balance of evidence lies all the other way—that things have been self-developed, not created?

First, then, let it be broadly stated, that all the more intelligent of those philosophers who have been the strongest advocates for development such as Huxley and Darwin, indignantly repudiate the charge of atheism. Whatever exception we may take to any of their views, and however much we may disapprove of the terms they may have made use of in expressing those views, we are yet bound to believe them when they distinctly avow their belief in a personal Creator. All they affirm is, that matter is endowed with properties which enable it to do a vast number of things of itself, which are often, in popular language, attributed directly to the Creator; and that as long as matter has such properties, the investigation of them is, like any other study of the works of creation, not only the legitimate exercise of our reason, but one of the highest functions of God's rational creatures. It will be worth while, perhaps, briefly to overhaul Huxley's celebrated lecture on that terrible protoplasm which, on its first delivery, frightened such numbers from their propriety. Very natural and justifiable was the professor's delight at this new revelation of science, and very jubilant, the tone in which he sang a bold pæon to its praise. It is quite possible, also, that in the flourish of language he indulged in, he might wickedly intend to scare an old woman or two. After describing this living protoplasmic jelly, as it lay before his astonished sight, vibrating and palpitating in its nettle cradle, and after tracing its appearance in algæ and fungi, he finds it at last constituting the colourless corpuscles in our own blood. We have but to prick our finger (he tells us,) and keep a drop of blood at the temperature of the body, and these corpuscles of protoplasm "will be seen to exhibit a marvellous activity, changing their forms with great rapidity, drawing in and thrusting out prolongations of their substance, and creeping about as if they were independent organisms." But why should the Professor say "*as if* they were independent organisms?" Surely they are independent organisms. For he goes on to tell us that these corpuscles die. *Omnnes debemur morti, nos nostraque*—that *nostraque*. is a clever application of the Professor's—and when they are dead, it is found that there is in every corpuscle a nucleus, which in its lifetime was more or less hidden from view. Now pray, my friends, observe the nucleus; for this

it is which gives it its individuality, and constitutes it an independent organism. Professor Huxley formulates the whole discovery thus :—"A nucleated mass of protoplasm turns out to be what may be termed the structural unit of the human body." And again, "Protoplasm, simple or nucleated, is the formal basis of all life."

Now, these formulas at first sight look very precise, as if nature's operations in this direction had been fathomed. Whereas, the addition to our knowledge, though interesting, is nothing very great; and the formulæ are anything but precise. For what a very loose expression is this—*simple or nucleated*. It is just as loose as if I were to say, a half-penny or a rood of ground is the basis of all real property. In one sense, no doubt, the smallest current coin of the realm is the basis of all property, because such units, if accumulated in sufficient abundance, might amount to a million sterling, with which a large estate might be purchased. Put a rood of ground must have a title; and that title must originate with organised authority, and involves the whole idea of social rights and constitutional government. When, therefore, Huxley uses such a loose phrase as "simple or nucleated," as if the two things were nearly identical, or belonged to the same category, he has evidently overlooked the immense importance of the nucleus. What a world of power does a nucleus contain! The title-deeds to an estate may be of great import, but the inscription in a nucleus is more potent still. Though written in a character which no man can decipher, it is mightier than the mightiest magician's fabled spell. Presented in the proper quarter, it entitles its unconscious possessor to inherit sundry forms of being, with all their wondrous faculties and unnumbered sources of pleasure.

Let us take an example or two of a nucleus. If an acorn be examined, the great bulk of it is found to be merely nutriment stored up for the nurture of the oak during its helpless infancy. The infant oak itself springs from a minute germ; and if this germ be microscopically inspected, we arrive ultimately at a simple cell, and this cell contains a nucleus or germinal spot. Under certain conditions of warmth and moisture, that nucleus has vital power to germinate, and to become eventually a huge oak.

Now, take a hen's egg, and subject it to the same treatment as the acorn. The great bulk of the egg, as before, is merely pabulum, nutriment for the embryo chicken till it be hatched; and if the microscope be resorted to, it will disclose ultimately no more than was exhibited in the acorn—a simple germinal cell, with a nucleus. The most perspicacious eye, assisted by the highest magnifying power, will discover no more. But similar as these two nucleated cells are to each other, they are endowed with very different powers. One has power to produce an oak; the other a chicken. And it is just the same, *mutatis mutandis*, with the nucleated pellets of protoplasm which we are at present studying. I am disposed, therefore, to take exception to Professor Huxley's language, when he says, "Thus it becomes clear that all living powers are cognate, and that all living forms are fundamentally of one character." The latter part, that all living forms are fundamentally of one character may readily be granted as the result of observation : if by fundamentally is meant that all are traceable to some sort of protoplasmic monads. But it does not follow inferentially that the *powers* of these several protoplasmic monads are cognate. Perhaps some one may urge that the word *cognate* is employed by the Professor in a loose figurative way; but there is a simile in juxtaposition with the passage which shows exceedingly well the confusion of ideas under which the Professor is labouring. He calls this protoplasm, whether simple or nucleated, "the clay of the potter; which, bake it or paint it as he will, remains clay, separated by artifice, not by nature, from the commonest brick or sun-dried clod." Now, I maintain that *nucleated* protoplasm has no resemblance to clay in the hands of the potter. *Simple* protoplasm perhaps has; and so has carbonic acid and ammonia a resemblance to bricks and mortar; but *nucleated* masses of protoplasm are living agents, possessed of great activity and endowed with very wonderful powers. They do not play the part of bricks and mortar, as Snout and Starveling played the part of Wall to Pyramus and Thisbe; but are like intelligent hodmen, carrying materials here and there and depositing them, with unerring precision, wherever, in the amazing economy of living nature, the Great Architect has intended. It may be quite true that when these simple hodmen die they are very good eating, and serve to sustain by their carcasses, when properly cooked, other Cognate beings (*i.e.*, cognate as far as their *bodily fabrics* go); but that would not necessitate these new fabrics being endowed with cognate *powers*. Let us go back to the egg for an illustration. Suppose I am hungry, and order an egg to be boiled. The albumen coagulates, the yoke thickens, and, in less than five minutes, the egg is done. I eat it and my digestive apparatus assimilates its substance, and the whole, as nearly as possible, goes into my veins. But what of the nucleus, which is the most wonderful part of the whole egg? My stomach has taken no account of that; it makes no difference to me whether the egg were a hen's or a crocodile's. The nucleus dies, its vitality is destroyed, and, instead of a chicken running about my poultry yard, lo ! (as Professor Huxley would playfully say) this lecture with which I am boring my present audience. If we were to turn out a herd of swine under an oak tree, in autumn, a cognate thing would happen. The pigs would devour the acorns, and appropriate nutritious matter which might have served to mature the parturition of a whole forest of oaks; so that, instead of the oaks, there is an increase of fat upon the pigs. But the *nuclei* of egg and acorn had nothing to do with the matter. When I devoured the egg, to me it was simply food; and yet that egg was the sepulchre of a dead nucleus, which, when alive was in itself a world of marvels. It contained potentially a bird, complete in

every part, to the extreme tip of its smallest feather. It contained, besides every instinct which the bird was to inherit, its domestic habits, its maternal solicitude, its expressive cluck, and its other six or eight words of most unmistakable meaning. But, by eating the egg, did I inherit any of these instincts? Did I cluck, or take to sitting upon a basket of eggs? No; all the instincts died in the saucepan before the temperature reached 212°.

The inference I intend to draw from all this is that, identical as may be the material structure of all forms of protoplasm, their powers are neither necessarily nor observably cognate. The nettle protoplasm, like an idle loafer who is a nuisance wherever he comes, seems to have no higher function in life than to sting. The blood corpuscle, on the contrary, when in his proper element is a most useful and active little fellow. True, when you take him out of his element he may, as Professor Huxley describes him, lie helplessly sprawling about, and sending out prolongations, as an irritated Maori protrudes his tongue; but when in the blood it is wonderful how replete he is with instinct, and ever ready to do a useful turn. Should you cut your finger, a whole squadron of these corpuscles will rush like a nest of ants to the wound, and when there, without a moment's loss of time, will run themselves into strings like rouleaux of coin, and so provide a temporary covering for the wound. By the end of the week, if not interfered with, they will have a new piece of skin ready, as good as that which was damaged by the knife. There is no evidence that the nettle protoplasm could do any work of this kind. When, therefore, by the herbalist's prescription, you take a cup of nettle tea, the nettle protoplasm dies, and if it re-appears again in your veins, it will only be as pabulum to feed a totally different race of protoplasmic entities. How, then, does it appear that "all living powers are cognate?" or how has Professor Huxley demonstrated his three-fold unity, which at the commencement of his lecture he professed to be going to do—"a unity of power or faculty, a unity of form, and a unity of substantial composition pervading the whole living world." A unity of substantial composition, especially round the more immediate nuclei of life, there, no doubt, is; but to talk of a unity of power or faculty is a wordy straining after generalisation, with little or no meaning. Even Huxley himself calls attention to the fact that the nucleated protoplasm of vegetables and animals have different powers, when he reminds us that the vegetable alone possesses the faculty of manufacturing fresh protoplasm out of lifeless compounds—viz., out of solutions of carbonic acid and ammonia. The animal world cannot do this. Both animals and vegetables require protoplasm for the perfection of their growth and fructification, but the vegetable manufactures it for itself; the animal gets it from the vegetable ready made. But mark this—the animal does not convey into its veins the living protoplasm which was in the vegetable, but only after it has died. True, when the protoplasm is found in the veins of the animal it is alive again and nucleated again, but the law of life written in this new nucleus may be—nay, palpably is,—very different from that in the old nucleus which was once alive in the vegetable.

It may seem strange to talk, as I have done, of corpuscles in the blood having instincts of their own; but the word expresses exactly the idea. For, what is instinct? It is a blind, unreasoning impulse, or desire to do some specific thing. The creature which possesses it did not acquire it by experience, or reason, or the exercise of any energy of its own; but had it from the beginning of its existence. Chickens, which were in the egg-shell only a few hours ago, may be seen any day actively running about, and as the parent hen scratches the ground they pick up with unerring instinct minute grains which serve for their nutriment. Even the human infant, though far more stupid than the active little chicken, yet has instinct enough to rub its nose about in search of the alimentary fountain which is to maintain its life. When, however, reason, availing itself of past experiences and of its powers of comparison and anticipation, comes to play so important a part in forming the will as it does in man, instinct sinks into comparative subordination. And so it comes to pass that we hold mere animal instinct in deserved contempt, as something servile, and to be controlled by those higher functions of soul and mind with which we are endowed. Would we see instinct in unalloyed operation we must view it in such animals as exercise very little reason, and work nearly always in only one way, albeit with exquisite beauty and exact precision. The silk worm always spins the same sort of cocoon; the titmouse always elaborates the same sort of beautiful nest. Some instincts there are which animate a whole multitude together and impel them to construct a common work. A community of ants, for instance, shall consist of many thousands of individuals, indeed tens of thousands, all working at the same thing, in the same way, and producing a fabric of a specific character, each knowing what all the rest want to do.

Now I mean to assert that the blood corpuscles are living organisms, each endowed with identically the same instinct as its fellow—not as in the case of the ant, mixed up with other instincts and other faculties, which produce in their combination a certain amount of intelligent will—but with an instinct so blind that the corpuscle is constrained to act within very definite limits, and takes pleasure (if pleasure it is capable of feeling) in doing one or two things only as external circumstances occur to stimulate it to do them. Indeed, it may be observed generally that as we descend the scale of animated being, while reason and thought grow less, instinct increases in strength. It may jar upon the preconceived notions of many a man to be told that he carries about with him, wherever he goes, such a multitude of living things which will do as they like, whether he will or no, and which are such an intimate part of himself; but he will find, upon examination, an abundant corroboration

of the fact in other and more accessible portions of his body : for the structure of our animal frame is composite, and consists of really distinct animals, though united at certain points to the common system. Wherever there is a ganglion, or even a plexus of nerves, there is a distinct animal, with a certain amount of independent action. Consider, for example, the arrangement of nerves by which we swallow our food. The muscles (the pharyngeal) so employed we are utterly unable to move by any effort of our own will; all we can do is, by means of the muscles of the tongue and mouth, to bring some morsel into contact with the deglutition, and the deglutition so stimulated, like a distinct animal, swallows the morsel of itself; so, in like manner, the sneezing apparatus is a distinct animal. Such parts of our bodies are, under ordinary circumstances, fast asleep, yet capable at any moment of being roused into wakeful activity. The sternutation may be effectually roused by a pinch of snuff, just as a sleeping lion may be roused up to roar by a sharp prod in the ribs.

To return, then, to the corpuscles of the blood, I say that to all intents and purposes they are distinct animals; they are independent organisms, having bodies of protoplasm and powerful instincts. Whether we like it or not, there they are, ready to help us if we treat them properly; but if we maltreat them by pouring into our blood ingredients which paralyse and emaciate them, then they give us a great deal of trouble, being the great agents in evolving every form of disease. At the same time it is quite possible to pamper and over-feed them, as a plethoric man sometimes finds out to his cost. These microscopic monads in the blood I have likened to hodmen and bricklayers. They are perpetually employed in bringing materials as they are wanted, and laying them with exactness in the right manner at the right place; but this duty they perform at the sacrifice of their own lives, just as the coral builders rear vast reefs of rock by means of their calcareous skeletons. There is not so much difficulty in conceiving of the corpuscles doing this kind of work in an adult animal, because then they have only to deposit their materials at spots requiring them and prepared to receive them. There is greater difficulty in conceiving of them building up the framework of the animal from its earliest embryo. After all, however, I do not see that the difficulty is any greater than in conceiving how a corporation of termites should inherit from their parents the instinct to make a nest always in a particular way—not any nest, it must be remembered, but one of a peculiar construction,—and that, too, of great size and exceedingly complicated. Whether, however, we find the conception easy or difficult to our minds, we see that the thing is so; and that in animals of the same blood particular instincts are transmitted and as it would appear by the agency of living monads, through that infinitesimally narrow pathway which separates one generation of animals from another.

And now another question arises. Are these nucleated corpuscles constrained by their instinct always to build a living fabric in exactly the same way? No, not exactly. The many curious facts which Darwin adduces, by" showing how, under climatic and other influences, new varieties of plants and animals are ever liable to spring up, go to prove that to these monads has been given a certain latitude of independent action—an independence which they occasionally exercise in a markedly capricious manner. Let a single example suffice. A child was born in Germany with six fingers on each hand. Had the incident terminated here it might have been accounted for by supposing that parts of two animals in the embryo condition had got mixed up together, in the same way as a lamb is born with two heads and six legs. But that this is not the right interpretation in the present case is obvious from the fact that this six-fingered variety of man has a son with six fingers also, and that the tendency to this variety continues through several generations. So that the change which is brought about becomes congenital; and the man of athiestic turn of mind cries out, "See now, you cannot say that this six-fingered man was made in the Divine image. Why then the five-fingered man ? It is clearly all nature's workmanship, and she shows her power and agency by altering that image whenever it suits the blindness of her caprice." The fact, we admit, is no doubt significant. It proves how extensive is the sway of general laws; it proves that Providence does not interpose at every moment to adjust the machinery of this marvellous world when, according to our view of things, it gets a little out of gear.

But, notwithstanding all Darwin's accumulated facts, nothing can be clearer than that this tendency to new varieties is under a very severe control; and with good reason, too; for if animals and vegetables were always wandering away into endless mixtures of species, we see at a glance what a scene of unutterable confusion the physical world would become.

The learned government botanist, Dr. Mueller, has some very pertinent observations on this topic in his preface to the *Vegetation of the Chatham Islands*. He writes:—"A study of plants growing in localities, where they are exposed to most unusual agencies, yields results of profound significance; and the revelations to be derived from a clear insight into the vegetation of Australia are in many cases as startling as replete with deep instructive meaning. It is there where we may trace plants in strangely altered forms from the glacier regions to forest depressions, in the mild air of which even tropical plants may luxuriate; it is there again where we may witness the effects of the sirocco of a desert country or otherwise alpine or tropical jungle-plants."

But while recognising this wonderful adaptability of the species to singularly different circumstances, Dr. Mueller expresses his conviction that the Supreme Power, to which the universe owes its existence purposely called forth structures of symmetry and perfection specifically unalterable. "Structures," he says, "in which a

transit to other species would destroy the beautiful harmony of their organisation, and would annihilate their power to perform the functions specially allotted to each from the morn of creation to the end of this epoch."

While, therefore, it may be quite true, for ought we know, that in secular periods of unknown duration one species of animals may have been developed by the agency of some general law of creation out of another species, as, for instance, the man out of the monkey; yet we conclude that nothing of that sort has occurred or can occur within the limits of a single epoch. To our view, distinct species must be regarded as distinct acts of creation, as distinguished from generation.

By way of illustration, let us cast our eyes abroad on the expanse of heaven. The telescope will now do for us here what the microscope has been doing for us before, and we shall see in incalculably remote distances nebulae, which there is reason to believe are solar systems in process of condensation; but as the process will probably occupy some countless billions of years no observed result can ever form part of established human knowledge. When, however, we have recourse to our own planetary system to see what evidence there exists to support such a theory, we discover that such really does exist; for the revolutions and rotations of the planets are such as they might be expected to have if at their successive distances rings of the condensing vapour were thrown off, and then allowed to curl up into rolling balls. But if we ask ourselves why matter should successively curl up at such or such a point, and why the law of gradual condensation should not be permitted to work on uniformly to its legitimate issue, we can assign no efficient cause. All we can discover is that the arresting process must have been attended with some little convulsion, for the orbit of no one planet is circular as it ought to be, its equator and its ecliptic never coincide, and no two move in exactly the same plane. But while the *efficient* cause, the *secondary* means by which the result has been brought about are beyond our ken, yet the *final* cause seems obvious enough; for provision has thus been made by the Great Architect, whose ways are past finding out, to educe order and distinctness from what would otherwise be chaotic.

Well, then, it is much the same with respect to the transmutation of species. What is true of the greatest things in creation is true also of the smallest. When we see the ease with which varieties spring up in plants and animals we might at first sight conclude that this was the great and only law, that any sort of animal might in successive generations be elicited from another, and a flea become the remote ancestor of an elephant. But it is not so. The harmonious demarcations which separate all created things are rigidly maintained. Distinct species stand permanently apart, like the colours in the solar spectrum, or the successive notes of the gamut.

We seem, therefore, in all such cases, to discern two sets of laws in operation. By one set is maintained great permanency and conservation. Whatever movement takes place in any direction seems to be brought about by most minute gradations. Yet, suddenly, in the midst of a this uniformity there breaks in a systematic series of catastrophes which throw things apart—beautifully so—in which state they are destined to continue till another secular period—mother *magnus annus*—come round, and a new order, harmoniously connected With what has gone before, commences afresh.

Professor Huxley has a rather humorous illustration of this subject—though, by-the-by, he erroneously calls it an analogy. His illustration is something like this: He introduces a common clock as a mode of uniform action. But the striking of the clock, he says, is essentially a catastrophe. Indeed the hammer, instead of striking one o'clock, might just as easily be made to explode one hundred weight of gunpowder. And so this "terrible catastrophe, irregular and lawless as it apparently would be, might yet depend upon machinery as absolutely uniform as does the motion of the hands. Thus we might have two schools of clock-theorists, one studying the hammer and the other the pendulum, who, though opposed to each other, may yet both be right. Just so is it in the material universe: the great course of nature may run on for untold ages with the regularity of clock-work, and yet all the while be ripening for some pre-ordained catastrophe which from the foundation of the cosmos was, as Plato would phrase it, an idea in the Divine mind.

Thus far, then, the natural world around us has furnished the means whereby the human mind may acquire some knowledge—however imperfect and dim—of the workings of an infinite Creator. We have seen that, if we examine any piece of natural mechanism, we find not only that it has been constructed with an unmistakably manifest design, but that most ingenious and elaborate contrivances have been provided to meet all contingences, and are such as we ourselves, in the exercise of our ingenuity, should devise, if only we could exert the same wonder-working control over the realm of nature. "We have noted, also, that we are conscious ourselves of possessing reason and will, though utterly without the power to understand whence they spring; but the very possession of them enables us to conceive how they might be exercised by a power far greater than ourselves. Further, we have seen that when we carry our researches up to the extreme verge of human penetration, there is no slackening of marvellous agencies; but rather the reverse. As we descend the scale of animal life the exercise of reason may grow feebler, but the powers of instinct grow stronger; and instinct is nothing else than a direct inspiration from the Almighty.

Well, but if this be the case—if instinct is so immediate a gift from God, might we not say that the lower animals are more highly endowed than ourselves? The teachings of the Almighty are surely superior to the

feeble efforts of human intellect and ingenuity. This is true; and wherever man endeavours to compete with animal instincts in their special sphere of action, he will find himself surpassed. But man though his animal instincts may be inferior, has not been by any means disregarded by his Maker; and I shall employ the remainder of my lecture in endeavouring to point out his true position in the universe He is a new creation—indeed "creation's heir"—"midway from nothing to infinity."

Professor M'Coy, in a very thoughtful and learned lecture, recently delivered before this Society, pointed out in what way the discoveries of science support the statements of Holy Writ. Creation began with the call into existence of lifeless atoms of definite size, and shape, and weight; and of these were made not only the earth, but the most distant orbs of heaven. When the almighty fiat went forth—" Let there be light—electric and magnetic forces on a large scale, and chemical affinities on a small, sprang into being. The step to organic life is another creative act: the growth of the simplest plant is something vastly different in kind from the aggregation of the most delicate crystal. When we come to consciousness, we have a new creation again, there being no discernible link between mere organic growth and mental consciousness or any other power of an animal's soul. At this point the learned Professor stopped, his subject closing there. When, however, we go on to man, once more there is a new creation, for man has capacities differing in kind from those of the lower animals. He has powers of imagination, and can abstract his mind altogether from the things of sense, and so realise to himself things past and things to come; he can thus hold converse with the mighty dead, and has irrepressible longings after a happy future. Much more than this—he has capacity to reverence his Maker; he has a moral sense of right and wrong; he has a conscience which feels pain if he thinks he has offended his spiritual Father, and pleasure if he thinks he is forgiven. But although such capacities as these are part of the human soul as created by God, we cannot but acknowledge that many men are nothing more than animals. A mere savage is only a kind of dangerously clever brute. The normal man may have higher capacities than the brute, yet capacity does not imply that a thing is necessarily replenished with what it is capable of containing. A vessel may have capacity to hold a gallon and may yet be empty. Besides which, a faculty may be lost or it may have been defective from birth, just as some men are born blind, though sight is an essential part of man in his normal condition.

What then, let us ask, is the essential difference between savage and civilised man ? In other words, is the most highly cultivated man only a variety of the cannibal, just as many fruits and flowers admit of vast improvement by mere force of circumstances? Or in man's progress to perfection have faculties of a higher order been granted to him over and above what he had before? In resolving this question I shall first invite your attention to the revelations which the sacred page of Scripture makes on this subject.

Twice in the epistles of St. Paul are the constituents of man spoken of as *body*, *soul* and *spirit*: and corresponding with these three terms, we have in Scripture three phrases—*the carnal man*, *the psychical man* and *the spiritual man*. It must be noted, however, that in one translation the word *psychical* does not occur. *Psyche* is the Greek for soul; and although we have the word *soul*, we have no adjective corresponding to it. In this poverty of our language the translators were compelled to have recourse to the word *natural*, and in one passage to the word *sensual*, which is simply confounding it with the word *carnal*. In Scripture, indeed, this confusion does not make any logical difference; for there both the carnal and the psychical man are put in direct contrast with the spiritual man. Put to the subject under discussion the distinction between the two words becomes important, for we want to ascertain how one passes into the other—whether by development or by a new creation.

A brute animal has a body and some kind of soul. Man—the natural man—has a body and a higher order of soul. But what is the spirit in man ? It is altogether a higher life, and gifted with faculties of a higher order. It is as much the life of the soul, as the soul is the life of the body. Without the soul the body ceases to live: and without the spirit the soul ceases to live. Hence the validity of the Scripture phrase, "the second death." The earliest gifts of the spirit are, like the earliest gifts of the body and of the soul, instinctive. Hunger and thirst are bodily instincts; anger and fear, avarice and ambition, are instincts of the soul; and with these instincts brute animals and man were endowed in various ways and degrees at their several creations. The instincts of the spirit are quite as distinctively marked. We call them gifts or graces of the Holy Spirit. Not more surely do hunger and thirst prove the existence of aliments suited to our bodily sustenance; not more surely do fear and avarice prove the existence of danger, and the necessity of providing against want, than do the earnest longings of the spiritual man to feel clean in the sight of God, and to know more of the deep things of God, prove the reality of the things he longs for. The habit of prayer, or at all events the appetency for it incident to man, is another proof of some essential connection with an unseen world. Prayer is not a mere petition for things of which we stand in need; but, as sings the poet:—

Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,  
Uttered or unexpressed;  
The motion of a hidden fire  
Which trembles in the breast.

To express the act of preferring some special request at the throne of grace there is another word in Scripture, *supplication*; but prayer is the communion of the soul with God, even when no especial want is felt. Therefore are we bidden to pray always—*i. e.*, at all stated seasons; for prayer is the food of the spirit. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are standing witnesses of the truths of revelation. "The Holy Spirit beareth witness with our spirit." A man with his bodily eye always knows when he sees the light, from the inseparable connection there is between light and his visual organ. In exactly the same way, the spiritual eye recognises spiritual truth. When Simon Peter answered and said, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God," flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him. And in the same way no man can call Jesus the Christ, except through the instrumentality of spiritual eyesight; otherwise he is blind, knowing nothing.

Here, however, I must pause to put you on your guard against a common source of error. Inspiration is often confounded with revelation; but the two are essentially distinct. Revelation is a special communication from the Holy Spirit, made only to a few chosen individuals; but all believers are, without exception, in their degree inspired. Thus, also, all Scripture is inspired: but it does not all consist of revelation. When the inspired Paul sent for his cloak, which he had left behind at Troas, he was not prompted thereto by the Holy Spirit; and there are many things put down in Scripture of the like order.

One man alone is spoken of in the sacred records, to whom the Spirit was given without measure. But every believer is warranted to expect and to hope that he may be filled with all the fulness of God; and so different is the faculty thus given from any other faculty previously possessed, that the Apostle Paul hesitates not to designate the Christian as a new creation of the Almighty. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature,"—not *creature*, as we now understand the word, but a fresh product in the work of creation.

Now, had Scripture been an exact science, this would have settled the question at once. But Scripture is not an exact science, and the question remains to be asked—Does the Apostle, when he uses the word *creation* here, employ it in the way of bold hyperbole, to which figure of speech the oriental mind has always been partial; or does he really mean a literally new creation? In other words—Is the Scripture language on this subject only "after the manner of men,"—a mere accommodation to the weakness of our mental faculties,—or are the terms *new birth* and *new creation bona fide* analogies? I answer that in my own opinion they are real analogies.

For what is a natural analogy? It is a certain correspondence or harmony which prevails throughout all created things, betokening that they come from the same common source—were conceived by the same creative mind. A type, once obtaining in any department of nature, is slowly departed from, and then for assignable reasons. Parallels may be found in widely separated regions of contemplation which reflect a mutual light. This principle of analogy is of immense importance to us. Were not for this great principle our knowledge of anything beyond the reach of our senses would be very limited indeed. We should not be able to classify any of the multitudinous objects in the physical world; but should be constrained to depend upon sheer memory for all we knew. And even then our knowledge would be a shapeless mass of unconnected facts without mutual harmony, nor would they inspire anything of that intense interest which is now lent to them by the wonderful analogies reigning everywhere. The continuity of law prevails throughout all God's works so vigorously, and is so conscientiously carried out—I say *conscientiously*, for in accommodation to our weakness, God has condescended to be regarded by his creatures as faithful and true, faithful to all his covenants, notwithstanding his irresistible power to act as capriciously as he chooses—that a given type is apparently never arbitrarily departed from; but one phase of creation passes on to another by hardly-perceptible steps of gradation. Indeed, this very uniformity in the laws of creation has proved a stumbling block to some, leading them to fancy that laws so undeviating must be self originating. But the real effect of this fidelity, this absence of all "variableness or shadow of turning, is to enable us with telescopic glance to see immeasurable distances into past ages, and to form legitimate conjectures respecting tilings unseen.

If then, theology and science dovetail with each other in this remarkable manner, are we not justified in studying them in combination, and so obtain the broadest possible view of Divine wisdom which the two united are competent to display? What a vista has not the geologist opened to our wondering gaze through the abyss of his measureless periods of past time! Turning our eyes in that direction, we see creative power unceasingly at work, while at the same time whole races of animals have been continually passing out of existence. And yet, such is the harmonious linking on of the successive phases of being, that we cannot conceal

from ourselves the extreme probability that creation itself was governed by a certain continuity of law, and that each consecutive fiat of the Almighty through vast cycles of ages was the graduated evolution of one stupendous plan, which existed in the Divine mind before the foundation of the Universe. Such exhibitions of Almighty wisdom and power must be numbered with those things which the angels are said to desire to look into. They may contemplate them not in one orb only, but in far other analogues in the great immensity of being. As for ourselves we must be content to catch only faint and uncertain glimpses of such things; but we see enough to convince us that there is no impropriety, no extravagance in speaking of the spiritual man as a new creation. True, his soul closely resembles the soul of the unregenerate man; yet what objection is this? seeing that the body of that same unregenerate man quite as closely resembles the body of the antecedent gorilla. The chain of creation leads up with distinct, though wonderfully intertwined, links to man, who is at once both carnal and psychical—carnal inasmuch as he is allied on the side of his flesh to the beasts that perish; and psychical, inasmuch as he possesses a soul—a soul capable of vast development, but not of attaining spiritual life. We need no museum of specimens wherein to pursue our study of mankind. Unhappily, examples of the carnal man abound on every side. We may see him daily if we please, sunk in every sense to the level of the beasts that perish. Of the unregenerate psychical man we have a specimen in the highly cultivated unbeliever who, after grasping all human knowledge with the power of his commanding intellect, ends by exclaiming—"There is no God!" The highest type of spiritual man is portrayed in Scripture.

Let us now return to St. Paul, and see how the philosophic mind of the apostle deals with the origin of Christianity. He describes the whole world as groaning and travailing in pain (*i. e.*, in birth pangs) up to that period; and not the world only, but even Christians also, who had the first-fruits of the spirit, were nevertheless not yet free from the embryo state of spiritual creation. There was still groaning of the like kind to endure within themselves before the process which the apostle here calls the adoption were complete, and the body redeemed. What we have particularly then to notice is, that with this act of spiritual creation the whole world co-operated, as if it were the matrix out of which the new creation sprung. The unregenerate world it was which felt the birth-pains that, the Church of Christ might be born. I am perfectly aware how hard it is to say in all such Scripture statements how much is due to figurative illustration, and how much to a *bona fide* analogy; for it is only by distant adumbrations that we could expect to comprehend truths removed so far from the sphere of our present faculties. Still when a figure is employed, it must always contain essential points of resemblance to the things figured, or else it would be only an idle flourish of words.

Assuming, then, that this last order of animated being distinct creation, I may well employ the brief time which remains at my disposal in discussing its most essential characteristic; and this is its moral responsibility.

After studying the great works of the Almighty and the marvellous power therein displayed, the impression produced upon our minds is that of our own utter impotency to alter or resist any of the simplest of his decrees—an impression so profound that we find it difficult to conceive that we can have any responsibility at all. The Almighty made us what we are, and if we fall short of the standard of perfection we say, "Why then doth he yet find fault?" If fault there be, it cannot rest with us, but must ultimately pass back to our Creator. Now, without having recourse to reason, instinct would of itself suggest that there must be some error in this conclusion, for we are all morally conscious of responsibility, and sensitively shrink from imputing our sins and shortcomings to our Heavenly Father. When, however, we *do* apply our powers of reason to resolve the difficulty, we see that we have committed the same mistake by endeavouring to fathom infinity in the moral world, as those of which already in my lecture I have pointed out examples as occurring in the world of physical abstractions. Man cannot grasp infinity in any shape. To our view infinite justice and infinite mercy are incompatible, for God cannot be infinitely just if He allows one guilty person to escape, nor infinitely merciful if from a single culprit his pardon is withheld. Again, infinite wisdom and infinite power come into collision, for infinite wisdom is concerned in compassing by means of ingenious contrivances objects however difficult of attainment. But infinite power knows nothing of obstacles or impediments, but is exhibited in the instant execution of a purpose. Like a flash of lightning, the wish is no sooner conceived than the act is done. By virtue, however, of certain covenants made with the creatures of his hand, both animate and inanimate, the Sovereign of the Universe has put limits to his own power, so that something of the Great Incomprehensible comes within the limits of our comprehension. The covenant which God has made with the inanimate world is seen in the universal reign of law—a subject which the present Duke of Argyll has handled with such wonderful ability; and thus we comprehend his wisdom notwithstanding his infinite power. In like fashion he has made a covenant with his responsible creatures, the terms of which are perfectly intelligible; and as long as we confine ourselves within the limits of that covenant we meet with no difficulty but the practical one of doing our duty well. The moment, however, we attempt in our speculations to pass beyond the limits of this covenant, exactly the same order of difficulties besets us as in the physical world when, after having groped our way to the borders of our present epoch, we attempted to pass beyond an act of creation into another epoch of its existence. In the covenanted scheme of grace the Almighty has condescended to deal with his creatures as a

man—to speak to them as a man speaks, to act as a man acts. In the covenant or bargain he has made with us he has slated the conditions; and while we are fully certain that he for his part will most surely perform the promise he has made, so are we assured that adequate powers are within our reach whereby we can perform our portion of it too. All this is plainly revealed and is intelligible enough. But when we go further back, and come to consider the first step of a soul's approach to Christ, we become involved in inextricable perplexity. We read that no man can come to Jesus except the Father draw him: but we nowhere read how this is done. How does the Father draw him? By what mysterious law? Upon what grand principle of universal government? How came it to pass that the publican and harlot entered the kingdom of God before the well-instructed scribe and pharisee? Again, how far must the Father draw the soul, before the soul has power to act and choose for itself? Where does free will commence? Where does the soul's responsibility begin? Why are not all influenced alike? but some are drawn and others not? Holy Scripture furnishes no reply. Indeed, the very words of our Great Teacher, that no man can come to him except *the Father* draw him, prove that the subject is beyond the range of our present faculties. For we see it is the *Father's* doing; and what the Father does by himself must of necessity be out of the reach of our present faculties. What the *Son* does, we may understand; for *his* proceedings come professedly and purposely within the scope of our faculties; and so, again, what the Son with human means reveals of the Father, we may with human powers conceive: but that which the Father hath put in his own power, which he hath reserved entirely to himself, we must not expect to comprehend. Within the limits of the covenant our comprehension corresponds with what we understand of germination in the vegetable world, or of generation in the animal; and the very fact that such figures are repeatedly introduced in Scripture to illustrate the subject, gives reason to believe that such parallels are more than mere illustrations—that, they are positive analogies. But as we cannot in the least understand how the microscopic germ spot in an acorn should contain the future oak, or, in the egg, the future chicken, so neither can we understand how a soul is spiritually born. All such researches go too far back for us; all human knowledge takes its date from a point much nearer to ourselves.

Many have been greatly shocked at the idea of such multitudes of souls going down the broad road to perdition, while but few comparatively enter the narrow gate which leadeth unto life: and certainly, if such souls were to be tortured, as some have imagined, to all eternity, because they were not sufficiently gifted to be good Christians here, or because they never heard the word of salvation preached to them at all, there would indeed be strong ground for impugning the righteousness of God. But this necessary immortality of the soul is not a Christian dogma, but has rather been culled from the school of Plato. Our Teacher's words on the subject are—"Fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both body and soul in hell." Whatever gift of immortality was made to Adam at his creation, on the very day that he transgressed he died—lost not his animal life, but the principle of his spiritual life. We see clearly that his animal life was left to him. Now, as that which is born of the flesh is flesh by an essential law of creation, none of his posterity can have inherited from him any particle whatever of spiritual and immortal life. St. Paul takes this quite for granted (in 1 Cor. xv.) where he says that the first man is of the earth earthy, *i.e.*, made of clay; just as was said of him in Genesis—"Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return"—mere dust, with an animated soul breathed in. That St. Paul included this mortal soul in his idea of Adam's body is clear, by his own words; for when he has said there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body; he immediately adds—"and so it is written, the first Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam a quickening spirit." The body of the first Adam, along with its indwelling soul, he speaks of as corruptible, though capable of inheriting in corruption—mortal, though capable, under the influence of the quickening spirit, of putting on immortality. If it were immortal before, how could it put on immortality?

This leads me to notice in the last place the second death—a phrase which as you know occurs in Rev. ii, 11, "He that hath ears, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches. He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the second death;" and at Chap, xx, "Death and hell shall be cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire"—from which I argue that the lake of fire symbolises the great destroying agent. Death and Hell could be east into it for no other purpose than to be destroyed: and into it will be eventually thrown everything offensive, everything unfit to appear in the glories of that new creation in the dawn of which we now walk.

In taking this view of the destructibility of the human soul (and we may notice, by the way, that St. Paul always uses the word perdition) we by no means encourage the idea of man's irresponsibility. For although there may be but comparatively few who enter in by the straight gate, yet these are they who will eventually stand before the judgment seat of Christ; and it is exceedingly apposite to this topic to notice that in the parable of the marriage-feast, when the master comes in to see the guests, there is one, and only one, who has not on a wedding garment. This man must be the type and representative of a class very different from the vast multitudes who go down the broad way which leadeth to destruction. This unworthy man is actually found among the living at the feast of the blessed; but he represents apparently a very small minority. This is the man

punished with many stripes. The majority of the lost, being punished with few stripes, have already disappeared. From all which I am disposed to infer that those who never had a living faith will at their decease pass painlessly, like the brute-beasts, into a painless non-existence; and herein does Scripture confirm what sober reason would suggest. They have enjoyed their fair share of good things in this life, and they lose nothing at their death. Nothing—for they cannot be said to be deprived of what they never had, and which, if offered to them, they would value so little that, like Esau, they would probably sell it for a mess of pottage. But a very painful and heavy sentence overhangs that living soul, which, when the pleasant feast of immortality with its full serenity of joy is just about to begin, will have to be carried to the outer darkness to await along with Others, amid weeping and gnashing of teeth, the final destiny, whatever that may be—the second death.

I will conclude my lecture with citing a very remarkable passage from a heathen writer, one of the most remarkable passages outside the sacred writings, tallying, as it does, with our Saviour's parable in exhibiting the painfulness of the second death. It occurs in Persius's Satires. Persius is described to us as an ingenuous Roman youth of great refinement who died early, uncontaminated by the deluge of vice amid which he lived. He had joined the strictest sect of the religious opinions of his time—that of the Stoics. Speaking of savage tyrants whose souls had been stimulated to frightful lust, steeped in boiling poison, he prays to the great father of the gods, "*Magne paler divum,*" to punish them with a punishment which he designates as far worse than Phalaris's brazen bull, or Damocles' suspended sword, viz., that they should just catch a glimpse of the loveliness of virtue, and then pine away with unutterable regret that it was lost to them for ever.

Fergusson and Moore, Printers, 48 Flinders Lane East, Melbourne.

## Political Progress;

## Its Tendency and Limit: a Lecture

Delivered at the Duke of Edinburgh Theatre, on Monday, 22Nd August, 1870,

By the

Hon. H. J. Wrixon,

Solicitor-General of Victoria.

THE chair was taken by the Hon. GEORGE HIGINBOTHAM, late Attorney-General of Victoria, who introduced the lecturer.

The Hon. H. J. WRIXON said:—

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.

I hope it is not necessary that on the present occasion I should make any apology to you for asking your attention to a subject that relates to the Study of Government. No one, of course, would have the bad taste, when addressing an audience assembled under the circumstances in which we meet, to allude to politics in its party aspect, or to touch upon any of its aspects that might justly or fairly excite party opinions on either side. But, quite apart from politics in that aspect, there are general views connected with the Study of Government, general information bearing on that study, and general considerations deduced from the facts which we learn by enquiry, all of which it is important to bear in mind when we deal with the theory and principles of political life and action. In the political arena itself, these more general considerations are naturally enough rather at a discount, because, in the actual conflict of politics, to discourse then upon these general principles is something like discussing the theory of war in the middle of a general engagement, and fairly enough does not meet with any great favour. But yet, without a consideration of those general views and principles, it is almost impossible to form an intelligent public opinion on this important subject. You may of course, have your party views, and persons following one party or another with great devotion, but, without a consideration of the theories and principles on which the Science of Government—if it may be so called—depends, you will not have that intelligent public opinion which is so useful for the guidance and control of that active party political warfare in which we are all at various times engaged. Therefore I hope, Ladies and Gentlemen, in asking your attention to this subject, I may be able to bring before you some topics which will be instructive in the aspect I have alluded to, and which will, I trust, also be found not wholly uninteresting; and as I have a good deal to which I desire to ask your attention, I think I had better without further preface begin.

Now, when you talk of the Political Science or the Study of Government, you are in the first instance at once remitted to the origin of the political state; but I do not mean, this evening, to detain you by any erudite discussion as to the manner in which that origin is to be traced. Different theories have been suggested and different explanations given, all of which are supported by plausible views, and can be maintained by ingenious

arguments. But, without discussing that topic, we may begin with the undoubted fact that the first form of government—the infancy of the political state—is to be found in what is termed the patriarchal system of government: that is, in fact, the government of a family broadening into the government of a tribe. The family soon spreads into the tribe; the head of the family becomes the head of the tribe, and in that capacity has to discharge the" different duties of the ruler and the law giver, to which, in these earliest times, were also added those of the priest. You all recollect how an example of this very infant form of government is to be found in that most remarkable writing—the Book of Job. Those of you who are familiar with that book will recollect there a picture of a ruler who occupied such a position. You will recollect that Job appears to have been the governor of his tribe, and to have discharged, in addition to the duties of a ruler, those also of judge and priest. This is, of course, in the mere infancy—the first beginnings of human government. We find, however, that very rapidly the wants of men required a more complex state of government, and man's intelligence very soon came to be directed to those wants. We might refer, for example of the next stage of progress, to poems of a very ancient composition. I allude to the poems of Homer. You will find reflected there what I take as the next progressive stage of human government. We find developed in Homer's poems a system of government more advanced than that at which I have just glanced, but yet simple and child-like as compared with that which now prevails amongst men. We find in his poems a plan of government developed in which there appear to have been leading men—god-like men as they were termed—who controlled and influenced the body of the people. They were assisted by a council of chiefs, all of whom held their position oil account of their intrinsic merit, being as it were naturally born to command; and then there was also a general assembly of the people, in which the views of the leaders were propounded and discussed. But in this early system of government it is interesting to note that several principles which are now accepted as common-place's among us, seem to have had no part or portion whatever. For example, of the principle of equality—of one man being as good as another—about which I shall have more to say before I sit down, we see no germ whatever.

Of another principle, too, now familiar to us, and which is the great instrument by which we work our political institutions—I mean the principle majority ruling—there is no trace to be found in the poems of Homer. On the contrary, we find that when those leading men—the wise men and chiefs—consulted the people, it was not so much with any view of obtaining the opinion of the majority, or of being Raided by it, but rather for the purpose of influencing the people to comply with the conclusions that they had previously agreed upon. And they certainly seem to have adopted with their opposition a much more summary course than in our times would be considered at all allowable. We read of one debate in which the project of the leaders was opposed by a poor and ignorant man, but his objections were put down summarily by the violence of one of the chiefs, who assailed him and belaboured him with his sceptre, and that amid the general laughter and approval of the assembly. So that in this first form of human government, consultation with the people, and their admission to deliberative rights, appears to have obtained in a very circumscribed and limited manner indeed. Well, now, if we go a little further beyond these two first stages of human government, we find in the works of another ancient writer, much deeper and keener reflections on the principles of human government than anything suggested in what I have already adverted to. We find in the works of Aristotle several acute and profound reflections on the theory of human government; and it is interesting and important to us in observing these early views, to notice how diverse they often are from those which now prevail amongst us. For we are very apt to get into the groove of the age in which we live. We are exceedingly apt to think that the only wisdom is that which we see obtaining in our own age; and it is profitable to us, and tends to enlarge our views and ideas, to consult older writers, men of great intellect, and who present views of government different to those which are familiar to us at the present time.

Now this writer (Aristotle,) at whose views I will just glance, enters with great acuteness into several problems which then perplexed men, and which cannot at all yet be considered to be settled. He enumerates the different kinds of human government. He says that if you give the government to the many, they are apt to oppress the few; and that, as the majority are poor and the few rich, you will have the many poor oppressing the few rich. On the other hand, if you give the government to the few who are wealthy, they, again, will oppress and disregard the rights of those who are poor. But, if you have an aristocracy—which in his time meant the best of the people, not only those who had been born to the position, but were really the best of the community—that means the exclusion from honours and offices of all but the aristocrats themselves Having set out these difficulties clearly, he observes that some may say the law should be supreme; but he at once answers that you must have some one to execute the law, and thus you have all your difficulties to face again. He further says that in every business there are three classes of people. There are the people who do the work, there are the people who superintend the work, and there are the people who study the theory and he says that it is often found that they who do the work—those of the lowest class—though they are not able themselves to discharge the higher duties, are yet uncommonly good judges of those on whom those duties devolve. In politics, he observes, it is just the same. You have the mass of the people, and those who are statesmen, and those who

study the theory; and whatever you may think about the capability of the mass of the people to study the science of government, or to undertake administration, yet they are good judges, and keen judges, of those who take it upon themselves to discharge either the one duty or the other—good judges of practical men, and often, too, sound judges of theory.

And that is an observation which has been frequently used since. It affords foundation for an argument that Lord Russell puts forward in support of his views in favour of an enlarged political franchise; and it is interesting to note how this writer, who lived in such a totally different state of society from ourselves, and surrounded by conditions of human thought wholly alien to ours, suggests a view undoubtedly just, and a view which has influenced the course of political progress among ourselves. And you will see how totally different was the state of society in which Aristotle lived, when I tell you that in the same work in which is contained these deep reflections upon the political art, you find announced other principles, and other topics handled, which you would be very much surprised indeed to hear propounded now. For example, you hear him discoursing upon the manner in which the public feast tables should be laid out, devoting a whole chapter to the way in which the public dinners should be conducted, and discoursing at great length upon the question of marriage as a matter, the details of which the state ought to regulate, as also the manner of bringing up children, with regard to which he declares that only the healthy children should be preserved, and that the unhealthy and deformed should be made away with.

These are ideas we have wholly discarded, but that increases the interest in what remained; it increases our admiration of the man who, in the mere infancy of human thought, spoke so much and so clearly about principles upon which rest the foundations of society. But now, when we thus come to that period of political progress in which we reach a settled form of government, such as we find pretty fairly developed in the works of Aristotle—the regular institution, as it were, of politics—the best thing we can do in tracing its onward course is to take the history of our own country, both because in that history we find the most perfect chain of political progress, and also because its result has been a system of government which, slightly varied, bids fair to encompass the whole of the civilized world. If we propose to consider "Political Progress; its Tendency and its Limit," I don't think we can do better than take that political progress which in its origin is embodied in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race, and is now the property of the world. Not that I intend to detain you with any detailed account of the political history of Great Britain. I shall only glance at that history, and it will lead us up to the particular point to which I desire to ask your attention more fully this evening. Now, all of you who have considered the history of our own country are aware that in the early times, before we had parliamentary government, and knew the force of representative institutions, the king or sovereign was the great power in the community. Different writers have described the functions which he discharged, and the duties which devolved upon him, but you can get a very good idea of them by observing what is done in the name of the sovereign now. If you look at the *London Government Gazette*, or at our own *Government Gazette*, or observe the records of public proceedings you will be struck by the number of things the Queen is supposed to do—the number of duties and functions the sovereign is supposed to perform. Now the simple fact is, that, in the early times, the sovereign used pretty much in his own right and by his own power to perform all those functions. At present, as you know, they are practically done by persons who are answerable to the people; and though, nominally, the sovereign is doing these different acts, they are really done by persons who may, at any time, be called to account, which is the great feature of our political system. But, in the earlier days, the king performed most of these acts on his own responsibility. That being so, I need not tell you that his power was very great. This power seems, however, from the very earliest period, to have been limited by three qualifications,—qualifications about which authors have disputed with very great warmth as to how far they were binding, and how far only illusory, but which, I imagine, were disregarded when there was a strong sovereign and a weak parliament, and observed when there was a weak king and an active parliament. The restrictions, as you probably remember, were that the sovereign was not to tax without the consent of the parliament; that he was not to make laws without its sanction, and that he was under a general obligation to conduct the government of the country according to law.

These were the three general limitations which qualified the power of the sovereign, and which were enforced, more or less, very much as the people had power or opportunity to enforce them; and in the Great Charter which we have all read of in our school books, we find these principles recognised. And certainly that charter is a remarkable document, and one which may well justify all the enthusiasm which political writers have expressed about it, for in it we find embodied and clearly recognised great principles of human liberty, principles which were in practice often but imperfectly vindicated, but which still we find there asserted by all the leading men in England.

However, the mere granting of a charter, or any nominal concession of political rights, would not have been of much use to any people—as I need not tell you—unless some means of giving practical reality to what was conceded could be found out, and therefore it is that a peculiar interest attaches to the gradual growing up of

what we now know as the House of Commons. In these early times the House of Commons was a very different body indeed to that which now bears the name. It was then, in fact, an assemblage of persons, who were sent by the different constituencies to the general council of the country as their mere agents or attorneys, to stipulate for them with regard to the amount of the monetary contributions which they were to make to the general revenue. That was what the House of Commons was originally. Accordingly we find in those early times that a member sent to the House of Commons was paid his wages just as any other attorney or agent would have been. Now, when a man wishes to be elected to parliament, he frequently presents the inhabitants of the town, which he proposes to ask for election, with a fine park, or some other monument of his munificence or if that does not do, he spends thousands of pounds in securing his election. It is a well-known fact that one election has cost as much as £100,000; but it was very different in the old times. Then, when they sent agents or deputies to the general council, they had to pay them for giving their time and trouble to the service, and you find some very curious records of this state of affairs. For example, we find one sheriff of a county indicted because he paid too much for a member to go to Parliament. The indictment set forth that the sheriff had paid £20 when he could have got a man to go to Parliament just as well for £10. I mention this fact because it will give you a better and clearer idea of the real nature of the early House of Commons than any lengthened disquisition about it. But though that early House of Commons appears to us now to stand in a comparatively insignificant light, being thus an assemblage of persons paid to perform a simple service, and paid such small sums, yet there lay concealed in this institution a great and vital power to which is owing the whole of the political progress of England, and I may add of the world, namely—the power of money. It was their legitimate right (though often infringed in the early times) to say how much money was to be granted. That power was imperfectly recognised in the beginning, yet still they held fast to it. Under different reverses and infinite difficulties the House of Commons in England always adhered to that right, and England, you will observe, occupying an insular position, and not being compelled to support a standing army as were other continental nations, there was no really decisive way of bringing mere brute force to crush the rights thus claimed for the people. So we find throughout the whole history of Britain that the House of Commons having the power of giving money, and the sovereign always wanting money, they continued making demands, and he, in return for grants, making concessions. He had no effectual means of crushing the opposition of the Commons, and therefore he, from time to time, made terms with them. This, doubtless, is the secret of political success in Great Britain. I need not tell you that this success was a very gradual process, and that, though there was this germ of power, never wholly crushed, yet still its growth was slow. We find, from reign to reign, and generation to generation, the struggle continued, and from the time of King John even up to the time of Queen Elizabeth, we frequently notice how limited was the recognised power of the Commons, though, through their secret power as it were, their unrecognised power was gradually growing and surging upwards. We observe in the reign of Queen Elizabeth the request for free speech still continued every session. That is one of the most marked signs of the inferior position which the Commons held. Even as late as that reign, the speaker, every session, requested from the sovereign the right of free speech; and you may, possibly, recollect the answer of the haughty Queen to one of these demands, namely, that, as for free speech, she was quite willing they should have it, but she wished them to understand what it extended to—simply "aye" or "no," and nothing more. I need not tell you that that would be a license of parliamentary speech wholly inadequate to our present requirements. However, at this same period, several great changes had taken place in the world which were reacting on the course of English political progress. There was the Reformation, which signalled the unloosing of a great mental power, and which told more directly and pointedly on English politics than it did on the politics of any other country in the world. The invention of Printing—which I need scarcely allude to—was of itself alone sufficient to create and effect a revolution; and, accordingly, we find growing up during the reign of Queen Elizabeth a great power, which she was just able to keep under, but which her successors were wholly unable to control, namely—the Puritan element, which identified itself with the progressive and democratic party in England. Now, I need not go through in detail the various stages of political progress that followed. In the reign of Charles I. we find one marked stage signalled by the well-known Petition of Right—a great document in the history of English political freedom; a document which contains the principle frequently before that violated, but still never given up, viz., that the sovereign was in no case to tax without the authority of parliament. That was put foremost in this Petition of Right; for by this time the political leaders had come to clearly understand the primary importance of that political privilege. They clearly realised that everything depended on it, and accordingly we find it heading the claims of the Petition of Right. The second demand was, that he was not to imprison without the authority of law; the third was directed against an abuse at that time growing up, that he was not to introduce martial law, but leave unimpaired the authority of the common and statute law of the kingdom. This period, then, represents another stage of British political progress, though, as you will no doubt recollect, for a time the Petition of Right failed. The king broke loose from the obligations he had entered into, and himself fell a sacrifice to the indignation of those whose rights he had violated, and with whom he had

broken faith. No doubt, looking back on that—the first—revolution, in which Charles I. was brought to the scaffold, we must admit that it was imperfect. It was too violent. It was not conducted with English moderation, and on that account, no doubt, it ultimately failed, and the royal line was brought back again in Charles II. Yet that first revolution effected this great object: it, as it were, familiarised the people of England with the idea of revolution whenever it might be found necessary. It was, I say, imperfect in itself. It was too violent and did not succeed. Yet it left a lesson and made a mark on the minds of the people of England, that whenever they were very hard set they could have a revolution again; and that I take to be one great use of the revolution that brought Charles I. to the scaffold.

The second revolution, you will recollect—that which ejected James II. from England—was carried out in a much more business-like and effectual manner. You will remember that that was a revolution conducted and completed by some of the greatest statesmen and lawyers that have ever appeared in any country; who, by natural right as it were, went to the front—carried out that revolution—and recorded the rights which they claimed in the Bill of Rights, taking every step as closely as could be in accordance with the Constitution, from which for a time they had to depart.

The Bill of Rights, which was passed after James II. had been deposed, contained a record and summary of the privileges claimed by the people of England, defined, though in the midst of revolution, in a temperate and constitutional manner; and thus this revolution was marked by the absence of the excesses with which national movements of that kind have been often conducted, and was stamped with a peculiarly English character; conducted, as it was, by statesmen, led by an aristocracy then the natural leaders of the people, and perfected by the advent of a constitutional prince. This moderation enabled them to achieve permanent success; and we thus reach a stage of political progress where we find parliamentary government clearly established, and constitutional rule as the normal condition of English sovereignty. No marked change, nor any striking principle, presents itself from this time until about the end of the eighteenth century, when we reach a period distinguished by a great upheaval of the human intellect, by a novel development of political principle, which wholly modified the current of English political progress, established principles that are yet actively at work among us, and of which we have not yet seen the limit, or ultimate effect.

Before I advert to this new principle, let me ask you to observe that so far in English political progress the great effort and struggle of the people was to secure their chartered rights. All their struggle was to secure what was given to them by such and such a charter. Were they to be deprived of what was secured to them by this act of parliament or that? We find nothing about the rights of men in general, it is all about the rights of Englishmen. The first charter to which I have alluded, for example (that of King John,) was supposed to be a copy of an earlier charter, which was itself asserted to be a mere embodiment of the ancient common law rights of the people. We find in the Petition of Rights the same point alluded to. In this petition it is asserted that "your servants have *inherited* this freedom." In the Bill of Rights they recite again that they propose to do as their ancestors have in like case done in the vindication of their liberties; and throughout the whole course and current of English political progress you will find the same feature obtaining in a marked degree. "What are our legal rights?" was the question they asked themselves; and, turning to different charters, they pointed out what they were entitled to, and of what they were illegally deprived. You may recollect that Shakspeare, who is such a correct interpreter of the feeling and character of his age, in representing the career of Jack Cade, a violent and reckless rebel, shows that this feeling of ancient lineage and ancient rights was a potent principle with the people of England, because Cade, you may remember, when haranguing the mere rabble, tells them that he was entitled to their favour because his father was a Mortimer, his mother a Plantagenet, and his wife a descendant of the Lacies; and when he reproaches the people, he says that he did not think they would have given up their arms until they had vindicated their *ancient* freedom. And Shakspeare only represents what was the settled principle of the English people. In fact, the great question with them was one often found in old law volumes,—"What saith the book?" what, in fact saith the letter of the law? In all their struggles and demands you find no allusion to the rights of men; it is all, what are they entitled to under their charters as Englishmen.

But now a great change was coming over the world, and over England too. I have alluded to the end of the eighteenth century as the period when this change began to set in. Just at this time there was a new principle about to be announced, a principle which is yet actively at work, and which has not nearly run its course, and the ultimate effect of which none can tell. I refer to the principle of the equality of men. Now, when I call it a new principle I mean new as applied to the active affairs of life; because it was not an entirely new idea—this principle of the equality of men. In very early times, quite as early as those to which I referred when I commenced to address you, we find this notion expounded by different political writers. It was one of the principles of the Roman lawyers—the principle that all men were equal was one that was recognised as amongst the settled axioms of their science. But it was with them a mere idea, a mere principle which was necessary for the logical unity of their system, just as in the same way we find lawyers in the present day asserting that everyone knows the law—a principle which, I need not say, is open to criticism, because some of

the lawyers themselves do not know it, but yet it is necessary for the logical consistency of the theory of English law. Well, just in the same way, those early Roman lawyers used to assert that all men were equal, but only, in that aspect, as for the purpose of rendering complete the juridical system they expounded. The principle was also announced by different philosophers and men of science and letters in later times. Hobbs, a great English thinker, proclaimed it point blank—nature, he said, had made very little difference between them. But although he announced this as a matter of science, he was himself in political principle an ardent Tory. But with much more earnestness and force was this principle championed by the thinkers, philosophers and writers of the French school. Rousseau amongst others embraced and championed it illustrated it with ingenuity, and clothed it with eloquent language. These thinkers and philosophers, disgusted as they were with the tyranny and oppression which kept clown the mass of men, and seeing the narrow theories and selfish principles that ruled the institutions about them, championed abroad the grand idea that, whatever institutions you might have, whatever form of government you instituted, however hopeless and miserable the social lot of the people, yet men were entitled to equal rights; and that whatever oppression you subjected them to you did not destroy those rights. There still remained the great principle implanted by the Deity in the human heart, that all men were entitled to equality.

They heralded and championed this view, but still it was with them only the sentiment—though a noble sentiment—of a few men of letters. But about this time came the great French Revolution. That revolution was in itself, as we all know, marked by horrible atrocities, by those exhibitions of fiendish disposition which we must expect in men just loosed from slavery. But amidst all its crimes it had still this great merit: it bore aloft, as it were, and raised into the living world, the great principle of the equality of men, wherever they came from, and proclaimed that no kings, or aristocracies, or institutions of government could suppress that great truth. With all the excesses of the French Revolution it embodied that principle, and it bore the idea of the equality of men—for the first time it bore it—prominently into the active every day world. But now, if it had merely been left with the French to work out, much would not have come of it, because, admirable as the French people are in many respects, they are not distinguished by practical persistence in supporting their views, and they had been so long subject to slavery that theirs were not the hands to win victory for this principle. It is strange to notice the way in which Providence seems to work out great movements in the world; for just at the time that this great principle of human equality was raised aloft for a moment by the French Revolution in a wild shriek of liberty; just at this time there was at the other end of the world—practically much more remote than we are now from Europe—growing up the United States of America; and there you had a people eminently qualified to embody, preserve, and adorn any political principle they embraced. This people, just rising from infancy into nationality, with all their instincts in favour of freedom quickened by their separation from the mother country, and, at the same time, east loose from the mere heritage of charters, or acts of parliament, which had at once preserved and limited English freedom: this people, just rising into independence—a steady people—a grave people—a moral people: they were just the very people to take up and give practical effect to this mere principle thrown up among men by the great French Revolution. And, accordingly, this idea of the equality of men was caught up and responded to by the young American states, and preserved there, until it has become the great active principle of our time. Prominent among the men who championed this principle was Thomas Jefferson, who is another example of what is often observed, that the men who most influence mankind are often not themselves really the ablest, intellectually. Thomas Jefferson was a man by no means of a commanding intellect; but, nevertheless, he possessed great determination and a clear insight into things political. With him is identified mainly the progress and success of the principle of human equality in the United States. He threw himself body and soul, as it were, into the advocacy of that principle, and secured its complete predominance in the Government and institutions of America. We find in his first inaugural message, for the first time clearly announced, the principle that the majority must rule. And the principles thus given practical shape in the United States, soon reacted on England. I apprehend it will be found, that after the close of the eighteenth century, the political progress of England was something different from what it was before. You do not find after this period the same adherence to the mere chartered rights of Englishmen. You find new ideas of political progress setting in. For example, in the great reform of 1832, there is a prominent and decisive move towards the general rights of all—a move that could not be justified merely by a reference to the ancient theory of political liberty. On the contrary, I think that the observation of the Duke of Wellington made at that time was really a true one, though he did not take the deepest and most statesmanlike view of what was going on. But when he said it was "revolution by due course of law," he said what was perfectly right, because that was really what then began—taking into account not merely the change in the electoral franchise that was then made, but the manner in which it was carried, viz., by establishing formally the political principle that the House of Lords was not entitled, in any case, to object to what the Commons finally determined on. There you find a marked advance in the political progression of England, and an advance due, as it seems to me, to this one principle brought to light by the French Revolution. Well, after this reform of 1832, it was easy to see that

progression must go on more and more. Some of the politicians who had brought about that reform spoke of it as being final—Lord John Russell, for example, and the witty dean of St. Paul's. Sydney Smith, who was an ardent supporter of the reform measure, a few years after it was passed began complaining of its effects, clearly showing this—that all the time political progress was rushing on, while the men who had effected that political movement were standing still. I will read to you the observations that Sydney Smith makes, because it is curious to observe what he says about it, and to compare with his observations what has since occurred. He says:—

*"It is hardly necessary to say anything about universal suffrage, as there is no act of folly or madness that it may not in the beginning produce. There would be the greatest risk that the monarchy, as at present constituted, the funded debt, the established church, titles, and the hereditary peerage, would give way before it. Many really honest men may wish for this change. I know, or at least believe, that wheat and barley would grow if there were no Archbishop of Canterbury; the domestic fowl would still breed if our Viscount Melbourne were again called Mr. Lamb; but he has stronger nerves than I have who would venture to bring this change about..... The people seem to be hurrying through all the well-known steps to anarchy. They must be stopped at some pass or another. The first is the best, and most easily defended."*

This shows us how political progression was going on, because these were the words of a man who most ardently supported the cause of reform in 1832; but he stood aghast at the effects that measure produced. What is the answer to these fears and remonstrances? What is the next thing? "Why, that we find the Conservative or Tory party, not very many years after, passing a reform bill that closely approximates to universal suffrage. We find the principle of an established church, you may say, practically given up; we find the ballot in England conceded; we find the question of the re-distribution of seats, as it is termed—or giving members more to numbers—also conceded, as one that must necessarily be included in any new measure of reform; so that, in a very few years, changes which the political reformers of thirty years ago would, even in the heat of their conflict, have denounced, are now being accomplished.

The London *Punch* of a very few years ago amused his readers with some satirical sketches of what was to happen in England at the end of the century, politically. Among these was one representing what was to take place in the House of Commons, and one feature of which was "Sir John Bright" being a member of the Government. That was then thought so amusing and extravagant that it formed a subject for *Punch*. Now we find not merely that that eminent man is a member of the Government, but that his views and principles are those which mainly influence the Government; and though he remains untitled, not the less is his influence predominating over the people and the Government of England. This shows how rapid is the political progress which is going on. Now Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright are the leading men—they are the progressive men—the men who embody the advanced views. But I doubtless address many young men this evening; and I can assure them that they will live to see the principles of Mr. Bright and Mr. Gladstone antiquated. They will live to see them regarded as men who were very good in their age, and who did very good service in their time to the liberal cause, just as Earl Russell and Lord Brougham are now regarded. But other men will take the lead and conduct the political progress which those men who now guide it will not be then considered sufficiently advanced to head. And now, if there is anything in this view of political progress that we have been taking, if it be true as a fact—and it is only of facts that I desire to speak—that we are all hurrying on with this rapid progress, I think it is only natural for one to inquire, "Where is all this going to?—In what is all this political progress to end?" From centuries ago, when the people contended for the mere right not to have their money taken from them without their consent, and not to be imprisoned without due course of law—to the next stage, when they contended to keep unimpaired the privileges of their representatives—to the subsequent stage, when they contended for the admission to political rights of a larger section of the people—to the present stage, when so many of the ancient landmarks of the Constitution have been swept away—from that early time to this, and looking forward to further progress, I think it is a natural question to ask, "Where is it all to end?—what is its object?—what, in fact, is its tendency?" In order to consider what is the tendency of all this, I beg you to observe, at the outset, what it is that is really taking place. You find some people speaking of the dread they feel of a loosening of all the powers of government, and of a fear that political progress will lead to the relaxing of that authority which is necessary for the maintenance of the social state. Now that I take to be a complete mistake, for nothing of the kind is going on. What is really going on is this: there is a transfer of power taking place from one set of depositories to another, a transferring of the power from kings and aristocracies to the mass of the people. That is the real movement which is going on, and it is in the light of that movement that we have to consider the different tendencies which are observable and will be observable with regard to this political progress.

Now, there are several minor, though very important tendencies to which I think I need not ask your attention in detail. The most marked of these minor tendencies is the tendency to sink individualism in the general power and weight of the community. This is one which unquestionably accompanies political

progress—the tendency to make the individual less and the community more. I might illustrate this tendency to make less of individual rights. Lord Chatham, alluding at one time to the rights of Englishmen, said that the poorest man in his cottage might defy all the force of the Crown. It might be ruined, its walls might be broken down, the wind might enter it, the rain might enter it, but the king of England could not. With all his forces he could not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement. Now, what Lord Chatham expressed in those picturesque terms figures the power of the individual—his being entitled to stand on his rights against the representative of the whole community, and in doing so it figures a principle which daily tends to grow weaker. The more political progress advances, the less will be the weight of those individual rights. You will observe that I am not now discussing whether these tendencies be good or bad—how far they are objectionable, or how far they are to be applauded—but I am only alluding to what they unquestionably are, and no one who observes the course of political progress will doubt that one great tendency of it will be to weaken the position of the individual. It tends, indeed, to have a deeper and keener influence than is represented by any mere infringement of men's personal rights. It has a tendency to control thought itself. It will be found that the more political progress advances the more the general opinion of all tells : and the more the weight of the general mind of the community comes to be felt, the less scope there is for individual opinion; in fact, the less chance there is for a man to be singular. His opinions are apt to be controlled and dominated by the great weight of the general opinion about him, pressing him in on all sides, enclosing him, contracting him, as it were, and subjecting him to the general pressure—like the air itself—of the common opinion. I do not mean to say that this tendency must necessarily run its full course, because there is great friction in human society, and if we want real progress we should endeavour to prevent tyranny of opinion as much as any other tyranny. Nevertheless, there is this tendency, and it will become more marked every day. Accompanying this increasing tendency of the majority to absolute dominance you certainly have this compensating influence, you have, the general rectitude of the views of the majority as a security. If the majority do predominate, if the majority do claim and exercise this weight, it is accompanied by this, that generally the efforts of the majority are for the good of the whole. There is a remarkable illustration of that in the late American war. In that war I don't think it can be questioned that the minority, the Southerners, had the law on their side. They were strictly contending only for their constitutional rights. I believe that anyone who has studied that constitutional question will say that this is the case, and, therefore, so far it was an invasion on the part of the majority of the constitutional right of the South; but yet, you will observe that that invasion of those rights was marked by a determination to vindicate the great principle of human freedom, and was distinguished, when they did succeed, by a remarkable consideration and forbearance towards those whom they had conquered. Whatever view we may take of that American war, none can question, I think, that it exhibited these two features, and so it is an illustration of the fact that this marked tendency of modern political progress—the tendency to sink the individual—dangerous though it be, carries with itself, at least, one great compensating principle. But we need not pursue these different political tendencies in detail, because there is this great tendency of political progress one which embraces all the rest—which is becoming more marked each year that we live, and which has only begun to produce its effects,—and that is the tendency more and more to effect that equality of men to which I have alluded, and I believe that the avowed aspiration of all political progress is to promote and secure that equality. That is the distinguishing feature and the marked tendency of all political progress in our time.

Now, it is no use to talk merely of generalities. Let us look a little more closely at what the meaning of this political equality is; let us see, in fact, what we mean when we talk of the equality of men. When we talk of men being equal, what do we mean? Take one set of persons who are without education or means of knowledge, who reflect on very little beyond their own mere animal wants. Take again the number of men who, to borrow an old expressive phrase, serve vice, are the slaves of vice, as if bound to give to it all their energies. Take those again who are tyrants in their own petty sphere, either over their families or the lower animals, if I may allude to a branch of human morality not yet much thought of. Take these. Take, then, others, persons of great knowledge, reflection, and intelligence; persons who strive to live according to their sense of duty and right; persons who are so controlled by their own sense of right that they would not oppress the poorest and meanest thing within their reach. Take these two classes which we know are in every human state. Why, go out into Bourke Street late in the evening, and you will see some of the one class; and, doubtless, you know among your friends those of the other. And what do you think of the assertion that they all are equal? What equality do you see between one and the other? It is of no use repeating a thing, no matter how often, or by what number of people, unless it is really true; therefore, I ask, What do you mean by the equality of men? Unquestionably, whether you like it or not, or believe it or not, that is the great principle that is now actuating mankind—this tendency to the equality of men. What is the meaning of it? What is the real effect of it. Some men, and very able men too, satirise the whole notion, and look upon it as ridiculous. For example, Carlyle, in that paper of his which excited a good deal of attention some time ago, "Shooting Niagara," alludes to the principle of equality of men in these terms:—

*"Singular, in the case of human swarms, with what perfection of unanimity and quasi religious conviction the stupidest absurdities can be received as the axioms of Euclid, nay, as articles of faith which you are not only to believe, unless malignantly insane, but are, if you have any honour or morality, to push into practice, quasi primum, and to see done if your soul would live. Divine commandment to vote (manhood suffrage, horsehood, doghood ditto, not yet treated of,) universal glorious liberty (to sons of the devil in overwhelming majority as would appear,) count of heads the God-appointed way in this universe—all other ways devil-appointed—in one brief word, which includes whatever of palpable inequality delirious absurdity universally believed can be littered or imagined on these points, 'the equality of men.' Any man equal to any other: Quashee-nigger to Socrates or Shakespeare, Judas Iscariot to Jesus Christ, and Bedlam or Gehenna equal to the New Jerusalem, shall we say?"*

Such is his criticism and satire on this principle of human government. A little further on he shows his idea of our political progress. For he says, the whole of it means, "Anarchy *plus* a constable." No one can go to pick your pocket but some constable is sure to have him. Except that limitation, the whole is anarchy. Rather a melancholy thing if it is the right view; because, you observe, whether we like it or not he thing goes on. Whether you believe in it or whether you do not, no doubt this great principle is actuating men, and anyone taking the trouble to study the political history of the world and the course of events will see this movement prepared from period to period, as it were by the hands of Providence, and the force of human society from different races and countries setting in to carry it forward. Therefore, if Carlyle's view be true, it is an unfortunate fact; but the fact is that Carlyle, like many other able men, is misled by his feelings and impulses. His feelings overcome the force of his judgment. If it were not for this, he would never have misrepresented or misunderstood the real meaning of that great principle. Nobody supposes, no sane man would pretend that, to use a colloquial and vulgar representation of this principle, one man is as good as another, and better. That will not be true—can never be true. Men will really be different, and one set of men will be better than another always, and entitled to weight and respect when others deserve only contempt. But the real meaning of this great principle now actuating the whole civilised world is this, that men are equal in the sense that all start fair—so far as the state is concerned,—that no one has prescriptive rights, that no class of men are by human institutions unduly weighted in the struggle of life—that, in fact, we are all entitled to engage in this troublesome conflict for what you call success in life on equal terms. That is the real and only possible meaning of that principle, and it is, let me say, a great meaning, and for the first time practically proclaims to the human race that man, whether high-born or low-born, whatever be his race or colour (because we have only just seen a great revolution, which deluged a whole continent in blood and is supposed to have cost half-a-million of lives, to assert this equality for the blacks,) or how poor any may be in natural gifts, there is proclaimed for all a right greater than was ever given by any charter, wider and deeper and broader than was ever embodied in any muniments of political freedom—the right to start fair in the race of life, and then to depend on yourself for success or failure in that race.

It may be said, and may be said truly, that this principle can never perform satisfactorily all that it promises; that it excites hopes that can never be realised, and holds out prospects to men that are never reached. That, I think, is true. But in that respect it only resembles other kinds of hope that actuate, and actuate most effectively, the human mind. For, if we think of it, that hope which tells so much upon men, which nerves them to the greatest actions, which makes them endure all troubles exertion, and toil, and difficulty, is, in the main, a hope that is never satisfied by attainment. This hope is seldom followed up by the reality to which men look forward; and therefore, when this principle of the equality is stigmatised as exciting expectations that are never satisfied, I say that it is just like the rest of the hopes that actuate mankind, but that it is not on that account the less potent as a saving principle elevating the human race, stimulating human progress, and shedding light over the toiling, struggling, masses of men.

And, now, I have undertaken to say something about the limit of this political progress. Its tendency, I take it, is clearly towards the equality of the human race. It is a tendency actively at work, and which has by no means yet run its course; and when I come to talk of its limit, I can well understand that you may be rather sceptical, considering the purport of what I have already addressed to you; for I propose now to talk of a limit to what I have already indicated to be almost without a limit. And certainly he would be a brave man who would undertake to lay down with particularity how this political progress is to be bounded, and what is to be the end of it. I may give you an instance of how difficult it is even in the case of the greatest political thinkers to prophesy what is coming in this era of civilisation. I apprehend that there are no two men who more keenly observed and clearly understood the nature of the political movements now going on among men, than De Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill. I don't mean to say that they are the best men of our age, but there are no two men who have more closely and ably analysed the nature of the political movements going on among us. Not many years ago De Tocqueville announced that, whatever difficulties and dangers might be incident to modern society, there would be no fear of the majority ever using systematic force against the minority, and putting

them down permanently. John Stuart Mill commented upon this, and said he completely agreed with it, that all the minority had to fear was the transitory violence of the mob, and that once it was known that they would resist this, by force if necessary, it would never be attempted. Both these two eminent thinkers, only a few years ago, deliberately announced that as their settled opinion. What followed? A few years afterwards came the great American war, when the very thing they said was impossible came to pass, because here you had an instance of the majority rising as one man, and permanently conquering the minority. But no wonder the human intellect is at fault when it endeavours to say how this political progress will go; and for this reason, that there has never yet been seen in the history of the world anything like what is going on now—any political progress such as prevails in the present time—because, whatever the form of the democracies in the ancient time, they were democracies in which the government was by the few. For instance, in the government of Athens, there were only 25,000 voters in a population of 500,000, and, although the voters had an extremely democratic form of government, they were merely a minority of the whole. Again, under republics of the middle ages, only the privileged class voted. It is now totally different. What is now being worked out, the principle that is now dawning upon the human mind, a principle yet imperfect, marked with defects, embarrassed with many difficulties and met on all sides by obstacles, which, however, I believe, it will ultimately overcome, is, that none are to be excluded from the privilege and responsibility of government, that the voice of all is to be heard, their wishes considered, and, if possible, their wants met.

This, I say, is something wholly new; and in connection with it we have nothing to guide us in the previous history of man. In contemplating it we may well be disposed to say, with an eminent thinker, that we feel inclined to burn all our books, and look at nothing which was past; and, in contemplating it, he would be a brave man indeed who would mark out the particular limits within which this political progress is to take place. But, notwithstanding all this, I will say that there is a limit to this political progress; and it is a limit well worthy of our consideration. I say that the real limit of all political progress in our time—in our cycle of civilisation—will be the extent of social progress. That, however, is a mere general observation. Let us look at the matter more closely. Supposing, you take a community of men who have made great advances in social condition. For example, take the case of the Pitcairn Islanders, a very small community, but they will serve to illustrate what I mean. There you have a community of persons who are not pressed by social wants, who are greatly influenced by moral and religious teaching. They are not marked (it seems strange, but it is so) by any of the fierce passions which render necessary so many means for suppressing violence among other and greater peoples. Their different disputes are settled by elders whom they select, and they talk over their affairs in common when they meet together. Now, among such a people, so advanced socially, you might have any political institutions you like. You might have justice administered in the general assembly of the people, and the legislature held in the Eastern Market—if they have an Eastern Market. In fact, no political institution could go wrong with them, the simple; reason being that their social condition is such as to make any political institutions safe. Now, take another case. Take the case of the city of New York, and in alluding to this let me say that you must not misunderstand me as desiring now to reflect either upon the American people or American institutions. I do not wish to do anything of the kind, and it would be most unjust to do so, for this reason: in New York the foreign voters as compared with the native-born are as seven to five;—the city, in fact, being populated by the outcasts of Europe—the mere scum of Europe—who come shoaling in, time after time, degrading its whole social condition. You may imagine how low is the condition of these persons who are the source of political power there, when I tell you that patriotic Americans, who have been trying to improve matters and reform abuses, suggest as a complete remedy one which they contend (and rightly so, I believe.) would revolutionise the whole state of affairs—that the voter, to qualify, should be required to be able to read a little simple English. If they are called on to do that it would clear off all the disturbing elements, and everything would go right. Therefore, do not understand me as reflecting upon the American people, or their institutions; but I state the fact in this view: There is a degraded population—a population that has not made social progress: but they have the most advanced political institutions that you can imagine. As far as democratic progress goes they could not well go further. Everything is in their own hands. They elect their judges, their executive officers, and their legislative officers; everything goes by the vote of the people, and there is no limitation and no control. But all the while that they have these advanced political institutions, the real success—the real progress—in any intelligible sensible meaning, of their institutions is limited by the fact that the people who exercise these political privileges are not socially advanced. They are not able to bear the weight of the privileges conferred upon them. The result is that corruption, ignorance and brutality govern there, and not the people. And no institutions that could be given to them; no form of constitution; no plans of statesmen can make the people rule until they become socially advanced. And this will show you that the real difficulty now of political progress is the want of social progress. In fact, the political science is every day becoming more and more a social science. The difficulty in its way is the social difficulty. They triumph or fail together. Political wrongs and difficulties are really social wrongs and difficulties; and social wrongs must be

met by social remedies; and when I say this, I at once indicate the grandeur and the difficulty of the movement which is now going on amongst us.

When people talk—as you hear very well-meaning people, and persons whose views one often respects, talk—of their anxiety to set this or that political concession, I think one cannot but bear in mind that while their view is right in so far as this, that political institutions, unless greatly abused, tend of themselves to advance the people socially,—they yet don't realise the real want of our time. There is no difficulty in getting any constitution you please. The people of France have had several constitutions—they have from time to time set up different constitutions; and the same is the case in the United States. The people there can mould and form any constitution they please; and so it will be all over the civilised world. There is no difficulty so far. There is no power outside the people to prevent them having what constitution they like; but all the while Providence is stronger than man, and the real question is—for not all the people of the world united, or all its forces combined, will be able to accomplish what is desired unless by social progress—the real question is, to make the people themselves equal and apt to the institutions of the age; and, in fact, to enable them to realise and to work out in its true sense the great principle of the equality of men. Now, I am conscious that when I go so far I am trenching upon what may be supposed to be dangerous ground, because you may say, "Well, if that be so, if the real question after all is a social question, the real difficulty a social difficulty, is there not a kind of hollowness in your talking of human equality? What is the use of telling a man whose life is a continued struggle with want (as is unfortunately the case with many in the older countries,) who is engaged in perpetual conflict with want and misery, which crushes him clown in degradation and vice, that he is equal to another man whose only trouble is that he does not know how to dispose of his leisure? What is the use of talking of equality to miserable wretches brought up in vice and crime, who know nothing of the great principles which guide and support others? What, for example, if the use of preaching equality to men living in the purlieus of London or New York, where the very light of the sun seems to be saddened by entering their miserable habitations? Is there not a hollowness in this whole idea, and would it not be better to avow inequality in theory, when you see such marked inequality in the actual conditions of men?" I am aware that that view may be put; but while, as I have said, this principle of equality cannot satisfy all the aspirations which it raises, it is yet not the less an active living power for improvement, penetrating through the whole of the human race, and such as has never before been heralded to man. It is a principle of hope, which it animates in every heart, and penetrates to every human creature. It is a principle of hope that stimulates to effort through all classes in the only way in which you can teach men to progress. The only way in which you can improve men is putting in their hands the principle of and expectation of progress, and trusting to them then to profit and improve by it, as we trust to political progress to show that they will. I am sensible that a great problem lies as it were behind all this—a problem the difficulty of which we are comparatively free from here, but which is agitating Europe. In that problem is concerned the contest between labour and capital, between wealth and poverty. Into that, however, we need not go; it is outside my subject and not suited to this occasion. It is a difficulty which is pressing strongly on the older countries, a difficulty which is agitating greatly the minds of the humbler classes at home, and in a way that those in a higher position do not realise. I believe, myself, that a solution for it will be found, because I believe that Providence decrees the progress of the human race and the advance of civilisation. I will only say that I think we are fortunate in this country in being comparatively free from that difficulty, and in being able to shape our course, as far as by human means we can, to avoid it. More than that I will not say about it, but in the presence of that difficulty I will pause. I will only make one more observation before I sit down. I am not, of course, going to touch—and I hope in my observations I have not done so—on party politics, and yet, I think, without trenching on this limit. I may say that there is one view suggested by what I have addressed to you which it may not be out of place to make a remark about. We often find people in this country, and in other countries, complaining of politicians and of the condition of political affairs generally. Now, I think this is rather unreasonable, because, if there is any truth in what I have said, political affairs really depend on the social condition of the people themselves. Your politicians and statesmen,—they are nothing, and in this age they become more and more what the general condition of the country renders them. Not only are we the creatures of your making, and the work of your hands, but all our efforts and all our plans are limited by that social improvement which it rests with the people alone to accomplish, without which no nation can be politically progressive, and without which, indeed, in our time, no community can be safe.

Melbourne: Fergusson and Moore, Printers, Flinders Lane East.

Settlement under the 42ND Clause Amending Land Act, 1865.

By the Special Reporter of "The Argus."

Reprinted from "the Argus" Newspaper.

STILLWELL & KNIGHT PRINTERS, Melbourne : 78 COLLINS EAST. 1869.

The special reporter of *The Argus* submits to the public the following letters illustrative of the working of the 42nd Clause of the Amending Land Act of 1865, introduced to Parliament by the Hon. J. M. Grant. He does

so in accordance with a very generally expressed wish that his reports should be published in a form more compact and more easy of reference than that in which they originally appeared.

# Settlement Under the 42ND Clause of the Amending Land Act, 1865.

## No. I.—*Jan. 14th, 1869.*

The manner in which the 42nd clause of the Amending Land Act has been administered by the department, and the very liberal interpretation which has been given to it, have caused it in a great measure to supercede every other mode of obtaining land provided by the act. By it, indeed, the old Convention idea of free selection before survey has, to a great extent, and within limited areas, been realised. Various rumours have been current as to the effects produced by the operation of the clause, the reliability of which it was difficult to determine. In order to set at rest the doubts thus caused, and to give a fair and candid description of the results following the administration of this portion of the act, I, in accordance with directions received from the Editor of *The Argus*, have visited some of the principal localities in which a large amount of land has been taken up under the provisions of the clause referred to. I shall now proceed to give the results of the inspection I have made, and the conclusions at which I have arrived, after personal interviews with a considerable number of selectors of all classes, from the struggling miner or labourer striving to eke out a living upon ten or twenty acres of comparatively barren soil, to the more fortunate storekeeper, banker, or merchant—for all these classes are to be met with—who, having secured front eighty up to two or three hundred acres of valuable and fertile kind, have, entered with enthusiasm into agricultural pursuits. Before commencing my report I may state, however, that I proceeded on my investigation unhampered by any instructions, being only directed closely to examine the nature and extent of the settlement which had taken place under the 42nd clause, and fairly and impartially to state the result of such examination. My report of course in no way alludes to the land taken up under the regulations recently issued, as too short a period has elapsed since they came into operation to allow any opinion to be formed as to their probable effect upon the country.

The facilities for settlement afforded by the 42nd clause have, perhaps, been taken more advantage of in the county of Talbot than in any other portion of the colony, and it was this district, therefore, which I first visited, starting from Castlemaine as a centre, and proceeding through all the most important localities. In the immediate neighbourhood of Castlemaine, the greater portion of all the available land under the 42nd clause was occupied very shortly after the passing of the Amending Act, by those persons whose peculiar circumstances the clause was originally intended to meet. Accordingly there is here but very little farming. The ground has been principally taken up in small allotments by miners and others with whom it was a matter of absolute necessity that their homes should be as near as possible to the scene of their daily avocations. With the exception of those who selected a few sites for vineyards, the majority who have taken up land appear to have done so with the intention not of abandoning their former pursuits, but of establishing themselves in a permanent home, and by cultivating a small portion of ground in their leisure time, assist the somewhat precarious income derived either from mining or the other labour in which they were engaged. In the parish of Castlemaine proper there are some sixty holdings, mostly of an unimportant character, varying in extent from a couple up to twenty acres, and averaging perhaps ten acres each. The soil is generally of a very inferior character, many of the allotments consisting of small pieces of land on the slopes of the various ranges in some instances covered with quartz and granite boulders, and in others presenting the appearance of a mere wilderness of gravel. Yet, in spite of such unpromising conditions, the occupants have in most instances boldly faced the difficulties of their position, and as the result there may be observed patches of vegetation—here a few potatoes and other vegetables for the use of the household, or a small plot of wheat sufficient to secure bread until after next harvest; and there a patch of oats, for the oats for the benefit of the horse which, working in the puddling-machine or dray, is no mean contributor to the family income. Whatever success attends the exertions of these men they richly deserve it all. Only by the most untiring perseverance could anything like cultivation have been induced in such barren spots, and the very fact that such land has been fenced in—a house, however humble built upon it, and the ground, even to a small extent, brought under cultivation—slows the ardent desire to possess land which exists in the minds of those who have apparently linked their fortunes to such sterile localities. It is in this parish that the small allotment occupied by Stansmore is situated. In the columns of *The Argus* he has already complained that a neighbour named Hobby has been permitted to fence in

a road, depriving him of all access to his holding save by a most circuitous route, and rendering it almost worthless. Stansmore's complaint is well founded. The road has been improperly closed, and the Crown lands bailiff took action against Hobby with a view of compelling him to open it. Hobby, however, appears to have friends at court, and the Crown lands bailiff was ordered by the department to discontinue proceedings. It is difficult to conceive what reason could have induced the Lands department to act in such a manner; and I trust Mr. Grant will see the necessity of allowing the law to take its proper course, and of doing an act of common justice, by securing the reopening of the road. I may here remark that in almost every case which came under my notice in which the 42nd clause had been abused in order to forward the interests of mere land-sharks and speculators, and in which the act had been evaded, the circumstance was the result of undue influences, of a very corrupt appearance, having been brought to bear upon the head of the Lands department, consequent upon which the recommendations of the local authorities have been entirely disregarded, and the demands of political supporters and subservient members of Parliament have been acceded to. I shall, however, have occasion to refer at greater length to this subject in subsequent letters.

From Castlemaine I proceeded through Guildford, Yandoit, and Franklin, towards Daylesford. All through the three former parishes, until the precipitous and barren ranges which surround Daylesford on that side rendered agriculture impossible, I was surrounded by a perfect network of settlements. Most of the land in Guildford taken up under the 42nd section is, however, extremely poor, and of a similar character to that already described as prevailing in Castlemaine. These conversant with the distinguishing features of our principal gold-fields will scarce need to be reminded of the arid nature of the soil which, as a rule, is to be found in their immediate vicinity, and Guildford affords a fair sample land of this description. Such, however, has been the desire to obtain land that almost every available acre has been occupied, and is either under cultivation or has been fenced in for grazing purposes by small dairymen. Judging from the surface appearance many sections of land have been taken up, and parties are actually residing on them, the quality of which is so poor that there does not seem to be soil enough spread over a whole acre to grow a single head of cabbage. Most of this land was selected in 1865 and 1866 by persons who were unable to obtain more eligible locations within ten miles of a gold-field—the extreme distance then allowed by the regulations. In this parish there are some seventy holdings, averaging about twenty acres each. So far as I was able to ascertain two-thirds of the selectors are residing on the land, the remainder of the holdings belonging to small farmers who had previously purchased land in the district, and who availed themselves of the opportunity afforded by the clause to enlarge their farms and extend the circle of their operations. As a rule, this latter class appear to have monopolised the best of the land, and this is precisely what was to have been expected. They were the first cultivators of the soil in the neighbourhood; had, of course, selected the most eligible sites to purchase, and knew precisely where the next best land was to be obtained. To these men the provisions of the 42nd clause have proved quite as advantageous as to any other class. They have been enabled to emerge from their confined and chrysalis state, and by obtaining on easy terms more land, just when they were enabled profitably to occupy it, have been enabled materially to improve their condition. Although the general nature of the soil is so poor, there are small patches in the bends of the creek, and in other localities, where the land is really good; and on some of these—although the present season has been anything but favourable—as much as thirty bushels of wheat to the acre have been realised. The general average, however, will scarcely come up to half that quantity. Many of the settlers in this locality keep a few cows with the view of adding to their income by the sale of dairy produce; but the drought which has so long prevailed has considerably diminished the assistance which, under more favourable conditions, would have been derived from this source. The selectors, however, notwithstanding the difficulties they have had to encounter, are in good spirits, and console themselves for the poor returns of the present year by anticipating a better and more profitable season. At present, many of them have as much as they can do to make a bare livelihood. The soil is so poor that as yet they have only managed to bring a small portion of their holdings under cultivation, but being essentially working men they struggle manfully on, having no doubt of being able eventually to surmount the obstacles which they at first experienced in their endeavours to found a home.

From Guildford I proceeded through Yandoit. Here, although much of the land is poor and sterile, there is some of a much better description and, generally speaking, it is an improvement on Guildford. Some of the allotments, however, which have been fenced in in this locality appear so utterly worthless that it is difficult to conceive how they can possibly be turned to profitable account. As yet no attempt has been made to cultivate them, and, indeed, anyone trying to plough such land would only be regarded as but one degree removed from a lunatic. For grazing purposes the soil is equally unfit. The ground is covered with loose gravel, scanty tufts of grass, and moderately thick scrubby bush. One selector to whom I spoke, said that a few years ago he would not have accepted such land as a gift, but that now he had no choice in the neighbourhood, as the whole district was occupied. Still there is no doubt of the *bonâ fides* of these men. Many of them are residing on the land; they have gone to the expense of fencing it in; and notwithstanding all the unfavourable circumstances' by which

they are surrounded they express confidence in their ultimate success. Some having small holdings complain of the rent they have to pay, it being *pro rata* far in excess of that demanded from these occupying larger selections; but I shall deal more fully with this important aspect of the whole case in a future communication. In these portions of Yandoit where the soil is of a better description than that just referred to the settlers display great energy. Advantage has been taken of every bit of open ground, and wherever the plough would work a crop has been put in, without waiting for the clearance of the remainder of the holding. The appearance thus presented is sometimes very picturesque :—fields of golden grain, fringed by forest land, and affording a remarkable contrast to the surrounding scrub and bush. Some of these crops have turned out very well, although the yield is not so great as was at one time anticipated. The sharp frosts which were experienced just as the wheat was commencing to form, and the long drought which followed, prevented the grain tilling out as it would otherwise have done, and the consequence is that the average yield in this locality will not be more than from twelve to fifteen bushels to the acre. A considerable number of Italians have settled in Yandoit, and they appear to be able to do more with poor land than either the English, Irish, or Scotch. They are plodding and persevering—in many instances have formed small vineyards, and have gone to considerable trouble and expense in providing water for the irrigation of their settlements. There are in Yandoit about one hundred holdings, averaging from twenty-five to thirty acres each. The township of Yandoit is now extremely dull. There is but little mining going on, and the place appears to be almost entirely dependent upon the agricultural settlers in the neighbourhood. At present there are four or five hotels open, but how the proprietors obtain a living is a mystery to the uninitiated. Some hopes are entertained of a revival in mining affairs, and a new company is, I believe, in process of formation. There may be some good deep leads yet undiscovered in the neighbourhood, but the general formation of the country does not indicate the existence of remunerative shallow auriferous deposits. Should some payable reefs, or good deep leads, be discovered in the locality, Yandoit will doubtless become an important place, but at present it seems likely to remain one of the quietest of all quiet country villages.

## No. II.—*Jan. 16th, 1869.*

Franklin, the next parish to Yandoit on the road to Paylesford, takes its name from the well-known mount in that locality, at the base of which Sir John Franklin, when on his tour of discovery through the colony, stayed for some little time. He resided with Mr. Parker, the holder of the run, at what was then the home station. The building still exists, but in a most dilapidated condition. There is a small township or village, called Franklinford, just as you enter the parish from township allotments were originally sold at a high a few fetching over £100 per acre; but the place is now very quiet. There is, however, still some energy amongst the inhabitants, for I observed a substantial brick building in the course of erection which is intended for a common school house, and the greater portion of the cost had, I was informed, been locally subscribed. The land in the parish of Franklin is of a superior character to any that I had hitherto passed through. A great portion consists of good undulating country, lightly timbered, with comparatively rich, chocolate-coloured soil. Of course, as you approach Daylesford, a very considerable difference is observed, but I am now referring to that portion of the district which is under settlement. In Franklin, eighty-five licenses have been issued, covering a total area of 2,020 acres, and averaging about twenty-five acres each. I believe I am correct in saying that the whole of this land has been fenced in by the licencees, and cultivation has proceeded very extensively. In some places I observed very good crops, which I was told would yield as much as twenty bushels to the acre, but, from the causes mentioned in my previous letter, the general average will be far below that quantity. As is the case in almost all the earlier settled localities, much of the land taken up here under the 42nd clause is occupied by farmers in connection with their previously purchased holdings. In this district all the forty-seconders, as they are termed, are doing comparatively well, and their prospects are certainly much better than these of their friends in Guildford and Yandoit.

Leaving the more settled districts of Franklin, and proceeding on the road to Daylesford, you find yourself in the midst of precipitous ranges, with slate reefs and quartz or granite boulders cropping out in every direction. Of course, in such country very little land has been selected, but here and there, wherever in a break in the ranges a passably level piece of ground could be obtained, some enterprising individual has secured it. At short intervals, therefore, substantially-fenced and cleared holdings, with small huts or weatherboard houses erected on them, and a patch of cultivation refreshingly verdant agreeably varies the romantic scenery of these sterile ranges. The road lies through Shepherd's-flat and Hepburn, running nearly the whole distance along the sides of almost perpendicular declivities, which are eminently suggestive of the inevitable consequences which would follow any unusual display of eccentricity on the part of the horses you may be driving; in fact the roads are as execrable as the country is picturesque. The local authorities seem to have done something with the idea

of improving them, such as throwing down in the worst places a cart-load or so of quartz boulders of the average size of a man's head, or, where these were not available, a similar quantity of cubes of slate of an equally convenient size, leaving the work of distribution to the vehicles and horses which are obliged to stumble over them. In some cases they have certainly cut down the crown of the hill, and done something towards levelling a sideling, but the only and general effect has been to produce an awful amount of dust everywhere. In the entire district apportioned to the Crown lands bailiff of Daylesford there are 883 licences under the 12nd clause, occupying an aggregate area of 26,997 acres. These are distributed as follows:—In the parish of Bourke, 105 holdings, containing 3,500 acres; in the parish of Holcombe, 71 holdings, containing 2,000 acres; in the parish of Dean, 105, containing 2,300 acres; in Glenlyon, 42, containing 1,560 acres; in the parish of Coliban, 60, containing 3,350 acres; in Franklin 85, containing 2,020 acres; in Bullarook, 123, containing 3,452 acres; in the parish of Wombat, 126, containing 2,530 acres; in the parish of Trentham, 96, containing 4,100 acres; in the parish of Tylden, 15, containing 685 acres; and in what is known as the state forest—parish unnamed—55 holdings, containing 1,500. The principal holdings, or rather these in which most progress has been made, are Franklin (already described), Burke, Dean, Bullarook, and Wombat. In Trentham, also, the soil is of magnificent quality, but heavily timbered, and the settlers, all of whom appear *bona fide*, are for the most part engaged in fencing and clearing, but little having been as yet accomplished in the way of cultivation. In Tylden, Holcombe and Glenlyon, a considerable area is very light soil, and is principally used for grazing purposes. The whole of it, however, appears to be profitably occupied, and where the land is of a better quality it is being rapidly brought under cultivation.

It is in the four parishes of Burke, Dean, Bullarook, and Wombat, however, that the energy of the miners and others who have taken up land is most conspicuously manifested. A great portion of this land was, but a short time since, a dense and almost impenetrable forest. Most of the holdings are only twenty acres each, and these who selected so small a portion of such country, with the idea of forming a home and making a living, must have been possessed of no small amount of pluck and endurance. They, however, knew the quality of the soil, and that it would well repay all the outlay both of capital and labour expended upon it. It is, in fact, some of the very finest that can be found in the whole colony, and is worth at least £5 an acre. Consequently, there is scarcely an eligible site which has not been occupied, and which is not being improved. On most of the holdings good weatherboard habitations have been erected, and there is generally an air of independence, comfort, and contentment prevalent amongst the forty-seconders in these districts which speaks well for their future prosperity. In many cases the roughest part of the work has been done, and already they are reaping the reward of their past labour. Passing over Wombat Hill, I was told that the greater portion had all been cleared, but it was only by comparing the fenced in and partially cultivated holdings with the untouched forest in the immediate vicinity that the fact could be realised, and with something like astonishment I beheld fields of luxuriant grain growing amidst what still appeared to be a very respectable forest, but it was all dead timber. The living trees, which would have exhausted the soil and injured the crops, had been removed, and either converted into posts and rails for fencing, or had served the good people of Daylesford for fuel. In some instances, however, the timber had only been dragged to the boundary of the holding, where it formed a dog rail or bush fence. The number of transfers which have been applied for in this district is exceedingly small, almost every individual residing on the allotment originally selected by him. The crops here are generally good, though not quite so forward as in these districts through which I had previously passed. The soil seemed to grow everything equally well, and in a comparatively short distance I observed wheat, oats, carrots, potatoes, mangolds, and vines all looking exceedingly healthy and promising. I conversed with several of the selectors, and from none did I hear anything like a complaint. One hard-working, good-tempered, good-humoured Irishman, who was nearly as black as the charred stumps of the monarchs of the forest which he was engaged in clearing away, said, in answer to my questions, "He couldn't complain; he took up twenty acres a little more than twelve months ago; this season he had seven or eight acres under cultivation, and the produce of that would keep his family until after the next harvest. Next year he would have more land cleared and under cultivation, and he should then do better." This man is only a type of a lame class who have settled in this district, and to whom the 42nd clause has undoubtedly proved a great boon. When not engaged on their land they do a little mining, carting, or other work as opportunity may offer, and the money thus earned, instead of being squandered in the haunts of vice and dissipation, is expended in improving their holdings, and adding to the comforts of their homes. The settlers in this locality do not appear to have suffered so much from the drought as in other parts of the colony. A great portion of the land lies higher, and is not so much affected by the scorching hot winds, whilst the thick forests in the locality also exercise an ameliorating influence upon the climate. Vegetation here, consequently, does not present that same shrivelled appearance which is so noticeable in other districts not similarly favoured.

As I have already intimated, a considerable portion of the area taken up under the 42nd clause in this district has been merely fenced in, and is used for glazing purposes. Some objection has been taken to this, but

there does not appear to be any tangible ground for it. If small dairymen are content to go to the expense of fencing in the ground for the sustenance of their cattle, or merely in order to have a safe place in which to keep them during the night, and to pay the rent demanded by the Government from them for their holdings, it would be most unjust to refuse them the opportunity of so doing. In their sphere they are as useful and as necessary as the agriculturist. The two avocations, indeed, depend greatly upon each other for their mutual success, and all who are engaged in them constitute equally desirable colonists. Throughout the whole of this district I saw no signs of dummyism, nor of any attempt to evade the provisions of the act; nor did the inquiries I made lead me to suspect that anything of the sort had taken place. Of course it is impossible for me to say positively that no land has been taken up for the mere purpose of speculation, but it must at any rate have been to a very harmless and limited extent. As a rule, all the selectors are residing on their allotments, and all have made expensive and substantial improvements. Daylesford itself is a prettily-situated, clean, and, I should imagine, very healthy township. It is at present exceedingly quiet, owing to the great falling off which has taken place in the yield of the mines of the district. Hopes are, however, entertained that a reaction will speedily take place, but whether this be the case or not, Daylesford will always be a township of considerable importance, in consequence of its healthy position and the large amount of agricultural settlement which has taken place in the neighbourhood.

Returning from Daylesford, through Hepburn and Shepherd's Flat, at both of which places there are some small settlements, though of an unimportant nature, as the soil is of anything but an inviting character I again passed through Yandoit, on my way to Strangways, Sandon, Tarrengower and Maldon. In Strangways there has been a large amount of settlement, over seventy licences having been issued, averaging about forty acres each, and a total area of nearly 3,500 acres being occupied under the clause. Generally speaking, the land here may be described as fair agricultural soil, lightly timbered. It is not so rich as that in the Daylesford district, but then, on the other hand, the expense of clearing and preparing it for the plough is much less. So far as I was able to ascertain, there is no available land unoccupied, and nearly all of it has been fenced in and brought under cultivation. There are not so many persons, however, residing on their several holdings, as a considerable portion has been selected by farmers who are living on their own purchased land. The crops here are not so good as was at one time anticipated, but the wheat will, in all probability, turn out from thirteen to fifteen bushels to the acre. In this parish I met with one of these difficulties which the Land department is sometimes required to solve. A section of twenty acres was taken up by one Hugh Smith in 1865. He fenced it in and otherwise improved it, but shortly afterwards left the locality, and has not been heard of for some two years past. One Ainsley, who is a relative of Smith's, quietly took possession of the land and improvements, and has since cultivated it and paid the rent, in the expectation, as he now alleges, that Smith would soon return and resume possession of his property. But a short time since a man named Abbis, finding that Ainsley was in illegal occupation of the land, it never having been transferred to him, jumped the ground, and now claims it and the improvements, the latter being valued at £200. The matter will probably come either before the next land commission which sits in the district, or before the department in Melbourne, to be determined. In either case some curious questions will arise, such as to whom the land should be adjudged; if to the jumper Abbis, should the improvements go with it, or do they revert to the Crown; and should Ainsley be called upon for an account of the crops he has already taken from the land of which he has been, and is, in illegal occupation.

The road from Strangways, through Sandon, lies through a narrow strip of purchased land; and backwards from this, on both sides, the farmers who own the purchased land have taken up additional areas under the 42nd clause. There are, however, a considerable number of persons in this parish who hold all their land in this manner, and nearly all of these have their ground fenced in, and a great portion under cultivation. The whole of this locality presents very evident signs of steady prosperity. There are sixty-nine licensees, whose allotments average about thirty acres each. I here met the Rev. Mr. Minte, the Presbyterian clergyman of the district, and speaking from an intimate knowledge of the circumstances of the inhabitants, he gave a very encouraging account of their condition. Within the last eighteen months, he said, settlement had greatly increased, and his congregation had doubled. He himself has shared in the prosperity of the district, for, instead of the weatherboard cottage once occupied by the minister, he now resides in an extremely comfortable and substantial brick house, the land being purchased and the building erected at the sole cost of his parishioners. Besides this, the young men have erected a very good weatherboard and shingled stable for the accommodation of their horses whilst they are attending the rev. gentleman's ministrations on the Sunday. The land he describes as generally good, the people as contented, and with fair prospects; whilst, strange to relate, he remarked that he has never heard of any agitation for the reduction of the rent.

## **No. II.—*Jan. 19th, 1869.***

There are a few settlements around Glengower—the late Mr. Donald Campbell's run—at the south west

corner of Sandon, and on the borders of Rodborough and Campbelltown. Most of the best land here however, was purchased long ago, Mr. Campbell alone having secured some 16,000 acres, the greater portion of which is good agricultural country. Still, wherever any eligible sites were left unoccupied they were speedily taken up under the provisions of the clause. I observed here some selections adjoining the pre-emptive right of Campbell's station which appeared to have been marked out for other than agricultural purposes. The greater portion of the land was so thickly studded with granite boulders that it would be all but impossible to clear it. It, however, adjoins, the sheep-wash and dam belonging to the station, upon which some £200 has been recently spent, and if this land is taken away the whole of the improvements will be useless, as there will be no convenient place to run the sheep immediately after they are washed. The first party who took up this land made no improvement upon it, and another has now jumped it and lodged a notice of intention to apply for the area at the next sitting of the commission in the district. The present manager of the station applied to have one or two lots immediately adjoining the sheep-wash withdrawn from selection, but the Lands department refused to do so on the ground that the late Mr. Campbell had purchased 10,000 acres of the finest land in the district. It is somewhat difficult, however, to see why this is a reason that a portion of the property should be spoiled, or that his widow should be compelled to buy off parties who take up land for the mere purposes of extortion. If the allotments applied for consisted of even moderately good agricultural land the case would be different, but with the exception of a very few acres, to the granting of which no objection is offered, the whole area is fit for nothing but the purpose to which it has hitherto been applied—to run sheep on after being washed. The case appears so much the harder because the present sheep-wash had to be constructed in consequence of one previously built having been rendered worthless by the sludge which came down the creek from the mines.

Proceeding from Campbelltown through West Sandon, I came to the parish of Tarrengower. Here there are about eighty holdings, varying from twenty to eighty acres in extent, and averaging about forty acres each. Nearly all the allotments have been fenced in and cultivated, and in most instances the parties, except where they possess purchased land, are residing on them. In some cases the members of a large family have combined, and managed to secure between them a very decent sized farm. Thus, one family named Munro, just on the borders of Tarrengower, have some 200 acres enclosed in a ring-fence, and nearly the whole area has been brought under cultivation. In other cases a small allotment is worked by a family, without any extraneous assistance—father, mother, and the little ones all contributing their share, for there is always something even for the smallest to do. The only drawback to the pleasant reflections induced by the manifestation of such a resolute determination to succeed is the thought that the children, instead of being at work, should be receiving that education which alone can properly fit them for worthily and successfully playing their part in life. A week or two ago there might have been seen in Tarrengower a field of wheat being reaped entirely by children. The captain of the company was a young girl, some fifteen years of age, and she had with her three brothers the eldest about thirteen and the youngest about six years old, all of them handling the reaping-hook and working with an earnestness which would have put to shame many older heads and stronger hands. Their father had, unfortunately for himself and family, earned a short time before rather more money than usual, which, in the most approved fashion, he had knocked down at the most convenient shanty. The consequence may be easily imagined. He drank himself mad, and for his own safety, as well as for the well-ordering of society, he was sent to gaol for three months. The mother—a steady and respectable woman—was in the meantime doing the best she could to support the family, and the children gathered in the crop of wheat in the manner I have just stated.

In this district, as in nearly all I passed through, the crops are comparatively poor. There are some exceptions, but as a rule the wheat will not average more than from ten to fifteen bushels to the acre. This is no doubt to be principally attributed to the drought. Another reason, however, is also given—the sowing of machine-thrashed wheat. Large numbers of farmers attribute their short crops to this cause. One—Donald Grant—who has a farm on the borders of Moolort, told me that from hand-thrashed seed he obtained twenty bushels of wheat to the acre, whilst the most that he got from machine thrashed waster, although both were sown at the same time, and in precisely similar soil. Another farmer, in Tarrengower, said that, whilst from hand-thrashed seed he got twenty-six bushels to the acre, his machine-thrashed only gave him from ten to twelve bushels, although, as in the previous case, there was no difference in the character of the soil, or the time of sowing, and the usual allowance was also made for the proportion of machine-thrashed wheat, which is always supposed to be damaged. At Maldon, Moolort, Mount Greenock, and Eddington, I heard similar complaints, and a general determination was expressed, never for the future, under any circumstances, to use any but hand thrashed seed. I saw several instances in this locality of the extraordinary desire which possesses a large portion of the community to obtain a home which they can call their own. One man had actually taken up a portion of land thickly covered with sludge, deposited by the Jim Crow Creek when it overflowed its natural boundaries—a circumstance of frequent occurrence, as the original bed of the stream is almost entirely choked up by the refuse from the neighbouring mines. This man had thrown up a small embankment to guard against the future incursions of the creek, and then had actually set to work to cultivate the sludge. To a certain extent

he had been successful. Vegetables were growing where all vegetation appeared impossible, and the man was seemingly content to pay a rental of some 4s. per acre per annum for the privilege he enjoyed of growing potatoes and cabbages in the sludge from the mines. To attempt to cultivate a hundred acres of such land would be quite sufficient to ruin even a moderately wealthy man. Yet this miner reaped at least a small profit from the little plot which he called his home. It is, indeed, astonishing to witness the amount of labour which people ungrudgingly bestow upon a small piece of land as soon as they imagine they have a title to it. Meeting another man, who had taken up an allotment of some twelve acres, I asked him what he thought of the 42nd clause. "It has been the salvation of the country," he immediately replied. "How so?" I inquired. "Why, look at me," he answered, "I am now an independent man. Last year I cultivated an acre or so of potatoes and about half a dozen acres of wheat and this will give me enough bread and potatoes to keep my family until after the next harvest, and in the meantime I can take any work that offers, besides further improving the land." This man was very anxious to get about eight acres improving land adjoining his present holding, but as some shallow holes had been at one time sunk upon it he was unable to do so in consequence of a recent regulation issued by the Lands Department, that no abandoned diggings should under any circumstances be granted. No doubt this is a very judicious arrangement, and I suppose it is difficult to make provision for special cases, although in the instance to which I refer no harm could by any means follow, as the ground is all shallow, has been well tried, and there is no possibility of anything like a lead passing through it.

In the parish of Maldon the holdings are not very important, They have been principally taken up by miners, and others resident in the township. There never was much available land in this neighbourhood open for selection under the clause, and what there was has been rapidly taken possession of by *bona fide* selectors, anything like the evasion of the act being rendered almost impossible by the keen watch over the movements of these who had secured land by these who were less fortunate. There are altogether about ninety holdings in this parish, varying from five up to eighty acres in extent. There are, however, very few of the larger area, and the general average will be from eighteen to twenty acres. Nearly all the land has been fenced, and a considerable quantity has been brought under cultivation. In Baringhup, the adjoining parish to Maldon, the greater portion of the best land passed into the possession of the Messrs. Bryant, the pastoral tenants of the run many years ago. Some portions of fair agricultural country were, however, left, and these have now all been taken up. There are altogether thirty-four holdings, averaging about sixty acres each. Most of these have been fenced in and are under cultivation, but others have been taken up more recently, and the improvements which have been made are not of an important character. Some of the allotments have been selected by storekeepers and brokers. On a few of these no improvements have been effected, and a suspicion prevails that the selectors have acted in the interests of the holders of the run. These I was informed will be reported for forfeiture for nonfulfilment of the conditions of the lease.

Proceeding almost due south from Baringhup you reach the Moolert Plains in the parish of Moolert, and here the settlement is of an entirely different character to that hitherto met with. Instead of comparatively small holdings of inferior land occupied by men striving for a livelihood, you are surrounded on every hand by farms of a respectable size, substantially fenced, and in a great many instances having comfortable houses erected on them. The land here is, with very few exceptions, of excellent quality. The general size of the allotments is eighty acres, but by means of transfers several selectors have managed to secure from 160 to 200 acres each, and in a few cases even larger areas. All these are doing well, and their prospects are excellent. A great want of water has been experienced this season, and many of the farmers are either sinking wells or forming reservoirs in order to be better prepared in the future for a like contingency. About 120 licences, averaging sixty-five acres each, have been issued for this district, making the total area taken up under the clause nearly 8,000 acres. I could discover only two or three instances in which the conditions of improvement had not been carried out. In one a man and his family had managed to obtain no less than 640 acres, and in twelve months had only cultivated some five acres and put up a few chains of fencing. It was pretty evident that this land had only been occupied for speculative purposes. I was informed that several persons were waiting to jump portions of it, and that unless the holder at once commenced to improve in earnest the area taken up by him it was extremely probable he would lose it all, as the Crown lands bailiff had already given him notice that he should report against him. Another lot, containing some 200 acres, had been fenced in for grazing purposes, but as this was very stony land it would cost a great deal to clear, and as the occupier had cattle upon it it was not considered likely that he would be interfered with, especially as there appeared to be no doubt of his *bonâ fides*. In another instance a lot of land was taken up by some persons who pretended they were going to start a sugar plantation; but after a considerable delay—the public when appealed to being anything but enthusiastic in their support of the proposition—the whole scheme fell to the ground, and the land was forfeited. It had been forfeited by the same persons once before, and again selected by them, they, by this rather clever move, evading the payment of the rent due. The land—some 200 acres—has since been taken up by farmers, who, for ten years previously, had rented farms at Taradale, the property of Mr. Tucker, the late rejected of Castlemaine. As a rule the wheat

crops in this district have been very fair, in some instances averaging twenty bushels to the acre, and in others from fifteen to eighteen. Very few oats were sown, and of the small quantity put in, the greater portion was cut for hay, so that many farmers have not even sufficient for their own use, whilst scarcely one has any to dispose of. It is a rather singular fact that, although the soil in this locality is very good, potatoes will not grow, every attempt both this year and last to cultivate them proving an entire failure. When planted early the frost seems to cut them off, and when planted late there is not sufficient moisture to permit the tubers to develop. Almost all the selectors in this district consist of merchants, storekeepers, and others, having more or less capital, and many have laid out over £1,000 on their selections. The holdings being large, the rent is not so much as that charged for small allotments, it being in the one case 2s. 10½d. per acre, and in the other is and over. Yet, strange to say, it was principally in this district that I heard any complaints relative to the rent demanded by the Government, and it was here I met with the greatest number of persons anxious that the rent should be considered and taken as a portion of the purchase money. Nothing could be more unfair to the country generally. The rent charged is extremely moderate, for nearly all the land is worth at least from £3 to £5 an acre, and I am satisfied that if country of a similar quality in a like situation were to be now offered for rental by auction, it would certainly fetch two or three times the amount at present charged by the Government. What has already taken place in the district constitutes a safe basis upon which to form an opinion. It was here that the late Mr. Ramsay, M.L.A., and his sons-in-law took up some 400 acres, a proceeding which caused no little stir at the time. Although not a brilliant politician, Mr. Ramsay appears to have had a very keen eye to what is popularly known as the main chance. At any rate he was a very good judge of land. The section taken up by him was one of the best in Moolert. Since his death it has been disposed of to two brothers named Garlick. At the most liberal valuation the improvements, including a few head of cattle, were not worth more than £200, but the Messrs Garlick gave Mrs. Ramsay £560 for them, or, in other words, they paid a premium of nearly £1 per acre for the privilege of renting the holding from the Government at 2s. 10½d. acre per annum. Facts like these are a sufficient answer to those who allege that the present rental is an exorbitant charge for such land as that I have been just describing. One retired storekeeper who has secured a first-class allotment in this district, and who has taken a very active part in the agitation now going on for a reduction in the rent, or for its being received as a portion of the purchase money, pointed out to me that he had taken up 160 acres, eighty in his own name and eighty in that of his daughter. The first year he said he was only able to cultivate a small portion of his holding, and yet he had to pay rent for the whole area, which he appeared to consider a great hardship. I quietly asked him whether it would not have been better for him if he had contented himself with one eighty acres, and let the other go, in order to have avoided paying so much rent. He did not at all coincide with this view of the case, and, as I expected, appeared to regard me as little better than a maniac for making the suggestion. At the same time, he entirely ignored the fact that if taking up the 160 acres at the rent charged, although he could not cultivate the whole at once, had not been a remarkably good speculation, he would have had nothing to do with it; and he also forgot the fact that there were hundreds of men in the district who would have been delighted to get the eighty acres he took up in his daughter's name, even though they had to pay for it a much higher rental. Taking the whole of the district of Moolert the settlers are doing exceedingly well, and the only thing to be regretted is that there is not plenty of such land, as eligibly situated, open for selection upon the same advantageous terms. It would not long stand idle.

## **No. IV.—*Jan. 21 st 1869.***

Proceeding from Moolert plains towards Majorca, I passed through Rodborough. All the best land in this parish was purchased long ago by Messrs. Donald Campbell and Bucknall, the latter alone having some 17,000 acres. There was still, however, some very fair land left, of which the forty-seconders speedily availed themselves, and consequently fifty-eight selectors are settled here, whose holdings average some sixty acres each. All this land has been improved—fenced in and partly cultivated—but the farms scarcely present so flourishing an appearance as these in Moolert. On Bucknall's plains, in this parish, some of the crops have given very poor yields, and here again I found many of the settlers ascribe the falling-off quite as much to sowing machine-thrashed wheat as to the drought. The early sown oats in this district, however, did very well, some averaging as much as forty bushels to the acre; but unfortunately there was very little land placed under that crop, the settlers being induced by the high price of wheat about sowing time to depend principally upon that cereal. Here again I met with an instance of the mischief which arises from extraneous influences being allowed to interfere with the working of the Lands department. From some cause, which I was unable satisfactorily to determine, one man had been improperly and unjustly deprived of the original selection made by him. In order to compensate for this wrong, he appears to have had a roving commission to select where he liked, and very good use he made of the opportunity. He took up eighty acres of the choicest portion of a reserve on Bucknall's

run, which includes a spring powerful enough to turn a small Hour-mill, and which, in the earlier days of the colony, actually did turn a mill for the Messrs. Bucknall. The Government had previously refused all applications for this land, very properly reserving it for the public, in consequence of the admirable water supply. Besides this, the land is of magnificent quality, and I was credibly informed that the owners of the run on which it is situated would have been happy to give £20 an acre for it. There is such an abundance of feed all the year round that it is almost impossible for the cattle to eat it down; and it has always been a favourite camping-place for teamsters.

Leaving Rodborough I passed on through Majorca to Talbot, and visited the holdings around Mount Greenock and Mount Glasgow. There is here a large amount of settlement under the clause. In the Talbot division, including portions of the parishes of Amherst, Lillicur, Caralulup, and Eglinton, the greater portion of Craigie, and a small part of Bung Bong, there are no less than 470 holdings, averaging about sixty acres each. Nearly all these are fenced-in, on some of them very comfortable dwellings are erected, and nearly all the land that was granted the year before last—about 1,500 acres—is under cultivation, the principal crop being wheat. The average yield is from twelve to fourteen bushels to the acre, although in some few localities as much as thirty bushels to the acre have been obtained. In Bandy Creek Flat, in the parish of Craigie, I saw a portion of land which certainly looked of the most uninviting description. It is situated immediately between Majorca and Deep Creek. The man who first took up a holding here some two years ago was laughed at for his pains. His crops, however, turned out well, and as the natural result he soon had a number of neighbours, every available acre being speedily occupied. This season the yield on this flat has been superior to that of nearly every other part of the district, the general average being over thirty bushels. It is, however, an incident worthy the attention of our agriculturists that this year the light sandy soil has given far better yields than the black or rich chocolate coloured varieties. The drought appears to have had far more effect on this last description of land. It seems to have been entirely dried up, and large fissures varying from three to six inches in width and from three to five feet in depth have formed, rendering it in some instances absolutely unsafe for the horses in the reaping or stripping machines to go over it. The whole of the available land from Majorca to Chines has been taken up under the clause, but some of it is very poor, and appears to have been selected by carters and bullock drivers more as a home for themselves and an enclosure in which to keep their teams, than for any other purpose. It has, however, been all fenced, nine out of every ten selectors have erected dwellings of some—many of a superior—description, and in not a few instances some small portions have been brought under cultivation. In this district a strange complication has arisen. The Climes reefs are supposed to run all through this land, and consequent upon the excitement in quartz mining which has recently taken place in the locality, the whole of the country has been marked out for mining leases, and the applications have, I believe, been duly lodged in the office of the department of Mines. No less than 2,900 acres have recently been marked out for this purpose by the mining surveyor of the district. In all leases issued under the 42nd section of the Land Act ample power of entrance for mining purposes is reserved, but it is rather singular to see land that for so many years has lain idle thus suddenly acquire a double value. In many places the surveyed line of the reefs runs through well-cultivated and flourishing farms, and if the expectations of some sanguine individuals are realised, this must become one of the most flourishing districts in the colony. Mining and agriculture will be alike successful? and the locality will be as celebrated for its grain as for its gold.

In this district I met with two of the most flagrant cases of evasion of the Land Act, and of the spirit and intention of the 42nd clause, which up to that time had come under my notice, and both of these were attributable to the political influence of members of Parliament. In the remarks I am about to make nothing is farther from my intention than to charge either the political head or the officers of the Land Department with anything approaching corrupt conduct. All that can feasibly be attributed to them is the fault of crediting too readily the representations made by members of Parliament and the friends whom they introduce. It would be well for the country if in the Land office no private interviews relative to the disposal of land were granted at all. I am satisfied that were many of the statements with which Mr. Grant's ear is too frequently abused made public, their accuracy would be indignantly denied by all acquainted with the facts. As a rule, when, to serve their constituents, members of Parliament go to the Land office, they appear as the briefed advocates of their clients. Whether they receive fees with their briefs or not I do not pretend to determine, but I have seen quite enough to convince me that if the representations made by them are not absolutely incorrect, they are framed in such a manner, and are of such a partial character, as to produce a very incorrect impression, and an unfair decision follows as a matter of course—that is if the representations be attended to. In one of the cases of evasion of the act to which I have referred, several allotments were marked out by the proprietors of the run on which the land was situated—Messrs. Macdonald and Grant, of Clunes—in the names of their shepherds or other employés. The surveyor's fees, advertising charges, and all other necessary expenses, were paid by Mr. Grant, and the men in whose names the land was taken up did not even know where it was situated. All these facts, I was informed on good authority, were proved at the commission, and the selections were at first

cancelled. Yet, notwithstanding such unblushing dummyism and the reports of the Crown lands bailiff condemnatory of the whole affair, sufficient political influence was brought to bear on the department to cause the applications to be granted, and eventually the land was transferred to either Mr. Grant or Mr. Macdonald. I may, perhaps, be wrong in the names, as there are more than two persons interested in the station, but with this exception the facts are as I have stated them. To show the value of this land, I may state that land of a similar character has recently been sold by the proprietors of this same run at £8 per acre, the purchaser having seven years to pay it in, and the purchase-money bearing bank interest.

The other case of evasion is in the immediate vicinity of Talbot. Here Mr. Samuels, a gold-broker, has managed to obtain under the 42nd clause a section of 570 acres. This was done by means of a judiciously-arranged system of transfers. This land, judging from surface indications, must be highly auriferous. On the one side are situated the rich leads of Mount Greenock, and on the other, distant but a few hundred yards, is a mine which is now yielding from 200oz. to 300oz of gold a fortnight. The section of land to which I refer is situated immediately between the two leads—if there be two; but whatever leads there are they must, apparently, run through it. It was originally occupied under mining leases, and Mr. Samuels, by some means, obtained the assent of the licensees to the land being transferred to him under the 42nd clause; but as these persons—with one exception—had done nothing at all to test the ground, their assent or dissent, in a public point of view, was of but small value. The land for agricultural purposes is worth but little, and has evidently been taken up for speculative objects. I admit that Mr. Samuels has a house and garden in one corner of the section, and that the whole has been surrounded by a low stone wall, constructed of stones picked from off the land; but there has been no other attempt at improvement, and it is attributing no crime to Mr. Samuels to say that his evident object is to obtain the fee-simple of the estate. Of course, so long as it remains under the 42nd clause no great harm is done, as the land may at any time be entered upon for mining purposes. But, whilst mining is dull in the district, it is quite possible that the land may be offered for sale, and sold without public attention being actively directed to the circumstance. Were anything of the sort to be permitted, a monstrous wrong would be perpetrated, not only on the district, but on the colony at large, for should the leads now trending towards the land run through it, it will be worth scores of thousands of pounds.

The Maryborough division of the district, under the charge of the Maryborough Crown lands bailiff, includes portions of the parishes of Eddington, Bet Bet, Wareek, Bung Bong, the whole of Carisbrook, and part of Craigie. Within this circle there are 380 selectors under the clause, and their holdings average from forty-five to fifty acres each. In the immediate vicinity of the township of Maryborough most of the selections are small, and the ground poor. They are principally occupied by miners and others who have other avocations, and who, like these in the neighbourhood of Castlemaine, are not solely dependent upon the land for their livelihood. At some distance from the township, however, the selections are larger, the land is of a better quality, and cultivation has taken place to a greater extent. It is worthy of remark that all through this district the residents are entirely dependent for their supply of vegetables on the Chinese, notwithstanding the very large amount of settlement which exists and the extensive area which is under cultivation. The care and labour requisite to grow vegetables to perfection in this district appear to be too severe a tax upon the industry of Europeans, and were it not for the plodding perseverance of the immigrants from the flowery land, the inhabitants of the locality would have to go without these highly necessary articles of food altogether, or would have to pay a far higher price for them. All along the Bet Bet the whole country is under settlement, the land is of an average quality; and although this year the crops have been poor, yet in a more favourable season the selectors would doubtless obtain good returns. The land around Carisbrook is patchy, but it is generally more level and of a richer description than that in Craigie. There are here forty-five holdings, averaging forty acres each. All are substantially fenced in; on many of them comfortable residences have been erected, and a considerable portion is under cultivation. A large quantity of the richest land in this locality—on the Charlotte Plains—is owned by Messrs. M'Culloch, Sellar, and Co., who are believed to be the real holders of the run.

In the Avoca division of this district, including the parishes of Avoca and Rathscar, part of the parish of Glenlogie going of the Pyrenees, Lainplough, Yalong, a small portion of Bung Bong and a part of Lexton, the settlement is not of so important a character as in the other two divisions. The greater portion of it was taken up in the year 1868, so that as yet there is but little under cultivation. The land also is generally of a poor description, with the exception of a few fertile spots in the immediate neighbourhood of the Pyrenees. About 257 selections, averaging some forty acres each, have, however, been made in this district, and notwithstanding the short time that has elapsed nearly all of them have been fenced in. There are not more than some 250 acres under crop, and the average yield of wheat from this will be about ten bushels to the acre. This certainly is not very cheering, but the selectors have not lost heart. They cling to their homes, and hope for better times; and if manly hearts and resolute perseverance can command them, better times will come.

Returning from Carisbrook towards Castlemaine, I passed through the parish of Kddington, which lies on each side of the Deep Creek, and extends to the Loddon. This parish has been nearly all taken up under the

42nd clause, and the few small portions left have been pegged out preparatory to application being made for them at the next commission. There have already been issued here 178 licences, the average area of the holdings being fifty acres, so that in this parish alone some 9,000 acres are held under the clause. Nearly the whole of this has been fenced in, more than one half of it is under cultivation, and a large number of the selectors are resident upon their lots, some of them having erected substantial and comfortable houses. This settlement is one of the most flourishing through which I passed. All the settlers with whom I conversed expressed great confidence in their prospects, and appeared well contented with their position. Throughout the greater portion of the parish the soil is of a rich, dark chocolate colour, tolerably level, and admirably adapted for wheat-growing purposes. The general average this season has been about fifteen bushels to the acre, and this, taking into consideration the long drought, is very fair. A few of the selectors here have formed gardens and planted vineyards, and I tasted some very fair wine which I was told was made in the district, but this was the produce of a vineyard planted on land purchased some years ago. Many of these who occupy land in this locality under the 42nd clause are extremely anxious to purchase their holdings, and in one or two instances their improvements have been valued, and the land is advertised for sale, the upset price being fixed at 25s. per acre. This is a very low figure for such land as is to be found in this locality, and unless a very liberal valuation has been placed upon the improvements, I should not be surprised to see a remarkably brisk competition for some of the allotments.

From Eddington I proceeded through Neerewan, Bradford, Walmer, Ravenswood, Harcourt, and a portion of Muckleford, into Castlemaine. In Neerewan the soil is of an inferior nature, and much more heavily timbered than in Eddington. There consequently has not been so much demand for the land. Only fifteen holdings, averaging about thirty acres each, have been selected. These, however, have all been fenced in, and partly cultivated, the average yield this season being about twelve bushels to the acre, in Bradford the soil is very poor, of a hard sandy nature, and a great portion of the country consists of ranges covered with a miserable scrub. There is hardly any feed for cattle, and only one holding of forty acres has been taken up. The land in Walmer is better than at Bradford, although even here it is very poor. Still, it appears to have been in requisition. Forty-nine allotments, averaging thirty acres each, have been selected. These have been fenced in, a fair proportion is under cultivation, and the selectors are living either on or adjacent to their respective holdings. The settlement under the clause in Ravenswood and Harcourt demands but little notice. In the former only one holding of forty acres has been taken up; and in the latter only fourteen, averaging twenty-five acres each. These, however, have all been fenced in, and are being cultivated. In Muckleford the land is of a very different character, consisting of a rich dark loamy soil. Most of it, however, was purchased long ago by small settlers, who have taken advantage of the clause to increase the size of their original farms. It is almost needless to say that these have all carried out the conditions of improvement. The number of licences issued in this locality is twenty-eight, and the average size of the holdings thirty-five acres. A constant supply of excellent water flows through the townships of North and South Muckleford, and a general air of substantial prosperity pervades the whole district.

## **No. V.—Jan. 28th, 1869.**

In my former letters I have dealt principally with the settlement which has taken place in what is generally known as the Castlemaine district, occasionally travelling out of it when a considerable quantity of land occupied under the clause lay near my line of route. The selections already described are without doubt the most important which have taken place, although the recent extension of the operation of the 42nd clause to areas within thirty miles of a gold-field may, in a short time, place them in a very secondary position. The operations of the clause in what may be termed the Ballarat and Ararat districts have, however, been but little less important than these already referred to, and in my future communications I shall give the result of my observations during a tour extending from Ballarat, through Creswick, Smeaton, and Climes, thence across Dowling Forest to Burrumbeet, Beaufort, Ararat, and Pleasant Creek.

Between Ballarat and Creswick Creek the settlements are few and unimportant. On the left-hand side of the main road nearly all the land at all fitted for agricultural pursuits was purchased years ago, and on the right hand most of it is considered auriferous, was mined on during the earlier days of the gold-fields, and in some places is still the scene of mining operations. Even where this is not the case, the soil is generally of the very poorest description, covered with quartz gravel, and anything but eligible for settlement. Notwithstanding this, several small patches, where the ground is not quite so barren, have been taken up and appropriated as homes by persons whose avocations necessitate their residence in the district. These have all been improved; and although the crops, whether of vegetables or grain, are not remarkably luxuriant, and the tenements erected on the land have no great architectural pretensions, still the residents have effected a considerable improvement in

their position. They have homes, which they did not possess before, and have exchanged uncomfortable tents for habitations of a more substantial description; whilst the small amount of cultivation already indulged in materially adds to the support and comfort of family. In the parish of Creswick proper the settlement is also of a very limited character from two causes. A very large portion of the land is occupied for mining purposes, and what is not thus held was either sold by auction some year since or is reserved lest it should hereafter prove auriferous. On some land of this latter description several families are now settled, but are in illegal occupation. It was intended to proceed against them some months ago, but the authorities have exercised a Wise discretion in abstaining at present from any interference with them. The people residing on the land are neither loafers nor dummies, but hard-working miners, who would be only too happy to pay for a licence if they could procure one, and certainly would not grumble at the rent charged to these more fortunately situated. The small patches they have taken up are all cultivated, and comfortable homes are erected upon them. Of course if the land is hereafter required for mining purposes they must give way, but in the mean time there is no occasion to disturb them, and to eject them from the holdings to which, by the peculiar exigencies of the case, they are unable to obtain a legal title, would be little better than an act of unnecessary cruelty. There are some allotments averaging from sixty to eighty acres each, in close proximity to the township, which are held by storekeepers, publicans, and others, on which no improvement has been made, with the exception of the fencing. The land is certainly of an inferior description, and in some places stony. It is ostensibly held for grazing purposes, but the probability appears to be that it was taken up wholly for speculative objects, and with the intention of eventually securing the freehold at a low price. Were this land still open for selection, it would certainly be more profitably occupied, and the attention of the proper authorities should be directed to it, as simply fencing in a section of land, without in any manner utilising it, is certainly not complying with the intention of the clause or the conditions of the lease. The few who, in this locality, have cultivated their allotments, are for the most part doing well, and their crops are better than the average in the neighborhood. At Spring-hill, which adjoins Creswick, nearly all the land has been purchased, and there is no settlement under the clause which requires notice.

Passing from Clunes we come to a fine agricultural district—Smeaton, or what is more generally known as the Smeaton Plains. Here there has been a large area of land taken up, both under the 42nd clause and by virtue of rural store licences issued under the Land Act of 1862. Prior to the passing of the act of 1865 a large quantity of land was taken up under these licences, with the view of acquiring a sort of pre-emptive right to the ground, and by the 27th clause of that act it was provided that where homesteads had been formed on such areas the licensee should, under certain provisions, have the exclusive right of purchasing such allotment within six months after the passing of the act. I believe the whole of the holders of these licences in this district applied to be allowed to purchase the land occupied by them within the specified period, and their improvements were valued with a view to the applications being acceded to. Prior, however, to the sale taking place, the Mining department stepped in, and protested against the land being alienated, on the ground that in all probability it would prove to be highly auriferous. This occurred more than two years ago, and nothing has been done since. The Government decline to sell the land, and the occupiers pay no rent, but continue to hold and cultivate their several allotments. Of course by this arrangement a considerable revenue is annually lost to the state. As there appears to be a well-founded objection against the sale of at least a considerable portion of the land in question, the best mode of solving the difficulty would be to place all the rural store licensees under the provisions of the 42nd clause, and change the one tenure for the other. By this means no injustice would be done to anyone, and at the same time the national income would be materially benefited, since at the present time there are upwards of two thousand acres divided into fifty-three allotments held in this manner. All of this land has been cleared, fenced-in, is under cultivation, and on twenty-one allotments comfortable, and in a few instances substantial, stone or brick residences have been erected. The total value of the improvements thus effected is estimated at close on £10,000, or an average of something like £4 12s. per acre. About one thousand acres in the parish are held under the 42nd clause, and, like the land just described, improvements of a very satisfactory nature have been carried out on all the holdings. Indeed, this portion of the country presents a highly gratifying appearance. Comfortable homesteads surround the observer on every side, and nothing approaching poverty is to be seen. All the available land has been taken up here, save a few pieces which have been reserved for public purposes. These have recently been applied for, but as the land has acquired an exceptional value, it would be scarcely fair to lease it under the clause. If not required for the objects for which it was at first set apart, it should be offered for public competition, so that the state may obtain the enhanced price which it is sure to realise. A small portion of the land in this district is stony, and has been very expensive to clear, but the soil is generally good, consisting in some places of a light loam, whilst in others it is black with a sandy bottom. As appears to be the general rule this season, the crops are not so good as was anticipated. Oats have yielded fairly, the average being about twenty-five bushels to the acre; but the wheat will not give more than from twelve to fifteen, although in some few cases I heard of as much as thirty being obtained. The wheat on some of the farms

in this locality has suffered severely from rust. The grain has a shrivelled appearance, and where thirty bushels were expected, only from seven to ten have been realised. I was told that the Adelaide seed and the Golden Cup were the sorts which suffered most from this cause, whilst the Tuscan was more free from the disease than any other description. Rust has shown itself in this district in places where it was least expected—on good and well drained land, and where one crop of potatoes was all that had been previously taken off it.

In the parish of Campbelltown about 1,500 acres have been taken up under the rural store licenses, and 11,000 under the 42nd section, the combined area being held in the names of 225 persons. The settlement here is not of a very satisfactory character. Joyce's Creek divides the parish into two parts, known respectively as East and West Campbelltown. In the western portion there is far more land held under the clause than in the eastern, but at the same time there is a much greater amount of cultivation in the latter than in the former. The soil in this locality is not of a first-class character, but it is not to this cause alone that the paucity of settlement, as compared with the quantity of land selected in the western portion, is to be attributed, for country of a worse description has been taken up, and is being successfully cultivated. Some allotments here have been taken up by farmers living on their own land, who use them as grazing-paddocks, and this there is not much objection. The case, however, is entirely different when some hundreds of acres are surrounded by one fence, although the land is held in different names, and no attempt is made either to cultivate a profitable use. It is alleged that the allotments thus alluded to were taken up by persons in the interest of the Messrs. Anderson, who are the taken up proprietors of some saw-mills in the neighbourhood Messrs. Anderson, by means of transfers, hold a large quantity of and in their own name, and loud complaints are made by the farmers, who state that whilst they are compelled to keep their farms clear of thistles, Caledonia's emblem flourishes most luxuriantly on the allotments thus held in contravention of the provisions of the clause, and the seed is consequently scattered all over the country by every wind that blows. Altogether the settlement in the western portion of this parish is, with few exceptions, a sham; the land has been taken up by dummies, and the sooner it is again thrown open for selection the better. To the east of Joyce's Creek a very different condition of things is to be observed. Here most of the selections appear to be *bonâ fide*. In the majority of instances the land has been fenced in, portions are under cultivation, and in some cases the holders are residing on their allotments. Consequent upon the drought, however, the crops are but poor, and inferior to these in the neighbouring parishes of Smeaton and Glengower.

In Glengower, which lies to the west of Campbelltown, about 5,000 acres have been taken up under the rural store licenses and the 42nd clause, but principally under the latter. The soil here is much better than that in Campbelltown, and on some of the bills it is exceedingly good, being of a dark chocolate colour, and formed principally of decomposed basaltic rock. The land in this parish was originally hold by about 100 persons, but by subsequent transfers the number has been greatly reduced, and the holdings have proportionately increased in size. Most of the settlers here appear to be in very comfortable circumstances. They have erected neat residences; and the appearances of the farm-yards, short as the crops have been, indicate anything but poverty and want. Some of the land in this locality is held by farmers who had homesteads prior to the passing of the Amending Land Act, and of course these reside on their own purchased property. In many cases, in order to satisfy the commission who visited the district some time since, these persons erected small wooden shanties at an expense of some £10 or £15 each on the allotments taken up by them under the 42nd clause. These are now tumbling to pieces; but as the ground has in nearly every case been fenced in and cultivated, there is no room for complaint. The land is all profitably occupied, and the district has reaped considerable benefit from the operation of the clause.

## **No. VI.—Jan. 30th, 1869.**

All around Clunes there are a number of holdings under the 42nd clause, most of which appear to be held by persons who highly value their allotments, and have made material improvements upon them; and this is not to be wondered at. Clunes at the present time is one of the most thriving inland townships of Victoria; and, although in existence for many years, it has apparently but just entered on what promises to be a long career of prosperity. As I mentioned in a former letter, all the land between here and Majorca has been taken up under mining leases, as well as under the 42nd clause; and it was perfectly refreshing—after some of the Sleepy Hollows through which I had previously passed—to witness the air of bustling activity which prevailed through the town. Nearly all the land selected under the clause is profitably occupied and cultivated, and there is little doubt but that the holders are doing, and will do, well. Climes itself is very prettily situated on the sides of two hills, the creek running through the centre. I was informed, however, that I saw it in its most favourable aspect, as in the winter season the low-lying streets are almost impassable for mud. This will, no doubt, be soon remedied, for the town is rapidly extending itself; and when the streets are properly made, the inconvenience

now complained of will not be felt. Some of the forty-seconders have already obtained the fee-simple of their allotments, and others are anxious to do so. Great care should, however, be exercised in alienating land in this district, for it appears almost impossible to determine what is and what is not auriferous. Some few months ago land was sold here absolutely adjoining the township—that is, it came right up to the township buildings; how far the legal boundary extends I am unable to say—which certainly ought not to have been sold, and particularly in the manner in which it was disposed of. There were altogether ten allotments, containing about 420 acres. The land was offered at the upset price of £1 per acre; but, as is usual in such cases, the improvements were liberally valued, amounting in some cases to as much as £15 per acre, and averaging all round £4 per acre. Of course, under these circumstances, there was no competition, and the land fell into the hands of these who had effected the improvements. As a general rule, this is the most desirable result, even though the ground should be worth a trifle more than it actually realises; but some circumspection should be used where there is a probability of the land being required for the extension of the neighbouring township, and especially where there appears a likelihood of its subsequently proving auriferous. There can be no question that in this district no land should be sold except with the sanction of the Mining department, given after the locality has been visited by a competent and experienced mining surveyor. It is far easier to reserve the land in the first instance than it is to settle the complications which are sure to arise relative to the vexed question of mining upon or under purchased property. Of course, where there are no strong objections to the alienation of land, the very best course to adopt is to dispose of it to these who have already settled upon it, and are anxious to obtain a title, which cannot be invalidated, to that which they have become accustomed to regard as their home.

Having visited Clunes, I returned to Creswick, and then started *viâ* Burrumbeet for Beaufort. On the road there is comparatively but little settlement under the 42nd clause. Nearly all the land, including almost the whole of what is known as Bowling Forest, was sold years ago, and is now either held by the original proprietors or rented by farmers. The soil for the most part is remarkably good; and here we have an instance of what good agricultural land, near a market, is considered worth. Messrs. Morton, Kinnersley, and another, rent from Mr. W. J. T. Clarke some thousands of acres at an annual rental, which I heard variously stated at from 8s. to 10s. per acre. This land they sublet to the farmers in the district at prices varying from 10s. up to 25s. per acre, netting a very respectable income by the transaction. I admit that some of this land is perhaps as fine as any in the colony but there is just as good land now occupied under the 42nd clause, and for which the Government is getting less than 3s. per acre. It would be anything but desirable that the Government should play the part of the harsh landlord, but such fact as these serve to show what little ground there is for the cry which, in some quarters, has been so industriously raised for a reduction of the rent. Some of the crops in this locality have this year been very poor the result to a great extent of bad fanning, the land being wretchedly duty in consequence of long-continued cropping without manure or dressing of any description. It is not until after crossing the Trewalla Creek some four or five miles from Beaufort that you again come amongst the settlers under the 42nd clause. Close to Simpson's Home Station, at Trewalla, there are some forty-seconders, who are doing extremely well. Their holdings are all fenced in, a considerable portion is under cultivation, and the crops generally are remarkably good as compared with other districts. I was told of one man who was threshing as much as sixty bushels of wheat to the acre. This certainly was an exceptional case, but thirty bushels was by no means an extraordinary occurrence. The land here is almost all taken up, and the pastoral tenant confined to his purchased land. There is a great difference in the quality of the land in the Beaufort district. In some places it is poor, cold, and sandy, whilst in others, such as the alluvial flats between Raglan and Mount Cole, it is very good and bears excellent crops. Taking the whole area in charge of the contract surveyor at Beaufort, which includes the parishes of Beaufort, Eurambeen, Raglan, Mount Cole, Trawalla, Woodnaggerak, Shirley, Nanimia, Wahkwallok, Buangor, Livingstone, and Longe Kal Kal there are 278 selectors, holding 14,308 acres, of which about 3,000 are under cultivation. A great portion of this land has been but recently taken up, and this in a great measure accounts for but a comparatively small portion being under cultivation. It is nearly all, however, fenced in, and, as a rule, there is but little doubt of the *bona fides* of the holders. Indeed, the manner in which the forty-seconders have gone to work and improved their selections affords a striking contrast to the operations of the selectors under the 12th section. Some of these latter have fenced in their allotments, but very few have done anything more, the land being apparently still used by the neighbouring squatter to graze his sheep. As soon as you enter the area occupied by the forty-seconders an entirely different scene presents itself. Here the holdings, varying from twenty up to eighty acres in extent, are fenced in, small patches are under cultivation, and in a number of instances residences of a more or less substantial nature have been erected. In the one case there are all the indications of settlement, progress, and cultivation; in the other there are none. The settlement near Mount Cole is generally very satisfactory. Here, and in the neighbourhood of Raglan, miners who have been long resident in the district have taken up eighteen or twenty acres, have fenced their allotments in, and have established for themselves comfortable homes. In

Beaufort, a good many allotments have been taken up by residents in the township, who, as yet, have done nothing but fence them in. They, however, express their intention of cultivating them, although it is scarcely likely that whilst engaged at their places of business they will erect habitations on land at a distance which they could not conveniently use. Many of the selectors in this district are deserving of all praise for the manner in which they have resolutely struggled on and overcome the difficulties which they encountered when they first took up the land between two and three years ago. I was credibly informed that some of them, when they selected their holdings, had not even money enough to pay the surveyor's fees, and some of the land was very poor. They, however, never lost heart. By some means or other they managed to plough up a few acres and sow, some a little wheat, others a few potatoes, and some both. Whilst their crops were growing, they fenced in their land, the storekeepers gave them credit for the few necessaries of life upon which they existed, and from this small beginning they have steadily worked along, until now many of them have comfortable homes, and at the end of the present season will have to their credit snug little sums, varying from £50 up to £150, and in some cases £200 each. The crops in this district are generally good. The wheat may be averaged at from twenty to twenty-five bushels to the acre, and the oats, which are rather light, at about the same. Beaufort was at one time the centre of an extensive and prosperous mining district, but at present all the alluvial leads appear to be worked out, and, with the exception of a few diggers who remain fossicking about the old ground, there is literally nothing doing. The gullies and flats where, a few years ago, there were thousands of miners busily employed, are now all deserted, and the scrub is again making its appearance amongst the old holes, and on the ground which was once so valuable that every inch was disputed with that keenness which men seldom exemplify save when engaged in the search for gold. There may be plenty of good reefs in the district, but as yet little has been done towards their development. One has recently been opened from which a fair prospect has been obtained, and some are sanguine enough to hope that this is but the commencement of a revival which, to some extent at least, shall restore the glories of "old Fiery Creek." Whether these anticipations be realised or not, it appears pretty certain that Beaufort has seen its worst days. It is now almost entirely dependent upon the 42nd and other settlers in the district; and as cultivation becomes more extended, and settlement increases, the agricultural interest will advance in importance, and the township must share in its prosperity. Were it not for the settlers under the 42nd clause the storekeepers and others in Beaufort could not possibly exist, and it may, therefore, be easily believed that they regard with considerable interest the operations and progress of these who take up land in this manner. At the next commission there will be about sixty new applications to be heard, the intending selections comprising some 2,800 acres of land.

## **No. VII.—*Feb. 4th, 1869.***

Leaving the Beaufort, or what is more popularly known as the old Fiery Creek, district, but little settlement under the 42nd clause is met with until Ararat is approached, and even here the settlement which has taken place does not present these important features which I have had to chronicle with regard to some portions of the country through which I previously passed. There are more reasons than one for this. The Ararat district is one of the furthest removed from the great centres of population, and therefore there is not so much to induce persons to engage in agricultural pursuits. Added to this, although Ararat can no longer boast the glories of the old Canton Lead, where at one time between 60,000 and 70,000 persons were gathered together within a radius of some two or three miles, and when golden holes were almost the rule and "duffers" the exception, still there is a very fair amount of gold even now being obtained, and I was informed that the yield for the quarter ending the 31st December bust showed an increase upon the previous three months of two thousand ounces. As a rule, I found that in the neighbourhood of the gold-fields, wherever the miners were doing tolerably well, less attention was paid to agriculture; and with the exception of small blocks taken up for residence only, less land was taken up under the 42nd clause than in other places not so favourably situated. Thus, although mining at Ararat is far from being brisk, still there is more doing than in many other mining districts, and two or three years ago, when the clause first came into operation, mining affairs were far more lively than even at the present time. There was consequently not so much attention paid to the facilities afforded for settlement, and a great portion of what has been selected has only recently been taken up, so that there has not been much time to effect any great improvements, or to cultivate any extensive area. The advantages offered by the clause are, however, far from being neglected even here. Going south from the township, and following the course of the Hopkins on its western side, a number of comfortable homesteads, surrounded by small portions of well-cultivated land, may be observed. The land taken up here under the clause was originally part of the united Ararat Borough and Gold-fields Common, but it is now put to a far better use. Nearly all the available intervening land between the Hopkins and the foot of the Mount Ararat range has been taken up by selectors, and even the mountain itself has not been held sacred from their invasions. Par up the sides may be noticed

small areas of land fenced in, and at no very considerable distance from the summit, there are small but flourishing vineyards, the wine from which is, I believe, highly appreciated in the neighbourhood. Some of the selectors in this locality held small pieces of land in fee simple before the passing of the Amended Land Act, and these, as in other districts, have taken advantage of its provisions to enlarge their holdings. One of the most comfortable of the forty-seconders started here a few years ago with no other capital than a few goats. But milk at that time was at a premium, and the half-dozen or so goats did not prove such a very bad start after all. At any rate, the milk given by them, coupled with the industry and perseverance of their owner, has secured for him one of the most comfortable homesteads in the neighbourhood. Passing round Kangaroo Point, and proceeding through Logan's pre-emptive right, I came to Phillips's-flat, where there are some few sections taken up under the clause, but they presented little worthy of notice. Some of the proprietors appeared to be small dairyman, who seemed to have taken up the land principally as enclosures for their cattle, whilst others had cultivated small patches of the best land they had obtained, and had apparently settled down. Very many of them were, however, evidently in straggling circumstances, but there is little doubt of their ultimate success, although they have plenty of uphill work before them. At Moyston, a small township some five miles from Ararat, there is not so much settlement as might have been anticipated. The soil is not good, but in other districts land far inferior has been taken up with great avidity, and the selectors are doing comparatively well upon it. Most of the holdings at Moyston are being improved, and nearly all these who have taken upland appear to be *bonâ fide* settlers. In this district the land is generally of a poor description. There are, however, some good bits fronting the Hopkins and in a few other places, and there is no doubt that before any very long period has elapsed there will be a far greater amount of settlement than at present exists. In but few instances did I here observe small allotments taken up by miners with the view of forming comfortable homes for their families, and as a rule I should say that the diggers here are not so settled as on some of the gold-fields I previously visited. No doubt a considerable portion of the land in this district has been selected for speculative purposes only, and as there has been no inspection with the view of ascertaining to what extent the land has been improved and the conditions carried out, the dummies have had it pretty well all their own way. It would have a very beneficial effect if the Crown land bailiffs were ordered to make periodical examinations of their districts, with the view of reporting for forfeiture all land taken up under the clause, upon which no improvements had been made, and upon which the parties selecting evinced no intention of residing. This would not only render the operations of mere land sharks and loafers far more difficult than at present, but would afford to the real settlers better opportunities of obtaining allotments suitable for their purposes.

In this district my attention was directed to a large tract of land some eleven miles in length, and averaging about four in breadth, which has been reserved from selection because it is believed that the deep leads of Ararat run through it. In fact, from the position of the land and the contour of the surrounding country, there can be but very little doubt of the fact, although the leads have never been traced, and at present there appears but little probability of their speedy development. This land is situated immediately to the south of the township, is bounded for the most part on the north and west by the river Hopkins, and is intersected by Jackson's Creek. It immediately overlies the basaltic rock formation, comprises some of the most eligible land for settlement in the district, and a considerable number of persons are desirous of occupying it under the 42nd clause. The only attempt worth noticing which has been made to trace the deep lead here has been made by the Black Lead Gold-Mining Company. They hold some 4,000 acres under the Ararat bye-laws, have erected powerful machinery, spent thousands of pounds, and have been working for some years past, but, I am sorry to say, without much success. The sinking in the ground referred to will vary from 150 feet to over 300 feet in depth, and in consequence of the large quantity of water which has to be contended with, very powerful and expensive machinery must be employed. It would, of course, be highly improper, and ultimately most disastrous to the district, were any land to be alienated which would hinder the tracing and working of these leads; but, at the same time, there does not appear the slightest necessity to reserve from settlement such an immense area as forty-four square miles. Mr. Couchman, the mining surveyor, was ordered to report on this matter some time since, and he recommended that the land should be eligible for settlement under the 42nd clause, provided that it was marked out in twenty-acre blocks, and a portion five chains wide reserved around every block. This suggestion, if carried out, would in effect prevent settlement altogether. Twenty acres is not enough to give a man a fair chance of success in this district, and there is not the slightest necessity for the reservation of such a large portion as is proposed by Mr. Couchman. If ever the land is worked it will be by large companies, and the shafts will of necessity be sunk at a considerable distance from each other. Were the land to be surveyed in eighty-acre sections, and a strip five chains wide reserved around each allotment, that, together with the right of re-entry retained by the Government, would answer every purpose; all necessary facilities for tracing the leads would be preserved to the miners at the same time a large portion of land which now lies idle would be brought under cultivation, and a considerable benefit be there by conferred upon the whole community residing in the neighbourhood. Any absolute sale of the land whilst there is any doubt as to the precise course the leads of

gold will take would be most unwise; but the same objection does not exist to occupation under the 42nd clause, especially when the selectors are aware of the risk they run.

In the whole of the Ararat district, which is a very extensive one, including Ararat proper, Stawell, and Pleasant Creek, Landsborough, Eversley, Crowlands, and Lake Boloke, there are 933 selectors, who have taken up altogether 34,070 acres of land, so that their allotments average about thirty-five acres each. Taking the district as a whole, there is perhaps comparatively less land under cultivation than in any other which I had previously inspected. It must, however, be remembered that the greater portion of the selections were made during 1867 and 1868, and there is no doubt but that, at the expiration of another twelvemonths, a very considerable improvement will be observed.

## **No. VIII.—Feb. 6th, 1869.**

The only portion of the Ararat district that demands a more extended notice than that already given it, is Pleasant Creek. Shortly after the great rush to the Canton Lead, at Ararat, it came into prominent notice in consequence of the rich discoveries which were then being made there, and a rush to it ensued second only in importance to the one to the Canton itself. The rich alluvial leads, however, which once gave remunerative employment to thousands, and small fortunes to hundreds, are now almost entirely worked out, or have been lost in deep and wet sinking, where the prospects scarcely warrant the erection of expensive machinery, without which the ground cannot be worked. Pleasant Creek, fortunately for those interested in its progress, did not depend wholly upon the alluvial mines. It is perhaps the richest quartz reefing district in the whole colony, and the visitor is filled with astonishment at the rapid development of this important branch of mining industry, by which on every hand he is surrounded. With the two exceptions of Ballarat and Chines I saw nothing approaching the bustle and activity which prevails at Pleasant Creek throughout the whole of the districts I had previously visited; and even Chines, nourishing as it undoubtedly is, and important as it is rapidly becoming, is distanced by it. The township here is called "The Reefs." There is a Government township named "Stawell," about two miles off, but there are very few persons resident there. The great centre of attraction is "The Reefs," and not the least surprising thing to be witnessed here is the number of miners' dwellings now being built and which have recently been erected. The old calico tents—eight by ten—which kept out neither wind nor rain, have all gone, with many other things of the past gold-digging era, and in their places are to be found substantial and comfortable weatherboard cottages. Everything about tins place wears a substantial and permanent aspect never to be found at mere alluvial rushes. The inhabitants of Pleasant Creek, and especially the reefers, are a little egotistical; but for this they may be excused, since the development of the reefs is due almost solely to their own unaided efforts. The same men are to be found there now who were the pioneers of the place some thirteen years ago. A great many of them have done remarkably well, but instead of spending their money elsewhere, they invested it in prospecting the reefs by which they were surrounded; and as a reward for their enterprise, some of them are now reaping handsome fortunes. A few are drawing as much as from £1,000 up to £2,500 per month in dividends; and I heard of many who are worth from £5,000 up to £10,000 a-year. I am not going to attempt to give a description of the reefs, for although not quite a stranger to the district, and although every one I met talked reefs—indeed seemed to live and move and have their being in these quartz formations—still, I have a profound opinion that in order to give anything like an adequate description of them it would be necessary to burrow and live underground for about a month. I may, however, state that the reefs have been traced from the surface to a depth of over 600ft., and that some of the companies recently started expect to go down over 1,000ft. The reefs here are found in curious combinations, altogether upsetting many of the theories that have been indulged in relative to their formation. The first worked was what I believe is termed the cross reef. Immense yields were obtained from it; indeed, had not that been the case, it would never at that time, have been worked at all, as will be easily believed when I state that at first it cost from £12 to £15 to raise and crush a ton of stone. Apparently running under or joining this reef, at nearly right angles, is the Scotchman's, which is also turning out extremely well, and was traced from the surface to its connexion with the Cross. There are a number of other reefs, the very names of which I am unacquainted with. The prospects on all of them appear to be very good. An immense area of ground has recently been taken up, and a vast amount of machinery is being erected. The crushing-mills are going night and day, and as some criterion of what the district is doing I may mention that, during the three months ending the 31st of December last, 20,000 tons of quartz were crushed, averaging 18dwt. to the ton, and 5,000 tons averaging over 1oz. It is expected that during the current quarter this quantity will be largely exceeded. There appears to be little doubt that even with the reefs already opened there will be remunerative work for a large population at Pleasant Creek for, I may say, scores of years to come. Whilst going over the reefs, and surrounded by magnificent machinery, I came upon a curious and interesting relic of the past. It looked like a leviathan grindstone with a beam through

the centre. It was the original crushing-machine. By means of this stone, roughly hewn by the miners themselves from a huge block of granite, some of the earliest and richest quartz obtained in the district was crushed, and in this rude and primitive manner was the wealth and importance of the locality first demonstrated. Like many other places, the great requisite here is water, the supply being at present very inferior, both as to quantity and quality. With that spirit of independence characteristic of the early pioneers of the district, the inhabitants have, however, decided to supply the want themselves. A company, entitled the Pleasant Creek Waterworks and Tramroad Company, has been formed for the object not only of providing a constant supply of water for domestic, mining, and irrigation purposes, but also to construct a tramway for the purpose of conveying to the reefs, at a cheap rate, the immense quantities of timber required for the mines. From the persons already connected with the company there appears every probability of its success and if the propositions now made are carried out, an immense benefit will be conferred on the community. Taken altogether, Pleasant Creek at the present time is perhaps busiest place in the whole colony, and its prosperity appears to rest upon a very substantial and permanent basis.

Coming to the settlement which has taken place in the district, I am bound to confess that more attention is paid to gold than to grain, and that, as a rule, the inhabitants prefer reefing to ploughing. A considerable quantity of land has, however, been taken up in the neighbourhood and many of the selectors are doing remarkably well. A great portion of the land I is very poor, and it would be little short of madness to attempt to cultivate it. There is, however, some good soil here, especially near what are known as "the lakes"—the lakes being in reality a chain of large water holes, the largest three miles in length, on the Little Wimmera. All round here the ground has been taken up, fenced in, and a large portion is under cultivation. The crops have been but moderate, having, as in other districts, suffered severely from the drought. I here met two of the earliest settlers in the district, who are regarded almost in the light of historical personages—Messrs. Scoullar and Brinkman. Some twelve or thirteen years ago they occupied on the margin of the lakes less than an acre of land, for the purpose of forming a home and growing a few vegetables. They took out miners' rights sufficient to cover the areas selected by them, and flattered themselves that they were in legal occupation. They, however, found themselves mistaken. Mr. Commissioner Wright pounced down upon them, and, contending that the gold-fields regulations did not extend so far as their location, summoned them for being in illegal occupation of Crown lands. In these days the law was not too liberally interpreted, and Messrs. Scoullar and Brinkman were fined £10, or, in default, one month's imprisonment. They went to gaol, objecting to pay the fine; but indignation meetings were held in the district, the fine was paid for them, and an agitation commenced which gave no small impetus to the land reform movement. Subsequently Messrs. Scoullar and Brinkman took out an occupation licence, and for the small plot of ground held by them, paid no less than £50 per year. They have since purchased that and some adjoining land, and also hold about eighty acres under the 42nd clause. In the immediate neighbourhood of Pleasant Creek there are one hundred and ten licensees, who have been over twelve months in possession of their holdings. They have about nine hundred and fifty acres under cultivation, and the value of the improvements effected is estimated at close upon £16,000. In order, however, to arrive at a fair estimate of what has really been done by the selectors generally, about £6,000 should be deducted from that amount, as this sum represents the value of a few handsome residences erected by wealthy reefers on small areas taken up for residence purposes only. This will reduce the value of the improvements on the great bulk of the allotments to £10,000, or about £100 each, which, as the average area is only some thirty acres, must be considered highly satisfactory. As one of the results of the settlement under the 42nd clause in this district, I may mention that a flour mill is now in course of erection at Stawell, and it is anticipated that next year, sufficient grain will be grown in the locality to keep it constantly at work. There is not much good land open for selection in the neighbourhood of Pleasant Creek, and several persons complained that almost the only really eligible country for agricultural pursuits in the district—which is situated near the Richardson, in the parishes of Burrum-Burrum and Wircheliba—is being rapidly sold by auction in such lots that it falls into the hands of the large landholders, so that in a short time all further settlement, except on very inferior soil, will be rendered impossible.

Returning from Pleasant Creek, I stayed for a short time at the Great Western diggings. A few sections have been taken up here under the clause, and the improvements effected are generally of a satisfactory character. The population, however, is but small, and there is not much doing. At this place I visited a very nice vineyard, on purchased land, the property of the occupier, Mr. Trouett. The vines are doing far better here than might have been expected, and Mr. Trouett has succeeded in making some capital wine. One sample which I tried was extremely delicate, and possessed a very fine bouquet. It is named the Nice Blanc.

In what may be termed the district of Ballarat proper, the settlements under the 42nd clause, so far as I was able to observe, are of a very scattered character. Indeed, it was impossible but that such should be the case, because, leaving out of the question the immense area occupied by the various mining companies, nearly all the best land was alienated from the Crown long before the Amending Land Act came into operation. Within a few

miles of Ballarat, there are a number of small holdings, ranging from two up to twenty acres in extent, occupied by miners, carters, and woodcutters, who spend whatever leisure time they have in cultivating and otherwise improving their allotments. Of the *bona fides* of these men there is no question, and they appear to appreciate the privilege of having a home, notwithstanding the difficulty they experience in rendering it comfortable and the land profitable. Nearly all the land on the side of the road leading from Ballarat to Buninyong was at one time taken up by residents in the former township. This, however, appears to have been done for purely speculative purposes, as there is scarcely an allotment upon which any improvements have been effected, and consequently the greater number of them have been forfeited. Perhaps the most interesting settlement in this district is in the parish of Buninyong. The greater portion of the land here is very good, of a rich chocolate colour. The land around the Mount was at first reserved from selection, but in consequence of the numerous applications for it, the department had it surveyed in ten-acre sections, and all these have been taken up. The selectors, in a number of instances, are resident upon their allotments, and cultivation is progressing in the most satisfactory manner. This Mount, indeed, reminded me very forcibly of the settlement at Wombat Hill, Daylesford, which I have previously described. In both cases the right sort of people appear to have got hold of the land, and they are making the best possible use of it. Some very good crops have been raised in this locality. I heard of as much as fifty bushels of wheat and sixty bushels of oats to the acre, and I was told that a general average would give thirty bushels of wheat and forty of oats. At Warrenheip, the land is also of very fair quality, and most of that which has been taken up is fenced in and being rapidly improved. Prior to the passing of the Amending Land Act, the parish of Kerrit Bareet was a dense forest, the ground being covered with fine stringy bark trees. Before the industry and perseverance of the forty-seconders the land is, however, being brought under cultivation, and these portions which have been cleared have this season yielded very good crops. The settlers here have good prospects before them, and as springs are very numerous, giving a fair supply of water all the year round, there is little doubt that another fair supply improvement in this locality. The land here has become more valuable of late in consequence of the gold discoveries at Gordons and Egerton. I am unable to give the quantity of land taken up under the clause in these last-named parishes, as the statistics have not yet been made up by the land officers.

## No. IX.—*Feb. 11 th, 1869.*

It may be not unreasonably expected that in closing my reports relative to the settlement which has taken place under the 42nd clause of the Amending Land Act, I should give the conclusions at which I have arrived respecting it, and the effect of such settlement upon the colony at large. There can be no question but that the clause has been interpreted in a manner which was never dreamt of at the time of its initiation. Originally intended to provide for the wants of small dairymen in the neighbourhood of the gold-fields, and to afford facilities to these miners who were desirous of settling in the neighbourhood of the scene of their avocations, it has been so administered that its operation has been rendered almost universal throughout the colony; and instead of being a comparatively insignificant portion of our land law, it has far exceeded in importance all other sections of the act, and has become the principal instrument of settling the people on the land. Leaving altogether out of the question how far such a straining of the clause was rendered justifiable by the requirements of the colony, I proceed to consider what has been the result. In answering this question I am compelled to acknowledge that in the districts I have visited more *bonâ fide* settlement has taken place under the clause than by any other means previously adopted, and the working of the scheme merits almost unqualified commendation. I may here mention that the portions of the colony I have recently visited were all familiar to me from ten to fifteen years ago. Scores of times I have ridden over the ground before there was an acre of it cultivated, save perhaps a few small plots around the home stations of the pastoral tenants, and the change which I now witnessed—prepared as I was to see a very great difference—certainly filled me with astonishment. Then, in going from one place to another, I had to take bearings from some mountain, or other well-defined landmark in the distance; now the traveller is compelled either to keep the high road, or avail himself of the slip-panels in the farmer's fences. Then almost the only signs of settlement or civilisation were the solitary shepherds, as they tended their various flocks; now, in driving some five hundred miles through the Castlemaine, Ballarat, Ararat, and Talbot districts, I only saw two flocks of sheep. No doubt there were more, but they were either grazing on the purchased land of their owners, or were close to the home stations. The vast tracts of land over which they once roamed at will are now all taken up, and the solitary shepherd and his sheep have been replaced by comfortable homesteads and waving fields of golden grain. There are, no doubt, some instances in which the privileges granted by the clause have been abused. Sections of land have been taken up by means of dummies, for the mere purposes of speculation, or in order to secure the use of them to the pastoral tenant of the run; whilst, on the other hand—as I previously mentioned in the case of the run of Mrs. Campbell,

at Glengower—the squatters have occasionally been subjected to unnecessary annoyance through persons taking up portions of land near to their improvements for the mere purpose of extortion. Wherever the land is really wanted for settlement, the squatter must of course give way; but such practices as these to which I have alluded should be discouraged in every possible manner, because when indulged in and successful, they have a most demoralising effect upon those concerned in them.

Whilst, however, admitting these evils, I must at the same time state that they exist to but a comparatively trifling extent; and that, taking the working of the clause as a whole, it has been eminently satisfactory, and the settlement which has taken place under it cannot fail to be highly beneficial to the country. In some instances, consequent upon the nature of the country and the alienation by auction long ago of all the best land, the settlement is of a straggling character; in others, as at Moolart and Eddington, cultivated fields, dotted with flourishing homesteads, are to be seen extending over an area of several square miles. In each instance, however, the settlers appear to be almost equally content. They have had, and in many cases still have, plenty of difficulties to encounter; but, one by one, they cheerfully met, and either have overcome or are overcoming them. It has been urged that the area of land which can be taken up under the clause is too small to give a man a fair chance of success; and that the consequence will be the creation of a class of pauper agriculturists. I have no fear of anything of the sort arising. In some instances the smallness of the original holdings has been remedied by means of transfers—a proceeding to which, when there is no question of the *bona fides* of both parties, the Lands Department very properly offers no objection. I readily admit that in the majority of cases the settlers under the 42nd clause have not very great opportunities of realising fortunes, but as a rule, they are in a position to do what for the country at large is a great deal better. They will be enabled to bring up their families in comfort and in plenty, to give their children a fair education, and thus, by their attachment to the homes they have created for themselves, and consequently to the country of their adoption, will become most valuable colonists, true conservatives in the only sensible meaning of the word, and a powerful check upon anything approaching that rabid and false democracy which is so dangerous to a young country in which all have equal political privileges. As soon as a man becomes a landholder, and has a home that he can call his own, he becomes a far more valuable citizen than he ever was before. He has something to care for, something to protect, and he acknowledges the responsibility. If his holding is comparatively large, he becomes an employer of labour, and thus adds directly to the wealth of the country; if, on the contrary, the plot of ground which he calls his home is but small and insufficient of itself to support him, then he becomes the most valuable and trustworthy assistant to these more fortunate than himself. Society possesses a material guarantee for his good behaviour, and in his sphere he proves as useful a member of the community as his wealthy neighbour.

Viewing the subject in this light, it appears quite as desirable that farm labourers should have homes, as it is that there should be large and flourishing farms upon which they can be employed. That these men should continue, as they have hitherto been, semi-vagabonds, wandering to and fro through the country from one station or one farm to another, is a condition of things good for neither employer nor employed. The former uncertain as to what labour he can depend upon; the latter becomes habitually careless, and but too frequently this carelessness ends in dissipation and crime. The 42nd clause, by rendering settlement easy, tends to check the erratic disposition so easily developed in a new country; and if it did this alone it would be matter for great congratulation. It has however, done much more. It has immensely increased the area of land under cultivation, and, as a matter of course, a large increase in the quantity of grain produced will naturally follow. Up to the present time, and even this season, the increase will not be so appreciable as will be the case a couple of years hence. As yet but a comparatively small proportion of the land taken up has been actually cultivated. The selectors have been hitherto busily engaged in fencing, clearing, and erecting their dwellings; but the next year or two will see nearly all the selections under crop. This year the yield has been generally poor; but even with this there will be amply sufficient wheat to supply our wants, and when, as will be the case in a short time, the annual yield is largely increased, the question will arise, "What is to be done with the surplus?" It must either be shipped to foreign markets, or an additional demand must be created at home. The latter is the only true and politic solution of the difficulty. It will not be long before we shall be raising sufficient for thousands more than our present population numbers, and not only shall we have food for them, but we shall have work also. All through the country the general cry is for more labour—more hands to work, more mouths to feed; and I am satisfied that if during the coming session a judicious scheme of immigration be devised and actively carried out, Victoria will see quite as prosperous, if not even more prosperous times, than during the early days of the gold-fields. There will not be that whirl of excitement, or the squandering of hundreds of pounds in a day, but there will be a permanent and substantial prosperity far more beneficial to the colony, and far more conducive to its progress.

The agitation for a reduction of the rent paid to the Government has, apparently, taken but small hold upon the selectors under the 42nd clause. Most of them are content with the terms upon which they occupy the land; and even these who are engaged in the agitation scarcely attempt to defend it, but content themselves with

saying that if there is to be any reduction, or if a portion of the rent is to go as purchase-money, why, of course, they may as well take advantage of it; and, therefore, they help the cause—or the "swindle," as it is more generally termed—along. There are, however, some anomalies in connexion with the rent paid under the 42nd clause which require remedying. Those who first took up small sections near the gold-fields have, as a rule, very inferior land, and are paying a far higher rental than these who subsequently took advantage of the fresh regulations, and secured comparatively large areas of really good agricultural country. The rent charged is for any quantity under ten acres, £2 per annum; from ten acres to twenty, £4; over twenty, £6 10s.; over forty, £9; and from sixty to eighty acres, £11 10s. per annum. Some of the small selectors, therefore, who took up but a few acres, have for the last three or four years been paying from 6s. up to 10s. per acre a year rent, and in this way have actually paid already far more than the land is worth. It appears to me that by "far the fairest plan would be to charge a uniform rental of from 2s. 6d. to 3s. per acre per annum for all land occupied under the clause. No doubt land varies greatly in value, but it would be a matter of very great difficulty to adjust the rent according to the quality of the soil. Still, although in favour of a uniform rental, I am most decidedly opposed to what is sought by some parties, viz. a uniform upset price of £1 per acre when the land is put up for sale. No doubt some allowance should be made for the expense which the selectors have incurred in clearing heavily-timbered land, but there are thousands of acres occupied under the 42nd clause which were worth from £2 to £5 per acre before a tree was cut down, or a single rood of land ploughed. To sell this at £1 per acre would be simply robbing the revenue. So far as I was able to learn, it is the selectors under the 12th clause who are the prime movers in the endeavour to get rid of their liability to the state. They are, however, unable to produce even a shadow of justification for their demand. In most instances, they have taken up large areas of land, being altogether destitute of the necessary capital to cultivate it. Unlike the 42nders, they have not been content to creep before they could walk, but, with the idea of making a fortune at a hand gallop, they have become involved, and now coolly ask the Government to help them to pay their debts; for that is really what their request amounts to. If they have been imprudent in their speculations, they must, like all other classes, work out their own salvation, or put up with the result and begin again. The man who sinks his money in an unprofitable mine, and the merchant who loses thousands of pounds upon a single cargo of merchandise, do not ask the Government to make good their losses; and it is difficult to see how the agriculturist has any better claim. The 12th clause selectors have the land upon very easy terms, and if they cannot pay the small rental demanded from them, it is because they have been very imprudent, or have entirely mistaken their vocation. I am willing to admit that they have had very bad seasons, but these only form one of these difficulties which, in some shape or another, every person has to encounter. To accept any portion of the rent as part of the purchase money would not only be unjust to the community generally, but would open the door to a repetition of that land swindling which rendered the Duffy Act altogether unworkable, and which led to such disastrous results to the country. I would advise the selectors under the 12th clause to take an example by the 42nders. If they have not means enough to cultivate one hundred acres, let them be content with fifty; and if they cannot manage fifty, let them try twenty. If they only put their own shoulders to the wheel, they will find many of their difficulties disappear, and will occupy a far nobler position than they will if they persist in becoming cringing suppliants to the state.

## **No. X.—CONCLUSION.—*Feb. 13th, 1869.***

In some of my former letters I have alluded to the undue influence exercised by members of Parliament on the Lands department, and the evasions of the act which consequently but too frequently take place. At the same time I have been careful to exonerate the officers of that branch of the service from any charge of corrupt influences. Indeed, I may go further, and I have no hesitation in saying that nearly all the officials with whom I became acquainted were almost enthusiastic in the performance of their duties, and appeared to take a personal interest in the success of the law which they had to administer. That they do not become corrupt is solely due to the high appreciation which they entertain of the responsibilities devolving upon them, and of their own official position. More than one complained to me of the manner in which they are interfered with by members of Parliament. In one case a very pretty swindle was attempted to be worked. A mining company was initiated which wished to obtain possession of a most valuable piece of Crown land, the adjoining lion having been sold but a short time before for several thousand pounds. The district surveyor of course reported against the grant, pointing out all the circumstances of the case, and by some hon. members of Parliament he was told that he had better mind the duties of his office and shut his eyes to what did not concern him. Is it too great a stretch of imagination to suppose that members who would act in this manner would also be prepared to purchase both blindness and silence? Other cases also came under my notice in which officials were told to take things easy, and not bother the department with reports adverse to the wishes of certain parties or it might be worse for

them. Under such circumstances, would it be surprising if the officers who are treated in this manner did neglect their duty or betray their trust? They can make no complaints; they must suffer all this browbeating as best they may, for they well know if they make enemies of some members of Parliament no effort will be spared to effect their removal. The offender in this respect will be most carefully watched, and the slightest error will be so magnified that the head of the department will be almost forced to believe that instead of a trustworthy official, he has a careless and utterly useless servant. There is no other department of the public service in which the officers are so worried, and at times so insulted, by members of Parliament and their friends, and no other which offers such great temptations to dishonest practices. Under these circumstances it is no little credit to these gentlemen that so few allegations have ever been brought against them. Prior to my tour through the country I heard a great deal of the manner in which the Land-office was worked, but was unable to discover the *modus operandi*. The following cases, however, for the facts of which I can vouch, materially enlightened me, and will, no doubt, prove interesting to the public.

The secretary of one of the most important public institutions on Ballarat desired to obtain possession of a certain portion of valuable land. In the interests of the public his application could not be granted, and it was, therefore, refused. Shortly afterwards a member of the Assembly—wholly unconnected with the district—went to the Land-office and was most persistent in his efforts to obtain for Mr. Secretary the piece of land upon which he had set his heart. The local officials were asked to again report upon the application, and one of them went to Mr. Secretary and asked him if he knew Mr.—, M.L.A., the gentleman who had so interested himself in his behalf. "No," replied Mr. Secretary; "never saw him to my knowledge." "Ah, then," said the acute civil servant, "I suppose you employed Mr.—," mentioning a well known agent, thoroughly initiated in all the mysteries of Spargoism—in the matter. Mr. Secretary denied the soft impeachment, but it was afterwards discovered that he had given this agent a blank sheet of paper with his signature at the bottom, and confessed that had he obtained the land he should have had to pay him. Thus was this highly honourable M.L.A. set in motion. Now I suppose I shall be asked to believe that this conscientious representative of the people worried the Minister of Lands, or some of the officials, to do for Mr. Secretary—a man of whom he knew nothing—the thing they knew to be wrong, out of pure superabundant benevolence. It is satisfactory to know that the worthy trio—the secretary, the agent, and the M.L.A.—were unsuccessful. The department was proof against all their blandishments and they were sent empty away. The superabundant benevolence theory is open to these who choose to believe in it. I prefer the more uncharitable conclusion that even were the M.L.A. as generous as a publican, he would never have acted in such a manner unless he had received or been promised a very substantial *quid pro quo*. In this instance, had the local officials been remiss in their duties, a grievous wrong would have been inflicted on the public. This circumstance will serve to illustrate one phase of the little game that at times goes on. Now for another:—

The holders of sawmill and some other licences have, under certain conditions, the right of purchasing a definite portion of land at the upset price, without auction. One of these licensees, residing not many hundred miles from Ballarat, was a short time since, waited upon by an M.L.A. and a notorious land agent, and asked for the loan of his licence or licences, being at the same time informed that anything done by means of them would not interfere with his individual right to select. Believing this statement, he handed over his licences. The M.L.A., and his friend the agent, at once took up a very valuable section of land, which in a short time they disposed of at a profit of some £340. They returned the licences to the owner giving him 40 as his share of the spoil. For the time he was well satisfied, but a month or two afterwards, wishing to select on his own account, he sent the licences in again, and made the necessary application, when to his great surprise, he was politely informed that his claim had been satisfied, and he found himself sold. Belying upon the honour of a member of Parliament, he found himself cruelly deceived, and deprived of the opportunity upon which he relied to procure a comfortable home. No doubt the man was a simpleton to imagine that his licences could be used twice for the same purpose, but this does not lessen the culpability of these who took advantage of his foolishness.

One more instance, of a character somewhat different from either of the two preceding cases, and I have finished with this extremely unpleasant subject. One of the great family of Mac's who is privileged to write J.P. after his name, applied in February, 1865, for a rural store licence for a section of land on Smeaton Plains. To entitle him to a licence of that description at that time it was necessary that he should have made substantial improvements on the allotment. This he had not done. There was no fencing, and only the skeleton of a hut—*sans* door, *sans* window, *sans* floor, *sans* everything. The licence was refused. In the following April the application was again made before a commission, of which Mr. Ligar was chairman, and again refused; but notwithstanding the refusal the persistent Mac fenced in the land. In August of the same year he again applied, was again refused, ordered to remove off the land, and in the following March was ejected by the police authorities. Shortly after some other persons who occupied a portion of the land by virtue of miners' rights applied for a part of it under the 42nd section. They were also refused, as it was thought the land would be required for the purposes of the water supply to the district, and in August, 1867, Mr. Mac—, J.P., obtained a

rural store licence for the section, and in May, 1868, applied for the whole of it under the 42nd section. He was refused, and was reminded that whatever improvements he had placed on the land, he had put up in defiance of the Land department. At the same time the original applicants were given to understand that if the land was not required for the water supply, they would get it. It was subsequently found that the land was not so wanted, but instead of the original applicants under the 42nd clause obtaining it, Mr. Mac—, J.P., through the interference of a member of Parliament, procured the issue of the licence to himself direct from the department, without having advertised his application, or complied with any of the forms required by the regulation. Before obtaining the licence, this worthy J.P. said there was no objection at all to its issue upon the part of anyone, entirely concealing the fact that there was a cottage erected on the land worth some £250, belonging to one of the original applicants under the clause. Of course, as soon as the facts of the case became known, a vigorous protest was entered against the action of the department. An inquiry was instituted, and the result was adverse to this representative of the Mac's. He, however, still remains in possession, and has given the owners of the cottage notice to quit. Now, in this case, had it not been for the influence used by a member of Parliament, the licence would never have been issued in such an irregular way. I admit that the department may have been deceived by the M.L.A., who in return may have placed too much reliance on the statements of the J.P.; and of their truthfulness some idea may be formed, when he coolly asserts that there is no objection to his obtaining possession of a piece of land on which other persons are residing, and on which they have erected a cottage worth some £250. I trust that justice may soon be done in this matter, and at the same time I may ask, "Is a man who will condescend to such disreputable conduct as this J.P., fit to be intrusted with the commission of the peace?"

The whole system of members of Parliament going to the Land-office, pestering the Minister and badgering the officials, is radically bad. The Minister supposes that all members deal honourably with him, and make no representations the accuracy of which they cannot from their own personal knowledge guarantee, and thus he is sometimes led into mistakes which he would not otherwise commit. It would be a good thing for the colony were a board, with the inscription, "No members of Parliament admitted," placed over the entrance to the Lands-office. The large majority of members would rejoice were such the case, and only those would be dissatisfied who are afflicted with that kind of superabundant benevolence which yearns to expend itself in the manner I have already alluded to.

In conclusion, I beg to acknowledge the courtesy and cordial assistance which I received from every officer of the Lands department with whom during the course of my inquiry I was brought into contact.

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

**Retrospects and Prospects of the Colony.**

A Lecture

By

The Hon. Archibald Michie,

DELIVERED IN THE EXHIBITION BUILDING, WILLIAM STREET, ON MONDAY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 1866.

*Reprinted from "The Argus" of the 20th November.*

Wilson and Mackinnon, Printers and Publishers Melbourne : Collins Street East. 1866.

Price Sixpence.

## **Retrospects and Prospects of the Colony.**

On Monday the Hon. A. Michie delivered a lecture, in the old Exhibition building, on "Retrospects and Prospects of the Colony." There was a crowded attendance. The Mayor of Melbourne (Mr. Williams) occupied the chair; and among those on the platform we observed the Hon. Mr. McCulloch, the Hon. Mr. Bindon, the Hon. Mr. Vale, the Hon. C. Gavan Duffy, the Hon. Mr. Francis, the Hon. T. T. A'Beckett, M.L.C.; the Hon C J. Jenner, M L C.; the Hon. Mr. Cole, M.L.C.; Mr. Henty, M.L.A.; Mr. Balfour, M.L.A.; Mr. Bayles, M.L.A.; Mr. Langton, M.L.A.; Mr. O'Grady, M.L.A.; and Mr. M'Kean, M.L.A.

The CHAIRMAN briefly introduced

Mr. MICHIE, who on rising was warmly cheered. He said—Mr. Mayor, and Ladies and Gentlemen,—In appearing before you in the interests of our St. Kilda volunteers, permit me at the outset to express my acknowledgements to our citizen-soldiers generally; for it is now to be put to their credit that, after upwards of seven years' submission to the discipline of the soldier's profession, they can at any time show us in round numbers some 3,000 efficient men in the field. An answer has thus been given to those who, on the first organisation of this force, insinuated that the movement would not last, and that those who joined it were principally attracted by the prospect of wearing a pretty Uniform. In the camp and in the field they have stood the test of professional criticism; and for myself I will say that the value of this force extends beyond that of its

merely military character. It must be obvious to the most superficial observer, that in the course of the volunteer's duty every class of society is brought into more intimate communion and sympathy with every other class—a result which assuredly is in itself a great good. Not until I first took part as a spectator in one of our peaceful battles, and saw even our high sheriff lead on his own company, among whom might have been not only some of his own bailiffs, but even some with whom he might have stood in still more tender relations, did I adequately appreciate the civil as well as the military importance of this portion of our defences. Seeing, then, that the volunteer does not merge the citizen in the soldier, and that we are all—as an ancient philosopher calls men-political animals alike, it is not in the presence of such a body that I need apologise either for the matter or the manner of much that I am going to say. It is pretty certain, that—as on the occasion of my last appearance in this place—in some points my hearers will differ from me, as in other points they will probably agree with me; but just as in their own force Volunteers would not inquire into their right or left hand comrade's opinions before acting on an instruction to fire into an enemy about to land, so I hope they will accept me as a comrade to-night, and fire away at me as hard as they like tomorrow morning. It cannot. I think, but be a great comfort to some of us that—Mr. Francis and the Custom-house notwithstanding—the drapers' windows make as beautiful a show as ever. Still throng the carriages between three and five in a certain part of Collins-street. Has not our worthy ex-mayor, Mr. Bayles, ridden the whirlwind, and directed the soft-goods storm into that vast hall which has so lately shown us of what great things drapery is still capable? And cannot those inexhaustible fountains of honour, our excellent fellow-citizens, Moubray and Lush, manufacture any number of princes, and peers, and marchionesses, and mesdames on the shortest notice, and on the most reasonable terms? As these questions can be only answered in the affirmative, I feel I may approach with becoming composure of spirit, and I propose to talk about, I trust with all possible good humour, such interesting topics as free trade and protection, the tariff, the land question, the press, the people, and the mob; about public opinion and the modes of influencing it, and about the probable future of the colony. I do not think I can select any other equal number of topics as interesting as these at the present time, and therefore I cannot but hope a portion of our evening may be rationally passed in temperately discussing them. With the greatest deference to the analysis of our Legislative Assembly given at a late extra-Parliamentary utterance at Ballarat, and notwithstanding the alleged formed opinions of various sections of our representatives, I do not think it superfluous to start with the elementary question, "What is the meaning of free trade?" These two words represent for me an idea which I endeavour to express to myself thus:—It is an operation by which all men enjoy the unrestricted power of exchanging with each other the fruits of their labours. The above few words embody with sufficient clearness to my own mind the meaning I attach to the words "free trade," when I use those words. What do I mean when I use the word "protection?" I mean the application of a law by the force of which the fruit of the labour of one man, or set of men, is favoured and made profitable in any particular market, by saving it from competition with the labour of any other man, or set of men, who, in the natural course of human dealings, would otherwise resort to such market. For all practical purposes the above definitions will suffice. Assuming, then, that I have fairly explained the proper meaning of the terms free trade and protection, it may safely be averred that there never can be free trade where there is a custom house; and there never can be protection which does not drive us to buy of the protected industry. In other words, there cannot be perfect free trade where there is any restriction; and that cannot be protection which does not protect. Duties, however light, are, as far as they go, contradictory of and inconsistent with free trade. On the other hand, duties, however heavy, never protect any industry while that industry is still left exposed to the successful competition of the general industry of the world. But, inasmuch as most countries are in the habit of collecting a revenue through the custom house, and yet some countries—England, for instance—claim to be considered free-traders, it see me clear that in the contemplation of, many respectable authorities light duties, not amounting to prohibition of foreign industries, are not deemed incompatible with-a reasonable compliance with the principle of free trade. For instance, England is said to have free trade in corn, although a shilling a quarter duty is imposed on the importation of foreign bread stuffs into Great Britain. This slight and insignificant duty, how ever, does not and cannot operate to exclude foreign produce, for it yields about £60,000 a year to the general revenue. This sum (assuming that England exports no corn) exactly measures the difference between the quantity of corn which England grows and the quantity which England consumes. The home grower is not protected; the foreign grower is not excluded; and therefore it is that English statesmen and journalists are justified in saying that this shilling duty is for revenue, and not for protection. At the same time, it is demonstrable that, use what language you may, the English grower derives whatever advantage arises from the Imposition on the foreign article of that shilling a quarter, from which the home grower is exempt. To this extent, infinitesimal though it be, England at the present moment is deprived of free trade in corn; and yet, by reason of the deprivation being but infinitesimal, we admit that substantially free trade in corn exists in the mother I country. In the above cited instance we, find that a slight duty on a commodity for purposes of revenue is not incompatible with two countries exchanging with all reasonable and required freedom their products against each other; and this, too although the fact is indisputable

that the foreign grower of corn cannot find a market in England unless he can sell as cheap as England can sell after the payment by the foreign grower of that shilling a quarter duty which is the necessary passport to the English market. Now, let us apply the above observations to the new tariff, which, we are told, must next session be made a protectionist one. Notwithstanding the clamour which was at first got up about this measure, I find it difficult to believe that any real apprehension ever existed in the mind of any man that even the so-called protectionists themselves ever desired the enforcement of prohibitive duties in this colony. Be that as it may, it is not easy to understand the policy of that section of our public men who, being professed free-traders, are for what they call giving protection all round—to the farmer as well as to the manufacturer. These politicians apparently inculcate the policy—

*"A little fostering is a dangerous thing:  
Drink deep, or taste not the protective spring."*

A policy which seems to imply their belief that a thing bad in itself becomes good when you increase the dose. This curious and self-contradictory policy affects to proceed on the belief that the present tariff is protectionist, in the ordinary sense in which that term is employed. Mere counter-assertions as to the character of the tariff will prove nothing, so we must go to evidence and proofs. Fortunately the tariff itself will help us to an answer; and perhaps an occasional importer will be found an important witness on the same point. For the tariff being a sort of table of fixed quantities is of course, a mere matter of arithmetic. It shows either the amount, or the means by which the amount may be calculated, chargeable Upon the various articles therein named. These articles, so named, comprise scarcely a fifth of the annual imports to this colony, the aggregate of which, for the period between the beginning of the year and the 10th of this present month of November, I find returned at £11,982,359 against £10,722,363 for the corresponding period of last year. Four fifths of those imports are not brought under any tariff at all, and piece goods of every description also enter our ports free. Keeping these important facts before our minds, now let us see what account experience enables us to give of the new duties. I find that the new duties down to the 31st October last have brought in £115,273, falling short of the estimate by upwards of £7,000, which deficiency is no matter for surprise, seeing that for more than twelve months past goods intended for New South Wales have been carried up to the Murray River in bond, and have there paid duty to the sister colony. For the whole year, therefore, we should have, on account of the new duties, a sum under £150,000. which amount, taking the new articles subject to the new tariff at two millions in value, would represent only from seven to eight per cent, on that value. Of course the per centage is higher on some few exceptionally cheap articles, such as dried fruits, &c, but from seven to eight per cent seems the average. Now, in England ten per cent, is regarded as perfectly reasonable for purposes of revenue, and as not in any way savouring of protective duties. It is large enough to yield revenue; it is not large enough to shut out foreign goods. Moreover, the rate of duties leviable under this new tariff is less than that of almost any other British colony, and does not amount to one-third of the duties levied under the Canadian tariff. But here it is also necessary to remark that the £150,000 collectable under the new tariff, is not an addition to the previously existing burthens of the country; it is a substitution only for the reduced duties on sugar, tea, gold, and opium. The new imposts just about balance the old abolished imposts. The gross amount of taxation through the Custom House remains under the new tariff what it had been under the old one. The opposition, therefore, when opposition arose in the first instance, had nothing to fasten on with respect to the gross amount of taxation; that opposition could only assail the alleged impolitic substitution. That substitution being a substitution of duties on various manufactured fabrics, in lieu of the previous higher duties on tea, sugar, opium, and gold, it is important to ascertain whether such substitution is, in the aggregate, a greater burthen to the consumer than were the displaced duties. If consumers pay no more in taxation, who is hurt? If a man is to pay £5 a year in taxation, what does it matter to him whether he pays that £5 on sugar or on shoddy? How, in the main, has it appeared, as yet, that the new tariff is more oppressive than were the displaced duties on tea, sugar, opium, and gold? It has been said that no duties on tea and Sugar can be protective, because we cannot produce tea and sugar, but that duties on hats, caps, and widows' cap fronts, may be protective, because we can and do produce these and similar articles. Let us examine this position, and endeavour to ascertain what it is worth. As I have said already, and as the fact is, piece goods come in free. Why was this distinction observed between piece goods and goods worked up into slops? Apparently because we cannot produce muslins, calicoes, silks, and other fabrics, any more than we can produce tea, coffee, or sugar; but we possess in abundance the labour which can work up the untaxed fabrics into shapes fit for human use. This, of course, will not be denied. But then, again, it may be said that the purchasers and wearers of slops have a right to buy in the cheapest market; that if the labour bestowed in England in converting these piece goods into slops is cheaper than similar labour here, the consumers in Victoria have a right to buy that English labour in preference to the

Victorian labour. Not disregarding such a position what is the choice before the colonists? On the one hand, we have before us, as proposed objects of taxation, the labour involved in the production of tea and sugar, and, on the other hand, the labour involved in the production of English slops. Assuming—although I by no means admit the fact—that the tax necessarily falls on the consumer, I ask if I and other taxpayers choose to say we will pay our tax on the labour in the slops rather than on the labour in the tea and sugar, what is that to any one? It will not be denied that it is of the essence of freedom that men should be entitled to choose how and upon what particular product of labour they should tax themselves. "Oh," but it may be said, "by taxing the labour in the slops, you encourage, or even foster, the colonial labour!" Well, if you do so, what of that? That colonial labour will be as cheap as the imported labour, or it will not. If as cheap, nobody has the colour of a right to complain. If, however, the colonial labour be not so cheap, why have not the colonists a light to say, as tax-payers, that they choose to hand over to the Custom-house £5, though it may ultimately go into the pockets of the colonial labourer, rather than pay £5 which is ultimately to go into the pockets of the English or the American labourer? The £5 so expended will put in motion a corresponding amount of labour here; it draws no capital into channels into which that capital is not ready almost of itself to flow; and if the aggregate of the taxation be no more than before, what principle, either of politics or political economy, forbids us from saying in plain terms that we will, through the Custom-house (as is done in so-called free-trade England at the present moment), offer a premium to domestic industry to produce, if it can, the same sort of articles which are produced elsewhere? But at this stage of the discussion it is frequently [*unclear*: interpoed] that the two objects of revenue and protection are incompatible: that the one negatives or excludes the other. I have already admitted as much in the definition of protection to which I have given in my adherence at the outset of these observations. But does it follow, or, having regard to our daily experience, in it the fact, that the two objects of revenue, and the more rapid advancement of domestic manufactures, are inconsistent and incompatible? Certainly not. To assert this would be to deny facts which are daily taking place under our very eyes. In every country which has a custom-house we find foreign articles taxed, and yet coming into the taxing country concurrently with that taxing country producing in large quantities the same description of articles as the imported taxed article. I may give an instance to be found in evidence presented to one of our own Parliamentary committees. In the select committee on manufactures, which sat, and took evidence some two years back, Mr. Aitkin the brewer, was called in. In question 240, he is asked, "With reference to the duty on beer, will you give the benefit of your experience? Answer: The duty on beer is 6d. a gallon. 241. How has that acted? Has it encouraged the brewer?—It has. In 1853 to 1861 English ale averaged from £8 to £10 a hogshead. Through all these years that was the average. 242. How many brewers were there in and around Melbourne then?—Four. M'Cracken's, Henderson's, Murphy's, and my own. Since then there are seventeen, in Melbourne and suburbs. 243. Has the fact of new breweries starting decreased the price of the English article?—The price of English ale from 1862 to the present time has averaged from £4 to £6. 244. That is good English ale?—Yes. You can buy good English ale in the market at present at £5." Now, here we have certain facts, which, being facts, must be reconciled with some theory or other. In the first place, we see that this duty is an encouragement *pro tanto* to Victoria brewing. Secondly, it does not exclude English beer, large quantities of which continue to be imported: and thirdly, the most important consequence of all is that the consumer can buy English beer much cheaper since the imposition of the 6d. a gallon duty, than he could do before the imposition of that duty. Assuming that Mr. Aitkin is not deceiving us as to the facts, how are they to be accounted for but on the supposition either that competition between the English and the colonial brewers has brought down the produce of both, or that diminished cost of production in England has lowered the price of the English article here; and which is the more reasonable supposition of the two? Is it likely, or does anyone suggest, that the cheaper production of beer in England just occurred coincidentally with the imposition of 6d. a gallon duty on that article when entering our port? The duty, then, has apparently operated to bring into existence many new breweries in the colony. It does yield revenue, and the article is cheaper to consumers, and we are properly told that we are never to forget the consumers. That the English article comes in in large quantities, simultaneously with the impulse given to the Victorian trade, need not surprise us, as there is always a more or less numerous class, in any community, who cannot be deterred by a tax from the purchase of a foreign article which is, upon any ground of preference, real or imaginary, an object of desire to the purchaser. So large a reliance, indeed, on this principle of human nature, have the United States Government manifested, even very recently, that they, during the late war, imposed a tax of fifty per cent, on all foreign manufactured goods, imported into the States. This taxation was avowedly for revenue, and declared to be necessary for providing the means of paying the interest on their then rapidly increasing national debt. Yet, even this brought in revenue, nor need the weight of that revenue (as is so frequently assumed), necessarily fall on the consumer, It might fall on either producer, importer, or consumer, or distributively among them, just as mercantile competition or demand and supply at the time of the particular transaction might determine; a position distinctly admitted by Mr. Mill himself in one of his essays "On some unsettled questions of political economy," and also as distinctly asserted by a

Melbourne importer in a letter to *The Argus* of date 15th of June of this year, to the interesting matter of which letter I beg to refer my present audience. But no one here is advocating, or proposing to advocate, such taxation as that of America, on which I am now commenting. I only refer to it as rather remarkable evidence of the extent to which taxation at the Custom-house may both yield revenue, and yet go on side by side with the home industry. In short, some people buy the home made article and others the imported article, and therefore it is in the face of experience to say that revenue and encouragement of home industry are incompatible, or that there cannot be such a thing as incidental encouragement of such an industry. Now, it has often occurred to me, on thinking over this and related subjects, that on such topics as this one we are discussing, new communities may learn quite as much from the actual experience of each other as from the closest speculations of economists. For economists generally have written of and from the experience of old countries. But in old communities, the country for human use is already made, so to speak. In young communities we are making the country, whilst we are applying to it, as well as we can, the abstract truths of economical science. In old countries which have reached their up-most point of development, all new taxation is simply a burthen and an almost unmitigated evil. In a new country, on the other hand, new taxation, if wisely imposed and judiciously expended, may be made the most direct and effective means of cheapening goods to the consumer, and consequently of extending commerce and promoting the prosperity of the merchant, the tradesman, and the manufacturer. It is quite possible that to many this will sound like a paradox. And yet, as you will see from what I am about to read to you, it is truth as capable of being worked out to demonstration as any theorem in Euclid. To show this I invite your attention to an extract from Mr. Russell's recently-published book on Canada. The writer reporting Mr. Galt's defence of the tariff of Canada—Mr. Galt being the Finance Minister of that colony—introduces the passage as follows:—"Mr. Galt argues that an increase of customs duties does not necessarily injuriously affect foreign trade within certain limits, and that those limits have not been exceeded in Canada. Formerly, the cost of British goods in Canada was much enhanced owing to natural causes, whilst Canadian producers obtained a minimum price for their exports. The duty was then generally two and a half per cent., but the price of goods was enormous; and the Canadian suffered *pro tanto* in his means to purchase them. Suppose the duties increased five per cent, were to produce a reduction of ten per cent, on other charges, the benefit,' says Mr. Galt, 'would accrue equally to the British manufacturer and to the consumer; the consumer would pay live per cent, more to the Government, but ten per cent, less to the merchant and forwarder.'" As Mr. Galt considers the principle of Canadian finance and Customs to be misapprehended in England as well as in the United States, it may be as well to give his own words:—"The Government has increased the duties for the purpose of enabling them to meet the interest on the public works necessary to reduce all the various charges upon the imports and exports of the country. Lighthouses have been built, and steamships subsidised to reduce the charges for freight and insurance; the St. Lawrence has been deepened, and the canals constructed, to reduce the cost of inland navigation to a minimum; railways have been assisted to give speed, safety, and permanency to trade interrupted by the severity of the winter. All these improvements have been undertaken with the twofold object of diminishing the cost to the consumer of what he imports, and of increasing the net result of the labour of the country when realised in Great Britain. These great improvements could not be effected without large outlay; and the burthen necessarily had to be put either through direct taxation or by customs duties on the goods imported, or upon the trade by excessive tolls corresponding with the rates previously charged. Direct taxation was the medium employed, through the local municipalities, for the construction of all minor local works—roads, court-houses and goals, education and the vast variety of objects required in a newly settled country; and this source of taxation has thus been used to the full extent which is believed practicable without producing serious discontent. No one can for a moment argue that, in an enlightened age, any Government could adopt such a clumsy mode of raising money as to maintain excessive rates of tolls; nor would it have attained the object, as American channels of trade were created simultaneously that would then have defied competition. The only effect, therefore, of attempting such a course would have been to give the United States the complete control of our markets, and virtually to exclude British goods. The only other course was therefore adopted, and the producer has been required to pay, through increased customs duties, for the vastly greater deductions he secured through the improvements referred to. What, then, has been the result to the British manufacturer? His goods are, it is true, in many cases subjected to twenty per cent., instead of two and a half per cent but the cost to the consumer has been diminished in a very much greater degree; and the aggregate of cost, original price, duty, freight, and charges, are now very much less than when the duty was two and a half per cent., and consequently the legitimate protection to the home—*i.e.*, the Canadian—manufacturer is to this extent diminished. Nor is this all: the interest of the British manufacturer is not merely that he shall be able to lay down his goods at the least cost to the consumer, but equally is he interested in the ability of the consumer to buy. Now, this latter point is attained precisely through the saw means which have cheapened the goods. The produce of Canada is now increased in value exactly in proportion to the saving on the cost of delivering it in the market of consumption," "If the aggregate of cost to the consumer remained the same now as it was before

the era of canals and railroads in Canada, what possible difference would it make to the British manufacturers whether the excess over the cost in Great Britain were paid to the Government or to merchants and forwarders? It would certainly not in any way affect the question of the protection to home (*i. e.*, Canadian) manufacturers; but when it can be clearly shown that by the action of the Government in raising funds through increased customs duties, the cost to the consumer is now very much less, upon what ground can the British manufacturer complain that these duties have been restrictive on his trade?" "The undersigned might truly point to the rapid increase in the population and wealth of Canada arising from its policy of improvement, whereby its ability of consumption has been so largely increased. He might also show that these improvements have, in a great degree, also tended to the rapid advance of the Western States, and to their increased ability to purchase British goods. He might point to the fact that the grain supplied from the Western States and Canada keeps down prices in Great Britain, and therefore enables the British manufacturer to produce still cheaper. But he prefers resting his case as to the propriety of imposing increased customs duties solely on the one point, that through that increase the cost of British manufactured goods, including duty, has been reduced to the Canadian consumer, and that, consequently, the increase has, in its results, tended to an augmentation of the market for British goods." Thus far, Mr. Galt; and I venture to say that there are very few lines of the above passage which are not strictly applicable to the circumstances, past and present, of this colony. Have not we incurred a vast outlay for lighthouses, harbour accommodation, railways, clearing of rivers, &c.? Was there not a time when the cost of carriage of goods from Melbourne to Mount Alexander (a distance of only seventy-two miles) was £130 a ton? Is not the cost now 35s, a ton? Does not this reduction cheapen the cost of imported goods to consumers all over the colony, and give extra value to our colonial produce in the English market? Does not this at once greatly benefit the merchant, the manufacturer, and the squatter? Is it too much to say that we should make all contribute to the cost of what so greatly benefits all? Unless we do this, how, as against colonial manufacturers and artisans are we to justify these great Improvements at all? Upon our own principles of free trade, might not colonial manufacturers and artisans have said when these improvements were first projected, "why is our industry to be taxed for the purpose of annihilating the natural protection we possess? In other words why are we to provide the means of bringing all foreign industries more cheaply into competition with our own?" We are at present masters of the situation, and is it consistent with the "let alone" principle we so frequently hear advocated, that the state should make lighthouses and, railways and improve rivers for foreign merchants, and for our own colonial importers and exporters, and charge nothing for these advantages? Is it free trade that such bounties in such shapes should be provided for foreign industries exclusively at our own expense? It is idle to say that the state is paid for providing these facilities to commerce, for we do not get back in the harbour dues and railway fares interest on the outlay, much less any profit on the work. So also, if it be said that our artisan gets the benefit of this cheapness in common with other purchasers, he will tell you that the thing might as well be dear if he cannot buy it at all; and that he cannot buy it at all if cheapened English labour has cut him out of employment altogether, or has greatly reduced his purchasing power. It comes to this, then, that, as Mr. Galt puts the Canadian case, so may we fairly put ours. We have by these vast works greatly cheapened the way of foreign importers to our market. By thus reducing the cost we have increased the demand. If we charge foreign importers nothing for this benefit either in toll or in customs duty, we as effectually provide them with a bounty on their labour at the expense of our colonial labour, as if we had made them a present of the money with which the improvements have been made. On the other hand, if we take from them, in the shape of duty, only a fourth or a fifth of what is saved by reason of these improvements, we charge them only for less than the value received by them, we, at the same time, provide ourselves with the means of carrying out further improvements for our joint further benefit. We do no violence in any direction to any principle of political economy. We do not allow the poor Brighton or St. Kilda market-gardener to bring his produce to the Eastern market without paying the St. Kilda toll. Why do we impose this toll? Because we have made a good road, for which we tell him he must pay. If this be a good answer for him, is it a bad answer to the foreign manufacturer or merchant, or his commission agent here? Ask the market-gardener whether he would rather be without either road or toll, or enjoying the one as the consideration for the other. Ask the city warehouseman in Cheapside, whether he would rather have a free port here, and cost of carriage £130 a ton to Castlemaine, or pay ten per cent, at our port and see his goods whipped to Castlemaine in a few hours and at a cost of a few shillings, where, in the olden time, he paid many times more than as many pounds. We know very well what the answer would be. Thus far, then, It will be seen that, in the above observations on Mr. Russell's statement of the Canadian case, I have dealt merely with the position that customs duties, apart from all considerations of free trade or protection, can be made the most convenient and expeditious means of advancing the fortunes and prosperity of a new country. In such a case, and in this view, taxation is raised and expended for the country, as we raise and expend it for a municipality—namely, that Governments may do those things which in new countries, by reason of the scarcity of capital, can never be undertaken by private enterprise. There is no absolute rule, and there can be no absolute rule, as to what things shall be undertaken by a Government. The rule must be flexible to

circumstances. In England private companies can make the railroads. In these colonies we should as yet have had no railroads to the interior had not Government undertaken the work; and I presume that no man now listening to me would unmake the Ballarat and Murray River railways, and return the money they cost, even if he could do so. Now, related to the subject of taxation, is another topic which has often been referred to by public men among us, and about which I observe much misconception prevails. The topic I refer to is Mr. Mill's so called and miscalled "exceptional instance" to the doctrine of free-trade. Before I offer a single observation on Mr. Mill's words, allow me to read them to you:—"The only case (writes Mr. Mill) in which on mere principles of political economy, protecting duties can be defensible, is when they are imposed temporarily, especially in a young and rising nation, in hopes of naturalising a foreign industry, in itself perfectly suitable to the circumstances of the country. The superiority of one country over another in a branch of production often arises only from having begun it sooner. There may be no inherent advantage on one part, or disadvantage on the other, but only a present superiority of acquired skill and experience. A country which has this skill and experience yet to acquire, may in other respects be better adapted to the production than those which were earlier in the field; and, besides, it is a just remark that nothing has a greater tendency to promote improvements in any branch of production than its trial under a new set of conditions. But it cannot be expected that individuals should, at their own risk, or rather to their certain loss. Introduce a new manufacture, and bear the burden of carrying it on until the producers have been educated up to the level of those with whom the processes are traditional. A protecting duty, continued for a reasonable time, will sometimes be the least inconvenient mode in which the nation can tax itself for the support of such an experiment." Now, in this passage we see that Mr. Mill ignores no economical principle, either precedently or subsequently laid down in the same work. He rests his suggestion—to use his own language—on "the mere principles of political economy." He is in pursuit of the best means of securing the cheapest market. With this object, he is of opinion that, on large and long views of things, it may sometimes be wise in a community to tax themselves for the purpose of establishing manufactures among them which without such early fostering might never be able to struggle into existence at all. "A protecting duty, then, on the mere principles of political economy, can be only, as it were, the present price wherewith we buy our way into a cheaper home market than any which we can command abroad. Mr. Mill here does no more than submit an abstract proposition, leaving the application of it to particular societies. Of course, it is for these societies to consider the whole of the circumstances of any proposed application of the proposition; and having balanced the present cost against the presumed future advantage, then to determine how far it will be ultimately advantageous to foster its own industries. That Mr. Mill's proposition may be unwisely as well as wisely acted upon of course cannot affect the intrinsic soundness of the proposition itself. Why do I dwell on Mr. Mill's proposition on the present occasion? For two reasons—one personal to myself; another purely in relation to the public interest. I have been unjustly accused of having, on a former occasion, referred "derisively" to this passage of Mr. Mill. My words stand, and they speak for themselves. I said that Mr. Mill's equally eminent father—I speak only from memory, as I have not any report of my former lecture at hand—had not submitted or relied on such a proposition as the one under notice. I certainly should feel pained could I, by inadvertence, have expressed myself in terms other than those of deep respect towards a man whom I regard as not merely one of the wisest men of this or of any time, but as one who has ever proved himself the intrepid champion of moral truth, howsoever his championship may have brought him into collision with the strongest and most entrenched prejudices of his day. Craving pardon for thus obtruding my own humble personality into this discussion, I proceed to my second reason for calling attention to the so-oft-quoted passage I have read. It must be apparent to any candid mind that, if Mr. Mill's proposition can ever be properly applicable at all, it must be in young countries; in countries of, it may be, great and peculiar yet untried and undeveloped natural capabilities. I do not say that Victoria is a country where such experiments as Mr. Mill suggests should as yet be extensively entered upon; but I will unhesitatingly say that, could clear cases be made out for such experiments, I would at once vote for them, and in doing so, I should not only not be violating any sound principle, but I should be advancing the ultimate objects of the science of political economy itself. What are the probabilities of such experiments ever becoming expedient in this country? To answer such a question, we must carefully study our society, its component elements, and the circumstances by which our people are surrounded. I am here to speak my own sincere thought, and if I tread on the toes of colonial self-love I apologise by anticipation, and pass on. We so often indulge in the pleasant exercise of praising ourselves, that, by way of corrective, we may do no harm by standing for a moment or two at the confessional. If it be asserted that our colony is "the brightest jewel in the British Crown," that our golden resources are marvellous. That our progress has been wonder fully rapid, and that we are entitled—especially when taken at our own valuation—to a good many notes of admiration from the world in general, I suppose all this must, as usual, be admitted. But there are other things which, I think, must also be admitted. Our brightest jewel has some very unpleasant spots upon it. What do you think of that tarring and feathering business, and of the occasion which led to it, at the Adelaide Lead the other day? Is it pleasant to find Christian miners trying to

smoke each other to death in their respective claims? Are "skull-bankers" an agreeable section of our fellow-citizens? Many of you do not know what a skull banker is. I did not myself know the nature and attributes of a skull-banker until they were explained to me some time back by the Hon. W. J. T. Clarke. A skull banker is a species of the genus loafer—half highwayman, half beggar. He is a haunter of stations, and lives on the squatters, amongst whom he makes his circuit, affecting to seek work and determining not to find it. A dozen or so of these skull-bankers were some time back congregated on a run of Mr. Clarke's, and when I, in the Supreme Court, asked a witness (a resident on the station) who those men were, he justified their presence there by saying "they were Mr. Clarke's friends." But the peculiarity of this friendship was, that whenever Mr. Clarke made his appearance at the 'station the whole of these guests used to acknowledge the arrival of their patron and benefactor by taking to flight and hiding themselves in a dry creek. Again, look at another class of men among us, commonly called "Bolters." The most experienced police magistrate in this city, many months back, called upon me to represent (and to consider the mode of dealing with) the great and constantly growing evil of husbands and fathers leaving their wives and helpless children a burthen on the community at large. Does not this state of things necessitate the encouragement of reformatories, of industrial schools, of benevolent asylums, and of young ladies hunting modest young gentlemen about at hospital bazaars, on a scale which may be inevitable in an old and population-burthened country, but which surely ought not to be necessary in a young community like ours? Does not this too common disregard of the ties of blood produce much crime and demoralisation, the necessary results of broken up families, and of their consequent misery and destitution? These questions will only admit of one answer, for the facts which prompt the questions are so patent that our very familiarity with them dulls our apprehension of them, and causes us to overlook their injurious effects on society at large. Independent of these terrible evils, however, I do not consider that he is a colonist whose years are spent in oscillating backwards and forwards between Victoria and New Zealand; between summer diggings in the one colony and winter diggings in the other. But would he do this were he able to do anything better? Ought we not, therefore, to be astute to increase the number, and to extend the variety of trades and employments for our people, wherever we can do so consistently with the general interests of the country? Mr. Mill's doctrine becomes worthy of grave consideration, when we are suffering under such anti-social phenomena as I have here pointed out. To eradicate these evils, if we could, were a work worthy indeed of the wisest Parliaments and the most paternal Governments, I fear, however, that such evils are unavoidable whilst the constituent elements of our community exist in their present proportions. We have over 80,000 miners grubbing all the year round for gold. These not being enough, we offer rewards for the discovery of new gold fields, that we may take security, as well as we can, against the commonly recurring flights of miners to other countries, such as Port Curtis, New Zealand, or Nova Scotia. At the same time, we have only some 1,100 pastoral tenants of the Crown. When we contemplate these 1,100 pastoral tenants side by side with these 80,000 miners, can we fail to be struck with the amazing disproportion of able-bodied men devoted to a pursuit at once very exciting to ordinary imaginations, and not very much tending to fix any man's affections to any particular spot? A farmer may and perhaps generally does more or less love the field he has tilled? Can the miner love his worked-out claim, still less the claim which has disappointed his hopes? The expression "new rush" goes a great way towards describing this mining section of our people. The calm, patient, and provident household virtues have not here a very congenial home. Gambling is so large an element in the miner's pursuit, that all the social vices and defects incident to gambling naturally become prominent in such a condition. The intense and morbid craving for gold which appears to be generated of constantly alternating success and failure, seems in many men altogether to deaden the moral sense. These are too commonly the men who abandon wives and children to inevitable starvation, but for the bounty of society at large. Is it at "Sailor's Gully," or "Murderer's Flat" that we can expect to find the simple, pious, reverent life which may exist in the poorest societies, and of which Burns gives us so exquisite a picture in his "Cotter's Saturday Night?" No. The diggers' and mining speculators' Saturday night will I am afraid, seldom do for a companion picture. Come even down to Melbourne, and inspect the mining speculator; there can you without fear and trembling, contemplate that special convocation of politic dealers in scrip who seem to live their active lives near the Chamber of Commerce, and who blockade that part of the pavement. As they discuss the live-long day at high pressure the last telegram from Ballarat, and incessantly give and take the correctest information with high relish, and with an appetite, which is never sated. Have you ever been to the Polytechnic, in Regent-street, London, and seen in that instructive institution the drop of water magnified, I forget how many thousands of times, upon a large illuminated circular plane, by way of giving you accurate and philosophical impressions of what you are in the habit of swallowing every day of your life, without suspecting it? You remember the myriads of monstrous things almost all stomach, and with any number of eyes, and legs, and tails, and of all imaginable shapes and modes of motion, and which seem to exist only for the great purpose of swallowing each other whole all day long in a distracting no-system of society, in which everybody swallows who has the power and he remains unswallowed who can. If you have ever seen all this, take another glance at the outside of the Chamber of

Commerce when next you pass, and see what it reminds you of. But, turning from the moral aspect of this mining pursuit, is it at all clear that the physical benefit ultimately accruing to Victoria from the business itself will afford compensation for the evils I have referred to? I think that the history of other auriferous countries will justify many doubts on this point. Upon reflection, it seems scarcely possible to understand how any mere gold country can, for any long period together, be a rich country. "This yellow slave, this ever fresh, young, and delicate wooer, this visible god," as Timon calls it, is after all only a better sort of guano to the people among whom it is found. Every ounce that is exported leaves the country by so much less for ever, just as if such ounce had never existed. It has been exchanged for so much brandy and slops. The digger has lived his troubled and feverish life for the comfort of the Chamber of Commerce, the English merchant, and the English manufacturer. When the gold is gone the digger must go too, or turn to something else if he can find anything else to turn to. For his so-called wealth is simply fugitive and a gold country worked out is, unless other interests have sprung up during the operation, worse off than a country which never had gold within its soil. Regarded in this light, Mr. Carey, an eminent political economist of America, would argue that nothing but preliminary protection, pending the growth of new interests, could save such a country from eventual bankruptcy and ruin. For Mr. Carey contends that even agriculture, by itself, in a new country—and he instances some of the eastern states of America—cannot in the long run hold its own against manufactures in the open markets of the world; and he puts his position in such a way as to elicit from Mr. John Stuart Mill a very respectful and well considered answer. Mr. Carey says this: that in as much as all soils, even the richest, sooner or later, wear out, the American farmer with each successive crop is deprived of a certain proportion of his capital—viz., the productive power of his land; that the crop, therefore, which he exchanges against foreign manufactures represents not merely the annual income or revenue from his land, but comprises also portions of the land itself; that, therefore, sooner or later, the farmer will have nothing left to exchange against foreign manufactures, and that, in the case put, foreign trade must some time or other cease. Mr. Mill appears to be somewhat pressed by this case, and he meets it thus. He contends that the alleged gradual deterioration of the land can be corrected by art; that its exhaustive productiveness can be renewed; and that for the effecting this renewal the farmer can import manure. In making this suggestion, Mr. Mill seems to be affected by a doubt whether it would pay a farmer to import a bulky article of freight like manure, and he therefore endeavours to vindicate the reasonableness of his suggestion by remarking that all which is most potent and valuable in manures, viz., the phosphates, lie in narrow bulk, and may be inexpensively carried. This suggested importation of manure is doubtless a merely practical question, and some farmers may give it for Mr. Mill, some for Mr. Carey. But it must be observed that the above answer of Mr. Mill to Mr. Carey's case is the best answer with which Mr. Mill seems to be provided. If Mr. Mill's mode of meeting Mr. Carey's position should, however, fail in actual practice, it does not follow that Mr. Carey is right. In such extensive territories as the states, land worked out, or partially worked, might be allowed to lie fallow until it had recovered the fertility of which man had deprived it, and thus nature would as it were replace the exhausted capital of which Mr. Carey speaks. But, whatever may be the result of this controversy in relation to Mr. Carey's agricultural instance, there can be no doubt whatsoever that Mr. Carey's observation that international trade cannot be permanent where the actual capital of one country is exchanged against the steady and ever recurring industrial income of another country, has much more and even conclusive, force when applied to gold. For gold is neither a manufacture, nor is it an annually recurring product, like the harvest, the wool clip, or the vintage; and as, therefore, it cannot be denied that, sooner or later of gold-fields must be like a tale that is told, it is a matter of public concern to offer the utmost facilities for the miner to transfer himself to the farm, the factory, and the workshop. At present he is too frequently a wanderer on the face of the earth. But the disciples of the "let alone school" may exclaim, as indeed they have often exclaimed "There is no cure for this. Diggers must and will continue to rush about, and they have no disposition nor can you ever induce them to turn to anything else." This answer cannot be accepted as satisfactory, until it can be shown that we have at any time since the gold discoveries afforded the miner any inducements, or even facilities for turning from mining to any other pursuit, or for dividing his energies between mining and farming, or some other business more healthful to mind and body than working in a drive. Among 80,000 miners, consisting of an infinite variety of men, many of whom have merely temporarily transferred themselves from other pursuits to this of mining, there must be, as among any other equal number of persons, men of every possible variety of tastes and capability. Have we ever sought to fasten these men to the soil? Have we offered them facilities for becoming freeholders? As the business of gold digging must at some time or other come to an end, or become so unprofitable and precarious as to be followed only in connexion with some other less uncertain pursuit, are we wise in constantly regarding this industry as a permanent one, when we know that in its very nature it can be only temporary? For years past our produce of gold has been falling off, and therefore should we not at least, especially on free trade principles, remove all impediments in the way of the miner using his present industry as the means of rising into some other calling which might give us a settled citizen in exchange for a very hardworking, and frequently reckless, wanderer?

What, until very lately, has operated to prevent, not merely miners, but all other classes, from so changing their occupations? I answer, our entire land system has thus steadily operated down to the time of the passing of the new land act now under administration, and which even yet is on its trial. Therefore it was that a few moments back I glanced at our extraordinary society, composed, among other elements, of 80,000 miners, alongside, as it were, of some 1,100 squatters. I have endeavoured, in perfectly good faith, to give a rapid sketch of the too common condition of the digger; let us, with equal good faith, now turn our attention to the squatter. It can not be denied with truth that for many years our squatters have been a somewhat privileged class. They have had vast tracts of land at an almost nominal rent; some of them have grown very rich and powerful (that is powerful in that kind of power which riches confer) in the enjoyment of these advantages. I believe that with many of them the beau-ideal of a great country is a country which begins by handing over the bulk of its territory to eleven hundred persons, and ever there after respectfully buys its beef and mutton from these elevated eleven hundred. I am disposed to think that we have a number of banks here which devoutly believe this to be a highly satisfactory arrangement. They have substantial reasons for so believing. Much of their business consists of advancing on squatting properties, and in renewing, and renewing, or abruptly pulling up, according to the position of the squatter, whose position, in its turn, must depend upon times and season, as upon his own industry and prudence. There are no droughts in a banker's ledger. There, interest grows all the year round, defiant of scab and foot-rot. The bright consummate dividend of twenty per cent, is in large measure made what it is out of our Australian soil. It solaces the benevolent hearts of many absentee gentlemen, living in elegant mansions in the polite neighbourhoods of Kensington and Tiburnia. We are told that all flesh is grass, and if this, be so, I am very certain that a large quantity of London flesh at this very moment is Australian grass. In short, the squatter, in many instances, is the mere bailiff of the banker, and the banker is squatter in disguise. The Australian banker is frequently a wolf in sheep's clothing, without prejudice to his becoming, whenever necessary, good honest wolf. In so far as his banking personality does its direful arithmetic behind the bluff, smiling, pale-ale-consuming, and only partially conscious squatter, the banker is genuine wolf, and his clothing is the sheepskin of his pastoral friend. But when things go wrong, and when drought-withered station on the one hand, and the ledger on the other, will not balance, and the squatter has his credit stopped, and tremblingly calls for his account, and has it smilingly handed to him, and finds E. O. E.—venerated and cautious capitals—that his account is closed, and himself closed with it, then the banker at once appears, and the scene changes. Flocks and stations having gone down the maw of banker, it is of course time for squatter and banker to part. Squatter pays his addresses to Mr. Noel—banker to Kaye and Butchart. Kaye and Butchart announce that "they have the honour to be instructed, &c.," and so the game goes on—with a sort of everlasting fee-fa-fo-fum, banker always smelling the blood of all sorts of Englishmen (without prejudice to other nationalities) who, be they alive, or be they dead, have their pastoral bones perennially ground to make the banker's bread. In the reference I have thus made to the relations between bankers and squatters, let it not be supposed for a moment that I am for encouraging any narrow jealousy of capital, or that I think English money of itself more injurious in this colony than any other money. But I am certainly under a strong impression that this squatter and banker relation involves some of the evils which existed in Ireland before the passing of the Encumbered Estates Act. A largely mortgaged estate has generally a sort of blight on it. A mortgagor cannot improve if he would; a mortgagee will not improve if he can. A mortgagor's solicitude about meeting "interest" confines his attention to fat stock, and he has hardly a thought for bipeds; a banker-mortgagee thinks only of the account in the ledger. You therefore see few indications of civilisation on an Australian squatting station. What you might see under more favourable circumstances you may find sketched by Sir Philip Sidney in his "Arcadia." Let me cut out the delicious little picture, for the sake of the contrast:—"There were hills which garnished their proud heights with stately trees: humble valleys whose base estate seemed comforted with refreshing of silver rivers: meadows, enamelled with all sorts of eye pleasing flowers: thickets, which, being lined with most pleasant shade, were witnessed so too by the cheerful deposition of many well-tuned birds: each pasture stored with sheep feeding with sober security, while the pretty lambs with bleating oratory caved the dams' comfort: here a shepherd's boy piping as though he should never be old: there a young shepherdess knitting, and withal singing, and it seemed that her voice comforted her bands to work, and her bands kept time to her voice's musick." Put beside this sheep station of Sir Philip Sidney one of our banker-nursed stations, garnished with "skull-bankers." In place of the shepherd's boy, piping as though he should never be old, most of our shepherds look as if they had never been young. And as for a shepherdess, how much would a bank manager advance upon her? Of what use are shepherdesses in Australia, when you cannot put them into an inventory, and hand them over with the rest of the stock on the establishment; and how could shepherdesses knit and sine here on damper, and beef, and Barrett's twist, and under the almost dog-like domicile of a slab but? I am unable, therefore, to feel any sort of regret that the present state of things pastoral is likely soon to pass away. Equity, free trade, common sense, civilisation, the required variety of human pursuits, nay, even religion and morality, demand that that state of things shall cease. Equity demands it on tolerably clear grounds.

The squatter and banker between them have had the land for many years on almost their own terms; and it is my purpose to show that, according to my apprehension, these terms are not only inconsistent with equity, but that they do also expressly violate that spontaneous development of society and those principles of free trade about which we have lately heard so much. When the advocates of free trade assert it to be so very good a thing, they of course mean that it is a very good thing all round—not a very good thing merely for miners and mechanics, and a very bad thing for bankers and squatters. Assuming that they are thus far consistent I assert, and propose to show, that there has never yet been anything like free trade in land in this colony. If, further, it can be shown that squatters and bankers have become, and propose to continue, wealthy by reason of this violation of the principle of free trade in their favour, is it quite modest that the men in this position should be so specially demonstrative in favour of enforcing free trade on every other class but themselves? That there has never been free trade in land in this colony the short history of our land system will show. What is that history? As there are many new arrivals among us unacquainted with the facts, they may be given in few words. Before the year 1831, free grants in New South Wales were made to settlers in consideration of their taking charge of convicts. This practice is commonly referred to as "the assignment system." The grant was proportioned to the number of convicts assigned. In the year 1831, Lord Ripon's regulations for the abolition of free grants and for the sale by auction of all Crown lands, were first promulgated. Until the year 1839 the minimum price was 5s. an acre for country lands, and in that year this minimum price was raised from 5s. to 12s. an acre, but the change did not extend to lands previously advertised at the lower price, of which there was a large quantity at the time of the change. In the year 1841 the system of sale at a fixed price of £1 an acre was introduced in the district of Port Phillip, now Victoria. In 1842 the system of sale by auction was resumed throughout the colony at a minimum upset price of 12s. an acre for country lands, with liberty to select at the upset price portions not bid for. In the year 1843 the minimum price was raised to £1 an acre by the act of the Imperial Parliament 5th and 6th of Vict., ch. 36, with liberty to select at the upset price country portions put up to auction and not bid for, or on which the deposit had been forfeited. Chronologically, you have thus in a nutshell the successive periods of the various changes, from the beginning of our first land system down to the year 1843. It would be beside my present purpose to show by what influences, and with what objects, the present upset price was first determined on. It is sufficient to say that it effectually achieved the following results:—It at once all but annihilated the land fund; it secured to the squatters their runs for next to nothing—as nobody gave, or thought of giving, £1 an acre for had land in New South Wales, 16,000 miles from England, when at least equally good land could be bought at the Cape of Good Hope for 2s. an acre, in Canada at 5s. an acre, and for 6d. an acre in the territory ceded by the Indians to the United States shortly before the adoption of the £1 an acre price in Australia. What wonder, then, that in the year 1844 the entire quantity of country lands and town allotments sold in New South Wales, inclusive of Port Phillip was only 4,259 acres, yielding the insignificant sum of £9,174 15s. 3d., whilst in 1837, when the population was only 85,000 persons (being less than half of the population in 1844) the amount of town and country lands sold was 388 695 acres, bringing into the Treasury £121,962 12s. 5d. In the year 1847 came out the celebrated Orders in Council of which you have heard so much, and which proposed (among other curious arrangements exhibiting remarkable ignorance of the circumstances of the colony) to confer on the pastoral tenants of the Crown fourteen years' leases, renewable until the land should be bought for twenty shillings an acre. The net result of this ridiculous system—the invention of the perverse ingenuity of Earl Grey—was, that the squatters practically before the gold era had freeholds in vast tracts of country constituting their runs. Outsiders never dreamt of giving £1 an acre for unimproved land not worth 5s. an acre, and of course squatters themselves were not such fools as to buy that which in effect they were already enjoying for next to nothing. Emigration to Australia all but ceased, agriculture was discouraged, class animosities sprang up at such an outrageous state of things, the squatters strove to obtain the issuing of the leases, the colonists generally opposing, when in the year 1851 gold was discovered in Australia. This great fact, of course, went a long way towards practically settling a question which is perhaps not finally settled yet. Now, I have thus rapidly taken a retrospect of our land history for this purpose. I asserted awhile ago that there had never been free trade in land in Victoria. We cannot have our common sense outraged by the assertion that dribbles of sales by auction constitute free trade whilst principalities, altogether free from auction, are occupied by the squatters at a merely nominal rent. Free trade in land can only obtain where there is one simple uniform system for all lands, pastoral or arable, by auction or otherwise, without partiality or special advantage to any class of society whatsoever. Where, do we find such a system? I answer in the United States. There, the embryo of the future state was to be found in the settlers of a new territory. The backwoodsman marched into the forest, and cleared himself a homestead with his axe. Government followed him, surveyed, and sold him his land at a few shillings an acre; and as this kind of population increased, the territory in the fulness of time became a state, and a member of the Union. The importer of goods, hard or soft, who said to such a settler as this. "I require you to buy my goods untaxed at the custom-house, as I bring them from London, the cheapest market," at least addressed a settler who was allowed

to draw from our common mother earth the means wherewith to pay for such goods. But when our Australian importer and our bankers and squatters address in the same terms immigrants generally, may the latter not reasonably, even as honest free-traders, retort, "Free trade, if good as you say it is, must be good for all persons, and should prevail in all things?" When William the Norman distributed broad England among his companions in arms, he did much as the British legislature did when it handed over our territory to some 1,100 squatters. But the tenants in chief of Norman William at the least sub let the same land, so that human creatures lived upon it after all; whereas our barons people their acres only with cattle and sheep. Are these barons exactly the authorities to preach the beautiful simplicity of politico-economical science? What right has a six-hundredth part of the population first to appropriate almost the whole of the land of a country, and then to require the other five hundred and ninety-nine parts of the community to buy in any particular market, when they have never been allowed freely to grow produce where with to pay for their purchases? These considerations are not urged in any hostile spirit to the squatters, among whom are many very sensible, just, and reasonable men. I desire only to call attention to the inconsistency of the same men, in the same society, calling out for what they term the natural system as applied to dealings with merchandise, and as lustily advocating the artificial system as respects land. It is certain, however, that this artificial system has been allowed to attain such proportions under the law that no statesman can now deal with the land question exactly as he might have dealt with it in the beginning. It is one of the inevitable incidents of an artificial system that it cannot suddenly be abolished without injustice, not merely to those who have dealt under the system, but also to many more than those directly interested in it. But without too roughly interfering with squatters' runs, we may now hope soon to see the country more rapidly settled than has been its experience heretofore, for the 42nd clause works. I am rejoiced to find, not merely from official reports, but from the interesting statements of the *Age* and *The Argus* special correspondents, that settlement is rapidly extending in many districts. New farm buildings are going up; new fencing everywhere appearing; solitudes are becoming peopled; civilisation is reclaiming the wilderness; the sum of human happiness is increasing in the land. But the year 1870 draws nigh, and once again will the squatters and their backers fight for a still longer day. Can we be surprised, ought we even to feel much disgusted, should they do this? Every where, and in all times, we find class interests striving to gain the ascendancy over the public weal. There seems to have been always, at one period or other, with special modifications, a squatting question everywhere. The history of the Gracchi and of the *Ager Publicus* of ancient Rome is in many of its features not unlike our own land question. Our own forefathers in England, nearly three centuries back, had their anti-squatting agitations. Mr. Francis Bacon—afterwards the great chancellor—brought two liberal land bills into the House of Commons, and made pregnant speeches against "the Lords," who, as he said, had "enclosed great grounds, and pulled down even whole towns, and converted them to sheep pastures." "For enclosure of grounds," continues he, "brings depopulation, which brings forth, first, idleness"—their squatting you see, generated skull-bankers, even as our squatting does;—"secondly, decay of tillage; thirdly, subversion of houses, and decrease of charity, and charge to the poor's maintenance; fourthly, the impoverishing the state of the realm. A law for the taking away of which inconveniences is not to be thought ill or hurtful unto the general state. And I should be sorry to see within this kingdom that piece of Ovid's verse prove true, '*Jam seges est ubi Troja fuit*;' so in England, instead of a whole town full of people, none but green fields—but a shepherd and a dog." Not less distinct and emphatic on the same monopolising evil is Sir Thomas More, in his *Utopia*. I quote from Bishop Burnet's translation. Two of the characters in this work discussing the then distressing prevalence of wandering thieves in England—"There is another cause of it (*i. e.*, stealing), that is more peculiar to England," says one of the speakers. "What is that?" said the cardinal. "The increase of pasture, said I,"—here the author is apparently speaking in his own person,— "by which your sheep, that are naturally mild and easily kept in order, may be said to devour men, and unpeople not only villages but towns; for wherever it is found that the sheep of any soil yield a softer and a richer wool than ordinary, there the nobility and gentry, and even those holy men the abbots, not contented with the old rents which their farms yielded, nor thinking it enough that they, living at their ease, do no good to the public, resolve to do it hurt instead of good. They stop the course of agriculture, inclose grounds, and destroy houses and towns, reserving only the churches, that they may lodge their sheep in them." This must be a wrinkle for some of our squatters—and perhaps Geelong may tremble—"and, as if forests and parks had swallowed up too little soil, those worthy countrymen turn the best inhabited places into solitudes; for when any unsatiable wretch who is a plague to his country,"—Sir Thomas More, who was a, most pious and conscientious man, had evidently never heard of the heinous sin of "setting class against class"—"for when any unsatiable wretch who is a plague to his country resolves to inclose many thousand acres of ground, the owners as well as tenants are turned out by tricks"—were there dummies in those days?—"or by main force, or being wearied out by ill usage, they are forced to sell them. So those miserable people, both men and women, married and unmarried, old and young, with their poor but numerous families (since country business requires many hands), are all forced to change their seats, not knowing whither to go: and they must sell for almost nothing their household stuff, which could

not bring them much money, even though they might stay for a buyer. When that little money is at an end—for it will be soon spent—what is left for them to do but either to steal, and so be hanged. God knows how justly—or go about and beg? and If they do this, they are put in prison as Idle vagabonds; whereas they would willingly work, but can find none that will hire them, for there is no more occasion for country labour, to which they have been bred, when there is no arable ground left. One shepherd can look after a flock, which will stock an extent of ground which would require many hands if it were to be ploughed and reaped. . . . Since the increase of pasture God has punished the avarice of the owners by a rot among the sheep, which has destroyed vast numbers of them, but had been more justly laid upon the owners themselves." And so the writer proceeds in the same vein on the same theme, like a mere Wilson Gray; and notwithstanding the fuss Sir James Macintosh and other critics have made about the beautiful simplicity and the unbending integrity of Sir Thomas More's character, and despite the stories about Henry VIII. walking about the garden with his arm round Sir Thomas's neck, I can hardly help thinking Sir Thomas More must have been considered rather a disreputable character in his own day by the upper ten thousand. Even as it was, he came at last to have his head chopped off—perhaps a fitting, finale for one who held such singular, not to say disgustingly radical, views on the "land question." But to come down from the days of Sir Thomas More to those of the Hon. W. J. T. Clarke. Of course it will be said, as has been said many thousands of times already, that agriculture will not pay in Australia; that sheep and cattle are the best products for such a laud as ours; that nature is not to be overruled by man, and that therefore we ought to allow the squatters to remain in undisturbed possession. I grant that nature is not to be overruled by man, and that land fit only for pasture cannot be profitably worked as arable land. But the persons who stand up so stoutly for nature, on behalf of the claims of the squatters, begin by committing the very offence they deprecate in others. They *have* overruled nature. They commence by dedicating to a 600th, part of the community the common heritage of all, and then say to the rest of the population buy in an open market, deprived in large measure of the natural means of buying in any market at all. We may be told that we have no right to mix up such considerations with the application of the principles of the economists to our society. I answer that we find them mixed up already in actual practice, coeval with the original constitution of our society. We have an artificial system to deal with, and we have no right to say that an evil which human error has brought into existence is to be left to nature to cure if [*unclear: ait*] can assist nature in effecting a cure. It is therefore idle to repeat that such social disturbances of what but for such disturbances would have been the natural current of our colonial industry are not to be heeded by statesmen when called upon to apply the principles of economical science. Special circumstances frequently call for special treatment; and in actual practice applied political economy runs into politics, and both into morals: a truth of which Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, had so clear a perception that I may be excused for quoting his own words. In the life and correspondence of this great and excellent; man will be found, in a letter of January 23rd 1840, the following passage:—"I agree with Carlyle in thinking that they (the Liberal party) greatly over-estimate Bentham, and also that they overestimate the political economists generally; not that I doubt the ability of those writers, or the truth of their conclusions as far as regards their own science; but I think that the *summum bonum* of their science and of human life are not identical; and therefore many questions in which free trade is involved, and the advantages of large capital, &c., although perfectly simple in an economical point of view, become when considered politically very complex; and the economical good is very often, from a neglect of other points, made in practice a direct evil." Now, it may be as well to keep the solid meaning of Dr. Arnold's words in mind, not merely on our own political questions, but even when we come across some of those impatient and bitter expressions of disgusted and self-satisfied superiority which occasionally appear in the colonial press at what is denounced as the ignorant and retrograde policy of Canada on the subject of taxation, and of America, and other young countries on the subject of free trade. May it not be that the Americans know perfectly well what they are about? Can they be so ignorant as not to know that a high duty *per se* is worse than a low duty? Judged by mere politico-economical lights, a people taking to protection for its own sake deliberately will the partial annihilation of their own productive powers. I cannot easily conceive of such a case. I think it less unreasonable to suppose that the Americans, with full knowledge of the nature and cost of the means they use, employ them as a mere purchasing power for attracting as many people from the old European communities as can be drawn to the New World. The Americans apparently imagine that it is not inexpedient to pay a high price for population, frequently the weakness of an old country, but always the strength of a new one. If homestead bills and customs duties draw this population to their shores, and if the authors of such measures and those who are affected by them are content. I am not aware that any other people have any right to object. We ourselves buy population by means which, at least, equally violate the first principles of political economy, which should leave labour, like capital, to flow into or out of a country, according to the ordinary principle of supply and demand. Let all these points of policy and motives of national conduct, however, be what they may, every nation guides its affairs as best it can; and in all countries fit for freedom even errors ought to be turned to account, as the free play of responsible government, guided by public opinion, must always more or less

gravitate towards the true guidance and economising of a nation's resources. Have we a public opinion competent to pilot its way through these intricacies, and among these depths and shallows of human interests, shifting as they do, or rather as they appear to do, from time to time with the goats of party prejudice or passion? A momentous question, this! "Public opinion." What is it?—where is it? Who can answer these questions? How many even strive to answer them to their own understandings? With difficulty, and only through the aid of statistics, can we attain to some knowledge even of the general composition of our society as respects ranks and callings. But when we strive to detect that impalpable essence called "public opinion," I suspect we are all more or less perplexed, more or less at fault, and more or less the creatures of prejudice, and of imperfect, occasional, and seldom altogether reliable observation. Unless always on our guard against our own weakness and partial vision, we are apt to erect our tastes and our dis gusts into opinions and principles of action. Every man is more or less swayed by mere fragmentary experience, and by isolated phenomena of character and conduct. For instance, to explain by an extreme example what I mean, some months back, walking home accompanied by a neighbour, we suddenly came on a prostrate and motionless human figure, all in white, coiled up in an angle formed by the abutments of a railway bridge. The recumbent figure might be dead, or in a fit, or merely asleep. I and my companion drew near him, and I exclaimed, judging from his loose baggy cotton dress, "Why, he's a Chinaman!" The figure without in the least altering its attitude, returned with an imperfect pronunciation which explained his case at once, and set our minds at ease, "No, no, Oim not a Choingman, Oim an Oirishman." Radiating alcohol into the general atmosphere, as was this fellow-citizen of ours, the indignant remnant of his consciousness was stung into activity by my too hasty judgment, and his outraged nationality vindicated itself by his claim of the Emerald Isle as the country of his birth. We walked away; and I could not help saying to myself, "There lies a specimen of manhood suffrage; there, with its lodging on the cold ground; and looking uncomfortably like a houseless and unregistered dog, is portion of the majesty of the people; there is an enlightened discriminator between protection and free trade!" This first thought was a depressing one. The next thought, whether a wise one or not, was, I think, but a fair and just one. How much of this man's character or powers did or could I know from this transitory glance? The presumptions were against him, it is true. But Sheridan was once roused up by the watchman from a similar *al fresco* slumber, and when interrogated as to who he was, gave for answer—the delicious humour of which almost redeemed its falsehood—that he was Mr. Wilberforce. Was Mr. Sheridan unfit to exercise the franchise? You will perhaps hesitate to answer this question in the affirmative. But you may say that every man who gets drunk, and soberses himself *sub-Dio*, is not a Sheridan Granted. But, all I am contending for is this: that mere casual observations of men afford you nest to no means of ascertaining their general character. For aught I or you could know recumbent Irishman might in his soberer moods be a man who could draw nice distinctions. He might on this occasion have been for the first time in his life drinking too much colonial wine, and it might not have agreed with IBM; and in any view of his case we know that he must get sober some time or other, and go about his business like any other man. Such snatches and passages of observation as this one of mine, could never justify the conclusion that the class to which the sleeper belonged was unlit to be trusted with the power of voting for one or the other of two Parliamentary candidates. To come to just conclusions on such a subject, we must have more extended observations, and found our final judgments upon a much wider experience. Where or how are we to get this experience? Why, surely, by striving to take in all the particulars of which our society is composed; by giving to each of these particulars its due weight in our ultimate judgment, and no more. To instance again. If your mind is depressed, and very naturally and justly depressed, by the sight of a drunkard sleeping off his debauch, are your feelings not elevated and cheered in much more than a corresponding degree by the sight of that procession of healthy, sober, well-dressed, stalwart men, who in the pardonable pride of success, celebrate annually, with banners and high festival, the eight-hours system? Looking as I have looked, long and carefully, at the composition of this procession; and, looking as I have looked, long and carefully, at the assemblage on the grand stand at one of our champion races, I am sure I am unable—and so I suspect are you—to pronounce which assemblage contains the greater amount of political wisdom. At what point in the social scale, going upwards, are we to begin to look for this sort of wisdom? The men of Collingwood are not supposed to possess it, because they are so curiously demonstrative at public meetings. But their whole lives are not spent at public meetings. The labour of their hands is perhaps the whole estate of many of them; and we may feel assured that they often think seriously enough about that. They are not always singing of that everlasting march of old John Browns soul. But whatever this general public may be, and howsoever composed, it is certain that it is the public which must ultimately be responsible for the efficient working of our representative institutions, and for the general Shaping of our laws. This public may be taught, advised with, guided; it can never be bullied or driven. It is fitting that we should bear this in mind, whilst endeavouring to acquire some clear in- sight into its nature and composition. In making this assertion, I must, in passing, express my regret that *The Argus* so frequently refers to some "numerical majority as a port of terrible, blind, and unreasoning power, ever on the alert to oppress and victimise a wise, rich, and virtuous minority.

Surely such a distinction is a mere figment of the brain. Does any one here seriously believe that in Victoria we have any sufficiently numerous section of the ignorant, the houseless, or of the dwellers in garrets or cellars, such as constitute in many old countries "a dangerous class?" Are our police cognisant of each a class strong enough to be a disturbing quantity in good government or in society? I venture to think not. Nor do I believe that the numerical majority of any particular class have any interest (although like every class they have their prejudices) alien or antagonistic to the just and general interests of society at large. How many little freeholders are there throughout the length and breadth of this colony, all of whom it is certain are extremely conservative of their little freehold. How many thousands of careful workingmen are month by month acquiring (despite of the long locked-up lands) dwellings through the numerous building and benefit societies in operation amongst us? Are these people of the *sans culotte stamp*? Are they a likely class to cry out *à la lanterne!* or to throw up barricades against their own trustees? I can understand anyone calling, us all democrats or all conservatives (excepting, of course, the thieves), but the distinction insisted on by *The Argus* is not easy to comprehend. The above observations derive additional force from the consideration that our representative institutions now rest on an electoral basis of 110,000 men, of whom 70,000 are ratepayers; the residue of 40,000 are men who have a right to vote under their manhood suffrage; and many even of these have interests in mines or in mining claims. We have thus two-thirds at least who may be said to vote under a sort of property qualification, which we may reasonably take as some indication of steadiness, industry, and fore thought in those who have attained to such a position. I observe that even in England a tenant of a house rented at £8 a year is regarded as a safe man to be trusted with the franchise. There are probably few ratepayers here who are not rated in respect of houses the rent of which is at least double £8. Mr. Archer's last published statistics tell us that 535,043 persons are housed; that four-fifths of them above five years old can read and write, and that ten-elevenths of them can read. Both physically and intellectually, then, this our community, as a body, is made up of material very different from that which goes to the composition of what is commonly called "a mob." And yet we are told that there is a mob here, and that it was a mob which, during the last election, refused to hear Mr. Graham Berry in his defence at Collingwood. Now, I am not going to attempt a defence of mobs, for, in the first place, I am not very clear as to what constitutes a mob. It is a word of rather vague meaning. Johnson derives it, and no doubt rightly, from *mobile*, easily to be moved; and he describes a mob as "a crowd, a tumultuous rout." which the bulk of a people can hardly be. He also gives an extract from Dryden, which shows how large an interpretation even that great classic put on the word, in the expression he uses, "a mob of kings." The essence of a thing called a mob would appear, then, to be its movableness, its excitability; and therefore we may have well-dressed mobs and ill-dressed mobs—movableness, excitability, being essential to all of them. When William the Fourth once went down to the House of Lords to dissolve Parliament, he was received by a tumultuous assemblage of vociferating angry peers, who for some moments were a mob. There may be a mob, then, any where, and most variously composed. There may be a Collingwood mob, who do the thing cheaply with good strong lungs, and there may be an Exhibition-building mob, who sometimes do the thing more aristocratically and expensively with pepper and rotten eggs. Neither of them, however, is the better for the tumultuous and merely excitable element, and to be impartial, we must censure both. But in our censure let us at any rate discriminate. This susceptibility to being moved may be very various in character. An instructed mob can seldom, if ever, be as mischievous as an ignorant mob. The gross and savage mob of the Lord George Gordon riots was, I take it, very different from any that could be got together in our own day. Fun, rather than malice, seems to be the principal characteristic of our Victorian gatherings. Fun is certainly the principal characteristic of a Collingwood convocation. Let us glance back at Mr. Graham Berry's meeting, held, I think, during the late general election. The comic element of that occasion lay in Mr. Berry's proclaimed grievance that the meeting were robbing him in not hearing him, inasmuch as he had paid for the room. I am inclined to think that he was in a manner robbed; and yet I cannot but also think that the mass of the meeting were actuated by a mere spirit of downright fun in thus converting Mr. Berry's room into so rough a temple for concerted music as it became that night. Whenever Mr. Berry's own soul was for marching on to its vindication, the perpetual motion of that old John Brown's soul seemed to be always in opposition. I have been in a few of these breezes myself, and I think that there are few large bodies of men in any rank, where not assembled on an occasion which demands peculiar decorum who would be much more grave than a Collingwood gathering, provided only the comic elements in each case were the same. There is no malice in these demonstrations, and it says much for our society that violence to the person has been almost unknown both in our Parliamentary and our municipal elections. At the same time, before quitting this part of my address I would remind my hearers of the words of a great statesman and philosopher— words which may be quite as profitably pondered by our higher classes as by the demonstrative men of Collingwood:—"Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains upon their own appetites . . . Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without." Words full of wisdom, and worthy of being learned by heart. How many of us can

conscientiously say that we reach the standard of moderation here suggested? Can any one of us say so? Amongst the various appetites by which we find ourselves betrayed, are the appetites for dominion, for detraction, for the subjugation of other men's wills, and actions to our own. How often do we assail the spirit of liberty in the very act of defrauding it? Are we not all more or less tyrants, frequently without suspecting the fact? Men have been burned at the stake, their executioners believing they were discharging a religious duty, when they were only feeding the perverted pride of a crossed will, which, by one of those tricks men's vanity and self-love can always play, gets called zeal, enthusiasm, devotion to truth; *i. e.* the truth of the man who urges it on the acceptance of his fellows. Our civilisation has outgrown the fires of Smith field; but does none of the spirit which lighted those fires survive? Can or do we all respect in others that liberty of thought we claim for ourselves? The men of Collingwood were rated for boo-booing the speaker who claimed to address them, and I am not going to attempt to defend what is plainly indefensible; but are there no symptoms of a more deliberate and still less defensible tyranny among those who probably claim to be the betters of the men of Collingwood? Are there not well authenticated accounts (from Geelong and other places) of tradesmen threatened with loss of custom if they did not vote according to the dictation of the threateners? And still worse—have we not seen this tyranny assailing the private lives of persons politically obnoxious to the assailants? And is not this the worst tyranny of all—the attempted tyranny over thought—that free thought to which alone is due almost all the moral good we enjoy in these latter days? I think before we are so hard on the mote in the Collingwood eye, that some of us may think a little on the beam in our own. On what agencies are we to rely for the holding in check this spirit of tyranny which is never dead—which only sleeps until roused up again by an adequate provocative? We have the press, the pulpit, the lecture-room, the infinite talk of men in all the walks of life, the ever-mutually correcting moral censures and political experience of an ever-widening world brought home to us by electricity and by steam. Of all these agencies one of the most potent is the press—*nan vi sed scepe cadendo*—for it speaks to us daily, and we hardly want Cowper's assurance of the efficacy of iteration in influencing men's thoughts and action. How desirable, therefore, that in every civilised country, and more especially in every free country, we should see mirrored in its press the collective intelligence, convictions, and purposes of the entire community. Is the press of Victoria such a mirror? I think not quite. It is hardly possible for it to be so, for at the same time that it is only wanted to express our immediate local necessities, the press of Victoria must suffer, because it does not carry on its functions under the same conditions which beset and control the English press. Behind and around the English newspaper press is a literature unsurpassed in power and variety in any age of the world. And behind this again are many thousands of men of much literature, who do not write, but who have nevertheless a great influence over those who do. The unwritten thought of a country, with many learned men in it, must always largely shape, and qualify, and keep within the bounds of justice, decorum, and fairplay, the class of journalists, even if the latter in so large a community could ever feel any temptation to abuse their position. The English press, therefore, will always mirror everything English, very much that is imperial, and even cosmopolitan; and on the other hand, the English people, as a nation, know only and are influenced only by their own English press. Press and people therefore grow together, and each is ever being subdued to the quality of the other. But here in Victoria, the local press is not our only press; many of us could not feel that we were living if the English press did not come to us by every mail. For our sympathies and our curiosity extend beyond the sphere of our immediate interests; we would know the central world though on the outer part of it; and, therefore, it is not surprising that Victorians, active and energetic, and congregated here from the world at large, and most of them owing fealty to early memories originating elsewhere, should so frequently utterly ignore the exhortations of our press, and refuse to recognise its authority. Touching the general ability of our press, it is perhaps not too much to say that, upon the whole, it stands as high as any provincial press out of England. As to its independence, its conscientiousness, its regard for fairplay, I am afraid that no man who has been much before the public is quite an impartial or trustworthy judge on these points, and, therefore, I shall offer no opinion upon them. But as I read English as well as Victorian newspapers, I often fancy that I miss from the latter the nicely balanced thought the fine judicial spirit, and the courtesy and moderation of expression, which, even in the height of party Straggles at home, are generally displayed by first-class journals—qualities which give these journals a certain air of authority for all classes of readers I will, however candidly admit that *The Argus* has one contributor. Whose originality and uniform courtesy, together with his slashing and vigorous style (so like Burke's in one respect, as ever hovering between prose and poetry), always command my respect, and enchain my attention to the end. Is it necessary for me to say that I can refer to no other person than our much-respected old friend, Tom Stubbs? I cannot quit the subject of the press without adverting to an observation I have seen more than once made in newspaper columns. It has been said that most of the country press, and also the press of the neighbouring colonies, have been found in opposition to the present Government. It must be admitted that, so far as this is genuine and honest expression of local opinion, it affords, where the writers have mastered their subject—and not otherwise—an additional authority against the Government. But I take leave to question

the genuineness of much of this so called opinion. It is matter almost of notoriety, that much country journalism is Melbourne manufacture—a manufacture of which you may have as much as you have money to pay for. I do not think that all the members of the Victorian press would like to make affidavit that even some of the articles published in neighbouring colonies have been produced altogether independent of Melbourne authorship. Opinions, like light, can be reflected back upon us from distant surface, and a small political party, under manifold disguises, can apparently multiply themselves, and recruit their strength as small theatrical armies sometimes swell their ranks by bringing across the stage over and over again, in various garbs, everybody in the establishment, down even to the money-takers, the carpenters, and the call-boy. If, however, it be true that a majority of our press is on the one side, as moot undoubtedly a very large majority of the people are on the other side, the spectacle is certainly an interesting one, for the majority of the people are, in the main, either right or wrong. If right, they are wiser than the press which assumes to instruct them; if wrong, there is a noble opportunity for the press to convert them. If wrong, and unconverted, our people are either unteachable, or our press cannot teach, the dilemma is one which deserves serious consideration. One thing is certain, that those who desire to teach must not exhibit from the judgment-seat of journalism too great an anxiety to effect the ends of party. Let them candidly discuss the views of opponents, for as Aristotle says, "Among all the searchers for truth, none completely succeed, and none completely fail; those from whose conclusions we dissent do us service, by exercising our intelligence." Is not this at once modest and true? And do you not feel that could Aristotle come back to us and edit a newspaper, he would do his work like a gentleman, and like a gentleman, too, not at all confident that wisdom would die with him. But as time admonishes me that I am trespassing upon your patience greatly beyond the little hour permitted by custom to the lecturer, it is fortunate that but one subject remains on which I desire to offer a few observations. That subject is our Parliamentary constitution. I wish, and so I am sure do you, to see that constitution work harmoniously and usefully for the public interests. It may have been an oversight in the framers of our Constitution to make no provision for the possibility of a dead-lock between the two Houses. But the absence of this provision entails on both Chambers an additional necessity for mutual forbearance, and a mutual endeavour to conciliate opposition. And as Victoria must now depend, entirely on herself for whatever of political truth or wisdom there may be in her future policy, I am sure that the honourable gentlemen of the Council will allow me to assume that they are not behind any of us in their desire to advance the interests of a country which as our great Intercolonial Exhibition now shows us, has at immediate command, and bounded by our own seas, the profuse and various wealth of tropical and temperate climes. To make such wealth available for millions yet unborn, the works before us seem plain and simple:—General and sound education for the rising generation, and the elevation of their moral character; the facilitating by bold and statesman like land legislation the more rapid settlement of the country; the providing that country with roads, irrigation, and water supply: the wise promotion and encouragement of new industries; the steady subordination of mere sectional interests to the great general interests of the public at large, seem to be plain and peremptory duties lying in our path, and as man does not live by the material alone, I would add the adorning and making attractive to surrounding populations this our capital city of Melbourne; and last, although far from least, the federation of all these Australian colonies, and the consequent economising and consolidation of their resources and strength. On such subjects can there be irreconcilable differences of opinion among reasonable men? On such subjects can there be permanently one body of opinion for the Assembly, another for the Council? I humbly think not. But if there be such difference of opinion it is all important that it should be expressed in both Chambers. As there must be give and take in politics, an Englishman can always bear being denied a thing if sensible and honest reasons only be given for the denial. But no deliberative body in the world—call it by whatsoever exalted title you may—can command respect save by the intellectual manifestation of the power it exercises. We are often told—and it is a very trite truth after all—that political power, uncontrolled by conscience and unguided by knowledge, is a terrible power for evil. But all history shows—and our common human nature approves it—that such power is quite as dangerous in the hands of the rich as in the hands of the poor; in the hands of the prosperous few, as in the hands of the struggling many. Therefore, all political power, aristocratic or democratic, must justify itself to the critical intellect of the governed, or it will cease to be power. When the Council checks hasty legislation, it must do so as if really understanding its work; it must not do so in still greater haste and in solemn silence, as we drink to the memory of departed friends. I am aware that Mr. Fellows, in his speech at the opening of the Deaf and Dumb Institution, expressed an opinion that the Council, as well as the Assembly, might improve by still further approximating to the deaf and dumb inmates at Prahran; but I think he does the Council injustice in insinuating that they have too much to say. At any rate, one of the most competent, and one of the best informed among Mr. Fellows's own fellow councillors, lately held an opinion opposed to him on this very subject; for only some three years back, the gentleman to whom I refer, read to his fellow legislators the following startling passage, for the edification, I suppose, of the pastoral interest as represented in that House:—"They are all ignorant; all dumb dogs; they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea,

they are greedy dogs, which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand. They all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter." *Non meus hic sermo*. With my critical, and facetious friend (whose lively fancy has perhaps a little exaggerated here), it seems as if ordinary language broke down, under the strong conviction he did groan withal, and nothing short of the nervous words and the strong colours of Isaiah \_ sufficed for the portrait. All I can say is, that *I* should never have been permitted to go to such a source for descriptive materials. But I suppose that in a bishop's registrar is but a choleric word, which in a poor outsider like me would be flat blasphemy. In conclusion, I hope I need hardly say that I have aimed only at one purpose—viz, fair and candid discussion—in the views I have submitted. I do not affect any particular devotion to "this, my adopted country," as the phrase goes—a phrase which is a common form in so many addresses, and which seems to flow mechanically from so many lips. But I think that we are all compelled to take a peculiar interest in a country which, although never to be loved as our own until we can change our nature with our skies, is yet very tenderly regarded as the native country of those who are dearest to us. With his children about him every man is a Conservative, unless he proposes to run away from them. I therefore, by virtue of the hostages I have given to fortune, claim to be as good a Conservative as any one here; but I mean the wise conservatism which can only conserve even the good we have by recognising and discharging the duties which must ever devolve on the first occupants of a new country, and the first founders of a new nation. This distinguishes our position from that of any equal number of people among any of the old populations of the world. For I believe that in the order of Providence, which in its good time raises and depresses dynasties and peoples, the legitimate office of a young land like this is to be the refuge for the weary and the heavy-laden, as well as for the resolute and the self-reliant, who from among the crowded and struggling populations of the Old World may desire to cast in their fortunes with ours. The interests of such a land and the spirit of its legislation are, or ought to be, as large as the interests of humanity itself; and in dealing with them we should do so in the reverent spirit of the old Puritan poet, who, counselling moderation to the antagonist political forces of his day, pleads for the solemn interests and the essential truth and dignity of a human common wealth as paramount to the mere forms of its civil life, in the few grandly simple lines with which, leaving you to apply them, I bid you good night:—"Let not your King and Parliament in one, much less apart, mistake themselves for that which is most worthy to be thought upon, nor think they are essentially the state. Let them not fancy that the authority and privileges upon them bestowed, conferred, are to set up a majesty, a power, or a glory of their own! But let them know 'twas for a deeper life, which they but represent—

*That there's on earth a yet auguster thing,  
Veil'd though it be, than Parliament and King."*

[The learned lecturer, who had been frequently applauded during the course of his remarks, which occupied in their delivery nearly two hours and a half, eat down amidst loud and long-continued cheering.]

Colonel ANDERSON rose to propose a vote of thanks to the lecturer, for the great intellectual treat which he had given the audience. This duty had been confided to IBM, he presumed, as being the representative of the force on behalf of a portion of which—the St. Kilda Artillery—the lecture had been delivered. The members of this body, he was certain, must be highly gratified with what they had heard that evening.

Captain SARGOOD seconded the motion, and on behalf of the St. Kilda Artillery, thanked Mr. Michie for his lecture.

Mr. MICHIE briefly returned thanks; and the proceedings closed with vote of thanked to the mayor for presiding.

Wilson and MackInnon, Printers, Collins Street East, Melbourne.

The Hamlet Controversy.

Was Hamlet Mad?

Or, the Lucubrations of

MESSRS. Smith, Brown, Jones, and Robinson.

with a preface by

The Editor of the "Argus."

*"Great wits are sure to madness near allied, And thin partitions do their bounds divide"*

DRYDEN.

H. T. Dwight Melbourne : Bourke Street East, Near Parliament Houses. 1867.

## Preface.

THE controversy which is embodied in this little pamphlet arose out of the question, "Is Mr. Montgomery justified in basing his interpretation of *Hamlet* on the supposition that his madness was feigned and not real?" In a letter to the Editor of the "*Argus*," Mr. James Smith contended that this view of the character is erroneous, and in direct opposition to the opinions of some of the best Shakspearian commentators, Mr. Smith was promptly replied to by Messrs. Brown, Jones, and Robinson (senior and junior), who held that Mr. Montgomery's reading of the character is the correct one; and as the discussion has excited wide and general interest amongst students of Shakspeare, and lovers of the drama generally, the publisher thought that a reprint of the letters in a convenient form would prove acceptable to the public.

As the play is now played out, and no reason for the preservation of the anonymous any longer exists, it may add interest to the controversy to give the real names of the actors in the little comedy. The name of Mr. James Smith of course speaks for itself; the rest of the dramatis persona, with their pseudonyms, are as follows:—

It is only necessary to add that the Editor's duties have been confined simply to seeing fair play between the combatants, to a careful revision of the proofs, and the writing of these few introductory lines.  
F.W.H.

"ARGUS" OFFICE,

6th August, 1867.

Mr. Walter Montgomery's "*Hamlet*."

## To the Editor of the *Argus*.

SIR—So many queries have been addressed to me, both personally and by letter, with respect to Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet*, that I will venture, with your permission, to reply to them through the columns of the *Argus*.

Let me premise that every *Hamlet* of note I have ever seen has been largely affected by, if it has not faithfully reflected, the temperament of the actor. Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet* is no exception to the rule. It is essentially lymphatic. The portrait he presents to us is that of an amiable, affectionate, self-indulgent, plaintive, and somewhat lachrymose *Prince*. He brings out in strong relief the vacillating, wayward, irresolute, and half-hearted traits in *Hamlet's* character. He shows him to be unstable as water, as variable as the clouds, as inconstant as the moon. His melancholy is not so deeply seated as to render him incapable of fugitive moods of cheerfulness. He can be diverted from his purpose by trivial incidents, and find a pretext for procrastination in dreamy reveries. His grief is the indulgence of a weak mind, and not an influential principle of action operating upon a strong one. It is content to expend itself in "the windy suspiration of forced breath." When it should serve as a goad or a spur, it is found to restrain him like a curb. Were his nature less gracious his manner less urbane, and his speech less gentle, we should be provoked to despise him as a poor shiftless creature, who is always "letting 'I dare not' wait upon 'I would,' like the poor cat i' the adage." He exhibits none of the "stern effects" of which *Hamlet* speaks, and which actors of greater vigour have been accustomed to display; but, on the other hand, he reveals to us—which some of them do not—the deep undercurrent of affection which he supposes the *Prince* to entertain for *Ophelia*, the mental pang which he imagines that *Hamlet* experiences on discovering her prevarication, and the profound reluctance, which he conceives the *Prince* must feel in renouncing, from a sense of duty and in disregard of the dictates of his heart, the passion he has cherished for her. Mr. Montgomery's is an eminently agreeable and thoroughly artistic *Hamlet*. It is most effective where other representatives of the character have been least so; and it is comparatively unimpressive in those scenes—the interview with the *Ghost*, and the closet scene, for example—in which previous actors, and Mr. Anderson especially so, have made their strongest points, and produced their most powerful impressions. In both these instances Mr. Montgomery presents us with a striking picture of mental abstraction when, as I think, it should be one of mental absorption. His mood of mind is subjective, when it should be objective. He is occupied with his own meditations when every nerve might be supposed to be strung to the highest tension, and every faculty wholly engrossed by the awful apparition, the hour, the place, and the astounding nature of the revelation made to him by the "dread corse." Thus much is obvious from the text; and it derives additional sanction from the traditions of the stage, handed down to us from the time in which Shakspeare played the *Ghost* in his own tragedy, and is reported to have instructed Burbage in the part of *Hamlet*, and reproved Kemp for his "villanous" gagging. How Garrick bore himself in presence of the spirit we know from Partridge's

ingenious remark in *Tom Jones*; and I think we may accept Shakspeare and Garrick as high authorities on this point; and may be justified, in this wise, for disputing the wisdom and propriety of innovations which have nothing to recommend them beyond the fact of their novelty. If the foundations of *Hamlet's* reason are not—as two such experts as Drs. Bucknill and Conolly assert they are—overthrown by the appalling revelation which has been just made to him by the *Ghost*; if he does not join together—as Coleridge, as M. Villemain, and as nearly all the great critics, English, German, and French, declare he does—"the light of reason, the cunning of intentional error, and the involuntary disorder of the soul," his mind was unquestionably unsettled; while, physically, he appears to have been in a state of hysteria. Not otherwise can we account for the unfilial and scoffing language which he employs towards his father, which are so significant of *Hamlet's* state of mind, and which Mr. Montgomery, strange to say, altogether omits. They are these:  
*Ham.*

—Ha, ha, boy! say'st thou so? Art thou there, Truepenny?  
Come on, you hear this fellow in the cellarage.

And again—

Well said, old mole! Canst work i' the earth so fast?  
A worthy pioneer.

So, too, in the play scene. Mr. Montgomery cuts out whole passages which are not less demonstrative of a disordered intellect, and not less important aids to the spectator, who is anxious to divine the true condition of the *Prince's* mind. The lines excised are these:—

*Ham.*—Would not this, sir, and a forest of feathers (if the rest of my fortunes turn Turk with me), with two Provencal roses on my razed shoes, get me a fellowship in a cry of players, sir? *Hor.*—Half a share. *Ham.*—A whole one, ay.

Fur thou dost know, O Damon dear,  
This realm dismantled was  
Of Jove himself, and now reigns here  
A very, very—peacock.

This extravagance of conduct and language, it will be observed is exhibited when none but *Horatio* is present, and when no necessity exists for acting the madman; while the flightiness of the couplet—

For if the *King* like not the comedy,  
Why, then, belike—he likes it not, perdy—

resembles that of many of *Madge Wildfire's* crazy speeches.

In the purely colloquial passages of the play Mr. Montgomery is very happy; and while, in the "business" of the piece, he does not refuse to adopt what has been engrafted upon it by his predecessors, he gives proof of originality of conception, and endeavours, indeed, to clear up some obscurities of the text by the light which his action projects upon them. Thus, he mitigates the apparent harshness of *Hamlet's* language and conduct to *Ophelia* in the first scene of the second act, by conveying to the audience, as explicitly as possible, the assurance of the fact that the *King* and his *Chamberlain* are eaves-dropping behind the arras; while he also renders broadly manifest the shock communicated to the *Prince's* moral nature when he discovers *Ophelia* to have paltered with the truth by declaring that her father is at home at the very moment she is aware of his being an ear-witness of all that passes in her interview with her royal lover. Mr. Montgomery represents *Hamlet* as actuated by conflicting emotions throughout the entire scene—grieved and exasperated by *Ophelia's* complicity in the espionage to which he is exposed, but still yearning towards her with a tenderness that transforms wrath into pity, and that converts the injunction, "Get thee to a nunnery," into a loving admonition, springing either from the conviction that there she would find a haven of security and repose, or from the selfishness which would prompt him to debar others from winning that place in her affections which he had held, and had voluntarily, but reluctantly, vacated. Elegant and agreeable, however, as this is, there is nothing either in the

text or the stage directions to warrant it; and harsh, violent, and cruel as *Hamlet's* language and demeanour are towards *Ophelia*, they are strictly natural, and are perfectly appropriate to his state of mind. Shakspeare well knew that in cases of mental disease or distemper, the sufferer hates and distrusts, upbraids and abuses, those whom, in mental health, he has loved and esteemed; just as—to digress for a moment—pure-minded women, if they become insane, will indulge in the lewdest conversation. And hence the dramatist, with a rare knowledge of intellectual disorder, puts snatches of coarse ballads into the mouth of the mad *Ophelia*. Therefore any display of tenderness towards her in the particular scene referred to, any softening down of his brutality, must be, as Dr. Conolly justly observes, "an unauthorised departure from the delineation of his character by Shakspeare." I think that experienced physician's criticism of this part of the play is one of the best ever penned; and it derives the utmost weight from his professional experience. "*Hamlet's* expressions," he writes, "from the commencement of his directly addressing *Ophelia*, are all of the tissue of a madman's talk, with no clearly determined application to immediate circumstances, and addressed by a disturbed mind and heart to the empty air, or to the shadows of images crowding among his troubled thoughts. They contain unconnected allusions to himself, broken reflections unconsciously wounding *Ophelia*, starts of general suspicion, and sudden threats which flash and disappear, but which would have been carefully refrained from if there had been only deception intended to make the path to vengeance clear. If we would unravel all these mingled expressions, we find that it is scarcely of *Ophelia* that *Hamlet* is speaking thus wildly, but of his mother, of her detested marriage, and of his own conscious imperfections; all these things are tinging his discourse, but giving it no true colour."

Furthermore, Mr. Montgomery is wrong, I conceive, in his delivery—graceful and pleasing though it is—of the well-known soliloquy, "To be, or not to be;" which is not the philosophical speculation of a Cato or a Seneca, but the passionate utterance of a soul at war with life, but dreading death, and agonised by the struggle between these two sentiments. With these abatements, and with the general objection that Mr. Montgomery does not allow *Hamlet* to exhibit that "exaggerated energy under provocation" of which mild and sensitive natures like his are peculiarly capable, and in which the *Prince* indulges as often as his indignation gets the better of his indecision, the portraiture is graphic consistent, and harmonious; deficient in power, but careful in finish and delicate in detail. If I were to borrow an illustration from a sister art, I should liken the picture to a clever watercolour drawing, lacking the depth and solidity of an oil-painting, but compensating for the absence of these by the presence of other qualities—by airiness of tone, simplicity of treatment, transparency of colour, lightness of touch, and a certain sobriety of effect—a pleasant twilight, equally removed from the gloom of evening and the garishness of the afternoon.

In brief, Mr. Montgomery tones down the roughness and violence of the poet's *Hamlet*, and presents IBM to us *en beau*. It is not *Hamlet* the moody, with a wildness that is half false, and a madness that is half real; the misanthropical, the vindictive, with a thin crust of courtly culture overlying the fundamental coarseness of his race, and broken up by fitful eruptions of fiery and ungovernable passion; but *Hamlet* the lover, *Hamlet* the dawdling dreamy *fainéant Hamlet* the *débonnaire*, *Hamlet* with a large infusion of Werther. I am indisposed to disparage it on that account. It is the actor's own conception of the character, and he is to be commended for thinking it out, and for embodying it in a concrete and consistent form. Let us be just to him, and let us be equally just to other actors who offer us the fruits of their genius, their study, their observation, and experience, even although we differ from them in the reading of a passage or the idea of a part.

James Smith.

## ***To the Editor of the Argus.***

SIR—I never knew till this moment what a misfortune it is to be obscure. I am not naturally of an envious disposition, but I cannot help feeling that it is worth living for, to be able to say that a whole people is on the tiptoe of expectation to learn one's opinion. On the other hand, I trust the inhabitants of this and the neighbouring colonies are properly sensible of their obligations to Mr. James Smith, for having at last spoken, and so relieved them from the distressing uncertainty, of how they should estimate the quality of Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet*. As to Mr. Montgomery himself, having now been made aware of the sad truth that he is not the great actor some of his critics and admirers have pronounced IBM, it can hardly help but that he will return to Europe in the "Great Britain," and be for the rest of his life content to rate himself among the lesser lights of the theatrical firmament. Nevertheless, there be dissentients in this, as in most other matters of opinion; and, to be frank with you, I at once proclaim myself of an entirely different way of thinking from Mr. Smith. You may perhaps shudder and stand aghast at the temerity which refuses accord with the sentiments of a gentleman who, it appears, holds the right to speak oracularly in matters of theatrical criticism; but your own experience will render it unnecessary for me to remind you that obstinate people of my complexion continually present themselves, even when so potent an authority as Mr. James Smith has to be confronted.

Freely translated, and highly condensed, Mr. Smith's letter appears to me to consist of some such declaration as this:—"Mr. Montgomery is passable, and that is about all; he walks quietly through his part, and reads fairly enough, and—*voilà tout*." If you submit this letter of mine to a similar process of transmutation, it may declare to this effect:—That Mr. Montgomery, being strongly impressed with the prevailing fault of actors in making their characters only pieces of stage-mechanism, more or less skilful or clumsy, has determined on presenting them as living and breathing things, having human passions and prejudices, and so expressing these, not according to arbitrary models, but in obedience to that kind of impulse from which all the greatest works of art result.

Taking Mr. Smith's letter in detail, however, I find that he begins by informing an anxious public that "every *Hamlet* of note has been largely affected by, if it has not faithfully reflected, the temperament of the actor;" and that Mr. Montgomery's temperament is "essentially lymphatic." I reply by denying that his temperament is "essentially lymphatic," and I assert, on the contrary, that it is principally of the nervo-sanguineous kind. I assert, further—and in so asserting do but declare what innumerable examples have proved to be an invariable truth—that it would be simply impossible for a man whose temperament was "essentially lymphatic" ever to attain to eminence as an actor in any line of his art, if even the desire for distinction should exist, which is not very likely. So far, therefore, from Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet* "faithfully reflecting" his temperament, it is an instance of complete subordination of temperament to the necessities of the character. The endeavour, therefore, to explain his acting as consistent with a "lymphatic temperament" needs no reply, as it is nothing else than drawing a conclusion from false data. "But," says Mr. Smith, "Mr. Montgomery's is an eminently agreeable *Hamlet*. Logically, then, as, according to Mr. Smith, it is vastly different from all other *Hamlets*, I might remind him that this admission leaves us to infer that all preceding *Hamlets* have been eminently disagreeable. But without insisting on this inference, and conceding that this is not precisely what he desires to say, I go on with the letter, and presently find myself in a fog; for one of the reasons adduced to demonstrate this quality of eminent agreeableness is that Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet* is "comparatively unimpressive in those scenes—the interview with the *Ghost*, and the closet scene, for example—in which previous actors, and Mr. Anderson especially so, have made their strongest points;" and then we are told "Mr. Montgomery presents us with a striking picture of mental abstraction," which we are further informed should have been "mental absorption," and that the state of his mind is "subjective" instead of "objective." I have no doubt that many waverers in opinion about Mr. Montgomery, and Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet*, wavered no longer when they got to this part of Mr. Smith's letter; because, you see, though this imposing array of the terms "abstraction," "absorption," "subjective," and "objective," may convey no information whatever to a great many of Mr. Smith's readers, they are dictionary words so formidable and important, that they are sure to have created a profound impression. You remember the story of some highly-impressible old ladies who always used to weep whenever they heard the Rev. Mr. Whitfield pronounce the word "Mesopotamia." There was no reason in the world why the old ladies should weep at the word Mesopotamia, any more than, let us say, at the word "pickles," but the fact remains that they did weep; and the fact will also remain that conviction will have followed, with an equal reason for following, the abstraction-absorption-subjective-objective appeal. Then Mr. Smith says, with a triumphant sort of flourish, "Thus much is obvious from the text;" but I confess, with great humiliation at the consciousness of my incapacity, that I do not here see what is obvious, and that I do not know what portion of the text should make it so. But since Mr. Smith follows up the remark by telling us that, as the traditions of the stage have been handed down from the time of Shakspeare, who instructed Burbage and reprov'd Kemp, and that as *Tom Jones* tells us how Garrick bore himself in the part, we are justified in disputing the wisdom and propriety of certain innovations, his admirers will dispute them accordingly.

Next he brings in Drs. Bucknill and Conolly, two most learned physicians and graceful writers, it is true, but who, having been exclusively engaged many years in the treatment of lunatics, manifestly, and perhaps not unnaturally, came at last to consider madness an inevitable condition of humanity, and so found that *Hamlet*, despite his frequent protestation to the contrary, was really mad, the particular proof of his madness consisting in using "unfilial and scoffing language towards his father." I should be afraid to say how many young gentlemen in Victoria are mad, if the use of unfilial and scoffing language towards their fathers be positive proof thereof. But, without staying to inquire how far it might be desirable to make provision for the accommodation of thirty or forty thousand additional lunatics prospectively on the enforcement of this principle, let us see how it applies to *Hamlet*, who, Mr. Smith says, is to be deemed insane because he accosts the subterranean ghost jocularly. It is probably in the experience of every person to have felt an irrepressible desire in certain moments of great solemnity to laugh or utter a jest, or indulge in some grimace or antic, preposterously inconsistent with the time and place. It would seem as if the excessive restraint imposed by the circumstances prompted a relief in some shape; and thus it is found sometimes at funerals, that remarks are made strangely at variance with the sombre surroundings. Conformably with this propensity *Hamlet*, who has

just experienced a very agony of terror at the sight of his father's spirit, finds much relief in passing, even for a moment, to the extreme state of playful sportiveness. But this feeling Shakspeare very properly makes only a transient one, for, after letting *Hamlet* allude to the ghost as "this fellow in the cellarage," and "an old mole i' the ground," his reverential feelings are allowed again to predominate, and he exclaims, "Rest, rest, perturbed spirit." I do not doubt that Mr. Montgomery's own judgment would incline him to the restoration of these passages of jocularly; and, I dare say, it is only in unavoidable deference to the prejudices of the audience, who have so long been accustomed to a mutilated version, that for a time he consents to follow the beaten track. So again Mr. Smith informs us that the jubilant exclamation beginning with

*For thou dost know, O Damon dear,*

is "not less demonstrative of a disordered intellect;" in answer to which I may reply that nothing is more common than for a person suddenly made aware of the successful termination of an experiment, or enterprise, to indulge in a mock-tragic demonstration, a bit of extemporised recitative, a snatch of some song—for *Hamlet* might consistently sing these lines—a quotation from Scripture, however irreverently applied, or any other interjectional mode of testifying satisfaction. For the moment, *Hamlet's* delight at the perfect success of his murder-test overcomes every other feeling, and being, as we know, a humourist as well as a philosopher, he bids *Horatio* congratulate him, and asks him if he does not think he was made for an actor? There is certainly nothing inconsistent with sanity in all this; and Mr. Montgomery, I am sure, does not omit these lines because they are inconsistent with *Hamlet's* reason, but because some excisions being necessary, these seem to permit of being excised without material impairment of the rest. Mr. Smith's usually more "fireworks." He says in effect if not in words that it ought to be delivered according to *Bottom's* notion as "a part to tear a cat in, to make all split." And then, passing from the soliloquy to the character generally, he says, "It is like a clever water-colour drawing, lacking the depth and solidity of an oil-painting;" or, it is "a pleasant twilight, neither morning nor afternoon." With Mr. Smith's understood acquaintance with pictorial art, it is something remarkable that he should have selected so unfortunate an illustration to prove Mr. Montgomery's inferiority, for he should know that the water-colours of this day have all the force and more than the finish of oil-paintings. Let him take comfort, however. If he will go a little higher up the street, he will get his oil-painting with the colours plastered on "thick and slab;" and as to the other comparison, he will there also find the sun so hot and blazing that ordinary people do not soon recover from its effects. Finally, I am Pagan enough to thank the gods they have sent us an actor who—in obedience to the promptings which urged on John Millais and Holman Hunt to tread a new road in painting, and Ruskin, with Scott to second him, to demolish the bastard abortions of eighteenth-century architectural art—has charged himself with the great and noble mission of interpreting Shakspeare unclogged by tradition, and guided only by the light of nature and a fine intelligence. John Brown.

## ***To the Editor of the Argus.***

SIR—As I have reason to anticipate that a large number of persons are about to inquire of me my opinion of Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet*, I will venture, with your permission, to reply to them through the columns of the *Argus*.

After the elaborate letter from Mr. James Smith which appeared in your issue of yesterday, it is scarcely necessary for me to premise that, were not my convictions materially opposed to those of that practised critic, I should not now address you. However, it so happens that I differ from him almost *in toto*, and cannot conceal my gratification at finding, by to-day's *Argus*, that so excellent an authority as Mr. John Brown has arrived at a conclusion very similar to my own. I dissent from Mr. Smith's *dicta* relative to Mr. Montgomery; I protest against his assumptions regarding the character of *Hamlet*. Mr. Brown has replied to Mr. Smith convincingly upon most of the topics contained in his letter; and I now modestly desire to unfold myself upon one or two points which Mr. Brown has thought proper to treat with indifference.

Mr. Smith's principal cause of complaint against Mr. Montgomery is, that he does not represent *Hamlet* as really mad—that, in short, he takes *Hamlet's* word in preference to that of many of his critics, and believes that he

*—essentially is not in madness,  
But mad in craft.*

This, which to Mr. Smith is so serious a ground of offence, is to me Mr. Montgomery's surpassing merit. Nothing can be easier than to represent *Hamlet* as an occasional madman. The actor—incapable of

comprehending the full scope of *Hamlet's* varied and complex character, disinclined to piece out and supplement the meagre stage directions which accompany the text—falls back upon the ready plea of madness, and in a moment finds an excuse for his wildest extravagances, his densest stupidities. Any meaning, or no meaning, can with ease be covered by it. Does the *Prince* seem to be gratuitously harsh and cruel to *Ophelia*—it is his madness. Is he apparently merry where good Monsieur Critic thinks he should be doleful, and sad where he should be playful—it is his madness. For resourceless actor and soulless critic, this is alike a city of refuge. But it is a Zoar which cannot much longer be tolerated, and, spite of the illustrious names gilding the imposture, it will come to be regarded as a remnant of the system of false criticism of which Nahum Tate is the arch-apostle, which seeks to twist the mighty utterances of Shakspeare into harmony with foregone conclusions, rather than reverently to investigate, by the best light the age can furnish, the true meaning of his grand creations. And in setting about this task, we must not forget that Shakspeare's plays are eminently acting plays; that if we have but capable actors, the enjoyment derivable from the presentation of these dramas on the stage must far surpass that to be obtained from closet study. But though conceived with an immediate eye to theatrical exhibition and fitted for the stage as are no other dramatic compositions, they are singularly barren of stage direction. When *Hamlet* requests young *Osric* to "put his bonnet to its right use," we are informed for the first time that the latter has entered bare-headed; and so when *Macduff* is besought not to hide his face with his hat, but to give sorrow vent, the earliest intimation is conveyed of the natural action which marked his reception of the news of his irreparable loss. In these cases the "business" of the scene is unmistakable; but there are others of equal importance where it is more obscure. Among these I rank such scenes as that between *Hamlet* and *Ophelia* in the third act; and in these it is not only justifiable, but it is the bounden duty of every actor of mark to study to discover in what way the "business" may be made best conducive to the elucidation of the text. When Shakspeare was by to explain his own ideal, it mattered not that the stage directions were few and meagre; but now, when instead of Shakspeare we have stage tradition, burdened with the fancies of two and a half centuries, the omission of these finger-posts becomes an important feature, and every original actor must seek by study of the text, and perhaps the text alone, to reconstruct them. It is this which Mr. Montgomery seems to me to have done, and in this way he has produced a *Hamlet* perfectly sane and consistent with human nature, though not, perhaps, the model, orthodox, methodical character which, if he is not to be mad, some critics would have him be.

The more closely I look into this character of *Hamlet* the more revolting does the assumption of semi-madness appear. Was there ever mind more thoroughly sane? It is so sane that it cannot take a leap in the dark, though prompted to it by almost ungovernable impulse, but must have

———*grounds*  
*More relative than this.*

It is so sane that, when firmly resolved on a course which it clearly sees to be right, it adheres to it in spite of the most terrible obstacles, as witness the scene in the *Queen's* chamber, where, though *Hamlet* has by an unhappy chance killed the father of her he loves he yet, with almost ruthless decision, continues the interview with his mother, and strives to make her

*Repent what's past, avoid what is to come.*

If his be madness, it is of a strange nature, which can be pre-arranged by himself, and put on or off as his purpose serves. The passages Mr. Smith quotes in token of *Hamlet's* craziness might well be incorporated in the current acting copy, without in the slightest degree impairing the conception of the character which Mr. "Montgomery presents to us. Besides, Mr. Smith proves too much. If *Hamlet* be mad when he asks if the success of his "mouse-trap" scheme might not get him "a fellowship in a cry of players," *Horatio* cannot be sane to reply, "Half a share." And while on this subject, I may remark how strange it is that, if *Hamlet* be really touched, he should be deemed mad by all saving the two who may be supposed best acquainted with his "heart of hearts"—his father's ghost, and his dear friend *Horatio*. Ordinarily, it is those most closely attached to a man who first discern his flightiness.

Another grave fault which Mr. Smith discovers in the *Hamlet* of Mr. Montgomery is that it lacks force, that it has a large infusion of Werther. Strange how minds differ! It is this very absence of mere brute force, this admixture of German dreaminess, which forms in my estimation one of the charms of this conception. *Hamlet* is the realization, the embodiment—if I may use the word in this sense—of mental, not physical greatness. He is no savage hodman, who having found out his wronger goes and punishes him, but a man of genius of "large discourse," a free thinker, who dares to condemn the customs of his country when he conceives them to be at odds with reason. He is irresolute through excess of mental clear-seeing, and his is too highly strung a nervous organization to be forcible.

On this theme one might write by the yard, and still have much to say, but as I cannot hope to induce you to publish a *Hamlet* supplement, I will conclude. Mr. Smith has had his say, happily for mankind; Mr. Brown has had Ms; and now, by your leave I have had mine. The world may not be much the wiser by our utterances; for, after all, what can we poor criticlings do in front of such a play as "*Hamlet*," and such a representative of the noble *Prince*? Mainly, to my thinking, be very thankful. As to comparing this *Hamlet* with any of those we have seen before in this colony, it is idle. This is flesh and blood, which they were not; and I should as soon think of comparing the genial Arternas Ward, who died at Southampton, with the figure in Mr. Sohier's window. So far as our stage history extends, I may say of Mr. Montgomery in this character, to quote a somewhat hackneyed phrase of Macaulay's, "He has distanced all his competitors so decidedly, that it is not worth while to place them. Eclipse is first, and the rest nowhere."

Thomas Jones

Melbourne,

July 31.

## ***To the Editor of the Argus.***

SIR—I think it is only what the public expect of the editor of the *Argus*, that he should keep his columns open for me. I do not write these words in any light spirit, for during the growing interest generated of the criticism of Smith, Brown, and Jones, my neighbours have been, one and all, at me with such expressions as this—"Well, Robinson, what are *you* going to say to all this?" or, "Robinson, are you a Smithian or a Brownist," &c. Apprehending, therefore, as I do, that the vital statistics of the colony may be most unfavourably affected from mere anxiety of mind unless I complete the quartette, I at once, without apology, conquer my constitutional indolence, and throw my critical cap into the ring.

And surely, at starting, my excellent friend Jones is on the right track for truth when he calls attention to the great fact that Shakspeare's plays are, and were intended by their author to be, acting plays. As affording a boundless field for subsequent criticism, it was an advantage that Shakspeare was an actor as well as an author. In every line he wrote he had evidently, and almost instinctively, an eye to the *mise en scene*: and thus his men and women always talk and act as do men and women in real life. Action and passion, impulse and reason, storm and calm, interrupt and cross each other, just as they do wherever our nature is wrought upon by the actual business of the world. What has traditional acting to do with such scenes as these I What is it, or what should it be, to Mr. Montgomery how Garrick played *Hamlet*, or what Partridge thought of it? If Mr. Montgomery can see a ghost as well as Garrick, and feel the presence of a ghost as well as Garrick, he will (physical qualities being equal) play *Hamlet* as well as Garrick. Those who cultivate the superstitions of the stage will, of course, laugh at bringing Garrick's and Montgomery's names in juxtaposition. So has tradition derided the mention of Garrick's name by the side of Betterton's; and yet, different as they were from each other, both were excellent, because both were natural and original. The same remark may be made on the exceedingly diverse styles—if Hazlitt and all the critics of that day are to be believed—of John Kemble and Edmund Kean.

Why, therefore, should Mr. Smith subject Mr. Montgomery to a standard—the traditional one—which every original actor has a right to disregard wherever that standard conflicts with his own convictions? Mr. Smith relies (in his second letter of yesterday) on "nearly all the commentators of Shakspeare" as authority for requiring us to believe that the *Hamlet* of Shakspeare is really mad. But if an actor by close study of the part, lighted up by his observation of human creatures, shall come to a different conclusion, what is the choice before him? He must give us a mechanical, lifeless, unreal copy of the rendering authorised by the commentators, or he must trust to nature and his convictions, and give us his own conception. Mr. Montgomery has, I think, wisely acted on the latter alternative. I have not seen (it is my loss) his *Hamlet*, but crediting Jones, Brown, and the apparently responsive public, Mr. Montgomery has done wisely. Relying, therefore, on nature and observation—as I think every great actor has always done, and to be really great must always do [Edmund Kean once, as *Richard III.*, thrilled the house by a last abortive attempt to strike *Richmond*, an attempt acknowledged to have been borrowed from an exhausted and fainting prize-fighter in the ring], he becomes a true and honest interpreter at any rate, and stands just as good a chance of being a faithful interpreter as if he were to become the copy of a copy, Rachel, the little orange girl of Paris, was wise enough to know this. Fechter has achieved his fame by knowing this, and acting on it. *Melius est petere fontes, quam sectari rivulos,*

is a sound old maxim, which, freely rendered, assures us that it is better to seek the fountain-head, human nature, than slavishly to follow the commentators.

For doing this, it appears, from the testimony of Brown and Jones, that Mr. Montgomery may be left to his own resources. That he is not wrong in giving us a sane *Hamlet* will, I think, appear by portions of the text not yet referred to by Brown or Jones. Following the "Well said, old mole," which, in its apparently shocking irreverence towards his father's ghost, is only, as Mr. Smith thinks, to be explained by insanity, we have the not very insane words—

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,  
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy. But come;—  
Here, as before, never, so help you mercy  
How strange or odd soe'er I bear myself—  
As I, perchance, hereafter shall think meet  
To put an antic disposition on;  
That you, at such times, &c.

Have we not here a distinct intimation that *Hamlet* purposes to assume madness—"to put an antic disposition on"—a passage frequently altogether disregarded by "the commentators." And as to the "Well said, old mole," which so staggers Mr. Smith's sense of filial duty, the expression is consistent with perfect, although highly-excited sanity. It is akin to the light jests sometimes heard under the scaffold at a public execution. There is a condition of the mind—especially in nervous and highly-organised natures, such as *Hamlet's*—not unlike hysteria; your correspondent Brown refers to it, and it is common in Italy and other southern climes. Whilst a man is in this state, you cannot always tell what is in the heart merely from what comes out of the mouth, Shakspeare understood this fact in our nature so well that he frequently employs it with marvellous effect. After the awful scene between *Hamlet* and his father's ghost, the former utters the magnificently sane soliloquy, commencing—

*O, all you host of heaven! O earth!*  
interrupted by *Horatio* and *Marcellus*—

HORATIO (within)—"Hillo, ho, ho, my lord."

HAMLET—"Hillo, ho, ho, boy! come, bird, come."

Does Mr. Smith think that *Hamlet* is at this point suddenly struck mad, or that he says, "Come, bird, come," as a sportsman might say it? In *Lear* and other plays are many other indications of the feeling to which I refer—indications as true to human nature as they are apparently incongruous.

I venture to think that the charge against *Hamlet* of being irresolute is not much better founded than the suggestion of Ms madness. Where, and when, and how is he irresolute? *Hamlet* was a scholar, a gentleman, a man of thought; not a headstrong fool to kill his uncle, when that killing might be a murder. An ignorant rustic might have been resolute enough to act on the *Ghost's* evidence alone; not so *Hamlet*—

———Give me that man  
That is not passion's slave, and I will wear him  
In my heart's core.

*Hamlet*, distrusting the *Ghost*, gets up the play to see how the king's demeanour will answer to and confirm the *Ghost's* revelations. He says to *Horatio*—

There is a play to-night before the king;  
One scene of it comes near the circumstance  
Which I have told thee of my father's death.  
I prythee when thou see'st that act a-foot,  
Even with the very comment of thy soul  
Observe mine uncle: if his occulted guilt

Do not itself unkennel in one speech,  
It is a damned ghost that we have seen,  
And my imaginations are as foul  
As Vulcan's stithy.

It is not, indeed, until the scene where *Hamlet* enters and finds his uncle in the very act of confession and prayer that he shows any symptom of vacillation—

Now might I do it pat—now he is praying,  
And now I'll do't:—and so he goes to heaven,  
And so am I revenged? That would be scanned.  
A villain kills my father; and for that  
I, his sole son, do this same villain send  
To heaven.  
Why, this is hire and salary, not revenge.  
He took my father grossly, full of bread,  
With all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May,  
And how his audit stands, who knows save heaven?  
But in our circumstance and course of thought  
'Tis heavy with him: and am I then revenged  
To take him in the purging of his soul,  
When he is fit and seasoned for his passage?  
No.  
Up, sword, and know thou a more horrid hent  
When he is drunk, asleep, or in his rage;  
Or in th' incestuous pleasures of his bed—  
At gaming, swearing, or about some act  
That has no relish of salvation in't.

This, the first good opportunity *Hamlet* has—after reasonable conviction of his uncle's guilt—for revenge, is about the only good opportunity he loses. He would have been overpowered by guards and attendants in the interview with his uncle, after the disastrous killing of old *Polonius*. *Hamlet* does his work promptly enough in the fencing scene. He has fulfilled his destiny—

The time was out of joint; oh, cursed spite,  
That ever he was born to set it right.

Yet, in the last grand scene, we learn how sane, and thoughtful, and unselfish *Hamlet's* soul was; how it could forget its own personal sorrows in the high thoughts which became a great prince. We there see the real greatness which, having shown itself in public affairs (not before us in the play), had made him "loved of the distracted multitude." With his last breath he thinks only of the charge which might have been his—

I cannot live to hear the news from England;  
But I do prophecy the election lights  
On Fortinbras: he has my dying voice;  
So tell him, with the occurrents, more and less,  
Which have solicited. The rest is silence. (*Dies.*)

I have altogether outrun my own purpose, and committed an unwitting trespass on your columns, by the length of this letter. The offence, however, is committed, and it may be that other members of our numerous family are erring in like fashion. If so, you have the editorial remedy in your own hands, by choosing from amongst us, and for yourself, your own

Jack Robinson.

August 1, 1867.

## ***To the Editor of the Argus.***

SIR—*Et ego in Arcadiâ*. Pray, of your goodness, allow this particular member of the distinguished family of Robinson to have his brief say touching the topic which his celebrated form-fellows, Smith, Brown, and Jones, are so hotly debating in your generously open columns.

I start with claiming to be a far more competent critic of Mr. Montgomery's *Hamlet* than either of my three friends aforesaid, and for the simple reason that I have never seen it. A disadvantage, you call it I Well, there you are wrong. Was it not Sydney Smith's fixed canon of criticism never to read a book before reviewing it, because "it prejudices one so?" And did not Mr. James Mill father of the illustrious member for Westminster, preface his very able *History of India* with an elaborate dissertation, proving that the best man to write the history of any country is a man who has never seen it? Here is warrant more than sufficient for the modest claim I prefer. Unprejudiced and unbiassed, I am also enthusiastic "'Tis distance lends," &c.

With the unhesitating frankness of perfect impartiality, then, I at once take side with Mr. Montgomery, and with my friends, Brown and Jones, and against Mr. Smith, albeit he is backed up by those two noted experts, Drs. Bucknill and Conolly, I declare war to the knife with the specious but baseless and untenable theory of a mad *Hamlet*. Mad! indeed. No doubt had the noble *Prince of Denmark* lived in these our days, those three noted experts, Drs. Smith, Bucknill and Conolly, would have had out a writ *de lunatico* at once, clapped him into Hanwell without any circumlocution, and then set zealously to work to exercise their joint professional skill on him. How the three would have revelled in psychological analysis! What an infinite deal of professional prattle there would have been about the poor patient's "subjective" and "objective" moods! How positive in its terms the certificate of insanity, clear and undoubted, which these practised adepts in all forms of mania would have sent to the old *King* at Elsinore.

But Hanwell and its psychological doctors apart, the question still remains open for discussion—Did Shakspeare design to depict a mere phase of madness in his character of *Hamlet*? Mr. Smith says "Yes," and claims to have all the critics with IBM. Now I on the other side, concede to Mr. Smith the two mad doctors from Hanwell. The critics, I maintain, are with me. Every one of them worth the name goes dead against the madness theory. In proof I name Hazlitt, Schlegel, Goëthe, Tieck, Franz Horn, and in fact all the later German critics, with G. H. Lewes, W. S. Walker, and generally all the English critics since Hazlitt's time. Even Coleridge's view (of *Hamlet's* undoubted madness) is qualified with so many limitations that one may justly say that Coleridge himself was to the last in doubt upon the point. And Hartley Coleridge, the finely-gifted son, ably vindicates the view of *Hamlet's* perfect sanity in one of the most delightful Shakspearian essays ever written. It is entitled, "On the Feigned Madness of *Hamlet*," and was published first in *Blackwood*, and afterwards in Hartley's collected writings (*Marginalia*). I think I may venture to assert that the old theory of *Hamlet's* insanity has now become as obsolete as the text of Malone and Steevens, or the notes of Warburton. Mr. Montgomery's conception of the character is, therefore, in entire accord with the latest results of Shakspearian criticism; and, I may add, with the soundest principles of psychology. Mr. Smith seems to have got no further in his philosophy than the old Kantian principle of the categorical imperative, He stops at the "subjective" and "objective." Did he never hear of Schelling, with his doctrine of the absolute correlation of the subjective and the objective? or of Hegel, with his magnificent theory of the subjectivity of the objective, and the objectivity of the subjective. This is the famous theory which solves all mundane problems with infallible certainty, while one may say

Jack Robinson (Jun.).

Ballarat,

August 1.

## ***To the Editor of the Argus.***

SIR—With your permission, I will reply to your correspondents on the only material point in controversy

between us—the sanity or insanity of my Lord *Hamlet*. The theory I hold is this:—That he originally feigned madness; his motive for so doing being left in doubt by the dramatist. It is not improbable that *Hamlet's* introspective habit of mind had apprised him of the alarming fact that the germs of insanity were latent in his nature, and were liable to be quickened into pernicious activity by severely depressing or greatly exciting circumstances. From the moment the *Ghost* communicated to him the particulars of the murder, and urged him to revenge, *Hamlet's* reason was unsettled. But the malady was intermittent. He had lucid intervals, in which he conversed and acted rationally; and it was this very inconsistency of conduct that puzzled the courtiers and has perplexed the critics. *Polonius*, who, with all his garrulity and pomposity, was an eminently shrewd observer, and who, knowing nothing of *Hamlet's* supernatural shock, imputed his derangement to love, has described, with perfect accuracy, the stages of physical disorder through which *Hamlet* passed before reaching a condition of *dementia*. He

Fell into a sadness; then into a fast;  
Thence to a watch; and thence into a weakness;  
Thence to a lightness; and, by this declension,  
Into the madness wherein now he raves,  
And we all wail for.

Now this, as Dr. Conolly points out, "might have been copied from the clinical notes of a student of mental disorders. We recognise all the phenomena of an attack of mental disorder consequent on a sudden and sorrowful shock; first, the loss of all habitual interest in surrounding things; then, indifference to food, incapacity for customary and natural sleep; and then a weaker stage of fitful tears and levity, the mirth so strangely mixed with 'extremest grief;' and then subsidence into a chronic state in which the faculties are generally deranged." *Hamlet*, it is true, protests more than once or twice that he is not mad; but such asseverations are constantly made by the insane. He challenges inquisition; but so do madmen, and frequently baffle for hours and days together the inquiries of the ablest barristers and the most experienced physicians. His language is coherent, his reflections are philosophical, and his replies are "pregnant;" but as *Polonius* sagaciously observes, this is "a happiness that often madness hits on, which reason and sanity could not so prosperously be delivered of." But in the last act Shakspeare makes *Hamlet* himself resolve all doubts in the minds of his family and friends as to the reality of his madness by acknowledging to *Laertes* that he (*Hamlet*) had destroyed *Polonius* and driven *Ophelia* to distraction, despair, and death under the influence of lunacy:—

You must needs have heard how I am punish'd  
With a sore distraction. What I have done,  
That might your nature, honour, and exception  
Roughly awake, I here proclaim was madness.  
Was't *Hamlet* wronged *Laertes*? Never, *Hamlet*.  
If *Hamlet* from himself be ta'en away,  
And when he's not himself does wrong; *Laertes*,  
Then *Hamlet* does it not: *Hamlet* denies it.  
Who does it then! His madness. If't be so,  
*Hamlet* is of the faction that is wrong'd;  
His madness is poor *Hamlet's* enemy.

A parallel instance is reported by M. Louret, in his *Fragmens Psychologiques sur la Folie*, 1845, where he mentions that a French Abbé whom he had treated for insanity, apologised to him during: a lucid interval in these words: "*Mon délire m'a souvent emporté à des injures et à de faux jugemens: mais si le bon vous calomnie, l'homme sain vous rend justice et vous demande pardon pour l'autre.*"

Here, then, *Hamlet* is impaled on the horns of a dilemma. He had been either mad or sane. If sane, such an attempt to evade the moral responsibility of his actions by pretending to *Laertes* that he had been out of his mind, and excusing his conduct on that plea, would stamp *Hamlet* as guilty of the basest falsehood, chicanery, and cowardice. It is impossible to believe him to have been capable of either. He was brave, honourable, and truthful, though vacillating and irresolute. His brutality to *Ophelia* and his murder of her father were the acts of a madman; and in this lucid interval, when his mind had been solemnised and tranquillised by the presentiment of his own death, he freely confesses and deplores his madness, and speaks of himself with a self-pity which is very natural and infinitely touching. The shadow of impending death was settling down upon his mind. "Thou

would'st not think," he pathetically exclaims to *Horatio*, "how ill all's here about my heart." His friend interposes with a gentle "Nay, good my lord;" but the *Prince*, interrupting him, observes, "It is but foolery; but it is such a kind of gain-giving (*i.e.*, misgiving) as would, perhaps, trouble a woman." *Horatio* offers to employ his mediation with a view to postpone the duel, but *Hamlet* rejoins, "We defy augury," and proceeds to reason like a fatalist—"If it be now, 'tis not to come;" &c. The next moment his opponent appears upon the scene, and it is at this solemn juncture that *Hamlet* "proclaims" the reality of his madness, and adjures *Laertes* to believe him while making this public "disclaimer of a purposed evil." Is it conceivable that if *Hamlet* had been feigning insanity throughout, he would, at such a time, in such a presence, and with such a presentiment of death at his heart, dare to confront the dread "something after death" with a cowardly lie upon his lips? Would *Horatio*—of whom *Hamlet* had said that he was "e'en as just a man as e'er his conversation coped withal"—with a full knowledge of (and who could have known so well?) the falsehood of the plea, have talked of "flights of angels singing" the soul of a slain perjurer "to its rest?" As I have already intimated, many of the doubts which have been entertained with respect to *Hamlet's* derangement have arisen from the surprising brilliancy and profundity of his mental speculations. But what says one of the greatest French authorities (M. Esquirol) on this very point? "*Presque tous les aliénés confiés à mes soins . . . avoient eul une grande activité de facultés intellectuelles el morales qui avoient redoubles d'énergie quelque tems avant l'accès.*" Again, after every such access of frenzy, *Hamlet* appears to have had a lucid interval; a circumstance which Shakspeare, with his amazing knowledge of mental derangement or disease, has not omitted to acquaint us with; for when the *Prince* and *Laertes*, after wrestling on' *Ophelia's* coffin, leap out of the grave, and *Hamlet* "mouths" and "rants," the *Queen* exclaims:—

This is mere madness:  
 And thus a while the lit will work on him;  
 Anon as patient as the female dove,  
 When that her golden couplets are disclosed,  
 His silence will sit drooping.

If any one will be at the trouble to turn up the *Anatomy of Melancholy* of Shakspeare's contemporary, Burton, he will find all the symptoms of *Hamlet's* disorder—the "*melancholia attonita* of nosologists"—described with the minutest accuracy in a chapter from which I cannot forbear making the following quotation:—"They (*i.e.*, the persons so afflicted) are of profound judgments in some things, excellent apprehensions, judicious, wise, and witty; for melancholy advanceth men's conceits more than any humour what- ever. Fearful, suspicious of all, yet again many of them desperate hairbrains; rash, careless, fit to be assassinated, as being void of all ruth and sorrow. *Tedium ritæ*: is a common symptom; they soon are tired with all things—*sequitur nunc vivendi nunc moriendi cupido*; often tempted to make away with themselves—*vivere nolunt, mori nesciunt*; they cannot die, they will not live; they complain, lament, weep, and think they lead a most melancholy life." To those who lay great stress upon *Polonius's* remark, "Though this be madness, yet there's method in it," as implying that the chamberlain suspected the reality of *Hamlet's* frenzy, I would reply in the words of Horace—"*Insanire paret certo ratione modoque.*" *Horatio's* absolute silence on the subject has little or no significance either way; yet it is interesting to observe that, after the first act, everything he says to *Hamlet* is soothing and acquiescent. He never thwarts him, never argues with him, never contradicts him—he humours and indulges him. He assents to all he says with an invariable "Ay, my good lord," and conducts himself towards the distempered *Prince* with a delicate and sympathetic consideration, with a lenitive gentleness, in which compassion for his malady is blended with a tender friendship for his old friend and fellow-student. It is unnecessary to occupy your columns with quotations from the tragedy—since everybody can consult it—to show that *Hamlet* was believed to be mad by his mother, his uncle (whose opinions, however, wavered on the subject), *Polonius*, *Ophelia*, and the people of Denmark; but it would help us to a settlement of the matter in controversy if we could ascertain how the character of *Hamlet* was played in Shakspeare's theatre, under his instruction, or with his sanction. This can only be arrived at inferentially. The lines in Burbage's "Funeral Elogy"—

No more, young Hamlet, though hut scant of breath,  
 Shall cry "Revenge!" for his dear father's death—

will not assist us much; but in the writings of contemporary poets and dramatists—of men who had seen *Hamlet* played at the Globe or at the Blackfriars Theatre, and had spent convivial evenings with "Gentle Will"

at the Mermaid—we find allusions to the hero of the tragedy, which denote, I think, that his insanity was a commonly-accepted fact. Thus in *Eastward Hoe*, the joint production of George Chapman, Ben Jonson, and John Marston, published in 1605, a footman named *Hamlet* enters, and is accosted by a tankard-bearer in these words:—"S foote, Hamlet, are *you* mad?" So, too, in Pecker's *Bel-man's Nightwalkes*, published in 1612, we read the following:—"But if any *mad Hamlet*, hearing this, smell villanie, and rush in to see what the tawny deveils are doing," &c. And, again, in Antony Scoloker's poem entitled *Daiphantus*," published in 1604, occurs this couplet:—

Puts off his clothes; his shirt he only weaves,  
Much like mad Hamlet; thus as passion teares.

It only remains to quote the opinions of some of the greatest of Shakspearian critics and commentators on this much-vexed question. Goëthe's well-known dictum is that "Shakspeare meant, in the present case, to represent the effects of a great action laid upon a soul unfit for the performance of it. In this view the whole piece seems to me to be composed. There is an oak-tree planted in a costly jar, which should have borne only pleasant flowers in its bosom—the roots expand, the jar is shivered."

Professor Gervinus, the latest and not the least eminent of Shakspeare's expositors in Germany, quotes and adopts Goëthe's view of *Hamlet's* distemper, which he thus analyses and unfolds:—"The cause of this extremity of dejection lies in the events which befall him—events which suddenly impoverish him, which rob him, as Goëthe says, of the true conception he had formed of his parents, which unhinge his mind, and roll upon him a tide of affliction, sorrow, uneasiness, and dire forebodings, which, in the course of their fulfilment, produce unrestrained derangement."

Coleridge declares that "*Hamlet's* wildness is but half false." Guizot asserts that he was "mad from calculation, and perhaps slightly mad from nature." Thomas Campbell, while disbelieving that *Hamlet's* mind was absolutely diseased, observes:—"Most certain it is that his whole perfect being had received a shock that had unsettled his faculties." Dr. Maginn says:—"Hamlet is doubtless insane; but the species of intellectual disturbance, the peculiar form of mental malady under which he suffers, is of the subtlest character." Dr. Ferriar, the learned author of an *Essay on Apparitions*, published in 1813, terms *Hamlet's* mental distemper "latent lunacy," and remarks—"He feigns madness for political purposes, while the poet means to represent his understanding as really (and unconsciously to himself) unhinged by the cruel circumstances in which he is placed." Mr. R. G. While, the highest Shakspearian authority in the United States, contrasts "the fierce madness" of *Lear* with the "weak intellectual disorder" of *Hamlet*. M. Philarète Chasles traces the derangement of the melancholy prince to the ghostly revelation he had received:—"Sa communication récente avec le monde des esprits jette dans son intelligence les premiers germes de la folie." And Professor Villemain has thus felicitously indicated the mixture of simulated and of real insanity in *Hamlet's* conduct:—"Par une combinaison singulière, Shakspeare a représenté la folie feinte aussi souvent que la elle-même; enfin il a imaginé de les mêler toutes deux dans le personnage bizarre d'Hamlet, et de joindre ensemble les éclairs de la raison les ruses d'un égarement calculé, et le désordre involontaire de l'âme."

Cardinal Wiseman considered that the question of *Hamlet's* insanity had been finally disposed of by Dr. Conolly, who had conclusively shown that the *Prince* was "labouring under real madness, yet was able to put on a fictitious and artificial derangement for the purposes which he kept in view."

I am aware that a contrary opinion was held by Sir Henry Hallford; but his excellent 'essay on this subject was effectually dealt with by a Quarterly Reviewer, in 1833, whose article may be consulted with advantage by Shakspearian students and psychologists.

James Smith.

Melbourne,

3rd August, 1867.

POSTSCRIPT.—While these sheets are passing through the press, a friend informs me that "*Amleth*" is an old Danish word signifying intellectual disturbance or "crankiness;" and allied, I presume, to the Gaelic words *Ahmluadh* and *Ahmluaidh*, which have the meaning of *animi perturbatio*.

*Mr. Smith does not appear to remember that Prince Hamlet's father's name was also Hamlet.—ED.*

# To the Editor of the Age.

SIR—In one of the earlier numbers of Forbes Winslow's *Journal of Psychological Medicine*, an article will be found entitled "Madness as treated by Shakspeare." It was written by me at the request of Dr. Window, and certainly the more the subject was studied the more deeply interesting it became, and the more wonderful appeared Shakspeare's intuitive perception, not only of the varieties and peculiarities of the forms of demonstration, but of the fine gradations, as in *King Lear*, or the abrupt transitions and fitfulness of the lucid intervals, as in *Hamlet*—supposing him to be, so far, in a state of aberration of intellect. But in any case, among the whole tribe—nation, one might almost say—of Shakspeare's characters, the great psychological puzzle has always been, and perhaps always will be, the character of *Hamlet*—the fine analyses of Goëthe, Schlegel, Hazlitt, and others notwithstanding.

Another great German author and critic (Ludwig Boern) puts the question of *Hamlet's* character in a new light. I have not the work at hand, but having translated the whole essay, I am quite clear as to the main points. If *Hamlet* was not mad, he must have been a very bad fellow. If he had not that excuse for what he says and does in several instances, more shame for him. Boerne thinks he was not mad, and that "the glass of fashion and the mould of form" was a prince of villains. One may feel shocked and indignant when reading such arguments and opinions; but Ludwig Boerne is entitled, like my accomplished literary friends of the firm of Smith, B., J., and R., to his independent judgment.

In the first place, then, according to this German critic, it seems clear that *Hamlet* had seduced *Ophelia*. Certain things she utters during her madness greatly help to prove this. According to Boerne's view, *Hamlet's* desertion of her might or might not be heartless, but his cruel personal conduct towards her was quite inexcusable, or at least unnecessary; it drove her mad, and caused her to commit suicide. Perhaps the critic is wrong as to his first proposition; but the rest may be regarded as unquestionable. When he finds he has killed the father of the lady thus deeply wronged (in any view), so far from displaying the slightest shock of dismay or touch of grief at the moment, he calls the dead body "names," and says, "I took thee for thy better!" His method of hiding the corpse under the staircase is very like the half-cunningness, half-carelessness, of madness; and when, after equivocating with horrible jests about *Polonius* being "at supper" (with the worms), he is obliged to confess where he has hidden the corpse, he tells the interrogator he "may nose him, as he goes up the stairs!" Let us hope all this was said during at least a temporary fit of madness. "What else could excuse it? Not even the excellent and nicely-discriminating phrase of "hysteria" employed by one of the learned critical firm of Smith, B., J., and R.

What would be thought, felt, and said of such conduct in real life if recorded as facts of history? If brought home to modern times, how intolerable: Suppose some young duke or prince—say, of Denmark—came out here, and, after winning the affections of the elegant and accomplished only daughter of one of our most eminent official magnates, treated her in so outrageous a manner as to drive her into madness and suicide! It is scarcely possible that we could regard such a prince as being in his proper mind. Then look at the Lord Chamberlain, *Polonius*—not as he is too commonly mis-represented on the stage, but as an amiable gentleman and scholar; an aged, but faithful official; a man of varied attainments, or the intellect of *Claudius* would not have held him in such esteem and confidence; one also of great knowledge of men and manners, as specially evidenced by his description of the gradations from love and melancholy into madness, and by his parting advice to his son; and when we thus consider the courtly old *Lord Chamberlain*, must we not feel that the treatment of him, when alive, by the *Prince of Denmark* was rude and offensive in the extreme—like the behaviour of one who had lost all command over himself; while the treatment of him when dead was to the last degree revolting? What, then, should we think of the mental condition of any young duke or prince of modern Denmark who treated the father of a deserted young lady—say, one of our learned judges or the Honourable the Minister of Justice—in so insulting a style when living; who then killed him like a rat, virtually said it served him perfectly right for "intruding," and then, dragging his dead body under the stairs, left him there to rot? It does not bear thinking about. Old times or new times are not the question; it would have been shocking in the time of Nebuchadnezzar or Nero. Let us hope that *Hamlet* had fits not merely of hysteria, but also of madness and that he was not the wicked villain of Ludwig Boerne.

I had written thus far, when the last letter of Mr. James Smith appeared in this morning's *Argus* (5th August), and I think he has very well summed up the arguments, and is right in the main. He takes the view of Professor Vilemam and Dr. Conolly, and with good grounds. My own opinion has also been that *Hamlet* presents an extraordinary instance of sudden alternations of madness and sanity. That he could not be mad while uttering the consecutive thoughts of philosophy and meditative speculation for which he is so remarkable, I feel convinced; but it is equally evident that his brain was at the mercy of the next moment of excitement.

Madmen reason at times, like the best of us, but they "gambol" from the theme, as *Hamlet* himself remarks. Madmen are often self-conscious of their state. I think *Hamlet* sometimes pretended to be more mad than he really was, in order to disguise the fact of that degree of which he was conscious. He also did some things that may be regarded as the intermediate stages—such as the hiding the body of *Polonius* under the stairs, where it was sure to be found; and his stealing the despatches on shipboard, in the night, and forging fresh documents, with signature and seal, in order to get the heads of *Rosencrantz* and *Guiltenstern* cut off instead of his own. It is, however, the sudden alternations of an intellect of the first order, with an intellect and with actions which denote a diseased volition, that have rendered his character a psychological problem in years gone by, if not a puzzle, as it certainly has proved a battle-field, at the present day.

So much has been said in the way of criticism on the acting of this tragedy at the Theatre Royal that I must not intrude upon the department of the dramatic critic. Permit me, however, to touch upon a few points. Thoughtful actors do what they intend, but they often do more than they know. Mr. Montgomery may not intend to show *Hamlet* as mad, but his performance throughout is so profoundly sad and pathetic, that the author of the *Anatomy of Melancholy* would have had no doubt as to the illustration. But, apart from this question, the acting of Mr. Montgomery in several scenes is of the highest class, both in pathos and artistic finish. The fine expressions of his face are among the rarest things ever seen on the stage, and often remind one of the pictures of Titian and Guido. His scene with *Ophelia* when he discovers she is telling him an untruth; his scene with his mother when the ghost of his father appears; and the scene at the grave of *Ophelia*, are events to the mind that can never be forgotten. It is not only an elegant performance throughout, but more touching and tearful than any *Hamlet* I have seen. His death is perfectly true to nature, and at the same time the finest example of the histrionic art. It is the most beautifully pathetic picture I ever saw on the stage. Whoever has watched with breathless emotion a beautiful dying face, or a beautiful expression in dying, cannot fail to recognise this as something deep beyond tears, whatever tears may flow.

The lateness of the hour prevents me from saying what I would wish about *Claudius*, and Mr. Vincent's clear and excellent version of this finely-drawn character. *Claudius* is the practical mover of the tragedy; the *Ghost* strives to be so, but fails, for at the last moment *Hamlet* kills the king, not on account of any of the *Ghost's* exhortations, but from a mad, or half mad, rage and indignation at finding the treachery that has been practised upon him with the poisoned foils. It is a compliment to a Melbourne audience, not always deserved, to say that the house was crowded in every part. So may it be every time Mr. Montgomery plays *Hamlet*. It is a fine lesson for a public far too much given to burlesque and vulgarity, to the love of laughing at serious emotions, and at fine subjects made ridiculous.

R. H. H.

Mason, Firth and Co., Printers, Flinders Lane West.

Protoplasm: the Basis of Physical Life.

By Professor Huxley.

[Reprinted from the *Fortnightly Review*.]

Price Sixpence.

Published by Peter C Alcock Melbourne : 50 Temple Court, And Sold by all Booksellers. 1869.

Fergusson and Moore, Printers Melbourne : Flinders Lane East.

## Protoplasm: the Physical Basis of Life.

The substance of this paper was contained in a discourse which was delivered in Edinburgh on the evening of Sunday, the 8th of November, 1868—being the first of a series of Sunday evening addresses upon non-theological topics, instituted by the Rev. J. Cranbrook. Some phrases, which could possess only a transitory and local interest, have been omitted; instead of the newspaper report of the Archbishop of York's address, his Grace's subsequently-published pamphlet "On the Limits of Philosophical Inquiry," is quoted; and I have, here and there, endeavoured to express my meaning more fully and clearly than I seem to have done in speaking—if I may judge by sundry criticisms upon what I am supposed to have said, which have appeared. But in substance, and so far as my recollection serves, in form, what is here written corresponds with what was there said.

IN order to make the title of this discourse generally intelligible, I have translated the term "Protoplasm," which is the scientific name of the substance of which I am about to speak, by the words "the physical basis of life." I suppose that, to many, the idea that there is "such a thing as a physical basis, or matter, of life may be novel—so widely spread is the conception of life as a something which works through matter, but is independent of it: and even those who are aware" that matter and life are inseparably connected, may not be prepared for the conclusion plainly suggested by the phrase, "the physical basis or matter of life," that there is

some one kind of matter which is common to all living beings, and that their endless diversities are bound together by a physical, as well as an ideal, unity. In fact, when first apprehended, such a doctrine as this appears almost shocking to common sense.

What, truly, can seem to be more obviously different from one another in faculty, in form, and in substance, than the various kinds of living beings? What community of faculty can there be between the brightly-coloured lichen, which so nearly resembles a mere mineral incrustation" of the bare rock on which it grows, and the painter, to whom it is instinct with beauty, or the botanist, whom it feeds with knowledge?

Again, think of the microscopic fungus—a mere infinitesimal ovoid particle, which finds space and duration enough to multiply into countless millions in the body of a living fly; and then, of the wealth of foliage, the luxuriance of flower and fruit, which lies between this bald sketch of a plant and the giant pine of California, towering to the dimensions of a cathedral spire, or the Indian fig, which covers acres with its profound shadow, and endures while nations and empires come and go round its vast circumference? Or, turning to the other half of the world of life, picture to yourselves the great Finner whale, hugest of beasts that live, or have lived, disporting his eighty or ninety feet of bone, muscle, and blubber, with easy roll, among waves in which the stoutest ship that ever left dockyard would founder hopelessly; and contrast him with the invisible animalcules—mere gelatinous specks, multitudes of which could, in fact, dance upon the point of a needle with the same ease as the angels of the schoolmen could, in imagination. With these images before your minds, you may well ask what community of form, or structure, is there between the animalcule and the whale; or between the fungus and the fig tree? And, *à fortiori*, between all four?

Finally, if we regard substance, or material composition, what hidden bond can connect the flower which a girl wears in her hair and the blood which courses through her youthful veins; or, what is there in common between the dense and resisting mass of the oak, or the strong fabric of the tortoise, and those broad disks of glassy jelly which may be seen pulsating through the waters of a calm sea, but which drain away to mere films in the hand which raises them out of their element?

Such objections as these must, I think, arise in the mind of every one who ponders, for the first time, upon the conception of a single physical basis of life underlying all the diversities of vital existence; but I propose to demonstrate to you that, notwithstanding these apparent difficulties, a threefold unity—namely, a unity of power or faculty, a unity of form, and a unity of substantial composition—does pervade the whole living world.

No very abstruse argumentation is needed, in the first place, to prove that the powers, or faculties, of all kinds of living matter, diverse as they may be in degree, are substantially similar in kind.

Goethe has condensed a survey of all the powers of mankind into the well-known epigram:—

*"Warum treibt sich das Volk so and schreit? Es will sich ernähren, Kinder zeugen, and die nähren so gut es vermag.*

\* \* \* \* \*

*Weiter bringt es kein Mensch, stell' er sich wie er auch will."*

In physiological language this means, that all the multifarious and complicated activities of man are comprehensible under three categories. Either they are immediately directed towards the maintenance and development of the body, or they effect transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body, or they tend towards the continuance of the species. Even those manifestations of intellect, of feeling, and of will, which we rightly name the higher faculties, are not excluded from this classification, inasmuch as to every one but the subject of them, they are known only as transitory changes in the relative positions of parts of the body. Speech, gesture, and every other form of human action are, in the long run, resolvable into muscular contraction, and muscular contraction is but a transitory change in the relative positions of the parts of a muscle. But the scheme which is large enough to embrace the activities of the highest form of life covers all those of the lower creatures. The lowest plant, or animalcule, feeds, grows, and reproduces its kind. In addition, all animals manifest those transitory changes of form which we class under irritability and contractility; and, it is more than probable, that when the vegetable world is thoroughly explored, we shall find all plants in possession of the same powers, at one time or other of their existence.

I am not now alluding to such phenomena, at once rare and conspicuous, as those exhibited by the leaflets of the sensitive plant, or the Stamens of the barbary, but to much more widely-spread, and, at the same time, more subtle and hidden, manifestations of vegetable contractility. You are doubtless aware that the common nettle owes its stinging property to the innumerable stiff and needle-like, though exquisitely delicate, hairs which cover its surface. Each stinging-needle tapers from a broad base to a slender summit, which, though rounded at the end, is of such microscopic fineness that it readily penetrates, and breaks off in, the skin. The whole hair consists of a very delicate outer case of wood, closely applied to the inner surface of which is a layer of semi-fluid matter, full of innumerable granules of extreme minuteness. This semi-fluid lining is protoplasm, which thus constitutes a kind of bag, full of a limpid liquid, and roughly corresponding in form with the interior of the hair which it fills. When viewed with a sufficiently high magnifying power the protoplasmic layer of the

nettle hair is seen to be in a condition of unceasing activity. Local contractions of the whole thickness of its substance pass slowly and gradually from point to point, and give rise to the appearance of progressive waves, just as the bending of successive stalks of corn by a breeze produces the apparent billows of a corn-field.

But, in addition to these movements, and independently of them, the granules are driven, in relatively rapid streams, through channels in the protoplasm which seem to have a considerable amount of persistence. Most commonly, the currents in adjacent parts of the protoplasm take similar directions; and, thus, there is a general stream up one side of the hair and down the other. But this does not prevent the existence of partial currents which take different routes; and, sometimes, trains of granules may be seen coursing swiftly in opposite directions, within a twenty-thousandth of an inch of one another; while, occasionally, opposite streams come into direct collision, and, after a longer or shorter struggle, one predominates. The cause of these currents seems to lie in contractions of the protoplasm which bounds the channels in which they flow, but which are so minute that the best microscopes show only their effects, and not themselves.

The spectacle afforded by the wonderful energies prisoned within the compass of the microscopic hair of a plant, which we commonly regard as a merely passive organism, is not easily forgotten by one who has watched its display, continued hour after hour, without pause or sign of weakening. The possible complexity of many other organic forms, seemingly as simple as the protoplasm of the nettle, dawns upon one; and the comparison of such a protoplasm to a body with an internal circulation, which has been put forward by an eminent physiologist, loses much of its startling character. Currents similar to those of the hairs of the nettle have been observed in a great multitude of very different plants, and weighty authorities have suggested that they probably occur, in more or less perfection, in all young vegetable cells. If such be the case, the wonderful noonday silence of a tropical forest is, after all, due only to the dulness of our hearing; and could our ears catch the murmur of those tiny Maelstroms, as they whirl in the innumerable myriads of living cells which constitute each tree, we should be stunned, as with the roar of a great city.

Among the lower plants, it is the rule rather than the exception, that contractility should be still more openly manifested at some periods of their existence. The protoplasm of *Algæ* and *Fungi* becomes, under many circumstances, partially, or completely, freed from its woody case, and exhibits movements of its whole mass, or is propelled by the contractility of one, or more, hair-like prolongations of its body, which are called vibratile cilia. And so far as the conditions of the manifestation of the phenomena of contractility have yet been studied, they are the same for the plant as for the animal. Heat and electric shocks influence both, and in the same way, though it may be in different degrees. It is by no means my intention to suggest that there is no difference in faculty between the lowest plant and the highest, or between plants and animals. But the difference between the powers of the lowest plant, or animal, and those of the highest is one of degree, not of kind, and depends, as Milne-Edwards long ago so well pointed out, upon the extent to which the principle of the division of labour is carried out in the living economy. In the lowest organism all parts are competent to perform all functions, and one and the same portion of protoplasm may successively take on the function of feeding, moving, or reproducing apparatus. In the highest, on the contrary, a great number of parts combine to perform each function, each part doing its allotted share of the work with great accuracy and efficiency, but being useless for any other purpose.

On the other hand, notwithstanding all the fundamental resemblances which exist between the powers of the protoplasm in plants and in animals, they present a striking difference (to which I shall advert more at length presently.) in the fact that plants can manufacture fresh protoplasm out of mineral compounds, whereas animals are obliged to procure it ready made, and hence, in the long run, depend upon plants. Upon what condition this difference in the powers of the two great divisions of the world of life depends nothing is at present known.

With such qualification as arises out of the last-mentioned fact, it may be truly said that the acts of all living things are fundamentally one. Is any such unity predicable of their forms? Let us seek in easily verified facts for a reply to this question. If a drop of blood be drawn by pricking one's finger, and viewed with proper precautions and under a sufficiently high microscopic power, there will be seen, among the innumerable multitude of little, circular, discoidal bodies, or corpuscles, which float in it and give it its colour, a comparatively small number of colourless corpuscles, of somewhat larger size and very irregular shape. If the drop of blood be kept at the temperature of the body, these colourless corpuscles will be seen to exhibit a marvellous activity, changing their forms with great rapidity, drawing in and thrusting out prolongations of their substance, and creeping about as if they were independent organisms.

The substance which is thus active is a mass of protoplasm, and its activity differs in detail, rather than in principle, from that of the protoplasm of the nettle. Under sundry circumstances the corpuscle dies and becomes distended into a round mass, in the midst of which is seen a smaller spherical body, which existed, but was more or less hidden, in the living corpuscle, and is called its *nucleus*. Corpuscles of essentially similar structure are to be found in the skin, in the lining of the mouth, and scattered through the whole framework of the body.

Nay, more; in the earliest condition of the human organism, in that state in which it has but just become distinguishable from the egg in which it arises, it is nothing but an aggregation of such corpuscles, and every organ of the body was, once, no more than such an aggregation.

Thus a nucleated mass of protoplasm turns out to be what may be termed the structural unit of the human body. As a matter of fact, the body, in its, earliest state, is a mere multiple of such units; and, in its perfect condition, it is a multiple of such units variously modified.

But does the formula which expresses the essential structural character of the highest animal cover all the rest, as the statement of its powers and faculties covered that of all others? Very nearly. Beast and fowl, reptile and fish, mollusk, worm, and polype, are all composed of structural units of the same character, namely, masses of protoplasm with a nucleus. There are sundry very low animals, each of which, structurally, is a mere colourless blood-corpuscle, leading an independent life. But, at the very bottom of the animal scale, even this simplicity becomes simplified and all the phenomena of life are manifested by a particle of protoplasm without a nucleus. Nor are such organisms insignificant by reason of their want of complexity. It is a fair question whether the protoplasm of those simplest forms of life, which people an immense extent of the bottom of the sea, would not outweigh that of all the higher living beings which inhabit the land put together. And in ancient times, no less than at the present day, such living beings as these have been the greatest of rock builders.

What has been said of the animal world is no less true of plants. Imbedded in the protoplasm at the broad, or attached, end of the nettle hair, there lies a spheroidal nucleus. Careful examination further proves that the whole substance of the nettle is made up of a repetition of such masses of nucleated protoplasm, each contained in a wooden case, which is modified in form, sometimes into a woody fibre, sometimes into a duct or spiral vessel, sometimes into a pollen grain, or an ovule. Traced back to its earliest state, the nettle arises as the man does, in a particle of nucleated protoplasm. And in the lowest plants, as in the lowest animals, a single mass of such protoplasm may constitute the whole plant, or the protoplasm may exist without a nucleus.

Under these circumstances it may well be asked, how is one mass of non-nucleated protoplasm to be distinguished from another? why call one "plant" and the other "animal?"

The only reply is that, so far as form is concerned, plants and animals are not separable, and that, in many cases, it is a mere matter of convention whether we call a given organism an animal or a plant. There is a living body called *Æthelium septicum*, which appears upon decaying vegetable substances, and in one of its forms is common upon the surfaces of tan pits. In this condition it is, to all intents and purposes, a fungus, and formerly was always regarded as such; but the remarkable investigations of De Bary have shown that, in another condition, the *Æthelium* is an actively locomotive creature, and takes in solid matters, upon which, apparently, it feeds, thus exhibiting the most characteristic feature of animality. Is this a plant; or is it an animal? Is it both; or is it neither? Some decide in favour of the last supposition, and establish an intermediate kingdom, a sort of biological No Man's Land for all these questionable forms. But, as it is admittedly impossible to draw any distinct boundary line between this no man's land and the vegetable world on the one hand, or the animal on the other, it appears to me that this proceeding merely doubles the difficulty which, before, was single.

Protoplasm, simple or nucleated, is the formal basis of all life. It is the clay of the potter: which, bake it and paint it as he will, remains clay, separated by artifice, and not by nature, from the commonest brick or sun-dried clod.

Thus it becomes clear that all living powers are cognate, and that all living forms are fundamentally of one character. The researches of the chemist have revealed a no less striking uniformity of material composition in living matter.

In perfect strictness, it is true that chemical investigation can tell us little or nothing, directly, of the composition of living matter, inasmuch as such matter must needs die in the act of analysis,—and upon this very obvious ground, objections, which I confess seem to me to be somewhat frivolous, have been raised to the drawing of any conclusions whatever respecting the composition of actually living matter, from that of the dead matter of life, which alone is accessible to us. But objectors of this class do not seem to reflect that it is also, in strictness, true that we know nothing about the composition of any body whatever, as it is. The statement that a crystal of calc-spar consists of carbonate of lime is quite true, if we only mean that, by appropriate processes, it may be resolved into carbonic acid and quicklime. If you pass the same carbonic acid over the very quicklime thus obtained, you will obtain carbonate of lime again; but it will not be calc-spar, nor anything like it. Can it, therefore, be said that chemical analysis teaches nothing about the chemical composition of calc-spar? Such a statement would be absurd; but it is hardly more so than the talk one occasionally hears about the uselessness of applying the results of chemical analysis to the living bodies which have yielded them.

One fact, at any rate, is out of reach of such refinements, and this is, that all the forms of protoplasm which have yet been examined contain the four elements, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, in very complex union, and that they behave similarly towards several reagents. To this complex combination, the nature of which has never been determined with exactness, the name of Protein has been applied. And if we use this term

with such caution as may properly arise out of our comparative ignorance of the things for which it stands, it may be truly said, that all protoplasm is proteinaceous; or, as the white, or albumen, of an egg is one of the commonest examples of a nearly pure proteine matter, we may say that all living matter is more or less albuminoid.

Perhaps it would not yet be safe to say that all forms of protoplasm are affected by the direct action of electric shocks; and yet the number of cases in which the contraction of protoplasm is shewn to be effected by this agency increases every day.

Nor can it be affirmed with perfect confidence, that all forms of protoplasm are liable to undergo that peculiar coagulation at a temperature of 40°—50° centigrade, which has been called "heat-stiffening," though Kühne's beautiful researches have proved this occurrence to take place in so many and such diverse living beings, that it is hardly rash to expect that the law holds good for all.

Enough has, perhaps, been said to prove the existence of a general uniformity in the character of the protoplasm, or physical basis, of life, in whatever group of living beings it may be studied. But it will be understood that this general uniformity by no means excludes any amount of special modifications of the fundamental substance. The mineral, carbonate of lime, assumes an immense diversity of characters, though no one doubts that under all these Protean changes it is one and the same thing.

And now what is the ultimate fate, and what the origin, of the matter of life?

Is it, as some of the older naturalists supposed, diffused throughout the universe in molecules, which are indestructible and unchangeable in themselves; but, in endless transmigration, unite in innumerable permutations, into the diversified forms of life we know? Or, is the matter of life composed of ordinary matter, differing from it only in the manner in which its atoms are aggregated. Is it built up of ordinary matter, and again resolved into ordinary matter when its work is done?

Modern science does not hesitate a moment between these alternatives, Physiology writes over the portals of life—

*"Debemur mortii nos nostraque,"*

with a profounder meaning than the Roman poet attached to that melancholy line. Under whatever disguise it takes refuge, whether fungus or oak "worm or man. The living protoplasm not only ultimately dies and is resolved into its mineral and lifeless constituents, but is always dying, and, strange as the paradox may sound, could not live unless it died.

In the wonderful story of the "Peau de Chagrin," the hero becomes possessed of a magical wild ass's skin, which yields him the means of gratifying all his wishes. But its surface represents the duration of the proprietor's life; and for every satisfied desire the skin shrinks in proportion to the intensity of fruition, until at length life and the last hand-breadth of the *peau de chagrin* disappear with the gratification of a last wish.

Balzac's studies had led him over a wide range of thought and speculation, and his shadowing forth of physiological truth in this strange story may have been intentional. At any rate, the matter of life is a veritable *peau de chagrin*, and for every vital act it is somewhat the smaller. All work implies waste, and the work of life results, directly or indirectly, in the waste of protoplasm.

Every word uttered by a speaker costs him some physical loss; and, in the strictest sense, he burns that others may have light—so much eloquence, so much of his body resolved into carbonic acid, water, and area. It is clear that this process of expenditure cannot go on for ever. But, happily, the protoplasmic *peau de chagrin* differs from Balzac's in its capacity of being repaired, and brought back to its full size, after every exertion.

For example, this present lecture, whatever its intellectual worth to you, has a certain physical value to me, which is, conceivably, expressible by the number of grains of protoplasm and other bodily substance wasted in maintaining my vital processes during its delivery. My *peau de chagrin* will be distinctly smaller at the end of the discourse than it was at the beginning. By-and-by, I shall probably have recourse to the substance commonly called mutton, for the purpose of stretching it back to its original size. Now, this mutton was once the living protoplasm, more or less modified, of another animal—a sheep. As I shall eat it, it is the same matter altered, not only by death, but by exposure to sundry artificial operations in the process of cooking.

But these changes, whatever be their extent, have not rendered it incompetent to resume its old functions as matter of life. A singular inward laboratory, which I possess, will dissolve a certain portion of the modified protoplasm, the solution so formed will pass into my veins; and the subtle influences to which it will then be subjected will convert the dead protoplasm into living protoplasm, and transubstantiate sheep into man.

Nor is this all. If digestion were a thing to be trifled with, I might sup upon lobster, and the matter of life of the crustacean would undergo the same wonderful metamorphosis into humanity. And were I to return to my own place by sea, and undergo shipwreck, the crustacea might and probably would, return the compliment, and demonstrate our common nature by turning my protoplasm into living lobster. Or, if nothing better were to be had, I might supply my wants with mere bread, and I should find the protoplasm of the wheat-plant to be convertible into man with no more trouble than that of the sheep, and with far less, I fancy than that of the

lobster.

Hence it appears to be a matter of no great moment what animal, or what plant, I lay under contribution for protoplasm, and the fact speaks volumes for the general identity of that substance in all living beings. I share this catholicity of assimilation with other animals, all of which, so far as we know, could thrive equally well on the protoplasm of any of their fellows, or of any plant; but here the assimilative powers of the animal world cease. A solution of smelling-salts in water, with an infinitesimal proportion of some other saline matters, contains all the elementary bodies which enter into the composition of the protoplasm; but, as I need hardly say, a hogshead of that fluid would not keep a hungry man from starving, nor would it save any animal whatever from a like fate. An animal cannot make protoplasm, but must take it ready-made from some other animal, or some plant—the animal's highest feat of constructive chemistry being to convert dead protoplasm into that living matter of life which is appropriate to itself.

Therefore, in seeking for the origin of protoplasm, we must eventually turn to the vegetable world. The fluid containing carbonic acid, water, and ammonia, which offers such a Barmecide feast to the animal, is a table richly spread to multitudes of plants; and with a due supply of only such material, many a plant will not only maintain itself in vigour, but grow and multiply until it has increased a million-fold, or a million million-fold, the quantity of protoplasm which it originally possessed; in this way building up the matter of life, to an indefinite extent, from the common matter of the universe.

Thus, the animal can only raise the complex substance of dead protoplasm to the higher power, as one may say, of living protoplasm; while the plant can raise the less complex substances—carbonic acid, water, and ammonia—to the same stage of living protoplasm, if not to the same level. But the plant also has its limitations. Some of the fungi, for example, appear to need higher compounds to start with; and no known plant can live upon the uncompounded elements of protoplasm. A plant supplied with pure carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, phosphorus, sulphur, and the like, would as infallibly die as the animal in his bath of smelling-salts, though it would be surrounded by all the constituents of protoplasm. Nor, indeed, need the process of simplification of vegetable food be carried so far as this, in order to arrive at the limit of the plant's thaumaturgy. Let water, carbonic acid, and all other needful constituents be supplied without ammonia, and an ordinary plant will still be unable to manufacture protoplasm.

Thus the matter of life, so far as we know it (and we have no right to speculate on any other,) breaks up, in consequence of that continual death which is the condition of its manifesting vitality, into carbonic acid, water and ammonia, which certainly possess no properties but those of ordinary matter. And out of these "same forms of ordinary matter, and from none which are simpler, the vegetable world builds up all the protoplasm which keeps the animal world agoing. Plants are the accumulators of the power which animals distribute and disperse.

But it will be observed, that the existence of the matter of life depends upon the pre-existence of certain compounds, namely, carbonic acid, water, and ammonia. Withdraw any one of these three from the world, and all vital phenomena come to an end. They are related to the protoplasm of the plant, as the protoplasm of the plant is to that of the animal. Carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen are all lifeless bodies. Of these, carbon and oxygen unite in certain proportions and under certain conditions, to give rise to carbonic acid; hydrogen and oxygen produce water; nitrogen and hydrogen give rise to ammonia. These new compounds, like the elementary bodies of which they are composed, are lifeless. But when they are brought together, under certain conditions they give rise to the still more complex body, protoplasm, and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomena of life.

I see no break in this series of steps in molecular complication, and I am unable to understand why the language which is applicable to any one term of the series may not be used to any of the others. We think fit to call different kinds of matter carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen, and to speak of the various powers and activities of these substances as the properties of the matter of which they are composed.

When hydrogen and oxygen are mixed in a certain proportion, and an electric spark is passed through them, they disappear, and a quantity of water, equal in weight to the sum of their weights, appears in their place. There is not the slightest parity between the passive and active powers of the water and those of the oxygen and hydrogen which have given rise to it. At 32° Fahrenheit, and far below that temperature, oxygen and hydrogen are elastic gaseous bodies, whose particles tend to rush away from one another with great force. Water, at the same temperature, is a strong though brittle solid, whose particles tend to cohere into definite geometrical shapes, and sometimes build up frosty imitations of the most complex forms of vegetable foliage.

Nevertheless we call these, and many other strange phenomena, the properties of the water, and we do not hesitate to believe that, in some way or another, they result from the properties of the component elements of the water. We do not assume that a something called "aquosity" entered into and took possession of the oxide of hydrogen as soon as it was formed, and then guided the aqueous particles to their places in the facets of the crystal, or amongst the leaflets of the hoar-frost. On the contrary, we live in the hope and in the faith that, by the advance of molecular physics, we shall by and-by be able to see our way as clearly from the constituents of

water to the properties of water, as we are now able to deduce the operations of a watch from the form of its parts and the manner in which they are put together.

Is the case in any way changed when carbonic acid, water, and ammonia disappear, and in their place, under the influence of pre-existing living protoplasm, an equivalent weight of the matter of life makes its appearance?

It is true that there is no sort of parity between the properties of the components and the properties of the resultant, but neither was there in the case of the water. It is also true that what I have spoken of as the influence of pre-existing living matter is something quite unintelligible; but does anybody quite comprehend the *modus operandi* of an electric spark, which traverses a mixture of oxygen and hydrogen?

What justification is there, then, for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something which has no representative or correlative in the not living matter which gave rise to it? What better philosophical status has "vitality" than "aquosity?" And why should "vitality" hope for a better fate than the other "itys" which have disappeared since Martinus Scriblerus accounted for the operation of the meat-jack by its inherent "meat-roasting quality," and scorned the "materialism" of these who explained the turning of the spit by a certain mechanism worked by the draught of the chimney?

If scientific language is to possess a definite and constant signification whenever it is employed, it seems to me that we are logically bound to apply to the protoplasm, or physical basis of life, the same conceptions as those which are held to be legitimate elsewhere. If the phenomena exhibited by water are its properties, so are those presented by protoplasm, living or dead, its properties.

If the properties of water may be properly said to result from the nature and disposition of its component molecules, I can find no intelligible ground for refusing to say that the properties of protoplasm result from the nature and disposition of its molecules.

But I bid you beware that, in accepting these conclusions, you are placing your feet on the first rung of a ladder which, in most people's estimation, is the reverse of Jacob's, and leads to the antipodes of heaven. It may seem a small thing to admit that the dull vital actions of a fungus, or a foraminifer, are the properties of their protoplasm, and are the direct results of the nature of the matter of which they are composed. But if, as I have endeavoured to prove to you, their protoplasm is essentially identical with, and most readily converted into, that of any animal, I can discover no logical halting-place between the admission that such is the case, and the further concession that all vital action may, with equal propriety, be said to be the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it. And if so, it must be true, in the same sense and to the same extent, that the thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them, are the expression of molecular changes in that matter of life which is the source of our other vital phenomena.

Past experience leads me to be tolerably certain that, when the propositions I have just placed before you are accessible to public comment and criticism, they will be condemned by many zealous persons, and perhaps by some few of the wise and thoughtful. I should not wonder if "gross and brutal materialism" were the mildest phrase applied to them in certain quarters. And most undoubtedly the terms of the propositions are distinctly materialistic. Nevertheless two things are certain; the one, that I hold the statements to be substantially true; the other, that I, individually, am no materialist, but, on the contrary, believe materialism to involve grave philosophical error.

This union of materialistic terminology with the repudiation of materialistic philosophy, I share with some of the most thoughtful men with whom I am acquainted. And, when I first undertook to deliver the present discourse, it appeared to me to be a fitting opportunity to explain how such an union is not only consistent with, but necessitated by, sound logic. I Proposed to lead you through the territory of vital phenomena She materialistic slough in which you find yourselves now plunged and then to point out to you the sole path by which, in my judgment, extrication is possible.

An occurrence of which I was unaware until my arrival here last night renders this line of argument singularly opportune. I found in your papers the eloquent address "On the Limits of Philosophical Inquiry, which a distinguished prelate of the English Church delivered before the members of the Philosophical Institute on the previous day. My argument also, turns upon this very point of limits of philosophical inquiry; and I cannot bring out my own views better than by contrasting them with those so plainly, and in the main, fairly, stated by the Archbishop of York.

But I may be permitted to make a preliminary comment upon an occurrence that greatly astonished me. Applying the name of "The New Philosophy" to that estimate of the limits of philosophical inquiry which I, in common with many other men of science, hold to be just, the Archbishop opens his address by identifying this "New Philosophy" with the Positive Philosophy of M. Comte (of whom he speaks as its "founder;") and then proceeds to attack that philosopher and his doctrines vigorously.

Now, so far as I am concerned, the most reverend prelate might didactically hew M. Comte in pieces, as a modern Agag, and I should not attempt to stay his hand. In so far as my study of what specially characterises

the Positive Philosophy has led me, I find therein little or nothing of any scientific value, and a great deal, which is as thoroughly antagonistic to the very essence of science as anything in ultramontane Catholicism. In fact, M. Comte's philosophy in practice might be compendiously described as Catholicism *minus* Christianity.

But what has Comtism to do with the "New Philosophy," as the Archbishop defines it in the following passage?—

*"Let me briefly remind you of the leading principled of this new philosophy.*

*"All knowledge is experience of facts acquired by the senses. The traditions of older philosophies have obscured our experience by mixing with it much that the senses cannot observe, and until these additions are discarded our knowledge is impure. Thus metaphysics tell us that one fact which we observe is a cause, and another is the effect of that cause; but upon a rigid analysis, we find that our senses observe nothing of cause or effect: they observe, first, that one fact succeeds another, and after some opportunity, that this fact has never failed to follow—that for cause and effect we should substitute invariable succession. An older philosophy teaches us to define an object by distinguishing its essential from its accidental qualities: but experience knows nothing of essential and accidental; she sees only that certain marks attach to an object, and, after many observations, that some of them attach invariably, whilst others may at times be absent As all knowledge is relative, the notion of anything being necessary must be banished with other traditions."*

*"The Limits of Philosophical Inquiry," pp. 4 and 5.*

There is much here that expresses the spirit of the "New Philosophy," if by that term be meant the spirit of modern science; but I cannot but marvel that the assembled wisdom and learning of Edinburgh should have uttered no sign of dissent, when Comte was declared to be the founder of these doctrines. No one will accuse Scotchmen of habitually forgetting their great countrymen; but it was enough to make David Hume turn in his grave, that here, almost within ear-shot of his house an instructed audience should have listened, without a murmur, while his most characteristic doctrines were attributed to a French writer of fifty years later date, in whose dreary and verbose pages we miss alike the vigour of thought and the exquisite clearness of style of the man whom I make bold to term the most acute thinker of the eighteenth century—even though that century produced Kant.

But I did not come to Scotland to vindicate the honour of one of the greatest men she has ever produced. My business is to point out to you that the only way of escape out of the crass materialism in which we just now landed is the adoption and strict working-out of the very principles which the Archbishop holds up to reprobation.

Let us suppose that knowledge is absolute, and not relative, and there fore, that our conception of matter represents that which it really is. Let us suppose, further, that we know more of cause and effect than a certain definite order of succession among facts, and that we have a knowledge of the necessity of that succession—and hence, of necessary laws—and I, for my part, do not see what escape there is from utter materialism and necessarianism. For it is obvious that our knowledge of what we call the material world is, to begin with, at least as certain and definite as that of the spiritual world, and that our acquaintance with law is of as old a date as our knowledge of spontaneity. Further, I take it to be demonstrable that it is utterly impossible to prove that anything whatever may not be the effect of a material and necessary cause, and that human logic is equally incompetent to prove that any act is really spontaneous. A really spontaneous act is one which, by the assumption, has no cause; and the attempt to prove such a negative as this is, on the face of the matter, absurd. And while it is thus a philosophical impossibility to demonstrate that any given phenomenon is not the effect of a material cause, any one who is acquainted with the history of science will admit, that its progress has, in all ages, meant, and now, more than ever, means, the extinction of the province of what we call matter and causation, and the concomitant gradual banishment from all regions of human thought of what we call spirit and spontaneity.

I have endeavoured, in the first part of this discourse, to give you a conception of the direction towards which modern physiology is tending; and I ask you, what is the difference between the conception of life as the product of a certain disposition of material molecules, and the old notion of an Archæus governing and directing blind matter within each living body, except this—that here, as elsewhere, matter and law have devoured spirit and spontaneity? And as surely as every future grows out of past and present, so will the physiology of the future gradually extend the realm of matter and law until it is co-extensive with knowledge, with feeling, and with action.

The consciousness of this great truth weighs like a nightmare. I believe, upon many of the best minds of these days. They watch what they conceive to be the progress of materialism, in such fear and powerless anger as a savage feels, when, during an eclipse, the great shadow creeps over the face of the sun. The advancing tide of matter threatens to drown their souls; the tightening grasp of law impedes their freedom; they are alarmed lest men's moral nature be debased by the increase of his wisdom.

If the "New Philosophy" be worthy of the reprobation with which it is visited I confess their fears seem to

me to be well founded. While, on the contrary could David Hume be consulted, I think he would smile at their perplexities, and chide them for doing even as the heathen, and falling down in terror before the hideous idols their own hands have raised.

For, after all, what do we know of this terrible "matter," except as a name for the unknown and hypothetical cause of states of our own consciousness? And what do we know of that "spirit," over whose threatened extinction by matter a great lamentation is arising, like that which was heard at the death of Pan, except that it is also a name for an unknown and hypothetical cause, or condition, of states of consciousness? In other words, "matter and spirit are but names for the imaginary substrata of groups of natural phenomena.

And what is the dire necessity and "iron" law under which men groan? Truly, most gratuitously invented bugbears. I suppose if there be an "iron" law, it is that of gravitation; and if there be a physical necessity, it is that a stone, unsupported, must fall to the ground. But what is all we really know and can know about the latter phenomenon? Simply, that, in all human experience, stones have fallen to the ground under these conditions, that we have not the smallest reason for believing that any stone so circumstanced will not fall to the ground; and that we have, on the contrary, every reason to believe that it will so fall. It is very convenient to indicate that all the conditions of belief have been fulfilled in this case, by calling the statement that unsupported stones will fall to the ground, "a law of nature." But when, as commonly happens, we change *will* into *must*, we introduce an idea of necessity which most assuredly does not lie in the observed facts, and has no warranty that I can discover elsewhere. For my part. I utterly repudiate and anathematise the intruder. Fact I know; and Law I know; but what is this Necessity, save an empty shadow of my own mind's throwing?

But, if it is certain that we can have no knowledge of the nature of either matter or spirit, and that the notion of necessity is something illegitimately thrust into the perfectly legitimate conception of law, the materialistic position that there is nothing in the world but matter, force, and necessity, is as utterly devoid of justification as the most baseless of theological dogmas. The fundamental doctrines of materialism, like those of spiritualism, and most other "isms," lie outside "the limits of philosophical inquiry," and David Hume's great service to humanity is his irrefragable demonstration of what these limits are. Hume called himself a sceptic, and therefore others cannot be blamed if they apply the same title to him; but that does not alter the fact that the name, with its existing implications, does him gross injustice.

If a man asks me what the politics of the inhabitants of the moon are, and I reply that I do not know; that neither I. nor any one else, have any means of knowing; and that, under these circumstances. I decline to trouble myself about the subject at all, I do not think he has any right to call me a sceptic. On the contrary, in replying thus, I conceive that I am simply honest and truthful, and show a proper regard for the economy of time. So Hume's strong and subtle intellect takes up a great many problems about which we are naturally curious, and shows us that they are essentially questions of lunar politics, in their essence incapable of being answered, and therefore not worth the attention of men who have work to do in the world. And he thus ends one of his essays:—

*"If we take in hand any volume of Divinity, or school metaphysics, for instance, let us ask, Does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number? No. Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact and existence? No. Commit it then to the flames; for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion."*

*Hume's Essay, "Of the Academical or Sceptical Philosophy" in the "Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding."*

Permit me to enforce this most wise advice. Why trouble ourselves about matters of which, however important they may be, we do know nothing, and can know nothing? We live in a world which is full of misery and ignorance, and the plain duty of each and all of us is to try to make the little corner he can influence somewhat less miserable and some-what less ignorant than it was before he entered it. To do this effectually it is necessary to be fully possessed of only two beliefs: the first that the order of nature is ascertainable by our faculties to an extent which is practically unlimited; the second, that our volition counts for something as a condition of the course of events.

Each of these beliefs can be verified experimentally, as often as we like to try. Each, therefore, stands upon the strongest foundation upon which any belief can rest; and forms one of our highest truths. If we find that the ascertainment of the order of nature is facilitated by using one terminology, or one set of symbols, rather than another, it is our clear duty to use the former; and no harm can accrue, so long as we can bear in mind that we are dealing merely with terms and symbols.

In itself it is of little moment whether we express the phenomena of matter in terms of spirit; or the phenomena of spirit, in terms of matter; matter may be regarded as a form of thought, thought may be regarded as a property of matter—each statement has a certain relative truth. But with a view to the progress of science, the materialistic terminology is in every way to be preferred. For it connects thought with the other phenomena of the universe, and suggests inquiry into the nature of those physical conditions, or concomitants of thought,

which are more or less accessible to us, and a knowledge of which may, in future, help us to exercise the same kind of control over the world of thought, as we already possess in respect of the material world; whereas, the alternative, or spiritualistic, terminology is utterly barren, and leads to nothing but obscurity and confusion of ideas.

Thus there can be little doubt that the further science advances the more extensively and consistently will all the phenomena of nature be represented by materialistic formulæ and symbols.

But the man of science, who, forgetting the limits of philosophical inquiry, slides from these formula; and symbols into what is commonly understood by materialism, seems to me to place himself on a level with the mathematician, who should mistake the  $x$ 's and  $y$ 's, with which he works his problems, for real entities—and with this further disadvantage, as compared with the mathematician, that the blunders of the latter are of no practical consequence, while the errors of systematic materialism may paralyse the energies and destroy the beauty of a life.

Fergusson and Moore, Printers, Flinders Lane East, Melbourne.

The Condition & Prospects of Australia as Compared with Older Lands. A Lecture  
Delivered at the Princess' Theatre, Melbourne, on May 3 1869,

By H. J. Wrixon, Esq., M.P.

Being the first of a Course of Lectures under the Auspices of the Early Closing Association.

*Published by Direction of the Committee.*

Fergusson & Moore, Printers Melbourne: 48 Flinders Lane East. 1869.

## The Condition and Prospects of Australia as Compared with Older Lands.

THE RIGHT WORSHIPFUL THE MAYOR having introduced the Lecturer of the evening,

Mr. H. J. WRIXON said:—Mr. Mayor, ladies and gentlemen, I can assure you that it gives me great pleasure to appear before you this evening. Indeed, I esteem it a great honour to have this opportunity of meeting such a large assemblage of my fellow-colonists, and I venture to observe that it would be well for us if the institution of the public platform had a greater hold on this country than it has (hear, hear,) because we must bear in mind that in such a community as ours everything depends on the proper enlightenment of public opinion. The pulpit, the press, the political arena, our noble system of jurisprudence, are all great agencies furthering the one good cause; but I think that, in addition to them all, the public platform has its own particular merits. From it you can hear the views and opinions of men untrammelled by the restraints of etiquette, or by considerations such as may limit the expression of opinion in other arenas. I certainly venture to hope that as the progress of the country continues, and we get a class more and more identified with Australia, we shall find the public platform become one of our recognised institutions, doing its share of work in enlightening and directing the public opinion of the country. (Hear.) Now, Mr. Mayor, and ladies and gentlemen, I am going to speak to you to-night about our country. In any age, and in every clime, such a subject ought to be an interesting one to those who are settled in the land to be spoken about; but it seems to me that there are particular reasons why we should inquire into the condition and prospects of Victoria at the present time, because I think it must be noticed by all who pay attention to our public and social affairs, that we have a very considerable class of rather unreasonable critics among us. (Applause.) I do not at all make any imputation on the motives or the intention of those critics, but I only observe that it is a fact—which I think must have struck any of us who are attached to this country as a painful fact—that we have a considerable number of persons, intelligent persons, persons of position and rank in our land, who take the most gloomy and adverse view of the condition and prospects of Australia. Now, some of these critics feel, no doubt, that though with us they are not of us. They are looking forward to going home, and spending the evening of their days in scenes that are endeared to them by the recollection of childhood, and so they regard themselves as mere birds of passage, and not in any way particularly interested in maintaining the credit and character of Australia. (Cheers.) But there are others who are bound to this country,—men who have given hostages, as Bacon says, to fortune; men who are pledged to society, who have their families here, whose home this country is, and yet whom you will hear day by day expressing none but the most melancholy and craven views of this land, which is to be their home and the home of their children after them. It is, I can assure you, not a mere story, but a fact, that not very long ago, an acquaintance of mine—and a worthy, intelligent man, too, an educated man, and what is more, a young man, and not naturally entitled, therefore, to take very gloomy views of affairs,—it is not long ago, I say, that such an acquaintance of mine informed me that for a considerable period he had despaired of Victoria, but that when recent occurrences, more or less present to the minds of all, happened, he gave us up finally.

I think this, then, is a rather serious question for us who belong to this country. Possibly, I do not address many men who were born or, like myself brought up here; but I certainly do address a great many who are fixed permanently to Australia, who can look to no other country if this fails them, and who have no other prospect if this land proves unable to afford them a home such as they desire. It is therefore, I say, a serious question for us to inquire, if this gloomy view of our affairs is a sound one. It is an important matter for us, by a wise, careful, and critical consideration, to determine whether we really are all attached to a sinking ship; all inhabitants, as it were, of a city of the plain, doomed to destruction, and with no mountains of refuge to fly to. You will quite understand me, that I do not at all deprecate—on the contrary, I most highly approve of—having a healthy sense of our national defects. I think such a sense is a most important feature of national character, and one without which no nation can make real progress; but there is a great difference between being sensible of defects and having a keen sense of the dangers that may encompass us, and being possessed by that craven, abject, woe-begone spirit that marks too many of those who ought to take a prominent interest in our affairs. Nations, in many respects, are not unlike individuals. No single man can really become a worthy man, develop his character properly, or perform his duty effectually, unless he is conscious of his weak points, guards against them and endeavours to remedy them. That is necessary for every individual who wishes to become a real man. But what would you say if you saw an individual adopt towards himself that craven tone which some of our citizens adopt towards this country. What would you think of an individual if he went about among his acquaintances saying, "Well, I am certainly a most miserable fellow. I have no right principles, I am utterly without energy, my prospects are barren; and as for emulating my respectable parents,—why, the idea is absurd." I think you would be very apt to take such a man at his own valuation, and believe him to be quite as miserable a fellow as he said he was. Now, I say, before we give in—I speak as an Australian—to this abject tone of criticism, which misrepresents equally our institutions and our social tendencies, we ought in all seriousness to inquire whether such a view is reasonable or the opposite. Of course, if it is true, it will be a most melancholy fact, but we must accept it. But let us critically and carefully inquire whether it is so.

Now, the only way you can inquire is by *comparing* our condition with that of older lands, because, let me say, I have noticed that these severe critics of ours seem to think that their case is made out when they point to this that is wrong, to that that is doubtful, and to a third that is dangerous in our state. They seem to think that then their case is made out; and that they are entitled, on pointing out certain defects, to profess despair of the country, and to separate themselves entirely from its service. But you must recollect that, in the whole of human society, in every age of the world for the last 6000 years in which we have been acquainted with it, in every clime, and among every people, there has been carried on a constant struggle between evil and good; as one of the most philosophical statesmen of our age has remarked—I allude to Guizot—"Evil and good appear to dispute for the mastery of society, because they simultaneously possess it, because they co-exist in it." And the whole of what is noble in human life depends on manfully maintaining the struggle on behalf of good influences against evil influences, and so evolving from that contest what is called progress. (Applause.) Therefore, I say, we will not allow ourselves to be borne down by gloomy anticipations because certain defects are pointed out, and certain difficulties shown in our social and political condition. We will recollect that there have always been difficulties to be met, always been dangers to be avoided, always been prevalent in human society not a little that good and honourable men cannot approve of; and what we will do before we despair of our future, give over this young country and renounce its service—as most of these gloomy critics do—is, we will look to other states of society in other countries and in other times, and see how they stand in comparison. And I venture to say that if you will follow me to-night in that inquiry, so far from having any reason to despond, so far from finding any foundation for a craven distrust of the destinies of Australia, you will feel more disposed than ever to regard cheerfully the present, and to look hopefully towards the future. (Applause.) You quite observe, Mr. Mayor, and ladies and gentlemen, the design of my argument. I want to show that, though difficulties and dangers encompass our present position—as undoubtedly they do,—they are not only not in a greater, but are in a lesser degree, than have faced men in other ages, and now face men in other lands. For example, take the good old times, for often critics, such as I have alluded to, look back with regret to "the good old times." If there is anything wrong in our condition, if anything bad happens in our political or social world, they advert at once to the good old times when such things could not happen. Let us look, then, at the good old times. Let us see how the good old times would have got on if those on whom it then devolved to maintain the struggle on behalf of good influences quietly despaired, said that things were too bad, and washed their hands of all trouble and responsibility. Let us look and see what kind of difficulties they had to contend with. Take a century ago as a fair test, because that period involves a remarkable and brilliant period of English history. Take a century ago, and look at the condition of England. At that time you know the aristocracy were at the head of affairs. They were not, as now, merely ornamental in the state. They were the real rulers of the nation. They led society; they governed in politics; they influenced the judicial department; and generally constituted and represented the enlightenment of Great Britain. Now, what was the condition of this

aristocracy? Glance for a moment at the state of religious thought and belief among them. You find it forcibly expressed by Bishop Butler, in the advertisement to his great work—the "Analogy." He describes it as taken for granted that Christianity is not so much a subject for inquiry, but that it is looked upon as at length discovered to be fictitious, treated as such "among all people of discernment," and set up as a "principal subject of mirth and ridicule."

If you would take the moral condition of the aristocracy, refer to the literature of that day, and you get a striking picture of those who then led and gave the tone to English society. I cannot well go into the details which would be revealed by reference to that literature, but I might give you a simple illustration, by which you can judge whether we are much worse than the people who lived in that time. You have all heard, no doubt, of the marriage difficulty of our day. It is the principal theme of lectures and railings in newspapers of all kinds in the old country; and the fact that young men do not marry is regarded and represented as a clear proof of the bad tendencies of our age. As to why they do not marry, and what can be their objections, I am unable to say—it is not a subject I can speak of authoritatively, myself; (laughter), but if it is so, all I can say is that it is exceedingly wrong. But now look at the good old times. You will find if you inquire into the history of social life at that time, that they had then to contend with a difficulty which does not seem, as well as I can gather, to be felt in an equal degree now, viz., that the young ladies would not marry then, any more than the young men. You will find in the fashionable world, in the aristocracy of that day, just the same contempt for married life, for the honourable estate of matrimony and home life, that is now attributed to our young men. If you refer to the letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montague, you will find her lamenting this condition of affairs in the fashionable world. She says that she is extremely sorry for the forlorn state of matrimony, which is as much ridiculed by the young ladies as it used to be by the young men. This is not her opinion only, because in the letters of the Princess Dowager the same complaint is made. That shows how apt people are, dwelling on the disadvantages of the present, to magnify them unduly and think them worse than those of any previous age. They seem to think that the evils we meet are some strange thing that has happened to us. Look at the home press today, and you will find this neglect to marry treated as something new and extraordinary, and yet just the same evil in a much worse form characterised the aristocracy of England, at a time when that aristocracy influenced the whole of English society and gave a tone to the whole of English thought. Now, in the same way we complain in our community here—justly too, I think—of the spirit of gambling evinced. We say that our gold-mines propagate that spirit and give it scope: and there can be no doubt that when we take into account all the drawbacks, social and material, we pay dearly enough for our gold after all. But look at the good old times! We find that same evil present them in a greater and more aggravated form. Gambling was a main element in social life, not merely of the aristocracy but of the middle classes. If you take, for example, that notable instance of gambling and swindling, the South Sea scheme, you will see involved in that gigantic gambling fraud not a few speculators of doubtful character—men who live by their wits—but some of the foremost men in England. No doubt, most of you have in your minds the particulars of the history of that scheme; but I may say, for the information of the younger portion of the audience (I will not go into detail,) that it was something like what you see now and then done in this country. Often you will hear of a mine of extraordinary richness, somewhere in the Gipps Land ranges—in a very out of the way place, which people cannot easily get at. Numbers are induced to pay money for shares and calls to the enterprising directors, and to go on doing so, till at last they wake up to the fact that no one can make out where the mine really is, and all that they can learn about their money is, that it has gone into the pockets of the directors. That is exactly like what the South Sea scheme was. Perhaps you will say, "Oh, but that is against your argument, it shows that we are so bad as they were." I say, no. For this reason—in that South Sea affair there were mixed up the Chancellor of the Exchequer—he was one of the participators—two or three state ministers, several members of Parliament, and actually some of the favourites of the Sovereign himself. So that these gambling frauds in the good old times were not confined to a few gentlemen who, it is said may be seen "Under the Verandah" (laughter,) but were participated in by the leading statesmen and principal men of the country. Now, this aristocracy thus marked by the characteristics I have only glanced at,—because I cannot go fully into the matter—exercised absolute sway in the political world. It constituted the whole of the political world of Great Britain. It was not merely that it had influence, but it was everything. A considerable number of the aristocracy owned boroughs that gave seats to Parliament. These boroughs they sold just as people sell their houses or any other portion of their property. If you look at the journals and magazines of the time you will see in them advertisements from men wanting boroughs, and ready to pay for them. The aristocracy had thus not only the direct influence of their position, but they had the vast additional influence of commanding seats in Parliament, and it was only a few of the great towns that had any independent representation at all.

And what was the condition of the political world in such hands? We hear, unfortunately in our own time—and I am sorry to say, too, in our own country—of corruption, and a serious matter it is. But in that day it presented a different aspect—it was a regularly organised system, not struggled against and reprobated, as I

trust it ever will be by the people of this country (cheers) not engaged in by a few men, the mere outcasts of political life (applause;) it was, I say, an organised system, and adopted as a recognised principle of political action. You find it permeating every part of the aristocratic House of Commons of the last century. Not merely were political votes openly bought for particular occasions, but members were regularly kept in the pay of the ministry of the day. We are told that from £500 to £800 a-year was the range of the allowances these gentlemen got, and they were expected for that sum to be ready to vote whenever they were called upon, to attend at any hour, and to go for whichever side they were told. On particular occasions, when the need was pressing, money payments were made directly and openly for votes, just as you would go into a shop now, and pay for a coat or a pair of boots; and a striking feature about this corruption was, that votes were bought for questions on which, perhaps, the whole destiny and safety of the kingdom hung. It was not, as we sometimes hear, of votes being influenced on matters of small importance, but votes were bought and paid for, to be given on measures for, for instance,—declaring war or making peace at critical periods measures which might affect, perhaps, the very existence of the country. I could give you an example in point. When the question came before Parliament, in the last century, of ratifying the peace which had been made with Spain—a measure strongly objected to by the patriotic party in England—in order to carry it through Parliament, a pay-office was opened under the auspices of Henry Fox. £25,000 were paid away in bribes to members of Parliament in one morning, and the gentleman who was paymaster on that occasion was afterwards made a peer for his services in that corruption, and his descendants figure now among the aristocracy of Great Britain, as the holders of a peerage bought by such public conduct. Lord Macaulay describes part of the period to which I refer as a time when anything short of direct embezzlement was considered quite fair in public men; and Lord Bolingbroke says, that not merely a pamphlet, but a regular treatise, "under distinct heads," could be written of the corruption, dishonesty, and fraud which tainted every part of the state, and to which (as he justly observes,) the principal men in the land had made themselves parties. Now, all this, you see, was done openly, and without rebuke: it was all done as using the legitimate and proper means of political warfare. Public opinion, then, was not alive to the guilt and shame of such transactions. That feeling was only beginning to tell towards the close of the century. Why, one great secret of the astonishing success and popularity of the two Pitts—Earl Chatham, in the first instance, and his son, William Pitt, in the second—was the simple fact that it was known that they were both above personal meanness or corruption. That was thought something so extraordinary—it so went home to the hearts of English people (I mean the humbler classes,) that they were each able to take the nation by storm, and, notwithstanding all their mistakes, errors, and defects of character, they have remained enshrined ever since in the memories of their countrymen, not, I am sure, merely on account of their talents, but because they were known to be above personal corruption, and to be animated by a patriotism pure as it was ardent. (Applause.)

But, indeed, I need scarcely further illustrate, in detail, this view of the condition of the political world of the last century. You all know that the stage and the players are the abstracts and brief chronicles of the time. I suppose a good many of you have gone to see the "Man of the World," in another place—to use parliamentary phrase. (Laughter.) I am, myself, acquainted with a gentleman—a very intelligent man, too, though not given much to literature—who went to see that play, and came away with the firm conviction in his mind that the play was expressly written with a view to our political defects, or at least that it was touched up for and pointed at our political evils. This friend of mine, I should say, looks at everything in the blackest way possible and takes the very worst view of our condition, so when he saw that play, he firmly believed that it referred to our difficulties. Now, I suppose, you are aware that it really was pointed at political wrongs, but at those of a century ago, when it was written for the express purpose of satirising and exposing the political abuses of that day. If you look at the original text of the "Man of the World," you will see in how much worse a condition they were in at that time than we can be supposed to be now. The "Man of the World" shows how to achieve success in the walks of political life. You will find that he described lords, members of Parliament, judges, generals, and bishops as suppliant appendages to the minister in power. He says, "The places of fashionable resort are crowded with purse-proud upstarts, who got their riches from lottery-tickets or gambling in 'Change Alley." He describes the distinction between a knave and an honest man as mere nonsense; and he lays down the principle of the "two consciences," which it is necessary, he declares, for men to have in public life. He describes his own career in this way to his son, whom he is endeavouring to bring up in the way he should go:—"Sir, I bowed, and watched, and attended, and dangled upon the great man until I got into the very bowels of his confidence. Hah! got my snack of the clothing, the foraging, the contracts, the lottery-tickets, and all the political bonuses, till at length I became a much wealthier man than one-half of the golden calves I had been so long a-bowing to." So that you see members of Parliament in those days seem to have got rich by extracting "snacks" from contracts and lottery-tickets. He also describes to his son how he gained an election, viz., by bribing the electors all round. This, he says, begat a friendship between him and them which bore fruit on the day of poll. You will further find brought out in this play a conspiracy between two members of the bar, one a sergeant-at-law, in a position of dignity, to betray a client for a bribe; it is the sergeant-at-law who gets the bribe

and betrays his client. One of the good characters of the play says, "that faction and public venality are taught as measures necessary to the prosperity of the Briton and the patriot;" while the "Man of the World," the successful man, significantly remarks that all these fine principles might have done uncommonly well for the old Romans, but were very ill-adapted for the modern Britons. (Laughter.) All this, you see, is about the good old times.

I am sure that it will not be supposed that I mean to convey any oblique excuse for corruption in our own political sphere. Far from it. It seems to me that once corruption obtains away in a democratic country, free institutions at all become of very doubtful advantage, inasmuch as they only familiarise the people with the idea of hypocrisy and dishonesty as conducing to success in life. Herein is the great distinction between corruption in an aristocratic or despotic government, and corruption in a democracy. In the former, a class only is tainted; in the latter, the whole people are demoralised. All see and know what is going on; and, what is more, can hope to participate in it. Every time a public rogue succeeds, there is not a petty village schemer throughout the country that does not secretly take heart, and look for his turn to come, when he will be enabled to cheat constituencies as well as the best of them. And the people should ever bear in mind that it is *they*, not the upper classes, who really suffer by dishonest politicians. Those who can pay most, will be best served. I have asked to be allowed to add this note, as I intended to have said something to the same effect, when touching on the subject.

If from the aristocracy we turn for a moment to the condition of the mass of the people, it is very hard indeed to say anything about them, because they were absolutely neglected and unknown. A competent authority—Phillimore—says that one in ten of the people of England was either a pauper or a felon. They were utterly debased and brutalised. It was only now and then that society got a glimpse of what they really were; when they broke out in riots, such as the Gordon riots, and then they displayed all the ferocity and debasement that could characterise a low grade of savages. It is almost impossible to depict in detail the social position of the people at this period, because they were so absolutely neglected that none cared or inquired about them. One indication of their condition, however, was encouragement they gave to crime. We have heard of bushranging in a neighbouring colony, and how the class of small settlers was supposed to favour the bushrangers. Now, in the good old times, highway robbers were an institution in England. The highwaymen were highly respected by a considerable portion of the people, were sheltered by them, and served by them as heroes. You will find in the newspapers of that day, that such a bold front were highway robbers enabled to show, not merely in the country—not in a distant bush—but in the middle of London, that it was necessary for people going to the opera, or to an evening gathering such as this, to have guards in order to see them safely home; and we read of highwaymen in the middle of London and other fashionable places successfully plying their trade. And this was not merely owing to the daring of the highwaymen, but because so degraded was a large proportion of the people that they regarded them as fine fellows enough till their time came and they were actually hanged. Sydney Smith, you know, once said of a neighbouring colony that no one was out of society there till he was hanged (laughter;) and so in the good old times, these highwaymen were in good repute enough among the people until they were taken from society altogether. The only way in which crime was at all kept in check was by this same Government that neglected the people and left them grovelling in ignorance and degradation, striking at it when it did come within their grasp with ruthless barbarity. You will find in the papers of that day painful details of the punishments by which it was sought to protect society. For example, in one year, at one place of execution—the Old Bailey—ninety-six persons were executed. In one day, in the Old Bailey, fifty-eight persons were sentenced to death, and nearly every morning, at the different places of execution in London, numbers of those miserable wretches were strung up; in addition to which wholesale butchery, all kinds of cruel and ferocious punishments, were freely resorted to, in order to hold in check crimes that were the result of a social state, that the institutions of the country left entirely without those remedial measures which in modern times occupy so much, and so justly public attention.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I will not dwell further on this point. This part of my subject has been, I think, sufficiently put before you, and you see it is important for us in this way to look back, because when we are told of the difficulties which we have now to contend with, and the evils that now mark our political and social state, it is important for us to see whether any novelty has happened to us, and to consider whether we are much worse or better than men were in other times. Look back to those olden times, and you see that in every respect we are better. Why, just imagine the position some of our critics, those who take such severe views of our state and prospects would have been in had they lived in that day. What would they have said then? "Here," they would say, "is an aristocracy profligate and corrupt, dominant in politics, and surrounding state affairs with an atmosphere of corruption, while the mass of the people are neglected and brutalised. Why, the case is hopeless! It is idle for us to try and stem the torrent. We have nothing to do but fold our arms, sit down and criticise evils that we are not able to contend with." That is the tone *our* critics would have adopted in that day; but it was not by adopting such a tone that real progress was made. It was by a few good-hearted and good-principled men,

proposing to themselves noble aims and just designs, uniting and struggling together with the ardour that is inspired by love of country, and continuing to struggle, too, in the face of difficulties, misrepresentation and reverses, struggling on, I say, bravely and persistently, knowing that though they could not look for complete success in that age, yet it was no small thing to maintain the good fight, and to hold aloft the light of truth and knowledge, certain as it is, though sometimes dimmed, to be caught up and reflected from age to age.

But now, Mr. Mayor, and ladies and gentlemen, it will be said that we ought to compare ourselves, not with a century ago, but with the present day. I think that is very true. I merely glance at these things to show you that when we hear people refer, in an authoritative way, to the good old times as something so admirable, they are talking of what they are not very well acquainted with. I quite agree that we ought to look for progress, and see how we stand in relation to other countries now. I suppose that it will not be expected of me that I should entertain comparisons with any other lands than the United States and the mother country. I think if we bear a fan-comparison to either one or the other we have no reason to despond. (Hear, hear.) Now with regard to the United States, I want to say at once that I think a casual glance will show that we are in a better and safer position. Not merely have they got some terrible problems to struggle with—for example, the negro question—but, it seems to me, that they have started on rather a false principle of democracy, and one which is bearing very bad fruits. I have no doubt they will recover the effects of their error, but they will have some trouble to go through before they settle down to a permanent and safe national life. I think they have adopted a false principle of democracy in laying down—as was laid down by Jefferson and since adopted by some of the most important political parties in that country—in laying down the principle, that the will of the people is not merely to be the rule of government,—all must admit that—but that the will of the people is, in fact, the rule of right and wrong. I think the laying down of such a principle has borne lamentable fruits in that country. (Hear, hear.) That principle labours under this disadvantage—it is not true; it is false. Not only no individual, but no number of people have the right to set up their will as the rule of right and wrong. Take the case of an individual. Has any man a right to say that he intends to guide himself by his mere will, and by it determine what is right and what is wrong? Not for a moment. If it is not right for him, it is not right for a million men, or twenty million men. (Hear.) Mind, I distinguish between accepting the will of the people as the rule of government, and laying it down as indicating the distinction between right and wrong. The two things are quite different. The United States have, I think, then, fallen into that radical error, and it will be found to entail—as it has already—some seriously bad consequences. No doubt, however, they will work through, and I would prognosticate for that country a great future; but I think they will have to pass through some severe public sufferings and difficulties, all owing to that false doctrine, which seems to have very much clouded in the popular mind the great truth that men, both individually and collectively, ought always to remember that they are subject to a Higher Power, and that no number of people have a right to disregard the dictates of honesty and truth, or to scorn the voice of wisdom. (Applause.)

Well, now, if we come to the mother country, I am equally ready to maintain the argument here; but, before we consider the condition of England, I have something which I wish to lay clearly before you. I think that, when we are considering the condition and prospects of Victoria, we ought to direct our attention, not so much to particular political difficulties or dangers, as to the general question of how we stand with regard to that great principle on which the safety of nations depends. Now, what is that principle? What is the great problem on which the success or failure of national life in our age depends? I maintain that it will be found to consist in combining the social tendencies of the age with its political tendencies, so that, instead of any antagonism being excited between them, they will act and react beneficially on one another, and by their mutual action assist the progress of both. Now, in so far as any nation does this, in so far as it combines the social tendencies of the age with the political, in so far it will be a success as regards national life. In so far as any nation fails to do this, dangers will be in its path. And I must be allowed to say that I think how to do this well is by no means an easy problem to solve. I do not at all agree with some politicians who are of opinion that they have nothing to do but let "everything take its course, and then everything will be right. I do not agree with that view, and I will tell you why. If we look at what we see going on about us we will notice two great tendencies at work in the world, particularly among the Anglo-Saxon race. One is the tendency of civilisation to heap up wealth, to the accumulation of capital, to the making of millionaires, and to the spread of luxury: the other is the tendency, which is visible everywhere, to democratic equality. Now, the first tendency, the tendency to the heaping up of wealth and the increase of luxury, is visible enough in England, America, and here. The second tendency towards democratic equality you may see throughout the world. It is dominant in England; it is powerful, though for the present held in check, in France; it is agitating the whole of the Continent; it is brooding uneasily over the face of Russia. There are, therefore, these two great tendencies working together, especially in Anglo-Saxon communities, and each is apt to run into a dangerous excess. The tendency to accumulate wealth—as will clearly appear from the mother country—is obviously apt to run into a perilous extreme, viz., by accumulating and leaving accumulated enormous sums of money in a few hands. The tendency to

democratic equality is also apt to run into another dangerous extreme, viz., the attempt to realise in practice an ideal of absolute equality,—that, I am afraid, will be found in itself impossible. However, these are the two great tendencies, and I hope you will see clearly the view I wish to present to you. These are the two great tendencies most powerful in this age, and among the Anglo-Saxon race. Now, the grand problem for our time, and especially for a community such as ours, is so to combine these two tendencies that they may act beneficially on each other; that they may qualify rather than obstruct one another; that each may mitigate what may be faulty in the other; and that so you may avoid provoking between them a dangerous conflict which, once it is provoked, must end either in the throwing back of civilisation, as in Mexico, or the eclipse of democracy, as in France.

Premising that view, let us come now to the mother country; and I am sure I need not tell you, that I would not for a moment desire to say a word in depreciation of that grand country from which we spring, with which we are identified, and with which also we all trust to be long and long connected. (Loud and continued applause.) That country, by the service it has rendered to the cause of progress, has established claims to the gratitude of mankind, which will never be forgotten so long as civilisation and enlightenment exist among men. You will not for a moment imagine, that, in criticising the condition of our loved motherland, I have any other object or desire than to consider seriously and reasonably whether it is true that our condition is so bad in comparison. I want to consider whether *it is true*, that when you take our social state, and compare it with that of the mother country, we have any cause to despair, and whether these severe criticisms we frequently hear launched against our country are justified by fact or not. Now, take the great feature of English business life—the great system of factories, and the wealth that springs from that system. If you look closely to the actual working of that which produces such great results as regards the accumulation of capital, I think you will see that it is eminently unsatisfactory and dangerous. You have millions of people in the old country toiling away in the factories, engaged in sustaining that industry that has spread its results all over the world, that has achieved such wonders and accumulated such wealth, and yet this people themselves, these millions of toilers, are to a great extent in a state of semi-barbarity, (hear, hear) all day long working away, the living appendages to the great machines that human ingenuity has invented. They have no idea of home life or home virtues—at least, the great majority of them have none, and can have none. The places where they sleep are not entitled to be called homes;—places where men, women, and children congregate for short intervals of sleep in their life's toil at the mill,—the men frequently resorting to stimulants, or to debasing pleasures to give them some change from the ceaseless monotony of labour, and the women and children of the family left unheeded and degraded. You think that is strong language, perhaps; but just allow me to read an extract from an authority which you will not suspect of over-statement—a short extract as to the condition of those millions of Englishmen who are working this great system of factories. I read from the report of Mr. Baker, inspector of factories for 1865, an official, you will see—a man who looked into the question merely as a matter of business, and of course with no wish or desire to exaggerate what he might see. He says:—"Most of the workshops of this great commercial country have fallen into the inevitable track of competitive industry when unrestricted by law, namely, to cheapen prices by the employment of women and children—in the first instance, to increase production by protracted hours of work, without regard to age, sex, or physical capability, or to the need of social requirements. Thus we have thousands of the working-classes in a state of semi-barbarity—parents who appear to have little or no natural affection, fathers who are wholly sensual, mothers who are without domestic knowledge, children utterly ignorant and without obedience, and masters who are not perhaps regardless, but who have never duly considered the consequences of congregations formed of such materials." And another equally good authority, the *Quarterly Review*—the great conservative organ of England—for April, 1866, says that there are *a million and a-half* of children, young persons, and women engaged in manufacturing employments, &c., "subjected to an excess of physical toil and an amount of premature exertion ruinous to their health, fatal in many instances to their lives, and depriving them of every opportunity of relaxation, and of the means of education and mental improvement." Now, as you may well imagine this dangerous state of affairs, millions of the working classes in such a condition on the one hand, and men making rapid fortunes by the toil of those millions on the other; all this is not going on without some serious movements in the popular mind—in the minds of these people—as to what the meaning of it is, and as to whether this condition of things is altogether a fail one. And you may guess the intensity of that feeling—you may form some idea of the depth and force with which a sense of injustice has penetrated the minds of the masses in England by the revelations of the "Trade Unions' Commission," of which we all heard a little time ago. You had there proved on undoubted evidence that the intelligent working people of England, steady English workmen, in large numbers, deliberately engaged in schemes for assassinating and murdering men whom they supposed they had grievances against. This "Trade Unions' Commission" revealed that a system was adopted by the working classes in England which was compared, and not inaptly, to the Thuggism of India. But the real explanation—nobody would say justification—of such things is to be found in the shocking inequality of the social state in which

these men find themselves. (Applause.)

Now, if you turn from the manufacturing population of England to the agricultural population—if you turn to the smiling fields of England which form such an admirable topic for poets, and on which so much beautiful poetry has been written, I venture to assert that there are few among us who really know what the condition of the agricultural population in England is. However, if you refer to works of undoubted credit—in particular, I allude to the treatise on "Political Economy" by Professor Faweett, a book of unquestionable authority, you will find the condition of the English labourer there described to be that of penury and semi-starvation for the whole of his life, he and his family struggling from morning to night for the sake of getting a mere living, and that not a living such as the people of this country would call a living (cheers,) but enough just to keep body and soul together. That eminent master of political economy strikingly puts the condition of the agricultural classes of England when he says, that if those classes were made slaves to-morrow it would be for the interest of their masters to feed them better than they are now fed. (Hear, hear.) This is not all. There is one feature of the condition of the agricultural population of the mother country which really passes belief, or certainly would pass belief, unless it were evidenced by testimony which does not admit of doubt. Political economy, you know, has declared against small farms; at least, the point has been much disputed among political economists, but the weight of authority seems to be against small farms in the mother country. The result is, that the peasantry in the agricultural counties of England have gradually, for some years back, been subjected to the process of being driven off from their cottages and homes, and turned into what are called open villages, where they live congregated together in wretchedness, to be trooped out every morning to till those smiling fields. Now, I say, you would scarcely believe that state of affairs without testimony that did not admit of doubt, and I will read you a short extract from the same authority I gave you before, I mean the *Quarterly Review*, this time for July, 1867. You will recollect that the *Quarterly Review* is not merely the great conservative authority of England, but is the organ of the landed gentry, and also a publication of undoubted weight and respectability. Now, let me read to you a description which this *Quarterly Review*, at so late a period as July, 1867, gives of the condition of millions of the agricultural population of England:—

"The system (that system of turning people off the farms) to which we refer is that peculiar organisation of rural industry known as the Agricultural Gang, and which prevails extensively in Lincolnshire, Huntingdonshire, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Nottinghamshire, and in a more limited degree in the counties of Bedford, Rutland, and Northampton. \* \* \* \* In this reclaimed portion of England, farm-houses, barns, and stables, sufficient for all the requirements of a prosperous agriculture, were erected. The cattle of the farm were housed in comfort, but no thought was taken of the labouring man. No cottages were built for his accommodation, and, as he could not reside on the land where his services were required, he had to submit to the hard necessity of rising an hour or two earlier than he otherwise would, and of walking, perhaps, miles to his work. On those estates on which the tenant was so fortunate as to secure some humble tenement to shelter him, he was dispossessed of it as speedily as possible, lest he should one day become a pauper and a burthen to the parish, and he was driven to find a home where and how he could. One of the worst results of this mistaken policy on the part of some great landed proprietors is the existence of these large 'open' villages, common to the midland counties and eastern parts of England. The aspect of these villages is generally repulsive in the extreme. The result is an aggregation of wretched hovels; the houses are low, the rents high, and they afford the most miserable accommodation. These villages constitute what may be termed the penal settlements of the surrounding neighbourhood, and to them the scum of the country flows as by a natural affinity, and they afford a natural asylum for every man who has lost his character, and for every woman who has forfeited her virtue. The faculty of making little children work is the peculiar art of the gang-master, and he obtains his living by pressing his gang to the very utmost of their strength, his object being to extort the greatest possible quantity of labour for the smallest possible remuneration. He is thus, by the very condition of his occupation, a hard task-master; for he must realise a profit on every woman, young person, and child, whom he employs. The gang-master is frequently stigmatised as a slave-driver, and the system has been denounced as little better than negro bondage. If the whip is not employed, other modes of compulsion are resorted to; and one of the most painful facts elicited by the Commissioners' inquiries is, that children are occasionally compelled to work in the gangs for two or three hours longer than adults." I should tell you that this is a comment upon an official document presented to Parliament, so that we have not merely the high authority of the *Review*, but the fact that it is based on official reports to Parliament. "Gang-masters are generally men of indolent and drinking habits, and not unfrequently of notorious depravity. They are described as having almost the entire control of the children in every district where the system prevails. These men collect their gangs very early in the morning, and the scene when 500 or 600 women, boys, and, girls assemble at early dawn, to be marshalled by their respective gangs-men, and led off in different directions to their work, is described as most revolting. There are to be seen youths who have never known the restraints of parental discipline, or the humanising influences of a respectable home; girls depraved by constant association with some of the worst characters of their sex; married

women who prefer the rude independence of the fields to the restraints of domestic life; little children who should be receiving their first lesson in the village school, instead of imbibing those of premature and certain vice; and, above all, the gang-master, often hoary with years, too, certainly profligate in character, '*corruptas simul et corruptor*,' and, therefore, more disposed to encourage obscene language than to check it. As it is important to the gang-master that the whole of his flock should arrive at the scene of their labour quickly and simultaneously, the pace at which the gang drives is trying to the strongest. When driving is found ineffectual, the younger children are tempted to over-exert themselves by the promise of sweetmeats. The ages at which young children commence work, and the distances they have to walk, or rather to run, before they begin the labours of the day, are astounding. Eight appears to be the ordinary age at which children of both sexes join in the common gang, although seven is not unusual, and instances are mentioned in which children only six years of age were found regularly at work." (Cries of "Hear, hear!")

Here, then, you have undoubted testimony of what the condition of a large portion of the agricultural population of England is. I must just glance, before I leave this topic, at another striking proof of what the condition of the mass of the people is. It is a very short fact—a very small one; it is based on a few figures very short and precise, but terribly telling. It is found by careful inquiry, and statistics kept for a series of years, that the children of the upper classes in Great Britain die at the rate of twenty per cent, under the age of five. But you must, of course, recollect that children of the upper classes often do not come of a very healthy stock, and are not as much in the open air as they ought to be; therefore, they have difficulties of their own to contend with. But the children of the working classes of Great Britain, taken as a whole, under the age of five, die at the rate of fifty per cent., or more than double the rate of the children of the upper classes. I need not point out to you the significance of that fact. It means that double the number of children of the humbler classes die through sheer want, misery, and neglect. It is found that in ten years, according to calculation, 1,150,000 children die, which if they had been taken proper care of, if their parents had had the proper means to look after them, would have lived. This most pregnant fact I take from Professor Faweett. It is, indeed, a most startling fact, hut still, more startling is it to find that political economists say, that after all it is not of so very much consequence, and not really to be very much deplored, because if they lived there would be nothing for them to do. (Applause, mingled with laughter.) Is not the fact significant? If you could get a detailed account of all the misery and wretchedness, vice and recklessness, fathers driven to despair, mothers broken-hearted, children languishing in neglect—if you could get all drawn out before you that that short fact indicates, I think you would be apt to be more contented with this country of Australia. (Cheers.) I have quoted from a political economist just now, and I will trouble you with one more short extract from another authority on the same subject. I am going to quote to you an observation of Dr. Arnold, late head master of Rugby school, a divine of eminence, a scholar of great accomplishments, a man not accustomed to take violent or extreme views, but who looked fairly at things as they were presented to his notice. He says:—"Men do not think of the fearful state in which we are living; if they could be once brought to notice and to appreciate the evil, I should not even yet despair that the remedy may be found and applied, even though it is the solution of the most difficult problem ever yet proposed to man's wisdom, and the greatest triumph over selfishness ever yet required of his virtue. It seems to me that people are not enough aware of the monstrous state of society, absolutely without a parallel in the history of the world, with a population poor, miserable, and degraded in body and mind, as much as if they were slaves, and yet called free men. And the hopes entertained by many of the effects to be wrought by new churches and schools, While the social evils of their condition are left uncorrected, appear to be utterly wild" And there is one further consideration about the condition of this miserable population who are toiling away in the manner I have indicated, and it is this, that these people, through all their life's struggle, have no hope. Now, a man in this and any other country may and will, I have no doubt, have difficulties to contend with; he will here as well as elsewhere require the exercise of energy and industry to succeed in life—but at least he has hope. In all his struggles, toils, and labours he can look forward to something. When he thinks of his wife and family, he feels that by working for them he can secure something for them—some end. But the great majority of the working classes in the agricultural districts of England have no hope whatever but the work-house. They barely keep themselves alive by their toil so long as they are able to work, and they have no refuge—nothing to keep life in them when they become past work and are decrepit with old age—no refuge but the workhouse. And this is such a recognised institution in the old country that it is quite a matter of careful business inquiry to determine to what particular parish a pauper belongs, so that paupers found in one parish to which they do not belong are at once shifted over to that on which they can be saddled. They are regarded as encumbrances to be disposed of. Somebody must keep them—they cannot help that—but it is a strict business matter to say where they can be put away best, and the greatest efforts are made by each parish to get rid of as many as possible. Now, do you know what kind of homes these union workhouses are, to which such numbers of persons go in their old age? Have you any idea of what they are? Just let me read a short account of the subject, but before I do so let me give you a few figures, for it is important to bring the circumstances clearly to mind. The average of paupers

annually maintained in this way in workhouses in England, for the ten years ending in 1860, was 1,109,275. That is the yearly average, and the sum paid for keeping them alive was from £6,000,000 to £7,000,000 a year. The total spent in those ten years, in keeping this host of paupers from starvation, was £92,285,965. Here let me read you a short extract, to show what kind of home these people have, and from an authority as good as any I have hitherto given. And in selecting authorities to bring before you, I have been anxious to get such as could not be suspected of any bias, or of presenting any unreasonable or enthusiastic views one way or another. I read to you now from *The Times*, the leading journal of England, and not given to depreciating that country:—"There is hardly in all the earth a sadder sight than the multitudes of from 300 to 1000 shut up in workhouses. Broken hearts and fortunes, high spirits still untamed, minds in ruin and decay, good natures corrupted into evil, cheerful souls turned to bitterness, youth just beginning to struggle with the world, and vast masses of childhood are there subjected, not to the educated, the gentle and the good, but to the rude, the rough, the coarse, the ignorant and narrow-minded. The qualifications for the governor of a workhouse are those we expect in a gaoler or a policeman, or the keeper of wild beasts." And, Mr. Mayor, and ladies and gentlemen, just think for one moment of there being in that condition, subject to that bondage—with such places for their home for life—a number of the people of England equal to the number of the whole populations of Victoria and South Australia put together. It is a terrible fact that you have, in the condition thus described by the leading journal of England, a number of people equal to the whole populations of those two great and flourishing communities. (Applause.)

And now, ladies and gentlemen, to hurry on. Perhaps, you will say to me, "But has not wealth greatly increased of late in England? Do we not hear of the wonderful expansion of trade; the vast growth of industry?" That is all, undoubtedly, true; there is not a doubt about it. But that is one of the most serious facts in the whole matter. The increase of wealth all the time has been, on its side, almost incredible. For example, in the year 1849, the exports of England amounted in value to £60,000,000; in 1861, just twelve years after, those very exports reached to £120,000,000, so that, in these twelve years the commerce of the country had doubled; and, indeed, in the united Kingdom on every side you see evidence of the accumulation of capital and heaping up of wealth, in a manner and to a degree unprecedented in previous ages. In the last century, when Pitt proposed his legacy duty, he only provided for fortunes up to £1,000,000. No provision was made for fortunes beyond a million, because it was impossible that there would be any beyond that sum: but now, every year you read of men in the old country leaving fortunes of a million, and beyond a million. In the great cities of England, you see on all sides evidence of the accumulation of boundless wealth, and the growing up of luxurious classes who weary themselves only in the effort to spend their riches. The country is brimful of capital—running over. They scatter it abroad—to build railways in Russia, for public works in Canada, or to tunnel the Alps, They would send any quantity of it to us here if we would only give them their own terms, and take it as they like to give it. (Laughter.) They do not know what to do with their wealth, and so it goes on year after year heaping up; but the serious point is, that pauperism, misery and degradation go on *increasing* unceasingly as well. Refer to the best authorities and you will find that pauperism in England is greatly on the increase latterly. Indeed, the conflict between the two social influences thus at work, is strikingly illustrated by the telegrams that from time to time convey to us the mail news; the same mail that tells us that money is so plentiful that the owners do not know what to do with it, also tells us that the people are rioting for bread. Lately, we read of money being cheap beyond precedent,—but, at the same time, we also read of people being found in the garrets of London starved to death. Why, at this very time when we here are living in comparative independence, comparative wealth, and with plenty of good employment, it has been calculated that there will be, in one district of London alone, some 180,000 heads of families, not only without work and without means of living, but utterly without hope of getting either one or the other to keep their families from starvation. And this in the midst of all the wealth!

I have often thought that from one scene in London you may get an apt picture of the social state of England. In the great cities at home you always may find a number of persons who are outside the pale, as it were, of all the agencies of relief,—the very outcasts of civilised life, they are not reached by the hand of mercy at all. In London there is a large number of such persons; they keep prowling about all day to live as best they can, and they slink away at night to sleep wherever they can. Go any night into St. James's Park and you will find some two or three hundred of these miserables trying to find a refuge till morning. There they are, the disowned of the social state; broken-down old men, boys and girls, young in years but long familiar with wretchedness,—miserable women—nestling under the shrubs or crouching beneath the scats or behind the trees—somewhere to rest and wait for morning. And all around them rise the noble palaces of the proudest and wealthiest aristocracy of the world, lit up with splendour and dazzling with all the brilliancy that the resources of a luxurious age can impart. In that little scene you have an apt illustration of the condition of English society—the mountains of wealth and depths of poverty by which it is distinguished. And it is these extremes that constitute the difficulty of England; the difficulty of England in working out that problem which I have

stated, namely, how to combine the social with the political tendencies of the age. For when you come to add, as the mother country has added and must have added, democracy to such a state of society, you surely propound a tremendous problem for any people to solve. If there is truth in the view I have endeavoured to present of what will constitute the success or failure of national life in our age, which country, I ask you,—England or Australia—has the best chance of working through? Not that I would at all wish to indicate any despair of the condition of the mother country; but yet, seriously, when we find people pointing to our difficulties, exaggerating our dangers, telling us that they despair of our country, and that they long to take their children away to the old country, I think they show that they are not aware of the real difficulties that old country has to contend with, or the real immunities which we enjoy. (Cheers.) For you must recollect, that there is this wide distinction between our condition and that of England, viz.,—that let them there do their best, as no doubt they will, act as energetically as they please, let all classes unite to face their social difficulties in the best way, yet the fact remains—there are those crushing difficulties formed and matured among them—difficulties that with all their efforts they may possibly not be able to adequately solve—while at the same time we are free from those difficulties. No doubt they will gradually present themselves here; but it is one thing to have precipitated against one another two hostile tendencies, each fully developed, and it is another thing to deal with them as they are both growing up together. It will, I imagine, be not impossible, by a wise foresight, to indirectly mitigate the tendency to that alarming extreme of social fortune that is so dangerously manifest in England. We have the matter to some extent at least in our own hands. We have our destiny a good deal under our own control, and if we do go wrong and do fail, it will not be because of difficulties that we cannot overcome, but because we ourselves are wanting, and do not bear ourselves in a manner becoming the citizens of a free country. (Cheers.) It will, I say, be entirely our own fault, and owing to a want of patriotic feeling on the part of our own people. Surely there is a great difference in being in a country so situated, surrounded by the elements of success, where all we want is to evoke a sound tone of public feeling (cheers,) and having our lot cast where, be as patriotic as we please, we would still be paralysed by social difficulties such as I have adverted to.

Now, you see, Mr. Mayor, and ladies and gentlemen, the view which I endeavour to present to you. If I had time, I ought now, by right, in order to complete my subject with exactness, to go into the condition of Victoria. (Loud cries of "Go on.") Well, ladies and gentlemen, I have now been engaging your attention for nearly an hour and a-half. (A voice: "Never mind that—take another hour and a-half," and cheers.) I am sure I am very much flattered at the attention you have shown; but, perhaps, Mr. Mayor, and ladies and gentlemen, I had better not go into details on this part of the subject, for two reasons. One is, that for the purposes of my argument—which you see is as to the relative prospect of our national success as compared with England—you know of yourselves enough of our condition. You see our elements of prosperity. You know that any man with energy, industry, and honest conduct, in any position, can, relying on himself, achieve not only competence but wealth. Not one of us is doomed to live outside the pale of citizenship and society. We all know enough to support my argument. And further, if you will look at our programme, you will see that the reverend gentleman who is to follow me on this day fortnight will deal with the question of "The Land we Live in," and you will probably hear from him in detail, and with greater ability than I possess, a discussion of the aspect of the question that you desire. But though I do not enlarge on our condition, you must not at all imagine that I believe we are without dangers and difficulties. I believe nothing of the kind. We have considerable difficulties facing us, and dangers which demand prudence and care to avoid. I think that to indulge in a blind spirit of self-congratulation would be as dangerous for the community as it would be to give way to that craven tone of distrust that, by a considerable number, is made a mere excuse for want of patriotism and public spirit. I do not wish you at all to believe that I mean to say that we have no difficulties, in fact nothing to do, but to do as we like. On the contrary, I think it behoves us, if we are at all concerned for Australia and the prospects of those who come after us, to look closely to our weak points and endeavour to face them.

And what is the greatest difficulty we have to meet? I fully believe it is that which I have glanced at more than once. It is not that the evil elements among us are of themselves so dangerous. There are such in every age and among every people. But the real difficulty is, that we have not got yet, I am afraid, a class of men who are interested in the state, who have a patriotic regard for it—who really feel for Australia what men in other lands feel for their country. If that were not so, we never could have these heartless criticisms and satires on our condition that a portion of the public seem absolutely to enjoy. But these men look upon Australia as merely a resting-place. They regard some other land as their country, and while they claim here the rights, they scorn to undertake the duties of citizenship. That is a real difficulty—a real danger in our condition. And to whom, now, do I chiefly look for the remedy? I must say—though yet a young man myself—that I mainly look to the young men of the country—those who, if not born here, have been bred here, or at least are fixed here with their families, and who do not look beyond Australia for a home. I look forward to this class as forming a real body of Australian citizens, who will safely guide this land through dangers that may beset us. I believe I am now

addressing some such, and let me say that it is but rarely in the world's history that men have an opportunity of taking a part in shaping their country's destiny. Generally, men find their nation with history made and fate fixed. In older lands, when they would excite the patriotic feeling of the people, they remind them of their ancestors. But we are the ancestors here. (Cheers.) We are the ancestors of this country, and when I say this, I speak of the whole people of this Australian continent. With us it lies to make or to mar the future of Australia. Never was there an opportunity so grand, nor a responsibility so serious. A great Grecian orator and statesman has said, in a moment of enthusiasm, that the whole world was the monument of great men. The idea is grand, though perhaps a little exaggerated. We may give it a limited application here, and say that if we of this generation would only excite some patriotic feeling, and strive to leave to those who will come after us good institutions, just principles, and a sound social state, we may look forward to the whole future of Australia forming a noble and abiding monument to the labours of us, its real citizens. (Loud applause, during which the lecturer resumed his seat.)

On the motion of Judge BINDON, seconded by the Rev. A. F. ORNSTEIN, a vote of thanks to the Lecturer was agreed to by acclamation.

It was duly acknowledged, and, after a vote of thanks to the Right Worshipful the Mayor for presiding had been similarly carried and acknowledged, the audience dispersed.

Fergusson and Moore, Printers, 48 Flinders Lane East, Melbourne.

**Loyalty, Royalty: and the Prince's Visits. A Lecture**

*Delivered at the Princess' Theatre, Melbourne, on July 12, 1869,*

By the HON. A. MICHIE, Q.C.

Being the Sixth of a Series of Lectures under the Auspices of the Early Closing Association.

*Published by Direction of the Committee.*

Price Sixpence.

Still Well And Knight, Printers Melbourne: Collins Street. 1869.

## **Loyalty, Royalty: and the Prince's Visits.**

The sixth lecture in aid of the Early Closing Association was delivered on Monday, July 12, at the Academy of Music (Princess's Theatre). The lecturer was the Hon. A. Michie, Q.C., who took for his subject "Loyalty, Royalty, and the Prince's Visits," and whose great popularity as a lecturer attracted an audience not only sufficiently numerous to crowd the theatre and its avenues, but also comprising a large number of gentlemen distinguished in politics and the learned professions. Among them were the Hon. J. M'Culloch (Chief Secretary), the Hon. Geo. Higinbotham, the Hon. C. Gavan Duffy, his Honour Judge Bindon, the Rev. Dr. Bromby, Professor M'Coy, the mayor of Melbourne (Mr. T. Moubray), Mr. F. Wilkinson (master in equity), and several members of the Legislative Assembly. The chair was occupied by the Hon. C. J. Jenner, M.L.C.

The CHAIRMAN having briefly introduced the hon and learned lecturer,

Mr. MICHIE (who was heartily cheered on his first appearance, and who came forward amidst deafening applause) said:—Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen,—If we ask of Dr. Johnson the Question "What is loyalty?" we find his answer to be rather bald, and meagre, and by no means dispensing with the necessity for further inquiry. He tells us that it is "firm and faithful adherence to a prince." He cites various instances of the application of the term by some of our leading writers. Besides Shakspeare and Clarendon, he quotes Milton and Butler, in two well-known passages—

*"Abdiel, faithful found—  
Unshaken, unseduced, unterrified—  
His loyalty he kept."*

Butler is in another strain—

*"For loyalty is still the same,  
Whether it win or lose the game;  
True as the dial to the sun,  
Although it be not shone upon."*

You remember that Butler, in his *Hudibras*, is the champion of the Royalists as opposed to the

Parliamentarians, in the great civil war generated of Charles the First's efforts to make himself an absolute and irresponsible monarch. In the lines I have just quoted, loyalty is represented as playing a game against some other power which I must suppose Butler would have us to understand to be disloyalty, as represented in the persons of the Parliamentarians. His metaphor, howsoever ingenious it may be thought, is nevertheless equivocal. If he meant to tell us that sincere and genuine loyalty—as I understand the sentiment, and as I shall hereafter attempt to explain it—is, or ought to be, true and faithful in its expression, irrespective of any hope of favour or advantage to ourselves, I am quite ready to subscribe to the position he here lays down. But if, instead of the meaning I have suggested, he would have loyalty to be a mere blind, unquestioning sentiment, I at once demur; for what would this be but a man surrendering his reason, his dignity, his independence, nay, even his very existence as a human creature, at the feet of another human creature like himself; and all, probably, for naught? The best specimen, perhaps, of such a virtue as this is that afforded us by the Highland man's extremely loyal wife, who coaxingly requested her husband to come out and be hanged, to please the laird—an affectionate request which Donald, not seeing it exactly as she did under the particular circumstances, rather lingered about complying with. This Highland wife's school of loyalty, then, I reject, as absurd in itself, and out of harmony with the nineteenth century. (Cheers.) And yet, I think, as we proceed we shall see that even a devotion like this points to a kind of sentiment which has not only existed and flourished, but which will naturally grow out of any patriarchal system of government in any country. We need hardly, indeed, go farther than to the admirable pictures of society in the pages of Walter Scott to learn the character of that devotion of clansmen to their chief which, as a last surviving relic of the feudal state of society, was common in the Highlands of Scotland until a comparatively recent date. Before commerce had dethroned force, different portions of society were either at war with each other, or they only preserved peace by constant readiness for war. In such times peculiar strength, prowess, or talent, would necessarily make many individuals natural kings, chiefs, leaders of men. The mutual attachment, springing out of the mutual interests of protector and protected, must have been the first foundation of the sentiment of loyalty. But when all the conditions of society are changed, when justices of the peace and constables come to be invented, such a loyalty becomes rather a tradition and habit of thought than a strong, living, active principle. Modern civilisation and such loyalty as this could hardly get on well together. But civilisation which rested on industry would grow impatient with the loyalty which fed on rapine, and would put it down with any instrument that came to hand, as Baillie Nicol Jarvie met the claymores of Rob Roy's caterans—with the novel, but effective, and, may we not add, the highly civilised weapon of the red hot poker. (Laughter.) I believe then that this blind and unquestioning loyalty, which was based either on personal attachment or on superstitious veneration for absolute monarchs, passed away with the society which produced it, and which could alone give it nourishment and strength. If, however, this devoted and patriarchal species of loyalty exists only in history, or in states of society similar to that which once obtained in the Highlands of Scotland, it is, nevertheless, observable that a loyalty of some sort still exists, for is it not constantly referred to in public addresses and in after-dinner speeches? I would, then, respectfully ask you to accompany me whilst I endeavour to ascertain what is the apparent nature of much of this loyalty in our day, and what its apparent depth or strength. In our own recent case, the immediate object of the sentiment was a young man between three and four and twenty years old, the descendant, and to us, in some sort, the living representative of a line of princes, some of them illustrious, and some of them rather the opposite, in any respectable sense. (Loud cheers.) Of the talents or the endowments of this young Prince, even were it becoming to discuss them, we are not in a position to speak with any degree of confidence. If, however, we have no actual knowledge that his intellectual qualities are greatly above, neither have we any reason for concluding that they are below the average of those of other well-educated young men of the same age. Thus much, however, alone seems tolerably certain—that on the Duke of Edinburgh's first arrival here, we knew little more of him than that he was the second son of our Queen and the captain of the Galatea. And yet, to welcome and enthusiastically greet this young man, there assembled here in Melbourne, on that first day of his landing, something not far short, perhaps, of 50,000 souls. At the same time, throughout the length and breadth of the land the population were equally on the alert to hail his coming, when it should become his pleasure to appear among them. Now, I think, we thus see at the outset that loyalty may be felt, or the demeanour that passes for loyalty may, at any rate, be manifested in great measure independently of any moral or intellectual qualities in the object thus regarded. It is this consideration which makes the whole subject as perplexing as it is interesting to many minds. How comes it that a simple, gentlemanly, unaffected young man, possessing the one mysterious advantage of Royal birth, should drive a reflecting, sober people frantic with the desire to gaze on him? (Laughter.) What did we gaze at, and why did we gaze? (Renewed laughter.) I ask this question because I think we must all be distinctly conscious that we cannot explain the interest we take in a prince exactly as easily as we are able to account for the interest we feel in some eminent man, who has distinguished himself in any way in his generation. For this latter person, independent of and apart from any factitious considerations, we are conscious of entertaining a respect as rooted as it is involuntary and sincere. For instance, a Nelson gains a

naval victory, or a Wellington a land action, which may change the balance of power in Europe; a Garibaldi, by the fascination of his individual enthusiasm and bravery, infuses a new national life into his countrymen; a first Napoleon annihilates thrones, and becomes a maker of kings—in all these cases we have exhibitions of power. These exhibitions deeply affect the interests of millions of people. The names of the principal actors are in everybody's mouth, and are mixed up in all political discussions. The minds of the millions become heated as they discuss the qualities or probable purposes of these conspicuous persons, and nothing is more natural than the desire to see those by whom such remarkable actions have been done, and of whom so much has been said and heard. So with other forms of power. A Gladstone or a Bright sways opinion in the greatest deliberative Assembly in the world. Their words may affect human interests throughout the globe. A Tennyson wells over with poetry which sounds the depths of all human hearts; a Dickens is the master of our laughter and our tears, as he passes before us a portrait gallery now as familiar to us as that of Shakspeare. In all these cases we delight to look on, and strive to know still more, and as far as our eyes and ears will help us—and no other knowledge ever seems equal to that we get through our eyes and ears—the remarkable persons who do these exceptional and extraordinary things. All this is very intelligible. But many people demand (some of our English critics among them)—"Is it equally intelligible that we should throng and crowd together, and almost choke each other with dust (laughter), and raise triumphal arches, and make gold trowels, and pawn our pianos, and go into general convulsions (prolonged laughter and cheers), on account of one whose pre-eminence consists of the accident of rank alone?" One is reminded, whilst urging such an inquiry, of the Barber's soliloquy on we nobleman,' in Beaumarchais's *Marriage of Figaro*, "What has your lordship done to earn all this?" "Vous, vous êtes donné la peine de naître." ("You took the trouble to be born.") (Continued laughter.) Are we provided with much more satisfactory explanations than that of the Barber? Now these and similar questions have been put by our English critics about ourselves, as if the conduct upon which they were commenting was something peculiar to colonists, and unknown in the mother-country. One able and caustic writer in the London *Spectator* went the length of saying some twelve months back, that we plainly had "Prince upon the brain." (Cheers and laughter.) I therefore propose to show you, before I proceed to inquire further into the nature of this moral phenomenon, that what some English journalists have called "the extravagance of our enthusiasm" in connexion with the Duke of Edinburgh's first visit to these shores, by no means exceeds English extravagance on like occasions. Who can forget the popular enthusiasm in England on the occasion of the marriage of the Prince of Wales? And if English journalists are at a loss for British parallels to some of the more emphatic of our loyal demonstrations, such parallels may easily be found scattered up and down in English memoirs and diaries. What can well be more ludicrous than the account Miss Burney—afterwards Madame D'Arblay, one of the ladies in waiting on Queen Charlotte—gives of the manner of George the Third's bathing at Weymouth. Whenever he went out to take his morning dip in the sea the people used to lie in wait for him, and a second bathing-machine, with a band in it (laughter), always pursued him into the water, the band vigorously playing. "God Save the King," until His Majesty had finished his Royal headers, and returned to land. (Roars of laughter.) Again, no obsequiousness of ours seems to exceed that described by Miss Burney as occurring on another occasion during this Weymouth visit. A deputation, consisting of the mayor and town council, waited on Queen Charlotte to present an address, congratulating her on the recent restoration of His Majesty's health. The mayor, as he approached the Queen to present the address, was whispered by gold-stick, or silver-stick, or some other stick in waiting (laughter)—the name of whose office I forget—"that the presenters of the address must kneel on one knee whilst passing Her Majesty." To the horror and consternation of the whole Court party, "the right worshipful" merely stiffly bowed, and passed on. The official stick pursued the offender, tapped him on the shoulder, and angrily whispered. You should have knelt, sir." "I can't," cries the mayor, in an agony, "I've got a wooden leg." (Prolonged laughter and cheers.) To complete the catastrophe—it must have appeared to the people of the court as if the end of the world was at hand—the whole of the councillors, taking the mayor as their standard, filed along in the same fashion; but whether from ignorance of court etiquette, or delicate respect for their chief, Miss Burney does not say. Here, then, have we equal extravagance—if that must be the word—of loyal demonstration in the mother country as in her colony. Our own acts and the home instances may very well keep each other in countenance. They are curious facts in the natural history of the human animal, and are well worthy of further examination. To say that such manifestations are peculiar to those who live under kingly government, will not account for them. In the United States a few years back, as dense, and even denser, crowds congregated in streets and assembly-rooms to look at the Prince of Wales. The feeling which brought these American crowds together could not be loyalty. What, then, was it? Was it merely that universal, yet vague feeling of curiosity which is excited by anything of which we have heard much, and know little, and would learn more? Is it that we unconsciously estimate every one, from a king down to a policeman, according to the stamp of authority which society and law have put upon them? Has this public sanction in some vague way led us to conceive of a prince, that with all the advantages of education and training any mortal can command, he will naturally have something in his own person to show for all this, and that there

must surely be some congruity and proportion between the individual himself and his most exalted station? Or is it that we throng together in thousands to look at a prince, in obedience to that infinite susceptibility to excitement within us which draws us out in thousands to welcome the arrival of a new governor, to meet an "All England Eleven," to witness an execution or a review, or even to gaze at the outside of a house said to be haunted? (Laughter.) So omnivorous is the human imagination, that there is scarcely anything lying outside its daily experience upon which it cannot be whipped up into temporary excitement: an excitement, too, frequently as superficial and fleeting as it is noisy and demonstrative. I well remember revolving this subject in my own mind on the occasion on which the Governor and the Royal Commission were at the Heads awaiting the first arrival of the Galatea. The commissioners were curiously stowed away for the night, throughout the numerous bedrooms of Mr. Adman's Queenscliff Hotel, men of all shades of politics, Loyal Liberals and Constitutionals together, within easy hail of each other. For once—

*"Opposing factions nearly wore allied,  
And thin partitions did their bounds divide."*

Ostensibly we were all here to await the coming of the Royal visitor, in order to escort him to Melbourne. What depth or earnestness of sentiment, thought I, is there at the bottom of this proceeding? In how many and in which of the commissioners' minds may the feeling most operate? Whose loyalty will keep him awake to-night? Here, like Don Quixote watching his armour, are we supposed to be watching the arrival of the Prince. How many people under this roof are seriously thinking about this business, or speculating as to what it may indicate or portend? Now that the Australias are assuming almost the proportions of independent states, a Royal personage condescends to come, or is judiciously shipped, to look at us. We are regarded at home as a somewhat democratic community; is Royalty commissioned to fascinate us by its superior morals and manners? Now that the supply of princes in Europe is so rapidly exceeding the demand—(great laughter)—may it not be that home Governments are on the look-out for "pleasant fields and pastures new" for Royal supernumeraries? (Renewed laughter.) In the midst of my reflections, which kept me awake some time—for, like Brindley, I can think most comfortably in bed—a familiar voice struck on my ear. It was that of a high legislative functionary, the rotundity and comeliness of whose figure proved that devotion to our Constitution by no means necessitated any foolish and uncalled for neglect of his own. As the energy and impatience of this high legislative voice showed me that, for the nonce, its owner was in some way, and for some moving reason or other, at present among the non-contents, curiosity drew my head out of the bed-clothes to listen. (Laughter.) What ailed him at this dead hour of the night? He soon made his case clear. "Waiter! waiter! where is my night shirt? (Great laughter.) What has become of my night-shirt?" exclaimed he. "I can't sleep without my night-shirt." (Continued laughter.) Now, I am free to admit—as they say in Parliament—that I strongly sympathised with the caller, for I labour under the same sort of infirmity myself. "Has he," thought I, "forgotten to bring a night-shirt with him, or has some fellow commissioner furtively appropriated that indispensable garment." (Fresh laughter.) In the intensity of my sympathy I was on the point of getting up and offering him my own, but prudently reflecting that it would be a tight and uncomfortable fit for him—(much laughter)—I kept it myself, and sank to sleep vaguely wondering about this mission we were all upon. Here was one of the most loyal of us, an important legislative functionary to boot, and yet his loyalty had never in my hearing imparted such moving tones to his voice as those which the loss of his bed gown extracted from him that night. (Laughter). Do I condemn or complain of this (at first sight) small querulousness on a great occasion? By no means. Which of us can say with perfect sincerity that our common creature wants have never kept fine sentiments waiting until a more convenient time? On the following day occurred other events, which showed us how we are apt to consider ourselves first and loyalty afterwards. With fear and trembling I noted this as we came up the bay. You remember that bay programme, and the now historical escorting flotilla of steamers. Perhaps some of you were on board a portion of that flotilla. If so, you will not easily forget the scene; for, on the whole, it was certainly one of the most animating and interesting the eye could rest on. The day, opening sullenly in clouds had cleared itself up; and our blue sky, and the almost equally blue waters of our bay seemed to join in the general joy. The hour had come, and the man; and as within a few minutes to one o'clock the noble [*unclear*: frige] rolled and plunged through the rip, reverently and loyally mustered our flotilla to take the Royal visitor into affectionate custody. Salutes blazed away from the Queenscliff battery, from the Victoria, and the Pharos; and the Galatea herself thundered a salute as Her Majesty's representative approached her tall side. But here, unfortunately for Captain Norman's beautifully arranged programme, the Galatea seemed to become altogether unconscious of our existence. Instead of waiting to be escorted—according to our pre-arranged plans—the frigate took to her Royal heels, and went straight ahead for Melbourne, leaving us all in the lurch. Thus this long-meditated and elaborately prepared escort was not only knocked into "a cocked hat"

at the very outset (as one figurative gentleman called it), but at the shortest notice it was converted into a hopeless chase—a chase, too, as ludicrous as that of the wooden legged man pursuing the hare, where the longer he ran the further he fell behind. (Laughter.) Never did I behold longer faces than on that occasion. I trembled for the cause of colonial loyalty. I had been for many days past a member of a commission of thirteen, consisting of judges, of Ministers (past and present), of the President of the Legislative Council, of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, of the mayor, and ex-mayor of Melbourne. Most of us had given many meetings for the exclusive purpose of making the best arrangements we could devise for receiving and entertaining with becoming respect our illustrious visitor. A very prominent portion of these arrangements consisted of this flotilla, most liberally contributed by the owners of the different steamers. Commodore Norman having previously unfolded to us on paper his impressive plans for the port and star-board lines of vessels, the time had now arrived to see how it all looked on blue water, and now the blue water knew it not. Each and every steamer seemed to come driving on, smoking away on her own particular and private account—the little *Pharos* nearly last, and apparently in the highest state of asthma, but struggling along with a "never say die" look about her intermittent paroxysms of smoke which was absolutely touching. (Laughter.) Nobody said much, so I suppose everybody thought the more. One dejected and almost spirit-crushed commissioner did, with suppressed emotion, say to me that "Such behaviour was not nice in the Prince at all." (Laughter.) I could think of no more original rejoinder than—

*"I'd excuse you, my dear, for disguising your love;  
But why do you kick us down stairs?"*

Royalty, decidedly, was not now shining on us, and we were, as it seemed to me, doing, or endeavouring to do, Butler's sun-dial under difficulties. I am disposed to think that many even moderate and unexacting people thought on this occasion that the Galatea authorities might, and even ought to have reflected that both the Government and the owners of these steamers had put themselves to much trouble and expense in the spirited exhibition of these reception courtesies, and that a loyalty to be warranted proof against any amount of contempt and indifference from its object would, possibly, in our age and generation, require a larger amount of nursing and weather-fending than it was likely to receive. Other and subsequent incidents connected with the Royal visit were calculated to excite similar reflections. On the Western tour the Prince and his suite and attendants rushed through Colac towards that day's haven of refuge, Mr. Robertson's house. Divers Colacians were known to be cruising in the neighbourhood with "a loyal address." The Prince, however, ran the blockade—the only blockade, I believe, he contrived to run throughout his country trips. (Laughter.) Did he exult? If so, I cannot but think he did not know all. Colac loyalty apparently never before received so rude a shock. A day or two after, the *Colac Observer* came out in the following startling terms—(laughter):—"The well-known loyalty of this journal—(renewed laughter)—forbids its attempting to give publicity to the bitterness of feeling openly expressed, and replied to only by an ominous silence on the part of the more guarded, who felt that an opportunity had been lost of cementing more closely the union which exists between this loyal colony and the glorious empire from which the majority of its inhabitants are privileged to hail." Now here we see what great events may from simple causes spring. (Laughter.) To save himself four or five minutes of a hot and dusty interview in Colac, the Prince had alienated a large number of persons. He is told that his few minutes' stay would have furnished an opportunity of cementing more closely this colony to the mother country. But he would not stay, and therefore, although the Colac cement may be undiminished in quantity, the "ominous silence" shows that some of the adhesive quality of the article is gone. (Laughter.) Now, we smile at this little extract from the *Colac Observer*, and I confess I laughed at it very heartily when I first read it. But let us make the Colac case our own. Suppose that, on the day of the *levée*, the Prince, at the end of the presentations, had rushed down the middle of the Exhibition-building to luncheon, and said he would not be bored with addresses at all, how would all our be-gowned and gorgeously got up presenters of addresses have looked under such portentous circumstances? Would they have felt their own cement affected? Had they, like the *Colac Observer*, done "the ominous" towards the British Empire, that self-complacent British Empire might e'en have laughed at us, as we laugh at the ominous silence of Colac. Everything is comparative. Is there any more incongruity in Colac than in Melbourne, or in Melbourne than in London, fearing for the integrity of the British Empire by reason of a Prince's impatience in one place or in another? Taking with us, then, the little indications of indifference or impatience to which I have referred as furnished from Adman's Hotel, from the bay, and from Colac, is, it too much to say that loyalty of this kind is in large measure formal and mechanical? that it more unpleasantly resembles the mere instinctive bustling and bussing of bees round their queen, than an operation of man's reason; and that withal, it is at the same time so complicated with our own self-love that it is very apt to turn absolutely sour, unless the vessel that contains it has been previously well cleaned out from

small vanities and foolish desires for personal notice? I will not, however, venture to say that I do not greatly admire or respect this noisy and demonstrative loyalty, without also giving you specific, and I trust not altogether unsatisfactory reasons, for the want of faith within me. I shall attempt, then, first to show by evidence that this bee loyalty not only almost necessarily corrupts and deforms the moral character both of the receiver and of the offerer of it, but that it is a sentiment—if sentiment we can call it—so superficial, so easily disturbed and displaced, that it affords no reliable guarantee to any sovereign that he may count upon it in any hour of need, And first for the manner in which it corrupts the character of the man who offers it. The word courtier is synonymous with everything that is hollow, insincere, and tricky in man. *Exeat aulâ qui vult esse pius* (he must go from court who would be honest). Histories, biographies, and diaries of statesmen and high officials, abound with the best authenticated anecdotes touching the absurd and contemptible situations people about courts have allowed themselves to be placed in, rather than run any, the slightest, risk of falling out of the Royal favour. I will, as my memory serves me, give you one or two of these anecdotes, to illustrate more distinctly what I here desire to convey to you. A good story is told of a king who was once curious to know which was the taller, himself or a certain courtier. "Let us measure," suggested the king. The king stood up to be measured first; but when the person who was selected to take their height came to measure the nobleman, he found it quite impossible, as he first rose on tip-toe, then crouched down, now shrugged up his shoulders to the right, then twisted himself to the left. Upon his friend afterwards asking him the reason of these unaccountable gesticulations, he replied, "I could not tell whether the King wished me to be taller or shorter than himself; and all the time I was making those odd movements I was watching his countenance to see what I ought to do." Here is another instance, not much less absurd, although it also shows that a man of a really independent spirit can sometimes show it even at court, In the memoirs of Count Grammont, it is related of Louis XIV. that, on the occasion of a dispute with one of his courtiers over a game of chess, no one of the bystanders would give an opinion. "Oh," cried the King, "here comes Count Hamilton; he shall decide which of us is in the right." "Your Majesty is in the wrong," the count replied, without looking at the board; on which the King, remonstrating with him on the impossibility of his judging till he saw the state of the game, he added, "Does your Majesty suppose that if you were in the right all these noblemen would stand by and say nothing?" If you desire, you may find plenty more such indications of the courtier character in the classes of works I have mentioned. And now, on the other hand, for the general effect on the recipient of this Kind of flattery. It evidently fosters an egotism of so peculiar, and frequently of so morbid a character, that it very often assumes even the appearance of insanity. It puts kings and princes above and beyond those conditions and sanctions of social life which surround and wholesomely limit and control the pride and vanity of ordinary men. Upon the Emperor Alexander of Russia once being offered, when in England, a glass of wine by a servant in livery, he started, it is said, as if he had trodden on a snake. The mischievous idiot King of Denmark, who married the unfortunate Caroline Matilda, the sister of our George III., among other Royal recreations, used to amuse himself by ordering people to box with him. If they refused, he punished them for disobeying the Royal commands; and if they complied and hit him too hard, he punished them for assaulting the Royal person. (Laughter.) It is an almost gross rudeness in Court etiquette to say anything to a Royal person which can possibly imply that his health is liable to disturbance like that of ordinary flesh and blood. In the *Table Talk* of Rogers, the Banker poet, he describes the following amusing incident:—"Once when in company with William the Fourth." says Rogers, "I quite forgot that it is against all etiquette to ask a sovereign about his health; and on his saying to me, 'Mr. Rogers, I hope you are well,' I replied, 'Very well, I thank your Majesty; I trust that your Majesty is quite well also.' Never was a king in greater confusion; he didn't know where to look, and stammered out, 'Yes, yes,—only a little rheumatism.'" Again, in *Raikes's Diary*, where he comments on the curious delusions of vanity under which the Fourth George at times laboured, we find the following remarkable testimony—"There is no doubt that for several years before his death, whether from early indulgence in luxury, or from a malady inherent in his family, his mind would occasionally wander, and many anecdotes have been current of the unfortunate impressions under which he laboured. After the glorious termination in 1815, of the long continental war, by the battle of Waterloo, it would not, perhaps, be unpardonable vanity in him to have thought that the English nation had mainly contributed to this great event; but he certainly at times, in conversation, arrogated to himself personally the glory of subduing Napoleon's power and giving peace to the world. It was upon one of these assumptions being reported to the sarcastic Sheridan, that he archly remarked "That is all well enough, but what he particularly, piques himself upon is the last abundant harvest." (Laughter.) We may add to Raikes by saying that this form of delusion George the Fourth inherited from his father. The latter once, on the receipt of a despatch announcing some advantage over the American colonists, then in arms against the mother country, rushed into the Queen's room excitedly, exclaiming, "Charlotte, Charlotte, I've beaten all the Americans." And when I speak of the morbid and ungovernable self-will generated in the minds of princes by the flattery of subjects, I know not where you may obtain clearer proofs of the strength and the manner of working of this feeling than from the career of this very King. I apprehend that few men possessed the domestic

virtues in larger measure than George the Third. They were the basis of his great popularity. He was a good husband, an indulgent father, a kind friend, and, moreover, a man of the simplest tastes and habits. His oft-quoted talent for making an excellent dinner off a boiled leg of mutton and turnips delighted his subjects, affording such clear proof, as it did, that a Royal stomach is human after all. One such touch of nature—even through the digestive organs—made him and all his subjects kin. Such, then, being the original personal qualities of George III., one would naturally think that he was about the least likely subject to be spoiled by the regal attributes and liabilities. And yet no man was more enslaved to a perfectly ungovernable wilfulness of character where his claim to rule was actively opposed, or even questioned. Witness his obstinate, persistent, dogged determination to continue the American war long after Lord North, his Prime Minister, would have abandoned the contest as at once unreasonable, hopeless, and condemned by all the enlightened statesmen of the day. In the mind of a man naturally kind had grown up a passionate sense of jealous authority, which could not brook the merest snow of opposition; and the destruction of thousands upon thousands of human lives on both sides was as nothing compared with the intolerable abomination of a subject having notions of taxation different from those of his king. Again, look at the manner in which this idol-worship of, princes commonly relaxes in, and sometime even obliterates from, their, minds, not only a proper regard for the opinions of others, but even the ordinary virtues of gratitude, honesty truth, and friendship. A prince too frequently comes to regard the world at large as a huge bank of pleasure, on which he may overdraw to any extent without his cheques ever being dishonoured. Why is a prince to have such a vulgar virtue as gratitude, when the mere fact of his accepting a service or benefit is, in the ethics of most courts, a quite sufficient acknowledgement and return of the service rendered? Look at the whole line of the Stuarts. Did ever a more hopelessly selfish, ungrateful set of men affront the moral sense of a nation? Even in the eyes of his apologist, Clarendon, Charles the First was a man who knew no touch of real friendship for any human creature; he was truthful only when he could gain nothing by falsehood. The using of Strafford for the ends of his own Royal will, or the signing of the death-warrant of Strafford when those ends miscarried, was equally justifiable and expedient for a king's convenience. Charles the Second has been by superficial popular opinion—ignorant of Pepys's account of him—considered rather better than his father, because among other good-natured sayings reported of him, is his death-bed speech, "Don't let poor Nelly starve." Now, if he had really-thought much more about poor Nelly than be thought of one of his spaniels, he might as well before the time arrived for making this speech, have settled a trifle on Nelly, and so have put her above the possible neglect or caprice of survivors. Follow the fortunes of this family as you may, in their exile on the Continent, in their heavy drafts on the blind and stupid loyalty of the Scotch Highlanders, from the flight of James the Second until the last attempt of Charles Stuart in 1745, and you see only a coarse, steadfast, undisguised egotism—as if on an assumed inherent privilege of the Lord's anointed—manifested throughout and in all things, These were the undeniable things openly and commonly uttered about the Stuarts by all men in the days of the Regency. Had it been decent, or courtly, or loyal to do so, even worse tilings might with perfect truth have been openly, as they were privately, said and known, of the Regent himself. That a prince should cast off old loves of which he is tired, is not much thought of, and some allowance is, perhaps, not unjustly made for the fact that he is not generally able, as are men of more humble rank, to choose a partner in life for himself. But a prince is never under the necessity of leaving an old lover to want and misery, and this did George the Fourth by Mary Robinson. He was equally heartless by a still more serious connexion; for although he authorised his companion, Mr. Fox, to go down to the House of Commons, and deny, "on authority," Mr. Pitt's assertion of the Prince's marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert; yet it soon afterwards clearly appeared that Mr. Fox had been duped, and the lady's feelings and reputation outraged, inasmuch as the marriage had really taken place. Again, mark this Prince's conduct among associates of his own sex. The case must be a had one, indeed, which can call for the expulsion of the Heir Apparent from the Jockey Club and yet George Prince of Wales was so expelled. He mixed freely with the Foxes, Sheridans, and Fitzpatricks of his day, principally with the pious desire to vex his father, for his subsequent conduct showed that he was never a Whig at heart, assuming that he had a heart. He let his old companion Sheridan—his advocate and creature in the House of Commons, and the panderer to some of the least creditable of bis Royal pleasures—die almost wanting the necessaries of life; and his manner of leaving Beau Brummell to a like fate is so characteristic as to be worth more than a passing glance. When Brummell (presuming on an intimacy which to the poor beau had all the appearance of that ease and mutuality of licence common among equals) said, "Wales, ring the bell," and Wales did ring the bell, but only to order Brummell's carriage, the latter realised for life the danger of presuming too much on Royal condescension, however familiarly that condescension may be manifested. Too effectually; poor cast-off Brummell learned that a prince never forgets the distance in rank between himself and an ordinary subject, any more than a cat forgets when you are romping with her that she has sharp claws within those velvet paws of hers. Banished at once, and for good, from the sunshine of the Royal countenance, and being unfit for any other sort of company, he drifts into a sort of small consular employment somewhere on the Continent, and finally dies in obscurity and want—George IV.

thinking no more of him than of a cast-off old shoe. Whilst unable to pity the poor fallen parasite, we are compelled into despising the miserable smallness of "the first gentleman in Europe," as he was called by the Court journalists of the day. (Applause.) With such precedents of princely bearing, then, as these before our eyes, why should a people, with any pretensions to knowledge of human nature, be so much put out, as many of our citizens were the other day, on reading that £3,500—(laughter)—had been put on the Imperial Estimates to defray the expense of the presents made by the Duke of Edinburgh when in Australia? When Captain Cook took out his stock of glass beads, and looking-glasses, and red cloth, with which to win the affections of the artless savages of the South Sea Islands, whoever expected he was to bear the cost of, as well as distribute, these harmless trifles? "But the destruction of the sentiment of the thing!" some one may, perhaps, object. Well, there is something in that. (Cheers.) I must admit this £3,500 looks too much as if Romeo had kept a pocket-ledger, and had therein duly entered to the debit of Juliet the cost of any little presents—(laughter)—he might have made her during his moonlight courtship, with the object afterwards of putting the values on old Capulet's "estimates" if the business should ever come to marriage settlements. (Renewed cheers and laughter.) But to proceed. I think it can hardly have (escaped you a moment back, when I was reporting Sheridan's facetious sarcasm at the expense of George IV., how the satellites of kings are accustomed to relieve their sense of humiliation by ridiculing those idols behind their backs, in the presence of which the irreverent scoffers can hardly stand upright. A king, therefore, and more especially an absolute king, must live, move, and have his very being in an atmosphere of falsehood, and if he happen to fall on evil times he may perhaps have many courtiers, but assuredly he will have but few friends. Cast back your minds to a period which can be easily covered by the memories of many now present. How many thrones have fallen within our own generation! Where are now the family of Louis Philippe of France? Where the ex-Royal family of Naples? With what apparent unconcern did all Europe, a few years back, behold the late King of Hanover, the first cousin of our Queen, driven forth from his little kingdom! How coolly is Count Bismark, even now, proceeding to appropriate this ex-king's immense private property, on the plea that he and other refugees—"reptiles" as the count calls them—are using the income from this wealth in the subsidising of journals to vilify and undermine the power of Prussia. With what cold-blooded indifference did those half savages, the Mexicans, shoot the poor ill-starred Emperor, who had been exported to them by his patron, Louis Napoleon! How summarily was King Otho deposed by his restless subjects, and another prince placed on the little throne of Greece; and last, but not least, look at the most recent Royal ruin of all—the expulsion and flight of Isabella of Spain, "the last of the Bourbons," as she is called. Disreputable as this woman was in her life, and altogether contemptible in intellect, yet you have to consider how hard it is to change a nation's habits; and Spain has been for so many centuries a monarchy that it is even yet problematical whether she will, or rather can, settle down to any other form of government. Enough, however, has already been achieved to show that courtiers melt away before revolutions like morning mists before the mounting sun; and it is certain that Europe, even in her darkest recesses, has lost the old, simple, confiding, uninquiring sentiment with which men once regarded the position and character of a crowned head. And yet the fine expression of Shakspeare, "There is a divinity doth hedge a king," is, with some qualification, as true now as ever it was. (Applause.) But he must be a king who lives and rules according to the age into which he is born. (Cheers.) He must not be a solecism in government, running counter to the best intellect and the noblest purposes of the society over which Providence has called upon him to preside. (Renewed cheers.) In one word, he must be what we call a constitutional sovereign—such a sovereign as, I think, all here present will admit our Queen Victoria to be. (Continued applause.) With no spirit of adulation would I profane this part of my subject. But think for an instant of the contrast between the two contemporaneous queens—the Queen of England and the Queen of Spain—the one an outcast from her kingdom, seeking an asylum in a foreign land; the other, reigning secure in the hearts of her people, and with a nation for her body-guard. (Prolonged cheers.) Have we tar to seek to understand the difference? Speaking from this side of the world about our Queen, we may, perhaps, without indelicacy, use almost the freedom of history I shall do so with all respect, and I am sure with all truth. In her early youth it was the peculiar good fortune of the Princess Victoria to be surrounded by wise and constitutional teachers, and their counsels fell on a kindly soil. Her uncle, the Duke of Sussex, of all the then Royal family the most liberal in his views, and the most commonly coming in contact with the people at public dinners and at other popular gatherings, was one of her most trusted advisers. She was carefully trained, therefore, with special reference to the future high destiny that awaited her. We cannot read the graphic account which has been published of the ease, the dignity, and the thorough self-possession with which the girl Queen presided at her first Cabinet Council, without perceiving distinctly the care with which she had been trained to her exalted station. It was her singularly happy fortune, too to be wedded when young to a partner whose remarkable abilities and sound judgment were equalled, if not exceeded, by a kindly disposition and an elevated and conscientious character, ever mindful of the critical and most important position he occupied. All their subsequent history, apart from such revelations as come down from Court circles to society at large, has been made familiar to us all in a narrative which affords an almost

perfect picture of thoroughly happy wedded life. And throughout this life, so beneficially influential as it must have been on society, Queen Victoria held, and has conscientiously discharged, the duties of a British sovereign, holding her high estate under the law. The will of the people, as expressed through their Parliament, has ever been to her the object of her peculiar solicitude, of which truth many illustrations have been afforded during her prosperous and memorable reign. The most interesting evidence of this has been afforded us within the last few months. I do not know how it struck my hearers, but, speaking for myself, I must say that I never read anything with greater interest, or anything which ever yet excited in myself so lively a feeling of admiration for the character of the Queen, as we account we recently received through the English newspapers, detailing the particulars of her interview with Mr. Bright on the occasion of his becoming a Cabinet Minister. (Applause.) Does history afford quite such another case of extremes meeting? Is such another proof to be found of the elasticity of the British Constitution? Thirty years back politicians, either in or out of Parliament would as soon have thought of William Cobbett, or of Orator Hunt, as of Mr. Bright being tendered office under the Crown, much less an office which, if accepted, must necessarily bring the holder of it into habitual communication with Majesty itself. And in the present case, in estimating the conduct of the Queen, we are not to lose sight of the fact that her previous habits and associations, and those of her new Ministry, must necessarily have caused Queen and subject to form very different opinions from each other on many most important questions. The Queen's whole life and conversation have been among the very *élite* of England's wealthy, powerful, and (in favour of their own order) naturally prejudiced aristocracy. On the other hand, Mr. Bright, born and bred in the middle class, has, from his earliest manhood, steadily held most liberal, not to say extreme, opinions; has sometimes stood almost alone in his resolute opposition to the war policy of successive Ministries; has frequently denounced the large army and navy establishments as being maintained merely as a mode of supporting the younger and poorer scions of the governing classes out of the public purse; has habitually praised the economy and efficiency of various Transatlantic institutions, and has dealt so many and such vigorous blows at the aristocracy that they could not possibly have grieved had he broken a blood-vessel, and dropped down dead in the midst of one of his ablest philippics. No wonder, therefore, that Mr. Gladstone felt some very natural embarrassment, when the thought first entered his head of offering Mr. Bright a post in the Cabinet. On the one hand he saw a man who by talent, by influence, and by character—for character still counts for something in England, in a public man, and more especially in a Minister (applause)—was already indicated by the public mind for high office; on the other hand was Her Majesty, who might not unreasonably—if swayed merely by personal considerations—object to Mr. Bright's appointment. But what course did she take? With a frankness and a candour, and a subordination of every other feeling to her sense of public duty, she at once expressed her willingness to receive Mr. Bright as one of her advisers. Attended by one of her daughters, she gave him a personal and special interview, and as we read of Mr. Bright's happy compliments to the amiable young princess, we almost see Milton's genial and sagacious elephant "wreathing his proboscis lithe, to make them sport." Such an historical picture as this is to me, at the least, as delightful as that big piece of work of Mr. Haydon's hanging on our walls, called the banishment of Aristides. (Laughter.) The loyalty, then, of which I spoke at the outset of these observations as the loyalty I should seek to explain and defend, as distinguished from the bee-loyalty of which I have spoken, is that sentiment which any, the wisest man, may reasonably feel and heartily express, viz., the fidelity of a citizen to a sovereign like this. For it is the loyalty which at once respects itself and its object, as expressly symbolising the morality and dignity of the state, and whilst not exacting too much, with a "proud submission" gives homage where homage is felt to be due. It is a loyalty which is alone consistent with the stability of empires. For does not that philosophy which teaches by example show us that most of the revolutions and changes of dynasties we read of in history were the inevitable results of princes and peoples losing sight of or disregarding the duties owing by each to the other—subjects too often forgetting that princes were only men, and princes as often appearing to think that subjects were not men at all? (Applause.) "The misfortunes of princes," said that poor Isabella the other day, writing from her place of exile, "fall heavily on their subjects." Poor royal refugee. She would have been nearer the mark had she said, "The misfortunes of princes too frequently arise from their mistaking themselves for the state." Committing this fatal error, their power is Hobbes's leviathan turned upside down—a pyramid trying to stand on its apex instead of on its base. (Laughter.) Now, in the remarks which I have thus far made on this subject, I have considered it merely in connexion with monarchical government. And but that I should not in the length of this lecture be properly respecting the "Early Closing Movement," I could say much—but I will say very little—on loyalty under other forms of government, and more especially under a republic. It has been my good fortune at different times in my life to be thrown into the company of cultivated and well informed Americans, moving in political circles in England. It is, of course, quite natural and becoming, that, born and nurtured under a republic, they should prefer her institutions before all others. Accordingly they would sometimes, in a quite polite and good-humoured spirit, in the course of political discussions, quietly quiz our English loyalty, even of the more rational kind, as a something scarcely comprehensible—a sort of mild and

harmless madness, perplexing to political philosophers. (Laughter.) At the same time they would delicately insinuate that in America there were no subjects, that every citizen was a sovereign, and, therefore, entirely master of himself, which is the very essence of true liberty. I confess there was a time when such representations as these made some impression on me. And even now, perhaps, some of us may be prepared to grant, conditionally, that a republican form of government is theoretically the best form of government that human ingenuity has ever invented. (Hear, hear). But the condition I would contend for as accompanying such an admission, is an important one, and it is this—that the community to live under such a government should be at once thoroughly wise, thoroughly honest, thoroughly unselfish, and thoroughly free from all disturbing passions in the administration of that government. (Cheers and laughter). In the exact proportion in which any people fall short of this description must, as I think, republican government fail to answer the expectations of its friends. The theory of republican government necessarily presupposes that unfettered play of political forces which shall bring the wisest and the best of the citizens to the management of the state. But that same play of the political forces which amongst good and unselfish politicians would yield the best and wisest men for rulers, will and must, among selfish politicians, give us inferior men even in the highest places. (Cheers.) Thus all the most respectable American writers are agreed, that for many years past, no man of line talents or of large and statesmanlike qualifications, has been elected to the presidential chair of the United States. At the same time, this "effect defective" is attributed by the same authorities to the patent fact, that the self-regarding jealousies of the ablest men have led to compromises which put mediocrity at the head because higher ability would not yield to his fellow from any regard to the state. Now, a temporary monarch of a republic, attaining to his elevation under these circumstances, is certainly not an object to evoke any very enthusiastic sentiment of loyalty; and accordingly we do not find that American citizens either write or speak of their Presidents in a spirit either of reverence or respect. What, then, is the proper object of American loyalty? They are consistent in answering, "It is the sovereign people themselves." It is a thirty-million-headed sovereign, instead of a sovereign of one head. Let us look at this loyalty a little closer, and see what the article is like. We are told by American travellers, and it is not denied by American statesmen, that every citizen—being, of course, a thirty-millionth part of a sovereign—conceives that he has the right (and a very inconvenient number of thirty-millionth parts exercises this right) of calling on the President at the White-house, and having an interview with him, although these visitors may not, in fact, have any business whatever to transact. (Laughter.) Only a few months back I was reading in an English newspaper an utterance of our old friend and fellow-colonist George Francis Train—(loud laughter)—whilst protesting against the imprisonment to which he was recently subjected in England, and I was amused by the form of a threat which he used, to the effect "that he should write to his servant, Mr. Johnson"—(laughter)—the Mr. Johnson referred to being no other than the then President of the United States. Now, our loyalty may be slavery, according to the George Francia Train frame of mind; but does not his expression very strongly savour of absolute tyranny—and is that much better? From what can this monstrous feeling arise except from pride or vanity, or both? From what but a rooted notion that the individual citizen has a sort of undivided interest or proprietorship in the person of the President, who is assumed to be always liable to be inspected and spoken to and to have his hand shaken by any of his owners—(laughter)—whenever they have leisure or inclination to drop in upon him to do so. (Laughter.) It will not do to say in defence of this practice that it is intended as complimentary to the officer. He has other and higher business than to receive mere time-consuming calls. No, I believe the true motive of such calls to be what I have stated, an "I'm as good as you" sort of feeling, the indulgence of which degrades a great officer down to some mere show thing in a public museum. (Laughter.) Rather vividly recurred to my mind this mode of dealing with Presidents, when I saw all persons whatsoever, the most delicate and weakly women as well as the strongest men, on various occasions and in almost every company always standing in the presence of the Duke of Edinburgh. Can there be no golden mean, thought I, which will enable loyal subjects to express all becoming respect for the highest rank and position, without a superfluous self-abasement which is not altogether free from the ludicrous? May we not show all reasonable reverence to the Pope without kissing his toe? (Laughter and cheers.) Must we always either stand in the presence of Princes and Presidents, or for ever see their right arms wrung out of their shoulder-joints by an endless succession of hand-shakers, who claim to exercise their sovereignty by this pump-handle process? (Laughter.) If there can be no mean between these extremes in manners, the choice is unquestionably a narrow and unpleasant one. In the one case, we seem to raise a mere human creature—perhaps altogether irrespective of merit—into what Lord Bacon calls "a God upon earth;" in the other case, we tolerate a democratic tyrant who only worships himself, whilst affecting a civility to the Constitutional head of the state. After a little reflection, however, I decided for myself—I do not say I am right; it is much a matter of taste—that were I compelled to choose between the two, I would rather stand before a stupid king until I was ready to drop, than I would see a possibly very wise President bored to death by an impudent intruder, calling himself the public. In the one case we abate our pretensions out of a regard for what we deem necessary and convenient restraints in human intercourse; in the other case, we defy

all such restraints in the contemplation of our beautiful and all-powerful selves. And as ceremony is a portion of the necessary machinery of society, I would prefer even the pliant demeanour of a courtier of the old sort to the insolent and ignorant self-assertion which assumes to be always carrying sovereignty about in its own private and particular stomach. (Laughter.) I have dwelt more particularly on this phase of Republicanism, because our American cousins are sometimes rather prone to flout us poor creatures of monarchy as down-trodden, and as yet unacquainted, in our besotted loyalty, with the true principles of civil liberty. In this, I confess, their manner of going to work too unpleasantly reminds me of the mode in which Diogenes lectured Plato. "Thus I trample on your splendour and pride," cried the snarling and self-complacent old cynic. "With still greater pride, oh Diogenes," returned Plato to the celebrated tenant of the tub. Royalists and Republicans then, respectively, may just as well agree to mind their own business, and learn and correct, as best they may, the defects in the morals and manners of their own, governing men. There may, perhaps, be in the one country too coarse a sense of what is required in the rulers of a great state. There is I humbly venture to think, too much obsequiousness to, and a too lax toleration of, the vices of Royal persons in the other country. The latter important consideration is our business, and the business of every thoughtful Englishman, to endeavour to understand, and, if possible, to correct. But you may say how is it possible to understand the ways of Royal persons? and are not the causes of their modes of feeling and action too subtle and inscrutable to admit of any remedy from art? Now, in answering such a question, I must further respectfully submit that evils which have been either produced or aggravated by art, ought to be corrigible by art: and that you may not think I am disposed to talk in enigmas, I come at once to the point, by saying that I do thoroughly believe that a disastrous effect has been for many years produced on the *orale* of English princes by the Royal Marriage Act, which, in the year 1772, and at the suggestion of the proud, short-sighted, leg-of-mutton-loving king already referred to, was passed under very discreditable circumstances, and with shamelessly indecent haste, by one of the most contemptible and slavish Parliaments that ever sat within the ancient chapel of St. Stephen. As Mr. Timbs would say, it is among the things not generally known, that George III. got conceded to him by this act an additional point of prerogative (involving a co-extensive derogation of private liberty) to which no preceding English monarch had ever made any pretensions. It was this. He obtained the law—as it now stands in the statute book—enacting "That no descendant of the body of George II., other than the issue of princesses married into foreign families, shall be capable of contracting marriage without the previous consent of the sovereign, signified under the great seal; and any such marriage without such consent is declared void. But such descendants, if above the age of twenty-five, may, after twelve months' notice given to the Privy Council, contract and solemnise marriage without consent of the Crown unless both Houses of Parliament shall, before the expiration of the year, expressly declare their disapproval of such intended marriage. The penalties of *præmunire* are visitable upon all persons who shall solemnise, assist, or be present at such marriage. The Royal message which was the precursor to the introduction of this extraordinary bill is unique and interesting, and may, without any great prejudice to "our early-closing movement," be quoted in its very terms. It sets forth—"That His Majesty, being desirous, from paternal affection to his own family, and anxious concern for the future welfare of his people [carry these exquisite words carefully in your memory, as they must be looked at again presently] and the honour and dignity of his crown, that the right of approving all marriages in the Royal Family (which ever has belonged to the kings of this realm as a matter of public concern) may be made effectual, recommends to both Houses to take into their serious consideration whether it may not be wise and expedient to supply the defects of the law now in being, and by some new provision more effectually to guard the descendants of his late majesty [meaning, of course, all George the Third's brothers and sisters, and their descendants, direct and collateral] other than the issue of princesses who have married, or may hereafter marry, into foreign families, from marrying without the approbation of his majesty, his heirs, or successors first had and obtained." The bill introduced in pursuance of this message was vigorously opposed in the House of Lords, where it was first launched, and it was still more resolutely fought in the House of Commons, the most consummate genius of that day, Edmund Burke, being there the foremost of its uncompromising assailants. All opposition was vain against obsequious majorities of "King's friends," the name given to the legislative tools who had been bought and paid for by the King's money. During the progress of the measure, the opinions of the judges were taken on the contested point of prerogative, and nine out of twelve of these learned persons plainly said that the King's "care and approbation" of Royal marriages extended only to "the children of the King, and the presumptive heir to the Crown (other than the issue of foreign families); but to what other branch of the Royal family such care and approbation do extend, the judges did not find determined." Despite this judicial condemnation of the King's pretensions, the bill passed the House of Lords in a very few days, having been introduced late in the month of February, 1772, and read the third time on the 3rd of March. Its passage through the Commons was equally triumphant; and thus his most sacred Majesty became not only King of Great Britain and Ireland, and their then pendant nuisance, Hanover, but he also became the legalised tyrant over the natural affections of every other member of his own family, with the trilling exceptions mentioned in the bill, The merely personal

considerations on which George III. moved in this matter were patent enough. Only a few years before, to his great disgust, his brother the Duke of Gloucester had married the Countess Dowager of Waldegrave, but the duke had not publicly acknowledged her as his wife, nor had she assumed his title. At Court she was neither received as his wife nor regarded as his mistress, but she held in that august region— where the rigour even of female virtue was at times tempered by fashion—a sort of suspended position, like Mahomet's coffin, between these two characters. This alliance of itself was enough to vex the pride of the King and outrage his German wife's passion for Royal quarterings. But soon came another, and still stronger outrage of the same kind. In the latter end of 1771, another brother of the King, the Duke of Cumberland, announced his marriage with Mrs. Horton, whom he at once recognised as Duchess of Cumberland. As an aggravation of the bitterness of this last dose, Mrs. Horton, a daughter of Lord Irwin, was the sister of the Colonel Luttrell, who had been assisted by all the Court party in ousting Wilkes from his seat for Middlesex. Walpole remarks on this odd conjunction, "Could punishment be more severe than to be thus scourged by their own instrument! And how singular the fate of Wilkes, that new revenge always presented itself to him when he was sunk to the lowest ebb." The public acknowledgement by the Duke of Cumberland of his marriage was followed by a similar avowal by the Duke of Gloucester in favour of his wife, who was, of course, not now disposed to remain any longer, coffin-wise, socially suspended as aforesaid, while her sister-in-law of Cumberland trod the earth as a real, live, acknowledged Royal duchess. And now, of course, George the Third's cup of bitterness was full. He made one effort to annul these marriages as illegal under the existing Marriage Act, but failed, inasmuch as his father had ingeniously contrived that that act should not extend to the Royal family. The best consolation, therefore, was to devise this new Marriage Act, to the terms of which I have just called your attention. Never, perhaps, did a law more absurdly fall short of its ostensible purpose. George III lived to verify in all its bitterness the truth that even powerful kings must fight a losing battle with Nature. It was from paternal affection for his family, and anxious concern for the future welfare of his people forsooth, that his son the Prince of Wales should have a goodly succession of English concubines, but not one English wife; that his second son, the Duke of York, should be under the thralldom of a Mrs. Clarke, and that he should disgrace the office of commander-in-chief as never before nor since has it been disgraced, by allowing his clever and commercially-minded mistress to sell commissions in his father's army, which thus became the fruitful exchequer of a shameless and extravagant wanton; it was for "the welfare of the people" that his son, the Duke of Clarence, should be prevented from marrying any daughter of England, and that in the fulness of time he should confer on that country the honour of supporting a family of Fitzclarences, of whom Mrs. Jordan, the actress, was the mother; it was for the honour of the Crown that the Duke of Cumberland, another son, should become the most detested man in England for Profligate treacheries which made his very name and title by-words of hatred and contempt; it was "paternal affection for his family," and a regard for the dignity of his Crown, that his brothers and sons should not degrade themselves by honest and honourable marriages of affection with the daughters of English noblemen and gentlemen, but that England might enjoy the distinguished honour of supplying his sons with mistresses, whilst their wives should be supplied by a foreign country; a country, too, consisting of a congeries of petty electorates and shabby-genteel principalities—of one of which the not very bad story has been told (I am afraid it is an old one) of a countryman of ours once being stopped for his passport by a soldier at the gate of a German town, and being asked who he was, made answer that he was "An elector of Middlesex." (Laughter.) The whole guard were at once turned out to present arms to him as to a Royal person. (Loud laughter and cheers.) Now, these immediate results of the Royal Marriage Act are by no means all, nor even the most important, moral and social consequences of that measure. It has produced in the public mind a sort of settled and contented conviction that there must be one sort of morality for Royal personages, and another sort of morality for their inferiors in rank; and this kind of conviction naturally tends to the conclusion, in too many minds, that all morality whatsoever is merely conventional, and may be outraged at will, according to the rank, or influence, or power, of the offender. That such feelings as these must inevitably tend to the demoralisation of a people, there can be no doubt; and therefore, if there were no more than this to be said against the Royal Marriage Act, it must be condemned. But when, in addition to such weighty considerations, we find that it necessarily fosters the notion in princes themselves that they are not ordinary flesh and blood; that they are an insulated and sacred "caste," exempt from the judgments visitable upon common men; that the wages of sin to them need not be death, but will probably be a handsome Parliamentary grant—(cheers and laughter)—we are presented with matter for very serious thought indeed. Nor are the evils merely of a moral character. Royal marriages, exclusively Continental, beget dynastic entanglements which in time become embarrassing to British Governments and British interests, as statesmen have too frequently discovered in these latter days. Such, then, being the natural and the bitter fruits of the Royal Marriage Act, it is not unreasonable to think that in these reforming times the supporters of this act, if there be any, are very likely to be soon called upon to show cause why it should not be repealed. (Great applause.) When we are giving liberty to all lower men, why are we not to give an honourable liberty to the natural affections of English princes? (Cheers.) Why should not they,

especially those of them who are never likely to come to the throne—pass gracefully into general society, and thus by marriage not only consult their own inclinations but perhaps make themselves independent of the British taxpayer? Such alliances were common enough in our earlier history, and are certainly not less reasonable now. If it shall be objected that we should be unduly derogating from the dignity of the Royal rank, we have two answers. What was no derogation among our feudal forefathers can be no derogation in this our more liberal age, when wealth and more extended culture are so rapidly softening away the hard edges of exclusiveness. But, secondly, reason this matter as we may, there is a spirit of progress abroad which will not be scared from any question. Everything old and new is being weighed in utilitarian scales; and even highest rank, in divers places, begins to see that to be respected it must work. (Great applause.) This weak notion of coming down from position—where the coming down involves nothing dishonourable—appals only the maudlin and the sickly sentimental. Almost daily we see noblemen more enlightened than, and with moral purpose in advance of, their fellows, beginning to discover that if they cannot maintain all their children, they must put them to some form of honest industry in this hard-working world. The Duke of Argyle recently placed—as we are told in the newspapers—one of his younger sons in a wine merchant's firm in Edinburgh. What sensible man will think the worse of him, if he only sells a good article—(great laughter)—and distinguishes himself in the trade by introducing our best Australian vintages to the home markets? (Renewed laughter and cheers.) The other day another nobleman, Lord Claud Hamilton, was a successful defendant in our Supreme Court, sued as a late owner of one of the now defunct Panama line of steamers. Let us wish his lordship more success in his next enterprise. Even the Duke of Edinburgh himself, according to the latest information, is a shareholder in a gold mine in New Zealand. If he be destined to know the delights of dividends, it will add, I am sure, to his pleasant recollections of the southern hemisphere, and if his fate shall be "calls"—(laughter)—it will still be that valuable chastening of the spirit—provided the calls be not put on the estimates—(great applause and laughter)—which has made so many of us wiser and soberer men. Here, then, have we a few only of the many indications significant enough of coming changes in the modes of thought and in the habits of society. Upon the whole, surely—the latest news notwithstanding—human affairs look wholesome enough throughout the world, everywhere we see the loyalty to mere persons rising into a loyalty to principles and to truth. (Loud cheers.) A noble race seems to be going on almost all over the world between material progress on the one hand and moral progress on the other. (Cheers.) What a budget did that last mail bring us! What were the conquests of Alexanders and of Cæsars compared with the peaceful conquests now being made over this globe itself. Suez canals, railroads from Atlantic to Pacific, the rush of the locomotive soon to be heard hundreds of fathoms down in those old Alps which were mightier than armies to a Hannibal and a Napoleon. And the same papers that tell us of these wondrous things have side by side in their columns not less noble conquests over prejudice and ignorance and greed and oppression. We see that old and crying injustice the Irish Established Church tottering to its fall. (Cheers.) We see a House of Commons apparently in earnest, and we see a debilitated House of Lords taking homœopathic doses of life members—(laughter)—two pills a year to keep it on its noble legs—(laughter)—and oh, wonder of wonders, we see Mr. Childers commanding in person the Channel fleet! (Cheers and laughter.) True, as a set-off to these amazing facts, we are told that war between perhaps the two greatest powers in the world, Great Britain and America, is possible, if not imminent. Let us hope that wisdom and moderation, a Christian consideration for human life, a regard for their commerce and industry, and a due prescience of the ruinous expense and the enormous future taxation attendant on hundreds of millions shot away in war, will avert from them and from us this direst of calamities to the advancing civilisation of the times. (Cheers.) But should wisdom and moderation not prevail, we are yet not without hope and a strong confidence in the future. Let Mr. Sumner talk his tallest—(laughter)—let Louis Napoleon plot his deepest—Childers commands the Channel fleet! (Much laughter.) You may read all about it for yourselves in *The Times* of the 20th of May last. "I believe," writes the special historian of this cruise, which seems to have been off the Scilly Islands—(laughter)—"I believe that this cruise is the only instance in which a first lord has commanded a British fleet at sea in person, and also attended Divine service on Sunday on board his own flagship." (Laughter and cheers.) We read that the thunders of Pericles's eloquence were only heard, even as their sacred Salaminian galley was only brought out by the Athenians on the most important crises of the state; and in like manner, the Lord High Admiral Childers takes to the sea when war lowers on the western horizon. In sober earnest, let us express our gratification that England has apparently found a very efficient First Lord of the Admiralty in one who received his political and administrative education in this our own colony of Victoria. And now, in saying good night, let me apologise by anticipation, if, in the course of handling a somewhat ticklish subject, I have given pain to any one here. We are not all equally endowed with the organ of veneration; and I may not have brought to the treatment of my subject—regarded as a very serious one by many—as much seriousness as it demands. A Roman poet, however, of some authority on these points, tells us that it is pleasant, and not unbecoming, to relax our gravity, in the proper place, and I can most honestly assure you I have only laughed when I could not help it. But what is of more account to the young men of the

early-closing movement, I have sought to show, and I hope not entirely without success, how all rank, even the highest, is worthless, if not mischievous, without personal character; that amidst all the degrees and titles into which kings and heralds can split the human race, intellect and integrity must, in the long run, rule the world; that every individual man has his personal dignity in his own keeping, independent of any dignity any other finite creature like himself can confer upon him, and that, in short, prince and peasant alike, must bow to the inevitable judgment that—

*"Honour and shame from no condition rise,  
Act well your part, there all the honour lies,  
Fortune in men hath some small difference made,  
One flaunts in rags, one flutters in brocade,  
The cobbler apron'd, and the parson gown'd,  
The friar hooded, and the monarch crown'd:  
'What differ more,' you cry, 'than crown and cowl?'  
I'll tell you friend, a wise man and a fool.  
You'll find if once the monarch acts the monk,  
Or, cobbler-like, the parson will be drunk,  
Worth makes the man, and want of it the fellow,  
The rest is all but leather and prunella.*

(Loud and continued cheering.)

Professor M'COY proposed a vote of thanks to the lecturer for 'the brilliant discourse he had delivered.

(Loud and continued cheering.)

Mr. T. MOUBRAY (mayor of Melbourne) seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

Mr. MICHIE briefly replied, apologising for having infringed the principles of the Early Closing Association by detaining his auditors until such a late hour—(cheers)—and concluded by proposing a vote of thanks to the chairman, who, though he had had not a very arduous task to perform that evening, had exhibited that dignified repose and perfect neutrality which were always happily attractive and becoming a member of the Upper House.

Captain AMSINCK, R.N., seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN briefly acknowledged the compliment, and expressed his entire sympathy with the objects of the Early Closing Association.

The proceedings then terminated, and the meeting dispersed.

Stillwell & Knight, Printers, 78, Collins-street East.

THE FROG AND THE OX. A Lecture

*Old Fable.*

*Delivered at the Princess' Theatre, Melbourne, on July 26, 1869,*

By James Smith, ESQ.

Being the Seventh of a Series of Lectures under the Auspices of the Early Closing Association.

Price Sixpence

Stillwell and Knight, Printers Melbourne: Collins Street. 1869.

## The Frog and the Ox.

The seventh of the series of lectures on behalf of the Early-Closing Society of Melbourne was given on Monday by Mr. James Smith, who chose for his subject "The Frog and the Ox," as told in one of La Fontaine's fables. The attendance was good. It was intended that the Hon. T. H. Fellows should preside as chairman, but in his unavoidable absence on circuit, his place was taken by Mr. R. Murray Smith.

The CHAIRMAN opened the proceedings by apologising for Mr. Fellows' absence, and briefly introduced the lecturer to the meeting.

Mr. JAMES SMITH came forward, amid applause, and said,—Custom prescribes that those who preach sermons should precede them by the delivery of a text, and as a lecture is a species of secular sermon, I will preface my own with a few Lines, which you will find in one of the fables of La Fontaine.

They are as follow:—

*"A frog, no bigger than a pullet's egg,  
A fat ox, feeding in a meadow, spied.  
The envious little creature blew and swelled;  
In vain to reach the big bull's bulk she tried.  
'Sister, now look ! observe me close!' she cried.  
'Is this enough?' No!' 'Toll me! now then, see !'  
'No, no!' 'Well, now I'm quite as big as he?'  
You're scarcely bigger than you were at first.'  
One more tremendous puff—she grew so large—she burst."*

Now, the ox, I think, may be looked upon as typifying a great and venerable empire—like that, for example, to which we have the honour to belong; while the frog may be accepted as the representative of some small community—suppose we say that of Nornansland—which has a disagreeable habit of distending its dimensions in a vain effort to emulate the bovine bulk, and of imitating—though with indifferent success—the bovine bellow. If, by any chance, a newspaper has ever reached you from the colony of Nomansland, you will find that its public speakers and public writers are greatly addicted to the practice of asseverating that theirs "is a great country," and that they "are a great people." And within certain limitations this is true. But it is only true relatively. The frog is a remarkably fine frog of its age, with a spacious marsh to pasture in; plenty of nutritious food, a strong, healthy croak, and a vigour of muscle that would do credit to the celebrated jumping frog of Calaveras before the sharp-witted American had filled its inside with quail shot. But, for all that, it is not so big as an ox. Were it not for its overweening self-complacency, and its exaggerated pretensions, no exception could be taken to the lively little animal. As frogs go, it is a credit to its species. And, as colonial dependencies go, Nomansland is a flourishing and progressive colony. Nevertheless, it is not Great Britain. Now, what is true of Nomansland is equally true of other colonies—possibly, in some degree, of our own. All young countries have what may be termed a tumid tendency, which is a very unhealthy symptom. They resemble the immortal hero of a well known nursery story. Providence having presented them with a Christmas pie of noble dimensions and savoury material, each of them falls to pulling out the plums, and exclaiming, "What a good boy am I!" I don't wish to detract one iota from the moral worth of Master Horner, but I think that young gentleman would have been much more estimable if he had been a little less boastful. Depend upon it, that the man or boy, nation or community, which is perpetually vaunting his or its own greatness and goodness, is deficient in some of the vital elements of both, and is destitute of genuine self-respect. You will remember, at the commencement of the civil war in America, how loud and confident were the boastings of the Northerners that they would "chaw up" the rebellion in ninety days, and how numerous and severe were the reverses they sustained. After a time this vain-glorious talk was abandoned, and they gathered up all their strength for a protracted struggle, which was brought to a successful issue at the end of four years, under the leadership of Ulysses the Silent. "Brag" may have been, as the proverb says, a good dog, though I think he is at all times a contemptible cur—but "Holdfast was a better." Let us look our faults fairly in the face, and endeavour to correct them. We boast of our material progress and political freedom, and are prone to consider these as our own handiwork exclusively. But to what extent does the credit of them belong to us? In producing the sum of human wealth, two great coefficients have to be taken into account—the gratuitous utilities of nature, and the skill and industry of man. The first of these we enjoy in wonderful variety and measureless abundance. The soil, the climate, and the mineral resources of Victoria are factors of material prosperity, for which we cannot be sufficiently grateful, and they co-operate with us to a decree which we inadequately acknowledge. They are God's gifts, and we can claim no share in their creation. Their development and usufruct alone are ours. Next comes our own contribution to the work. I have no intention of disparaging it. I am proud, as every Englishman must be, of the genius, the enterprise, the inventive ingenuity, and the vehement industry of my countrymen. But I cannot forbear asking myself—How much of the skill and ability the mechanical appliances, and powerful auxiliaries which arm industry with such irresistible forces, and render it so productive in our generation, is inherited and derived from the generations which preceded it? Our forefathers, and not only our forefathers but inventive men in every age and country, have bequeathed to us the magnificent estate of their ideas and discoveries. Some portion of the bequest is centuries old: another portion may have been devised to us by the inventor who died yesterday, or last week, or a year ago. The screw which propels our steam vessels was the legacy to mankind of a philosopher of Syracuse, who flourished more than 2,000 years ago. To him, also, we owe the crane, the pulley, and the lever. But why should I multiply instances of our indebtedness to those who have gone before us? Take from us this incalculably precious inheritance, and wherein should we be superior to the Maories of New Zealand? As the world grows older, and man's capacity to utilise the forces of nature increases in extent and power, his own

share in the work, and consequently the credit due to him for what he does, diminishes from day to day and year to year, so that there is a profound—indeed, one may say, a pathetic—truth in Tennyson's assertion that "the individual withers, and the world is more and more." It may be mortifying to our self-love that it should be so, but the hard, unalterable fact remains. Every addition to the sum of our capacities, comforts, and enjoyments, involves a corresponding addition to the sum of our indebtedness to those who have gone before us. We shine with a borrowed lustre, and are sumptuous in trappings which were bequeathed us by the dead. The fabric of our greatness is erected, like the coral islands of the Pacific, upon the remains of millions of animated beings who have preceded us: and we may apply to the whole human race—although in a different sense to that which was intended by the poet—the observation—

*"That men may rise on stepping stones  
Of their dead salves, to higher things."*

And if we attentively examine the title-deeds by which we hold our political franchises, we shall find that they bear the endorsement of names which the whole world holds in veneration—patriots and philosophers of all ages and of all countries; that the true principles of political science were as well understood in the days of Plato and Aristotle as in those of Bentham and Brougham; and that the liberty we prize is, in a much greater degree, an inheritance than a conquest. Considerations of this kind should moderate, I think, that spirit of arrogant self-assertion which is the reproach of young communities, and that everlasting "cock-a-doodle-doo," and clapping of wings, which we nineteenth century people are everywhere setting up over our acquisitions and performances. The foremost ripple on the sea-beach, as it breaks into creamy foam upon the glistening shingle and traces a sinuous furrow on the plastic sand, might as well claim to be the highest embodiment and grandest product of the vast ocean by which its movements are impelled, as we might plume ourselves upon our preeminence, simply because we happen to be "foremost in the ranks of time." It is the old story of the wren mounted upon the eagle's crest. The smaller bird soared higher and saw further than the king of the air; but it was upon the strong pinions of the latter that the former was borne aloft. In like manner the vantage ground which we occupy was raised for us by the labour of our forerunners. One of the consequences of this overweening self-complacency is, that it induces us to form erroneous estimates of history, and to pronounce unjust censures upon the various states of society and forms of government through which mankind has passed, and out of which it has emerged into the light of what is possibly a brighter day. A youth—for in all probability the world is only in its youth, with the down of early manhood scarcely visible upon its upper lip—might as reasonably despise himself for ever having been a child, as we disparage and contemn phases of civilisation and forms of polity and conditions of social existence which were the natural growth or reflection of, and were strictly appropriate to the circumstances, the wants, the habits, and the general intelligence, or un-intelligence of times gone by. It is not my intention, nor does it fall within the scope of my lecture, to institute any comparison between what we are accustomed to call the dark ages and our own epoch of moral, mental, and spiritual enlightenment. I am not absolutely certain that we are so much wiser, better, and happier than our forefathers as to justify us in speaking of them either with Pharisaical contempt or Christian compassion. I cannot discover that crime, vice, destitution, and disease, war, pestilence, and famine were the special characteristics of any epoch, or have been entirely banished from our own. When I am tempted to pick up an objurgatory stone, and hurl it at the wicked people who flourished centuries ago in Europe, I pause for a moment to reflect upon the baby-farms in the manufacturing districts of England, upon the elevation of fœticide and other nameless horrors into a distinct and lucrative profession in New York and other American cities, upon Mormonism, spiritualism, and free love, upon the hundreds of thousands who perished by famine the other day at Orissa, upon the assassinations and explosions at Sheffield, upon the awful carnage at Sadowa, upon the re-establishment of Cæsarism in France, upon the stupendous frauds perpetrated by "rings" in the United States and by great houses like that of Overend, Gurney, and Co. in the mother country; and upon the terrible increase of insanity in Europe and America, and I drop the stone with as much precipitation as may be. Nevertheless, mankind *may* be better, wiser, and happier, as it is undoubtedly richer, than it was; and he can always count on praise and popularity who asseverates that it is so. We will not stop to argue the point, but will accept it as proved. Being so much wiser than our predecessors, we can afford to pass a lenient judgment upon their institutions and their actions; as it is most fitting we should study them in a philosophical spirit. And bringing to their investigation this spirit, and pursuing it without prejudice, what is the conclusion we arrive at? I dare say many of those whom I have the honour to address have been familiar either in Europe or Australia with the magnificent spectacle of the sunrise in a mountainous district. They have seen the golden light smiting the splintered crags and snowy peaks until they seemed to stand transfigured in its stainless lustre. They have watched the warm glow creeping down the mountain side, robing its massive shoulders with a garment of luminous beauty,

penetrating dark rifts and sombre chasms with its swift effulgence, and dropping shafts of vivid radiance in among the forest trees. In a little while the morning sunshine has enveloped all the mountain and Hooded all the valley with its fervid glory and its animating warmth; and every object which looked so wan and indistinct in the cold grey light of early dawn, takes colour, form, and shapeliness, from the all-beholding, all-embracing light of cheerful day. Somewhat similar have been the dawn of knowledge and the incidence of political power. When modern civilisation was in its infancy, it was—in the first instance—only upon the regal eminences of society that the light of intelligence was seen to rest and irresponsible authority was permitted to devolve. Both extended, in process of time, to the ennobled classes and the ecclesiastics. And let it be remembered, to the credit of the Church of Rome, that, even then, it asserted the equality of all men in the sight of God; and—in direct opposition to the aristocratic and exclusive spirit of the governing classes—acknowledged no hereditary distinctions within its own pale, but adopted the elective principle with respect to some of its highest dignities and grandest offices, and did not debar the meanest serf in Christendom from ascending the Papal throne itself, provided he possessed the capacity to rise and rule. Eventually the trading classes in the great cities, acquiring wealth and intelligence in the pursuits of commerce, established their claims to certain immunities and to some degree of political influence; and then, as education diffused itself through all grades of society, the rights and privileges of citizenship were gradually conceded to the whole body, and thus we have reached the epoch of democracy in modern Europe, and in English speaking communities all over the world, to which we now find ourselves brought. But, occupying this novel stand-point, does it become us to speak superciliously of the past? Looking at the state of society in the middle ages, I think it is very doubtful whether a better system could have been devised for it than feudalism. Feudalism would be intolerable now; but feudalism was well adapted to a period in which the masses were ignorant, weak, superstitious, and dependent; and art, science, statesmanship, and letters were the possession of an exclusive few—it was exceedingly suitable to a rude and warlike epoch, in which the governing classes could offer substantial protection to the proletariat, in which the Church was strong enough to curb the licence of the Crown, and the monastery was the spiritual instructor, the moral teacher, the doctor, the almsgiver, and the protector of the poor. "If," as Ruskin observes, "the middle ages had their wars and agonies, they had also intense delights. Their gold was dashed with blood; but ours is sprinkled with dust. Their life was interwoven with white and purple; ours is one seamless stuff of brown." That monarchs misused their power, that aristocracies did the same, that abuses and corruptions crept into the church, and that mixed forms of government have been betrayed into follies and crimes, is only tantamount to saying that human beings in every grade of life, in every age and country, and under every kind of political institution, are human beings still, and that, with rare exceptions, the exercise of power tends to the demoralisation of its possessor; although this is true to a limited extent only of men who—like the more illustrious of our English statesmen—have been born or educated to it. The worst of tyrants is a *parvenu*. Only a pure heart and an incorruptible and well-balanced mind—calm, just, and passionless, like George Washington's—are proof against its terrible temptations. As I have said, we have now reached that stage in the political development of civilised mankind in which the equality of all men before the law has been finally, and I trust irrevocably, established; and it behoves us, instead of casting contemptuous or commiserating glances upon the past, and pluming ourselves upon our superior enlightenment and surprising attainments, to examine the dangers by which we are surrounded, in what I must venture to call our superficial and one-sided civilisation. Nor could I name one which appears to me to be more alarming than that deification of material prosperity and that Sordid worship of success which is rapidly supplanting all other forms of faith, and conducting us to a species of idolatry, compared with which, the belief of "the Pagan, suckled in some creed outworn," or of

—"*the poor Indian, whose untutored mind  
Sees God in clouds and hears him in the wind,*"

is piety and poetry itself. Look, for instance, at the ordinary method of estimating and describing the condition and progress of any country—of our own, let us say. So many ounces of gold produced, so many million pounds of wool exported, so many thousand gallons of gin, rum, and brandy taken out of bond, so much money lying to the credit of so many depositors in savings banks, so much merchandise consumed, and so forth. Now, let me guard myself against being supposed to disparage industry and frugality, or to undervalue the rational enjoyment of the fruits of both. I hold activity of mind and body to be one of the most efficacious promoters of human happiness, and I speak from the experience of my own life, which has been both a busy and a happy one, when I say that industry is essential to bodily and mental health. What I wish to convey is this—that we ought to apply quite other tests to the welfare and advancement of a people than those which are commonly made use of. Instead of searching for them in the *Customs Bill of Entry*, or in that lively and entertaining publication called the *Journal of Commerce*, I think we should seek them in satisfactory answers to

questions like the following :—Are your schools full, and your prisons empty? Have the doors of your courts of justice grown rusty on their hinges from sheer disuse, and are your laws so few in number that a little volume will contain them all? Is a drunkard as much a phenomenon in your streets, and as loathsome in the public estimation, as a leper? Is the practice of any vice considered to be a *prima facie* evidence of insanity? Is the word of every man, in all the transactions of daily life, as valid as his signature to a contract or a bill of exchange, and is the crime of perjury unknown? Is idleness reputed infamous, and slander an abomination? Have pauperism and mendicity been reduced to their minimum, and are life and property as secure as they were when a daughter of Erin, with a "bright gold ring on her wand," travelled from one end of Ireland to the other,

*"And her maiden smile  
In safety lighted her round the Green Isle."*

Would it be impossible to discover an adulterated article of food, or clothing, or utility, of any kind, throughout the length and breadth of the land? And is justice the supreme guide and regulating principle of conduct among the whole community? Now, I think it is a painful proof that we are really, as yet, in a very rudimentary stage of civilisation, and have advanced but a moderate distance along the path of progress, that the propounding of questions like these would inevitably subject the propounder to the imputation of being a dreamer and a visionary, if not a lunatic; and that the condition of society to which they point is one which would be characterised by ninety-nine people out of a hundred as Utopian in the highest degree. Yet no one will be bold enough to assert that upon any other than the moral basis just indicated would it be possible to construct a society which should be Christian in deed as well as in name, in sentiment as well as in profession; and which should endure as long as the human race endures. Wanting this moral basis, every great nation of antiquity has perished; as I will venture to assert, every great nation of modern times will likewise perish, when there is no longer a sufficiency of public and private virtue to be found in the minority of good men and women—"the salt of the earth," as you will remember they have been called—to preserve the whole mass of society from corruption and decay. This is no fanciful speculation, or presumptuous prediction of my own. It is a logical deduction from the lessons of history, and from the undeniable existence and incessant operation of that moral law which is written in our consciences, and every violation of which, whether by individuals or nations, is visited with its appropriate and unavoidable penalty. Seeing, then, that we are so far from that stage of human progress, towards which I hope and believe mankind is slowly moving, it seems to me that we cannot too steadily discourage, or too sternly repress those tumid tendencies, and that disposition to look up to ourselves, and to look down upon our forefathers, upon which I have already animadverted. It may be argued that we are young, and that conceit and braggadocio are as natural to youthful communities as they are to a good many young people; but such an argument is scarcely tenable. We are a fragment chipped off an old nation—a branch layered from an old stock in a new soil—a portion of an ancient edifice transferred to and re-erected upon a fresh site, in conformity with the general plan of the original structure. Therefore the plea of youth is inadmissible in extenuation of the faults I have enlarged upon. And these faults should be rigorously discountenanced, I think, because they are hostile to real progress and incompatible with true greatness. I do not think you will ever find this dissociated from modesty. The vain man—the man who is always sounding his own trumpet, and perpetually absorbed in the calculation and admiration of his own personal, moral, or mental qualifications—is almost invariably as weak and shallow as he is offensive and contemptible. The genuinely great man may or may not be conscious of the possession of distinguished gifts, but, in any case, he bears himself as meekly as King Duncan, as Michael Angelo, as Sir Isaac Newton. And this holds true, I think, of nations. There was a military commander in the early part of the present century, who, occupying a conquered country, at the head of a fine army, officered by splendid generals, arrogantly declared that he would drive the opposing army—which was inferior in numbers, in service and equipment—into the sea. That opposing army was led by a man from whose lips no boast was ever heard to fall. He was the servant of a nation which is proverbially reticent and taciturn. He possessed his soul in modesty and patience; and, in course of time, instead of being driven into the sea, he himself swept the country of its invaders, and drove them, defeated and dejected, across the Pyrenees. He never indulged in rhetorical flourishes about glory and victory—never wrote bombastic and mendacious bulletins—never told his soldiers that forty centuries were looking down upon them from the Pyramids of Egypt, nor talked grandiloquent rhodomontade of that kind,—he would not *brag*, and he could not *lie*:—

*"For this was England's greatest son,*

*He that gain'd a hundred fights,  
Nor ever lost an English gun."*

The magniloquent boaster suffered ignominious defeat, and died in exile; while his' antagonist—

*"Great in council and great in war,  
Foremost captain of his time,  
And, as the greatest only are,  
In his simplicity sublime;"*

lived to a ripe old age, accompanied by "love, honour, obedience, and troops of friends," and went down to an honoured grave amidst "an empire's lamentation." Now, I suppose, it will be scarcely disputed that it is better for a people to be modest and abstinent from boasting, like Wellington, than to be vain, arrogant, and gasconading like Napoleon. There results, from the imitation of the frog in the fable, that spirit of provincialism in politics, art, letters, and social life, which Poole has so pleasantly satirised in "Little Pedlington." A fond attachment to the land of our birth, or the land of our adoption—to the neighbourhood in which the best years of our life have been spent, or to the particular circle in which we prefer to move—is a natural sentiment. Most of us have felt—

*"As in a pensive dream  
When all our active powers were still,  
A distant dearness in the hill,  
A secret sweetness in the stream,  
The limit of our narrower fate,  
While yet beside its vocal springs  
We played at counsellors and kings  
With one who was our earliest mate."*

But the belief that these countries or neighbourhoods excel all others, and that outside of them there is neither grandeur nor attractiveness, neither excellence nor beauty, is quite another thing; is, in fact, a very mischievous and misleading delusion, almost as much so as the notion that what is alien must be necessarily hostile; and that what is unknown, because foreign or remote, must be therefore undesirable to know, if not actually eligible for aversion. The spirit of provincialism is a debasing and demoralising spirit. It dwarfs a man's intellect, narrows the range of his sympathies, and obstructs the full development of his nature. It disintegrates mankind—breaks it up into little communities, sects, coteries, and cliques; and is wholly opposed to the Gospel of Christ and the gospel of humanity. Show me a village, town, or district in which the spirit of provincialism is particularly rampant, and I will show you a hotbed of calumny and slander—a field for the display of little factions and petty animosities—an arena for the exercise of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness—a place in which the inhabitants dissipate no small proportion of their energies in foolish litigation, in rancorous quarrels, and perpetual backbiting. That was a magnificent illustration of provincialism which Leech once depicted in *Punch*:—"Who's 'im, Bill?" "A stranger." "'Eave 'arf a brick at 'im." How many of the wars of modern Europe are indirectly traceable to the rivalries, jealousies, and prejudices of provincialism—to a feeling, in short, like that which prompted the Staffordshire man to "'eave 'arf a brick" at the stranger. If you will just reflect for a moment upon the sanguinary quarrels which sprang up between one and another of the petty kingdoms into which England was formerly divided, you will find it impossible to avoid being struck by their ludicrous absurdity. It is as if the president of the road board of Boroondara should organise the able-bodied men of that sylvan district for the purpose of making a raid upon "the wild wood-carters of Nunawading" harrying their cattle, destroying their crops, emptying the bars of the bush inns of a good deal of indifferent brandy without offering to pay the reckoning, and burning down the homesteads of the Forty-second Regiment of *bonâ fide* settlers. Between such a war whether carried on in ancient Wessex or in modern Nunawading, and the wars of Euro- pean states, the difference is one of degree only. Common sense, self-interest, humanity, and the Christian religion—if the Christian religion may be mentioned without impropriety in these days when everybody doubts everything but his own omniscience—all concur in condemning such wars. For, to put the matter upon the lowest possible grounds, any merchant or shopkeeper

will, admit that the very worst use to which you can put a profitable customer is to impale him on a bayonet, or to bore holes through his body with conical bullets. But this is precisely what nations do when they fall out and come to loggerheads; and what it costs them to destroy their neighbours and customers defies all calculation, and would—if it could be accurately estimated—stagger belief. That a time will come when the story of the desolating and mutually destructive wars which have taken place between neighbouring nations will be read with mingled feelings of incredulity and pity by our wiser posterity, I no more doubt than I doubt that the sun will rise with his accustomed punctuality to-morrow morning; but before it can be confidently asserted that "the war drum throbs no longer and the battle flag is furled," the spirit of provincialism will have to die out, and frogs will have to acquiesce in that law of nature which confers superior dimensions and a lustier voice upon their bovine associates in the succulent pastures. And this leads me to speak of the political institutions of the future. If those which exist in the most advanced nations of the earth were the final outcome of democracy—or if democracy were the goal of humanity, instead of being, as I hold that it is a mere stage of growth, a phase of development, and a transitional form of government—we might be tempted to despair of the future of mankind. Let us look at America, for example. Now, I think it must be acknowledged that, in theory at least, and regard being had to the popular notions on the subject, the Constitution of the United States is as near perfection as possible. The popular branch of the Legislature is chosen by the people; the Senate is elected by the Legislatures of the various states, and the President is appointed by a species of electoral college, composed of a number of electors from each state equal to the whole number of senators and representatives which such state is entitled to send to Congress. Here is a really model constitution, framed by men of rare political ability, who were actuated by the loftiest patriotism; but has it secured the ends for which all governments are ordained? Has it, in the language of the preamble, "established justice, insured domestic tranquillity, and promoted the general welfare?" I find it stated in the *North American Review* for July, 1867, that justice is unblushingly bought and sold, and that the corruption which prevails is without a parallel in the judicial annals of any country. "The most shameful offences are constantly committed by men placed upon the bench by the popular vote. They listen privately to one or other of the suitors in a case which is afterwards to be brought before them, and openly take bribes for their decisions. It is well known that one judge received 10,000 dollars for giving judgment in a case, and he still remains upon the bench." In the state of New York, all the judges are elected, and their appointment is in the hands of the pickpockets, the prize-fighters, the immigrant touters, the pimps, and the lowest class of liquor dealers. And what is the result? I quote from an official document—the report of the commissioners of police for the year 1865:—"In no other city does the machinery of criminal justice so signally fail to restrain or punish serious and capital offences. As our laws and institutions are administered, they do not afford adequate protection to life and property. Some remedy must be found and applied, or life in the metropolis will drift rapidly towards the condition of barbarism." Only a few days ago, I took up the *New York Herald* for the 7th of April last, and in that one issue I found reports of no less than twelve murders, one of them being the assassination of a judge; together with the particulars of two robberies—a burglary in South-street, New York, where the thieves had carried off 100,000 dollars' worth of stock and shares; and another in Philadelphia, where the booty in bonds and greenbacks amounted to a million dollars. If we turn to the conduct of political affairs, we find ourselves confronted by corruption and speculation on all sides. An influential member of the Senate has stated—and the statement has never been contradicted—that upon the article of whiskey alone twenty millions sterling are collected which never find their way into the Treasury, but are stolen by the officials. The estimated expenses of the two Houses of Congress for the year 1868 were set down at £1,060,000 sterling, of which more than three-fifths are absorbed by the Lower House. At one time its members were supplied with stationery *ad libitum*, but they carried off such large quantities, besides franking their dirty linen to their own homes by the Government mails, that it was found necessary to compromise the matter by allowing each member £25 per annum to find himself in pens, ink, and paper. Among the items on the Estimates for the House of Representatives I find £280 for combs, brushes, and soap; but even these articles disappear in a most rapid and mysterious manner, and many members complained, at the close of the last session of Congress, that they had not received a comb, a brush, or so much as a piece of soap during the whole session. And considering the very dirty work in which some of them must have been engaged, a scarcity of soap must have been a terrible privation. The corruption of numerous members of Congress is a matter of common notoriety; and, as regards the State Legislature of New York, it has been openly asserted, and never denied, that as many as 118 out of the 160 members of which it is composed habitually sell their votes to the highest bidder, and not unfrequently take money on both sides. It was only in the month of April last that one of these venal scoundrels, on returning by rail from Albany to Troy, accidentally left his pocketbook on the seat of the carriage. A brakeman found and opened it, and discovered 1,800dol. in bills, besides some papers which gave him a clue to the owner. While the train was stopping, the brakeman went in search of and found the owner, who promptly rewarded him with twenty dollars. As the brakeman turned to go away, however, the legislator stopped him, took him on one side, and whispered in his ear words to this effect, "When you get up to our place tomorrow you needn't say anything

about my losing my pocketbook, You see, they wouldn't know how I came by that 1,800dol. exactly; in fact, I don't think I ever had so much money with me before; so you had better say nothing about it." It may be asked how it is that with so much profligacy, rapacity, and corruption among the representatives of the people in Congress and in the State Legislatures, the American cabinet should be composed, as it generally is, of men distinguished for their ability and probity? The answer is to be found in the fact that the President appoints his own Ministers subject to the formal confirmation of their appointments by the Senate; and thus the members of the Cabinet are relieved from the humiliating necessity of purchasing a precarious existence by trafficking departmental favours for legislative votes. Removed from the sphere of party conflict and of party intrigue in Congress, they can give their undivided attention to their administrative duties and to the preparation of necessary laws. Reverting, however, to the subject of corruption, let us look at the state of affairs in the "empire city" of the Union. The *New York Tribune* asserts that an alderman who could rob the city of £20,000, and squander half of it on the "boys" who nominated and elected him, would be regarded by the majority as a smart clever fellow, and would probably have an increased majority at the next election. The municipal government of New York, which raises a revenue of eight millions sterling, is virtually in the hands of seven men. They and their nominees, during the last sixteen years—I quote from the *North American Review* for October last—"have stolen not less than fifty millions of dollars, and not one of them has ever been punished, nor even made to disgorge." The price of a vote in the corporation of New York—I may add—ranges from fifty to five hundred dollars, according to circumstances. Finally, we arrive at that other object for which governments are instituted—namely, the general welfare of the people. Now, the material prosperity of the United States, taken as a whole, is undeniable, but to what agencies is that prosperity attributable? Upon this subject let us consult an American authority, Mr. David Wells, the special commissioner of internal revenue, whose dictum carries conviction with it. He says:—"These agencies are mainly two—first, great natural resources in respect to abundant and fertile territory, great natural facilities for intercommunication, abundant and cheap raw material, and diversity without insalubrity of climate; and, secondly, a form and spirit of government which heretofore has left man and capital, over an area almost continental, free and unrestrained, to work out their own development." In other words, industry flourished so long as the Government let it alone. But when the American Government is called upon to deal with some of the problems which perplex the statesmen of Europe, it proves to be unequal to the task. In the United States, as in England, the concentration of population produces an amount of crime and destitution which the authorities are impotent to grapple with. There are 52,000 paupers in the receipt of outdoor relief in New York, 1,500 professional thieves, 25,000 women of the town, and 15,000 of the dangerous classes; and the condition of some thousands of needle-women is no better than that of their sisters, the white slaves of London. "Murders," says a recent number of the *New York Sun*, "are a daily crop. Dear friends will in the morning go out to business, and are brought home mutilated corpses. Old men go out to sweep the pavement, and be cut to pieces with knives. Gentlemen, sitting quietly in their own rooms, awaiting company, are seized, bound, gagged, robbed, and threatened with a bullet if they resist. Nay, we have every reason to believe that some recreant members of the police force itself are in league with the thieves, murderers, assassins, and housebreakers. Vigilance committees are being formed in town and country, and it is this alarming riot of crime that has driven good citizens to this last resort of desperation." To sum all up, "Mr. Horace Greeley estimated last January that there were half a million persons within sight of the city steeples of New York who were hungry, destitute, and out of work." But New York, it may be objected, is the channel through which flows the enormous stream of immigration from Europe, and in that city are deposited both the scum and the sediment of that stream, of which the clear and wholesome elements flow westward. There is much force in the objection, so let us shift the scene for a moment. In the queen of the New England states, Massachusetts—which has the "modern Athens" for its capital—one person in every twenty-two is a pauper. With a population of 1,250,000 there are upwards of 57,000 destitute persons in the state, while there are between 10,000 and 11,000 prisoners, 2,500 inmates of the lunatic asylums, and 1,600 pupils in the reformatories, besides 5,000 deaf, dumb, blind, and otherwise dependent human creatures. In short, this is the picture of New England, presented in a state document laid before the Senate in January last:—"A helpless crowd of workers, the oppression of low wages, inevitable poverty, and a disguised serfdom; a rich master, a poor servant, and a mean population." Thus, then, you will perceive that democratic institutions do not necessarily "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, and promote the general welfare;" and for these reasons I believe that this principle of government will be no less transitory than feudalism was. Let us endeavour, for the better understanding of this important question, to survey it as the inhabitant of another planet might do. "These men," he would say, "in their individual capacities, profess to be governed by their reason. That is the law of their lives, and in proportion as the will of each person is subordinated to enlightened judgment and moral principle, will the conduct of that man be just, wise, temperate, and prosperous. Yet, when they come to act in a collective capacity as states, what do these terrestrials do? They make the representative bodies, which, as lawgivers and as administrators, have to fulfil the same functions as conscience and reason

discharge in man, the image and expression—of what? Of the collective reason of the people in its most dispassionate mood?—of its moral sense?—of its weightiest experience and deepest sagacity?—of the calmest judgment of the ablest, the soundest, the most discriminating and the most far-sighted thinkers? No such thing. These representative bodies merely reflect the popular will; so that it has come to pass in one of the foremost nations of Europe—in France, to wit—the intelligence and moral principle of the people are almost wholly unrepresented—are, in fact, hostile to and proscribed by the Government of the day. And, to make matters worse, these terrestrials, as often as they have occasion to renew their representative bodies, contrive to do so under circumstances so exciting as to prohibit the exercise of reflection and deliberation. In all countries possessing Parliamentary government, no party thinks of going to the hustings without what is called 'a good cry.' Instead of a principle, they are invited to swear by a phrase—a catch-word—a shibboleth. Party zeal, personal predilections or prejudices, national animosities, and religious fanaticism, are all inflamed at the very moment when men are called upon to make a calm and circumspect choice of enlightened and disinterested legislators and administrators. Verily, these terrestrials are strange beings." Now, this is how an ultra-mundane critic would deliver himself, I fancy, with respect to our method of managing our political affairs, and we could not find much fault with his strictures. But are we to be for ever amenable to such a reproach? Wilt our institutions be the institutions of after generations? If progress be the law of humanity, we may unhesitatingly answer, "No." That society must continue to rest upon a democratic basis, and that the equality of all men before the law is a sacred and eternal principle, I firmly believe; but I am also convinced that power in the good time which is coming will find a new depositary, a more satisfactory and enduring resting-place. It is unfortunate for the discussion of subjects like these that the technical language we employ has lost its original meaning, and has acquired improper and perverted significations. Thus, the word "aristocracy" has come to be confounded with a privileged class—with an hereditary caste; whereas it really implies the best men of a country, without respect to birth, or wealth, or station. And such an aristocracy I take to be the natural and rightful rulers of a country. These were the rulers of America when its Washingtons, its Hamiltons, its Madisons, its Jeffersons, and its Quincy Adamses were at the head of its affairs; and these will constitute the governments of the future in all English-speaking countries when the moral and intellectual elevation of the masses shall have qualified them to make a prudent and sagacious choice of rulers. That choice will most assuredly fall upon the *aristoi* of a nation. Whatever is most eminent in moral worth—in disinterestedness and purity of purpose—in unselfish and self-sacrificing devotion to the public interests—in splendid ability, shaped, directed, and controlled by a lofty and incorruptible integrity—a clear discernment and a steadfast pursuit of the right—that will the people honour and obey. But before this comes to pass, the intelligence and the moral sentiments of mankind—its instinctive sense of justice and its fidelity to truth—must and will have reached that high point of development at which little will be left for Presidents or Cabinets to do. When public virtue attains its maximum, the power of Governments will fall to zero. The best code of laws is that which is written in a cultivated and healthily active conscience; and when every man carries such a code about with him, and habitually defers to its authority, mankind will be able to make a bonfire of its statute books, though centuries may elapse before the arrival of this golden age, when men will be too just to require lawyers, and too healthy to need doctors. The best government, it has been said, is that which governs least; and as all governments exist by the surrender of a portion of our liberties for the better protection and preservation of what remains, we shall be wise to part with as few of them as we can, consistently with the maintenance of law and order, and to restrict the functions of governments within the narrowest possible limits; above all, we must regard with a jealous eye everything in the shape of privilege. The first great assertion of democracy as a political force in modern Europe was when in 1789 it arose in its wrath and smote down privilege in France, and privilege—that is to say, a private and particular law conferring special powers and immunities upon a class or body—is just as liable to be wrested to tyrannous uses by a parliament as by a nobility or sovereign. Privilege and democracy cannot co-exist; they are a contradiction in terms. And "Parliamentary privilege in a democracy," as was once remarked to me by the late Ebenezer Syme—one of the ablest and sincerest champions of democracy I ever knew—"is only arbitrary power masking its features in a cap of liberty." Finally, although the epoch at which the true *aristoi* of a country will govern its affairs is distant, it is not to be despaired of; and I ground my expectation of a brighter chapter in human history upon what may at first sight appear to be a paradox, but which, upon closer examination, will prove to be an axiomatic truth. It is this—Morality is identical with enlightened selfishness. To be just, truthful, diligent, prudent, and temperate, is to be healthy, happy, and prosperous. Like many other truths, this is one which is but slowly apprehended by the mass of mankind; but we must not be impatient of results, remembering that, in the lifetime of our race, a thousand years are but as a day in the lifetime of a man. Each of us may do something to accelerate the arrival of this desirable state of things; and no person, howsoever insignificant, can rightly estimate the value of his own example or foresee the extent of his individual influence, for good or for evil. The hope of every generation, and the promise of the future, are enclosed in its young men and women. To them is entrusted the honourable and responsible duty of

bearing aloft, and carrying forward, the torch of progress. In a few years the political and municipal government of this colony will fall—as it ought to fall—into the hands of those who have been born in the colony, or who came hither in their childhood. We who immigrated hither in the prime of life are more or less conscious of "a divided duty." We have been transplanted, and are not like the Anglo-Australians proper—"native and to the manner born." We cannot altogether forget the old country, nor obliterate from our hearts and minds old affections and old associations. Not so, however, our children. All their recollections and aspirations will centre here. Here will be found the past to which their memories will revert, and the future to which their hopes will be directed. Theirs will be the opportunity, as, I trust, theirs will be the honourable ambition, to build up the stately fabric of a commonwealth which will renew and perpetuate in this southern land the greatness and renown of that illustrious parent state,

*"Whose deep foundations lie  
In veneration and the people's love;  
Whose steps are equity, whose seat is law."*

Engaged in this exalted work, let them not undervalue the lessons of experience, nor be guilty of the filial ingratitude of despising the example and defaming the character of "that sceptred isle, that earth of majesty and seat of Mars—that precious stone set in the silver sea," which Milton loved and Shakspeare magnified. Hers is a great and glorious past. Be it yours to create a beneficent and brilliant future for this, almost the youngest born, of that august and venerable mother of nations; always maintaining that sober self-respect and modest dignity which best befit the children of such a parent, and always remembering that

*"Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,  
These three alone lead life to sovereign power."*

The Rev. H. HIGGINSON moved and Mr. FOORD seconded a vote of thanks to the lecturer.

The motion was carried by acclamation and duly acknowledged.

On the motion of Mr. JAS. SMITH, seconded by the Hon. E. LANGTON, a similar compliment was paid to the chairman, who acknowledged it by urging the members of the Early Closing Society to continue their exertions in their own behalf.

The proceedings then terminated.

Stillwell & Knight, Printers, 78, Collins-street East.

PRE-HISTORIC MAN. A Lecture

*Delivered at the Princess' Theatre, Melbourne, on August 9, 1869,*

By the REV. J. E. BROMBY, D.D.

Being the Eighth of a Series of Lectures under the Auspices of the Early Closing Association.

*Published by Direction of the Committee.*

Price Sixpence.

Stillwell and Knight, Printers Melbourne: Collins Street. 1869.

## Pre-Historic Man.

The following lecture, the last of the series given during the Winter of 1869, in connection with the Early Closing Association, was delivered by the Rev. J. E. Bromby, D.D., in the Princess Theater, to a large and appreciative audience. Upon the stage were a number of clergymen and scientific gentlemen, amongst whom were the following : His Lordship the Bishop of Melbourne (in the chair), the Revs. M. H. Beecher, H. H. P. Hand field, J. S. Waugh, I. Moore, S.J., J. Potter, D. MacDonald, Dr. Tucker, Professor M'Coy, Geo. Foord, Esq., Dr. Barker, E. Gill, Esq. J.P., D. O'Donovan, Esq., Dr. Thomson, Captain Amsinck.

DR. BROMBY said:—

It is my duty this evening, my friends, to discourse to you for an hour or so on our fellow-man before he emerges into the light of history—or man still wandering in the dim twilight of tradition; or even in times still earlier, while the vestiges which tell of his existence are few and far between—rude implements of stone maybe, or bones which he has once dined off and then thrown aside. But in this long line of our primæval ancestry where must I begin ? Why, of course, many of you will say, begin with Adam. Adam ! But then you must remember that the Hebrew word Adam means only man; nothing more, and nothing less. And to begin my

story of man by allusions to man, would be very like reasoning in a circle—the act of the tipsy cripple, who, having got his wooden leg into a plug-hole, went on walking round and round the stump. It is true the Bible translators have assumed a very arbitrary power in dealing with this word Adam. In the very same verse, or in consecutive verses, they translate it into man, and they transfer it untranslated; but in the original Hebrew it is just the same. The first time it occurs in Scripture is in the 1st chapter of Genesis—"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." But they might just as well have written, "Let us make Adam in our image." All that we can learn from Scripture is that God created man by a special fiat of his own. He made him out of the dust of the ground, but without showing how the elements were put together, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. This, I say, is all the Bible teaches; it deals only with the religious aspect of things; its element of inspiration is concerned only with the spirit. "The kingdom of God consisteth not in meat and drink." "Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven." If anything of science transpires through the pages of Scripture, it is in light from that far horizon where science and religion meet—strange forms looming dimly in grandest outline, overwhelming us by their dread and awe-inspiring shadows, or dazzling us with the jewelled brightness of the mere skirts of the Almighty's clothing. And as with science, so with history. It is just the same. Holy writ does not profess to teach us history as such. Even those parts of Scripture which usually go by the name of the historic books are always classed as part of the prophetic writings in that threefold division—the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. They are selections made by the prophets in their sacred colleges at Bethel and Jericho, from the chronicles of the time, to illustrate God's dealings with the world. Would you know more than this? As for instance, would you know "the rest of the acts of Ahah, and all that he did, and the ivory houses which he made, and all the cities which he built?" Then they tell you distinctly that you must go elsewhere for your information. "Are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the Kings of Israel?" *i. e.*, in those public annals which were kept by the Government recorder. Take a glance now at the chronology of Scripture. With what perfect indifference does it treat all such accurate calculations, upon which we are disposed to lay such immense stress when we reckon up the years and the ages that are passed. We read in the first chapter of Matthew that there were fourteen generations between David and the Captivity, and the individual names in the pedigree are recorded one by one; but when we turn to the Old Testament history, we find all these name indeed, but discover that there are three others deliberately left out by the evangelist, and that, too, for no good reason that can be assigned. Nor is there any deception intended in this; it was simply the custom of the people, with which inspiration did not interfere. Examples abound. Take this:—Laban is said to be the son of Bethuel, and Bethuel the son of Nahor, and yet we find repeatedly that Laban is called the son of Nahor. It came to the same thing in the mind of a Hebrew historian. Then, again, forty years seem to serve for any period of a man's life which did not happen to be known exactly. Isaac married Rebecca when he was forty years old; Esau married Judith when he was forty years old; Moses visited his brethren when he was forty years old; Israelites dwelt in the wilderness forty years. At the time of the Judges the land had rest, twice under Othniel and under Gideon, each time forty years; and was under the domination of the Philistines forty years. Eli judged Israel just forty years. Saul, David, Solomon, each reigned just forty years, and many others; and what is true of forty years is also true of forty days. In short, it is quite clear it was a mere habit they had of contenting themselves with a proximate round number, without caring to be precise.

If, then, chronology is not taught in Scripture, what shall we say of its history? In one respect it is quite as good without the chronology as with it. For spiritual truth does not depend upon times and seasons; indeed, it would appear that in some cases it is deteriorated by them, for the observance of these may degenerate into superstition. And so St. Paul remonstrates with the Galatians, "Ye observe days and months, and times and years; I am afraid of you." But the great spiritual truth is, that the times of all of us are in God's hand. So spake the prophet Daniel in that magnificent exordium to his interpretation of Belshazzar's dream—"Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever; for wisdom and might are His, and He changeth the times and the seasons." And what is true of chronology is as true of every other branch of human knowledge. We have now long ceased to fear lest Galileo's telescope should undermine the basis of religion; and though, to be sure, a similar panic from time to time returns whenever Science penetrates deeper into any of the arcana of nature—as geology did in the last age, and as everything, from positivism to protoplasm, does in this—yet Religion still holds her own, and never did she number in her ranks more men distinguished for science and research than she does at this very moment. In dealing, then, with the Scriptural account of man's creation, while we should always approach the sacred precincts reverentially, and, in imagination, put off our shoes from off our feet, for the place whereon we stand is holy ground, yet truth demands of us that we should not keep our eyes hoodwinked, but rather watch with an almost jealous suspicion lest the conventional traditions of man might displace what are really and truly the averments of the Written Word. Spiritual things can be discerned only by the spirit within us; but intelligible things come within the scope of the eye of the understanding, and are left to be made out by our own research.

On opening the Bible, in its earliest chapters, the first thing that strikes us is that there are at least two

distinct accounts of man's creation, just as in opening the New Testament we see there are four distinct accounts of our Lord's ministry and death. And just as, in the four gospels, where we find discrepancies in detail—as we do—we infer that such detail must be immaterial, so ought we to infer the same in the differing accounts of the creation.

In the first account of man's creation, which concludes with the third verse of the second chapter of Genesis, the Divine Creator is called by the simple name of God (*Elohim*). In the second account he is called by a more august title—the Lord God (*Jehovah Elohim*). The first commences with that pregnant phrase "In the beginning," and culminates in the statement, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." The second commences with the customary formula, "These are the generations of the heaven and the earth." and evinces its fragmentary character by the circumstance that, although it speaks of the creation of plants and herbs, it omits all mention of animals, but records the creation of man thus, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." Some Hebrew scholars have supposed the passage beginning with the fifth chapter to be a third record. It certainly commences with the formula, "This is the book of the generation of man," but, for all that, may be a resumption of the first document, which had been broken by the interposition of the second. It speaks of the creation of man in much the same terms, but is remarkable for speaking of both sexes under the same name—man; "Male and female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam;" showing that Adam could not, there at least, be a proper name.

Before leaving this portion of Scripture there is one term—"garden"—which needs a passing notice. It does not mean a small enclosure planted with flowers, but a large extensive park. The word which the Greek translators employed to represent the Paradise. These paradises were common enough in the East. They were the parks or hunting-grounds of the powerful monarchs of the Babylonish and Persian dynasties. They contained also choice trees of every kind, both for ornament and delight. When the Jews returned from the Babylonish captivity, they received grants from the Persian monarchs of the privilege to cut down timber in the royal paradises during the rebuilding of their city. The meaning of the writer would therefore be that the place where man commenced his existence upon earth was a natural park of vast extent, where edible fruits and wild animals abounded. Here would he find himself in the midst of every comfort, abundance of nutritious fruit, and venison to be had for the hunting. And it is a remarkable fact also, which we may note in passing, that almost all our fruit trees with which this day our gardens and orchards are stocked—apples, pears, figs, peaches, plums, vines, nay, even our coffee and our tea—all derive their origin from the East, emanating, it would appear, from that great garden of the Lord. While man lived in this delightful region, he lived in comparative innocence. He was, at all events, conscious of no sin. He could do no great wrong, and at first there would be no great temptation. This state of things then corresponded with the far-famed golden age, of which nearly every nation of antiquity held a tradition. This was the happy legendary period when Oromasdes reigned in Persia, Osiris in Egypt, Saturn in Italy, and Ogyges in Greece. I say legendary; it could not be historic, for reasons obvious enough; for not only had people not taught themselves letters, in such uneventful times there was really no history to write.

It is easy to see how rapidly, under such circumstances, people would multiply in the earth, and as people multiplied food would become proportionately scarce; and now man, instead of hunting down the sheep as game, would begin to pasture them in flocks. These would become his property, his wealth. The old Latin word for money (*pecunia*) is an immediate derivation from *pecus*, sheep—the earliest representative of riches. The next phase, after the nomadic and pastoral, would be the agricultural. In this young country we have an example of this. The squatter is driven off the face of the land by the selector, and thus it comes to pass the words of Scripture about Abel, the keeper of sheep, being killed by Cain, the tiller of the ground, seem almost to bear an allegorical sense, in addition to their primary one. This it is which lies at the root of that far-famed struggle for the Agrarian law which forms the leading feature of early Roman history, as soon as ever it emerges from the legendary period. Now, in order to show how rapidly Scripture passes over these preliminary stages of human life, it is but necessary to mention that Cain, the eldest son of Adam, is represented as building a city, and calling that city by the name of his eldest son, Enoch. Yes! even Cain builds a city—the first man after Adam.

But some will no doubt be disposed to remind me of the great length of time that men then lived, and therefore of the possibility of men becoming numerous enough even in two generations to build cities and live in towns. Let us discuss that topic next. All the days that Adam lived were 930 years; all the days that Enos lived were 905 years; and so on till we come down to the oldest of them, Methuselah, who lived 969 years. Now I have no hesitation in saying at once that I concur in the suggestion that these years are nothing but months, and these are my reasons:—In the first place, the Hebrew word for year, Hebrew word for year (though not, indeed, so used elsewhere) will very easily bear that meaning. Let me show you an illustration. When we meet with the word week, we think only of seven days,—from Sunday morning, it may be, till Saturday night; for that is its only meaning in English. But the Hebrew word for week conveys quite a different—idea. It means

merely a bundle of 7—a hebdomad. A Hebrew could quite as easily speak of a week of weeks or a week of years as he could a week of days. The context decides it when the latter now is omitted; and when we read that Jacob served a week for Laban and another week for Rachel nobody doubts but that the writer meant seven years in either case and not seven days. Now when we come to the word for a year, we find it to be a similar derivative from the number 2. The verb derived from it is to repeat—to begin at the same point and go over the same ground again. There can hardly be any doubt then that the original meaning of the Hebrew word for year was a revolution, as we call it—that is, the revolution of the sun through the seasons of the year. But in the primitive meaning of the word it might apply equally well to a revolution of the moon; and we must bear in mind too that in subtropical countries the revolutions of the moon are far more obvious and easy to be observed than the revolutions of the sun. In high latitudes indeed, where the snow lies deep upon the ground every winter, the revolutions of the seasons are obvious enough; but in that region which we have every reason to believe was the cradle of humanity this is by no means the case; and men would first begin to reckon the lapse of time by lunar periods, and

*"Count their birthdays by the moon."*

The word *annus* in Latin, from which we have our English word annual, meant only a great circle or ring; hence another English word, annular, [*unclear*: orring-shaped]. Admitting then that the word word meaning a reiterated period of time originally meant merely a reiterated period of time, as its derivation implies, it would stand in the earliest records of mankind for a month, but when later language appropriated it solely to a year, the earlier records would be exposed to misinterpretation, especially when a translation had to be made from one dialect to another. A ludicrous mistake of this order actually occurs in that very interesting account which the truth-loving Herodotus has left us of his travels. He had wandered (he tells us) northwards through Media till he arrived on the borders of Scythia, and not feeling disposed to travel further into those inclement regions, he contented himself with gathering all the information he could of what was further to the north from those who were resident on the spot. They told him—first you will come to such a country, then to such a country, till at last you come to parts which are utterly uninhabitable, because the air is filled with feathers. Though Herodotus puts this last statement down, he tells us with the utmost gravity that he don't believe it. And yet what doubt can there be but that these feathers in the Scythian language meant nothing more than flakes of snow? So in like manner, when we read that Adam, or primæval man, lived 930 years, we may, like Herodotus, assume a solemn face and say "we don't believe it." But divide this number 930 by the number of lunations in a year, and we have as the result a trifle more than seventy five years, and seventy-three years is the average age of all of them, except of Enoch, who died by this calculation at the age of thirty. But of his early death we have intimation in the expressive language that he walked with God, and was not, for God took him. Methuselah, the oldest of them, was just seventy eight. All this is very natural. But now arises a difficulty. On turning to the numbers again, we find that Adam begat a when son he was 130 years old. Consider these 130 years as months, and we find that ten and a half years was the age of the father when Seth his third son was born. Or, if Adam's case be thought peculiar, take that of Enoch, who was sixty five when his eldest son was born. Turn the sixty-five months into years, and this would make Enoch just five and a quarter years old when the nurse brought to him the little Methusaleh for his blessing. But mark now, when I turn to the Septuagint translation of the Scriptures—a work quite as authentic as the Hebrew—a version accepted by all the Jews prior to the Christian era who understood Greek, constantly quoted by Josephus, generally by the writers in the New Testament, and by all the Greek fathers, when—I say, I turn to the Septuagint, I find that all these patriarchs when their children are born are just 100 years older, with the exception of Jared and Lamech, and their ages in the Hebrew are far the largest in the list. So that, if these numbers are to be relied on, men in those days died at an average age of seventy five, and became fathers at an average age of fourteen or fifteen. And that I think not unlikely in a hot country, and when *trousseaux* were very inexpensive. I cannot leave these sacred pages of Scripture without once more reminding my hearers that their object is not to teach either history or science; and perhaps no stronger proof could be given of this than the manner in which they present their opening view of per-historic man. That it is pregnant with vastly deeper meaning than mere history is discernible at a glance. The very names of the trees which grow in the garden of Eden—the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the tree of life—are palpably allegorical; and the serpent speaking with human voice, as in the didactic fables of sage antiquity, bears testimony to the same fact. The condensed wisdom of these early chapters of inspiration is not history, and yet contains the quintessence of all the histories of all the peoples of the world up to the time of Abraham. If all those histories had been written in full, with their myriads of facts, and then translated into every speech and language under heaven, we may indeed say, in the words of the apostle John, "that the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." To show the necessity for condensing knowledge for the use of ordinary men take this illustration from natural history:—There are said to be no less than 40,000 different species of beetles preserved in the cabinet cases of scientific museums, each species with a different scientific name, and each having some specialty with which the entomologist is acquainted. What a tax upon

the memory to recollect them all; and yet all the wisdom contained in these 40,000 learned names is sufficiently condensed for the use of ordinary men into that one word "beetle." When, then, Abel, the keeper of sheep, was gone, and Cain had built his city Enoch, a portion of mankind had passed from a nomadic to what we should call a more civilized condition of life. Well might he be said at this juncture to have tasted of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. It is are through many chapters that Scripture passes before we are favored with a peep into the interior of one of these ancient cities. Yes, my friends, great as are the advantages of civilisation, these advantages are purchased at a fearful price. To this all the degrading vices, which spring up in towns like poisonous weeds, bear saddest witness. The knowledge of good and evil may raise men to a higher level in the scale of intellectual being, as no doubt it does—they become as gods, knowing good and evil, but they fall from a state of comparate innocence. And were it not that religion here steps in with its curative and regenerative virtues, it might well be said of most men, "far better were it that they had never known civilisation;" and of some, "far better that they had never been born." Is not that splendid Oriental metaphor true to this hour of many daughters of Eve, that, listening to the serpent's voice, and tasting of forbidden fruit, that very day they die.

If, now, we turn from the pages of Scripture, and address ourselves to study the history of our species by such tokens as we can discern with our own eyes upon the surface of the earth, the task becomes long and painful. Here a stone utensil, there a broken bone, tells a portion of the tale; even the manner in which a nutshell has been cracked, taken in connection with the matrix which imbeds the relic, conveys a meaning; and the laboriously traced etymologies of the earliest written languages serve as beacons in wandering through the dark recesses of the past. It requires, therefore, much enduring perseverance, coupled with great soberness of judgment, on the part of the enthusiastic antiquarian, before he can crystallise his many scattered facts into the transparent gem of truth. It is pleasant enough, as you sit in your easy-chair, to concoct all sorts of crude theories out of the Scripture text; but to dive to the bottom of a bone cave, where all is moist and dark, and ever and anon chill drippings from above find their way into your neck-hole, and day after day nothing perhaps to reward you for your pains, is a very different thing. *Hoc opus, hic labor est.* It reminds me of an anecdote of a painstaking English pastor who had taught an aged parishioner to read, and inquired one day of the wife how the old man got on in reading his Bible. "Bible," she says, "bless you, sir, he has got out of the Bible and into the newspapers long ago." The traces of man's primæval existence upon earth are, as we might have expected, faint and few, but where met with exceedingly significant. They extend in some sort over the whole face of the earth, and backwards in point of time to a period so remote that the 6,000 years estimated by Archbishop Ussher from the Scripture records, sink into utter insignificance. This branch of study is quite new. It began to dawn with the first year of the present century, when a Mr. John Frere discovered near Diss, in Suffolk, certain flints, which he tells us "were evidently weapons of war, fabricated and used by a people who had not the use of metals. They lay in great numbers at the depth of about twelve feet of a stratified soil, which was dug into for the purpose of clay for bricks. . . . The manner in which the flint weapons lay would lead to the persuasion that it was a place of their manufacture, and not of their accidental deposit. Their numbers were so great that the man who carried on the brick work, before he became aware of their being objects of curiosity, had emptied basketsful of them into the ruts of the adjoining road." Some of these implements are now in the British Museum. Possibly some of my hearers may have seen them; I have not. But another collection—one of the finest in the world I was told at that time—was in process of formation in the island of Guernsey during my residence there. A local antiquary—Mr. Lucas—conceived the idea of digging into the floors of what are sometimes called Druids' altars—the cromlechs. These altars, which are really places of sepulture, and abound in the Channel Islands, are rude structures of massive stones, placed upright round small enclosures, and roofed over with enormous ponderous slabs. Here they have stood for untold centuries, and the race of men which built them has completely passed away. Mr. Lucas's labours were rewarded by the discovery of a large number of these stone tools (Celts, as they call them, from the Latin *celtis*, a chisel), various in shape, and evidently intended to be applied to uses as different from each other as that of a hatchet from a razor. One would be notched that it might be fastened to a stick, and then used either as a hammer or an axe, according as the blunt side or the sharp one might be turned forward. Some would be spearheads. But there were others of much finer make and polish, and capable of performing such work as is now done by knife or scissors. The edge of them is so sharp, notwithstanding the number of centuries which have rolled over since they were deposited, that if you should heedlessly run your thumb over the edge it would at once cut you to the quick. Such, then, are among the earliest tools which man taught himself to use at the time when the first wave or two of population was spreading itself over the earth. We in this era of the world's existence, are still able to assist our imagination by studying localities where these first waves of population still exist—*e. g.*, among the Bosjesmen and Hottentots of South Africa, or even on our own continent. But they are now rapidly passing away. When the West India Islands were first discovered they swarmed with the aboriginal inhabitants—inoffensive people, lying lazily under the trees, and apparently happy as the day was long. But now not a man is left. Many of the savage races

with which we have come in contact—as for example, the Kaffirs in Africa, the red men in America, and the New Zealanders, are not the first but the second wave of population.

Now what is it which proves the great antiquity of man? It is partly the bones of animals found simultaneously deposited with these relics of him, and partly geological changes which have since taken place, and the time of which we are able in some degree to measure. Even Mr. Frere, at the beginning of the century, mentioned that in the stratum of sand above the gravel where they found the stone tools there lay "the jaw-bone and teeth of an enormous unknown animal—*i. e.*, unknown then, but had it been preserved till now, probably Professor Owen would have told us more about it. Within the last thirty years many similar gravel strata, and many bone caves, have been carefully searched both in England and France; and great precaution taken to ascertain exactly the manner in which these relics of man's handiwork are associated with the bones of extinct animals. These extinct animals are usually of large size. There were two species of European elephant—the *e. primigenius*, and the *e. antiquus*. There was a hippopotamus, and a woolly rhinoceros or two; there were bears and hyenas in abundance, besides gigantic deer and oxen, bisons, wolves, and swine. Let me quote the case of the famous Brixham cave in Devon shire, three or four miles west of Torquay. At the bottom was a very perfect flint tool, and at a higher level was a very perfect leg of an extinct species of bear, which must have been deposited there when the sinews were entire, for every bone was in its proper place, even the knee-pan; and overlying all was a solid crust of hard stalagmite, requiring a pickaxe to break through, and itself containing a reindeer's horn, and the bone of an extinct bear—of a bear that is of a species now nowhere to be found in the world. And though, to be sure, reindeer still exist, yet if you were to bring from Lapland any number of them to Brixham, they would sicken and die in a few months. The experiment was tried in Scotland. Now what we have particularly to observe is, that the Brixham cave is not an isolated instance of the sort, but the type of a multitude of others. In short, every year is adding to the testimony we already possess, that a very long time ago man, in his primitive condition, before he had found out the use of any metal whatever, was spread over all Europe; and that, at the same period, there lived elephants and rhinoceroses, and gigantic deer of a sort which now are nowhere to be found, being readily distinguishable from those of Asia and of Africa by the corrugation of their teeth.

Now it may be urged that the disappearance of these huge animals does not of itself necessarily indicate any great lapse of time. When the Cape of Good Hope was first colonised by the Dutch, only two centuries ago, animals as gigantic as the *e. antiquus* swarmed in the rivers and forests of Southern Africa; but they have all disappeared before the advance of man for hundreds of miles to the northward. But then, on the other hand, we must recollect that it would take many more centuries for a sparse and feeble race, whose deadliest weapons were stone hatchets, or arrows tipped with flint, to destroy these huge pachyderms than it would a flowing stream of European immigrants, agricultural in their habits, and armed with first-rate Manton rifles—so much more time, indeed, that many advocates of the briefer existence of man have preferred to attribute their disappearance from the fauna of Europe to geological changes of the earth's crust. But even then, if we do resort to geology, we shall have to draw very largely on the great bank of time for such phenomena to take place; for all geological evidence goes to prove that whatever occurred in those ancient eras occurred quietly, or at all events with no more violent cataclysms and disruptions than are occurring from time to time somewhere on the earth's surface now.

But let us turn to another page of man's primeval story. Denmark is particularly rich in the tokens it furnishes of the great antiquity of aboriginal man in Europe. The shores of nearly all Scandinavia, especially the Danish islands, are dotted with large mounds of shells—oyster-shells, cockle-shells, mussels, and periwinkles, interspersed with stone implements, and with bones of animals, which have had the gristle gnawed off the ends. The Danes call these mounds *Kyöken-mödding*—words which we have in our own language slightly modified in sound—*Kyöken* being identical with kitchen, and *mödding* with midden, or the manure-heap, which used to stand, and probably still stands, near almost every rural cottage in the north of England. The name is exceedingly expressive, for they were evidently the kitchen refuse-heaps of the Danish aborigines. There is no mistaking their being the relics of many an excellent dinner. The bones are almost all broken in a peculiar way for the extraction of the marrow, and then given to the domestic dogs to feed upon. Similar bones have been given to modern dogs to test this point, and are always left in precisely the same state. These mounds are, some of them 1,000 feet long by above 200 broad, and from three to ten feet high. Take an average of five feet high, and this gives us just 1,000,000 cubic feet in one single mound. And if we suppose a cubic inch of shell to have furnished a decent mouthful of fish, that would give us just 144,000,000 mouthfuls in one single mound. But we must remember we are only calculating the oyster-sauce; there is plenty of evidence to prove that many a good steak of red-deer and of roe supplied the *pièces de resistance* at these primitive feasts. So that whatever it was which caused these ancient people to disappear, they do not seem to have been starved out. Now, what evidence can we extract from these mounds to indicate the lapse of time? It is this :—The oyster shells, and especially the mussel shells, are much larger—about twice the size of the same species of shell found in that

neighbourhood now, the diminution *in* size being due to the deficiency of salt in the Baltic water. Clearly, therefore, in the lapse of pre-historic ages the Danish coast line must have undergone some geological change which has blocked up once-existing channels, and excluded the full tide of salt water which must have once flowed in from the German Sea. But this is not all. When we extend our examination from the shells to the bones found in the refuse" heaps in order to ascertain the kind of animals these Danish aborigines consorted with, we find they are all of recent species. No mammoth, no rhinoceros bones, but those of roe and red deer, of lynx, and fox, and wolf—all animals found in Europe still. There is, to be sure, one apparent exception—the urus, or wild bull, which now has disappeared; but we must remember that the urus is not prehistoric, for Julius Cæsar, the first invader of Britain, has left us a full description of it, so that, like the dodo, it lived into historic times. Old, then, as these Danish-mound people were, they were not so old as those bone-cave people of Brixham, or those of the gravel drifts, who were contemporaneous with bears and mammoths and hyenas of extinct sorts. And this inference is further corroborated by the comparison of the stone implements of the two peoples. For of that earliest race of man, the Hints are so rude that it is sometimes difficult for any but a practiced eye to see that they are implements at all; but in the mounds their edges are ground to greater nicety, showing a marked progress in such civilisation as these ancient peoples were capable of.

And now comes in a further proof of progressive advancement. There are in Denmark, besides these shell-mounds, certain peat bogs varying in depth from ten or thirty feet which have been accumulated in hollows which once were swamps, like those on the banks of the Yarra. Now the lowest stratum of this peat is composed entirely of swamp mosses. Above this another growth of peat, but no longer exclusively of swamp plants. We must observe this stratified character of the bogs, for it proves that they are in the state in which they were originally formed, and not like some Irish bogs, which, conceiving a passion for travel, go on moving at a certain slow pace, and fill up all the hollows which they cross. In these Danish bogs everything is in *situ*; and imbedded in the peat are found trunks of trees which have grown on the margin of the swamps, lived to a good old age, for many are three feet in diameter, and then fallen in. From these trees we are able, without much cross-examination, to extort some very important testimony. For in the lowest stratum the principal tree is the Scotch fir, and yet that tree has long ceased to be a denizen of the Danish islands. There is no record of its ever being teen there in historic times, and when curious acclimatisers try to plant it there now, it will not thrive. From some unknown cause, some gradual upheaval of the continent—so gradual as to have left the swamp still a swamp, and yet sufficient to have shut out a certain atmospheric stimulus—shut out, we will suppose, the benign influences of the Gulf-stream, which produce those splendid mists which Scotchmen love so much—whatever the cause, all these fir trees in course of time died out in Denmark, and were superseded by two species of oak in succession, both of which still grow in England. But the change did not stop here, but, as the ages rolled, the oaks disappeared in turn, and gave place to the common beech, which, within historic times, has been the great prevailing tree throughout Denmark.

Now, here is the place to introduce the single connecting link which gives significance to all these curious facts. It is this :—In the very lowest stratum of one bog, and under the prostrate trunk of a veritable Scotch fir, which had lain there undisturbed so many untold centuries, Professor Steenstruss (of Copenhagen) took out with his own hands a stone hatchet. To estimate, then, the antiquity of this venerable relic is the problem before us, and is identical with that of reckoning up the centuries which it must have taken the races of trees we have been speaking of to be successively exterminated. True, we are familiar enough with examples of this kind of extermination. A crop of this tiles will soon exterminate a crop of wheat. The common rat, which is now in all our sewers, was never seen in Europe till it crossed the Wolga, after an earthquake in 1727; but so much stronger was it than its softer cousin, the old black rat, which previously had occupied all the available rat-holes on the Continent, that it speedily extinguished him. Nay, not content with having all the continent of Europe to himself, he quickly comes to Hamburg, finds there a vessel bound for London—coolly puts his wife and family on board at dead of night—and, the voyage over, as coolly brings them all ashore at swapping. That's just the way he came to Melbourne. And now the brown rat is everywhere, and the black rat nowhere—all within less than a century and a half. But was this the rate, I ask, at which whole forests of Scotch fir gave way to oaks, and then the oaks to beeches? Certainly not. Thistle-down flies fast and far; and there are other weeds which, though possessing no wings of their own, can borrow the wings of birds which feed on them; for not only is their vitality not destroyed by passing through the alimentary canal, but, like guano-sown grain, they have their fertility increased. Not so with the acorn. Every new generation of oaks must grow within that narrow forest-border over which the highest wind can blow the acorn as it falls; and they must grow to maturity before they in turn can shed their fruit. And yet Denmark has three times changed its forests ! What countless winters, then, must have annually shed their coverlets of snow on those wondrous swamps which tell of these progressive changes! And, what is very striking—as the forests of different trees succeed each other, so also do tokens exhibit themselves of the progressive advancement of man; for in the Scotch-fir period we find him using stone implements and living upon shell-fish and venison; but when the oaks have superseded the fir-trees,

then bronze implements appear for the first time, together with bones of sheep and oxen. The conclusion of the whole record, then, is this:—The lowest stratum of peat presents us with indications of man existing in no higher condition than he was when the huge pachyderms roamed the continent; but we trace him through this early Scotch-fir period refining himself into the practice of polishing his stone tools for finer workmanship, and, probably, for the richer ornamentation of his person. But when the lapse of centuries has brought round the oaks, then he has risen to the higher civilisation of bronze utensils; and bronze, of course, brings us to the borders of reliable history.

Now, here we may pause to remark upon the very interesting fact that just when these stone implements of remote antiquity had begun, within these few years, to attract the attention of the antiquary, the stone period of existing peoples should be just passing away. When Tasmania was first discovered the aborigine of that island could be seen manufacturing his stone knives with great dexterity, and of a type closely resembling those which the Scandinavian aborigine manufactured such an incalculably long time ago. Picking up a likely stone, he would deftly chip off one side a few flakes and leave the other round for the hand to hold by. That was his knife, and when the edge was blunted he would fling it away and make another. But he has just ceased to be a living illustration. The last Tasmanian man died only the other day. (You read in the papers, I dare say, how some enthusiastic savant went in the darkness of the night and took his skull; and public propriety was shocked, and all with one accord cried fie ! But really it is difficult to see what ought to have been done. It was clearly wrong to walk off surreptitiously with the poor fellow's head, but then would it not have been equally wrong not to have secured it, in the cause of antiquarian science? Perhaps the happy medium would have best been hit by dividing the cranium in two parts, polishing one half for the Hobart Town museum, and burying the other under the altar of decency.) Living, I say, as we do at this peculiar era, when the stone age is passing away from the remotest corner of the earth, we resemble Moses on the top of Pisgah, and see from the same stand-point two totally distinct phases of human existence. The wilderness of the stone period, so to speak, we have left for ever, and yet it reaches to the very base of the mountain on which we stand. We have had the opportunity of verifying by ocular inspection what the degree of civilisation is which these stone utensils indicate. Those old aboriginal inhabitants of England and France whose implements are found sepulchred with the bones of rhinoceros and elephant in the gravel drift would be very much in the condition of the rude Tasmanian race who are just passing away. (Women remain.) Whereas the polished implements of the peat bog immediately prior to the introduction of bronze so closely resemble those of present Polynesian and Maori workmanship that we may estimate pretty fairly the kind of men who peopled Scandinavia before the oak had been exterminated by the beech. In a few years the opportunity of making this comparison by ocular inspection of living races will have passed away.

We must now take a rapid glance at Switzerland. In the winter of 1853-4 an unusual drought reduced the waters of all the Swiss lakes to a level lower than the oldest inhabitant could remember. The thrifty people resolved to turn the occasion to account, and to redeem some portion of the lake by doing what was done in the Botanic-gardens here during the last dry summer—raising some parts by deepening others. But the work was no sooner begun than the diggers came upon piles of wood driven into the mud, in which mud were also found a great many celts—axes and hammers and other tools, all in first-rate condition. In short, they had discovered the foundations of an ancient village, and it was soon ascertained that not one only, but seventy such villages, once existed in the various Swiss lakes, built upon piles in the middle of the water, and nearly all belonging to the stone period. Forty thousand piles have been calculated as belonging to one single village. Curiosity was highly excited, and every relic as it came to light was carefully studied and preserved. The pre-historic tale they tell is this:—The people who constructed these lake dwellings were decidedly further advanced in civilisation than the Danish aborigines. For we discover tokens of agriculture, three kinds of grain, four sorts of domesticated animals, fragments of pottery, even playthings for children. A canoe had foundered in the lake laden with stones; being intended, probably, when overtaken with misfortune, to strengthen the bases of the piles. The piles themselves could not have been driven in without the aid of ingenious mechanism. Stones of great weight must have been raised by strong cordage to do the work of the iron monkeys now employed in driving piles. So that we may be said to be contemplating a stage of advancement on a par with those extraordinary people who constructed the megalithic circles in England, of which the most celebrated is that on Salisbury Plain. What immense mechanical skill must have been exercised by a people who did not possess a single iron tool to drag stones of such enormous weight from incredible distances (for they are not the stones of the neighbourhood), and having set some of them upright to raise others equally ponderous to a great height to place them horizontally on the top. And then, again, there is the great serpent of Abury, which consists of massive stones arranged within sight of each other for miles upon miles in a serpentine line, in the middle of which is a small megalithic circle, the object of the long line of stones probably being to guide the people of a scattered race as they came periodically to attend their central place of worship. Traveling from east or west, they would find it much easier to strike the serpent somewhere than to hit the circle at once.

But to return to the lake-dwellers of Switzerland. Surprising as these monuments are of so remote an age, they are nevertheless the handiwork of a feeble race—of a race on the eve of extinction. The very circumstance of their having recourse to laboriously-constructed pile dwellings in the middle of the water, with a narrow access from the shore, seems to point to a sense of imbecility, and to the existence of a stronger race not far off of whom they were afraid. Nor were their fears vain, for a close inspection of the *débris* around these piles proves in the case of nearly every village that it has been destroyed by fire. Charred remains of rafters or other wood, and even of grains of corn, shed a melancholy light on this tragic story of a long-past age, when the bitter wail of wife and child must have risen up t Heaven as their burning homes sank in smoke and flame within the bosom of the once peaceful waters. There are two circumstances which make these lake dwellings particularly interesting—one is, that they present a point of osculation with written history; for Herodotus gives an account of a similar habitation in a small mountain lake in Thrace, five centuries before Christ, whose inhabitants were enabled to escape subjection to the Persian yoke during, the famous invasion of Greece, through their inaccessibility in the middle of the lake. And this very lake-village, by means of following out Herodotus's description, was re-discovered by a French savant, M. Deville, in 1862, *i. e.* seven years ago.

The second point of interest connected with the Swiss lake dwellings is that we have the means of approximating to the time in which they were first constructed; for the waters which flow into some of the lakes form deltas which gradually silt up at a definite rate per annum. Now, as we know how much has been silted up within historic periods, we have an element of calculation whereby to reach the building of the earliest dwelling. Three scientific gentlemen, taking quite different grounds, and making their calculations in perfect independence of each other, have come to very nearly the same conclusion—viz. that the bronze age must have begun about four or five thousand years ago, and the earliest stone age about a couple of thousand years before that. So that, if we just step back some sixty centuries of time we may see these ingenious savages actively at work with their ponderous stone monkeys driving their piles into the mud. And we must bear, too, in mind, that what we see being done in these few selected cases has been done at various times by similar peoples all over the world, sometimes attaining before their extinction a high degree of civilisation. In Central America the wandering traveller comes across the ruins of what must once have been extensive settlements of organised society, of which the present inhabitants can give no more account than we can of the people who constructed the megalithic circle at Stonehenge. And in the great basin of the Mississippi and of the Ohio there are hundreds of mounds which are the ruined temples of an extinct people; and so long ago is it since these tombs and temples have been buried in the earth, that large rivers have had time to change their courses, and whole generations of forests to succeed each other.

It is rather a curious circumstance that the Scriptures themselves, though they pass over the stone age historically, yet bear indirect testimony to its having once existed, by their mention of the use of stone implements in a religious ceremony. We know perfectly well how long religious usage will over live when other usages have become wholly changed by scientific discovery, or by political revolution. Indeed the very meaning of the word superstition is a surviving. When the Romans expelled their kings there was one religious ceremony which the king alone had been accustomed to perform; but rather than part with this ancient rite they appointed a special king to perform this special duty, and called him *rex sacrificulus*—a little sacrificing king. And exactly the same thing was done at Athens, one of the archons being created king for the self-same purpose. And so did the stone-knife survive in religious ceremonies long after it had been banished from the dinner-table and from the carpenter's shop. The Egyptians in Herodotus's time, when they embalmed a corpse, would open it only with a knife of stone. And so in Scripture we find that circumcision was originally so performed. Zipporah, the wife of Moses, discharged angrily this duty with a similar implement. And when Joshua, the son of Nun, died, at the age of 110, and they buried him on the north side of the hill of Gaash, the Septuagint copy goes on to say (though the verse is not in our present Hebrew text) that "there they laid with him in the tomb wherein they buried him there the stone knives wherewith he circumcised the children of Israel at the Gilgals, when he led them out of Egypt, as the Lord commanded. And there they are unto this day." But though this verse is not in the Hebrew text now, yet that it was in the Hebrew text from which the LXX. translated is made clear by the occurrence of a manifest Hebraism in their version. "In the tomb wherein they buried him there;" the word representing "wherein" in the Hebrew being a mere particle, and requiring the addition of "there" to indicate its antecedent.

Accustomed as we are to associate all branches of mechanical art and invention with the use of iron, we are prone to attach the idea of barbarism to an age when this metal was as yet undiscovered. But the idea is erroneous. A large amount of civilisation existed during the period of bronze, and before the introduction of steel. The admixture of the two metals copper and tin, which constitute bronze, furnished a very excellent and enduring material for every sort of work. If a tougher metal was required, more copper must be added; if a more brittle and harder one, then more tin. In the far famed siege of Troy, which is as it were the border ground between history and fable, the weapons fought with were of bronze, not steel, and we should gather that in the

bronze the quantity of tin was high, for of one doughty champion engaged in single combat, and discharging his spear against the foe, we read that the spear-head on striking his adversary's shield was splintered into fragments, being over-tempered, it would appear, to give greater sharpness to the point. Compare with this the combat of David with the giant of Gath. Here too is bronze. Goliath has a helmet of brass (ought to have been translated bronze) upon his head. His coat of mail weighed 5,000 shekels of brass ( $1\frac{1}{2}$ cwt), and he had greaves of brass upon his legs, and a target of brass between his shoulders. All his defensive armour is of bronze. But, unlike that of the Trojan hero, his spear-head was of iron, so that we should argue that even in David's time steel was a costlier metal than bronze. And with Homer still more so, for in the *Iliad* he arrays his heroes in bronze, and in the *Odyssey* classifies the treasures of Ulysses in the keeping of Penelope as of bronze, and gold, and iron. It was this costliness of armour which gave such an enormous preponderance to the great heroes in ancient war. Not only were they picked men of superior strength, but, clad in their panoply of bronze, they were each a host in himself; so that Homer's description of their mowing down whole companies of men as a mower mows the grass is hardly a poetic exaggeration.

I may appear to be dwelling too long upon this metal, but in point of fact it was intimately concerned in altering the whole face of the world, and advancing man to a higher civilisation. Once discovered and its uses known, pre-historic men became as eager in pursuit of its constituent metals as a prospector after a gold-field now. It is wonderful what distances the great merchant nations of antiquity went to secure possession of them. There is no doubt that the Cornish mines, and those of the Scilly Islands (called in those days the islands of tin), were wrought by the enterprising Phoenicians. Indeed in one Cornish mine a stone axe was found, in a mine which had been worked out and abandoned before history began. Even prior to the time when the Tyrian ships brought these metals through the straits of Gibraltar, there is traditional evidence that they came overland through the Celtic nations. Hence Gaul was stimulated to commercial enterprise; and when Julius Cesar invaded the country he found their ships on the west coast so large, and standing so high out of the water, that the Roman javelin could with difficulty reach their deck. Those couldn't be mere coasting vessels; and though, to be sure, they burst upon our view in the midst of an historic period, yet the very circumstance of their doing so without any previous intimation of their existence is only the stronger proof of the great advances in civilisation many nations must have made without our hearing a word about it through any channel whatever. When Gaul comes into the field of view for the first time it is as a nation of considerable wealth, enterprising, inquisitive, fairly organised under kings, with travelling merchants everywhere, and transit duties systematically levied. And what is true of Gaul is in a tenfold degree true of many nations of the East. The old myth of the Argo is the tradition of an actual expedition which went in search of gold: the golden fleece is only the clumsy precursor of the digger's cradle. Herodotus mentions that a Phoenician ship doubled the Cape of Good Hope; and though he tells us he doesn't believe it, yet the consistent detail he gives leaves hardly any doubt about the fact. And if some peoples were famous on the sea, so were others on the land. The great pyramid of Egypt, built at least forty centuries ago, is prehistoric. And yet, so many curious properties has it, the results of precise calculation, that there is hardly any resisting the surmise of Sir John Hersehel, that it is really a marvellous monument of science—an attempt to perpetuate to posterity as in a book of stone the accurate result of astronomic observation. In the first place, the circuit of the base is 366 cubits—indicating, it would appear, the number of days in the annual revolution of the sun. To this very day we divide our circle into  $360^\circ$ , the most convenient proximate number to the days in the year; but this practice we did not obtain from Egypt, but from the more recent Babylonian college of Magi, at which college there is some reason to believe that the great prophet Daniel was professor of mathematics. But this perimeter of the great pyramid, though representing the yearly course of the sun, was for building purposes made square instead of circular, and so, of course, could not have a radius. What must they do for a radius? They raised it vertically, and made it the height of the pyramid. 366 divided by 211 gives the height of the building in cubits. Then, again, the orientation of the building is most exact, the sides standing within 5 of the several points of the compass. But by far the most interesting point is that the entrance passage, which looks due north, slopes upwards at just that angle which looks towards the pole—but not exactly, for you are aware that there is no star exactly at the north pole, but by the precession of the equinox sometimes one star and sometimes another in long cycles of years will be nearest that point. At present the Polar star is Arcturus, the tip of the Little Bear's tail. But some thousands of years ago the most conspicuous star nearest the Pole was Andraconis. Sir John Hersehel made an astronomical calculation to ascertain when it was that this star would be seen through this entrance gallery. It was just about 4,000 years ago, and in one particular year in the same century it has been found that while Andraconis was crossing the field of view, the Pleiades was crossing the same meridian, right over head. I need not remind you what an important constellation the Pleiades was in ancient astronomy. The first astronomical question which the Lord, speaking to Job out of the whirlwind, puts to him is. "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of the Pleiades?"

This first great pyramid was the tribute of adoring wonder to the glories of astronomical science, and we can well imagine the deep enthusiasm its first fresh study would inspire. We need not entertain any misgivings

on the score of the motive being too feeble to produce so massive a result. The conclusion we arrive at is further corroborated by the fact that the great pyramid contains no inscriptions; whereas the other pyramids, which appear to be clumsy copies of this, and having a very imperfect orientation, are full of mural paintings and hieroglyphics of historic import. They were historic monuments; this, a mathematical one. The builders of it doubtless fancied that they were fixing a date from which all chronological calculations might be made thenceforward with unerring precision. We can imagine the great disappointment they would feel on finding that Andraconis, their polar star, soon began to wander away from his position, and that that which with so much trouble they had fixed as a guide to all future chronology should prove false to their anticipations. This maybe Daniel's meaning when he says of the Almighty, "He changeth the times and the seasons." What, however, disappointed them enables us to calculate backwards the time when they lived; and it is a curious circumstance that a great hieroglyphic scholar (William Osburn). by quite independent investigation, places the Egyptian dynasty, to which we owe the great pyramid in the same century, 2200 to 2100 B.C.

But it is time for me to be drawing to a close I have selected, as you will observe, some of the salient points of man's unwritten history which have escaped the deluge of oblivion. They betoken a gradual advance from uncultivated barbarism to a high development. It would have been impossible within the compass of a single lecture to go into greater detail. Taking a general view of the whole subject, I see no reason, physical, moral, or linguistic, to doubt that the earliest created human beings sprang from a single pair. My conviction is that the earliest of mankind were rude in the extreme, and that they continued a very long time in that condition—that, in fact, the earliest command given to man. "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish [or rather fill] the earth," was literally fulfilled before either Cain or Seth was thought of—that during that long period man might be comparatively innocent, having no sense of sin, but his intellect was not stimulated to any great activity, and this from the very nature of the case. He lived in a genial climate; his wants were few; laud to hunt over was plenty. If by natural increase particular localities grew over peopled, all the world was, so to speak, before him, and the teeming prairies of the earth were over inviting him to "seek fresh woods and pastures new." And thus the first wave of population which encompassed the world bore a striking uniformity of likeness in habits and manners to our primitive type. But when the second or third wave of population supervened, man had to enter upon quite a new career. He had to make good his position wherever he came against a race which had already preoccupied the ground. And now arose the necessity for some sort of social organisation; now was there scope for superiority of intellect to show itself. The art of war sprang up; men built walled towns and acquired property in sheep and oxen; the best grazing grounds acquired a value, which if the occupiers would keep to themselves they must do so by strenuous exertion and by force of arms, by submission to discipline, by circumspection and forethought. Under such influences, both intellect and strength of character would grow apace. Power once organised has a tendency to augment itself. Some mightier mind is sure in time to arise, and give such an impetus to the onward movement that a single lifetime witnesses a wondrous change. Weaker tribes, overpowered by the stronger, must submit to do their servile work. The innate passion for sovereignty and sway becomes developed to an extraordinary degree; and the world, at last, gazes with astonishment on such marvellous empires as disturbed the mind of Nebuchadnezzar in the visions of the night. And, strange to say, even these empires reached the zenith of their power prior to the commencement of what we now call history.

If now for one moment we turn back to the book of Genesis, we shall find these views confirmed. Except in that single tradition in which Noah's genealogy is traced, the word "Adam" is not a proper name, but a common noun, and takes the definite article, like another noun, "the man." Cain is the first man who is made to assume any individuality. He builded a city. He is the type and representative of those who first cultivated the ground, and who by natural consequence we're thus first able to concentrate population in a town. This is consistent. Again, concentration stimulates intellect. Mind dashes with mind; and a city's artificial wants bring ingenuity into play. And therefore it is that among Cain's immediate descendants Tubal Cain is found as an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron. But not only to mechanical arts does a city life give birth, but also to the refinements of poetry and music. Lamech, the fifth in descent from Cain, furnishes us with a specimen of the earliest poetry extant; and his son Jubal was the father of all who handle the harp and the organ. The letter of Scripture could not well hand down to us the tunes which Tubal played, still less the sound of his instruments; but Lamech's poetry has survived. It is of the same order as are most of the Psalms, or as those utterances of the great Balaam when he takes up his parable and speaks. It consists of language so balanced that the second half of a verse is the repetition of the first, with the wording changed. Lamech had, it would appear, accidentally killed a man, and it is thus that his conscience disburdened itself of its weight to his two wives :—

*Adah and Zillah, hear my voice,*

*Ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech.  
For I have slain a man to my wounding,  
And a young man to my hurt.  
If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold,  
Truly Lamech seventy and seven fold.*

And here the record suddenly stops. I will take advantage of the circumstance, and stop as suddenly. These old writings are the most wonderful in the world. Simple in their style, and of unknown authorship, they come before us without any pretensions. They don't claim, like Mohammed's *Koran*, to have been brought to earth by an archangel's hand. They are merely ancient records; and no inspired writer has ever said they were anything more. But they are genuine records, and replete with religious truth. It is our deep reverence for the religious truths they contain, and the greater truths they foreshadow, which may sometimes have led us to regard them with a prostration of mind amounting almost to superstition. But this is no more than befalls any other thing which is associated with religion. Our Great Teacher rebuked his countrymen for a too superstitious reverence for the Sabbath. And the same fault attaches to all who overvalue the husk of religion in their great reverence for religion itself; whether that husk be a sacred day, or a consecrated place, or a religious site, or the dominical table, or a canonised saint. It is the same reverent feeling which, in fervent excess, has led to Mariolatry, to Sabbatolatry, to Bibliolatry. Let us ever bear in mind that the letter killeth, but the spirit it is which giveth life.

The REV. I. MOORE, S.J., in moving a vote of thanks to the lecturer, bore testimony to the lucidity, comprehensiveness, and ability with which he had treated the subject; and whilst he could not receive all the interpretations and deductions from the scriptures which the lecturer had drawn, he could yet admire and appreciate the erudition which had been displayed.

DR. BARKER seconded the motion, which was carried with acclamation.

The Rev. Dr. BROMBY briefly returned thanks, and expressed his entire approval of the objects the Early-closing Association sought to attain, and his wish that they might succeed.

The Rev. J. S. WAUGH proposed a vote of thanks to the Right Rev. the Bishop of Melbourne for presiding.

Mr. G. FOORD seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP OF MELBOURNE, in returning thanks, expressed his pleasure at seeing the good account to which the association was trying to turn its influence, and the advantages it had gained by attending to the intellectual improvement of the people. So far as he was able, he should be always happy to promote their objects. He had derived much pleasure from the able and interesting lecture given by the Rev. Dr. Bromby, and while he did not agree with all the inferences he had drawn from his scientific research, he (the bishop) felt that religion had nothing to fear from science. No man who believed in the Bible should endeavour to restrain the progress of scientific men, as there was nothing to fear from their discoveries.

The Doxology was then sung, and after the Bishop had pronounced the Benediction, the meeting dispersed.  
Stillwell & Knight, Printers, 78, Collins-street East.