

The Evening Star,

Saturday, May 30, 1885.

The Early History of Otago.

No. I.

We have to thank various contributors for the following short sketches of events connected with the early settlement of the Otago Block, and shall, as opportunity offers, publish whatever authentic information we can obtain on so interesting a subject.

Although only thirty-seven years have elapsed since the founding of Otago, few persons of this generation are aware how nearly the project was abandoned. The scheme of settlement was mainly on the lines laid down by the late Edward Gibbon Wakefield, endorsed by that ill-managed emigration association, the New Zealand Company. The doings, or rather misdoings, of that Association are matters of history. They were brought prominently before the world in parliamentary reports and by occasional narratives published in the journals of the time telling of hopes not realised, of abortive efforts after peaceful settlement, and of occasional murders and cannibalism by the Natives of New Zealand. The Free Church of Scotland, through the agency of Mr. Wakefield, had entered into the New Zealand Company's scheme for the colonisation of New Zealand, and committees connected with the various churches had been formed for the purpose of founding the Otago settlement. Whatever enthusiasm was evoked on the first publication of the scheme, it gradually cooled, until there seemed every probability that all thought of it would be given up. News had been received of the disaster to the settlers at Nelson under Colonel Wakefield, and of the murder of Mrs. Gilfillan and some of her family at Wanganui; and people who some short time before regarded New Zealand as a promised land began to think that a humble pittance in Scotland was better than the risk of being cooked and devoured by some ruthless cannibals. One of the conditions of the arrangement of the Association with the New Zealand Company was that 200 properties should be sold before taking any steps towards colonisation. The Free Church Association, however, could not sell the required number; and informed the New Zealand Company that if that stipulation were insisted on, and if a beginning were not made, intending emigrants would not come forward.

How the Otago Settlement was Started.

The New Zealand Company agreed to modify the condition, and early in 1847 a meeting was convened of the Committee of the Lay Association of the Free Church for the Settlement of Otago, in their rooms, George street, Edinburgh. They had previously had a conference with Mr Currie, a director of the New Zealand Company, in which the question of carrying forward or abandoning the settlement of was discussed. Only four members of the Committee were present, viz., Captain William Cargill, Mr Robert Cargill (his brother), the Rev. Dr Burns, and Mr Edward M'Glashan. The latter gentleman was elected chairman. A resolution was moved by Captain Cargill that two ships should be chartered for the conveyance of emigrants to Otago—one to sail from London and the other from the Clyde. This motion was seconded by the Rev. Dr Burns, and carried, Mr Robert Cargill dissenting. The resolution, as passed, was forwarded to the New Zealand Company and adopted, and on this narrow basis the settlement of Otago was built.

The First Building Society in Dunedin.

The first building society in Dunedin was projected in 1840, on board a Leith and London steamer, in which was a party of emigrants on their passage to join the ship *Mariner*, about to sail for Port Chalmers. Among the passengers were Messrs Edward M'Glashan, Thomas Bain, John Healey, Peter Lindsay, and others. Discussing plans for the future, when they should reach their destination, Mr M'Glashan happened to suggest that it would be a good plan to form a society for the purchase of land and for building upon it. Mr Bain, who had been a fellow-member with Mr M'Glashan in a similar association in Edinburgh, entered into the plan. Mr M'Glashan obtained a copy of the rules, and, after his return from a visit to the Australian Colonies, the Society was formed and the rules were adopted. Among other members was Mr John Hill, cabinet-maker. The Society was most successful. The balance-sheet was shown to Sir George Grey, then Governor, on his second visit to

Dunedin. Who expressed his high approval of the manner in which the Building and Land Society had been conducted.

Bridge Building Subsidised by the Government.

Before the introduction of Provincial Government, necessity arose providing roads and bridges in the interior. The difficulty of carrying produce to the ports of shipment became manifest as soon as sheep were shorn on the few stations taken up and stocked. The creeks in the Shag Valley and Moeraki districts were difficult and uncertain to ford, and travelling was uncertain and, in times of flood, dangerous. The settlers thus inconvenienced assembled together, and in due form proceeded to consider how best to move the Government to help them. This important meeting—the precursor of many more pretensions but not more urgent ones—was held in Hertslett's store, where a quantity of wool was warehoused, waiting for conveyance to the Port, in those primitive gatherings, to which people went from long distances, and were consequently hungry and thirsty on their arrival, one very important part of their day's work was to refresh themselves after their ride, so that they might be invigorated for the return. But inns there were none. Those luxuries appeared afterwards. But it is not absolutely necessary to the fortifying of the inner man that the machinery of innkeeping should be constructed. Bottled ale and Scotch whisky are equally refreshing and stimulating, no matter what sort of shelter overshadows it or what walls enclose it, and it was quite possible to combine business and refreshment as well as to save time by the amalgamation. So in Hertslett's store they assembled and ranged themselves in order. Their glasses filled, Mr Edward M'Glashan was elected chairman, and in due form he followed the example of the Lord Chancellor of England and seated himself on a woolpack. Who the speakers were we are not informed, nor are the powerful arguments recorded by which the movers and seconders carried their resolutions—but they were carried; and it was unanimously resolved to request Captain Cargill, then acting for the New Zealand Government, to give assistance to the settlers in their sore distress. How much was spent in bottled beer and strong waters tradition does not tell us; how the chairman's health was drunk, nor the eloquence with which he returned thanks for the honor of being elevated to the woolsack. The resolution was duly transmitted to Captain Cargill, and was graciously considered by him, and in due course a grant in aid was made to the settlers of the magnificent sum of Five Pounds.

M.

Early Days.

Although the citizens of Dunedin, and residents in Otago generally, are now-a-days pretty well occupied with the present, in endeavoring either to make both ends meet or lay past a little for a rainy day, a large number of the readers of the EVENING STAR will no doubt be glad to learn something of early days in the "settlement," as the Otago Block was called at the time the first batch of immigrants arrived. The word or term "settlement" was applied to each of the districts, both in the North and South Islands, which the New Zealand Company proposed to settle or colonise, and which were afterwards known by the more familiar name of provinces.

As an introduction to remarks on subject, and probably carrying far more weight than anything that could be said as inference at the present time, extracts from a speech of the late Captain Cargill, generally and properly recognised as the founder of this settlement, will be received with confidence as regards veracity and faithfulness. At a soiree held in Dunedin on the 21st January, 1851, and arranged by the following householders—Messrs John Healy, Henry Clark, Peter Proudfoot, James Adam, and Charles Robertson, three of whom are still alive and who will remember the circumstances, Captain Cargill, in an Address on "The Aspects of the Colony," stated in substance as follows:—"It is necessary on this interesting subject in the first place shortly to refer to the circumstances in which the Otago settlement was undertaken. New Zealand colonisation having been grievously obstructed for a series of years, chiefly by misrule and inconsistency on the part of the Government, and partly, also, by inveterate quarrelling: between the New Zealand Company and the Government authorities, an apparent truce to these evils was announced in 1842, and followed in 1843 with such an appearance of peace and general redress that the scheme of the settlement then called New Edinburgh was published and about to be proceeded with. But it turned out that even then the main battle for redress had yet to be fought. Things got worse and worse; the old settlers were to great extent ruined and scattered, and New Zealand presented the singular aspect of being physically the most attractive to British colonists, and at the same time the most repulsive by means of injustice and misrule. The precise share of blame is not attributed to either party in this statement. Well, then, the battle was waged in earnest, and most nobly did the New Zealand Company take its part, showing at that time a tact, an energy, and a power, both in and out of Parliament, that could hardly be surpassed, and which secured the Parliamentary Committee of 1844 laying

bare the whole ulcer of New Zealand's wrongs, and was followed in 1845 by the debate on the report of that Committee, led by Mr. Charles Buller, and which decidedly carried the House. So far, the victory was complete. The sagacious Premier (Sir Robert Peel) admitted the whole of the evils complained of, and pledged his Cabinet that every one of them should be speedily and satisfactorily redressed. The pledge was honestly made, and everything that could be done was set about at once: but besides the complications of the whole matter there was the necessity, on many points, of corresponding with New Zealand, and it was not till 1847 that matters were sufficiently adjusted by Acts of Parliament and Orders-in-Council to warrant the resumption of colonisation. Had this adjustment occurred in 1843 there would probably have been sufficient faith in it; but the long series of wrongs, and the exposure of them from year to year, had so possessed the public mind that few would believe in the reality of the change, or that the Otago settlement now advertised was ready to be proceeded with. Almost everyone hung back till the fact should be established by others, and it was in these circumstances that the Company and the Otago Association resolved on the immediate despatch of a preliminary party. The party sailed accordingly in December, 1847, in the full knowledge of having to attack the wilderness in the beginning of winter, with provision indeed, but with no other appliances for present shelter and future progress than what they could create for themselves. Since that time a little over three years have elapsed, and now comes the question as to the result of that achievement, or in other words, the present aspect of the Colony. Be it observed that the sailing of the first little party could not have restored confidence in a general sense; that must depend on the reports of the party, and which, to be satisfactory, would require another three years or so; but it had the effect in the meanwhile of bringing forward a few and of thereby increasing our population by driblets from the 260 souls first landed to about 1,450, our present population as nearly as can be ascertained. Such, then, being our numbers, the questions to be answered are: What is the character of our people as settlers, and the progress they have made? What their experience of the climate and the capabilities of the site? And what the impression at Home as notified by recent arrivals? As to the character of the people, religious and industrial, and the proper mode by them as founders of the settlement, I will leave it to an experienced onlooker to state the impressions made by his present visit, and I crave this liberty on account of his having been urged, on leaving our fatherland, to look narrowly into our homesteads as well as to our public assemblies, and to report faithfully to those who take a deep interest in all that concerns us. I will only state in regard to the harvest now being reaped, and which is a good index to our progress, that it will amount to about 100 acres of excellent wheat, besides oats and barley: and, with the potatoes and other vegetables, should be equal to our consumption: that to the 273 houses erected on the 31st March last, at a cost of about £15,000, there has since been added about fifty more of a greatly improved and improving character: that the number of horses, sheep, and cattle have been about doubled within the year; and, what is still more to the purpose of reviewing our position, the settlers recorded their conviction of now being strong enough to stand alone, and to progress without further addition from home, if the will of God were so, but of which last I believe there is no indication whatever. As to our experience of the climate and the suitability of the soil, it is only necessary to mention the subject to receive a response from nearly all who hear me that these have generally exceeded our best expectations; and we have the further testimony of victors from the other settlements that for the extent of our scheme we have the most compact, attractive, and profitable site that could have been found, regard being had to its combined advantages for tillage, pasturage, and fisheries, together with inland navigation and a useful harbor. In regard to the impressions at Home, they are to be found in the documents lately published, especially the petition of the Association and Earl Grey's reply to it, and which impressions are further confirmed by the passengers of the *Titan*, so as to indicate additional arrivals of the same stamp as those who have lately joined us, and then not only to swell our numbers, but to maintain our character as a harmonious and well-doing community. I have assumed that the 'aspect of the Colony,' as stated in the programme, had special reference to the Otago settlement; but if we refer to the hopeful movement in Canterbury, to the partially renewed immigration to the older settlements, and to the fact that whatever contributes to the restored popularity of New Zealand colonisation must benefit the whole and every part of the Colony; if we refer, moreover, to the system of representative institutions—the only pledge that has not been made good to us, but now on its way from the Imperial Parliament—we cannot but admit that the aspect of the Colony is hopeful to our hearts' content."

It may be noted here that the passengers of the *Titan* referred to embraced Mr Macandrew, Mr Reynolds, and the Rev. Mr Nicolson, now of Hobart, who was referred to as the experienced onlooker.

Mr Nicolson, in response to Captain Cargill, and in speaking on "The Duty of Colonists," remarked that he had not yet sufficient time for examination to report particularly, but would say generally from what he had seen since his arrival a few days previously that the place and the people were entitled to a favorable certificate. In proof of his good opinion he mentioned two facts—viz., that since his arrival he had made himself an Otago laird, and that had it been consistent with his duty, and had he not been charged with a commission to proceed to another colony, he would have been very happy to have remained. He referred with great pleasure to the industry and enterprise he had witnessed amongst the agricultural community, having inspected several

localities where farming operations were going on, and was delighted to see the judicious and persevering operations of such men as Mr Valpy (at the Forbury), Mr Todd (Anderson Bay), and Mr Blackie (of Caversham), and others. Every bag of flour purchased out of a ship took so much money out of the Colony, but every bag purchased from those who had raised it in the Colony was a transaction not only advantageous to both parties, but retained the money among themselves as a means for further operations. It was by such means the Colony Would become self-supporting. Another class of persons useful in such a place as Otago was hardy laborers. Nor did he forget that in such a state of things as existed there would be found among the laboring classes many who had not been previously accustomed to manual labor; but it was plain the man, to be useful in an infant settlement, must either be possessed of money to pay for labor or be willing to labor himself. The useful colonist was he who, though at Home accustomed to walk erect and never soil his hands' work, was here ready to wage war with the manuka tree and the fern root, and every true-hearted man knew that in doing so he was laying the foundation for the future comfort and independence of his family, which he could not accomplish at Home. He cautioned them, however, against being in too great haste to become rich. The shortest way of doing a thing was not always the best, and gave in illustration the Anecdote of the Rev. Rowland Hill, who once advertised that in a sermon he would teach his hearers how to make a pair of shoes in five minutes, and which announcement attracted a very large audience. True to his promise, at the end of his sermon he told his audience that if they cut the legs off a pair of boots they would have a pair of shoes immediately.

Mr Justice Stephen spoke on "Social Harmony," illustrating his subject with great feeling and good taste, and with an impression on the audience which would not soon be forgotten.

Dr Purdie followed on "Intemperance," calling on everyone to do what he could to eradicate, and, above all, in a young colony, where the temptation was great, to guard against its entrance by every means in his power.

Rev. Mr Burns, in speaking on "Education," took the opportunity of stating how the statistics as to education stood at the moment, as made up by himself in the course of his ministerial visitations of the settlement. In the districts of Dunedin, North-east Valley, Halfway Bush, Green Island Bush, and Forbury and Anderson Bay there was a total population of 1,068, and the number of children from seven to fifteen years of age was 238. In the Harbor district, including Port Chalmers and the Heads, the Taieri, Waihola, Tokomairiro, and Clutha, there was a population of 387, and the children between the same years of age were fifty-nine, making a total of 1,445 souls, including the 297 children. That number of children should be in attendance at school, but the numbers attending were in school of Dunedin 40, the girls' school of Dunedin 20, and the other three schools in the North-east Valley, Anderson Bay, and Port Chalmers 40; in all 100 children in actual attendance at school, whilst there ought to be three times as many. This was a very staggering fact, more especially in view of the high national character in point of education which was inherited from their forefathers. Most earnestly he hoped that next year's statistics would present the state of education among them in a much more creditable position.

Considering the extreme range of age, the state of the roads—or, more properly, the total want of roads or tracks—at the time, the attendance need not be counted as very small; and perhaps the difficulty in reaching home may have also influenced the grownup folks who attended the soiree; for although the time at which it was held was midsummer, the meeting broke up at nine o'clock, all being highly pleased with the entertainment. The price of admission was 1s 11d a ticket, and the number sold about 150.

M'I.

Re-Printed from the Maryborough and Dunolly Advertiser,

May 26, 1873.

What you see is not Real;

Or, Matter is a Mode of Motion.

When through Christ it was said that if a man looked after a woman to lust after her he had already committed adultery with her in his heart, it seemed very hard to his hearers, for it was tantamount to saying he

who thinks evil is just as guilty as he who commits the outward act. The following paper, which was last year read at the Royal Society, explains clearly that this is in truth the case, for it shows that it is the mind which plans, the body is merely the instrument to carry out the thoughts of the mind. The evil thought is the reality, and it is immaterial whether or not the thought is outwardly manifested in and through the body. For it is shown that thought is but the consciousness of the possession of an idea. An evil thought, then, is the proof of the possession of an evil mind, and the guilt is the same as if the thought were carried out by the body, the mind's instrument. To think evil, but to refrain from the carrying out of the evil thought through the body, is what Christ described as "washing the outside of the cup and platter," while within all is filth and wickedness. All "religions" and "moralities" are doing this—washing the outside of the cup—and are therefore of no avail. What is required is that the evil mind which can only think evil should be destroyed, and a pure mind substituted, and this only God can do, not man.

"The world seems to be slowly coming to the comprehension that light, heat, electricity, magnetism, are but modes of motion. But human beings are unable to conceive of motion without at the same time conceiving of a something which they think real, and call 'matter.' They call it real because they can see it, can feel it, can smell it, can hear it, can taste it. But if these senses are analysed we find that the sight is a nervous instrument which can only take cognizance of motion of the waves of æther producing the effect of light of various colours, according to the number of pulses per second. That touch is a nervous instrument which can only appreciate the slower undulations of the æther called heat-waves, and of those motions of the internal particles of bodies which are known as molecular motions and which convey to the mind the impression of mere solidity, heat or cold, according as the pulsations of the internal particles of the body are in frequency equal to, greater or less than, the similar pulsations in the nerves. That smell is an abnormal motion of the mucous membrane of the nose, set up by the molecular motions of bodies, gaseous or solid, which are brought into contact with it. That hearing is a motion of vibration set up in the auditory nerve, which conveys to the mind the impact or series of impacts of air-waves upon the drum of the ear. That taste is but the motion of the papillæ of the tongue, &c., set up by contact of certain bodies which thus convey the consciousness of their special molecular motion to the mind. Thus it will be readily seen that the human body is an instrument which is only capable of conveying to the mind impressions of a great variety of modifications of motion. In other words—nothing exists for us but motion, therefore matter, solid and real as it appears to the mundane mind is nothing else but *motion*.

"Motion of what? Of nothing which you can perceive, because, as already shown, the mind can only become conscious of motion in some one of its infinity of phases. *Therefore, to speak of matter apart from motion is an absurdity*, a gratuitous imagination, or rather one of those numerous superstitions under which the human race has laboured for 6,000 years.

"Those who suppose they investigate molecular motion are forced to assume that matter is composed of myriads of indivisible atoms—that is points—in rapid motion *inter se*. Now a point has no magnitude, therefore is a creature of the imagination, for what occupies no space cannot in physics exist. And molecular motion is simply that phase of motion called heat, because if you increase the heat the range and rapidity of this motion increases, and diminishes *ad infinitum* if you take away the heat. Then if heat becomes *nil*, molecular motion ceases, and as points have no real existence, matter ceases to be. It thus follows that if the sun, the immediate source of the earth's supply of heat, should—like many other suns of the Universe—be blotted out, the earth and all that it contains would vanish like a dream. Can things of earth be rightly called realities? We have seen that the human mind has no instrument wherewith to become conscious of things around but the body, and the body can transmit to the mind no impression but that of motion. This one idea, then, is all that the baby mind of man can imbibe—and all the high-sounding departments of physics, astronomy, electricity, spectroscopy, chemistry, mechanics, are but little bits of that one idea which the so-called great and wise have never comprehended, and can never fully comprehend, and all the varying forms, colors, textures' motions, of things around, are but modifications of that one idea *motion*.

"What then is motion? The means by which outward things *impress themselves* upon the mind of man and evoke ideas. Each one of us then, is a *purely receptive being*, and the power to speak or act is a purely delegated one, called forth by impressions from without. And to each one here the only reality is the mind which receives these impressions from without and from within. And these impressions are to the mind what food is to the body, and have to be in like manner digested before they become part of us. Thus the mind is built up of ideas which are nourished by impressions; and thought or reflection is but the consciousness of the possession of these ideas, as sensation is the consciousness of the possession of a body. But the body—the mind's instrument—being composed of what you call matter, is, as already shown, not a real existence, and the only realities are ideas, since these belong to the mind, the only reality. The preservation of the body, the mind's instrument, the only communication between Nature and the incarnate mind, is naturally the strongest instinct; and by means of the impressions hunger, thirst, cold, heat—pleasurable and painful sensations of all kinds—the mind is forced into activity to preserve or satisfy the body, which must move about and keep open to the

reception of new impressions for the use of the mind. And thus the mind, limited according to its stage of growth, uses the body as an instrument to act upon these impressions and carry out the ideas which are excited. This relation of man to Nature—God's garment—cannot be put into better or more simple language than that used the other day by a child of 9 years of age whose mind has not been corrupted by books, those fosterers of indolence and consequent disease of mind through imitations of other men's ideas. 'God has created man and taught him to work, he has taught him to change the form of things that God has made, but not to create things himself. A large oak once fell in a forest, when some men came and split it up into planks and boards, and made them into a very large boat. But man did not create the boat; he only changed the oak into a boat. God created all the trees and plants and grass, but man can only change their form.'

"Can only change their form! This, then, is all that man can do, and this only by permission of Him whose glorious ideas they represent, and whose manifestations man so mangles and distorts. When a man changes an oak into a boat he but carries out an idea already impressed upon him. His idea thus becomes visible to others—that is, impresses others. In the same way God makes His ideas visible to us through the hills, seas, air, trees, flowers, animals, that they may impress us. And as the ideas of man become manifest to us in a boat, or a man of war (and we can in so far read his mind, and see love of money and hatred of his brother), so the ideas of our Creator, in the wondrous forms of life, manifest His glorious mind and show us at every turn His infinite love to man, and our littleness and helplessness.

"The boat which was made after the pattern of the idea in the mind of the builder may be burnt, and as a boat it ceases to be. The boat then is not real, the only reality is the idea (still existent in the mind of the builder), upon the pattern of which another and a better boat may be constructed. For construction, which is the altering of the manifestations of the ideas of the Father, is like a digestion through which the idea grows upon every reproduction. Thus a spider, to which God has given the idea of a simple web, is incited by hunger to construct it, and each repetition of this construction is a more complex and more perfect manifestation of the idea implanted by God. The web may be burnt or may rot away, but the idea remains and grows, the spider's body being used as an instrument to construct a better web, and the body itself grows in adaptability to the growing purpose of the mind which governs it upon each reproduction; so that the mind which is in a spider, or other life-form (differing in degree, but not in kind, from those which hear these words) by a beautiful law passes onward through every kindred form of life, and culminates in man. It is customary to speak of the 'instinct' of 'brutes,' but the operation of the mind in animals is identical with that of the human mind, and more deserves the name of reason; for animals obey the laws of their being and are happy, while man, with a pride which springs from ignorance of himself and his true place in creation, disobeys, and thus builds up his own unhappiness.

"This disobedient mind, which has for 6,000 years reigned in every human being, in every incarnation, and under every possible cloak—chiefly of 'religion' and 'philanthropy'—is what is denominated in the Scriptures the 'carnal mind,' and the disease is so ingrained that this carnal mind is nothing but 'enmity to God, and is not subject to the law of God *neither indeed* can be.'

"Yet it was necessary that the carnal mind in each of us should be allowed to reign during these 60 centuries, and now in the fulness of time to bear its own bitter fruits of war, murder, disease, and crime. But now the whole earth, which is but one body, although composed, through our disobedience, of myriads of warring members, must as one great being Die, and be no more as it has been. Yet the Father, in His infinite love has provided a ransom. Through the engrafting of His Word, His Holy Spirit of Love upon the earth—the disobedient root—shall spring up a new heaven and a new earth, wherein will dwell righteousness. All that is now living shall die, shall pass away as a dream. Yet within the dying earth the Seed is springing into life—the fair and beautiful world which is to come. When this unseen world is fully prepared, then shall it throw off, like an old and rotten garment, the world that now is. That time is close at hand, and only those who are now receiving their daily bread—the Father—the Holy Spirit, and are being renewed in the spirit of their minds can live again in the Father—in whom alone is immortality and Heaven."

Law Reform in New South Wales and California.

To the Editor of the Herald.

Sir,—In the letter you did me the favour of publishing on the above subject on July 31, I endeavoured to

indicate to my fellow-colonists the true path of law reform as illustrated by the success of the Californian system. I alluded briefly to what the law reformers of that State had done with reference to four important subjects—(1) The codification of the statutes and of the common law as declared from time to time by judicial decisions, and its simplification by the substitution of modern phraseology and the suppression of obsolete forms and terms, which with us make the study of law a black art; (2) the abolition of all lawyers' costs and charges between party and party in courts of justice; (3) constitutional restrictions on the judges generally, and especially on judges presiding at Jury trials, and such amendments of the jury system as to lighten the burden of jury service on the public; and (4) the steady discouragement by the courts and the Legislature of all dilatory proceedings and technicalities, and of that hair-splitting mode of reasoning which was the glory of the learned schoolmen of the Middle Ages, but now only survives in our courts of law. In this letter I would ask your permission to enter more fully into the working of these four reforms, and the effect they have had in facilitating the administration of justice.

The whole system of Californian civil courts is arranged on a connected, harmonious plan. The lowest court in order is that of the justices of the peace, whose jurisdiction is limited to small-debts cases and simple matters. These courts are very much like our justices' small-debts courts, but with the important difference that every facility is afforded for appeal from the magistrates on points of law, so that the administration of the law in those courts is kept uniform with the interpretation of the same law by the other courts. Next in order come the District Courts. These are the most important tribunals in the State, and in them the bulk of the judicial business of the country is done. The District Courts only resemble our District Courts in name. In other respects they more nearly resemble our Supreme Court. Their jurisdiction is unlimited as to amount of damages and quality of cases tried, but they deal with each case only up to the termination of its jury-trial. All law points arising on pleadings or reserved during the trial are dealt with only by the Judges of the Supreme Court, which court is in California—purely a law court, dealing with questions of law only. All jury cases of whatever complexity or magnitude in amount are tried before the District Court Judges, with the assistance of a jury of 12, so that these courts might more appropriately be termed "jury courts," for trial of facts. They have certain territorial limitations of jurisdiction, in order to secure that the jury trials shall take place wherever it is most convenient for the parties and their witnesses.

There are 17 District Courts in the State of California, three of which (the fourth, twelfth, and fifteenth) sit in San Francisco; and the salaries of the Judges of these three District Courts are equal to those of the Supreme Court Judges.

The mode of levying execution for recovering the amount of judgments is the same for all courts, and the machinery for that purpose is common to all courts. There is only one sheriff's office for the whole State. In New South Wales we have not only three separate, but three conflicting, systems of levying execution, all these systems clashing more or less with each other, and giving rise to annoyance and expense both to suitors and the public. Our Supreme Court has its own sheriff's department, with its own offices, its own clerks, and its own bailiffs. Our District (or, more properly, County) Courts have for each court its own independent machinery of bailiffs, and its own mode of levying execution; and the magistrates' courts have their own independent system worked through the police. For each of these classes of court a different set of statutes provides divergent regulations on the subject of levying execution upon the judgments recovered in them; and when the bailiffs of all these different courts chance, as sometimes happens, to levy execution on the same estate under the judgments of their respective courts, their rights are liable to conflict. Under the Californian system, every writ, whether issued out of a Justice's Court or a Chief Justice's Court, is executed from the one sheriff's office, and goes through the one channel; there is but one mode of execution for the writs of all courts, and their power of reaching the debtor's property is the same in all cases. In the event of any third person's rights being interfered with by the levying of any executions, that person has in all cases the one prescribed method of asserting his rights against the judgment creditor or creditors; he is not put to the expense of asserting his rights in each separate court against each separate creditor and in each court by a different method, as may happen with us. By this system California is spared the expense of three separate and independent establishments for executing judgments, and the suitors are spared the expense of separate bailiffs acting under clashing jurisdictions and making conflicting levies; and, not least, the debtor, the unfortunate victim of all the levies, is not crushed by the cumulative expenses of separate seizures.

In my former letter I described very shortly the position occupied by the judge on a trial of issues of fact before a District Court, and stated that his duties are strictly confined to the determination of the legal questions arising during the trial, and that the incidents of the trial are taken down by an officer of the court called a "sworn reporter." In your leading-article referring to my letter you quoted from an English observer in the New York courts as follows:—"He (the Judge) took no notes; there being an official reporter. He rarely interfered with the examination of witnesses." This entirely bears out my statement, that the Judge takes no part in the contest. He simply presides to keep order, to see that no unfair blows are dealt, and to decide disputed questions

of law, and as to the admissibility of evidence. Otherwise he keeps aloof from the fight that is going on before him, just as her Majesty abstains from taking any side in favour of one or other of the political parties who contend in Parliament for the national verdict.

Under the Californian system a jury trial is conducted thus:—First, the juryman are selected—and this is the most tedious stage in the trial. Each man as he comes forward to be sworn is searchingly questioned by counsel on both Bides. The usual questions put are these:—"Are you related to either party to this suit by blood or marriage? Are you on terms of private intimacy with either party? Are you indebted to either party, or is he to you? Have you read or heard from anyone any of the circumstances in dispute in this case; and if so, have you formed any opinion of the merits of those circumstances in favour of either party? I once heard a juryman, in answer to the last of these questions, reply, "Well, yes, I have. I think if what is stated in the newspapers is true, the defendant is as big a rogue as can be found in this State; but I am willing to hear the evidence." The defendant's counsel asked this juryman to stand down.

After the jury is selected the trial proceeds, as with us, by counsel stating plaintiff's case and then calling his witnesses; but, contrary to our custom, the counsel as well as the witness under examination are both seated. Counsel are strictly held to a moderate and courteous tone when examining a witness. On one occasion, in the 12th District Court of San Francisco, a counsel accustomed to the English bar was examining a witness who persisted in giving evasive answers; the counsel then prefaced his further question with a sharply uttered "Sir!" he was at once stopped by the judge, who said, "Mr———, you will be good enough to address a witness in this court as you would address a gentleman in your own house." It is scarcely necessary to say that such a rule prevents any of the brow-beating and bamboozling of witnesses so much complained of in the colonies; at the same time I desire to add that I have heard quite as effective cross-examination of a witness who was trying to evade telling the truth in that same 12th District Court as I ever heard in England or here. When, however, counsel comes to make his address to the jury he stands up, and is then at liberty to declaim with all the power he is master of, and if he choose he may abuse the other side to his heart's content.

When the judge comes to charge the jury another peculiarity of the Californian system is observable. That system recognises the fact that of all the lawyers engaged in the trial the judge is the only one who comes to it without any previous special preparation upon the legal questions peculiar to it, and which questions may then, indeed, be arising for the first time in legal history, whereas the advocates on either side come fully primed with the law as applicable to their facts. In our courts the presumption is exactly the reverse; the judge is expected to be infallible, and on Him is laid the responsibility of being so. Counsel, at our jury trials, may, and frequently do, advance the wildest theories; anything, in fact, that may enable them to snatch a temporary victory, relying on the many chances and uncertainties in future stages of the case to enable them to hold the advantage thus obtained. In a Californian Court the practice is this: Before charging the jury with the law the judge calls upon the counsel on either side for a written statement of what he (the counsel) considers the jury should be instructed is the law, and the judge usually charges the jury in the words of one or other of these written statements, and then hands it to the "sworn reporter," to become part of the record. Thus are rendered impossible the evils which with us arise from defective memories of the listeners to the judge's charge, conflicting notes by opposite counsel, and the confused recollection of the judge himself as to what he actually did say as distinguished from what he has since read he ought to have said. The "sworn reporter's" record of the charge is the indisputable ground in case of appeal, and if statement so supplied by counsel is found to amount to a misdirection, the verdict he gained by it is lost. The practical result is, that the advocates are careful in California not to overstate the law. Another vital point of dissimilarity from our practice is that on appeals from the misdirection of a judge, the judge whose decision is called in question is not a member of the Court hearing the appeal. This arrangement eliminated from the discussion of a simple question of pure law one of the most disturbing elements in our practice.

Again, the Supreme Court Judges themselves in California are hedged round with safeguards tending to a careful and impartial decision; which safeguards are entirely wanting in our courts. Attached to the court is an officer called "reporter of the decisions," whose official salary sufficiently indicates the importance attached to his functions—it is the same as the salary of the Supreme Court Judges themselves. The court has also an officer, called the "phonographic reporter," who attends the sittings of the Supreme Court just as the "sworn reporter" attends those of the District Court, and his duty is, if there is any "oral" argument by counsel, to report the points made in such "oral" arguments, and also to "take down all opinions of the Court delivered 'orally'" (section 770, Political Code). The reader will observe this word "orally." In California the legal arguments of counsel addressed to the Supreme Court are put in writing, and are filed in court before the case is set down for oral argument, as I shall hereafter more fully explain. These notes of the phonographic reporter are transcribed and handed to the "reporter of decisions," who from them and from the judgment of the court prepares his reports of cases argued during each sitting, submits them to each member of the court for his correction and approval, and when approved they are published and sold at the rate of 16s. per volume, the price fixed by law.

Thus the common law of the State, as it is declared from time to time by the judges, is published in an authoritative form binding upon the judges themselves, and hence it becomes a safe guide to legal practitioners when advising clients. At the next quinquennial revision of the code the principles so published as laid down by the Supremo Court in the intervening five years are presented by the three permanent code-commissioners to the Legislature for their enactment and embodiment in the new code, and thereupon the legislature (that is, the country) approves or disapproves, and perhaps abolishes, the common law as laid down in any objectionable instance. Thus the judges, while performing their duties, have always in view this parliamentary supervision which will at the appointed time pass all their actions in review. Nor is this quinquennial revision of the code a mere form. The new decisions when placed in the draft bill of the new code prepared by the three permanent code-commissioners is first laid before a parliamentary committee, called the "Advisory Committee," then it passes to what is called the "Legislative Committee," and after that it finally comes before the Legislature and the Governor of the State. As a further proof that the code is in this process undergoing alteration and amendment, I may state that the index to its provisions is not printed till a very late stage of its progress. The three code-commissioners, in a note to the parliamentary bill of the political code in my possession, apologise for the absence of an index to that volume in the following words: "We have learned from experience that indices prepared for these bills (the codes) will not aid materially in the preparation of indices for the work when adopted. We ourselves on a critical examination of our work, and to perfect its arrangement, change the relative positions of many sections. . . . The Advisory Committee will do the same, and the Legislative Committee will make other alterations, so that in order to have accurate indices it will be necessary when the codes are adopted to make them an original work."

Let us now contrast some of the features of the Californian system of arguing, deciding, reporting, and codifying the legal decisions, with our system of arguing cases and publishing the judgments of our courts. I have above referred to the fact that legal arguments in the Californian Supreme Court are for the most part written, not oral. The argument of a law point is initiated by the lodgment of what is called a "demurrer book," which sets forth so much of the pleadings, and of the evidence, and of the ruling of the District Court Judge, as may be deemed necessary by the demurring counsel for the consideration of the questions to be argued, and the counsel adds to this "demurrer book" his argument as appellant in writing, together with a reference to the decided cases in point to his argument. To this "demurrer book" and argument the opposite counsel then adds, also in writing, his counter argument and cases in point, together with such further facts (or the whole evidence if he so pleases) as he deems necessary to elucidate his argument. The Judges thus have before them on the filed record the whole of the facts relied on, and the arguments respecting the same *pro* and *con*. The matter is then set down for "oral argument," and is called on in its turn; but it is not always that counsel appear or add any "oral" argument to their written arguments. The setting down the case for "oral" argument gives them the opportunity of adding to their written arguments if they should require to do so; but wherever there is "oral" argument it is usually very short, and whatever takes place is reported, as above stated, by the "phonographer" of the Court. Finally, when the case is decided by the Supreme Court, its written judgment is added to the demurrer-book, and then the whole matter is open for the "reporter of decisions," whose labours subject to the revision of the judges as above-mentioned, complete it as an authoritative decision binding on the judges and on the whole country until the next quinquennial revision.

Let us now contrast this with our system. We have no official "reporter of decisions," and our Judges not infrequently at a subsequent period impugn the accuracy of the reports of their reasonings as published in the New South Wales reports. Thus these reports which are our nearest approach to an authoritative declaration of the law as it is from time to time laid down by the Courts, are in reality no guide, or at all events, not a safe guide to the public and the profession. The statements published in them, therefore, do not bind the Courts. Again, we have in New South Wales no quinquennial or other revision of our declared common law or of our statutes; indeed, it would be impossible to revise a rubbish heap. The only corrective in our system is an occasional article in the press, condemnatory of some decision of the Court; but even this limited censorship is tempered by the terrors of imprisonment for contempt of Court, not only affecting the writer of such article, but also the newspaper that ventures to publish it. Our only constitutional corrective is an appeal so difficult and so expensive as to be almost prohibitory. An appeal to a distant English Court, ignorant alike of our wants and of the movements of colonial society, with which movements our common law decisions ought to harmonise. But even this mild corrective applied in a leader or letter in the newspaper is soon forgotten, however just and effective it may have been at the time, and the obnoxious decision sinks quietly into the conglomerate bed of the New South Wales reports. It is true that sometimes a judgment will be suppressed from the reports; but even then it remains on the Court records and in the memories of counsel, ready to be sprung upon by future generations of litigants. Our English and colonial reports are absolutely crammed with such impugned and doubtful cases, and they are downright pitfalls and snares. Sometimes the Court considers itself bound by them, and upholds them; at other times it bowls them over unhesitatingly, and generally in the latter case creeps out of

the difficulty by impugning the accuracy of the report. The result is—chaos. The compulsory reporting and correction by the Judges of the Supreme Court, as prescribed and practised under the Californian system and the subsequent quinquennial scrutiny by the Legislature, compels the Judges, for their own credits' sake, to be very cautious and careful in all their judgments, and it contributes to secure uniformity and simplicity in the principles of their decisions. The practice has banished from the Californian code that darkness of many words that encumbers, our statute book and reported cases, and it has likewise banished from the arguments of counsel and from the Courts all that hair-splitting technicality which so delights our lawyers, which they fondly think passes with the public for learning, but which is really as much out of joint with the times as the obsolete court costumes of the reasoners.

Professional objectors to law reform argue that law is necessarily a complex science, unintelligible to the laity, and they urge in proof of this contention that all attempts to make it simple and intelligible have always failed and always must fail, and in failing leave matters worse confounded than before. Now, although it must be admitted that most of the efforts at reform of procedure in the higher Courts both here and in England have hitherto been very discouraging, it must also be admitted that in these Australasian colonies we have a practical demonstration of the fallacy of the reasoning of the anti-reformers. The most difficult and doubtful branch of law used to be that of the conveyancing of real property. The well-known lawyer's toast—"May every acre of land be covered with parchments!"—did no more than express the cumbrous nature of the old conveyancing system. In England things are still in that cumbrous condition, but in these colonies the whole farrago of wordy rubbish was swept away at a blow—Torrens' Act revolutionised land transfer, and now a sale of real property is as simple and certain as the sale of a plough. Anyone who recollects the howl of objections with which Torrens' Act was met in each of the colonies when first proposed, will be able to estimate at its just value the opposition of those who would fain have the public believe that our methods of court procedure and the conglomeration of statute upon statute, where "Pelion is piled upon Ossa and Olympus on that," cannot be successfully made to undergo the same happy transformation.

I cannot conclude this letter without noticing the letter of another correspondent of your paper, signing himself "A. M.F.," who asserts that I must be "mistaken in believing that the Californians indulge in any such folly" as abolishing all costs of professional assistance to the suitors in their courts of justice. He seems to think that the hard-headed and close-fisted American traders would never have enacted such a "monstrous" piece of legislation to the manifest injury of their own pockets, and for the benefit of their opponents in litigation. I regret that I am unable to quote for "A. M.F." the very words of the code of civil procedure; but our hard-headed Sydney traders may rely upon the correctness of what I have asserted, viz., that the code abolishes absolutely all costs of professional assistance between party and party in Californian courts. There is a book in our Supreme Court library here in Sydney, Voorhuis' New York code of 1860, where "A. M.F." will find that over 25 years ago the equally hard-headed and practical New York merchants and traders had gone a long distance towards the abolition of such costs. At page 420 (section 303) "A. M.F." will find the following "monstrous" indulgence by the New Yorkers in similar mercantile "folly."

"Section 203. All statutes establishing or regulating the costs or fees of attorneys, solicitors, and counsel in civil actions, and all existing rules and provisions of law restricting or controlling the right of a party to agree with an attorney, solicitor, or counsel for his compensation, are repealed; and hereafter the measure of such compensation shall be left to the agreement, express or implied, of the parties; but there may be allowed to the prevailing party, upon the judgment, certain sums by way of indemnity for his expenses in the action, which allowances are in this Act (the code) termed costs." The code then goes on to provide for the addition to the final judgment of a certain lump sum as costs in certain classes of actions, and a percentage upon the damage recovered in certain other classes of action.

Thus the public and "A. M.F." will see that the Californian abolition of costs is the legitimate outcome of previous determined efforts in the State of New York—the leading mercantile State in the Union—to get rid of the system of taxed costs allowed to lawyers proportioned to the length and complexity of the proceedings carried on by them. The astute New Yorkers saw that such a system had led to increased length and complexity, and to a practical closing of their courts as instruments for settlement of their disputes, and no doubt they became disgusted with the system just as our colonists have become disgusted with it.

"A. M.F." also seems to doubt the large incomes which I stated were earned by the "gallant colonel" and by "Mr. Hall M'Alister," the two leaders of the Californian Bar in 1880. If, sir, you will hereafter allow me space for a further communication, I will endeavour to show how business is conducted in lawyers' offices in San Francisco, and I hope then to prove to the satisfaction of the public, and even of "A. M.F.," that not only were these large incomes earned and enjoyed by these gentlemen as I have stated, but that they were acquired without causing the widespread ruin and misery that the gains of our lawyers cause to the unfortunate suitors who are compelled to seek justice in our courts.

In fine, what Torrens' Act has done for a small but very dirty corner in the Augean stable of our legal

system, the Californian code above described has effected for their whole law.

I am, &c.,
Economy.

(Reprinted from the "Evening Star")

The following interesting letter on "India, her Wheat and Railways," by Major-General Fulton, has been presented to the Dunedin Chamber of Commerce, with permission to publish it:—

The 'Nineteenth Century' for February, 1884, has, under the above heading, an article showing the extraordinary development in the export trade of wheat from India during the decade 1873 to 1883. As wheat is one of our principal New Zealand products, and the shipment of it to England one of our main commercial undertakings, it may not be out of place to endeavor to trace the subject a little further, to see how we are likely to be affected by the Indian trade. Many things have of late years combined to produce the present state of wheat cultivation in India.

British rule, by putting an end to internecine wars, has not only forced large numbers to take to agriculture as a means of livelihood, but the immunity from plunderers has encouraged a better style of farming and an increase in the area cultivated. It is easy to understand that when a man ploughs with his sword by his side and his shield and matchlock slung over his back, he is not likely to cultivate more than is absolutely necessary, or give that consideration to his farming that he would have given under more peaceful conditions. Given the peaceful conditions under British rule, and the improved cultivation has followed to such an extent that in some cases the land revenue has had to be remitted, as, owing to the glut in the local market, farmers have been unable to realise on their produce, and had not the wherewith to meet the Government demand. War murder, rapine, infanticide, and suttee being stopped, or at least checked, the population has rapidly increased, and although there have been more mouths to feed, there have also been more hands to till lands which have long lain idle; hence increased production for both home and foreign consumption.

Irrigation has long been practised in India, but it is only of late years that the British Government have come to recognise its real benefits. Not many years ago famine used to stalk the land, striking down whole provinces at one time. The aged and weakly used to lie down and die, whilst the stronger members of the community fled to more prosperous localities. To meet such a condition of things Government introduced "famine protective works" in the forms of irrigation and railways. The first canal opened by the British Government was the Western Jumna, in 1819; the last was the Sirhind, into which water was admitted by the Viceroy on the 24th of November, 1882. Between these two dates the following have also been completed:—The Eastern Jumna, Ganges, Lower Ganges, Soane, Agra, Baree Doab, besides all the inundation canals and those of Rohilcund, Bengal, Madras, Scind, etc. Projects are now in hand for a canal from the Chenab River to water an enormous tract of land between the Chenab and Ravee. The Betwa and Surda Canals are also progressing. The principal sources of supply for the canals of Northern India—the great wheat-growing land—are the eternal snows of the Himalayas. The Rivers Indus, Chenab, Ravee, Sutlej, Jumna, and Ganges all take their rise in the northern barrier of India, and are, therefore, practically speaking, unfailing, and the canals drawn from them are called permanent canals, in contradistinction to the inundation channels, which flow only when the rivers are in flood during the monsoons. Besides these there are the different tanks or storage reservoirs, where the waters of the rainy season are collected and impounded for distribution during the drier months. Some of these works are of enormous extent, and confer immense benefits. Lastly, there are the wells, which are constantly increasing in number as Government make money advances for their construction; for so long as the water is within 25ft to 30ft of the surface it pays the Native cultivator to irrigate from his well.

In India there are two crops per annum; the spring crop, cut about April or May; and the autumn crop, cut in September or October. Wheat, barley, oats, gram, mustard, etc., belong to the spring crop; whilst rice, maize, millet, cotton, etc., are the autumn. Where possible, the land cultivated during one crop is allowed to be fallow during the next; but the rule is far from absolute, much of the land being cropped twice annually. There is an outside market for wheat and rice, whilst there is none for maize or millet; the people, therefore, though they prefer wheat as the most sustaining, nourishing cereal, sell their wheat and rice, and content themselves with that for which there is less demand. The opening of the Suez Canal and the development of the railway system through India have, without doubt, placed a profitable market within reach of the Hindoo trader; who has not been slow in taking advantage of it.

The position of the Indian railway lines at the beginning of the current official year 1884-85 is, by the latest returns to hand, given as follows:—

Of the lines in hand, it is expected that 1,103 miles will be opened during the year, leaving 1,864 miles for

completion at a later date. Long before they are done fresh projects will have been sanctioned, for Indian railways pay, after deducting accumulated interest during construction, the handsome return of 4.6 per cent. Wheat is carried at exceptional rates along all the Indian lines, as it is the policy of the Government to foster the export trade. As India can borrow any amount of money in England at 4 per cent., and the railways are paying 4 6 per cent., it will be seen that there is still a considerable margin left to be devoted to the reduction of carriage of wheat to the seaboard.

Education has opened the minds and enlarged the views of the people of Hindostan. Telegrams from the Corn Exchange in London keep the trading class of Natives throughout the country accurately posted as to the state of the European grain market. The old slow modes of water and land carriage have been discarded, so far as wheat is concerned, and railways only are used, for they have awakened to the fact that time is money.

The general classification of wheat in India, though often obscured by local terms, is fourfold, according as the grain is hard or soft, red or white. Soft white wheat, which commands the highest price in the European markets, is grown to perfection in Northern India and Rajpootana—a rich loam soil, well manured and irrigated, and a moderate severe winter, are its favorite conditions. Next in value come soft red wheats, which are often sown in Upper India, intermixed with barley or gram. One especially valuable species known as "pissi" comes from the Nerbudda Valley. White hard wheats are much prized by the Natives, and are found in the Deccan and South Mahratta country. This species is more delicate than the hard red, and requires careful culture. Hard red wheats form the predominant species in the central provinces, Rajpootana and Bombay. The European demand for soft wheats appears to be effecting a considerable change in the local estimation of the various sorts. There is a difference of some 5s per quarter in the price.

The area under wheat cultivation in British territory is reckoned at about 20,000,000 acres, and the yield about 6,000,000 tons. The area in Native States would give an additional 6,000,000 acres, with a yield of 1,250,000 tons. In British territory the Punjab heads the list with 7,000,000 acres—6,250,000 in the north-west provinces. Then follow the central provinces with 4,000,000, Bombay with 1,500,000, and Behar with 850,000 acres. Of the Native States, the Central India Agency and Rajpootana Agency have 2,500,000 of acres apiece; Hyderabad 750,000. The average yield per acre is estimated at ten bushels in the Punjab, thirteen in the North-west, nine in Bombay Presidency, and eight in the central provinces. These, of course, are only averages struck on whole areas and on lands irrigated and unirrigated. We should say fifteen bushels was nearer the actual average after eliminating failures, etc. We have seen as much as forty bushels bagged on good soil well irrigated.

The average cost of production is estimated at 1s per bushel, or, including rent, at 1s 6d, or 12s per quarter. The carriage from, say Delhi, which is the chief wheat mart of Upper India, comes to about 9s 4d per quarter to Bombay. Agency charges amount to nearly 8d. Freight by last advices was 38s per ton, or say 8s per quarter. From the above it will be seen that Indian wheat can be landed at Home for 40s per quarter.

The average prices of wheat per quarter since 1877 are as follows:—

During the last six months of 1883 the price has declined very considerably, and lowered the average. It is evident, then, that unless the cost of production and carriage can be reduced in some way, the margin of profit for the Indian cultivator will be very small. Fortunately for India, the cost of railway carriage can be reduced very considerably. The great expense on the line to Bombay has been the price of fuel. The opening up of the Wurdah and other new coalfields will reduce this to a very great extent; in fact, reductions have already taken place, though the figures are not at present to hand.

England annually consumes 25,000,000 quarters of wheat, and produces less than 10,000,000. The sharp competition for the custom of the English market will stimulate to the utmost the endeavor to reduce both cost of production and carriage. The Government Department of Agriculture and Commerce, of which Mr E. C. Buck is the head, is constantly introducing new implements, new kinds of seeds, new stud stock; giving money prizes at shows, advancing money for purchase of seed or stock, and fostering in every way agriculture, the great mainstay of Indian revenue.

The climate of India is so far favorable to wheat in that there is never any fear of the crop not ripening. If the wheat can be grown either by natural rainfall or artificial irrigation, it will ripen to perfection; so that the grain, unless wetted from without, will not discolor or spoil in transit. The soil, as we have shown, is fairly fertile, yielding from eight to forty bushels per acre. The cost of labor in Hindostan is so cheap that no country can on that score compete with it. The area fit for wheat cultivation is practically unlimited. There are millions of acres available, only waiting till means of irrigation and transport shall make it profitable to break them up or substitute wheat seed for millet. Everything tends to show that, in spite of Mr Gladstone, Egypt and the Suez Canal are being forced upon England. Freight from here to England is 35s per ton, whilst from Bombay, though only half the distance, it is 38s. The reduction of the Canal dues would at once enable Indian wheat to take the lead in the European market.

Mr Fowler, in his article, shows how the Indian wheat trade has steadily risen from 19,000 tons in 1873 to

nearly 1,000,000 tons in 1882. What is to check its further progress? Nothing that we know of short of a Russian invasion.

Evening Herald,

October 31, 1885.

The Platform.

The Previous Question of Science Regarding Evolution.

(Paper read at meeting of the Otago Institute, 13th October, by the Rev. JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., Oamaru.)

The evolution in question is especially of species in physical nature. It is an interesting circumstance that there is not one clear case of actual evolution of species in the history of nature as known to mankind. That was intimated a few months ago by the late Sir Wyville Thomson, an avowed Evolutionist, of Challenger reputation as a naturalist of highest class, in what I suppose to have been his last inaugural address. It was of course admitted by Mr Huxley, the diving apostle of evolutionism, when with his charming frankness, he said that we might have seen a case of actual evolution *if* we had been there—as of course we might, *if* the evolution was there. And it is implied in the well-known evolutionary postulate, that of this process of nature the result at every time must be supposed to be infinitesimally small, so as to be imperceptible to a microscopic onlooker on the spot.

The circumstance is impressive in relation to the question of fact, whether there is such a thing as evolution in physical nature. If the evolution was there, why are there no clear traces of it *here* and now? A vast army, horse, foot, artillery and baggage, has marched across a green field, and left no trace of the transition; but the turf unbroken, the prim-rose upright on the stem, while "ilka blade o' grass keeps its ain drap o' dew." Yet other things, even the tiniest, have left their traces clearly legible: the footprint of birds, the trail of earth-worms, the mark of rain drops, the ripple of gentle breezes on fine sands. Surely that army is a phantom host, like that of the avenging Teutons in vision of Erckmaun Chatrian's crazy German schoolmaster, on their way from Fatherland across the Rhine to reconquest of Elsass and Lothringen.

Other processes of nature, that is, those Really known to us, gravitation, for instance, and ordinary generation, bear witness to their reality every day, before our eyes, in actual cases of gravitation and generation countlessly multitudinous, infinitely more numerous than the stars in the firmament or the sands on the seashore. How comes it, then, that this alleged process of nature is fruitless in appearance as a long extinct volcano? A volcano can become extinct, as *gas* is turned off at the meter, or a fire burns down in the grate. But what can be meant *by* exhaustion of a great fundamental process of nature, while nature herself remains in full vigour of productiveness, as shown in her processes of generation and gravitation?

Besides, an extinct volcano leaves traces to all future ages of its activity in the past; although, as compared with the alleged evolution, its action can have been only as one evening watch fire in a series of great campaigns. The evolution must have extended over the whole history of origination, through all the vast aeons, Palaeozoic, Mesozoic, and Tertiary, recorded and depicted for our leading in Geologic Pictorial History of Origination, vols. I., IX, III., of which the grand *finale* of pur Quaternary with Man is only as the last page with a *Finis* at the foot. Yet, we are told, it has left no "foot-print on the sands of time."

And further, that fundamental process of nature, why should we have vainly to look for it only in the records of the past? Why do we not see it in operation at this hour? Why are there not clear cases now occurring of actual origination of new species? Not only around man throned and crowned as lord of ail, but higher than he, and yet higher, and higher still, like the steps of the ladder of angels at Mahanaim? It is true that we cannot at any moment see the grass growing; but we can see it grown; so that it is to-day in the summer where it was not in the early Spring. The new species, though they should be long on their way toward completeness, ought, as the result of evolution, to be every day arriving at completeness, coming into manifestation as new and distinct; ranks hitherto unseen ever coming into view on the heels of those which have become visible before, as the ranks of an endless army, in wave after wave, appearing on the crest of origination in the dawning, where the morn of life is jocund ever new—if, indeed, on the misty mountain top. We might have seen a case, you say, if we had been there. But we are there; on the theatre of the evolutionary process of nature—if, indeed, there be any such process, of a nature which is alive in the present as in the past.

The previous question, to which our attention is now to be directed, is of what lawyers call the issue in the

case: How are we to bring this matter into shape, for a judgment upon it according to truth? I propose that we should look upon it from the view point of science in the strict sense of physical or natural science, constituted by interpretation of physical nature in her facts for ascertainment of her doctrines. It is true that in a general sense, which is a true sense, science includes all reasoned information that is solid, all knowledge that rises above simple apprehension of details into comprehension of them through relative principle, or, to perception of the principle in pervasive domination of details. Regarding a process of nature we may have such information that is not derived from nature: as we may obtain knowledge of watch-work, not only through study of machinery and material but also from such relatively external sources at the testimony of a competent witness, and if we have such information regarding origin of species, the circumstance of its being extra-natural in source need not hinder it from being truly scientific in quality. We therefore shall reserve the right of all real knowledge of the matter to be taken into account in the final judgment of science regarding evolution. But for the present we shall contemplate the matter simply in the light of natural or physical science, self-restricted to ascertainment of nature's process from nature herself in her facts, observed, collected, tested and digested.

The previous question being—How are we to judge the claims of the evolution hypothesis to be received as a theory of the origin of species, I find the answer to be: By forming a clear and distinct idea," (1) Of the fact of the alleged process of nature, (2) Of the specific nature of the process, and (3) Of the alleged extent in physical nature. (1) Is it [unclear: image not readable] as a reality of nature? (2) What precisely is it said to be? (3) How far is it supposed to extend in operation? The Cartesian [unclear: image not readable] of "clear and distinct ideas" is important in relation to all questions of physical science; for it is in clearness that science lives, and by distinctness that she moves progressing through differentiation to victorious ascertainment, And it is peculiarly important in the present case, because in connection with evolution there appears to be a peculiar proclivity toward obscure indistinctness, as if the children of Evolutionism, had, like Israel in the Red Sea, been all baptised in the cloud.

I. Of Fact—alleged Process of Nature.

Science takes an interest in a hypothesis or doctrine only so far as it alleges a fact of physical nature—nature disclosing its process through its history. Thus her doctrine of gravitation is nature's fact of the apple's fall comprehended by reason, so that the apple's fall is for her the doctrine of gravitation apprehended through sense. Keeping this in view, we obtain deliverance, in relation to the alleged evolutionary process of nature, from entanglement with baseless naturalistic speculation on the one hand, and, on the other hand, from, supranaturalistic doctrine of creation.

1. Baseless naturalistic speculation about origin is represented by the "specs I grewed" of clever childish Topsy, and by the daydream of [unclear: image not readable] Athenians and others, in the clever childhood of people, regarding autochthonic origination of their fathers from their soil of fatherland. Such things are humanly interesting, phases of the pathetic history of human guesses truth near the deep springs of life. But by science, they are disregarded as guess-work, not solidly built up on ground of nature from her facts, but floating in air, on wings of imagination or fancy; or they are by her regarded with aversion as dangerous to solid ascertainment of truth, all the more hateful if they be plausible, so as to be peculiarly dangerous imposture. Such, in relation to the world as a whole, was the ancient cosmogony; to us represented by the noble poem of Lucretius, whose *rerum natura* is, not simply the system of things, but their genesis as a system, their systematic origination as a world, of *cosmos*, "order" or [unclear: image not readable] "the beautiful." We shall pause for a little in view of that speculation, which has lessons to our present from its past.

The method of inductive science, which had hardly begun to dawn upon the ancient masters of speculation, has in our new time come to be almost a second nature of inherited habit through generations of induction as a science and a practice; so that a *petit maitre* in our schools can easily obtain exact and full information about wide regions which were as worlds unknown, not only to the deep and far-penetrative industry of Aristotle's mighty intellect, but to the incarnate genius of speculation about ideal possibilities, eagle eyed adventurous, in the imperial reason of Plato the divine. This must be held in view of our minds if we will do justice to the old masters, and enter through sympathetic intelligence into comprehension of their speculation, and place our selves in right relation of discipleship to their genius; as Manfred saw hoar antiquity" majestic and lovely in the moonlit world he gazed on from the solitary tower, so that for him—

*The place became religion; and the heart ran o'er
In-silent worship of the great of old!
Those dead, but sceptre I sovereigns, who still rule
Our spirits from their urns.*

crude and crass intellectually, is interior to the Epicurean materialism in respect both of simplicity and of that cynical frankness of confessed guess-work, which underlies the Epicurean suggestion of a fortuitous

concourse of atoms. The assumption which it has in place of that guess, the one substance with one force, is a purely arbitrary creation of man's will; "shooting," as Hegel said of a kindred speculation, "the universe out of a pistol." In fact, the universe is assumed as begun, before we have begun to begin it. And this oddly fatalistic universe, thus originated by man's will before it begins to originate itself by necessity of physical nature, has in it a fatal incapacity of "marching," either through the origination or to it. For the speculation has no provision for either getting the one force in operation or sustaining it in operation once begun. And it is bewildering to try to think whether the resources of mathematical symbolism can conceivably furnish an expression for the infinite infinitude of infinity of chances against the origination, by one force always dispersing itself aimless in all conceivable directions, of a universe so thoroughly and essentially definite as ours, with a great system for every star, and a little world in every atom, through all its countlessly multitudinous infinitude of systems of differentiation, precise and harmonious, as if in express manifestation of one sovereign mind, "a manifold wisdom" all pervasive, pervasive "all in the whole, and all in every part." But from the view-point of real science what falls to be said of the speculation is this:—It is not only unscientific but anti-scientific, in matter and spirit, in method and result, from centre to circumference all round. To the real world known to science its ideal world stands in no relation but of persistent reciprocal exclusion and repulsion. To real knowledge it is related only as thesis to decisive antithesis. To a really scientific evolutionism, if such a thing there be, it is only an illustration of contrast. Upon disciplined reason it has no claim, except to be driven away from her bar as an old and oft-exposed impostor.

2. At the opposite extreme, we seek to avoid entanglement with the supranaturalistic doctrine of creation. Some appear to regard evolution simply as the antithesis of creation. And many under the impression that the one is of course exclusive of the other. But science knows not any matter of course. She will believe only what she perceives in the nature of the things in question. She therefore disregards any "strife of tongues" that may be among zealots of either science or theology. For zeal may be "not according to knowledge," nor conformable to the maxim, "He that believeth shall not make haste." And men may consult their ambition more than their qualification before rushing into a controversy so momentous in its issues, both for true rational science and for true rational theology. Disregarding then, "vain jangling," of men who perhaps "know not what they say nor whereof they affirm," let us look into the nature of the things in this case. It is represented by the expressions, respectively, process of nature, and will: evolution is, origination by process of nature, and creation is, origination by will. Here then there is difference with coincidence and connection. But that does not make a manifest necessity of collision. There is difference with coincidence and connection, yet there is no reality of collision, nor indeed possibility of it, in the case of space and time as related to one event, and in the case of colour and sound in relation to one body. And in the clear light of science we can see that there is no real necessity of collision between evolutionism and creationism in their own true natures.

On the face of the matter we see that while creationism with its will has to do only with extranatural, supernatural, relatively metaphysical, evolutionism, as a hypothesis of science, has to do only with the physical of nature and its process. Every thing extra natural is as such outside of the province of physical science as such, beyond her jurisdiction and her ken, her power of right to judge or to think. As summing the substantive reality of nature, she does not further inquire whether that reality reposes on supernatural, or whether it may not be self-existent and eternal, or whether it may not be constituted by chance assemblage of atoms. To any such question she cannot say either yes or no without so far ceasing to be as physical science. It would be suicidal on her part to think about anything metaphysical, supernatural, extranatural, even in her dreams. In relation to even thing but physical nature she is bound by her constitution, under penalty of death by "the happy despatch," to be dumb because deaf and blind, as Babbage's calculating machine.

An Evolutionist, it is true, besides being thus far a man of science in profession, may further in practice of thought or speech be a metaphysician—perhaps without knowing it, like the man who spoke prose. In this capacity he may, beyond inquiring into realities of nature, speculate about the ultimate constitution of the universe. And speculation may land him in the panphysicist doctrine, that physical nature is the only reality; so that what he sees in the looking glass is a sublimated beast and that correspondingly it is weak unscientific unreason to believe, with the Great Father of Modern Science, that most assuredly in the judgment of reason "this universe frame is" *not* "without a mind" (Bacon's *Essays*: "Of Atheism"). Or, speculation may root him and ground him in the doctrine, that, while physical nature is real and substantial, there is a supernatural not less real and substantial at each of her poles, both in man at our terrestrial pole of wondering contemplation, and in God at the celestial pole of sovereign gubernation and origination: that nature herself is to reason a mute eloquent plea for supernaturalism,—*"Shew me thy man, and I will shew thee my God."* (Theoph. Ant.) But Physical Science as such does not declare for or against either doctrine. He who says a word about either so far puts himself out of her court. The most devoted of her disciples, if he so much as begin to think about supernatural or extranatural in any way, of negation, affirmation, or dubitation, then and thereby "drops into" metaphysic of poetry, philosophy, or theology—apses *instantly* from physical science, as distinctly as Daniel

O'Rourke fell out of the moon, And if we dissolve from strict science into considerate philosophy for the occasion, and look into the heart of the matter, still we shall find no apparent necessity of collision.

Where creationism is at its highest, most eminently characteristic in supernaturalism expressed, there most clearly all possibility of collision is completely out of the question. It is inconceivable that there should be even contact. For there there is no ideal possibility either of evolution or of any other process of physical nature. I refer to what is called "immediate creation that is, the primary origination, with no employment of material or medium, by—(*rhema* not *logos*, He. 11: 3)—pure and simple *flat* of will. This extends to rational spirits or souls and to the raw material of the physical world. And in the origination of these it is inconceivable that there should be any process of physical nature; as it is that there should be "a natural body" outside of space and time. The rational spirit or soul in view of creationism does not belong to physical nature, It is not *of* her world even when *in* it: though here among her physica, it is *gershom*, "stranger here." Physical science as such, so far from having any theory of its origin, is not competently aware of its existence; she does not know, and even cannot competently inquire, whether any such thing as a rational soul has ever existed anywhere in the universe. Not less clearly the origination of the raw material of the physical world is altogether beyond her competency of knowledge. A raw material—*hulê*—which may be for metaphysic as *ens rationis*—is not *for* physical science as a concrete entity, an object of knowledge or distinct conception. As raw, formless, indeterminate, chaotic, it is to her apprehension only as an abyssmal darkness, to look upon which is to be struck blind. In order to have for her a cognisable existence, the matter must be indued with some form, or imbued with something of formative determination, were it only as bathybius or other slime. Thus far a formed world, an existing nature, at least in germ, actual or possible, real or imaginary, has to be presupposed in order to ideal possibility of so much as a germinal science. Doubly or trebly *a fortiori*, it is beyond the competency of science to frame any hypothesis of the origination of a raw material of nature or of world, To speak of a natural process of originating nature's raw material is like speaking of a mac's being the father of his grandfather.

The secondary origination which has place in a formed world introduces us to the doctrine of a "mediate" creation. Here Theology recognises the previously existing nature with its process. Thus, in the origination of individuals, parentage with generation. This she makes to be employed by the Creator as his material or medium. But in so doing she does not ostensibly annul the nature in respect of reality, nor cancel the process in respect of validity. On the contrary, she validates and conserves, and that in two ways. First, generally, all creation secures the reality of nature as resulting consequent. For a true creation is a positing of something real; so that if the creature be unreal the creation is illusory, and providence is without a sphere of preservation and government. And second and specially, mediate Creation further demands the validity of nature in her proses as antecedent condition. For here the Creator employs the previously existing nature as his medium. And only what is real can be really so employed, to employ is not to destroy but to conserve, in employment, for the employer. So of the origination of individuals. And so, conceivably, of the origination of species. If it be ascertained that the origination of species is, like that of individuals, by process of nature, for Theology the result needs to be only her finding, that the creation of species, like that of individuals, is not immediate but mediate.

The finding does not need to be for her an unwelcome surprise, as if thrust upon her by necessity of conforming to new ascertainments of science. Her doctrine of a mediate creation was formulated in her schools many ages before the new science had begun to be; and was applied to species as well as to individuals by the most illustrious of her masters, such as Thomas Aquinas, her Angel of the Schools. That may now appear to her—as it did to him—most fully in keeping with her general view as to immediate creation, that its appropriate work is origination of raw material and of souls. It may otherwise interest her as affecting her logic of classification or her metaphysic; of dogma. It does not touch her substantive doctrine of creation, as consisting in origination by will, with or without employment of medium or material previously existing. Her distinction between mediate and immediate affects only the way and manner of creation, not the substantive fact of creation. It enables her to show that in good faith she has no quarrel with evolution simply as origination by process of nature. But it leaves intact the grand reality of her fundamental confession and song, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth."

Physical science, on the other hand, on behalf of an hypothesis of origination by process of nature, has no call of interest, nor power of right, to quarrel with theology as affirming origination by will. We know that there can be an origination which is at once by process of nature and at the same time by will. For in the inner world of mind, while the origination of logical conclusions is wholly by process of nature intellectual, and while the origination of true poetry is wholly by process of nature æsthetic-imaginative, at the same time the origination in both cases is wholly by will, designing free agency, of the person as reasoner or poet. We do not know that it is otherwise in relation to the outer; world of physical nature. For aught that we can really see there may be there a rational agency along with the physical, yet distinct from it, as light is from atmosphere in space which by each of them is filled "all in all;" rational causation may be there in concourse with physical, to one and the

same effect, as light blends with heat in effect of the sunbeam; the physical may be employed as a second cause by the rational as first cause, witness the "voluntary" action of our body, a way conformable to its laws of body, but always controlled by the mind. So we reason and that from the view point of physical science.

So it is even when there is no origination of life in the question. In ordinary course of nature's history her falling apple makes us aware of a process of gravitation; the uniform direction of this becomes for us the revelation of a law; and through knowledge of that we rise into comprehension of the mechanical system of the universe. But what is this force thus proceeding through nature, or whose? May not that which here in nature appears as a law have its unseen fountain in sovereign personality as a statute or decree? May not this force be wielded for the purpose, if not ultimately reposed in the will, or even constituted in its operation by the stable persistent volition, of a supernatural free agent—an angel or a God? Questioning to which physical science cannot answer. This matter, metaphysical is beyond her: here she has "nothing to draw with, and the well is deep." Her sciolist, not knowing himself nor her, may be dogmatic in the presumption of ignorance, dreaming of omniscience where nesience—*docta inscitia*—is her deepest wisdom. But she, knowing herself, can school him, with the world's great master of wisdom in song—"There are things in heaven and earth, Horatio, that are not dreamed of in our philosophy." And her Newton, knowing himself and her, will subscribe to the confession of her reverent humility, and speak of himself as a child who gathers a few pebbles or shells on the sea shore, while the great ocean they came from remains to him ever an unfathomable and unsearchable deep.

II. OF DEFINITION—SPECIFIC NATURE OF THE PROCESS ALLEGED.

It is not enough to say generally, this evolution is a process of nature, in origination from a previously existing something. For definition here has to be specific. And in that general sense there are various other evolutionary processes of nature, from which, in order to adequate clearness of science, the process in the present case has to be distinguished. There are the twain evolutions of growth and decay, the generative evolution of individual offspring from parentage, the logical evolution of conclusion from premisses, and the æsthetic imaginative evolution of poetry, from what in the "maker's" mind is "sown a natural body" to be "raised a spiritual body." What, then, is the distinctive in the present case as compared with those other cases. And the answer, doubtless, is—Contribution of real specific difference. This is not merely said by us. It is seen by science in the nature of the thing. Since the distinctive result in this case is origin of species, the distinctive in process has to be, contribution of specific difference, constituting the new species, making it to be as new and distinct. This, and nothing else. This, or nothing to the purpose—nothing but delusion or baptism of cloud. If there be shown in nature any such thing as contribution of specific difference, then evolutionism is an established theory of origin of species; if not, not.

On behalf of Evolutionism it has been contended that the distinctness in a species, resulting from process of nature, does not, except in degree, amount to more than the distinctness in a variety, producible by directing intervention of man. If that be so, then a species may natively be only a variety that has hardened into stereotype. And correspondingly it may conceivably, without violence to nature, soften back into the variety,—perhaps on its way toward final delinquescence into protoplasm, or dissolution into that slime which the Challenger has found in place of the bathybius of Evolutionary imagination. And so the distinctness in specie's as in variety will be, not permanent because essential as the form in a statue of bronze, but only complexional and therefore evanescent, like a fading picture on canvas, or dyer's colour in cloth, or discolouration of a flooded river. Here then, when we come to propositions, may rise a question of the reality of species in nature; or, of the reality of nature as specific; and consequently, of the possibility or competency of natural science, as distinguished from a mere natural history which, in absence of knowledge of specific natures, can be only a more or less elevated gossip, about illusory surface aspects of a nature that is unreal. But at our present stage of definitions, we need only say that, though species should be really the same sort of thing as variety, nevertheless a new species has in it something new, distinct from all else in the world; and that this new something, in respect of which the species differs, is of course a specific difference, so far as it goes and so long as it endures. Though it should be superficial and fleeting as the ripple on the lake, the shadow on the hill side, or e'en—

*As the rainbow's lovely form
Evanishing amid the storm,—*

still, the origination of it is a contribution of a specific difference, constituting the new species, giving it being as now and distinct enough.

Notes of criticism of two famous phrases—*voces signatae*—of evolutionism, "spotaneous generation" and

"natural selection." They are loose poetical metaphors instead of exact scientific definitions. They are logically nonsensical; but rhetorically effective thus far, that through baptism of cloud they lead into worship of a wilderness calf, (1.) "Spontaneous generation." Here the "spontaneous" means that life is originated not from any previous life; while "generation" has no meaning except as implying that the origination is from previous life parental. Through this nonsense we land in the view (if view it may be called) that to inquire about prolongation of old chain (say, zinc or copper) is the way to ascertain a out origination of new metal (say bronzo, by fusion of these. (2.) "Natural selection" "Natural" here has to mean, without directing intelligence; for the word is employed by way of contrast to ("artificial selection) man's intervention of directing intelligence in the production of new varieties Now "selection" has no meaning except as imply in that there is directing intelligence operative in the process as appearing in the result. The nonsense here conducts through cloud to the co fused impression. (1) that the intrinsic nature of the process is affected by the absence or presence of directing intelligence in the exprinsic occasion of it; or (2), that in inquiring how, in what way or wanner nature contributes a specific difference, we are dealing with the truth or falsehood of evolutionism, that is, with the question of fact whether there is or is not any such contribution made by nature anyhow, no matter how,

Darwin's specialty is, that he places the cause of specific differentiation in the cosmical conditions of the general system of nature around, while other evolutionists place the cause in the previously existing specific nature of individual bodies. That makes a difference only between two schools of evolutionism, two modes of evolution. It presupposes that evo uti n, somehow, by prosess of nature, is a fact; while the present question is, whether in fact there is any such thing as natural evolution, causing the origination of specific life n the world.

(To be Concluded Next Week.)

The Daily Telegraph

Monday, October 26, 1885

The Daily Telegraph

The jury in the proceedings against Mr. Joseph Symes spent six hours anxiously considering whether that pleasant gentleman's curious Sunday performances ought to be classed under the head of "amusement" or "instruction," and found themselves after all unable to come to any conclusion. If they could be described as "amusement," Mr. Justice Higinbotham charged the jury, they were illegal; but if they could, by any stretch of charity, be classified as instruction, they must find for the prisoner. There were obvious difficulties in the way of either conclusion. All the facts, indeed, are fatal to the theory of "amusement." The very music, according to the evidence of a witness for the defence, is of so excruciating a character that he had to take refuge from it in the pages of a book. Mr. Justice Higinbotham's own estimate of Mr. Symes's performances makes it impossible to describe them as "amusing Mr. Symes's oratory, his Honour said, "consisted of very gross outrages and insults upon the faith of a large section of his fellow men." It was, no doubt, true that he is evading and breaking the law for the purpose of outraging the feelings—the sacred feelings—of his fellow countrymen. He has insulted the sacred beliefs of a large portion of this community. He has assailed the highest officers of the Government without, so far as we know, having the slightest ground for thus slandering them. He has insulted not merely the members of the Legislature, but the Houses of Legislature themselves." His Honour declared he would not pain, would not offend, would not insult the jury" by rehearsing Mr. Symes's rhetoric. The theory of "amusement," therefore, must be dismissed. There are equal difficulties in the way of the theory of "instruction." How can blasphemous revilings be "instructive?" "As an" intellectual performance," his Honour said, Mr. Symes's deliverances "were" beneath contempt; they had "neither, talent, knowledge, norreason, nor sense, nor taste, not a single merit to recommend them;" they were not only outrageously insulting," but recklessly erroneous." The jury toon gave up the attempt to make any literary classification of Mr. Symes's performances, and the case was made to turn on the single point of that gentleman's sincerity. Did he honestly meet his brother members of the Australian Secular Association," asked Mr. Justice Higinbotham, "on that day for the purpose of providing according to his means—his very poor means—instruction to his brother members? If they believed that was his honest object they should acquit him. On the other hand, from all the circumstances which took place at these proceedings, if it was his principal and primary purpose to provide amusement, and thereby make money, he would come within the Statute." Here, again, after six hours' painful meditation, and after listening to a four hours' exposition of bis own merits from Mr. Symes himself, the jury gave up the question of his "sincerity" as an entirely hopeless conundrum.

The result in these proceedings must be a disappointment to everyone, save Mr. Joseph Symes himself. Even that sanguine gentleman could scarcely have hoped that his four hours' tirade against all things in heaven and earth would be followed by a sympathetic verdict from an admiring jury. But as the jury failed to agree, being equally balanced between "guilty" and "not guilty," this is a result which, for a time, at least, saves Mr.

Joseph Symes's pocket and person, though not his character. A sensitive person would, no doubt, be made uncomfortable by the reflection that a jury of his countrymen, after hearing all he had to say in his own defence, were unable to acquit him of the charge of having committed a criminal offence. In (he case of Mr. Symes, however, his pert on and pocket are, for the moment, saved, and he will console himself for any injuries to his character by considerations resembling Falstaff's famous reflections on "honour." The failure of the jury to agree, however, is, on public grounds, a calamity, since, unless the blunder is repaired, it practically neutralises the whole Act, and makes possible the appearance every Sunday of fifty Halls of Science and a hundred concert rooms. Mr. Symes was indicted under Act 21 Geo. III., for "keeping a "disorderly house," and it seems impossible to doubt that the Hall of Science meetings are "disorderly" in even the untechnical and popular sense. The audience is "entertained" not merely by jovial musicandfree and easy debates, but by a liturgy, burlesque sacraments, and blasphemous feats, which are more worthy of John Wilkes and the "Hell-fire Club," and Medmenham Abbey, than of the City of Melbourne and the reign of Queen Victoria. The meetings are "disorderly," if only from their shocking personal attacks on the Queen. They outrage public decency and constitute a real peril to the public peace. But that the meetings are "disorderly" in the technical sense, as intended by the Act under which the proceedings were taken, is clear beyond any possibility of doubt. A house used as "a place of "entertainment for gain on Sundays," the Act defines as "disorderly." That Mr. Symes kept such a house for such a purpose is not only proved by evidence, but is notorious. Mr. Symes himself, indeed, boasts of the circumstance, and has chosen on this single point to engage in single combat with the whole authority of the law. The law is bad, he declares, and all the judges of the Supreme Court have blundered in their interpretation of it. The Act deserves no better fate than to be broken; and, for himself, it is his boast he *has* broken it, *is* breaking it, and intends to break it! And yet the jury found it possible to doubt Mr. SYMES'S account of his own doings, and were unable to agree whether he had, after all, broken the law or not.

The case cannot, of course, rest at its present stage. To leave things as they are would be to open the doors of a hundred Sunday "entertainments." We hope the law officers of the Crown will, in the public interest, lose no time in taking steps to have the question, whether such extraordinary "entertainments" are legal, authoritatively settled. Everyone must, of course, admire the conspicuous ability and impartiality of Mr. Justice Higinbotham's charge to the jury. But at one point, at least, the doctrine he laid down seems perilous. If Mr. Symes, or any one of his school, only makes his performance dull enough to render it impossible for anyone to describe it as "amusing," then the Act no longer applies! If enormous and impenetrable dulness constitutes a protection, we may be sure that the Symeses will always be safe. But is Mr. Justice Higinbotham's legal doctrine sound?

The Age, Monday,

October 26, 1885.

The Hall of Science Sunday Entertainments.

The Judge's Summing up.

The prosecution of Jos. Symes, free thought lecturer, for giving entertainments on Sunday to which admission was obtained by payment was resumed on Saturday before Mr. Justice Higinbotham. The hearing of the evidence and the addresses were concluded on Friday. On Saturday morning his Honor summed up, telling the jury that the whole of the case would, in his opinion, resolve itself into the consideration of one question. In the first place, the jury might dismiss from their minds all questions as to the existence or non-existence of the act under which the prosecution was laid. It was in active force here, and the provisions were intended to enforce on all members of the community the observance of a particular course of action upon that particular day of the week called Sunday. The jury had been told that the act had originated in ecclesiastical influence and was directed to serve ecclesiastical purposes. No doubt its author, or one of its principal authors, was an ecclesiastic, but it would be an entire mistake to suppose that it had for its purposes the preservation of the privileges of any one denomination. Long before religious denominations existed men felt that they wanted a periodical day of rest, and almost all civilised nations had established the day of rest, which all men liked to enjoy, and the enjoyment of which by all necessarily involved the observance by all of the law. In active industrial communities like ours such periods of rest were more necessary than elsewhere. For a long time it

was doubtful whether the act was in force in the colony or not. That question was, however, definitely settled. It would be difficult to find anything approaching uniformity of opinion among a large body of people as to what ought to be the law regulating the proper observance of Sundays, and if the present law were tyrannical or inexpedient it was quite within the legitimate rights of those who considered its operation injurious to agitate for, and if possible bring about, an amendment, but the law being as it stands it was not permissible for any person to deliberately break it without running the risk of incurring the penalties imposed for its infraction, be far as the law was concerned he had to tell the jury that it was in force. This being the case, the next question was, did the prisoner come within its provisions? The act was directed against the opening of public rooms of entertainment or amusement of any kind whatever on Sundays as a source of gain. Instruction and amusement went hand in hand, and where the former was imparted a very high sense of pleasure resulted. The primary or chief object of meeting in churches was not amusement. Some persons went there as a devotional duty, some to obtain instruction, some without any distinct motive at all; but it would be a gross misstatement to assert that the balk of church congregations assembled for amusement, or that the churches were opened to afford them that relaxation. To bring the prisoner within the operation of the act he must be proved to have kept a place of public entertainment open on Sunday, and to have made a profit in doing so by collecting or receiving money. There must be two elements to bring people within the operation of this act of Parliament. A man must be the keeper or occupier of a house or room, or the owner of it, or have some stake in it. He must keep it and use it for public entertainments on that day and he must also charge money for admission. These were necessary to bring persons within the operation of, the statute, the object being to prevent the use of property on Sunday for the purpose of amusement. The defendant was undoubtedly the keeper of the hall within the meaning of the statute. He had very frankly and candidly admitted that he was the sub-lessee of the hall, and it was abundantly proved that those who attended the meetings paid money for admission. Although it did not appear that anyone was absolutely refused entry for non-payment, the arrangements were conducted in a similar manner to those at the pit door of a theatre. The next question was the most important of all, being:—For what purposes did the accused use this hall? Was it for public entertainment or public amusement; with the object of obtaining money by means of the amusement provided by him? It was not suggested in any of the counts of the presentments that the hall was used on that day for any other purpose, but it was alleged that, it was used for public entertainment or amusement. Now, was that so, or was it used for the instruction of the adherents of the secular body? The latter view the defendant put forward. On that day, as alleged by him, he and a number of persons entertaining the views held by the Secular Association met, and the meeting was held with the honest purpose of mutual instruction and improvement, and hearing from the person whom they had chosen to preside over their meetings the view which he had to present to them about their conduct and belief. The defendant's case was that he stood on the same footing as other denominations. Here the divergence between the prosecution and the defence arose. The prosecution alleged that it was a place of entertainment within the meaning of the act, and the defendant called witnesses to prove that the proceedings were conducted with the view of imparting instruction, he being in a sense the minister of a denomination which differed from other so called religious bodies only in that it held different religious views. If the jury held this to be so, prisoner was entitled to a verdict at their hands, although he charged for admission. If the jury believed that that was the principal and primary purpose for which that hall was used on these three days that would entitle the defendant unquestionably to their verdict, even although he had charged admission to strangers or members, because, just as religious bodies or denominations might charge admission without bringing themselves under the provisions of the statute. The primary purpose was not amusement or profit, so if they thought this association honestly met in that way, and the hall was used for instruction, then would not be a case in which they could find defendant guilty. It was a question that deserved attention, and should certainly not be omitted. It would have to be determined by inferences drawn from the circumstances that took place in the hall, and they would have to consider the purposes for which the hall was used. The points they must take into consideration were the nature and character of the proceedings as narrated by the witnesses in the case. On the 6th September Senior-constable M'Hugh, whose accuracy was unchallenged, deposed that he saw the accused at the hall, and was told by him that he had just come from Sydney, in order to meet the prosecutions which had been threatened, and that was a point of the utmost importance. Not only was the law in force, but the defendant had had notice of its being in force. The judgment of the Supreme Court was delivered on the 1st of September. On the 5th of September Constable M'Hugh saw the defendant and told him that he was instructed to inform him that if he took part in the entertainment he would be prosecuted. If the law had not been decided to be in force, of course any individual would have a perfect right to question the act. Prisoner knowing it was in force therefore acted on his own responsibility. After the 1st September the existence of the law was *no* longer in question. On the evening of the 6th, accompanied by Constable Gleeson, he went to the hall and found defendant standing on the steps and addressing a crowd on the footpath of 50 or 60 persons, whom he informed that he was about to undergo prosecution. The doors were then opened and the proceedings commenced with a

pianoforte solo by a Mr. Ashworth, followed by a concert consisting of secular songs, unobjectionable in themselves. Defendant then made a number of announcements referring to the Australian Secular Association, one being that the newspapers had refused to insert his advertisements, and another that on the following Sunday "Joseph, by the Grace of God Archbishop of Victoria, will dedicate the Hall of Science the Church of St. Kerferd to the Worship of Heaven, and will fumigate the place with in-cense so as to banish all the devils and evil spirits." The character of that statement, together with other statements, deserved very great attention indeed. He then delivered an address, which concluded the proceedings. On the evening of the 13th the defendant also addressed the bystanders from the steps, informing them that it was contemplated prosecuting him under the statute for being the occupier of a disorderly house. That clause of the act meant that he was keeping a place open for the amusement of the public to which they were admitted by the payment of money, and not that there was any actual disorder there of the nature of fighting, &c. The defendant was altogether mistaken when he says he is charged with keeping a disorderly house. It was distinctly laid down that the person who acted contrary to the laws of the State should be liable to punishment either by fine or imprisonment. A musical performance, as before, commenced the proceedings, the same announcements were made, and the dedication service was postponed to the following Sunday, it being undertaken to return their money to any who were dissatisfied at having paid for the purpose of hearing it that evening. An address followed, defendant ridiculing Christianity, which he described as a failure. That was a subject on which he had a perfect right to address his fellow men. It was a subject of vast interest to all mankind, and also a subject of vast importance to those who thought upon it, and any man had an undoubted right to express an opinion upon it. But the object of such an address was to be inferred from the way in which it was given. On the 20th defendant addressed some fifty persons on the footpath announcing that he should sell tickets himself to relieve others from any liability, which he did. A musical entertainment followed; and announcements succeeded as before, the defendant intimating that he wanted twelve good men to give evidence in the police court as to whether the house was disorderly or not, after which defendant delivered an address prefaced by the statement that the principal difficulty encountered by earnest seekers after truth appeared to be finding a God to worship. This difficulty he had solved by finding a really respectable God—the God Cant. A burlesque of the opening part of the Church of England service and Te Deum succeeded, as described by the witnesses, the defendant attempting to chant the latter, but commencing in too high a pitch he broke down. A mock sermon, nominally inculcating obedience, which had been described by three witnesses, came next. His Honor then read passages of the sermon verbatim from the notes, remarking that he would not insult the jury by reading to them over again some of the blasphemous rubbish which they had already heard, and which, as an intellectual performance, was beneath contempt. At the close of the sermon defendant informed his audience that the service had been given with the special object of showing the Methodist people how little ridicule was necessary to prove that their religion was a farce, and concluding with an assertion of the rights of the Secularists to hold their meetings and propagate their views, defying both the persecution to which they were subjected, and the members of Parliament, who were neither rulers nor legislators, and received money for doing nothing. The jury must exercise their judgment as to the purpose which actuated these proceedings, a great part of which consisted of an insulting parody of the Church of England service, not calculated to inform or instruct those holding his own views, but to shock the feelings of those who entertain contrary ones. The object of the association, as detailed by defendant's witnesses, was to propagate and disseminate freedom of thought, and it was for the jury to say whether these proceedings tended to that end. The same freedom which the members claimed for themselves was due from them to other denominations. It might be that defendant honestly believed in the falsity of the creeds he was satirising, but his method of attacking them militated against the objects he claimed for his own. Did the jury think that this whole performance, postponed till it was perfect to defendant's ideas, was got up as an entertainment to make money? If that was his object he would be guilty under the statute if he opened the Hall on these occasions for amusement—an amusement to which some persons unfortunately sought admission. There were certainly some features in the performance as described which pointed in that direction. The announcement over the door was intended to catch the attention of passers by and the further object of the postponement of the so-called consecration was simply of the same nature. Persons who were really in earnest, though it might be holding erroneous opinions in the eyes of their fellow men, and who simply took money, not as for the purpose of making a profit, but for the purpose of aiding the objects of the association with which they are connected would not ordinarily offer to return the money of those who failed to gain admission on the first occasion. It was not an uncommon thing where performances for amusement were announced and were not given. The jury would have to say what construction they would put on these proceedings—what did they think their primary and principal purposes for which the defendant used the Hall on these occasions. That was in reality the sole question. The questions of fact were undisputed, but the other matter deserved their serious consideration. Did he honestly meet his brother members of the Australian Secular Association on that day for the purpose of providing according to his means—his very poor

means—instruction to his brother members? If they believed that was his honest object they should acquit him. On the other hand, from all the circumstances which took place at these proceedings, if it were his principle and primary purpose to provide amusement, and thereby make money, he would come within the Statute. If defendant honestly performed this insulting travesty to advance his own views, it was the best excuse that could be made for him; but the offer to return, money to auditors who were dissatisfied because the entertainment did not come up to their expectations was repugnant to that theory. The main and, in fact, the only question for the jury to consider was now fully before them, and with one more observation he left the case in their hands. It was suggested by the Crown that it was necessary that the law should be put in force against the defendant, because he was breaking the law with the object of outraging the sacred feelings of his fellow countrymen; while, on the other hand, defendant said that the law officers of the Crown, in instituting these proceedings, were instigated by the ministers of certain religious bodies from motives of jealousy. Neither of these questions ought to enter into the consideration of the jury. No sufficient data for the formation of an opinion existed, and it was not for the public to conclude on the one hand that the Crown officials had been influenced by improper considerations and that defendant was the victim of religious persecution, or, on the other, that the principles of the Secular Association were wrong and vicious in themselves.

The jury retired, and intimated that they were unable to agree. His Honor came into court at forty minutes past three, and on being informed that six of their number held defendant's meetings to be entertainments, while the other six considered them assemblies for instruction, directed them to be detained till; forty minutes past five, when they were discharged without giving a verdict, Mr. Symes being bound over in his own bail of 200 to surrender for trial at the November sessions.

THE prosecution of Mr. Joseph Symes, of Hall of Science notoriety, has broken down through the inability of the jury to agree among themselves that the house in which he gave his Sunday entertainments was a disorderly one within the meaning of Act 21, George IV., c. 49. To make it disorderly the entertainments must be given for the purpose of amusement and not instruction, and admission to them must be obtained by the payment of money at the doors or by tickets. About the latter point there was no doubt whatever. Mr. Symes did not deny that he had made a charge for admission, but on the contrary acknowledged it, and defended himself on the ground that the Churches also made such charges, and were not prohibited. His main defence was, however, that the law in question was a religious enactment designed to keep holy the Sabbath day, that the Sabbath day had no legal existence in this colony since there is no State religion, and that therefore the enactment was not in force and could not be pleaded against him. To this Mr. Justice Higinbotham replied that the point raised had been decided in the affirmative by the Full Court in September last, that the Act was in active force in the colony, and that if the defendant had violated it he was properly subject to the proceedings that had been taken against him. The object of the Act was not to inculcate the observance of any particular religious ceremony on any particular day, as Mr. Symes argued, but to enforce certain conditions on the community which were deemed necessary to make the seventh day a day of rest, one of these conditions being that popular entertainments which were intended to bring gain or profit to their promoters, and the primary object of which was amusement and not instruction, should be forbidden in the face of this explicit ruling the jury could scarcely have done otherwise than convict Mr. Symes on the point of law which he raised; and if they have let him off it must be therefore on the point of interpretation, that is to say, because they could not make up their minds that his entertainments were entirely destitute of the saving element of instruction. That they were grossly irreverential, stupidly unintellectual and as full of vulgarity and buffoonery as might have been anticipated from their authorship was placed beyond all dispute by the evidence; but the evidence also disclosed the fact that there were plenty of people in apparent possession of (their faculties ready to come forward and make affirmation that they had been seriously edified by them. Philosophy in sport is as instructive as philosophy in earnest. A burlesque sermon or a parody of the Litany may make Mr. Symes's meaning clearer to his audience than the most elaborate dissertation, and if it is lawful for him to teach the doctrines of free thought at all they may contend that it is lawful for him to teach them in his own way. Colonel Ingersoll's mode of disproving the Deluge by bringing the laws of arithmetic to bear upon the Ark and its living freight is as offensive as it well could be, but as a piece of criticism it is as rational and destructive as anything advanced by Bishop Colenso on the same subject. Of course, to a mind trained up on the biblical hypothesis it is downright blasphemy, but then blasphemy is an offence that is very delicately treated by the modern courts in the interests of free discussion, and Mr. Symes was not on his trial as a blasphemer. As Mr. Justice Higinbotham was careful to tell the jury, it was quite open to Mr. Symes or anybody else to give an address which should be designed to show that Christianity is a failure, because it is obviously a matter of opinion, and in a free country like ours everybody is entitled to express his opinion with perfect freedom. There is no law to prevent the dissemination of atheistical views, orally or in writing. The utmost hospitality is extended to all shades of belief and unbelief. The Chinaman worships in his Joss-house as securely as the Unitarian does in his chapel, or the Christian in his cathedral, and they can all make what terms of payment they please with the public. The public

are not forced to go, and if they do go they cannot complain if they are asked to comply with the conditions upon which they can be admitted. Neither can they complain if they hear what does not please them. If they go to Mr. Walters's they cannot be surprised if they hear the divinity of Christ called in question, and if they frequent the Secularists' Hall they will probably be told much that is even more impious and shocking to their feelings

There is the objection that may be taken to Mr. Symes's services, that cannot be taken to the others, namely, that in addition to the nauseous parodies of sacred things, which are intended as much to make his audience laugh as to make them disgusted with the popular theologies, there is a liberal supply of secular songs that have no connection whatever with the rest of the entertainment. The singing of the Churches is part and parcel of the theology of the Churches. It is as much doctrinal as the prayers or the preaching. But what conceivable relation has *The Turkish Patrol* or *Man the Lifeboat* to Mr. Symes's peculiar religious views? A service composed wholly of such songs, we take it, to which admission should be charged, would very soon bring him within the grasp of the law, which he has succeeded so far in evading. As for the other pictorial accessories to the entertainment, such as the flaming dedication of the Hall of Science to the worship of St. Kerferd, they are so grotesquely ridiculous and unmeaning that it makes one ashamed of one's species to think that any human being out of short frocks should see anything to laugh at in them, much less find serious food for reflection. If this is the sort of stuff that Secularism in Victoria delights to cultivate, then all we can say is it deserves the very worst that the law or public opinion can do to it. Criticising its teachings is out of the question, because sheer ribaldry and nonsense are amenable to no critical canons; and all we can hope is that the gradual elevation of the popular taste may in time prevent its professors from making such a vulgarising use of the liberty that the genius of a free age gives them, notwithstanding the poor return they make for it. Free thought has its martyrs whose place in the roll of human benefactors no one will challenge, but the mummeries and tom-fooleries of the Hall of Science imply a positive negation of the thinking faculty. Mr. Symes and his friends complain of being persecuted, but the little glimpse he has afforded us of the tone and habits of his platform show that he is bigoted, as vain-glorious and as intolerant as the veriest Torquemada among his religious assailants.

THE Administration of Justice Act is now in the hands of honorable members. It proposes to effect what *The Age* has been persistently advocating. The Supreme Court is to be remodelled on the basis of the English system by providing a separate staff of judges for the transaction of the Nisi Prius and the Appellate business. When these colonies obtained the power to govern themselves the administration of justice in England was in a disordered state. That is to say, no attempt at order had been made. There were three courts having almost concurrent jurisdiction at common law—the Exchequer, the Common Pleas and the Queen's Bench. At Equity there were the Master of the Rolls, two Vice-Chancellors, Lords Justices of Appeal and the Lord Chancellor. The law reform that began in England twenty years ago has scarcely yet made itself felt in Victoria. It was only last year that we adopted the judicature system which provides for a common form of procedure for both legal and equitable cases, and the Bill for the Administration of Justice is but a tardy effort to follow in the good work by separating Appellate from Nisi Prius business.

Mr. Kerferd's Bill is by no means perfect, but it is a step in the right direction, and it would be unwise to postpone so useful a reform. It will effectually put a stop to the block in the courts, it will complete the judicial system that will make the administration of justice in Victoria a model for the other colonies to follow. The Bill, however, proposes to reserve for the Appellate Judges all the criminal business, and practically abolishes the Court of General Sessions. To both these proposals grave objections may be urged. Is it wise to leave all the criminal business to one set of Judges and allow the others to get rusty in that branch of business? Is it not perpetuating the ill arrangements of the present system to send an Appellate Judge to Ballarat to try criminals and a Puisne Judge to try civil cases? Thus sending two Judges to do the business of one! And as for abolishing the General Sessions that is open to many objections. It forms the court of appeal against magistrates' convictions. To compel the litigants in such cases to come a great distance, say from Walhalla to Sale, would be a practical denial of justice. Places like Port Albert and Walhalla, where General Sessions are held, afford a ready means of settling these matters on the spot. To bring the litigants and the witnesses all the way to Sale, where the Appellate Court will sit, is cumbrous, expensive and: unwise.

The Bill enables the Chief Justice to require a Puisne Judge to hear criminal cases, but if it be necessary to enable him to transact the civil duties of an Appellate Judge he must be specially appointed by the Governor in Council, and his place filled up from the Bar. Yet if a permanent vacancy exists on the Appellate Bench it can be filled up by the appointment of any qualified person. These provisions are scarcely consistent. Would it not be better to provide that whenever a block exists on one side of the Bench the Judges of the other side may be called upon to assist? We think that the country would not stand by and allow one set of Judges to remain comparatively idle, while another set of Judges would be overworked. Air. Kerferd may be assured that by retaining four Appellate Judges and three for Nisi Prius, he can get the business well done. But he must provide against the recurrence of blocks, and the simplest method is to authorise the Chief Justice to require assistance

from either branch to help the other.

The practical abolition of the County Courts is one of the proposals that require careful consideration. These tribunals are ready of access, moderate in cost, and amenable to appeal if they go wrong. They are popular in England and almost indispensable here. It is their simplicity of procedure that has forced the law reform into the superior courts. It would be a curious development if the effect of their good example were to lead to their own annihilation. Part of their jurisdiction is to be transferred to justices, and if this be under the guidance of a police magistrate the reform would be a useful one. The other end of the jurisdiction is transferred to the three new Puisane Judges, who are to hold County Courts as well as the Supreme Court at the same sitting. How long this anomaly will be allowed to continue does not need much prescience to foretell. It is obvious that the Supreme Court will be "levelled down" to the County Court, and thus practically complete the extinction of those very popular tribunals. But what guarantee will the public get that high and ruinous costs will not follow upon the obliteration of the less costly tribunal? These are considerations that must not be overlooked. Whatever reform be adopted the public interests must be conserved. The costs of the judicial settlement of a dispute must not be raised. We cannot help what the lawyers may think of this. It is the public interests that must not be sacrificed.

The Bill contains many improvements in our judicial system, and we accept its introduction as an evidence that Mr. Kerferd really desires to place the administration of justice upon a sound basis. But we submit for his consideration whether it is desirable to limit the hearing of criminal cases to the Appellate Judges; whether Courts of General Sessions should be abolished; whether it is necessary to send two Judges to the same place, one to hear civil cases and the other to try civil actions; and whether it would not be better to make his Bill a self-acting one by authorising either branch of the judiciary upon the request of the Chief Justice to aid in the work of the other branch when a block exists or is threatened.

One of our contemporaries, with the wish evidently father to the thought, thinks that there will not be time to get through with this Bill this session. We do not anticipate any such result, and it would be a very great disappointment to the public if any such delay occurred. Another thinks it would have been better had the Bill been introduced earlier in the session in the Upper Chamber, where the leisure of the Legislative Council would be usefully employed in carefully considering it. But the *Argus* ought to know that as it is a Bill which appropriates public money it could not be introduced in the Council, nor even in the Assembly until resolutions had been passed in committee upon a message from the Governor. The Licensing Bill has blocked the way until just now, so that the Administration of Justice Bill could not have been brought on earlier. With the amendments that we have suggested, the Bill is one that commends itself to public approval.

The Argus, Tuesday

October 27, 1885.

The Confession of Faith.

To The Editor of The Argus.

Sir,—The Confession of Faith (chap. xxii. 4; says that "an oath is to be taken in the plain and common sense of the words." I asked the Rev. Mr. Thomson if he can in this manner adhere to the standards which he has signed. I wished to know if he believes in the "common sense of the words" that the church officers have "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and "power respectively to retain and remit sins."

In reply he tells us that the words "kingdom of heaven" mean only the Church, and after this interpretation he finds it all plain sailing, But that certainly is not the "plain and common sense of the words;" nor is there any hint, so far as I know, of any such meaning in any other part of the standards. It is true, as Mr. Thomson says, we are told (chap. xxv.) that "the visible church is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ;" but does he wish us to believe that that is the same thing as saying that the church is the kingdom of heaven?

That the authors of the Confession of Faith did not so understand their words is clear from the Scriptural texts they subjoin as authorities for their statements:—

"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Here the contrast is so sharply drawn between earth and heaven that any pretence to regard the "kingdom of heaven" as merely the Church is wholly vain. As for the alleged power to retain and remit sins, I do not see that any subtle apologies, such as those which Mr. Thomson has put forth, will satisfy a fair-minded man.

But it is foreign to my purpose to discuss these points in more than a very few words. What I wish to do—if

you will so far indulge me—is to place before your readers every Monday morning for a few weeks to come just one point at a time for Mr. Thomson to solve. If I put the question explicitly and Mr. Thomson answers straightforwardly, the public will be able to judge between us without my entering into any prolonged arguments.

The point I wish to call Mr. Thomson's attention to on this occasion is the following. According to the standards, a heathen who has never had a chance of becoming a Christian is to go to eternal perdition for not being a Christian. Does Mr. Thomson believe that?

"Men not professing the Christian religion cannot be saved in any other way whatsoever, be they ever so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the law of that religion they do profess; and to assert and maintain that they may is very pernicious, and to be detested."—(Chap. x. 4).

And, again, in the first chapter we are told that—

"Although the light of nature and the works of creation and Providence do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men in-excusable, yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of His will which is necessary unto salvation."

Now, let us see what happens to those who are not "saved," who have not attained the I "knowledge necessary unto salvation." According to the Larger Catechism, which is one of the standards of the church, they suffer

"Separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments In soul and body without intermission, in hell-fire for ever."—(Answer 29.)

In order to bring home properly the full meaning of this doctrine, let us take an illustrative case. Look back to three centuries ago, and imagine an aboriginal woman of this country. She spun out her miserable 40 or 50 years amid cruelty and want Every winter starved; every summer, when her lords were flushed with meat, she was beaten,; kicked, speared in the legs, rudely transferred from owner to owner, and finally put to death when it so pleased her master for the tim being. Poor old lubra, was that the end of your sufferings? No. According to the standards you went to be tormented in hell-fire. You have been roasting there these 300 years, since the time when Elizabeth filled the throne of merry England, and you will go on being roasted for 30 centuries yet to come. When that is finished, you will not yet have made a beginning. Let us then say 30 million years, or 30 millions of millions. It is all one; in neither case have you made the faintest approximation to the completion of even the smallest fraction of your punishment. *It is to go on for ever.*

And what are you punished for? Because you did not believe in the Christian religion. Yes, as you say truly enough, you died long before the first white man ever saw Australia. But that does not matter. For, according to the Confession of Faith, such is God's perfect sense of justice that you were bound to go to everlasting perdition for not doing what you had not the remotest chance of doing.

Does Mr. Thomson hold this doctrine? If he does, he shocks the moral sense of the community. If he does not, he cannot be said to hold the standards of his church.—

Yours, &c.,
Alexander Sutherland.

Oct. 24.

The Otago Daily Times

Wednesday, October 28, 1885.

The White Cross Society.

The Otago Daily Times

A public meeting was held at the Chamber of Commerce yesterday evening in connection with the newly-formed Dunedin White Cross Society. There was a large attendance of clergy of all denominations and laity, Mr E. B. Cargill, president of the society, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN said the meeting was held to complete the inauguration of the White Cross Society, the purposes of which were very simply and plainly set forth in the form of application which hail been circulated. A good deal of attention had been directed to this particular subject by the publication of a number of disclosures of vice in the more crowded parts of the world, which had caused a great sensation throughout the civilised world. But these dreadful evils which had been brought to the notice of the public as existing amongst

us, he did not think it was the purpose of this society to inquire particularly into—(hear). They all knew that a departure from right principle would lead men on and on into wrong until it was hard to say what amount of wrong they would come to. The purpose of the society, as he understood it, was to begin at the other end altogether, and to provide a means for checking the existing evils. The advertisement stated the meeting was for men only, but he did not suppose any of the speakers were going say anything that their wives would not listen to. They wanted to carry with them the sympathy of women, and to obtain their co-operation in maintaining this movement, as they could do very powerfully and effectively by their influence in society generally. He thought in initiating the movement there were certain things which they ought rather to avoid. He trusted it would not be considered necessary to make reference to any disclosures as to the existence of extreme forms of vice in society at large, as he did not see that this was going to effect any great good. The creation of a sound sentiment on this subject would do more to make men who offended against this law, looked upon as they deserved to be. One thing that should be avoided was exaggeration of statement as to the extent of these evils amongst us at present being greater than at any other time. He believed we were no worse than those of former times, and that generations gone by erred just as flagrantly as that in which we lived. Again he thought we should be very careful indeed how we allowed general reflections to be made which might seem to imply that there had been lately any breach of purity in our family life. We all believed that as regarded the inward life of our families the rule was the rule of purity, and he hoped no attempt would be made to interfere with this idea. The maintenance of a sound faith in a right state of things went a long way to support it, and it was therefore of great importance to us to look upon it as a matter of course that the law of purity reigned in our general family life, in all stations of society. He noticed in reports at Home that a vile application of the idea had been made in representing that this impurity was a means of the oppression of the poor man by the rich. This idea should, he believed, be contradicted and reprobated, as, in his opinion, the protection of law and sentiment extended more to the humbler classes now than in any previous age. What the society aimed at was this: there had come to prevail among us an idea that the rule of purity which it was necessary to apply in the case of a woman was not equally applicable in the case of a man—that it was a dreadful thing for any stain of impurity to attach to a woman or girl, but in a man or boy it was very venial. It was from this that there had grown up those forms of vice about which we heard such a hubbub at present, and that the development of the social evil had become so prominent amongst us. The intention of the society was to try and root out this idea, and instil the belief that it was as necessary and proper for men to keep themselves pure as it was for women. It was the society's desire to do this, and also to cultivate that feeling towards women which made all men believe themselves their natural protectors instead of, as was too often the case, their destroyers.

Dr DE ZOUCHE said he had been asked to move the following resolution:—" That this meeting warmly approves of the formation of the White Cross Society of Dunedin, and strongly commends it to public support." He explained that the idea of the formation of such a society in Dunedin had long been in his mind, but the means of doing so were not very clear. Recent events had, however, given the opportunity, and it only remained to take the necessary action. It was judged wise to retain the name of the White Cross Society, because although the organisation was an independent one, it was wished to indicate a unity of purpose. People asked whether this was not trenching upon the ground of the churches, and it was quite true that if men acted up to their religious professions there would be no need of such a society. But this was a special evil which had to be combatted by special means. Men who would scorn to tell a lie or embezzle money did not hesitate to pay a price for the degradation of a fellow-creature. It was also said that the very calling attention to this evil was likely to do harm, but he contended that nothing but harm could arise from a do-nothing policy.—What the society wanted was for young men to join in a crusade against vice. Too often the advice given by young men to their juniors was that impurity was not wrong in a man, and a good many arguments were used to justify it. It was said that prostitution had always existed and always would exist; but the same argument might be used to justify the crime of murder. Then, again, there was the humbug about physiological necessity. Such a rule was only made for one sex and he thought steps should be taken to secure some correct physiological teaching in our public schools. At present the sources of information on certain subjects were most imperfect among our young men, and it would be better to substitute proper teaching. Every member of the White Cross Society should consider himself a knight for the defence of the honour of women.—(Applause.)

The Rev. F. MONTAGU POWELL spoke as follows: They say there were 50,000 women who walk the streets at night in London who earn, by selling the sanctity of their womanhood, their casual existence. They say there are 150,000 women who earn their livelihood by the same fearful sacrifice in Paris. I ask you, if there are 50,000 women who thus live in London, where are the men? If there are 150,000 such women in Paris, where are the men? I buried a poor dear girl not long ago who died in a house which they call a house of ill-fame. I ask you, where was the man? We are not impugning anybody; we are not impugning any class. We are only just impugning our own common human nature. Speaking of ourselves to ourselves, Would such women be there if there had not been such men somewhere else? You say there has come to us no long correctly formulated

petition from the class of women (oh, that there ever should have been such a class!) to rescue them from what we see to be the abyss of misery into which they have fallen. But you know your-selves, my friends, quite well that there is an absolute silence which is more eloquent and more expressive than the loudest cry. You know that there are signs and tokens by which the human frame makes its wants felt quite clearly. You don't want to be told by your baby when it is dying that it is in need of medical aid. Its very state and condition is its loudest cry to you. And so it is for us who feel that in the state to which our social life has come. There does come up from it a cry so loud, so clear, and so distinct that I say there is no one in the world who has once heard that cry can feel any solid peace of mind until he has done all that in him lies to make this cry less observed, less felt, less needed, and to ameliorate the iniquity which he feels is blotting out the purity of the world.—(Applause.) We are enrolled by virtue by our very manhood—by virtue of our very inward idea of manhood—in an army which is bound to have for its object not only the support of our manhood in all its purity, but by that which is correlative and complimentary to it, and without which we can never find the full scope of our existence. I mean the pure ideal womanhood. You have all read "Don Quixote," and you have laughed to think how Cervantes has given the last final blow to ancient chivalry. I suppose the custom was too good a one to last. But in your laughter you cannot help admiring the old knight, when he imagines that every country-woman he sees is surely his princess in disguise. That is the soul and essence of true knight-errantry. It is to see under the gauze of every female form that ideal womanhood which you know and respect in your own mother, which you know and love in your wife. It is the ideal woman represented by every female form of which we speak to night; and though it may be blood-stained—though by man's weakness, selfishness, and vice it may be trampled on and crushed,—it is still there, and it is for us as knights errant of the White Cross army to restore the linaments, and give such a strong foothold to woman that such things as have happened in the past can never happen in future. I fear, my friends, I ought to apologise in speaking to you, because perhaps it may be that I am somewhat biassed, if not highly prejudiced, by the older social system and the older social fabric at Home, creating those miserable conventionalities, and those utterly aggressive artificial social lines which have been the ban and canker of the Old Country, but which, by the blessing of God, may never visit these fair shores. If a woman falls, a hundred hands are thrust out to push her down, and keep her down; but where is the man? A hundred hands are stretched out to welcome him. Is it fair, is it right, is it honourable, is it what the stronger should do towards the weaker? No; and therefore it is we feel that by enrolling ourselves in such a simple cause as this we may individually do as much as in us lies to make that law of purity which we rightly feel to be so landing upon our manhood. It seems to me we should band ourselves together for the purpose of preventing, if possible, a single breach of purity. People may say that this movement is one of those sentimental and hysterical public shrieks which are occasionally got up; but as we value our own peace of heart and peace of mind, so let us try to value the peace of mind and the peace of heart of others.—The Rev. Mr Powell concluded with a few appropriate lines from Matthew Arnold.

Rev. Dr STUART said this subject of impurity was a dreadful one, and had been so in all times. His reading of ancient history was to the effect that this social leprosy had been over all old nations, and that under its advancing rottenness one after another had perished. So desperately did it cling to all nations that even the chosen people scarcely ever succeeded in emancipating themselves from its hateful power. In modern times it was well to see that from the teaching of the New Testament the evil was seen and recognised. Those who were familiar with the history of Christianity know that the Churches had set themselves to combat it, and with wonderful success. But the evil broke out again in the time of Charles II, and spread like a contagion over all Christendom. Some 200 years ago a society existed called a society for the reform of manners, and one of its objects was to combat this evil which had penetrated into family life and everywhere carried moral poison with it. He rejoiced that in every age the Church had given commence to purity, which the New Testament taught was equally binding upon men and women, and the violation of which was equally fatal to the wellbeing of men and women. He agreed with the chairman in believing that vice was not in our day more rampant or widespread, or indeed so much so as in the past. This age, he thought, compared with any during the last 300 years. No doubt the extensive circulation of intelligence by news-papers and telegraphs caused us to begin to think that in our day all evils were more rampant. The truth was we were only better acquainted with them. The society was not going to combat evils which had never existed to the same extent, before, but at the same time he thought the movement was wise, and would greatly help the churches. The laymen did not help the churches to the extent they should. Why did they not back up their ministers, and encourage them in bringing matters of the kind before their congregations? Why leave ministers to do all this work—work from which sensitive men shrink? One thing aimed at should be to see to the housing of the people. In the case of families of six or seven living in a house with two or three rooms only, the younger members got into the habit of going out into the streets at night, and so mischief often began. He remembered sometime ago joining the chairman in the idea of forming a society to attend to this matter, but their secretary "skedaddled," and the whole thing collapsed.—(Laughter.) He thought they were indebted to Dr De Zouche for having brought the present matter

under notice, and trusted the society would work the good desired.

Mr J. M. RITCHIE had consented to say a few words, not for the purpose of giving any explanation or information, but more for the purpose of persuading those present that it was a matter quite as much for the laity as for those who might be called professional teachers of morality—the clergy. Without disparaging the tetter's office, if the idea got abroad that this was a specific of the clergy, it possibly might prevent some people from taking an interest in it. Above all things, it was a question for the laity, and especially for those who had boys growing up.

Bishop NEVILL said he could not refuse to say a few words at such an important meeting, although he must apologise for speaking without preparation. He had attended one of the preliminary meetings on the invitation of his friend Dr De Zouche, and had accepted that invitation gladly. He agreed with the remark that it was a subject for laymen to move in rather than the clergy, but he had been applied to by the founders of the movement in England to see if anything could be done regarding it in this part of New Zealand, and it was with much pleasure he expressed his sympathy with the movement. The lady whose name was associated with this movement had written to him enclosing the rules of the society. He referred to Mrs E. Hopkins.—(Applause.) He was glad to find that the name of the lady was well known, and her work appreciated, for the way in which she had thrown aside all those ordinary impediments which must hinder a lady from speaking on this subject, and the manner in which she had handled the subject, and had made her influence felt throughout the world, showed indeed that God's spirit does work sometimes in ways hardly expected, because her work would be felt ere long throughout the whole civilised world. He was also exceedingly glad to find at the preliminary meetings some members of the medical profession, because it seemed to him to be pre-eminently a subject in which medical men might make their influence felt. He sincerely hoped that the medical men would be found in the forefront of this movement. On the previous evening a working man had asked him (the speaker) if he would be allowed to join, and he had replied certainly, and that his influence would be valuable amongst young men of his own class. He presumed that this organisation was not intended to apply to any one class of the community, because vice did not belong exclusively to any one class, though he might say that a very considerable acquaintance with the working class had shown him that there was a vast deal of the truest modesty amongst the roughest working men, and he did not believe that the working classes were the least fraction more vicious in sentiment or action than those who occupied other positions. An organisation should be set on foot, or the influence they hoped to exercise could not be perpetuated. He presumed that what they were aiming at was the creation of public sentiment upon this subject. He, too, did not believe that this age was any more wicked in any respect than any age that had gone before it; but they desired to advance from that position, and to have the present age distinguished from all ages that had preceded it, not merely by an abstinence from vice, but by the exercise of virtue, and he desired to know if there was no prospect of a society to perpetuate the influence of the White Cross army here. The society should educate young men so as to create a proper manly sentiment that would acknowledge that selfish and vicious indulgence was the most unmanly thing that could be thought of. His Lordship also thought that something might be done in forwarding the aims of the society by the discountenance of plays of an immoral tendency. He was not going to say a word upon the general question of theatre-going. He had met players who were really excellent men, and really religiously-minded men, too, at the bottom, and they had said that there was no preference amongst actors for bad plays, that many of them hated the bad plays, but that what the public desired they must supply. He was not going to say that that view of the question was defensible, but it was clear that if the public declined to pay for bad plays they would not get them, and he thought that those who took the society's pledge were bound to discountenance plays which they felt were calculated to excite evil passions. His Lordship concluded by wishing permanent success to the institution whatever form it might take, and that its work should go on from generation to generation—a blessing to all that come after.

The Rev. Mr WHITE explained that what had been done so far was to form the nucleus of a society, merely electing the president, and that the public meeting had been called for the purpose of enabling an expression of sympathy to the movement to be made. He hoped that all present would enroll themselves as members before leaving the room.

Mr J. FULTON, M.H.R., thought that a great deal of evil had resulted in the past because people had been afraid to speak frankly and fairly with their boys as they grew up, and if this society, as had been well said by Mr Ritchie, merely gave them an opportunity of introducing the necessity of purity to the young men it would do a very good work. He had listened with feelings of pleasure and satisfaction to the impassioned address of the Rev. Mr Powell, and would say that they were not deserving of their manhood if they allowed the young men amongst them to go on degrading themselves and degrading their own mothers and sisters in degrading others of the same sex without saying a single word to help them into or keep them in right courses. He agreed that we were not worse than people had been in the past; but he would say with our opportunities and light, woe to us if we were not better than those who had gone before us.

The Rev. Dr ROSEBY, ON being requested to address the meeting, said that he had not prepared to speak, and he thought it would be a pity to prolong the proceedings when they had the important business of enrolment to perform. A few days ago he had read in one of the leading reviews a paper by Mr Lillie, a well-known Roman Catholic writer, who made the most startling statements regarding the national deterioration manifested already among the French people owing to the pre valance of the vice they had been speaking about. It was a startling thing to find a man with a full sense of the responsibility writing in his own name, and making such a serious accusation, and it struck him that there must surely be some truth in it. As they had heard most truly from Dr Stuart, vice had destroyed one after another all the great civilisations of the world, and it might be that they were having already in their own time a living illustration of the same thing. Surely these things should speak to them in a powerful voice of the necessity in the interests of our civilisation, in the interests of the community in which we dwell, of taking some such measures as those they were inaugurating.

The motion was then put, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. A. C. GILLIES: Does this society ignore the existence of God?

The CHAIRMAN: No; certainly not.

Rev. Mr GILLIES: Well, this meeting, to my surprise, has been conducted to this point without asking God's blessing upon it.

The Rev. Dr ROSEBY thought the omission to open with prayer was purely an inadvertence.

The CHAIRMAN said that if he had erred in the way he had opened the meeting he would apologise, but he must strongly protest against the inference that had been drawn—that because they had commenced the business without devotional exercises the society did not recognise the existence of God. He thought that was an outrageous thing to say, and strongly resented the imputation.

The Rev. Mr GILLIES said he had drawn no inference, hut had asked a question founded upon a fact.

The CHAIRMAN: A very improper question to ask, I think.

The Yen. Archdeacon EDWARDS proposed a vote of thanks to Mr Cargill for presiding, and in doing so remarked that there were two things worthy of notice. He believed the White Cross army was first set on foot by members of the Church of England.—("No, no.") Perhaps he was wrong there, but he might say that he did not remember any occasiou when ministers of all denominations had met together and joined so heartily in any movement. He thought that was a very good omen; and another was that medical men—Dr De Zouche and Dr Hocken—had been the first to move in this matter.

The motion was carried unanimously, and the proceedings were closed by Bishop Nevill pronouncing the Benediction.

At the close of the meeting a large number of those present signed the "White Cross" pledge, and were enrolled as members of the society.

The Evening Bell.

"In its tongue there hang a thousand virtues."

Saturday, October 31, 1885.

The Evening Bell

THE meeting of the Chamber of Commerce held yesterday fully came up to our expectations. Some of our members, it is true, were wise enough to be absent—those who attended were quite enough. Before the meeting was held, we indicated what Auckland, represented by Mr Aide in, expected of them; and Auckland was not disappointed. The members who were present were at all events sound as bells on the railway question. Each in his own way sot himself to comfort the disturbed mind of the Chamber on the subject, and we can only hope they were; successful. The conclusion of the whole matter so far as the members are concerned, is that they didn't know the loan was going to be raised; but they are quite sure it cannot be spent without the assent of Parliament. Just so. This is exactly what we told them from the first, and what the Treasurer tried to make the Chairman comprehend—only he could not do so. All that was said yesterday by the members fully corroborated Sir Julius Vogel, just as the Treasurer fully and almost word for word corroborated what we had said repeatedly. The Treasurer said be meant to raise the loan because it was sure to be wanted very soon, partly to repay advances from other loans, partly also to make advances in its turn to other works, the provision for which will then have been exhausted. He did not say that Parliament had instructed him to do this—certainly not; it had only empowered him to raise the money, and it looked to him to have money in hand to pay its way. In this matter he is the sole judge. If he judges amiss there will be some waste of money, because of the claim for interest perhaps, but it will not be very serious. In such a case, the House will be able to appreciate his want of foresight, and will no doubt resent it. If he judges rightly, and he may in this matter be pretty well trusted to do so, the House when it meets must and will approve of his action. That he will spend none of the money

without the authority of Parliament he has said, but he need not have said it to anyone less ignorant politics than the Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce. Had he been anxious to break the law, he is unable to do so in this way. As we have told our readers again and again there is no immediate danger to the loan or the railway except that which our members have made for themselves.

The speeches delivered to the Chamber yesterday make it plain enough where the danger lies. It lies in the want of unity and the want of capacity of our representatives. Of those who spoke yesterday we had men who voted for Captain Russell's motion, men who voted for the Government, and one judicious representative who didn't vote at all. The members who voted with Captain Russell had no idea they were in any way imperilling the railroad. Those who voted with the Government didn't know that they were defending it, and the one who did not vote had a shrewd idea that the matter was an awkward one, and so kept out of it altogether. If we compare this with the conduct of the Canterbury representatives, for instance, we shall appreciate the danger which threatens our public works. The members for Canterbury knew what they wanted, and voted for it. They knew that they had a grudge against the North Island, and especially the Auckland members, and they gratified it by their votes. There was very little division in their camp, and nobody was too cunning to record a vote at all. By voting for Captain Russell's resolution they knew they should punish Auckland, and they did so. Our own members who voted for it did the same without knowing what they were doing. And next session it will be the same. If Mr. Peacock's figures are right (which by the way, if it were worth while, we could show they are not), there will be plenty of money in the Treasury when the House next meets, besides the proceeds of the million loan. The House will then have to decide what shall be done with it. In all likelihood our members will be as shortsighted and divided then as now. The claptrap talk about the Treasurer's recklessness may easily prevent them from authorizing a new loan for general purposes, and it is quite likely the Canterbury members may aid them in this. Nevertheless new works will be provided for, and the million loan will go to pay for them. Of course it will only be advanced, but the point will be when and how it is to be paid back. This is what the Treasurer means, and what the Premier referred to, and unfortunately it is all true. In the past the Government fought for our Trunk railroad when our own members postponed it. It is quite possible they may fight for it again, and be again defeated—this time by the Southern members.

It is not clear that much has been gained by the action of our Chamber of Commerce. Yet if it has at last dawned upon the public that a little foresight and knowledge are desirable qualities in a representative, the thing may have served a good purpose. So far as the resolutions passed by the Chamber are concerned, they go for nothing. What the Chamber protests against, has never been proposed. The Government will of course use their own discretion about raising the loan. They are quite unable and have certainly not said they were willing to divert it in any way. As for Mr. Lamb's resolution condemning the negotiation of the loan, on the ground that it is not wanted—it was simply an impertinence. The Government are in a position to know, and Mr. Lamb and the Chamber of Commerce are not, whether this is true or otherwise. If they raise it too soon, they cannot spend it without the vote of the House, so it follows that nothing would be gained by raising it. In future no great harm and possibly some good will be done if the Chamber of Commerce and its chairman confine themselves to matters they understand.

The New Zealand Herald and Daily Southern Gross.

Saturday, October 31, 1885.

THE special meeting of the Chamber of Commerce yesterday, called to consider the proposal of the Government to raise and divert to public works generally the one million loan authorised for the North Island Trunk Railway was remarkable for two things. First of all there was complete unanimity on the part of those members of the House of Representatives present as to the fact that neither by those who last session voted for the reduction of the Public Works Estimates by £500,000, nor by those who voted against the motion for such reduction, was there the slightest conception that Government then cherished the covert intention to use the adoption of that motion as a pretext for utilising the North Island Trunk Railway loan for other public undertakings. Members who had taken different sides on the question of retrenchment, and who expressed their convictions on the invitation of the Chairman, declared emphatically that they had never heard of such an intention, and had never even suspected it. This was perhaps the most conclusive refutation that could have been given to the imputation of wilful blindness made by Sir Julius Vogel against those voting for the reduction of the Estimates in not recognising that the effect of their action would be precisely what they now strongly deprecated. It is clear that if those who opposed retrenchment equally with those who supported it failed to see that the carrying of the motion for retrenchment would be taken advantage of by the Government to our wit the

House, then the contention of Sir Julius, that those who had voted for Captain Russell's motion "must have refused to consider the subject intelligently," is thereby proved to be baseless. There is no way of escaping from this conclusion, unless indeed upon the supposition, which would be fatal to the honour of Sir Julius, that he himself meant to pursue a course which he purposely concealed, and that some of his supporters stood in his secret. Even this supposition, however, would not materially affect the inference to be made from the fact that some of the staunchest followers of the Government declared at the meeting yesterday that they had not the remotest idea that the action of the House in reducing the Estimates would be construed into an illogical reason for the divergence of the North Island Trunk Railway loan. The imputation of intentional obtuseness, of which the Treasurer accuses those Northern members who supported Captain Russell's retrenchment motion, therefore applies to some of his own devoted friends, and has the unpleasant consequence of exhibiting his relations to them in a peculiar and rather dubious light.

The second thing for which yesterday's meeting was noteworthy is the unanimity with which the members of the Chamber adopted the resolutions embodying a protest against the misappropriation of the loan in question. This is not to be wondered at, as the object of the meeting was one which concerned very closely the whole community they represented. Whatever diversity of view there may exist among our representatives or the electors on questions of general politics, they are in perfect harmony on the matter of preserving their Trunk Railway Loan sacred for the purpose to which in 1882 it was by Act of Parliament devoted. On this question, indeed, the whole of the members and inhabitants of the North Island may be said to think as one man. Not even those North Island members who have seats in the Cabinet can possibly entertain an opinion adverse to this view. Even though some of the representatives might advocate as a prudential course the stopping of the railway until the native lands through which it is to pass are obtained, they yet did not, by so doing, countenance in the very slightest degree the idea that the loan specially designed for that important work should be misappropriated. When Sir Julius Vogel asks, "What object could members have had in stopping the railway, and refusing other loans, except to use the Trunk loan for defence and other purposes?" he must have imagined these members to be exceedingly deficient in fertility of motive. Their object, surely, was patent enough—namely, that the loan should be reserved for the purpose for which it was sanctioned. If, at the same time, they refused to sanction other loans, their obvious reasons were the conviction that, in the interests of the colony, no further borrowing should be authorised, and that there was sufficient money on hand to enable Government to [unclear: atte] to the defence of the country, and other matters requiring attention in the meantime, without necessitating a sacrilegious attempt on the sum already dedicated by Parliament to a specific purpose. These are the views which might very obviously be supposed to sway the members, who deemed it unwise to proceed with the Trunk Railway of the North Island until some definite arrangement had been come to with the natives respecting the lands it would traverse. They might be right or they might be wrong in advocating such a postponement, but they certainly could never intend their opinion on this matter to be perverted into a justification of the illegal dissipating of the Railway loan. In crediting them with such an intention, Sir Julius Vogel could only be imputing to them his own wayward thoughts. On this matter the position occupied by the members in position was precisely the same as that held by the Chamber of Commerce yesterday. Its members, too, might possibly hold different views on the policy of securing the native lands before further expediting the Trunk Railway, as also on the policy of reducing the Public Works Estimates; but, as with one mind, they would yet be prepared to cry "Hands off" with respect to the Treasurer's projected seizure of their Railway loan. In the advocacy of their views it would never occur to any of them that this would be disingenuously used to the prejudice of their common interests; but the moment they became apprised of an official intention to resort to so unprincipled a device, they would unite in denouncing its nefariousness.

So obvious, indeed, is all this, that it is difficult to believe that either the Premier or the Treasurer is serious in the hints he has thrown out about floating the Trunk loan, and diverting it to general purposes. The statements made seem rather designed to serve a political purpose than to foreshadow a policy. It looks as if their object was to discredit the Northern members with their constituencies by drawing the attention of the latter to the financial loss they have sustained through the cutting down of the Public Works Estimates, which their members were mainly instrumental in effecting, and the still greater losses which such action might yet entail on them. That the Government might do what Mr. Stout and Sir Julius Vogel have virtually threatened to do, and, having used this loan for Public Works' votes, might then employ the necessities of the North Island Trunk Railway as a lever by which to compel the assent of the Northern members to the sanctioning of a large loan, to be available for certain speculative railways in the South as well as those sanctioned in the North, are among the possibilities which the proceedings of last session might tempt Ministers to realise. It would be a sweet revenge for the humiliation to which they were subjected to be able to make those who thwarted them feel that they were outmanoeuvred after all. But will they really do what they seem to say they are resolved on? We take leave to doubt it; and the expression, with which Sir Julius Vogel closes his somewhat rambling and illogical telegram to the Chamber of Commerce, of the Government's non-intention to

do anything but what the law requires, appears to favour this conclusion. It means in effect to say we might do what is hinted at, and it would only be serving you right if we did it, but yet we won't. Sir Julius Vogel has learned before now that, in politics especially, discretion is the better part of valour.

The Evening Star

Tuesday, November 3, 1885.

The Protection of Girls.

To the Editor.

SIR,—The following letter, in reply to "M.D.," who wrote supporting the position taken in a leading article in last Thursday's 'Otago Daily Times,' has been declined by that paper. If you can insert it in the STAR you will much oblige. Such evils as those recently disclosed at Home are known to have spread and taken deep root in New South Wales and Victoria, and are beginning to give unmistakeable evidence of their presence in this Colony. Patriotism and parental instincts alike demand an immediate strenuous effort to secure such preventive legislation as shall save this country from having in its midst a horrid Inferno, in the secret chambers of which the piteous cry of betrayed and outraged innocence can reach no pitying ear. I would suggest that the White Cross Society set itself to frame, with legal help, a special measure, in the light of recent disclosures, the general provisions of which shall have the hearty support of the country, and be pressed on the acceptance of the Legislature.

—I am, etc.,
Edward Walker.

St. Clair,

November 2.

Editor 'Otago Daily Times.'

SIR,—I am afraid the "Hush!" policy of "M.D." and others will not do much for the removal or prevention of the terrible social evils which are being proved to exist and are well known to be largely remediable by legislation. But no legislation in this direction is likely to be effected unless the people say they are determined to have it, and nothing short of a knowledge of the ghastly facts will arouse them to that determination. But given a universal knowledge of some of the facts, and unless the bulk of the community is utterly depraved, which we decline to think, the scoundrel authors of these things will not be much longer able to reproduce them within the sanction of the law.

I have read the 'Pall Mall' disclosures, but did not do so till within the past week. I confess to have taken up the paper with some trepidation on account of its possibly polluting character, judging by reflections I had seen upon it in some newspapers. I have laid it down as a paper which could have no such influence upon any most ordinarily decent individual, and as calculated to create in any humane mind only pity for the victims, abhorrence of the villains, and the conviction that it is the bounden duty of the New Zealand public to resolve that many of the things described shall be made not only legally impossible, but very perilous to be illegally done, in this young growing country. The things disclosed are made known with such a manifest abhorrence of their villainy, and such complete proof of the misty and hopelessness to which the victims are inevitably reduced, that if young people get their first knowledge about some things they are little instructed in from this source they may be thankful that that knowledge has come to them associated, as is so seldom the case, with such salutary warnings. Like those who have got their natural curiosity first awakened and partially met by the Books of Moses, in which the divine wrath is so unmistakeably revealed against impurity, they will be immeasurably less likely to go astray than those who are left at the pitiless mercy of what they can pick up in illicit secret conversations and the too-easily-accessible filthily-suggestive novel.

I do not know whether the White Cross Society contemplates educating the people with a view to special legislation, but hope it does. The public mind cannot be too much impressed with the significance of the fact

that while the law refuses to let a young woman dispose of her property as she likes until she is twenty-one years of age, and refuses her liberty to marry without the consent of her parents or guardians until she attains that age, if she has attained the age of thirteen only and cannot prove that she did not consent—and how could she prove it, however innocent, poor helpless thing?—he who has despoiled her of what should be more precious than property or life is shielded by the law as one who has done no wrong. This should not be, and I ask your readers, sir, to resolve that it shall not be, and bestir themselves till their righteous resolution takes effect inefficient legislation.

The country should say by law that so long as she deems it necessary to protect her daughters from their possible indiscretion respecting their property or marriage she will also be responsible for their safety in this more momentous matter—they shall not have legal power to consent, and seduction under any circumstances shall be a criminal offence. Their honor is at least as precious as their property, and should be protected at least as long. Corporal punishment is the fitting infliction for this corporal offence. The nonsense talked about "necessity" which no man can reasonably urge except as speaking for himself, would speedily vanish before the lash. By divine law the way of transgressors is hard. The religious community at least should not rest so long as by human law this murderous way of transgression is easy. If the social evil itself cannot be absolutely extinguished, the law against it should be so framed as to make every assault upon the innocence of youth extremely perilous. I have not read in the 'Pall Mall' disclosures anything more loathsome than what I have heard reported as discovered through certain recent investigations in this Colony, by which, at a certain place, boys of school age are allured to the basest possible beastliness of this bad business. The people must see the leprosy if the people are to prescribe for its removal. Focus the light upon it, sir, and the people will have cause to bless you.

—I am, etc.,
Edward Walker.

St. Clair,

October 30.

The Anglican Synod.

The first session of the seventh Anglican Diocesan Synod was opened at the Chamber of Commerce this afternoon.

Bishop NEVILL delivered the following address:—

Dear brethren of the clergy and of the laity—

Regarding the address to the Synod as an annual opportunity of speaking to the whole diocese as well as to the special representatives thereof, I have been wont to take advantage of the opportunity to touch upon broad questions of principle or of ecclesiastical relation, the recognition of which should operate to deliver us from the cramping and belittling influence of local questions or temporary accidents. Pursuing this plan, I propose, before entering upon the record of diocesan events, to dwell somewhat upon some necessary fundamental principles, which, though they lie deep down as the basis of our work, are not on that account to be lost sight of, but rather to be discovered as continually approaching the surface in practical bearings of the utmost importance to the very existence of our organisation—just, as the plutonic rocks, which form the very nucleus of the earth, protrude colossal arms in mountain chains and cliffs, which protect the lighter soils from the fury of the elements.

The Church a Spiritual Organisation.

Suffer me, then, on this occasion to remind you of the first great characteristic of the Church, viz., that she is a *spiritual* organisation—a character which will be so freely acknowledged that I am in danger of being charged with the utterance of a mere truism; but I am not so satisfied that this, her essential character, is always clearly present to the minds of her members; and I am only too well aware that the proper consequences of this fact are far from being accepted or even perceived. I wish to point out a mistake into which many fall in the application of those passages of holy Scripture which assert this spirituality, or argue from it as an admitted fact; these passages are habitually applied as though they only had reference to the Church in her supernatural relations and not to her material relations or moral condition. If we are told that "the weapons of our warfare are

not carnal," perhaps we think of the Church as militant against the Devil and his angels, but forget the world and the flesh. If we call to mind that conquest is declared to be "not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts," we take the conquest as referring to besetting sins or our manifold temptations, forgetting that these words were spoken on behalf of a prince of the ancient ecclesia who greatly needed support amid the very material obstacles which obstructed his building of the temple of God. When Christ said "My Kingdom is not of this world," surely no one supposes that he was speaking of the heavens and the angelic hosts; and if he was speaking of the ecclesia which the *kletoi* would form upon earth He was insisting upon its essential character, notwithstanding the fact, surely not unknown to Him, that the Church must ever be constituted of physical agents as well as evermore affected by material conditions. I cannot largely unfold, in such an address, the processes by which that which is natural becomes subordinated to that which is spiritual, but the case of the individual member of the kingdom illustrates sufficiently the nature of the whole. Christ's religion, into the fellowship of which we are admitted, is not to be regarded as a mere compact between two more or less independent beings for considerations which induce them thus to combine, but is rather the incorporation of the nature of the one into that of the other, Incarnate Deity being the means of this incorporation and eternal energising Spirit the instrument thereof. Thus of the individual it is said "your life is hid with Christ in God," and it is because thus united with the heavenly Head that we derive power to will and act in obedience to the will of Christ. What is true of the part is true of the whole. What is the mystical body but an aggregation of material bodies and immaterial souls, spiritualised by this mystical union that is betwixt Christ and His Church in the extension to, and penetration of, all by the living and life-giving Christ?

I repeat then, that the essential characteristic of the Church is that she is a spiritual organisation, having indeed relations on every hand with natural and even material things, which natural and material things she is not to despise and reject, but these, though they be rather her accidents than her nature, she is yet to interpenetrate and sanctify.

How wide-reaching, brother clergy and beloved laity, is this great principle to which I have drawn your attention. How constantly, too, it must present itself in the practical details of our work. If the kingdom be spiritual, then must the laws of the kingdom be spiritual, not carnal; and I say this in full recognition of the fact that we are flesh and blood, and that we have to do with such things as title deeds and money—that clergy need support, and that laity are called on for effort and should exhibit wisdom and care. I am no solifidian—I do not put an idle expression of faith in the place of a rational observation of our natural surroundings, and of prudent action in accordance with the same; but I do think this great spiritual institution is in danger if, instead of a bold adherence to her magnificent prerogative of spiritual principles, which reach to the very source of all power and might, she begins to rely upon petty maxims of worldly policy and to feel safe only when hedged about by resolutions and statutes, framed oftentimes to meet the circumstances, real or imaginary, of the moment, whereas those very laws of carnal commandment may themselves, at the next revolution of the wheel of time, become a weakness and a snare. Egypt, in sacred figure, always represents the world, and Israel the spiritual kingdom; and the warning description which God gives of Egypt to Israel is that she is as a broken reed, which, if a man lean thereon, she will go into his hand and pierce it. In like manner, I do believe that when the Church of Christ turns from His law of love and sacred influences to the minutiae of minatory regulations she is not providing that her body may be rent.

I am not without perception of the kind of answers which might be offered to these reflections; but I pass on, only pleading that they may not be misapprehended. Suffer me, indeed, by anticipation, to make the same pica for that which I proceed to say, for I have not yet done with the application of my proposition. It falls to my lot, dear brethren, both clerical and lay, from some peculiarities which appertain to it, to sow principles which need sowing, though they may not bring forth fruit till after my departure. I think it needful to emphasise as strongly as I can

The True Nature of the Church,

in order that all may perceive for themselves its essential distinction from all mere worldly institutions and organisations. These exist for special objects. Their purview does not extend beyond the particular object, scientific or financial, which they are constituted to promote; the presiding officers of those societies rightly confine their attention to financial or other special considerations. Now, if the parallel be allowed between such institutions as are alluded to by the Church, the true lesson to be derived from that parallel is widely different from that which we are accustomed to see presented for what is the prime object of the Church? If it be a divinely-formed institution for restoring men to their allegiance to the government of God, then the very same arguments which make it right for the manager of a commercial institution to present a report to his Constituents bearing upon the affairs in which they are interested makes it right for the priest in his parish, or the bishop in his Synod to treat-it may be deeply and largely and widely—on whatsoever things pertain to the

Kingdom of God. But truly, dear friends, this is not all. I dare not say that the parallel, which is too apt to be taken for granted amongst us, is a true parallel at all. If so; what becomes of all that fabric of spiritual and ministerial gifts upon which Christ and His Apostles insist so strongly, and which are Unquestionably declared to be bestowed upon the officers of the spiritual kingdom, as indeed in their measure upon every member of the same? That spiritual rule which St. Paul recognised that he had received, though not from man, he suffered no man to interfere with; and let it be noted that, whatever be the true fountain of authority in earthly government, the source in the heavenly kingdom is heavenly, and floweth onwards from above. These are distinctions which we should observe, and which, failing to observe, we are sure to get wrong, and to introduce, a clash of opposing principles, and therefore discord where there should be harmony. This must be so, believe me, because the Church was founded upon the principles I have laid down, and because she has, amid all the confusions of her contact with the world, maintained till now a hold upon those principles and if we in our corner of the spiritual kingdom are to proceed upon another idea, we shall be brought at every point into contact, if not with the canons of the Church, at least with her common law, which goes back directly to the theory of the Church herself. All this, therefore, is intensely practical—nothing can be more so—and for this reason I earnestly beg your unprejudiced attention to what I have advanced. If I have spoken boldly, with a courage which perhaps some will accuse of rashness, it is because these teachings may challenge study, and because there is ground for thinking them required.

The Church Always Democratic.

But I must notice the reply which is sure to be offered to the argument I have set forth. It amounts to this: "What the Bishop has said smacks of a long time ago. It is very likely a true description of the first few centuries of Christianity, but it won't do for modern ideas; and, if the Church does not adapt herself to modern Ideas she will have to go. When learning was confined to the clergy it was all very well for them to be a privileged class, but now that education has made many of the laity their equals or superiors this must give way." I feel sure that such thoughts will find place in some minds.

I am aware that some Clergy at Home have gained an easy popularity by asserting that as the age is democratic, and each year yields its tribute to the power of the people, therefore the Church must trim her sails to become democratic too. I differ from such persons in this, that I hold that the Church always has been, in the best sense, a democratic institution. The end of her being is the highest good for the greatest number. Every reader of history knows that even in the darkest days she was the best friend the people had. The question really is as to the arrangements for the attainment of the end in view and the principles upon which those arrangements are founded and if you allow that the arrangements and principles of which I have been speaking are scriptural and primitive, we have surely warrant for believing that the highest welfare of the people will be best attained by faithful action upon the same lines. Then as to the relation between clergy and laity being so much affected by the advance of education in modern times, there is much false reasoning and misapprehension on this matter. There was, no doubt, considerable disparity between the laity and clergy in the Middle Ages as to educational acquirements; but if we go further back this inequality to no small extent will disappear. The page of the profane historian shows us the social condition of those amongst whom the Christian Church was planted, and the pictures which display an almost luxurious wealth of the products of art, and science, and literature, a scarcely yet exceeded attainment of oratorical power, forensic ability, and spirit of philosophical inquiry in those Grecian and Roman cities which were the cradle of our religion; and when we remember that St. Paul could report from Rome that his converts were chiefly those of Cæsar's household, I cannot think that it was on account of any social or educational inferiority that the power of voting in the ancient Synods of the Church was limited to the superior orders of the ministry. In a former address I pointed out that the ministers of the primitive Church must have been quite as dependent upon the free-will offerings of the people for their support, and the carrying out of their work, as they are now in such a diocese as ours. I proceed to add that I believe that the laity were then as nearly the intellectual equals of the clergy as they are to-day. If we observe, then, a reverential abstinence from the exercise of their power it must have been, I think, at the first at least, a self-imposed abnegation arising from their recognition of the diversities of charismata which were bestowed upon the many members of the one body.

Status of the Laity.

The lay members of the Church in all colonial dioceses have been encouraged, as we all know, to exercise an equal voice, both deliberative and definitive, with any other order. This has never been so before in the history of the Church, and the call to the laity to exercise their voice, is now almost unanimous throughout the Anglican communion. The change is but of yesterday, and I think it speaks volumes for the right feeling of the

laity that such a change has brought with it so little of a revolutionary character. They have had no special training—indeed the most magnificent field of study open to mortal minds, known as theology, has been of late looked upon by most laymen with suspicion, or avoided as positively injurious—a result explicable only upon the hypothesis that they have come to regard as theology the narrow definitions and warped conclusions of certain modern systems instead of finding in theology the length and breadth and depth and height of a knowledge which passes knowledge, a science which is at once the mother and sum of all sciences, and which even the great Stagirite, heathen as he was, recognised as queen of all. I repeat, this world-wide introduction of the lay vote is absolutely new, and were the laity in a carnal spirit to push to an extreme the power they possess without the study and devout preparation such responsibility demands, there would be infinite danger to the more delicate, but nevertheless vital, structures of the spiritual body and consequent injury to the functions of the same. Nor does the danger stop here. It sometimes happens that the clergy themselves, moved by the laudable desire for the sympathetic co-operation of the lay brethren, are tempted to put aside, if not altogether to surrender, points with which they suspect what is called the lay mind is not in harmony. I am quite sure that this is wrong. I repudiate all distinctions of kind between the lay mind and the clerical—"For by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body, and have been made to drink into one Spirit"—the difference is only of degree, and, if I may allude to myself for a moment, having in my past career received credit for enlisting to a more than usual extent the intelligent co-operation of my lay people entirely on the lines of our Church's teaching, I may say that it was always by recognising this truth. I am always hurt when I hear any talking about "conciliating the laity." I think the laity have a right to feel insulted by such language; it argues that we think that they can never be anything but "carnal and walk as men." The right thing to do, O consecrated priest, is in private and tender communication to display, as Christ to Nicodemus, the mysteries of the Kingdom of God, which it is given you by office and opportunity to know. I have seldom met with anything but gratitude, and sometimes with an almost awful solemnising of whole man—as these things begin to possess the mind and spirit, such will grasp them with that trembling yet glad avidity which proves that the fountains of the great depths of the soul have been broken into, and the truths of God's unseen world in their Wondrous relations have entered into vital power and all-adjusting influence.

Dear friends, I hope my meaning is sufficiently clear to all. I trust my words will give offence to none; nay, let these words sink down into your ears. I have prepared this part of my address with care and almost on my knees. Many will think there is but little in it, and that all might have been comprised in a few sentences; yet, I will ask you not hastily to dismiss these words: the principles involved will bear on many a motion which now or hereafter will be brought before the Synod. And I will add that should any desire, as I hope they will, to enter more fully into the study of the Church, her character, and powers, they may get much help from books already to be found in the small theological library: which I have founded, and which, I trust, will before long be located in Dunedin, but which until that time may be obtained by application to myself.

"Of the things of which I have spoken this is the sum." "If we live in the spirit"—kingdom, "let us also walk in the spirit"—rule. Framing and using our canons and resolutions in this light, they will be to us rather helpful directions than penal enactments or irrefragable laws; not that a decision of the Synod may be lightly set aside—on the contrary, in the view I have put forth every such decision becomes invested with a weight of sacred obligation, which can never belong to any penal law, and that though the subject-matter of the regulation appear to be very secular or of trifling importance, it is surely on this principle that the first Synod brought in the sacred name of the Holy Ghost in the decision of such a matter as the eating of things killed strangling or of blood.

This recognition of our spiritual character should greatly solemnise our action and purify our motives, and it should cause each order in the Synod to accord due honor to the other as invested with some special qualification for the benefit of all; and if the laity have now been asked to come and use their gift, surely they will never try to secularise the Kingdom of God, but rather to spiritualise themselves. It is the whole Church which has asked them to come and which welcomes them as parts of the spirit-bearing body. Thus acting together, without suspicion, without covert desire of one to curtail the authority of another, but "of one accord, of one mind," we shall regain the influence as we regain the spirit which animated the primitive councils of the Church—an influence which was never greater than when she had no power to enforce her law other than the power of obedience to the law of love. This is the testimony of the Abbé Fleury, and with his description of the ancient Synods I close this part of my address. He says: "They were religious acts, and those who took part in them were guided by the will of God as read in His Word and exhibited in the simultaneous practice of the Catholic Church. There was neither struggle for pre-eminence, nor unfair advantage taken of opponents; modesty of opinion was accompanied with deference for the thoughts and spiritual experiences of others; the wisest counsels were honestly sought and loyally carried into practice. Mutual respect as a bond of union gave to such assemblies an immense force. The *placita* of such counsels easily obtained the force of law even beyond the limits of legitimate authority."

A Year's Retrospect.

I now turn from considerations of Church polity to a review of our diocesan history since my last synodical address, and, by the Divine goodness, I am able to do so with no little satisfaction. The year has, indeed, been one of much anxiety, from reasons too Well known to all; but, if the strain has been great, self-denying effort has hitherto proved equal to the task. It would be something to say that we have not lost ground; but I am devoutly thankful to be able to say more. There has been a distinct advance both in the extent of our work and in the solidarity of it. I desire to draw your attention to some of the evidence upon which this remark is founded. Since last we met I have not only been able, as usual, to visit all the settled parishes and parochial districts, but to go in careful detail round the very outer verge of our population. I visited from house to house the inhabitants of Orepuki, on Te Wae-wae Bay, in the extreme south-west; afterwards, in the course of four days spent in the saddle, I called upon all the members of our communion in and around Otautau, and, crossing over into the Waiau Valley, did the same at every house in Feldwick, and visited the stations near the Takitimo Mountains. On the north, inquiring in a similar manner at Wanaka, I found that a decided majority of the people there claimed to belong to our Church. I was subsequently able to spend a night at Duntroon on the Waitaki, and another at Livingstone. At this place I was met by the Rev. H. J. Davis, who, with great courage and no small trouble, led a horse for me twenty-five miles over the difficult pass under Mount Domett, known as Danzies Pass. Accompanying Mr Davis back again over this pass, I was able, at Naseby, to resume my ordinary work. At all the places have mentioned a great desire was expressed for the visitation of a clergyman, and at not a few of them I held services which were well attended. The results of my inquiries, and of the canvass for support which I set on foot, justified me in breaking fresh ground at Orepuki and Otautau, which I attached to the cure of Riverton; and from reports with which I have been recently furnished those portions of the Riverton charge appear to be fulfilling the promises made.

It will be seen from the statistical record which I append to this address that I confirmed during the year 253 individuals, which makes the total number confirmed by me in this diocese exceed 2,000. As to the clergy, one, the Rev. T. L. Stanley, has left the diocese. His genial bearing and generous conduct ensured his having many friends. Several of the charges held at various times during the fifteen years of his work here involved considerable exposure and hardship, and his name will always be associated with a loving care and refined taste lavishly bestowed upon any church and its surroundings placed in his custody. The Rev. H. J. Davies, who greatly needed rest, has been allowed to visit England; and the Rev. J. D. Knipe, M.A., is acting as his substitute. Besides having advanced the Revs M'Kenzie Gibson and F. W. Martin to priests' orders, I have received six clergymen into the diocese in the course of the year, which gives us an increase of five for this year, and of fourteen since my return to the diocese at the end of 1879. Of these clergy it may not be invidious to mention that the Rev. F. G. M. Powell, M.A., was selected by a commission in England for the parish of St. Matthew's; and that the Rev. T. Lloyd Keating, M.A., has, by his past services to this diocese, insured the welcome back to a seat in the Synod which I am sure will be fully accorded. I have been able to effect, with the consent of all concerned, certain modifications of districts, in virtue of which the Rev. J. Hobbs has recommenced clerical ministrations in Tapanui; the Rev. W. Ronaldson has exchanged Green Island for Mornington; and after Christmas, Cromwell, which has depended for some time past upon the very praiseworthy exertions of the lay reader (Mr E. H. Logan), will receive assistance from the clergyman to be placed at Clyde. With regard to Tapanui, I may add that at my last visit I made arrangements for the systematic gathering of subscriptions, as well as revived the action of the ladies' guild; and, as a result of these efforts, I have been led to believe that both current expenses and past liabilities, however incurred, will be duly discharged.

The negotiations for the appointment of a clergyman to Milton and the districts connected with it are not yet completed, but may be so in a few days. I held a private interview with the members of the Vestry of Milton last week; but there remains a point upon which it will be necessary for me to consult the Standing Committee.

Our instrumentalities have been augmented by the opening of two churches for Divine service during the year. Within three days of each other I dedicated the small church of the Holy Saviour, at Mataura, in the district of the Rev. Mr Hobbs, and "The Place of the Heavenly Assembly," at Puketeraki, within the cure of the Rev. Mr Sotham. These churches were practically free from debt—the former entirely so; and the latter was so in effect, as before the dedication I received the pledge of my excellent friend Mr Thomas Pratt, M.H.R., that he would hold himself responsible for what remained. The occasion of the opening of this church for the Maoris was a most interesting one, and many Natives came from a great distance to be present—some as far as from Timaru. Mr Wynter Blathwaite, at great expense and labor to himself, kindly acts as lay reader for this church, and also for the one at Moeraki. I have spoken thus far of the extension of our work and the agencies for carrying it on, but I ventured to say that the past year had witnessed not only the expansion but solidification of

our enterprises. In a most true sense, indeed, these ideas are not so distinct as might at first sight appear, for surely every additional clergyman, church, or school-house—such as the one ere long to be opened in St. Matthew's parish, of which I should like to say more—all these, I say, are most valuable contributions both to the extension and solidification of our work; even the acquisition of sites for churches, such as the valuable ones lately acquired at Riversdale and Fortrose—the one by gift, and the other by purchase—are, so far, additions to our strength. But confining our attention to the financial aspect of the question, there has been a good deal accomplished in the course of the year. The Diocesan Trusts Board reports the paying off of outstanding liabilities on general expenses account, and that the income of the general clergy maintenance fund has increased; and I am myself able to inform you that there is scarcely a parish or district in the diocese in which special sums have not been raised since last we met for one purpose or another, and not unfrequently for the reduction of debts upon fabrics. The fancy fair contributed in no unimportant measure to this end for our City and suburban parishes, the total release from debt by this effort being L1,093. Several of these parishes have also still further reduced their indebtedness by the less public means. The exceeding liberality of Mr Ritchie and some others has enabled me to claim the grant from S.P.C.K. which was made to St. Martin's Church in the North-east Valley on the usual conditions of thus freeing the church and its site from debt. L415 was the sum raised on this account. There still remains an encumbrance, however, upon other portions of that property. The mortgage upon the little church at Ravensbourne also fell due a few months ago and the money was demanded. I am thankful to be able to say that through the kind exertions of Mr Porter and others that money (L400) was paid off, and much more satisfactory arrangements made. Many outstanding accounts of that church have been discharged, and the improved attendance and offertories, notwithstanding the pressure of the times, has relieved my mind of anxiety as to the future of that enterprise.

To speak of more distant parishes. The Rev. Mr Gifford has collected L200, and therewith paid off the debt which remained upon St. Luke's parsonage, Oamaru, and efforts are at this time being made to reduce the debt of L650 upon the church. The liberal gifts of Mr William Fenwick, Mr Teschemaker, and others will, it is expected, shortly supply us with a new church at Maheno free of debt, greatly to the comfort and, I trust, advantage of the energetic clergyman of the district—Mr Cruden. The Rev. Mr Dodd has again distinguished himself by enlisting the earnest support of a poor population, and thereby paying off the remainder of the building debts of the churches of St. Mark's (Balclutha) and St. Peter's (Clinton), in addition to which the mortgage upon the parsonage has been reduced by L200. One-half of this was the gift of a lady in England obtained by Mr W. F. Pillans, and the rest the proceeds of a bazaar in Balclutha. Another debt which has been extinguished during the past year is that of L300 upon the church at Winton. This had remained ever since the erection of the church, which owed its existence to the kindness of the late Sir J. Richardson, and had been a constant source of trouble and anxiety. I feel very grateful to Mr Robson, who acted as my church officer, and to the many others whose spirited conduct has brought about the very desirable result I am able to record.

Of the results of the bazaar at Gore held last week for the reduction of church debts I am not able to speak, and of the one to be opened at Port Chalmers this week for the same purpose I can only say that I know that a considerable number of persons are interesting themselves in it in such wise as to deserve support. There are, I am well aware, many less conspicuous parochial efforts, such as concerts, sales of work, and collection of subscriptions by which no inconsiderable amounts have been obtained; but reckoning only those of which I have spoken it is safe to say that the indebtedness of the diocese upon its machinery has been reduced during the past year by the sum of L2,500.

I cannot forbear making special mention under this head of improvement of our properties of the very valuable and long-continued voluntary labors of Mr Finch, of Milton, to the church grounds of that parish. Besides having converted the churchyard into an attractive garden, Mr Finch has trenched and planted with trees and flowers a broad belt all round the glebe which adjoins the church. Nor is this all; he has skilfully drained the glebe land itself, carrying the trenches at the outlet to a depth of 6ft—this would represent a large sum in money, and is the contribution of a working man. Milton is distinguished for the gratuitous assistance of the parishioners. Nothing in the church needs to be paid for but the kerosene; but Mr Finch's work strikes me as the most remarkable example I have known of what can be effected by but one right-minded and devoted man.

Conclusion.

In concluding these remarks I have only to say that I have been somewhat more explicit in the details of parochial work than is usual in a bishop's address, because nothing short of a statement of facts was likely to correct a mistaken view of our position which has gained some currency. I feel greatly tempted to quote from my address to the Synod of 1879, when I had to face gloomy predictions of the "collapse of the diocese" which had prevailed during my absence. We have had nothing but bad times, commercially, since then; but by God's gracious aid we have filled the then vacant cures and made progress all along the line. God forbid that I should

err, even by one word, of over statement. I know well that for some time certain of my clerical brethren will find it difficult to maintain their ground; but I once more say that the "spirit of despondency has a worse effect than the hard times themselves, and that the right course is for a special appeal to be made to those who can give special aid to tide over a time of trial rather than that the clergy should be almost encouraged to retire from their charges." I have recently had to act on those words, spoken in 1879, and have been loyally and most liberally met.

In conclusion, there is, I think, but little need for special legislation at this meeting of our Synod. The schedule at the end of Statute No. 1, which has reference to the electoral districts and the number of members which each should return to the Synod, needs revising; and there are some inaccuracies in the statute for defining the mode of election to the General Synod. If the Synod were to express an opinion in favor of the casting of our statutes into the more convenient form of canons, arranged under various headings, I think gentlemen might be found willing to prepare such a rearranged code of our legislation for the approval of the Synod at a subsequent session. The action taken by the General Synod in this matter is, I believe, every-where acknowledged to be an advantage in the direction of simplification.

The following resolution, defining the application of the term "communicant," has been carried by the Synod of Wellington and forwarded to the other Synods of the province, for the expression of their views upon it. The subject is one of no small practical importance, and I hardly think that a more moderate proposal than the one thus presented to us can well be proposed for acceptance. The resolution and the one recommending it to our notice are as follows:—

"1. That in the opinion of this Synod it is desirable that the word 'communicant,' used in the canons of the General Synod as a qualification for the members of Synods, church-wardens, and vestrymen, should be interpreted to mean any church member who had communicated at least once in twelve months prior to his nomination for election, and that the president be requested to transmit this resolution to the Primate for presentation to the General Synod."

2. "That the president be respectfully requested to forward this resolution to the Bishops of the other dioceses, expressing the hope of this Synod that the different diocesan Synods will co-operate in a similar direction."

Dear Brethren, in the confidence of a father I have spoken. Now let us proceed to act together as a family, nay rather as one body; and as such, in the name of Jesus Christ our Head, let us "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

Amen

Evening Herald.

The newspaper is the great educator of the nineteenth century. There is no force compared with it. It is book, pulpit, platform, forum, all in one. And there is not an interest—religious, literary, commercial, scientific, agricultural, or mechanical—that is not within its grasp.

TALMAGE.

Dunedin. November 4, 1885.

Chats with Manufacturers.

The question of how far Protection will tend to relieve the prevailing depression is daily bulking more and more largely in men's thoughts, and those—both employers and employed—into whose souls the iron of hard times is entering deeply, are looking wistfully forward to a Protectionist tariff to provide a haven of comparative rest from the storm-tossing of dull times. There can be no question but that Protection has greatly advanced in public favour of late—to an ever increasing number it appears to be the one tangible panacea for the ills we are now bearing. Of all men, our local manufacturers should be *au fait* with this question, for to them its being satisfactorily answered is fraught with the most important results. We have taken steps to obtain expressions of opinion on this subject from some of the leading representatives of local industries, and propose placing them before our readers in a series of short articles. We first waited on

Mr Grant P. Farquhar,

who, as an old manufacturer, and president of the Manufacturers' Association, has a right to speak with a good deal of authority. He received us graciously, and, while he willingly answered our questions, he pointed out that the subject was one greatly complicated by aide issues and variety of surroundings. The following is a short account of our "chat" with Mr Farquhar:—

Reporter: the subject of Protection is, I suppose, one which both as a manufacturer yourself and as president of the Manufacturers' Association, you have thought a great deal about?

Mr Farquhar: I was a Freetrader at one time, and I endeavoured to the best of my ability to get down to the bottom of the matter and reason it out. Freetrade pure and simple so far as I can see means the abolition of the Custom House, and a tax or rental upon land to provide funds for carrying on Government. Land in combination with labour is the only source of wealth. Under these circumstances you would have an entirely free country. There is no reason that I can see why moneys for carrying on Government should be derived from taxation of goods that come into the country; surely it should rather be a portion of the products of the country, which form its real wealth, that should be impounded to meet the charges of Government. I am quite willing to admit that supposing all the world adopted Freetrade, and nations were all affectionately disposed one towards another, that under these circumstances Freetrade might probably be a very good thing, but then that would mean a very near approach to the millennium, and each man would have more regard for the good of his neighbour than his own. But, of course, that is mere dreaming, and cannot be. We must take the hard, practical conditions as our forefathers have left them to us, and make the most we can of them.

R.: What are your views with regard to the adoption of Protection in this colony?

Mr F.: The question is what do you want to make of New Zealand? If you want to build up an all-round nation you must have manufactures; you must produce as many articles as possible for your own use. You cannot very well attain that end without protection to industries, for the simple reason that a country with large manufacturing power firmly established has the market to a great extent at its command, and can sell at prices that struggling industries in a new country cannot possibly compete with. If the local market, small as it is in some instances, were assured to the manufacturer he could soon produce goods at a price as low—possibly lower—than they could be imported for

R.: Is there not a considerable measure of protection here now?

Mr F.: Of course every tax placed upon imported goods is practically a protectionist tax.

R.: Has the present tariff done good in developing industries?

Mr F.: Of course it has so far as it goes. We should not have had any manufactures here at all if it had not been for that

R.: It being clear that the present measure of Protection has done much good, do you think the colony might safely go further in the same direction?

Mr F.: That opens up a very large question indeed. Personally, I have always refused to say what protective duties I thought it would be advisable to put on goods in the trade with which I am more immediately connected, because I think the duties should be fixed by an impartial authority, who would be able to consider the matter independent of individual interests. Duties should be put on for the good of the country, and not for the benefit of mere individuals.

R.: Is it not a fact that not only in your trade, but in all trades, large quantities of goods are being imported which might be manufactured here?

Mr F.: Large quantities of goods are being imported into the colony in my trade which could be made here very well, and would be made here if the local market was secured to the local industries for, say, twelve months. After that very little would be imported.

R.: Does not that fact, coupled with the equally incontestable fact that large numbers of efficient workmen are leaving the country, show that heavier duties in the direction of Protection are called for?

Mr F.: There is no duty at all comparatively speaking, on our goods. It is not that we cannot produce goods now at a low enough price, but people have got used to certain peculiar makes as to appearance and finish, and look with suspicion on the locally made article. There is more than mere price in the matter, there is trade prejudice to be broken down. I know of one line of which it is perfectly true to say that it is not a question of price or quality at all that keeps out the local manufacturer, but simply prejudice.

R.: In your opinion would Protection have the effect of raising prices?

Mr F.: In our business it would have the effect of lowering them; it has had that effect in Victoria. Victoria is one of the cheapest places in the colonies. I do not think it would be to the interest of the business I am personally connected with that Protection should be the rule of the land. I think we are probably doing better as we are. But I would like to see Protection adopted more extensively because I believe it would be for the good of the country if it was. There is one direction in which we have Protection of a very high kind, to which I alluded in public on a recent occasion, that is the University. We could import lawyers, doctors, &c., far cheaper than we make them, but if, as I say, we are to make the country an all-round one, we must open up the avenues of the learned professions for our youth; we cannot send them all to till the land. A curious fact in this connection is that though the University is perhaps more highly protected than anything else in the country, yet the Professors are all rabid Freetraders.

R.: Would you make it a little dearer as to how Protection might detrimentally affect you

Mr F.: I will show you exactly how it is. We have built a Urge factory, one probably unequalled in the colonies, and Protection instead of having the result of benefiting us, might introduce competition and cut down prices until they ceased to leave any margin of profit. Some other businesses here are in a similar position.

R.: What, in your opinion, is likely to be the effect of Protection on working men?

Mr F.: I do not see why it should lower wages. There are no countries in the world where men are more free and independent than in Victoria and New Zealand. They rule the masters, not the masters them. Protection carried on for a few years eventually must bring a time when there will be a tendency to over-production, but that comes equally with Freetrade. It is the threshold of a question which neither Protectionists nor Freetraders care to face, the question of the future of over-populated, over-producing, civilised nations. That question is too broad and deep a one to enter upon,

R.: I gather from your conversation that you have had some personal knowledge of Victoria. What is your experience of the working of Protection and Freetrade there?

Mr F.: It is nearly 24 years since I was there. There were fewer manufactures in Victoria at that time than there are here now, and the condition of things was much worse than it is here.

R.: Had the question of Protection *versus* Freetrade arisen there then?

Mr F.: Yes, it had arisen; but anyone who advocated Protection was looked upon as a fool who was not posted up in political economy. I know what have been the subsequent results in Victoria in some respects. A number of people with whom I am acquainted were opposed to Protection at the outset, and now, not only strongly favour it, but acknowledge they were mistaken. The merchants in Victoria have progressed hand in hand with the manufacturers. There are a large number of things which we could hardly ever hope to manufacture here, and these would always maintain a large importing class. Further, in connection with the very process of establishing industries, there must be a large amount of importing. Victoria has got to this stage that she wants reciprocity with the other colonies. She is over producing, and could produce 25 per cent, more with comparatively little additional expenditure of capital. She has got command of the market, and her interest is that the other colonies should be free to receive her productions.

R.: There seems to be a feeling that the depression is still intensifying?

Mr F.: Of course the depression must increase unless we produce more or obtain better prices. The crops of wheat and oats last year paid no one, and the wool and frozen meat trades are just in about as miserable a condition as they well could be.

R.: Do you think a spirited Protection policy would go a considerable way towards removing the depression?

Mr F.: Yes; money that is going out of the country would be kept in it. It would operate in exactly the same way as borrowing money here, if we could do so, as opposed to borrowing it in England. Of course if we borrowed here the interest would be redistributed throughout the country. America is an illustration. She is a Protective country, and sells every pennyworth of goods she can here, yet takes but little of our products; there is no real interchange of trade. She has thus bled this country of thousands which might have been kept here with advantage.

R.: What hope do you think there is for the future?

Mr F.: Well, of course we cannot foretell what fluctuations may take place in the value of our staple products, and it is that which will affect us more materially than anything else, but the adoption of a more definite: Protectionist policy would afford a good deal of immediate relief. As was endeavoured to be shown by an article from a Home newspaper which I read at the Chamber of Commerce the other day the production of gold has a direct influence on the state of trade, and the present depression throughout the world is traceable to the great falling off in the supply of that metal. I think, therefore, that if we could possibly discover a new gold-field, find out some efficient means of extracting gold in large quantities from known deposits, or fall on any means to largely increasing our supply of gold, it would have a material effect in dispelling the depression. But the great point to my mind is this: that, as I have said, if we want to build up an all-round nation we must foster our industries, and give them a foothold by means of Protection.

The Depression.

A public meeting was held in the D.Y.M.C. Association Rooms last evening, under the auspices of the New Zealand Manufacturers Association to hear read and discuss a paper by Mr J. M. Ritchie, replying, from a Freetrade point of view, to the Protectionist paper read at the Chamber of Commerce recently. The room was quite filled, the assemblage including two ladies, and the following, amongst a number of other leading citizens:-Messrs A. H. Ross, W. D. Stewart, and Bradshaw, M.H.R.'s, Messrs K. Ramsay, T. W. Komphthorne, A. Hill Jack, M. Mendershausen, C. S. Reeves, G. P. Farquhar, J Mitchell, B Hallenstein, M. Sinclair, T.

Bracken, W. M. Bolt, C. Kettle, F. R. Chapman A. Rennie, Professor Mainwaring Brown

The PRESIDENT of the Manufacturers' Association (Mr G. P. Farquhar) opened the proceedings with the following remarks:—This meeting takes place under somewhat exceptional circumstances, and perhaps you will allow me to explain the position with regard to it of the Dunedin Manufacturers' Association. From time to time, under the auspices of our society, lectures have been delivered bearing upon subjects intimately connected with the progress of the colony, such as Industries of New Zealand" "State Bank of Issue," Commercial Depression," "Technical Education," "[unclear: Federli] on Fruit and Silk Culture," and some weeks ago a paper by a member of the association was read by Mr Eunson, our secretary, on "The Present Depression, its Cause and Remedy." To that paper, as with all previous lectures, the Manufacturers' Association held a somewhat neutral position; it was not in any way bound by the arguments advanced; but the Hon. Mr Stout, who kindly presided on the occasion, asked me at the conclusion of the discussion which followed whether it would not be well to invite a statement from the Freetrade point of view—to hear the subject treated from the opposite side if anyone cared to take the matter up. I at once accepted his suggestion on my own responsibility. You will understand, therefore, that Mr Ritchie's lecture this evening is the result of that suggestion by Mr Stout, and not from any particular deliberative action of the Manufacturers' Association, as was the case with previous lectures. While fully aware that our association is not a debating club, and that to provide means for opponents to ventilate their views is not within its scope of action, I very well know that they were always desirous to foster and stimulate to the utmost any public interest which might be aroused concerning the manufactures of the colony and the general advancement of New Zealand. Provided he is actuated by these considerations, we will, I am sure, gladly welcome any Freetrader who wishes to become a member of our association. Under ordinary circumstances I should, as president, have taken the chair this evening, but perhaps on this occasion it will be better that the meeting should elect a chairman.

On the motion of Mr C. S. REEVES, Mr Farquhar was unanimously elected chairman.

Mr Ritchie's Address,

Mr J. M. RITCHIE then read the following paper on the question of Freetrade v. Protection:—

In speaking to you this evening upon the causes of our commercial depression and its cure, I should much prefer to avoid altogether the burning question of Freetrade and Protection. I should much prefer that the advantages of the former over the latter could be accepted by all of us as a matter of course, and that we should be free to apply ourselves to discuss and emphasise those practical and economical reforms and correctives of the mistakes which all acknowledge have been made in the past. But, gentlemen, finding that the paper read to you a fortnight ago and the discussion which followed were neither more loss than assertions of the absolute efficacy of Protection to euro all our evils, I was bold enough to respond to the invitation given at the close of that meeting to say something on the other side; and so, by the kindness of your management, and my own rashness, I am hero to-night practically to frame an indictment against Protection, and say what I can in favour of Freetrade as the best policy for our adopted country. I am not sanguine enough to expect that I can convince by anything I say to night, and, indeed, am painfully conscious of having very little that is new to tell you. I have also been not a little embarrassed by the difficulty of selecting from a great mass of materials such information as would be most interesting and effective to lay before you. And first, I wish to clear away any idea which may exist that either in one or other of these opposing policies does there lie an infallible cure, or any quickly acting cure at all, for commercial depression. There does not. You will have this periodically recurring with absolute certainty as well under a Freetrade as under a Protective policy, and varying in acuteness and protraction alike under both systems. But what we Freetraders maintain is that under our policy there arises the "greatest good for the greatest number," and an increasing good as the nation grows in years. To apply the remark of a great Frenchman upon education, we say: "That nation which adops perfect freedom of commercial intercourse as her policy will become the greatest nation—if not to-day, certainly to-morrow." We all know that there are two ways of relief from the consequences of a debauch. When the poor drunkard awakes to the horrors of a recovery he may either obtain relief by resorting to the bottle again—or if he has enough moral courage left, he may endure for a time and school himself to do without stimulant altogether. The latter method is not the most pleasant one, but we all know which in the end is the best for the man himself. Now, in laying down the axiom of the greatest good for the greatest number, as that which we believe Freetrade but encourages, I do not presume for a moment to monopolise it for our side of the argument. I am very sure that not only is it equally acceptable to my friends the Protectionists as an abstract theory, but that they are shrewd enough to know that it will pay them all in the end to carry out that principle. On no other theory can I imagine many of them advocating Protection. I know not a few of them who have successfully established large industries; who have amassed wealth by doing so; who have secured the highest reputation for their manufactures, who can both beat in quality and undersell imported goods; and all this without any help from a

customs tariff, and on no other theory can I imagine such men being so rash and imprudent as to agitate for Protection, by getting which they will undoubtedly bring on themselves the fiercest competition, and ultimately seriously harm themselves. I may say I have no preconceived prejudice against Protection on theoretical grounds. The time was when I could not thoroughly understand why it might not really benefit young communities; but a careful study of its actual effects upon those countries which have adopted it have satisfied my mind beyond doubt that ultimately it works the greatest harm. And, mark you, it is getting a bad name. Its own advocates are getting ashamed of it under its old name; and so Sir Julius Vogel wants to rechristen it "Live and Let Live," and the Conservatives at Home, driven to their wits' end for a new battle-cry which is not stolen from the Liberals, want to call it "Fair Trade." It won't do, gentlemen. Far better adopt the method approved so long in the case of all dogs which have got a bad name—hang it. Well, gentlemen, at the outset I would ask you to think of this little point, that there is a similarity or analogy between the nature of that excess or debauch—which I think we all acknowledge has had much to do in leading up to our present evil state of depression—and Protection. Both are of the nature of stimulus. Both are of the nature of artificial stimulus. The former has no doubt been drawn from without, but still at our expense. We must ultimately pay back. The latter we shall have to draw from within ourselves, and pay back too. I do not say that we shall suffer the same effect from these approximating causes; but the comparison is suggestive and as a rule like produces like. Now, gentlemen, so far as I understand, the arguments of our friends the advocates of Protection run in this wise: We must increase local industries, spend our money within our borders instead of sending it away, so that we may have fuller employment for all and better wages. But being a young country we cannot compete with older nations on equal terms. At present we have a pretty general tariff, and we require to keep it up, perhaps even increase it, for purely commercial purposes. We must, therefore, so adjust it as to protect the industries which are suited to our opportunities and requirements, encourage the initiation of them, and give the impetus to them when begun. Now, I am anxious that you should grasp this fact; that the extent of productive power in a country is not necessarily measured by the amount of manufactures produced in it. The term productive power has a wider significance. It is really synonymous with wealth-producing power, and it is not difficult to imagine manufactures produced at a positive loss to a community. I would ask you, therefore, when you think of increasing production, not to confine your ideas solely to the establishment of factories, mills, &c., but rather to consider the means by which the wealth of the whole community is best increased, and this, be assured, means ultimately your own as well. Now international commerce is an absolute necessity to the production of wealth in every State. If another country, by reason of advantages found in the production of various commodities, can sell to you cheaper than you can produce yourself, you must buy from them or suffer loss. And if you produce under such disadvantages that the coat of your manufactures prohibits fair competition with other countries in the export of them, again you suffer loss. You must be able to send away your surplus products, or you will quickly "choke in your own grease." At the present moment America, where the inventive genius and power of cheap production nature to her manufacturers far surpasses those of any country, is notably in this unfortunate condition, and is lagging behind by decades in the race among the nations for want of foreign commerce. This is what Mr Fawcett, who was a good sound Radical reformer, and sincere friend to the working classes, says about foreign commerce: "It increases the productive powers of labour and capital, by causing these in each country to be applied to those particular branches of industry for which the country has the greatest natural advantages. . . . It therefore must exert some tendency towards increasing the wages of the labourer. When labour and capital are economised, an equal amount of national wealth can be produced by the application of a diminished quantity of labour and capital. If this be so, the labourers' wages will be increased without encroaching upon his employer's profits. In fact, since more wealth is produced, . . . profits as well as wages may be augmented." Again, man, we conceive, has an indefeasible right that the wealth which ministers to his wants should be produced with as little labour as possible. This can only be secured by perfectly free commercial intercourse between all nations. I am far from wishing to assert that our manufactures and local industries should not be fostered by every legitimate means, but I should like you to remember that if they are fostered by measures which fence us out from the first intercourse with all the nations around us, the result may be—indeed is certain to be—a loss of productive power to ourselves, and a lower standard of living for our wage-earning classes. This may be a convenient place to give a short explanation of this term, "standard of living." It is easy to understand that comparison of wages in different countries based on the money amount of these must always be unreliable, and in most cases quite misleading. There are the purchasing power of money in the country, the hours of labour, the opportunities for acquiring skill, and for cheapening production, the cost of education, the use of machinery, the comfort of living from climate as affecting health, and various other considerations, which must all be reckoned up on the debit and credit sides before the balance can be struck and the net advantage arrived at. This net balance has been called by an American writer the "standard of living." The same writer asserts that this standard increases "when all agencies have fair play, but decreases under restrictive laws; that when the standard of living is highest, productive power and inventions are fullest, and

production consequently cheapest." This is fully borne out by the fact that in England, where the standard is much higher than in France and Germany, production is cheaper than in their countries; and in America, where the standard is higher than anywhere else in the world, except perhaps in these colonies, production is cheapest of all, if the protective tax is deducted. I now pass on to the second point—that we cannot compete with older nations; there is prejudice against local manufactures: we are flooded with the cheap products of low-wage countries. Now it may be very effective on the part of Mr Blair to exclaim: What nation ever became great that confined itself to tending sheep and tilling the soil? But it is, nevertheless, the case that a young country must at first occupy itself chiefly, if not almost solely with agriculture, because the land is cheap, and in that direction lies their first chance of competing with older countries. We must use our opportunities as best we may, and not seek to wrest them by force to uses for which at present they may offer insufficient facilities. What hardship is it if we are compelled to use manufactures from England and America at a cheaper cost than we can possibly make here. Surely we can find remunerative employment for our capital in other directions than this very risky one of attempting to manufacture before we are in a position to do so successfully. Depend on it, so long as other countries from whatever reasons can send their products many thousand miles for our use at cheaper cost than we can manufacture the same, no Protection in the world will enable similar industries to thrive in our midst. It is only a question of time when they will eat their own hearts out, unless they possess the essential principles and possibilities of success. If they do they will seek for no Protection, but reject it, as really happened lately among ourselves, preferring in their own interests to grow up with the vigour of unrestricted freedom rather than pampered by artificial nourishment, which certainly induces infirmity and ultimate decay. And it seems to me that in this New Zealand we shall much sooner, and more easily than we think, successfully set up large manufacturing industries without any help, if only we are left alone. With a climate unsurpassed for comfort and health, abundant coal and mineral wealth, plenty of water, a lengthened seaboard, unlimited power of producing all kinds of food at the cheapest prices under the face of the sun; everything tends to prove that Nature has favoured us as no other nation is favoured. And under those circumstances it is difficult to conjecture from what we wish to be protected. Do you wish to be protected from the poorly-fed and ill-paid German, ground down by military taxation and service, poorly housed, and having to endure many months of a rigorous winter every year? or from your own countrymen in England, whose conditions of life in every respect are not to be placed in any way in the same category with your own? I think it much more manly and proper, instead of invoking the blessing of God upon a Protective tariff, as the writer of the paper did the other night, that we should one and all recognise that we already enjoy a full share of these blessings, and set to work vigorously to use them, without calling upon all our neighbours to contribute to our assistance. I commend to the thoughtful consideration of all of you the interesting comparison drawn by Mr Stout the other day at Wellington between our industrial state in 1865 and 1885, and to the wonderful progress we have made in these 20 years. Now, it is unfortunately quite true that we require a very general tariff in order to raise one necessary revenue, and this we can hardly ever hope to get rid of. But nevertheless it should not be forgotten that there is this very bad effect always arising out of a high revenue tariff—that it must always raise the prices of everything taxed, and so heighten the cost of living in the country. A customs tariff, therefore, should not be allowed to grow to undue dimensions, even for revenue purposes, but should always bear as equitable a proportion as possible to taxes on accumulated wealth, on land, on income, by way of stamps or death duties, or such other as may be fair and convenient to impose. I should always prefer to see taxes on the necessities of life lessened, even at the expense of these other subjects of taxation, so as to keep down the cost of living to the great mass of the community, and thus help to raise the standard of living amongst us. When the labourer or artisan thinks of leaving Home to begin life again in a new country, depend upon it, you can offer him no greater temptation to do so than the temptation of cheap living, and no country should be able to do this more easily than New Zealand. If this is right, and if, as I think you will all acknowledge, a high tariff, even for revenue, only tends to lower the standard of living, what an exaggeration of the evil comes when duties are so diverted and increased as to foster the setting up of local industries which are not possible without it. In the first place, you have a forcible diversion of capital and labour into less productive channels. Then you lose the revenue altogether so soon as the local manufacture supersedes the imported, and must tax something else. You have a double or treble loss; and what do you get in return? Nothing whatever but higher-priced commodities and a burden of vested interests—monopolies created by yourselves at the expense of yourselves, heavier and more permanent than the burden of the old man of the sea on the neck of Sinbad. It may be that to existing manufacturers, and to those who have special knowledge and capital to enable them to set up industrial works, Protection will bring considerable temporary advantages—but only temporary—for in the end, if they but wait for it, retribution will surely come—for "Protection fostering competition to unnatural fierceness becomes self-destructive in time." Still, there may be enough in it to cause a craving for it by this class; but, to the community generally, it must only bring loss. If the farmer gets a little more for his produce, he has to pay more for his necessities. If owners of land profit as they will, perhaps, more than anyone else, they will lose

by-and-bye by a depreciation of value arising out of the burdened land on the whole community. Those who have fixed incomes have absolutely no compensating advantages. And what shall I say of the groat wage-earning class—the bone and sinew of the colony—and if they only knew, the arbiters of our national destinies. Why, the whole system is produced and sustained at their expense. It is they who make it possible. It is they who contribute of their daily wages to build the factories, keep the machinery revolving, the fires burning, and enable the colony to gain the doubtful credit of being a manufacturing country. It is not the few who have saved and pay property tax that will be much affected by Protection; indeed, as I have said, landowners, at any rate, may profit by it materially; and it is likely, that on the top of the wave of apparent prosperity which for a short time might be set in motion, those who have accumulations would be able to add to them; but to those who are dependent upon daily labour for their bread, and who have made the colony their home—of whom, fortunately, there is a large and increasing proportion among us—in short, to the working man, Protection means nothing else than more taxation, and a permanent additional burden. Not only so, but it means unsettled wages, fluctuating violently in amount and uncertain at the best; it means a constant, insidious increase of the cost of living, eating into his wages, and reducing them he does not see how. For Protection is a disease of the nature of a creeping paralysis, which never stands still, but gradually and surely takes possession of every member of the body politic, and levies its contribution upon an ever-increasing number of the necessities of life. The expectation of more employment and better wages they will find to be a will-o'-the-wisp, always eluding their pursuit, or if for a moment apparently caught, only seized to escape as quickly. And, let me ask them, what are these chances of maintaining the rate of wages? Artificial stimulus will cause numerous industries to start up, and an artificial demand for workmen. For a time wages may be fairly good, though never so good as they appear. But the time will come when competition, shut up to a very narrow field, will tell severely, and while wages fall the cost of living will be kept up. Regular work and steady wages have been found impossible in those countries where Protection reigns. Let me ask, again, where is the justice or fairness in the State granting Protection to one and not to all? What right has the manufacturer to be protected, and not his workers? Are they to take their chance for their wages while a small—a very small—proportion of their fellows are to be assisted to make profits by general levy from the rest of the community? Surely there is something very unfair here. Have they no equal rights to be protected from an over-supply of their own class, from lower wages, from a raising of the cost of living? I earnestly hope that the working men will think well of it before throwing away their freedom in this way. The matter will be in their hands, and let them remember that, as against them, Protection is "heads I win, tails you lose." Now, gentlemen, let me give you one or two facts and some figures bearing upon what I have been saying to you. They are from America, stated by Americana, and embody some of the results of Protection in that country over a period of something like a quarter of a century. In 1860 there was a moderate tariff of about 19 per cent., and the exports of purely American manufacture were 23,900,000 dol; in 1872, a very prosperous year, but on which the tariff had risen to 48 per cent., 20,600,000 dol. In 1860 the imports into America of goods of the classes of local manufacture upon which the highest duty was levied, ranging from 35 per cent, to 200 per cent., was 163,600,000. In 1872 they had risen to 282,900,000dol—an increase of 72 per cent. In cotton goods the staple of which is purely American, and which America can in some few cases, spite the duty in all oases bar the duty, produce better and cheaper than any other country, England exports, after bringing? the raw material from America, 380,000,000dol against America's 13,000,000dol—or 30 times the value. These figures tell us two facts—that Protection cannot exclude European manufactures from America; that Protection does exclude American manufactures from European countries. Now as to wages. They are on an average about 20 per cent. higher in America than in England, but are subject there to the most violent fluctuations. Between 1873 and 1877 those of labourers fell from 37 to 50 per cent.; while the fall was even greater in the case of artisans and mechanics. On the other hand, almost every necessary of life was increased in cost fully 33 per cent. since the low tariff period before the war; rent and board rose about 40 per cent., potatoes over 50 per cent., other victuals from 20 to 40 per cent. The higher wages earned are, therefore, much more than neutralised by the higher cost of living; and it is not a question of pence per day extra for the latter, and shillings per day extra of wages, as you were told the other night. The serious spread of discontent and communistic principles in America are also strikingly described in a recent pamphlet. I quote a sentence: "Of late years the workmen of America have been less fortunate than those of England. Employment has been more irregular, wages have been subject to more frequent and violent fluctuations, commercial crisis and industrial depression have not only been more severe in the former country, but the burden of them has fallen in a far greater degree upon the wage-earning class. From this point of view the comparison is enormously to the disadvantage of the American workman. And it is in these facts that we naturally seek the explanation of that bitter discontent, of that more lawless spirit to which we have referred." The tendency in America is all in the direction of great fortunes, accumulated side by side with great poverty, great luxury, and great misery, and great monopolies, which control manufactures and all industries, and suffer not the smaller ones to live. Though the capital invested in

industrial pursuits increased 30 per cent, between 1870 and 1880, the number of establishments only increased between $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Just now 11 great companies monopolise the Bessemer steel production, and maintain the profits from this by force at a most exorbitant rate, to the destruction of the manufacture of the products. Henry George, after describing the great evils arising from this state of things, says they are due, among other reasons, to "the robbery involved in the protective tariff, which for every 25 cents, it puts in the Treasury, takes a dollar—or it may be four or five, out of the pockets of the consumers." Now, gentlemen, it is easy to assert, and prove by numerous isolated examples, that in protected America the working man is well off, while in Freetrade England he is starving; or that in Victoria there are 40,000 thriving artisans, while New South Wales only prospers by the aid of their land fund and borrowed money; or that the products of German pauper labour is flooding the English market because of Freetrade, and to the ruin of the honest English workman—so that I do not place any confidence in the statements of the present apparent condition of any country. AS in the case of most evil, there is a great attraction in Protection, and an apparent initial advantage in it to the superficial observer, while as in the case of most that is good, there is some faith and self-denial required" at the first if we adhere to Freetrade, as well as patience for the discovery of its great and permanent advantages. But America has tried Protection and pushed it to its extreme limit for now nearly a quarter of a century, so that the effects of it there, as shown by trade statistics, must have great weight with all thinking men. And I only wish I could persuade you to read what many of the manufacturers and political economists of that nation have written respecting it of late years. I am sure it will more than fill you with astonishment. Now, gentlemen, if I do not weary you too much, I should like to conclude with a few remarks about the depressed state in which we find ourselves at present, without bringing in either Protection or Freetrade. You have a fair indication of the two views which are held generally of this matter in the speeches lately delivered by the Prime Minister and Colonial Treasurer. Mr Stout refers first to the wasteful expenditure and extravagance prevalent, instancing, as he well might, the money which is spent by all classes in horse-racing. He then refers to the commercial stagnation all over the world, and consequent enormous reduction in the amounts paid to the wage earning classes, following, as it must inevitably, a decrease of production of wealth, and points out how we can hardly expect to escape, all the more since our products have seriously depredated in value. At the same time he shows, from the savings banks' returns and otherwise, that we are by no means so ill off as we might be, and that if we only economise and take pains to develop our natural resources, we may expect speedily to find ourselves with less cause of complaint. Sir Julius Vogel, in some contrast to this, talks of little else than a vigorous policy; expresses great regrets that the colony did not take up the East and West Coast railway; asserts that it is always safe to borrow for railways; ridicules the idea of screwing down our expenses to the last farthing; asserts that the greater the depression the greater need of work—which, by the context, seems to be defined as borrowing money and making West Coast harbours, borrowing money and pushing on railways, borrowing money and buying district railways. And he always tracks back to the glorious effect produced by the policy initiated in 1870. Mr Stout attempts to reconcile us to the inevitable, and encourage us to practise industry, economy, and self-denial. Sir Julius tells us "to take a hair of the dog that bit us." Let us never forget, gentlemen, that over since 1870 we have been living under the artificial stimulus of borrowed money and public expenditure. Under this have grown up both public and private extravagance. Every district—north, south, east and west—has no idea beyond attacking the Government, by foul means and fair, for money, or for authority to borrow. And privately as to our food and dress, notably as to the houses we live in, and our pleasures, we have all been wickedly lavish. We have learned an absolute disregard of the consequences of borrowing. We have all bought land which we cannot cultivate, and the interest on which is draining us to depletion. We have become imbued with a spirit of anticipation of the real wants of the colony by decades of years—under the guise of progress. As a result we now find ourselves with an enormous annual drain for interest—a real drain, for our railways do not pay the interest on their cost, and half of our debt has been spent upon what is directly unproductive, and the produce of the soil is insufficient to pay for the debt upon that. Can it be proper or prudent, gentlemen, but we should wantonly increase this unproductive business? Shall we take a bigger overdraft so long as we can get it, and spend money in a progressive policy irrespective of results? Are we to increase our turnover, disregard profit or loss, and merely trust to the extent of our operations to pull us through? Surely this cannot be right. No, gentlemen; we must seek to undo and crush the evils from the result of which we one and all agree that we suffer. As to public matters, we must economise, reduce the cost of government, decentralise, and throw more responsibility as well as work upon the local bodies, so as to bring home to the people what our present system of government really means. We must make liberal land laws, giving every just facility for settlement, and if possible by such means as will make private borrowing on the land more difficult. This has been a curse to all of us, and I despair of a cure for it, except by some method of compulsion. We must stop railways until what we have pay, or unless those undertaken can be shown to pay. Let us never forget that there has never been even a year's stop to our borrowing, so that we have not had a "washing up," and until we have that in some shape or form how can we judge our position accurately? And

lastly, we must encourage immigration of suitable classes of men and women. I trust there are none or few here present who hold to the exploded and dangerous doctrine that immigration reduces the chances of those already in the country. Believe me, it has no such effect. What do we want but more consumers, more people to help us to bear our burdens? In private we must all be more thrifty. It is not only the working man who finds the times to be hard. I can assure him from a varied personal knowledge and much unpleasant experience, that the men who are in greatest misery in these times are those who have been the employers of labour. In food, but especially in nameless dribbling away of small coins, the waste in this country is enormous. Not everyone thinks more of his small coins. Let us get into habits of paying cash for everything. Nothing is worse than a habit of taking credit, and I hold that those who offer inducements for ready money, and adhere rigidly to that system of business, deserve the support of all of us. It has the quality of mercy. It is twice blessed. It blesses him who gives and him who takes. If we cultivate the habit of looking more closely into small matters, many avenues of profit will be disclosed to us both in town and country, and many industries growing naturally from small beginnings and by experimental processes will spring into existence, as indeed they have been doing to a most satisfactory extent in the years that are past. It is of the highest importance that capital and labour should go hand in hand in these, and this can be encouraged but by working on the co-operative principle. Everything which reconciles the divergent or opposing interest of capital and labour should be encouraged. The two are mutually dependent each on the other, and in great industries I think it both unjust and dangerous that the latter should be debarred from some more or less direct interest in the net results. What better plan than that both should combine at the outset and share fortunes all through? Gentlemen, on some such lines as these, I take it, will be found the true cure for hard times, so long as the best qualities of Englishmen—courage, industry, self-command, perseverance, and thrift—can be trusted to produce better results both for the State and the individual than their opposites.

Mr HALLENSTEIN said: If there is one man more than another to whose commercial ability and sound judgment I attach some value, it is our friend Mr J. M. Ritchie, but like many men of good general ability, he has the failing of not being early moved out of a certain groove, whatever the circumstances may be. I do not know whether he is an Englishman or whether he hails from the land of cakes; but if he is an Englishman I venture to say he would not feel happy if he had not his plum-pudding on Christmas Day, though at that time of the season a lighter food would, in this climate, be more conducive to good digestion. However, be that as it may, like most of us he has no doubt imbibed Fretrade principles from his youth, and the Old World arguments in favour of Fretrade are so engrafted in his mind that the strongest team of bullocks would not pull them out. He, like many others, will not admit that the circumstances of old colonies are not analogous with those of a new country. Mr Ritchie not having given us the benefit of his paper beforehand, I am not prepared to cross swords with him to-night. As to what he has said regarding America, and the statistics he has given us, I would simply ask you as men of common sense, how is it that, year after year, hundreds and thousands of people migrate from Great Britain to America; how is it that thousands and thousands of people of all classes are at the present moment on their way to America? No doubt America feels the depression to a certain extent, but not so far by much as any other country. Mr Ritchie is also very much out if he wishes to convince the working classes that Fretrade is in their favour. Let me assure him that working men instinctively know on which side their bread is buttered. Unfortunately, hundreds of our best artisans are now leaving here for Protective but prosperous Victoria; happily they are better off than our farmers, who cannot so easily move. It is the farming class who have my sympathy. No one is more interested in the question of Fretrade and Protection than they are; unless we have a large population employed in a variety of industries to consume the bulk of the production of our soil, our farmers and present runholders will go to the wall, and the lands to which they have stuck for the last 10 or 20 years will fall into the hands of companies such as Mr Ritchie represents. Gentlemen, believe me, unless for a time we foster and encourage and protect our young industries we shall not become that great nation which I am sure every one of you, be he Protectionist or Fretrader, would like to see, and would like to see it in our own days.

Mr W. D. STEWART, M.H.R., said the question under consideration was one of paramount importance. The writer of the paper had indulged in several fallacies which would be apparent to those who had given any attention to this important subject. In the first place, before they could adapt the policy of one country to another they must see that the circumstances of these countries were similar, or nearly so. England did not adopt a Fretrade policy until she had a dense population, and her industries were very well developed indeed. What had been the case in regard to Ireland, for instance? Her industries had been handicapped in every direction, and that had to a great extent been the cause of the poverty and distress which had prevailed, and still prevailed, there. In considering this question, he thought it was a fallacy to place on the one side absolute Fretrade principles and on the other side absolute Protection principles. What was required in this colony was a revision of the tariff, which would foster those industries for which the country was adapted; but to lay down any broad rule for a general Protective tariff would be a mistake, just as it would be to adopt absolute Fretrade.

For his part, he was in favour of what the Americans called a Nationalist policy—that was, to support and foster those industries in the colony which were likely ultimately to succeed. America, perhaps, had a more severe Protective policy than was necessary; its industries had been protected until it could open its ports tomorrow and compete with almost any country in the world, and its workmen were as skilful as those of any other nation. What was suitable to an old country such as England was not necessarily suitable to a young country like New Zealand, and he believed that what was wanted here was not severe Protection, but judicious Protection. Mr Ritchie's suggestions, if followed, would reduce New Zealand to a country of producers and importers, and no country could attain permanent greatness if it did not have a large industrial class. Something had been said with regard to monopolies in America, but he believed that in many respects it would be very much more difficult to start an industry in England than in America, and that the tendency in America was to distribute capital, and to furnish labour to workmen; whereas in England it was to accumulate and strengthen capital, or to adopt Mr Ritchie's language, to create a limited wealthy class, and a very large poor class. Respecting the revision of the tariff, a great deal had been said about the rejection of the tariff proposals of the Government; but the fact was, that if the Government never clearly tested the feeling of the House on that part of their policy. The question raised was whether there should be an extra duty on tea; and though he was not a Freetrader he had voted against that, as tea could not be produced here, and the increased duty would tend to raise the cost of living. The question of the duty on spirits and bananas were also raised, but he believed that if the Government had gone on with the different items of the tariff, they would have received much greater support, and that they made a mistake in withdrawing it. A judicious Protective tariff, he believed, was required, for it was of no use bringing working men to the colony if we could not afford them employment, as they would soon leave again he agreed with the general policy laid down by Mr Ritchie, being strongly opposed to extravagant borrowing, or the prosecution of unproductive works, but he considered that the Freetrade principles advocated by Mr Ritchie would not lead to progress. The stand he took was that they should have a judicious and discriminative protective tariff.

Mr EUNSON said that, granting that Protection was selfishness, it was a national selfishness—not an individual selfishness. He could wish success to all who sought by voice or pen or influence to have our colonial industries and productions fostered, so that employment might be given to all who were willing to work. He thought that no one with a well-informed appreciation of what Protection had done for America could advocate for this colony the Freetrade of the so-called political economists. A journal, speaking of what the 20 years of Protection had done for America, said: "Under the present tariff we have grown from a purely agricultural country, largely dependent upon Europe for our manufactures, to a nation teeming with important industries. During 20 years we have added 20,000,000 to our population; the number of our cities and towns with over 8000 inhabitants has actually doubled, having increased from 141 to 286. The population of our cities has more than doubled, having increased from 5,000,000 in 1860 to upwards of 11,000,000 in 1880. The important industries have developed in the same proportions. The annual product of our coalmines has increased from 14,000,000 tons in 1860 to 96,000,000 now, or nearly sevenfold. Our iron mines in 1860 produced 900,000 tons of ore, but the stimulus of Protection has brought up the annual yield to nearly nine times that amount, or 8,000,000 tons. The various metal industries of the country were in 1860 employing about 53,000 hands, consuming 100,000,000dol worth of material, and producing 280,000,000dol worth of annual product. Today these same industries give employment to 300,000 hands, consume 380,000,000dol worth of material, and produce every year 600,000,000dol in value of manufactured goods. In 1860 about 130,000 persons were engaged in industries relating to wood and its manufacture; to-day 340,000 are so engaged, while the value of the annual product has increased threefold, exceeding now 500,000,000dol. A judicious tariff has increased the number employed in the woollen industry from 60,000 to over 160,000, while the value of the yearly product of our home mills has risen from 80,000,000dol to 270,000,000dol. In the cotton industry we have practically taken from England our entire home market of 55,000,000 customers, increased the number employed in our mills to 200,000 persons, and in the last two decades doubled the value of the product. Imports of cotton goods have declined from the enormous quantity of 227,000,000 yards in 1860 to almost nothing now, whilst in 1881 we exported 150,000,000 yards. The silk industry shows a like increase. Our 30,000 miles of railroad in 1860 have increased to 120,000 miles, or about equal to the railage of the rest of the world. And whilst all this has been going on to the great benefit of the producer, the consumer has also benefited by a marked cheapening of prices. Before the fostering care of a Protective tariff made us independent of the foreign manufacturer we were subject to such prices, often exorbitant, as he chose to exact. Now, the keenness of home consumption has settled all that. Prices under Protection are wonderfully less than under a low tariff. Millions have been saved to the consumer, hundreds of millions have gone to the wage-earning class, a home market has been secured to the farmer, and whilst everybody has been benefited and nobody hurt, we have rapidly grown to the proportions of a self-sustaining, independent nation. These broad, palpable, and undeniable facts are the envy of the world. History records no such industrial progress as has been made in the United States during the

past 20 years. The present popularity and strength of our protective system lie in the prosperity it has given the nation; in the great industrial cities it has built up; in the prosperous and diversified industries it has founded; in the profitable home market it has given our farmers; in the varied employment it has given the men and youths of the country. In all that goes to make a nation strong and prosperous; in all that goes to make a country great and independent; in all that goes to broaden the horizon of the labourer, increase his earnings, cheapen the cost of what he buys, and improve his condition—in all this lies the strength of the Protective system." Those facts respecting the marvellous growth of industries in America ought to teach lessons, and he thought that this colony should profit by them. He held that the appeal which had been made to workingmen that night was of no avail. Workingmen had minds of their own and could assert their independence when it was necessary. When the appeal was made to them they would rally around the banner and do what they thought was best for the good of the country. The question as to how employment was going to be found for the boys which were being turned out of our schools would have to be answered. Would importers find places for them in their offices? They were already overcrowded, and clerks' salaries by the competition had been brought down to the lowest level. He had applications made to him daily to obtain admission for boys to local factories, but there was no room for them. Unless they encouraged and fostered and stimulated local industries by all legitimate means, they would not be able to find employment for their boys, and the result would be that they would leave New Zealand and give other colonies the benefit of the education they had got here at such enormous cost. Let them think over these facts, and then resolve to do all they could to encourage local industries.

Professor MAINWARING BROWN said that it had been assumed by the three speakers who had objected to Mr Ritchie's remarks that a policy of Protection would necessarily make a very large increase to the population engaged in arts and mechanical trades. As to that, he would refer to hard facts. He had been comparing New Zealand with Victoria, and found the following results:—Traders, in Victoria 4.5 per cent., New Zealand 5 per cent.; agriculture, Victoria 31.9, New Zealand 23 per cent; arts and mechanics, Victoria 7.2, New Zealand 9.7 per cent. How much, then, did they expect to gain in their producing population in arts and mechanics by a policy of Protection?

Mr BRADSHAW, M.H.R., said he did not come there to speak—he came there without making a note and without a note in his pocket.—(Laughter). With regard to Mr Hallenstein's statement about people leaving Ireland for America, the reason of that was that they had not a home in Ireland, whereas they could take up land in America. Had it not been for the enormous number of people who were on the soil in America, the industries of that country would have been ruined. Out of 50,000,000 or 60,000,000 of people in America, 8,000,000 were freeholders, which meant that about 36,000,000 of men, women, and children were living on the soil and producing wealth. That was what made America a great country. At the present time in America there were 2,000,000 people out of work, and recently 100,000 were on strike in the iron trade. In six years in the most prosperous district of the States 78,800 women and children were killed from overwork, and there were 150,000 lying sick in bed at the same time from the same cause. England was in a similar condition under Protection, and in Belgium and France now, while there was cleanliness and prosperity in the industrial parts, there was immorality and poverty. Of 14,000 conscripts taken from the manufacturing centres of France only 500 were fit to serve, while of a similar number taken from the agricultural districts only 300 were rejected. Was an agricultural or an industrial country then the best? All this cry about Protection arose from selfishness. He was a Freetrader in principle, but was a Protectionist so far as it concerned himself. As a broker he would go in for Protection, but it would be proper Protection. He wanted a monopoly, and he was prepared to pay for it. There were about 15 brokers in this town, and if the Government would get a law passed sending about 14 of them to Heaven—that was about the best place he could wish them to go—and leave him here he would pay them handsomely for the monopoly; he would give them £2000 a year. He did not want Protection without paying for it. It was perfectly absurd talking about Protection in a country like this.—(Cries of "Time, time.") He did not come there to speak to them, and if they did not like what he was saying he could not help it. What were they going to do with their labouring men; the boys were working the men out. There were boys working fifteen hours a day in this place for 12s a week.—(Cries of "No, no," and "Name.") He would not give them the name, but the statement was in the inspector's report, If boys worked 15 hours a day only half the number would be employed that should be. (The speaker on resuming his seat was greeted with cheers and counter hisses.)

Mr A. RENNIE thought Mr Ritchie had delivered a very excellent address. Protection appeared to him to be absolute nonsense. If they wanted to progress they would have to face a reduction of men's wages, and a less margin of profit to employers.

Mr O'CONNELL (Bamington and Co.) scarcely thought that Mr Ritchie had laid down any principle in his paper, and Professor Brown had simply submitted an arithmetical riddle. A State schoolboy, no doubt, could easily solve the riddle, but practical men would look at something more practical, and if they saw that the colony was importing all classes of goods that could be made in the colony they would come to the conclusion that there was plenty of work here to furnish employment. Mr Bradshaw seemed to blow hot and cold with the

same breath. He announced himself as a Freetrader, and yet from his acts in Parliament, and even his speech to-night, he proved himself to be a Protectionist. He interfered with the law of Freetrade—that supply and demand could always regulate themselves, &c.,—and he brought forward an Act to regulate the employment of labour. That was protection for labour, and what Protectionists also required was protection for labour against the underpaid labour of Germany, England, and other countries of a lower grade of civilisation.—(Applause.)

Mr C. S. REEVES would ask any Freetrader to name any article that had increased in price since the introduction of Protection in Victoria. New Zealand had for years a Protective tariff, but it was not a reasonable one, as the heavy duties were not imposed on the proper articles. To prosper they must have great manufactures as well as agriculture.

Mr T. BALDWIN, who spoke from the body of the hall, remarked that the meeting had apparently taken the turn of canvassing for support at the next general election. Protection must result in a reduction of wages, and he hoped that working men would not be led away by any sentimental expressions, but that they would calmly and quietly consider the matter.

Mr HOGG argued at length that the country was over-governed, and opposed Protection.

Mr SHELTON advocated the adoption of Protection, arguing that Freetrade was calculated to benefit the distributors, and Protection to benefit the worker and the producer.

The proceedings concluded with votes of thanks to Mr Ritchie and the chairman.

The Otago Daily Times

Friday, November 6, 1885.

The Otago Daily Times

MR J. M. RITCHIE'S paper ON the prevailing depression, in especial relation to the question of Freetrade *versus* Protection, is excellent in its way as dealing with the broad general question of principle, but it to a certain extent flew over the heads of his audience, who are concerned more for practice than for principles. Many who heard him, or who will read his address in our columns, will be inclined to say, "It is all very well to talk about principles, but we are convinced that in practice our industries must be fostered by means of Protective duties, or they will not spring up at all"; and although Mr Ritchie did adduce a few warnings as to the practical effect of Protection in America and elsewhere, he laid his main stress on broad principles of general policy which, though sound enough, are cast aside by Protectionists as inapplicable to the circumstances of a young Colony. We are not surprised to see, therefore, by the discussion that followed, that Mr Ritchie's argument went for nothing with the class of men whom it is most desirable to convince. Nevertheless, with nearly every word that Mr Ritchie says about the general tendency and ultimate effects of Protection we cordially agree. It is a species of stimulus allied to the successive "nips" of the confirmed drunkard, it brings about in the end fierce competition between manufacturers, though for a time some who have already become firmly established may benefit. It ultimately reduces wages, because the workman is comparatively helpless against the power of capital. It reduces imports, and consequently the yield of a given *ad valorem* percentage of customs duties, and the deficiency has to be made up by other forms of taxation. It introduces a lower standard of living among the working classes in two ways—both by the pressure of artificial competition and consequent reduction of wages, and by raising the general cost of living. For once Protection is granted to certain industries we cannot see how it can be withheld from others; and that Protection does increase the cost of articles locally manufactured to the consumer, we hold to be self-evident. Otherwise all that the Protectionists would need would be a start of say three years. But when once high Protective duties are imposed, everyone knows that it is a matter almost of impossibility to get them reduced, even when, according to the manufacturers' own showing, the necessity for them has passed away, because, as they allege, they can ultimately produce cheaper than anyone can import. Perhaps the weightiest passage in Mr Ritchie's paper is that with regard to the narrow definition which manufacturers put on the phrase "productive industries." He says:—

Now, I am anxious that you should grasp this fact: that the extent of productive power in a country is not necessarily measured by the amount of manufactures produced in it. The term productive power has a wider significance. It is really synonymous with wealth-producing power, and it is not difficult to imagine manufactures produced at a positive loss to a community. I would ask you, therefore, when you think of increasing production, not to confine your ideas solely to the establishment of factories, mills, &c., but rather to consider the means by which the wealth of the whole community is best increased, and this, be assured, means ultimately your own as well. Now, international commerce is an absolute necessity to the production of wealth in every state. If another country, by reason of advantages found in the production of various commodities, can sell to you cheaper than you can produce yourself, you must buy from them or suffer loss. And if you produce under such disadvantages that the cost of your manufactures prohibits fair competition with

other countries in the export of them again, you suffer loss. You must be able to send away your surplus products, or you will quickly "choke in your own grease." At the present moment America, where the inventive genius and power of cheap production natural to her manufacturer far surpasses those of any country, is notably in this unfortunate condition, and is lagging behind by decades in the race among the nations for want of foreign commerce.

Professor Mainwaring Brown's figures go to show that even in Protectionist Victoria only 7.2 per cent, of the population are engaged in arts and manufactures; while, under a much milder form of Protection in New Zealand, 9.7 per cent, of the population are so engaged. At best the Protectionists can only show that they obtain employment, at the expense of a crushing tariff, for 2 or 3 per cent, of the population. As we have said before, however, general considerations will not avail with men who think they see a chance of making a temporary rise for themselves by shutting out competition from the outside. Working men would do well to give due consideration before they are led to support a system which ultimately, and perhaps sooner than they think, would greatly increase the burdens of the many for the benefit of the few. No argument as to the cheapness with which a large number of articles can be produced as compared with the cost of producing a few can apply to Colonial manufactures with anything like the force that it will apply to Home manufactures. Mr Burt, in the course of the recent interview of manufacturers with Sir Julius Vogel, said that in his trade the cost of producing a dozen articles of the same kind would be 25 per cent, cheaper than the cost of producing one. No doubt; but how about the cost to a Home manufacturer who produces a thousand of such articles for every 10 that Mr Burt could possibly be required to produce? Of course the extreme subdivision of labour at Home give an immense advantage in the case of such articles. Are we absolutely to refuse to avail ourselves of such advantages by shutting out the Home manufacturer altogether? In the course of that inter-view Sir Julius was kind enough to attribute the attitude of the Press on this question of Freetrade to the difficulty of forgetting old lessons. We do not think the Press is less amenable than politicians to the influences of the times and of public opinion, but it is the duty of the Press not unfrequently to go back to first lessons, and it is certainly not its duty to make itself the organ of an interested clique, whose first object is to serve their own interests at whatever cost to the community at large. We do not blame men for looking after what they conceive to be their own interests, but we take leave to point out that the whole tendency of the present agitation in favour of Protection is to favour the ends of the few manufacturers at the expense of the whole community. That is the conscientious belief of a very large number of the best-instructed men in the community, and it would be well if more of those who, like Mr Ritchie, are strongly imbued with Freetrade principles, would, like him, boldly enunciate them, even in the presence of an unsympathetic audience. We wish some competent person would take up the question in its practical aspects, and produce evidence such as we are sure, at the cost of some labour, could be produced, as to the actual effects of Protection in America and in Victoria, its bearing on the cost of living, on wages, on population, and on external trade. We have no doubt the Manufacturers' Association would listen to such a paper with the same fairness as was accorded to Mr Ritchie. There are some remarkable figures as to the relative gain and loss of population by Victoria and New South Wales, which go far to prove that Protection does not retain population as against a neighbouring Freetrade country. New South Wales has rapidly gained on its Protectionist neighbour. It has lately increased its numbers by additions from outside nearly twice as fast as Victoria, and next year will probably be the premier Colony in point of population, as it is in age. The results of the recent elections in that Colony go to show that the bulk of the population are by no means prepared to listen to the Protectionist charmer. We quite agree that neither Freetrade nor Protection will ensure an uninterrupted course of prosperity to any country, and neither policy will absolutely ruin any country. All we say is that the freer trade is, the greater will be the opportunities and rate of progress, and the more firm will be the foundations on which our prosperity will be built. We cannot have absolutely Freetrade. In no country in the world is there absolute freedom from fiscal imports. The New Zealand tariff is practically to a great extent a Protectionist tariff at present; the utmost we can hope for is to prevent its becoming more and more burdensome. The manufacturers are trying to persuade us that an extra 10 per cent.—in other words, a further dose of artificial stimulus—will do us a great deal of good. We reply that theory and practice both prove the contrary; and there for the present the quarrel rests.

Otago Daily Times,

November 6, 1885.

The Wellington Exhibition.

WELLINGTON,

November 1.

The New Zealand Industrial Exhibition, which has been open since August 1, was closed last evening, when his Excellency the Governor and the Premier delivered addresses. The Governor, who was accompanied by Captain Barker (of the United States corvette Enterprise), Major Eccles, A.D.C., and Mr Pennefather, private secretary, arrived at the Exhibition at 8 o'clock. About 2000 persons were present. After the "Festival Chorus" had been sung,

The Hon. Mr Stout said: Before asking his Excellency to pronounce this Exhibition closed, it may not be amiss to refer very briefly to one use that we may make of this Exhibition. No doubt this Exhibition has brought before us in a prominent way the high state of efficiency to which many of our manufacturers have attained. It has also shown us the lines on which our manufactures are proceeding. It has been useful also in proving to us that in our struggle for material advancement we have not forgotten those things that tend to soften, sweeten, and humanise life. We have had in this building beautiful music, both instrumental and vocal. We have amateurs who by their acting and recitations have shown to us that in the highest kind of art, the dramatic, we are not without much talent in our population. Then a visit to the fine art gallery and the home industry branch proves to us that the fine arts have a home in our midst. I believe, however, that in this, as in everything else, we can only arrive at any result by comparing things and thinking of the past, and perhaps casting our mind's eye into the future; and on more than one occasion, when, walking through the Exhibition, I have been reminded of another Exhibition that was held in the Colony 20 years ago. I allude to the Exhibition held in Dunedin in 1865, and, in passing, I may say that the first of the commissioners in that Exhibition, and one who did so much for its success, is the same Dr Hector who has done so much for the present Exhibition. Then, in thinking of that Exhibition, one naturally thinks of the state of the Colony 20 years ago; and, if you pardon me for a few minutes, I shall bring out some of the points that in what is called "this depressed time" we are apt to forget. At that time—the end of 1864 (I prefer to take the statistics of 1864 and compare them with those of 1884)—we had a population in New Zealand of 184,131 persons, including of course the Native race. But of that number 9136 were officers and men on military service, for we had then what might well be termed a standing army amongst us. Nowadays we are able to maintain the peace of the Colony with 300 Armed Constabulary, who do police duty in many instances as well, and are not all located in Native districts; and then if we look at the industries of the Colony that then existed, and the industries that now exist, I think they are sufficient to lilt us with considerable hope for the future. What have we done in 20 years? In 1864 we had under cultivation altogether only 382,655 acres. That included in crops 110,533 acres, and in sown grasses 272,123 acres. We had in 1884 no less than 6,391,075 acres in crops and sown grasses—viz., 1,132,241 acres in crops, and 5,258,834 acres in grass, and during the 20 years we had given from the Crown for settlement purposes no less than about 14,000,000 acres. We had in wheat alone in 1884 nearly as much land as we had altogether in crops and grass in 1864—viz., 377,706 acres. Then if we look at our productiveness, it will be seen what great advances we have made. In 1864 we exported 16,691, 666lb of wool, and in 1884 81,139,028lb, so that side-by-side with the growth of agriculture, pastoral pursuits have also increased. Then in 1864 we imported 19,801 tons of flour, at a cost of £383,546; we imported 331,116 bushels of wheat at a cost of £129,186; and we imported 189,046 bushels of barley, at a cost of £8561; and 99,296 bushels of oats, at a cost of £24,746. Our exports of wheat and barley in 1864 were only nominal. In 1884, however, we exported 2,706,775 bushels of wheat, valued at £536,728; we exported 128,450 bushels of barley, at a value of £25,138; we exported 51,311 bushels of malt, valued at £ 14,665; and 2,474,613 bushels of oats, at a value of £67,286, whilst our imports of flour and wheat in 1884 were a mere bagatelle—flour and wheat and all grain not exceeding 20 thousand pounds worth. Then the general exports have risen in the 20 years from £3,401,667 to £7,091,691. Our shipping has largely increased, and I need not tell those of the audience who were in the Colony in 1864 of the difference of our steam communication, coastal, intercolonial, and direct. Before I leave the exports I may point out that our exports of timber have also risen largely. £24,771 was the value exported in 1864, now it has risen to £152,311, which was the value of the timber exported in 1884. The value of the potatoes exported has increased from £982 to £53,536; of kauri gum, from £60,590 to £342,151; and even in the export of oil there has been the same increase. The value of our exports in that have risen from £2945 to £7414. Then, if I take another test of our wealth, it will be seen how largely it has increased. The number of depositors in our savings banks in 1864 was only 4669, and the amount to this credit was £94,248 6s 8d; but now our depositors number 79,514, and the amount to their credit is nearly two millions. And the deposits in our other banks, too, have enormously increased, so that they now amount up to nearly 10 millions—namely, £6,043,956 bearing interest, and £3,328,048 not bearing interest. These are sufficient to show you the enormous

advance that has been made in our material welfare. Now I must point out how we have advanced in other respects. Our live stock has increased in horses from 49,409 to about 170,000; our cattle from 249,760 to about 700,000; our sheep from 4,937,273 to 11,056,266; and our pigs from 61,276 to over 200,000. In 1864 we were importing not only flour and wheat, as I have pointed out, and oats, but we were importing cheese and butter and bacon and hams. In fact we had to rely almost entirely on foreign countries for what we ate. I have stated what we have done in the matter of flour, wheat, and oats; what have we done in reference to dairy produce? Last year we exported of cheese and butter £9667 worth, while our imports were only £750 worth, and we exported of bacon and hams £12,433 worth, but these are what may be termed the first things that a young settlement will have to look to—namely, to provide for its food. But what has been done in reference to clothing? In the Exhibition of 1864 the whole exhibits of New Zealand manufactures could have been contained in three of the spaces occupied by the small factory, the Kaiapoi factory, and Hallenstein Bro.'s exhibits. But what do we see in this exhibition? In clothing all that could have been exhibited in 1864 were some blankets and heavy thick tweeds, manufactured with a hand-loom, I believe, by Mr Webley, of Nelson. Now we have tweeds exhibited here equal to any in the world, and not from one factory alone, but from several; and we see throughout the Colony that, so far as tweed factories are concerned, every large town will soon have a factory of its own. In machinery the contrast is enormous. As regards agricultural machinery, which is always the first machinery that has to be attended to in a new country, in 1864 there was only, I think, one exhibitor of a Colonial-made plough; and I believe there were some harrows from some manufacturers in Canterbury. Now we have agricultural implements equal to any in the world. Not only ploughs and harrows, but all those things that tend to economise labour, and to enable farmers to produce their products cheaply. And in general machinery the contrast is still greater. In 1864 there was practically no machinery manufactured in the Colony. There were a few exhibitors no doubt, but they were not manufacturers in the true sense of the term. I doubt even if there were imported into New Zealand any such kitchen ranges as are now exhibited by Scott Bros., of Christchurch, far less made in the Colony. Then in furniture we were really almost entirely dependent on the imported articles. It is true a few cabinetmakers sent in tables that could be made out of New Zealand woods, but in 1864 there was no such thing as manufactories of furniture in the sense in which the term is now applied. Go through our furniture exhibits and you will see there exhibits that would not have disgraced an exhibition at Paris or Vienna. If we come to those things needed for household purposes, soap and candles for example, in 1864 there was no such thing as stearine candles, and all that was manufactured then in New Zealand were tallow dips and tallow moulds, and some common yellow soap. But now we can show the finest candles and the finest of soap. In leather, boots, shoes, and saddlery the advance has been enormous. In 1864 we imported roughly about £300,000 worth of leather, boots and shoes, and saddlery. In 1884, though our population has increased from 184,131 in 1864 to 608,401 persons, we have only imported £251,267 worth of leather, boots and shoes, and saddlery. And then we have begun to export leather to a very large extent. In 1864 there were only four exhibitors of leather and nine of saddlery and harness work, and the goods they exhibited were poor and small in number compared with what is seen in this Exhibition. In clothing, also, this Exhibition shows an enormous advance. In glasswork, in pottery, in preserved fruit, and a dozen of other things that I could mention, the exhibition shows that industries have taken such a hold on New Zealand that if there was a time which might be called the "whale-fishing" time, which afterwards passed into the pastoral time, then into the agricultural time, we might now fairly, looking at this exhibition, say that we have, at all events, begun the industrial era. And since I am showing how the Colony has progressed since 1864, I might point out how along with our material welfare other needs have been attended to. I need not tell you that in 1864 the railway system was only beginning. Something had been done in Canterbury and something in Southland. We have now 1527 miles of railway open. In 1861 we had only 295 post offices; we have now 969. In 1864 the total number of letters posted was only 2,112,771; now we have 16,611,959, including postcards, and our postal revenue has risen from £39,198 to £186,065, whilst I am happy to say that our expenditure has not increased in like proportion. There was a large expenditure in 1864, mainly through the heavy subsidies given for steam-service, amounting to £147,577. It only amounted to £161,070 for last year. The total miles travelled in our inland postal routes have risen from 676,507 to 329,501, and to show the effect of exchange in trade and commerce our money orders have risen from £16,592 to 186,052, and the amount from £78,557 to £572,666. Now as to our telegraph lines. In 1864 we had only 699 miles, now the length is 4264 miles. Then I might point out one thing that is of importance to show that though as a Colony we have increased in population more than treble in 20 years; although the births have kept about the same, I am glad to say that our death-rate has fallen. The number of deaths in 1864 was 2921, and in 1884, with more than three times the population, they were not doubled, but only 5740; or to take it per 1000, the rate in 1864 (excluding the military and their families) was 1615 per 1000, and in 1884 it was only 10 30. And what perhaps is still more gratifying, the number of persons committed to gaol in 1864 was 4114, while in 1884 it was only 5173. Had I time I might point out how our factories were increasing, how, if we compare even this exhibition with some held so late as 1881, there is an

enormous advance. We have now some industries started that were not known then. We have in metal-working exhibits that would not disgrace Birmingham, Messrs Burt's metal works, gas chandeliers, and all things in metal working are equal to any that could possibly be imported; and when one mentions gas-chandeliers they must, however, remember that in 1864 there were not many towns in New Zealand that had the benefit of gas. We have new industries starting every day. We have here, I notice, carpets made in the Colony, and we have, I hope, in preserved fruit and preserved fish the hint, if I might so term it, of canning industries for this Colony. There are other exhibits in the Exhibition that call for our notice. I have already referred to the fine art gallery. It is true that there are some here who exhibited in 1864—the names of the Hon. Mr Richmond, and of Mr Gully, and of Mr Barraud were in the catalogue of 1861, but their pictures are grander than they were then, and our art gallery in this Exhibition shows that we have growing up amongst us young artists who will yet bring fame to themselves and fame to the Colony in which they live. I hope the statistics that I have given you of the progress we have made in 20 years will be an incentive to us to have hope in the future. If you had told the less than 5000 people who inhabited Wellington 20 years ago—for there were only 4741 people in Wellington then, if you had told them that 20 years hence there would be an exhibition like this, that their city would contain 22,757 inhabitants, that the population of the Colony would have trebled, and that it would have had the wealth that it, now possesses, I do not believe that you would have had a single one who would have listened to or credited your story. And I ask you, What may we not look forward to in 20 years hence in this Colony, with its climate, its resources, and its people? If this Exhibition can have had this one effect—if it can have helped us to feel confidence in ourselves, and confidence in our Colony, it would not have been held in vain, and I feel sure it will do much more. It will tend to make us brace ourselves anew for the perennial conflict of man with nature, so that he may do good to himself and to his surroundings, and good to those that follow him.

Mr Stout sat down amidst great cheering.

His Excellency also delivered an address, and then declared the Exhibition closed.

The number of persons who have been registered as visitors to the Exhibition since the opening day is 130,000. The largest attendance in any one week was the first week, when it was 15,302. The second largest was the seventh week, when 13,412 attended. In the singing contest for tenor voice E. J. Hill was awarded first prize, and for baritone or bass W. Widdop first prize; soprano or contralto, Miss Cheritt and Miss Stanford equal; comic, W. D. Lyon, j first prize.

The five gold medals allocated by Executive Committee for general collection and display were awarded as follows:—

Class 1.—Haw and manufactured products: J. Kitchen and Sons (Limited), Wellington.

Class 2.—Apparatus and process used in the mechanical industries: A. and T. Burt, Dunedin; North and Scoullar, Dunedin.

Class 3.—Textile fabrics and clothing: New Zealand Clothing Factory, Dunedin.

Class 4.—Alimentary products: The Gear Meat-preserving and Freezing Company of Wellington (Limited).

It is stated that there will be very little, if any, loss on the Exhibition, and that the amounts depend on what the building realises.

In connection with the exhibition the number of silver medals awarded to exhibitors in the general branch is 149, no fewer than 56 of which go to Wellington; Auckland takes 20, Canterbury 21, and Otago 19.

Silver medals accorded as special first prizes have been allotted as follows:—Mark Sinclair (Dunedin), combination buggy; S. Danks and Son (Wellington), brass binnacle; A. and T. Burt (Dunedin), coppersmith's work; A. Littlejohn and Son (Wellington), clock and regulator; H. E. Liardet (Wellington), feather, muff, cuffs, collars.

The Evening Star

Saturday, November 7, 1885,

The Law of Divorce.

WE referred a few days ago to the act ion of Mr DOWNIE STEWART in respect to the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Bill, which has apparent y caused such a flutter in the dovecots of Dunedin West, and brought the honorable gentleman to the bar of public opinion, arraigned, as it were, on a charge of laxity of principle in relation to connubial bond. A story is told of an ancient philosopher who invariably appeared in public with a conspicuous rent somewhere in his garments. Being expostulated with by a friend, he explained

that he did so with a purpose, since people, criticising his slovenliness of apparel, might perhaps leave his character alone. Mr STEWART possibly may have had the ingenious design of drawing a red herring across the scent of his general political conduct by expressing broad views on the subject of divorce; and he certainly took up an extreme position when he declared himself disposed to go the length that, "where there were no children, if a couple mutually desired to separate, they should be entitled to get a divorce on signing an application before a Judge of the Supreme Court and renewing that application after an interval of six months." With perhaps this exception, we are inclined to the opinion that the suggestions of Mr STEWART were in the right direction, and they are based on what is now the law in at least two European countries—France and Belgium.

The 'Law Quarterly Review,' in the third number, which appeared in July last, contains an interesting article, entitled "The New French Divorce Act," which bears very directly on the subject at present to some extent agitating the public mind in New Zealand. The writer, Mr THOMAS BARCLAY—a name well known in the literature of jurisprudence—commences by giving a brief *précis* of the history of divorce in France. Repudiated by the Roman Catholic Church, it was not legally recognised under the old Monarchy, but was introduced into French law by the legislators of the Revolution. On the restoration of the Bourbons, one of the first changes made was the repeal of the "Title of the Civil Code on Divorce." This was done in 1816, and from then to 1881 the only legal remedy for aggrieved consorts was judicial separation. The movement in favor of the revival of divorce, which resulted in the present law, was begun in 1876, and the first proposals were simply met with ridicule. In 1879 the Bill was first taken seriously into consideration, but was not finally passed and promulgated until July, 1884. Though this law is in form a revival of the old "Title of the Civil Code," several of the provisions have been modified in essential particulars. Thus the original "title" (statute) only allowed infidelity of the husband as a ground of divorce under certain circumstances of gross impropriety, and, regarding marriage as a contract, dependent like other contracts on the consent of the parties, declared it to be revocable by mutual consent. The new Act has maintained the repeal of 1816 as regards this ground, so that divorce by mutual consent is not authorised; whilst husband and wife are placed on the same footing as regards unfaithfulness. The old statute also forbade the subsequent marriage of the divorced parties with each other. The new article forbids their remarriage only where one or the other party has, subsequently to the divorce, contracted a fresh marriage, followed by a second divorce. A second divorce of the same parties also is forbidden, except on the ground of a condemnation to severe criminal punishment. Especially to be noted is the new principle introduced into the Civil Code as regards judicial separation. Under the old statutes judicial separation was an alternative for divorce. Under the new Act it can be converted into divorce on the application of either of the parties after the lapse of three years from the judgment of separation, which can thus become a preliminary step to divorce. The grounds for divorce, where it is not the sequence of judicial separation, are the unfaithfulness respectively of either husband or wife, serious violence, cruelty, injury and insult on the part of either, or the condemnation of one of the consorts to grave criminal punishment. The law does not distinguish between husband and wife; the mode of proof must be the same, and criminal correspondence is held to be evidence against the husband as hitherto held against the wife. Connivance, collusion, and unfaithfulness on the part of the petitioner are not defences in the French law. By an article of the penal code, the wife convicted of unfaithfulness is liable to imprisonment for a period of not less than three months and not exceeding two years; power being given to the husband to arrest the punishment by taking back the culprit. There is no such penalty for the husband. The correspondent, as we should call him, is liable to the penalties of imprisonment and fine, and his marriage with the respondent is absolutely prohibited. In Belgium the principles of the divorce law are much the same as in France; but other additional grounds for divorce are admitted by the Courts, *e g.*, desertion by either husband or wife, coupled with circumstances indicating persistent intent; highly imprudent conduct; habitual drunkenness.

It may be seen that the new laws in force in France and Belgium contain provisions which suggest themselves as being at least worthy of consideration. The English law, which is practically our own, is, Mr BARCLAY states in the paper which has suggested this article, "a mere string of detailed fragments' without any governing principle or motive but that probably of its author's to push it through Parliament by concessions to conflicting prejudices in the interests of some momentary object, and regardless of any relation to general legal policy."

The Evening Star

Monday, November 9, 1885.

A Cantata.

[COMPOSED EXPRESSLY TO BE SUNG AT THE CLOSE OF THE ANGLICAN SYNOD.]

Music by the Rev. A. R. F———tt.

The musical arrangements will be under the direction of the Right Rev. the B———p of Dunedin. The Ven. Archdeacon E———s will sing a solo, "As lissom and straight as the rod," with cornet obligate by the Rev. Mr P———1. "This eloquent darling of Themis" will be sung as a trio by Messrs R———e (tenor), J———m. (baritone), and S———h (basso profundo).

Good folks from near and from far
Of this wicked Episcopal city,
Come list while I strike my trembling guitar,
And sing you a ditty, a ditty;
An ecclesiastical ditty,
A tragical-farcical ditty;
How Samuel T.
Dunedin, he
Refused to be bossed by his laity,
By his meddlesome Standing Committee,
Committee;
His meddlesome Standing Committee.

The Committee, they wanted to sit upon
His episcopal reverence N—v—I,
And a b-e-oo-tiful plan they had hit upon
To bring Samuel T. to his level.
Their graceless, unclerical level,
Their sinful, unsanctified level.
The divinely invested
Was not to be bested;

But, smiling, his Standing Committee requested

Politely to go to the Devil, the Devil,
Politely to go to the Devil.

J.S. was a limb of the law,
A smart 'un you'll find when you sight him;
With an infinite vigor of jaw
And eloquence *ad infinitum*,
Pugnacity *ad infinitum*,
And tenacity *ad infinitum*.
Now this little jigger
(I'm using a figure) (*Crescendo*);
Squared up to the Bishop and tried to look bigger;

And got on his spindles to fight him—to fight him,
And got on his spindles to fight him.

This eloquent darling of Themis
Proceeded to show what a pity
It was that the Bishop before he got up
Never thought to consult his Committee,
His responsible Standing Committee.
His infallible Standing Committee.

In eating or drinking,
Or sneezing or winking,
Or sitting, or standing, or speaking, or thinking.
He should first ask his Standing Committee,
Committee;
Ask leave of his Standing Committee.

His Lordship at first is struck dumb,

But instanter collecting his forces
He loftily raises his clerical thumb

To the point of his saintly proboscis,
His episcopal, holy proboscis,
His laity-scorning proboscis,
Says: "Gents, I've a notion
Anent this here motion,
That I must upset it, though much I regret it,
And don't you Just wish you may get it-may get it;

And don't you just wish you may get it?"

As lissom and straight as the rod
With which dear little fishes you fish up,
Spare and thin was this vicar of God,
With no adipose tissue to dish up,

For hungry Fijians to dish up,
For cannibal Tongans to dish up;
But though meagre and "high,"
His Lordship was "fly";
No finger must touch the diocesan pie,
Which must always be baked by the Bishop, the Bishop;
Exclusively baked by the Bishop.

'The Times, Thursday, September 10, 1885.

The British Association meets this year at Aberdeen under a certain sense of contrast. Last year it made a great and adventurous experiment. It crossed the Atlantic and set up its tent for the first time in one of the British colonies. This year it returns to the normal current of its traditions. The experiment of last year, great as was its success, could not, of course, be immediately repeated. No doubt science is truly catholic, as SIR LYON PLAYFAIR tells us, and is bounded only by the universe. But the British Association cannot as yet explore the further limits of its domain. Jupiter and Saturn, to say nothing of the new star in Andromeda, are not yet included within the ample bounds of the British Empire. The Association cannot go to them if it would, though, if it could, it might be able to tell us what has become of political economy, once regarded as a science, but now decried and condemned—not, indeed, by a man of science—as the "convenient cant of" selfish, wealth." True to the law of its own particular being, the Association has to be content, as a rule, with the narrower limits of the British Isles. From that vantage ground, as from any other which this limited globe affords, it can survey the universe in all its extent, and project its inquiring glance as far as the utmost limits of space and time. But the sense of contrast between Aberdeen and Montreal, between Scotland and Canada, between a little island in the corner of Europe and the great American Continent, cannot but be present to the imagination of 411 members of the Association who have taken part in both meetings. The contrast, however, is by no means to be regarded as all unfavourable to the meeting of the present year. The material size of a country is no necessary element in the intellectual greatness of its inhabitants. Greece was a small place, but its intellectual grandeur still surpasses that of the New World. If the Persian had conquered and ARISTOTLE had never lived, or had lived only in a Greece enslaved to the East, neither Europe nor America would be what they are to-day. We might easily enlarge on the debt which the world owes to the greatness of little countries. Without travelling beyond the instances cited by SIR LYON PLAYFAIR for another and less generous purpose, we might show how ERASMUS, a native of Holland, and SHAKESPEARE and BACON, Englishmen both, had determined the courses of modern culture, and how all of them, whether they acknowledged the descent or not, were the intellectual offspring of Greece and the direct product of its reviving influence on humanity. But modern science is impatient of reflections such as these. Like BACON, it denies or ignores its own parentage. Its heritage is in the future and its dwelling in the ideas of to-day. It may, therefore, easily be that it measures the contrast between Montreal and Aberdeen by a too material standard, and thinks it somewhat of a descent to visit the latter in succession to the former. It may take some comfort, however, from a juster historical view of the matter. It is the glory of Montreal to have invited the British Association to Canada; we trust it is no heresy to say that it is the greater glory of Aberdeen to have encouraged ERASMUS to come to England.

There is, moreover, another reflection irresistibly suggested by the meeting at Aberdeen. More than a quarter of a century ago the Association met for the first time in that city, and its President was, to borrow SIR LYON PLAYFAIR'S words, a great Prince. Time corrects many hasty judgments, and death, as BACON says, "openeth the gate to good "fame and extinguished envy." When the presidency of the British Association was offered, in 1859, to the late PRINCE CONSORT, there were some who thought that the offer and its acceptance were alike mistakes. The first impulse of the PRINCE himself was, as he declared in his address, to regard the thing as impossible. But the impossibility was accomplished, the critics were silenced, and the PRINCE abundantly vindicated his fitness to illustrate and adorn the position which the Association had invited him to occupy. At this distance of time, now that the rare intellectual qualities of the PRINCE CONSORT have been universally recognized, it is more natural to wonder that his selection should ever have been criticized than that he should have been able to justify it. Certainly no greater testimony to the intrinsic and permanent value of the PRINCE CONSORT'S Address to the Association in 1859 could be desired than the fact that SIR LYON PLAYFAIR, the President of the present year, selected as the text of his own discourse some pregnant remarks made by his illustrious predecessor on the relation of science to the State. Six-and-twenty years have elapsed since the British Association last met at Aberdeen, and we are still engaged with some of the problems which the PRINCE CONSORT propounded to his hearers on that occasion. SIR LYON PLAYFAIR is still dissatisfied with the encouragement given by the State to the advancement of science. He points with reproachful envy to the larger efforts made in this direction by countries less wealthy than our own. Germany has equipped Strasburg with a University which has cost nearly three-quarters of a million to rebuild, and receives an annual grant of £43,000. France has rebuilt her provincial colleges at a cost of £3,280,000, while her annual budget for their support now reaches half a million sterling. The United States, lavish in proportion to the national resources and the national development, have reserved 150,000,000 acres of the national land for the promotion of scientific education. By the side of efforts such as these the encouragement afforded in England to science by the State sinks into insignificance. We acknowledge the reproach, but the question is not without other aspects than those on which

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR chiefly dwelt. After all, the State is very much what the individuals who compose it choose to make it. Germany spends largely on science and scientific training, because the people of Germany have long learnt to set a high value on intellectual culture; Prance is now learning the same lesson in the bracing school of adversity. The United States lore to do things on a grand scale, and their immense natural resources enable them to make, with no vast immediate sacrifice, a magnificent provision for the future. England is very differently situated. We have no such natural resources as America, we have no such active and prevalent belief in intellectual culture as Germany, and we have had to learn no such terrible lesson as France. Our educational resources, derived from ancient endowments, are vast, though it may be conceded to SIR LYON PLAYFAIR that they are still largely misapplied. They could be almost indefinitely increased, without direct assistance from the State, if vested interests and lack of intelligent initiative did not so often stand in the way. Until these obstacles are removed by the pressure of an active and enlightened public opinion, the State itself can hardly be expected to do much more than it does. The same public opinion which would apply our existing resources to greater advantage would also quicken the action of the State in the same direction. But, until that opinion exists in an organized and effective shape, the demand for the encouragement of science by the State will be addressed, for the most part, to a faithless and unbelieving generation.

At the same time, we are inclined to think that, though SIR LYON PLAYFAIR'S reproaches are for the most part well-founded, it is not science, as matters stand at present, that has most reason to complain. The need for a thorough-going reorganization of our system of superior education—a reorganization in which science would assume its proper and rightful place—is hardly so much as recognized in this country. But, so far as it is recognized, it is science that gets the benefit of the recognition. So much is this the case that it is often difficult to get a hearing from men of science for the claims of other elements of mental culture. Men of science, as a rule, have nothing but contempt for what they are pleased to call "mere literary training." Even SIR LYON PLAYFAIR, who does his best to hold the balance even, and whose address would be reduced almost to a *caput mortuum* if every element of literary culture and historical training were eliminated from it, cannot resist the temptation of being unjust to the sources of much of his own inspiration. "While the teacher of literature," he says, "rests on authority and on books for his guidance, the teacher of science discards authority, and depends on facts at first hand, and on the book of nature for their interpretation." This, we take the liberty of saying, is a very unjust and very unworthy remark. The true object of literature, it has been well said, is to see things as they are, to know the world as it is; the true object of science cannot be anything else. The methods may be different, but the end is the same. The book of nature does not interpret itself. It has taken the best efforts of the greatest of human minds to interpret a few of its pages. Science is not, as SIR LYON PLAYFAIR acknowledges, an accumulation of unconnected facts. In what essential point, then, does the interpretation of nature, the correlation by science of unconnected facts, differ from the interpretation by literature of human action and experience? Books are as necessary to the one method as they are to the other. The student of biology gets his conception of natural selection from the "Origin of Species," the student of cosmical physics still studies the "Principia." Authority counts for as much or as little in science as it does in literature. We account ARISTOTLE a great philosopher, not because authority bids us, but because we can, if we choose to take the trouble, ascertain the fact for ourselves. Many of the truths of science are accepted on precisely the same grounds. If they were not, if every conclusion of science had to be verified afresh by every student who accepted it, the progress of science would be rendered almost impossible. We regret all the more that SIR LYON PLAYFAIR should thus have seemed to take a side in the groat controversy between science and letters, because in the greater part of his address he has evidently done his best to do equal justice to the two. It is not at all necessary to depreciate literary training in order to vindicate the legitimate claims of science to a place in superior education. We are all ready to recognize those claims, and if science were as fair to literature as literature has long been to science, the controversy would soon be ended. No true humanist can desire to underrate the services of science to mankind. Many a man of science would be the better for trying to do justice to the claims of humane letters we would oven go so far as to commend to SIR LYON PLAYFAIR, and his brothers in science at Aberdeen, the wise words of a champion of humane letters. "A poor humanist," says MR. MATTHEW ARNOLD, may possess his soul in patience, neither strive nor cry, admit the energy and brilliancy of the partisans of physical science, and their present favour with the public, to be far greater than his own, and still have a happy faith that the nature of things works silently on behalf of the studies which he loves, and that, while we shall all have to acquaint ourselves with the great results reached by modern science, and to give ourselves as much training in its disciplines as we can conveniently carry, yet the majority of men will always require humane letters; and so much the more, as they have the more and the greater results of science to relate to the need in man for conduct, and to the need in him for beauty."

Any voice that happens to be raised in this country in favour of change always awakens an immense number of echoes. Many people who decline to accept a novel proposition as it stands are yet ready to assume that there must be something in it, and to devise remedies of their own for evils of which they have become

suddenly and vaguely conscious. Politicians are always desperately nervous lest there should chance to be political capital in any new cry, and generally join in it more or less heartily merely by way of destroying their opponents' monopoly. Just at present nearly everybody is a land reformer, not because everybody has been convinced by serious study that land reform is necessary, or knows how to set about reform, supposing it to be necessary, but simply because considerable clamour is being made in some quarters and very violent remedies are being noisily advocated. At one end of the scale we have men like LORD HARTINGTON, who keep their hold firmly enough upon the leading economic conditions of the case, yet countenance some rather vague and formless aspirations for legislative improvement of the system of land transfer. At the other end we have theorists like MR. CHAMBERLAIN, who appear utterly unconscious that such things as invariable sequences of cause and effect exist in the sphere of economics, and are prepared to undertake the summary suppression by Act of Parliament of climate, history, the market, and human nature. The aggregate of talk upon the subject is all in favour of extreme men, because it tends to the subversion of sound convictions, and encourages the growth of that helpless bewilderment which finds expression in the most dangerous of political formulas—something must be done. People who are reduced to believing that something must be done, because they no longer know what ought not to be done, are ready to swallow any absurdity and assent to any folly. Their favourite resource is to "split the" difference"—in other words, to adopt some illogical compromise between common sense and the most preposterous demands that happen to have been made. Nothing suits the extreme men better, for they do not confine their demands to what they expect to get, and there is no finality about arrangements based on no principle.

The advocates of a general creation of peasant proprietors in this country are few in number, and fewer still are those whose advocacy could be thrown into forms definite enough to guide the draftsman of an Act of Parliament. But there are a considerable number who in a vague way would like to plant more people out on the soil, and vaguely believe that, though legislation cannot reorganize the whole land tenures of the country, it can by benevolent interference partially set aside the market, or get rid of the consequences of generations of development. To begin with the modest plea for simplification of transfer, it seems doubtful whether the real nature of the problem has been apprehended by many who join in the cry. There is really plenty of land to be bought, and its actual purchase is neither very difficult nor very expensive. What is both difficult and expensive is for the buyer to become quite certain that the seller has the right to sell. The difficulty is much less in most other countries, not because their laws are better, but because their history is different. English land is difficult to deal with simply because it has been freely dealt in for a longer time, and on a larger scale, than the land of other countries. Its history is scattered through deeds and contracts, while in France or Prussia we have only to go back to the beginning of the century to find the history of the greater part of the soil methodically and unimpeachably given in manorial records. Because the task of effecting a clear and satisfactory registry is more difficult than elsewhere, we need not despair of accomplishing it, but we might at least begin by recognizing its real nature, instead of talking nonsense, as many do, about land being properly transferable on the same principle as a horse. Again, when we consider schemes for improving the lot of agricultural folk, what necessity is there for ignoring the great economical fact, everywhere staring us in the face, that the very worst use to which a small capital can be put in this country is its investment in land? For reasons with which legislation has nothing to do, the return from money sunk in land is smaller than from any other investment whatever; yet people who desire to be thought men of business can conceive no more hopeful way of improving the position of the agricultural population than lending them money on condition that they invest it in a small holding. It is not landlords or legislators or Tories who have to be dealt with, but the hard facts of the market-place. Our correspondent "A. Y.," in the two interesting letters we have recently published, gives a vivid description of his own experience, contrasting the lot of labourers in his neighbourhood with that of small owners. Every one in contact with the facts can corroborate his views, and there is at least one fact to which he refers—the disappearance of the class of yeomen under modern conditions—palpable enough and striking enough to arrest the attention of the most superficial theorist. Why should we attempt the creation of a class of proprietor-labourers, when a similar class, historically rooted in the soil, and possessing advantages which we cannot confer on the new men, are unable to hold their ground? It is argued that railway and dock companies get power to take land on payment for their purposes, and that it is equally competent for the State to give powers of compulsory purchase to local bodies in order to promote the interests of agricultural labourers. Of course it is competent for the State to give such powers, but the real question is whether their exercise will in fact promote the interests of anybody. If men who got their land for nothing cannot live on it, how are labourers burdened with the debt of its market value to make the speculation pay?

According to MR. JESSE COLLINGS and other modern theorists, the rural population has been driven into the towns by the malignity of landowners and farmers, and means have to be found of replacing them on the soil, because the larger the number of persons who actually live on the land the better is it for the nation. It is only when we hear such sayings as these from the lips of our legislators, that we can fully appreciate MR.

LADSTONE'S light-hearted remark about the relegation of political economy to the exterior planets. The rural population has not been driven into the great towns, but has been attracted to them. The industrial development of the last half century has created an enormous demand for labour in towns, at rates of pay which offer overpowering temptations to country labourers. Not only so, but industry has gone forth to compete for labourers at their own doors. Any one who travels by rail and keeps his eyes and ears open will find that porters, platelayers, clerks, and often station-masters, speak the vernacular of the district. At every station it sets down among the green fields the railway enters into immediate competition with the local employers of labour. Once launched on their new life, whether in town or country, these men are lost to the farmer. It is, moreover, the best of the rural population, the most energetic, enterprising, and intelligent, who are drafted off, and the farmer has to pay higher wages than before for less effective labour. Abundant evidence of the increased cost and reduced efficiency of rural labour was given before the Duke of RICHMOND'S Commission, and, indeed, the agricultural work of the country must have come to a standstill, had not machinery been brought in to supplement the labour of the reduced population. Farmers and landowners can no more control the market than can millowners. They have to pay what labour will fetch, just like other people, and the notion that they favour a process which takes away their best hands and raises the wages of those who remain is condemned alike by political economy and common sense. The drain of industry to the towns is the natural and necessary result of the existence of industries more remunerative than agriculture. It is a result which, on free-trade principles, MR. COLLINGS should find entirely admirable. For the keystone of our free-trade policy is that men should devote themselves to the industries which give the greatest exchange value in return for labour. If by going to a town and making cotton cloth a man can obtain the price of a greater quantity of wheat than he could grow with the same labour in the fields, then he is right to go to the town. If this be denied, then we come back at once to protection and regulation of industry by artificial means, which, odd as it may seem, is what our advanced Radicals are now advocating under disguises which, perhaps, impose upon themselves. The whole of the current schemes for creating peasant-proprietors and for giving labourers allotments by public interference are, in fact, measures of protection for a particular industry. There is a good deal to be done in the way of improving the position of the agricultural labourer by means which wise landowners would adopt as a matter of business. LORD TOLLEMACHE and others who give allotments base their action on the ground that it is good for the estate as well as for the workmen. But when we go beyond business principles and embark upon schemes of benevolent interference in order to make country life conform to some ideal, we are simply offering subventions in aid of wages, no matter with what specious arguments we may endeavor to conceal the truth. But wages are fixed by the market, the essence of our fiscal policy is recognition of the folly of interfering with the market, and subventions, in whatever form, are bounties identical in kind with those of which our sugar refiners complain.

The French General Election has been fixed for Sunday, October the 4th, and the electoral struggle has now begun in good earnest. The PREMIER expounded his views at great length on Tuesday evening to the electors of the 10th Arrondissement, and the manifesto of the Royalist party is given by our Paris Correspondent this morning. We have already had occasion to comment upon the important speeches in which M. FERRY, rightly judging that a new Chamber opens a new chapter of political life, has preferred his claims to the confidence of the French people. A peculiar interest attaches to the coming election, because it is the first to be conducted upon the principle of *scrutin de liste*. GAMBETTA, notwithstanding, or perhaps on account of, his immense popularity, failed to procure the adoption of that electoral method, but since his death the ascendancy of a commanding personality has certainly not been the most pressing danger of the Republic. On the contrary, the instability of the Administrations which have followed one another in quick succession has brought home to men's minds the importance of measures for consolidating Parliamentary majorities. *Scrutin de liste*, which enables each elector to vote for all the representatives of his department, instead of for the representative of his electoral district alone, tends to eliminate purely local and personal influences, while giving increased importance to the discipline of party and the control of central organizations. Assuming discipline to be fairly good on all sides, rival parties vote, in American parlance, for their party "tickets," and success is won in large slices instead of in crumbs. The result of the experiment about to be tried will be awaited with great interest, but the drawbacks of *scrutin d'arrondissement*, or, as we should say, the one man one vote system, had reached in France such serious dimensions as almost to compel recourse to a change of method. Deputies were fast sinking, not only into the position of mere delegates on public questions, but into the yet more degrading position of agents for the furtherance of their constituents' private ambitions. When a member of Parliament is one of a score chosen by the suffrages of a county, he obviously has a double protection against unworthy solicitation he is not the sole representative of any man or coterie, but shares his responsibility towards each elector with nineteen of his colleagues, and, on the other hand, no strictly local interest is strong enough to make him feel its wrath, so long as he commands the confidence of the electoral body at large. The evils from which the French people are fleeing are palpable-enough; it remains to be seen what price they will have to pay

for their escape, and what are the practical drawbacks of their new system.

English readers will be struck by the similarity of the earnest appeals made by M. BRISSON and M. FERRY for the sinking of Republican differences and the presenting of a firm front to the common foes of all sections. The Monarchical fractions are apparently recognized by both as constituting a serious danger to the commonwealth. It will be seen from the manifesto of the Royalists that they are not sparing of their denunciations of the Republic. Indeed, the arguments of the two parties will remind many of us of a good deal that we have to listen to from more familiar lips. On one hand we have M. BRISSON and M. FERRY, each in his own way begging the electors to give France a strong Government, to keep out of sight burning questions, such as the revision of the constitution and the separation of Church and State, and to furnish Republican Ministers with the means to "save the country." On the other hand, we have the DUC DE BROGLIE and his friends denouncing the increase of expenditure, the growth of the national debt, and the war against the Church. They demand a strong and stable Government, resting upon a solid basis, and superior to parties, which in their view cannot be obtained without an executive power independent of the fluctuations of Republican opinion. M. BRISSON claims for the Republic that it has restored the eastern frontier, refortified Paris, created a national army, erected thousands of schools, carried out great public works, and extended public liberty. The Royalists, on the other hand, profess to be the only persons who can guarantee the interests of society, revive commerce, lighten the burdens of agriculture, promote manufactures, and give true liberty to all. There is a curious family resemblance between the appeals of politicians in all countries, and at bottom there is probably an equal inability on the part of the average elector everywhere to accept them at their own estimate. M. BRISSON is, no doubt, right; in believing that if the different sections of Republicans drop recriminations and show a capacity for compromise, the reactionary elements will have no chance. It is evident, however, that he is not altogether assured that this desirable moderation will be practised. The common platform is one of opportunism and self-restraint, for which it is unquestionably difficult to excite enthusiasm, even when the Monarchists are lying in wait to attempt what the PREMIER very aptly describes as a "revolution backwards."

Moderate Liberalism occupies a stronger position in France than among ourselves, if we may judge from the tone of authority in which M. FERRY proscribes the exclusion from the Republican lists of men advocating extreme views. The disendowment of the Church may be held as a private opinion, but the lists are to be open only to those who consent not to attempt it for the next four years. The revision of the Constitution is a Republican idea, to which, in itself, M. FERRY does not object, but he holds that the unity of the party will be imperilled if men are put upon the lists who aim at immediately opening up the question. M. BRISSON is equally earnest in pointing out how seriously the question of disendowment divides Liberal opinion, and in begging that it may be altogether excluded from the programme of the party. The urban population, as both speakers pointed out in their own ways, has adopted the Republic after its appropriate fashion, which is not the fashion of the towns. It is not to be fatigued by a pace suited only to the more ardent spirits of Paris and the industrial centres. Above all things it is necessary that the Republic should be a Government, and the Republicans are urged in different tones, but with perfect unanimity, to push no views that may weaken the cohesion of the party. The result of the elections will show how far this advice commends itself to the French people, and whether M. FERRY'S confident tone or M. BRISSON'S more plaintive and deprecatory one best suits the conditions springing out of the actual temper of the Republicans. The Government of the day has always exercised a great influence upon the course of French elections, and that influence will probably still be felt to some extent. It is announced, however, in a circular by the MINISTER of EDUCATION that the strictest impartiality will be observed by the Government, and that it expects similar conduct from all schoolmasters and public functionaries. An honest attempt to put down bureaucratic interference, coupled with the novel electoral arrangements now in force, makes the forthcoming election as interesting to political students abroad as is important for Frenchmen themselves.

Otago Daily Times,

November 5, 1885.

Deputation.

A deputation from the New Zealand Manufacturers' Association waited upon Sir Julius Vogel yesterday afternoon in pursuance of the following resolution passed at a meeting of the General Committee:—"That the policy of the Stout-Vogel Government of fostering and protecting Colonial industries has the hearty support and sympathy of this association, believing as they do that the future prosperity of the Colony depends

materially upon legislation in this direction." The deputation consisted of Messrs G. P. Farquhar (president), B. Hallenstein, T. W. Kempthorne, W. Henderson, A. Burt, R. S. Sparrow, H. E. Shacklock, C. Moore, and D. R. Eunson (hon. secretary).

Mr A. BURT introduced the members of the deputation, and explained the object of their visit.

Mr G. P. FARQUHAR said it was thought by the association that an expression of sympathy with the Government in their proposed alterations of the tariff last session might be of some use—at all events it might cheer the Government up and enable them to feel that some portion of the people at anyrate were at one with them upon the subject.

Sir JULIUS VOGEL.—I am at a loss to understand how intelligent men can fail to see that the future of the country depends upon the population finding employment, and that if they do not they simply go away, and other industries—the agricultural and pastoral—suffer. The persons who rail about Freetrade and call themselves Freetraders seem to do so from a sort of association with people at Home who take up the same line. They have read more or less about it, and they give us the same views that were propounded many years ago and used in quite an opposite direction. Protection was first invoked for the benefit of the agricultural classes, and it was they who stood up longest for it; but Freetraders are now trying to stir up the agriculturists against Protection. I cannot understand how they can be blind to the fact that unless we obtain a Home market for our produce we have to rely year by year upon the conditions of immense countries far away, of which we have little knowledge. The Home market is a safe market for us, and when we go beyond it it is to a great extent a plunge in the dark. Of course it is very gratifying to the Government to know that they have the support of many influential manufacturers such as are present here, but they want something more. They want your influence to be felt. It is not enough to console the Government that they were unsuccessful last session; but what is the association going to do to enable them to be successful in future years? In other words, what are your members going to do? Some went absolutely contrary to the promises made to their constituents. I am not blaming them, though, because I think every member has a right to use his own discretion. But, judging from what we see, Dunedin would seem to be the stronghold of the ultra-Freetrade party.

Mr BURT: I do not think so.

Mr HALLENSTEIN said he thought if the Government brought forward the same measures as last session and were defeated and went to the country, they would be returned with a majority. He believed the question had been more ventilated since last session, and that within 12 months the bulk of the population would be with them.

Mr FARQUHAR also thought the Protectionists were gaining power every day.

Sir J. VOGEL: I think you are, but the persons who take Freetrade views are very strong, and they have a great hold on the Press. It is easier for Press writers to write the old blue which comes natural to them like an old lesson, than to think out the subject. Nearly all the thoughtful men who have gone to Canada and examined the working of Protection there, have come back and said that, however suitable Freetrade may be for England, Protection has immensely benefited Canada. Lord Dufferin, Lord Lome, and the present Governor-general seem all of the same view. It is often not remembered what England has gone through. The Protective system in England built up half her trade. Look at the wool trade for example. For over a century it was a serious offence to export an ounce of wool. Protection was used in many shapes. It is rather absurd for us to declare ourselves like the England of the present day. We must be far more like the England of hundreds of years ago. You must not be content with passing resolutions encouraging the Government. The power in the country rests with the people, and all you manufacturers who give so much assistance to the labouring classes of the Colony can surely ask them to consider the matter. The time has passed, of course, when any control could be exercised, but the labouring classes are very intelligent, and if the case is put fairly before them are likely to see it. There may have been defects in the first tariff proposed, but the Government were awkwardly placed as regarded obtaining information from manufacturers, but afterwards we were in communication with a number of persons engaged in trade throughout the Colony, and the amendments proposed would, I think, have made a most suitable tariff. Softgoods, for instance, were to be in only two lines—one free and the other 16½ per cent, duty—and when this was proposed a softgoods man in the House sent me round a slip of paper to say that, if carried, this would make a perfect tariff. But the Freetrade members would not hear of it. They brought up the old books they had learnt at school, and it was thrown out. Then we came to increases for revenue purposes, and proposed to increase the duty on tea to what it had been before, but they would not listen to that; and the Opposition members who were really inclined to Protection, led by Major Atkinson, who has avowed himself a Protectionist, thought they might score a win off the Freetrade bat, and therefore went with the Freetraders. At next election I think the question will occupy some attention, and possibly members will be more reasonable. I am glad to see you, gentlemen; but why do you not interview your members as well separately?

Mr BURT: We have done it.

Sir J. VOGEL: It has not appeared in the papers.

Mr BURT; We are always at them.

Sir J. VOGEL: You should get them into a corner and ask what they are going to do, because there is no doubt that some who said they were going to vote one way voted another.

Mr BURT: We will do it at next election. There is no doubt that three-fourths of them were returned pledged to support local industries; but we will have better pledges next time, and make them go either for Protection or Free-trade.

Sir J. VOGEL: It is an important question, but I do not think it actually comes to Protection. For fiscal reasons we are bound to have a heavy tariff. The present tariff has been framed largely on the lines of Protection.

Mr BURT: No doubt the present is a Protective tariff, but it wants modifications.

Sir J. VOGEL agreed, and proceeded to mention several commodities—blankets, furniture, candles, &c.—which should be manufactured here.

Mr HALLENSTEIN said that many goods which could be made cheaper here were still imported, because importers could thus make a larger profit than by buying them here.

Sir JULIUS VOGEL said the Free-traders were indifferent to a well-known business principle—that things could be supplied much cheaper on a large scale than on a small.

Mr BURT said that in his line a difference of 25 per cent, could be made between the price of one article and the price of a dozen of the same.

Sir J. VOGEL said Free-traders did not seem to see this: that extending the theatre of the local manufacturers enabled them to produce much cheaper. In Germany Prince Bismarck had gone in for a thorough Protective system, and consequently the people were well occupied.

Mr HALLENSTEIN said things were better in Germany now than in England, and many English manufacturers had gone over to Germany.

Mr KEMPTHORNE said the deputation had come chiefly to thank Sir Julius for his efforts in the past. They would endeavour as far as they could to assert their opinions at the next election.

Sir J. VOGEL thought that if the members were earnestly spoken to upon the subject they would come round. One or two to whom he had spoken seemed inclined to alter their views.

Mr KEMPTHORNE said they would interview the members, and get their reported opinions. They must make use of the Press.

Sir J. VOGEL went on to refer to other anomalies in the tariff. Aerated waters, for one thing, were admitted free, and 15 per cent, was charged on many of the ingredients that had to be used for their manufacture in the Colony. It was a reproach to the intelligence of the Colony to pretend that we could not manufacture such a commodity as aerated waters. With regard to the fruit pulp, also, about which there had been some agitation. The pulp which was imported from Tasmania—and it was questionable if it was in a condition fit for food—was the means of preventing many acres in this Colony being planted with fruit trees.

Mr FARQUHAR congratulated the Colonial Treasurer upon the success of the Wellington, Exhibition, held under Government auspices, and expressed the opinion that it would do a great deal of good.

Sir J. VOGEL said it was proposed to hold the next exhibition in 1887, and it seemed to be a question whether it should be held in Dunedin or Christchurch. He suggested the matter might be settled by a friendly competition at rifle-shooting, or the two mayors might bid for the privilege at auction.

Mr BURT did not think manufacturers would care which city it was held in. He would as soon have it in Christchurch himself.

Mr KEMPTHORNE thought it was rather an advantage to manufacturers to have it away from their city, as their wares were seen by people who might never have seen them, before.

Mr HALLENSTEIN expressed an opinion that once in three years would be often enough to hold the exhibitions, as they entailed heavy expense to exhibitors.

The deputation then withdrew.

November 7, 1885.

Mr Gladstone's Manifesto.

We make the following extracts from the manifesto issued by Mr Gladstone:—

I will now approach the consideration of domestic affairs. In the first place, and at the threshold, I place the question of Parliamentary procedure. I desire clearly to point out the three cardinal points of the question. First,

that the congestion of business now notorious and inveterate degrades the House of Commons by placing it at the mercy of those among its members who seek notoriety by obstructing business instead of pursuing a more honourable road to reputation by useful service, or of those who, with more semblance of warrant, seek to cripple the action of the Commons in order to force the acceptance of their own political projects; secondly, it disappoints, irritates, and injures the country by the suspension of useful legislation; and, lastly, and perhaps worst of all, defeats the fundamental rule of our Parliamentary system, that the majority shall prevail, and puts it [*unclear: image not readable*] power of a minority to prevent unduly consuming the time of the House, the passing of measures which it dislikes, but of which it is afraid openly to declare its disapproval. This country will not in the full sense be a self-governing country until the present machinery of the House of Commons is annulled, and its procedure reformed.

I am not sure that the views of the country are so clear and its mind so fully ripened on the next great subject which I have to mention—that of local government. Here the first objects to be aimed are to rectify the balance of taxation as between real and personal property; to put an end to the gross injustice of charging upon labour, through the medium of the consolidated fund, local burdens which our laws have always wisely treated as incident to property; to relieve the ratepayers, not at the charge of the working population, but wholly or mainly by making over for local purposes carefully-chosen items of taxation to supply the local management with inducements for economy, instead of tempting and almost forcing it into waste; finally, and most of all, to render the system thoroughly representative and free. The gentry of our country have, especially in the counties, long, and with justice, been commended for their upright and intelligent discharge of their local duties. I am confident that they will continue to enjoy these favourable distinctions none the less when our system shall have been placed throughout under effective popular control. I will not omit to observe that this subject furnishes a medium through which we most reasonably look for the effectual adjustment of the laws relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors.

The next important subject is the reform of the laws relating to the land. I shall only touch on those parts of the question which I hope may be found mature for very early handling by the Liberal party. Belonging to the school which has much faith in economic laws, I disapprove of interference with them by entails, which I am still more opposed to on social and moral grounds. My desire is both to maintain freedom of bequest, and to establish freedom of possession as our future system, and also to deal in a friendly manner with the transfer of land, the registration of land, the taxation of land during life and upon death, and the custom of primogeniture as it now exists in cases of intestacy. I shall rejoice if the means thus provided, or other means in themselves commendable, shall lead to a close connection between the nation and the soil, through a large extension in the number of those directly interested in its possession and its produce, but most of all in the proprietorship of their own dwellings. The balance of taxation, as between movable and immovable property, and still more as between property and labour, should be adjusted when the occasion offers, with a scrupulousness which was, unhappily, too little observed at a time when property had the absolute command of Parliamentary action.

The Tories and the Irish Nationalists, who have acted with such unprecedented harmony for some years, are united in reproaching and then mocking the Liberal party on account of its divisions, but liberalism has to unite freedom of individual thought and action, to which so largely is due our sweet and healthy atmosphere, with corporate efficiency. This aim is noble, but it is difficult; and for my own part, although it is not the method best adapted to the personal convenience of those who may lead, nothing would induce me to exchange it for the high regimental discipline which brings two minorities, each in a well-fused mass, into the voting lobby. For this valued freedom and this abundant variety, cherished in the Liberal party, have not disabled it during the last half-century from efficient action. For more than two-thirds of that period the party has held power, and fully nine-tenths of our useful legislation have been due to its initiation and labours. What modern Britain at this moment is, she has become substantially through the agency of the Liberal party. Such being the facts, it seems natural to ask why may not the Liberal party of the future be useful with the same freedom and by the same methods as in the past? This interrogatory is doubtless very disagreeable to our opponents. It is now sought to startle and inflame the country by pointing to the views of our most advanced section, but no section constitutes the Liberal party. Each section constitutes an element of the party, and it is by the mixture and composition of the elements, and not by the unchecked dominance of any one among them, that results have been and will be attained. It appears probable, after all which the last half century has achieved, that the growth of population, the expansion of our relations throughout the world, the rapid development of social interests and the extensions of popular power will, at least for a considerable time, be amply represented in the new Legislature. From any full attempt to set them forth, the law of nature at my time of life dispenses me. But there are some among them as to which the foundations of discussion have already been laid, and which may therefore demand from me a few words. As respects the changes in the House of Lords, by far the best guarantee for the safe treatment of this important subject is one that can only be supplied by that House itself in the moderation and wisdom of its future conduct. I certainly cannot deny that there is a case sufficient to justify

an important change. Those who hold with Burke, as I do, that knowledge and virtue alone have an intrinsic right to govern, might desire to constitute a second chamber strictly on this basis; but we cannot in the nature of things exclude the action of other influences, especially the permanently growing and highly aggressive power of wealth. Among these secondary influences, allied with the past character and habits of the people, and as a check on other and yet more mixed agencies, I hope that in the reconstituted House of Peers, when it arrives, a reasonable share of power may be allowed under wise conditions to the principle of birth.

With respect to the severance of the Church from the State, I think it obvious that so great a question cannot become practicable until it shall have grown familiar to the public mind by thorough discussion. Neither can such a change arise in a country such as ours, except with a large observance of the principles of equity and liberality. We can hardly be surprised if those who observe that the current almost throughout the civilised world slowly sets in this direction should desire or fear that among ourselves too it may be found to operate. I cannot forecast the time and the distant courses of the future, but I have observed a vast and ever-increasing development for the last 50 years, both at home and abroad, in the church to which I belong, of the power of voluntary support by devoutness of life and by the solidity of the labour of the clergy, who are laying a good foundation for the time to come. The English Church also appears to be eminently suited, in many and weighty points, to the needs of the coming time, and I have a strong conviction that if this great modification of our inherited constitution shall hereafter be accomplished, the vitality of the church will be found equal to all the needs of the occasion. The subject of gratuitous primary education, to be paid for from sources wholly public, is one on which I desire to reserve my final judgment, but it appears to me to suggest some difficulties which demand grave consideration. According to the habits of this country, a contribution towards the cost of an article tends to it being more thoroughly valued by the receiver. The rule of our policy is that nothing should be done by the State which can be better or as well done by voluntary effort, and I am not aware that either in a moral or even literary aspect the work of the State for education has yet proved its superiority to the work of religious bodies or philanthropic individuals. Even from economical considerations the cost does not appear wholly trivial. Again, will there not be under the new system an increased jealousy of the introduction into schools of any subject not strictly rudimentary? There remains the religious difficulty. The nation does not appear disposed to confine public teaching in the primary schools to matters purely secular. If so, how are we to ask the entire population—Churchmen, Nonconformists, and Roman Catholics—to accept one and the same scheme of religious instruction despite denominational differences, and, above all, a scheme prescribed and limited by the authority of the State in a country and at a period where a large mass of opinion has grown up which is totally adverse to the use by the State of any prescribing and limiting authority at all in religious matters. There may be modes of meeting these difficulties, but until such modes have been carefully weighed and not found wanting, it would be premature in me to endeavour to press forward generally the subject of gratuitous primary education.

I have reserved until the close the mention of Ireland. Those grievances of Ireland with which we have been too familiar before and since the Union have at length been happily removed. The poison of religious ascendancy in various forms has been expelled from the country, and the condition of the cultivators of the soil, constituting the majority of the people, which has been a scandal and a danger to the Empire, has been fundamentally improved, at a cost of no small effort, by the action of Parliament; but the wants of Ireland have to be considered as well as its grievances. Down to this hour, Ireland has continued greatly in arrears both of England and Scotland with respect to those powers of local self-government which associate people in act and feeling with the law, and which are at the root of political stability, of the harmony of classes, and of national strength. Nothing can be easier than to mar and intercept by narrow prejudices, and by appeals to passion, any adjustment of this important question, which cannot be satisfactorily handled unless it be approached on one side and on the other in a spirit of enlightened moderation, should such a spirit prevail. I cannot believe that the political genius of these nations, illustrious in the history of the world, will be proved inadequate to the solution of the problem without a heavy drawback of embittered civil strife. In my opinion, not now for the first time delivered, the limit is clear within which any desires of Ireland constitutionally ascertained may, and beyond which they cannot, receive the assent of Parliament. To maintain the supremacy of the Crown and the unity of the Empire—and all the authority of Parliament is necessary for the conservation of that unity—is the first duty of every representative of the people. Subject to this governing principle, every grant to portions of the country of enlarged powers for the management of their own affairs is, in my view, not a source of danger, but a means of averting it, and is in the nature of a new guarantee for increased cohesion, happiness, and strength. The main question is whether it is for the interests of all the three countries that the thorough and enduring harmony which has now been long established, but only after centuries of manful strife, between England and Scotland, should include Ireland also. My personal answer to the question is this. I believe that history and posterity will consign to disgrace the name and memory of every man, be he who he may, and on whichever side of the Channel he may dwell, that, having the power to aid in an equitable settlement between Ireland and Great

Britain, shall use his power not to aid but to prevent or retard it. If the duty of working for this end cannot be doubted, then I trust that on the one hand Ireland will remember that she is too subject to the authority of reason and justice, and cannot always plead the wrongs of other days in bar of submission to them, and that the two sister kingdoms, aware of their overwhelming strength, will dismiss every fear except that of doing wrong, and will make yet another effort to complete the reconciling work which has already done so much to redeem the past, and which, when completed, will yet more redound to the honour of our legislation and our race.

I have avoided any criticism upon the proceedings of the Government in office. The most important part of them, so far as known to me, relates to the government of Ireland, and I am desirous to hold that subject altogether separate from prospective controversy. I may say that we have given, as was our duty, a cordial support to the new Administration in its endeavours to conclude an arrangement of the Afghanistan frontier with Russia, on the basis laid down by Earl Granville, and I have observed with satisfaction that the Secretary for the Colonies appears to exercise a wise caution in South Africa with reference to the further extension of territorial responsibilities, which I hold it most unwise to enlarge without an over-ruling necessity.

The Evening Bell.

"In its tongue there hang a thousand virtues."

Tuesday, November 10, 1885.

The Evening Bell

ONCE more the correspondent of our morning contemporary has made a political discovery. There is dissension it seems in the Cabinet, and every chance of a terrible disruption all about the North Island Trunk Railway loan. This is serious indeed. It would be more so perhaps, if the correspondent had not done it so often before. It would have a more alarming effect if he could have found out what the dissension was about, and who wore the dissenters. Nevertheless as it stands the sensation is well enough. It serves two good purposes at least. It keeps alive the idea that some of the Cabinet are bent on doing something which is very wrong; and it is a sort of certificate of character for one or two members of the Government who may be supposed to be locally interested in the question. The absurdity of the thing doesn't strike the correspondent, but judging from past experience, that is not surprising. Neither does it appear to have occurred to our contemporary, which is rather more remarkable. Yet it is absurd enough. It seems that somebody, name unknown, says the question of diverting the loan to other purposes has never come before the Cabinet. This is considered very important, evidently, as all that follows, both as letter and comment, depends upon it. Yet it is simply nonsense after all. Of course the question has not come before the Cabinet because no amount of discussion would enable the Cabinet to carry it out if proposed. Nor will it come before the Ministry hereafter for the same reason. That the loan will be raised about April next there can be no doubt, because the money will be needed. That it or any part of it will be diverted contrary to law to any other purposes there need be no fear, because it cannot be done.

If it were possible to make a certain class of minds understand the most elementary principles of Government finance, we should be saved a great deal of very silly talk and writing on the subject. This, it would seem is at present past praying for. There are minds so dense that they cannot see anything which they don't feel to be their interest to see, and not acute enough, to perceive what is to their own interest. Such minds as these would be glad to see this loan unraised, even if the consequence should be that the Treasury had to refuse payment of just claims from Public Works' contractors for work done, and from Civil servants for services performed. It would never occur to them that such a state of things would hurt New Zealand more than the delay of a Trunk Railway for twenty years. Fortunately all are not so stupid as this, and certainly the Cabinet as a whole is not. It will need no Council to decide that the colony must be in a position to pay its contractors and its officers, and even a member representing Auckland or Wellington will raise no protest against this course.

When the loan is raised, as we have said before, it will be exactly in the same position as any other loan money. Its ultimate destination is made by law the Trunk railroad; its present employment will depend entirely on the exigencies of the Public Account. This is true now under the Stout Government; it would have been equally true under the Atkinson Government. There is no tapu affecting one railway loan which does not affect other loans. In the Treasury it will be money, and simply money—only in the books of account will it or can it be kept sacred for a special purpose. The trunk railroad has borrowed from other loans, and they in turn will undoubtedly borrow from it until the meeting of Parliament and for a good while longer. The question is not one of borrowing—with any Cabinet and any Treasurer that would have been a certainty. It is one of repayment, and this is the only possible hitch. If Parliament agrees to borrow more money, out of which advances can be repaid, all will be well. If it does not the Trunk Rail-road will be as effectually stopped as it could have been even had Major Atkinson carried his resolution about acquiring native lands along its course.

These are the bare facts, and no amount of tall talk can alter them by one iota. The wishes of this Cabinet Minister or that will not affect them in any way; the incoherent protests of those who brought about the risk which now frightens them, cannot possibly remove it. It might of course have been more pleasant to have gone on in ignorance of these things until the next Session of Parliament, but it would certainly not have been any better. Disagreeable results always follow upon stupid conduct, and it would not have made the results in this case one whit less disagreeable that we only learnt them when nearly all the million loan had been advanced to other accounts to prevent repudiation by our Colonial Treasury.

The Oamaru Mail. Saturday, November 7, 1885.

Higher Education in Oamaru.

At the instance of the Rev. Dr Macgregor, a conference of the representation of the Otago Education Board, Waitaki High School Board of Governors, and the School Committees of North Otago, was held yesterday afternoon in the Athenæum Hall to confer upon the question of providing a more efficient system of secondary education in North Otago.

The representatives of the Education Board were the Chairman (Mr Fraer), and Messrs J. M'Kenzie and Dr Macgregor the representatives of the School Committees and the Waitaki High School being the Rev. J. Steven, Messrs Hislop, Sumpter, Procter, Hutton, Morton, J. Falconer, Elder, Jackson, Sutherland, Spence, Douglass, A. Ross (Otepopo), Goodall, Fricker, and Ross (Waianakarua). Mr Shrimski was also present.

Mr Fraer was voted to the chair, and after stating the object of the conference he read the following letter from Mr J. Reid, addressed to Dr Macgregor:—

My Dear Sir,—As no motion was brought forward, re your circular, at the last meeting of the Waitaki High School Board, I cannot appear to-morrow as a representative, and, therefore, think it better not to be present.

In any case, such an important matter will require considerable thought, and your meeting to-morrow will probably prepare the way for the matter being tested on its merits.

I, for my part, will not stand in the way of anything which is just and for the public good, but I shall require to be thoroughly convinced of this before I agree to support a change.—I am, my dear sir, yours faithfully, J. REID.

He (the Chairman) then called upon Dr Macgregor to lay his views before them.

Dr Macgregor said:

What the Board has requested through me is not legislation, but conference of parties interested. We might confer about anything without giving cause for complaint or alarm. If we were to compare notes about the question, whether Otago ought not to be declared an independent republic, our conference might be ridiculous, but would not be treasonable nor formidable. And now our conference need not be formidable, excepting to such as may not love light, when we compare notes about the question, whether a combination of two high schools into one might not, in the words of Mr Reid, of Elderslie, be "just and for the public good." In his opinion, the meeting of to-day "will probably prepare the way for the matter being tested on its merits." That is the utmost to be expected from a preliminary conference,—that the way should be opened for determination of the question, whether the proposed amendment of the constitution might not be "just and for the public good." And such conference appears a good means for that desirable end. The matter is one which concerns us all; that is, the secondary education of the people at the nation's expense. Those who have been called to the meeting are unquestionably parties interested. They completely represent the people, whose education is the public good in question, the only purpose of the existence of the High School as supported by the nation; and their representatives ought to know, or to be capable of learning through conference, what is good for that purpose. The people in this locality are represented by the School Committees of the Waitaki County, which have all been requested to send deputies; and also by the Chairman of Waitaki County and the Mayor of Oamaru, who are statutory Governors of Waitaki High School on account of their official connection with the locality. The people of Otago as a whole are represented by the Education Board, which is here through its Chairman and other members deputed for the purpose; and also by Mr Hislop, its nominee in the Waitaki Government. Messrs Miller and Reid are the only gentlemen invited who are not, directly or indirectly, technically representative of the people. But as nominated governors of Waitaki they are in a real sense educationally representative men in connection with the locality. These are all interested parties, and, so far as I can see, there are no other parties within call who are interested in the same manner. The conference called is completely representative. If this conference does not bring into view the real mind of the constituency, I do not know how it can be otherwise

ascertained, except by a plebiscite, or some other way of directly consulting the people themselves. The people themselves, so far as I know, have no opportunity of expressing their mind, about the national provision of secondary education for them here, excepting in the town of Oamaru. In connection with their Grammar School the citizens of Oamaru, regularly called to deliberate, have declared unanimously, at three distinct public meetings, first, that for the town and district it is vitally important to have secondary education within easy reach of both sexes and all classes; and second, that the Waitaki High School as now constituted does not accomplish that purpose, inasmuch as (1) it makes no provision for girls, and inasmuch as (2) the provision it makes for boys is practically beyond the reach of those who are not of the comparatively wealthy class. The town's resolutions to this effect; were repeatedly laid before the Education Board by deputies, one of the first deputation being the Mayor of Oamaru (Mr Procter), and one of the last being the Chairman of Schools Committee (Major Sumpter). The deputies of Schools Committee are now of course at liberty to declare their own minds. The mind of the town has been declared by itself, and stands recorded. The only charge ever laid by the town upon the Schools Committee in this matter has been, vigorously to prosecute the defence of the Grammar School, then threatened with disratement. In relation to the wider question, the mind of the town, declared by itself, is, (1) that secondary education is vitally important, and (2) that the Waitaki School does not serve that purpose. This, so far as I know, has, relatively to the matter, been the only regular and competent expression of opinion by the people of the land. As to the merits: At the outset I supposed that the two High Schools, of distinct types, might go on together, each in its own way. I am now persuaded that we cannot reasonably expect the nation to go on supporting two High Schools in this district; and I know that my conviction is shared by those whose judgment in that matter is the weightiest in more ways than one. We are now far on in the first of the two years of existence of the Grammar School agreed to by the Education Board; and it is far from certain that they would consent to a prolongation of the term. We have to contemplate the possibility of the people of North Otago here being thrown out of their only means of secondary education to their daughters, and also to their sons excepting in the case of those who can afford to send them to Waitaki with a fee of 10 guineas per boy. Now, the reason, the only reason, of this peril to secondary education, is the existence of Waitaki School. If it were not for Waitaki School no creature would dream of meddling with the constitution of the Grammar School. It is one evil of the existence of Waitaki as now constituted that it is a standing menace to Oamaru High School. But further, the Waitaki School itself is not a private property of select individuals. It is a national property, destined for the education of the people. And as now constituted it does not, and cannot, accomplish the purpose of its existence. That purpose it does not accomplish. The public money does not educate the people. How can a school be said to educate the people if it make no provision for girls? But Waitaki School does not even half educate the people. It is really accessible only to the boys who, as a class, are of comparatively wealthy parentage. Further, it does not even quarter educate the people. In the case of those boys of wealthy parentage, what is really accomplished by means of the nation's money? The cost of every one of them to the nation is, I am told by one gentleman, £70 a year, and by another £50. A wealthy grandee, if he have two or three boys at school, will thus receive from the nation from £100 to £200 a year—about as much as the whole cost of secondary education for all mankind in the Grammar school. And what is the result? Not that his children are educated. They would have been educated though there had not been a Waitaki School in existence. What really takes place is an addition to his income of about half as much as goes to the support of the destitute poor in Oamaru town. I might add that he really is not a gainer, though his poorer neighbors are losers. In a combined school his children could obtain at least as good an education as can ever be provided in either of the separate schools; probably better, as the staff would be larger, and the gradation more complete; while the fee to him and others would be much lower than the ten guineas, and the nation would be saved the whole present cost of secondary education in the Grammar School. How?—The combined school would be placed on the foundation of the primary education, a most excellent foundation for a secondary school to rise from, as soil on subsoil. On that foundation the combined school would receive a large revenue of capitation grant on account of the primary instruction. This, along with the Waitaki revenues, would suffice to maintain a two-sided high school of the foremost class, with a complete staff of teachers as good as can be got for money; while the fee might be made as low as the Otago fee of £2 a year, and boys and girls passing a high examination might have free education as a prize. When I, an old experienced educationist, think of the advantages to this region to be obtained in that way for all generations, it almost takes away my breath. If any party now prevent the benefit from being secured to the people, doubtless that will be observed and remembered. What is the alternative?—That a grandee shall receive public assistance in the maintenance of his family to the amount of £100 or £200 a year. I am sure that gentlemen who may thus be living upon their poorer neighbors have not reflected upon the sort of gilded pauperism involved to them in the existing constitution. Otherwise, they would be eager for a change. In any case, the people of the land must consider whether it is "just and for the public good" that a large revenue, intended for the education of the people, should be accomplishing nothing but an addition to the income of the wealthy class. What about the building; that is if

wrongly placed at present? Of course, it should be rightly placed for the future. If money have been misdirected at the outset in putting it in the wrong place, that is no reason for spending more money through all time on keeping it in the wrong place. But let us leave such minor questions as that of the building until we have agreed upon the essential question of the education, the abiding constitution of the school. To raise minor questions at the outset, so as to distract attention to the inessential from the essential question, would be to employ rotten branches for fencing a rotten tree. I am blaming no one for its being found that the existing constitution is unsatisfactory. The people of this locality are deeply indebted to those by whom the reserves were directed to the locality; and owe it to these benefactors to make sure that the educational purpose of the reserves is not frustrated by any fault of the constitution, which may not have been observed at the first. The original constitution was an experiment, in new circumstances, perhaps suggested by the case of Dunedin. It proves that the cases are very different. Dunedin, with hundreds of citizens able to pay a high fee where we have not tens, has a fee of only 1s where we have 10 guineas; it gives free education to all pupils passing an examination with 50 per cent, of marks, that is, all of fair ability who choose to try; it has ample provision for girls as well as boys; and the provision is in Dunedin, conveniently accessible to the children of the people. Timaru, with a full provision for girls, has a fee of only six guineas in the town. Waimate, with provision for girls as well as boys, has a fee of only 10s, in some cases, 12s 6d or 15s. In all these cases the nation's work of educating the people is really being done. Here it is not really being done, But it can be done, through amendment of the constitution, so that the nation shall be saved a considerable yearly outlay, and the people of the locality shall be more favorably placed for secondary education than those of any other locality that I know of in New Zealand. No blame to those who made the experiment. But there will be blame to those, if any, who will not learn from the result of an experiment already so costly. This is not a matter of private interest, of close corporation. It is a public interest, in relation to which the only question is, what, relatively to secondary education by means of public funds, is "just and for the public good." A public question about amending the constitution properly belongs, not to the administrators of the existing constitution, but to the constituency for whose interest it exists. The constituency are here to-day through its natural representatives. If there be need of more clear and full ascertainment of its mind, there can be an appeal to the constituency directly for an opinion, not only in Oamaru, but in all other school districts interested in the secondary education of the locality. The question of what should be done with the building was one of a number of minor questions, and these minor questions had to be put aside until the essential question had been settled. They could do anything with the building, even to putting a little gunpowder under it and blowing it up, but the essential question must be settled first.

Mr Elder said that the feeling of the residents in the district he came from was in favor of having some change made. There were children attending the school who had passed the 6th standard, and these children had to remain there because there was not a school for secondary education within their reach. In the country, the District High School was looked upon as an elementary school, and Waitaki High School was at too great a distance from Oamaru for them to think of sending them there. At the Maheno school, there were seven children who had passed the 6th standard, and these pupils should be in a way of getting secondary education. If there had been a school for secondary education in Oamaru, these children would no doubt have come there; but, as it was, they were obliged to remain. The country people were desirous of having the two High Schools amalgamated in some way which would bring secondary education within the reach of all.

Mr Jackson considered that great credit was due to Mr Shrimski for having secured the endowments towards the Waitaki High School; but it was a great blunder on the part of the Governors of the School to erect it where it was. Its present position and constitution would debar its being of any use to the people of the district. He thought that it might be placed upon one of the reserves in the town of Oamaru, and the sooner they set about its removal the better.

Mr Procter expressed the opinion that if parents wished their children educated after arriving at the age of 14, they ought to bear the cost themselves and not expect anything from the State. He did not think the Waitaki High School too far from the town.

The Chairman pointed out to Mr Procter that it was not what should be that they had to deal with but what was in existence. It was only fair that there should be a school for secondary education in the district, and there were the means provided for this in the Waitaki High School endowments, and the object of the conference was to endeavor to devise some scheme whereby these means should be utilised.

Mr Procter said the only object of dispute was the extra £150 a-year which the Education Board were asked to grant towards keeping up the District High School. Why should the Board desire to take this away from Oamaru after voting it for so many years? The population of Oamaru was increasing and the sum was so small, not more than the salary of a teacher.

Mr McKenzie wished the representatives of the Waitaki High School and Oamaru Schools Committee to understand that he and the other members of the Board were not there with any hostile spirit. He pointed out that the Board had only granted the District High School two years of life, and that on the understanding that

some arrangement might be come to in the meantime to so utilise the endowments of the Waitaki High School towards establishing a school for secondary education in its stead. He said that it was unfair for the people of Oamaru to expect the Education Board to provide secondary education apart from these endowments, which had been taken from the primary education reserves of Otago.

Mr Goodall wished to see the school placed upon a different basis. He had not heard of any report of the school being published and they had to trust to the Board to see that it was doing its proper work. He was in favor of the suggestion of Dr Macgregor that this should be made a test question at the next elections.

Mr D. Sutherland spoke as a parent wishing to see a change made. He thought the people of Oamaru and Waitaki should so trust to the election of any member to the Education Board as a means of having the District High School continued. He had always been against the Waitaki High School being erected at such a great cost and upon its present site, and, as one of the Board of Governors, had opposed its erection there. At that time he was surprised to find the then Mayor of Oamaru (Mr S. Gibbs) voting against him and against the interests of the people of Oamaru. The time had now come when they could not find money to keep up two institutions for the same purpose in Oamaru, and no one could say that the Waitaki High School fulfilled its proper functions. It would be better if they had one good school where all could get secondary education. It was said that 12 clever boys obtained education free at the Waitaki High School, but he held that it was at the expense of the State. It cost the State £50 a year each to educate these boys. He (Mr Sutherland) moved, "That in the interests of secondary education it is indispensable that the Waitaki High School be transferred to or near the town of Oamaru as Parliament may direct."

The resolution was seconded by Mr Morton.

Mr Shrimski here asked the Chairman if he might say a few words.

Dr Macgregor objected to anyone saying anything unless he were a representative at the conference.

Mr Shrimski said this showed the spirit of the discussion.

Dr Macgregor said that if anyone interfered with the business of the Conference a policeman would be sent for, and the party removed from the room.

Mr Shrimski then withdrew.

Mr Sumpter said that he had attended the meeting, not with a view of taking any part in its proceedings, but having heard what had been said he would like to be permitted to say a few words. He had worked heartily with Dr Macgregor in preventing the disrating of the District High School, the more particularly as there was no provision for the education of girls and because he saw no reason why for the sake of saving £160 per annum the school should be disrated. They had been informed that the Board could not legally do this or take away the status of the school without the expressed wish of the inhabitants of the town of Oamaru, and this Board was the first to throw the stone at the District High School. He had willingly cooperated with Dr Macgregor and others in striving to retain the position of the District High School. It was only about year ago that Dr Macgregor stated, he could not say the exact words, but to the effect that he saw no reason why the Waitaki and District High Schools should not occupy the same position as county and borough schools at Home, and to-day we have him asking for its destruction. As to the distance, some of his friends had stated that it was too great from the town to admit of children from the country attending it. He pointed out that there were no suitable trains running, so that children from a distance could attend, although he felt confident that, were such the case, every effort would be made by the Government to allow children to attend school, as the Government had always shown a desire to help in this direction. Whilst speaking on this, one thing had struck him, however, that although the District High School had been in existence for a number of years he had not heard of any effort being to send in children from Maheno or other places to the District High School, but immediately a school had been established which had acquired some fame for itself, thus the cry was to pull it down for the sake of preserving a High School in Oamaru. As regards the distance, Mr Elder said that he saw daily children passing his place who went from 4 to 6 miles to school, and yet he said this school was too far distant, although only a mile and half from town. It was true that when the school was being erected the great depression that occurred was unexpected, that more population was anticipated in and around the school, and that the construction of a tramway was looked forward to; but, owing to circumstances that were not singular to this part of the colony, these hopes were not altogether fulfilled. But the Governors took great pains as to the selection of a site, and took into consideration the advantages of plenty of room for the development of healthy bodies as well as healthy minds. He considered that Mr Shrimski and those who helped him had secured a great boon to the district by bringing about the setting aside of reserves, which naturally assisted the cause of secondary education, and he thought it was the duty of the public to try to conserve those reserves for our district, and he must raise a note of warning that if they allowed them to be taken from us and go into the general educational management they might lose their value to us altogether. As regards the fees the scales charged at other institutions at the time were obtained, and the Waitaki High School's made as nearly as possible the same. These would no doubt be brought down as the attendance and means increased. He could not follow Dr

Macgregor in his remarks as to the saving of nearly L100 a year to the rich at a cost to the State of L70, as the same argument would apply to those who received free education.

Mr Bislop said that country rep: esenta tives onght to remember that when it was proposed to put the Waitaki High chool on its present site protests were made, bat country people did not join in the efforts put forth to prevent the proposals of the thon governors from being carried out. Articles had appeared in the North Otago Times after he and others had drawn attention to the evils that would result. He himself had then used almost every argument against the site, and those who did not join in the protests then made were in a sense responsible for the present position of affairs. They had had had the matter settled, and, although unsatisfactorily, they could not expect to find a remedy at once. Revolutions every few years were not satisfactory. He would like to have heard from the promoters of the meeting some clear indication of what was proposed to be done. He thought the arguments that had been used in favor of placing the school one mile and a half beyond one of the town's boundaries ridiculous—the one in favor of space to get a lung full of fresh air particularly so, No doubt in time, and when the endowments increased in value, a change would have to be made. In the meantime, however, he hoped that nothing would be done to lessen the pood work now being done by the Waitaki High School. He referred to the arguments used against the school as peculiar. It had been said that it was wrong to assist those people who now sent their children to the school, and it was also urged that it was wrong that matters were not so managed that greater assistance might be given, so that others who could not afford to pay the present fee should be able to avail themselves of the school. He knew that the school was well managed and was doing good work, and he trusted and knew that on reflection the suggestions against the exigence of High Schools would not find a response. It was necessary, if we did not wish to fall behind in the march of civilisation, to have, not only wide spread knowledge, but facilities given to as many as possible to attain the highest culture possible.

After some remarks from Mr Fricker and Mr J. Falconer, the resolution was put and carried, and, on the motion of Mr. D. Sutherland, seconded by Mr Morton. Messrs Morton, Falconer, holder, Jackson, Sutherland, and Dr Macgregor were appointed a committee to take the necessary steps to give effect to the resolution.

The Otago Daily Times

Monday, November 16, 1885.

The Otago Daily Times

FEW books dealing with social and economic problems have been more widely read in recent years than Mr Henry George's "Progress and Poverty." Written with evident sincerity of purpose and earnestness of tone, and also in very forcible and persuasive language, it appealed not only to the sympathies of the working classes themselves but to those of a number of educated and thoughtful people who had pondered in vain the problem with which it proposed to deal. In many quarters it was hailed as a new gospel, the herald of glad tidings to the toiling myriads who seemed to be toiling in vain. More sturdy believers in the received doctrines of political economy were, however, not so easily led astray by Mr George's brilliant appeals to the sympathies of his readers, and we doubt if any political economist of eminence has been in any degree converted to his views. It was felt, however, that the book demanded a reply from the orthodox school, and the best and most complete reply we have yet seen is that which first appeared in the "Quarterly Review," and was last year reprinted under the title "Property and Progress." It is from the pen of Mr W. H. Mallock, and is to be found in our Athenæum library. We commend this volume to those of our readers who, having been struck with Mr George's remarkable theories, and also somewhat puzzled, desire to see the other side of the question fairly and calmly argued. Mr Mallock gives full credit to Mr George for the skill with which he states his case, and indulges in no vituperation; but he mercilessly deals with all his main positions, and points out the fallacies on which his arguments are founded. He speaks of him as an "unselfish philanthropist," as "the friend of the poor and not the enemy of the rich," and adds, "Morally, therefore, he fully deserves a hearing; and our condemnation of his doctrines, though it will certainly not be softened, will at least be accompanied by a certain respect for himself. . . . Gross as his errors are, they are the errors of a vigorous thinker; and he falls into delusions which most men would escape from from pursuing arguments that most men would be blind to.

In proceeding to answer Mr George's arguments he deals with them under five heads, which he states are the author's main propositions. Firstly, as the production of wealth grows greater the share that goes to the labouring class grows less; secondly, the labouring class creates its own wages as it receives them, it being wholly false that wages are drawn from capital; thirdly, population does not increase faster than do the means of subsistence, and thus the current explanations of poverty are no explanation at all; fourthly, poverty really is caused by the appropriation of land by individuals; fifthly, poverty would be cured by the confiscation of land by the State. As to the first point, Mr Mallock says (p. 78) that "all who have studied the subject carefully are

unanimous in declaring that it is wholly untrue. The poverty that underlies civilisation is no doubt a terrible evil; it may easily develop into a dangerous one; but so far is it from being *relatively* an increasing evil that there is every reason to believe it to be somewhat diminishing; whilst as to the middle classes, instead of being destroyed by modern progress, they are, on the contrary, its special and most evident product." In regard to the relation between wages and capital, and to the Malthusian theory of the pressure created by increased population, Mr Mallock, we think, very conclusively shows that Mr George misstates the problem, and thus entirely misleads himself by his own illustrations. Scarcely less conclusive is our author's exposition of the effect of making every occupier a tenant of the State, and he maintains with much force that under such a *regime*, "in the long run, so far as the general public are concerned, the evils Mr George complains of would remain wholly unaltered; that rents would be no lower; land no easier to get; and that the beggar might go houseless in the streets, exactly as he does now"—(page 69). We cannot in the brief space of one article reproduce all Mr Mallock's arguments; our desire is rather to attract attention to the book itself, which also contains several other papers with regard to socialistic theories, and one especially interesting on the "Statistics of Agitation." From this latter paper we make one or two extracts of figures bearing on the main positions of Mr George. The writer shows (page 211) that "in proportion to the increase of the population as a whole the class with incomes between L150 and L300 has increased during the past 30 years by 148 per cent., the class with incomes between L300 and L600 by 130 per cent., the class with incomes between L600 and L1000 by 77 per cent., and the class with incomes above L1000 by 76 per cent.," and he further shows that while the average of each increase in the lowest class is greater, the average of each increase in the higher class is actually less. Then with regard to the distribution of the land, he shows (p. 215) that the landed aristocracy, all told, number about 5000. Just below them come 4800 owners with estates that average 700 acres. Then come 32,000 with estates that average 200 acres; then 25,000 with estates that average 70 acres; and then 72,000 with estates that average 20 acres—the total number of the smaller proprietors being thus not less than 133,000, while the urban proprietors, with their quarter acre and the suburban proprietors, with their four acres, number no fewer than 820,000. The gross rental of England is about ninety-nine million pounds, and of this only thirty millions goes to the aristocracy, while those owners in England and Scotland who own estates of less than 50 acres enjoy a rental greater by four millions than the whole agricultural rental of both countries 30 years ago. He further shows (p. 225) that of the whole annual income of the United Kingdom—some twelve hundred millions—only one-eighth in all represents rentals of land, and only one-twenty-fourth rentals enjoyed by the landed aristocracy. If such figures are carefully considered, it will be seen how enormously the evils of landlordism have been exaggerated by Mr George, and that if he wants a redistribution of wealth he cannot possibly stop at the ownership of land, but must attack the profits of trade as well. We assume the correctness of Mr Mallock's figures, since he quotes the highest statistical authorities, and has himself too high a reputation to imperil it by careless statements which could easily be refuted. Taking them together, the papers contained in the volume from which we have quoted are at least valuable contributions to the controversy, and the onus now lies on the disciples of Mr George to refute this refutation.

John O'Groat Journal,

October 7, 1885.

Lecture on New Zealand.

LIFE ON THE GOLD FIELDS.

MR R. C. REID delivered a public lecture on the above subject, in the Temperance Hall, on Friday night last. Notwithstanding that the night was boisterous, the hall was full to the door. Mr Reid was accompanied to the platform by Provost Rao, Builies Dunnet and Bruce, Dean of Guild Brims, Councillors Adam, Geddes, Sutherland, and Ross; Mr John Scott, of Geelong, Victoria; Mr Laing, S.S.C., Edinburgh; Mr W. Peterson Smith, solicitor; Rev. Mr Renny, Messrs J. H Buik, J. T. Reid, and Andrew Louttit.

On the motion of Bailie Dunnet, seconded by Councillor Adam, the Provost took the chair.

Provost Rae said he had much pleasure in introducing Mr Reid, who had returned to his native town after an absence of 28 years. Taking advantage of his presence in the north, a number of citizens had asked him to give a public lecture on New Zealand, in which colony Mr Reid had vast experience as a journalist and legislator. He felt sure they would heartily welcome him on his visit here, and accord him an attentive hearing. (Applause.)

Mr Reid, who was loudly applauded on rising, said that having been asked by a number of citizens of this

town to deliver a public lecture on the Colony of New Zealand, where he had resided so long, he had much pleasure in acceding to the request. It was now particularly gratifying to him to be favoured with such a large assemblage of ladies and gentlemen of his native town, amongst whom he could see some, who were wont, in childhood's days with himself, to literally "paddle in the burn and pu' the gowans fine." While it was observable that many of the ancient landmarks in the town and county had been carried away, he could yet see around him, after an absence of 28 years, some of the old familiar forms and faces, upon the heads of whom time had laid his frosting brush, and others, once schoolmates, who now, with himself, were showing signs of fast approaching eventide. With an audience comprising such component parts, he had no hesitation in saying he felt at home, and he felt assured any shortcomings on his part would be overlooked by them he had selected as the subject of his lecture one of the phases of colonial life, and that one with which he was best acquainted, namely, "Life on the Gold Fields." He would confine himself to the magnitude and importance of the gold mining industry, and to the social habits and customs of the miners, and to the great value to be attached to the colonial gold fields generally, and more particularly to the colony of New Zealand. Gold mining had become one of the most important industries of the world. He contended that a party of miners producing any given quantity of gold from the earth did more real good to a community than any similar body of men in other occupations, because they had added to the working capital of the nation. He showed how England, as being the concentrator of the gold raised in the colonies, had benefited thereby in its trade, commerce, and manufactures. It had been estimated that over one thousand millions sterling had been produced by the gold mines of the world since the discoveries in 1849. During the past thirty-five years the Australian colonies, including New Zealand, had contributed over £300,000,000. New Zealand alone had exported to England, up to 31st March last, £41,634,507. Speaking of the social habits of the miners, he said they were, as a rule, a most intelligent class of men. They read a good deal, particularly newspapers and periodicals, and took great interest in the political affairs of the country in which they resided. The utmost order and respect for person and property now existed all over the gold fields. Miners liberally contributed to local hospitals, benevolent societies, churches, and many social institutions, not by coppers but by shillings and pounds. For over a quarter of a century, he (Mr Reid) had never seen a copper coin on the gold fields, sixpences being the smallest coin in currency. The very nature of the occupation of gold mining, at times tended to imbue the miner with a spirit of recklessness and extravagance. This spirit of recklessness was much worse in the early days of the gold fields than it is now. At the rushes of Bendigo and Ballarat, gold was at first so easily obtained that a succession of unusual strokes of good luck was immediately followed by unprecedented extravagance. But those lucky days, he feared, were gone, likewise most of the lucky men:—

*"For Sydney Ned, and Derwent Bill, and Murrumbidgee Joe;
Where are they now? All, mate, they'll drive no more to Bendigo!"*

These two lines were quoted from his friend Mr Thomas Bracken, who had been designated, and not undeservedly, "New Zealand's poet." Mr Bracken happened to be in Bendigo when a lad, and he had graphically described various scenes there. One was when Murphy's team got bogged, and when

*"Big Barney shouted—while the wheels were bedding low—
Faix boys, there's some good sinking, on the road to Bendigo."*

The poem was too long to quote, but the story was supposed to be told by a digger in later years, whose concluding couplet ran as follows:—

*"I feel a spider on my cheek—I've caught the varmint—No!
"Why, bless me! if it aint a tear, for dear old Bendigo."*

But he would ask his audience to accompany him to some of the more recent gold mines, to later El Dorados he had witnessed spring up like mushrooms, most of which have remained permanent fields of labour to the present time. He referred to such fields as Maryborough, Dunolly, Inglewood, Ararat, Pleasant Creek, Avoca, Bed Bank, Moonambel, and Majorca in Victoria; and later still Hokitika, Grey mouth, Westport, Reef-town, Kumara, and Rimu. Living in the heart of the Australian and New Zealand gold fields, for twenty-six years, he had had ample opportunities of studying the various characteristics of a digger's life, and he felt bound to say that gold mining was one of the most legitimate, honest, and honourable occupations that a

man can follow. The life was one that encouraged and fostered an independence of character unknown by any other class of labour. It was an occupation which invariably insured a good living, to say the least, with the hope and possibility of becoming prosperous and wealthy. At the outbreak of a new gold field, the great drawback to universal success was, that the more gold obtained the greater became the wants of those who obtained it; that was, that miners as a rule insisted upon living well up to their incomes, whether the incomes were calculated on so many pennyweights per week, or so many ounces. "Easily got, readily spent," was a term very applicable to mining pursuits. He then related numerous instances illustrative of this. One story told was that of a "hatter," which he explained was a mining term for a miner who worked single-handed without any mates. This "hatter" was a regular customer of the bank in which he (Mr Reid) held an appointment in Maryborough in the year 1860. Nearly every Saturday he presented for sale quantities of gold varying from one to two ounces. [unclear: This] miner's ounces instead of one meant a pound note extra to the "M'lvor" hotel and the "Bull and Mouth" opposite, with a like amount to Spooner's green cloth table. This went on for months, until one day he presented a nugget weighing over 300 ozs. He fixed a round thousand pounds in the bank, and spent the balance in what he called a "fly round." Years afterwards he met the same miner in New Zealand, with a light heart and a lighter purse. He had worked in the same spot and in hundreds of others since in the hope of meeting with another "stranger," but he was wont to quote from Hamlet wittingly and say, "I shall not look upon his like again." He would wisely moralise that it was better for his constitution and longevity of life that he didn't find another. Stories of much greater luck than this had been recorded of the discoverers of the "Welcome stranger" nugget at Dunolly, which yielded 2268 ozs. of pure gold, of the "Welcome" nugget at Ballarat, weighing 2166 ozs., and of the Kingour nugget, which yielded 1743 ozs. He contrasted these stories of good luck with one or two tales in the opposite direction. There were many slang terms applicable alike to misfortune, such as "doing a perish," "off the lead," "outside the run," "duffered out," and so forth. It had been his fate, alike with many others on the goldfields, to have "done a perish" more than once in gold-mining. Once he recollected joining an unlucky quartette of speculators, which included, as it happened, an Englishman (Mr H. L. Robin son), an Irishman (Mr W. Evans), a Jew (Mr M. Pollock), and a Scotchman. They held about a thousand shares each in a claim known by the name of "The Caledonian" at Reefton. So if there was any advantage at the baptism of the claim it was on his side. They had two small but magnificent crushings, which yielded about eight ounces to the ton, and gave them a shilling per share dividend on each occasion. Two of the parties, to his recollection, separately or conjointly entered into minute calculations at a directors' meeting as to their respective wealth in seven years from the receipt of the first dividend, based upon a shilling per month for the whole time, with compound interest. A very nice picture it made on paper! After the second dividend, however, they got "off the lead," and so great was their faith that they paid calls in place of receiving dividends, uninterruptedly for over ten years. That was a proper illustration of a "mining perish." Three out of the four still hold the scrip. The shares, which were once eagerly sought for by the share-brokers at 40s a piece, were, he believed, unsaleable at the present moment for a pound of salt or a good red herring. (Laughter.) The fate of that claim, and of another in Victoria, called by the name of "The Caithness Company," has convinced him that the land of cakes, however captivating as "a meet nurse for a poetic child," had but little charm over other countries in furnishing an infallible name for a rich and permanent gold mine. The excitement at the first of a new gold mining rush was intense. The residents of Wick might imagine they could form some slight estimate, from the annual increase to their population in July, of what commotion is caused by a sudden influx of people. But the finding of large quantities of gold carried with it greater excitement than the landing or curing of the very heaviest takes of fish. He had seen twenty, thirty, and even forty thousand inhabitants congregated, where stood nothing but a barren wilderness a few weeks previous. On several of the gold fields he had named in Australia, and likewise those of later dates on the West Coast of the Middle island of New Zealand, the golden fever raged intensely. The lecturer then described at length the two classes of mining, known as alluvial and quartz mining, and related numerous interesting incidents in connection with the rushes on the West Coast of New Zealand, from 1865 upwards, quoting passages from his recent publication entitled "The Golden Coast." Leaving the alluvial diggings, he asked them to accompany him on a Saturday night to Reefton in its earliest stages. This was the centre of a large quartz district, where the scrip mania was in full force. The excitement in brokers' offices and under the verandahs was intense. Crowds were congregated in the main street, and not a word was heard but scrip, scrip, everywhere. The temptation to speculate became positively irresistible, when it was no unusual occurrence to witness the most veritable "now chum," with possibly a better acquaintance with pewter quarts than golden quartz, converting a few five pound notes into as many hundreds between the rising and setting of the sun. There was probably no other industry in which so much money could be quickly and irretrievably wasted through ignorance and extravagance, as there could be and had been in attempts at gold mining. A proper knowledge of gold mining could only be acquired by long practical experience and intelligent application. There were two methods of conducting gold mining operations—the legitimate and illegitimate methods, both of which he described. An old friend of his came up to him yesterday and said, "I suppose you'll

be recommending us all to go to New Zealand, and take to gold mining." Far be it from him to venture upon any such wholesale advice. To those who are contented with their lot in this part of the country, let them by all means here abide, for it is a wise maxim that "contentment was great gain." But this much he would venture to say, that the colony of New Zealand, in its industry of mining alone—and there were dozens of other industries to which he might refer—opened a grand field of enterprise for industrious young men to strike out a path for themselves. No intelligent young man, with a will to work, with a good-constitution, and possessed of pluck and energy, need fear not meeting with success in that colony. When he spoke of mining, he of course referred more particularly to working men. He mentioned that the Westland County Council, according to the papers to hand by last mail, had passed regulations offering most liberal inducements to prospecting for gold in their large and undeveloped territory, by way of subsidies to prospectors and rewards for new discoveries. Although the subject of his lecture, in regard to New Zealand's industries, had been circumscribed to that portion with which he had been best acquainted, he trusted no one would go away with the impression that gold mining is the only industry which presents itself to public attention in the promising colony he had referred to. He mentioned briefly dozens of others, and enlarged upon the subject of fisheries, a report of which we hope to publish next week. When referring to this subject, he thought he ought not to omit mentioning the name of a pioneer and hermit named Sutherland from this town who, amongst many other efforts, attempted to establish a fishing company at Jackson's Bay. His attempt in this way, however, was not successful for want of capital. Sutherland had frequently assured him if a small amount of capital had been within his command, or combined labour had been available, that his fishing mission would have proved an undoubted success. As it is, his name was worthy of mention as a hardy pioneer of a new country, who has suffered great privations for a long series of years in [unclear: image not readable] on almost untrodden territory, which contains, there was little doubt, immense stores of undeveloped mineral wealth. It would not surprise him to hear, at any time, that in the southern part of the West Coast, to which he had so frequently referred, another great rush had set in, through the instrumentality of such plucky pioneers as Sutherland of Wick. (Applause.) After referring to the rates of wages in New Zealand, and to the land regulations existing there, he concluded by saying that he believed New Zealand was one of the most promising countries in the universe. It was a new country, presenting great facilities to men of every nation. None perhaps had been more successful there than their own countrymen, the Scotchmen, for they might be found in abundance, some regulating the colony's largest financial and commercial enterprises; others, for years, were to be seen at the head of its provincial institutions; and others again were in charge of the already large and fast increasing sailing and steamboat fleets of the colony; while at the present moment—and he felt proud to say this in the north of Scotland, a Shetland lad (the honourable Robert Stout,) was at the political helm, framing its liberal laws, and shaping its future destinies. (Loud applause.) In fact, Otago where the Premier usually resides, was originally a Scotch settlement. Of that province it has been written:—

*Oh! noble prospect! rich romantic land,
Awake! awake! thou canst no longer sleep;
Thy praise is heard afar; a sturdy band
Of Scottish pilgrims cross the restless deep
To claim thee as their own. Look! on the sea
Their snowy sails are dancing in the sun;
They reach the shore—thank God, for them and thee
The building of a nation has begun."*

They were the first to establish and build Dunedin, which now holds a prominent place among the cities of the southern hemisphere. Their noble efforts were greatly assisted by the golden pioneers, whose approach gave instant impetus to all commercial pursuits. Then came the echo to the Caledonian cry, "Gang Forward."

*"The new Edina, filled with fresher life,
Shakes off the calm that wrapped her in its fold.
Her fame is told afar—to Fortune's strife
Bold hearts are summoned by the cry of "gold."
They come, they come, the rough but gen'rous throng,
Bearded and brown, from Austral's sunny coast;
They come with gladsome shout and joyous song,*

*They come a stalwart, free-and-easy host;
From every clime, of every race, are they,
Not faultless all, but in the main still true;
No warmer hearts e'er dwelt in human clay
Than beat beneath those shirts of red and blue.
Otago never, never should forget
The men that gave to her the golden years
That spurred her on; we all still owe a debt
To those brave hearts—the Golden Pioneers."*

Often having echoed the well-known recital from Scott, with numbers of his countrymen at the antipodes, whilst speaking of this, our native country—

*"Breathes there the man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!"*

Might he not here, in like manner, though in reverse ratio, after "wandering on a foreign strand," be permitted to quote from their antipodean poet, on behalf of their adopted country—a country blessed with summer skies, and more generous soil, where dwell a people undisturbed by the frown of the factor, free from all terrors of landlordism—(applause)—and ever ready with a true Highland hospitality, in a land of beauty full of goodly promise, a new and brighter Scotland!—and say—

*"Guard Pacific's triple star
From the shafts of strife and war,
Make her praises heard afar,
God defend New Zealand!"*

At the conclusion of the lecture the applause was most hearty and prolonged.

The Rev. Mr Renny, in moving a vote of thanks to the lecturer, said that this magnificent audience was witness to the interest which the inhabitants of Wick took in her sons, who had gone to distant parts of the world and had worthily represented them. They watched their career with pride and rejoiced to see and hear them on their return. They had their reward that evening in the exceedingly interesting and instructive lecture to which they had listened. He regretted that he had not been able to be present at its commencement, and as he entered the hall he heard such a description of the gold fields that he was afraid lest some who had not visited the colonies, for old colonists like himself were not so ready to be misled, might imagine that all they had to do was to go to the isles of the Pacific and pick up guineas on the streets, or put their hands into the lucky bag of the New Zealand gold diggings and draw out a nugget. It recalled to him a story of his school days entitled "Whang the Miller." Whang dreamed one night that there was a gold mine beneath his mill, and next morning he set to work and took down his mill. He destroyed his means of living, but did not find any gold. As the lecturer proceeded, however, it was evident that in the land of his adoption as here, it was the hand of industry and well directed and intelligent enterprise that gained the day, although a few, as in gambling, might be fortunate prize takers. Mr Reid had carried with him a cultivated intelligence and an observant eye, and he was a well informed and reliable witness to the opportunities New Zealand offered to workmen of various classes, who had character and industry to realise a competency and raise themselves in the scale of society. He had much pleasure in moving a vote of thanks and would not destroy the effect of the lecture, and especially the peroration by further remarks.

Mr Andrew Louttit begged to second the motion that a hearty vote of thanks be accorded to Mr Reid for his very interesting and admirable lecture on New Zealand. Having listened with the "greatest attention, and happening to know something about many parts of New Zealand upon which Mr Reid had spoken, he was pleased to hear such a lucid and correct description of life on the gold fields. He could fully substantiate and corroborate every word that had been uttered. He considered it very fortunate that a gentleman like Mr Reid, an old colonist, (though young in years) and a fellow townsman should have returned to the old country able to give such a stirring and graphic account of colonial life, and to give us such a vast amount of very interesting

and useful information about that important colony. New Zealand, although far removed from Great Britain, being 16,000 miles off, had a large and increasing trade with Britain, and also a largely expanding trade in the southern hemisphere, which we here in the northern hemisphere know little of. It had a large trade with India, China, Japan, the Fijis, and in fact with all the islands in the South Pacific Ocean, as well as its extensive and growing trade with North and South America from Oregon and San Francisco in the north to Lima and Valparaiso in the south. It had several lines of sailing ships from this country, and has actually now two lines of large and magnificent steamers which make the voyage in 40 to 45 days. He would urge upon Mr Reid, should he return to his adopted country and enter again the political arena, that he will do all in his power to get the high tariff reduced, so that we can send them our manufactures at a lower rate, and if that were the case, our manufacturers at home would be enabled to raise the price of labour to the [unclear: image not readable] pause.) He also hoped that when the great scheme of federation of all the colonies which our worthy and esteemed nobleman the Earl of Rosebery is so anxious to bring about, comes to be discussed in the different Legislatures out there, that Mr Reid will give it his hearty support. Mr Reid has written a book on the gold fields of New Zealand, the first issue of which is entirely disposed of, and which entitles him to rank as one of the first of colonial authors. He had been largely connected with the press, so that he is, he might say, doubly qualified after such long and varied experience, to deliver such an excellent lecture as they had heard. He felt sure they would all cordially join in passing a hearty vote of thanks. (Applause.)

Mr Reid suitably acknowledged the compliments paid him, and felt much gratified at the hearty reception which had been accorded him. He proposed a vote of thanks to the Provost for occupying the chair, after which the meeting dispersed.

Divine Aid in War.

To the Editor of the Express and Star.

SIR,—May I ask you to print in juxtaposition the subjoined prayer recently published by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the following two extracts from the works of an illustrious writer, whom I am sure your readers will recognise.—I am, &c.,
Cassius.

O Almighty Lord God, King of all kings, and Governor of all things, that sittest in the throne judging right: we commend to Thy Fatherly goodness the men who through perils of war are serving this nation, beseeching Thee to take into Thine own hand both them and the cause wherein their country sends them. He Thou their tower of strength, that, armed with Thy defence, they may be protected through all dangers, to glorify Thee, who art the only giver of all victory. Grant also that we may evermore use Thy mercy to Thy glory, to the advancement of Thy kingdom, and the honour of our Sovereign; seeking always the deliverance of the oppressed, and, as much as lieth in us, the good of all mankind, through our only Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

How in our troubles and griefs the gods are always called in question. When our pride, our avarice, our interest, our desire to domineer, are worked upon, are we not for ever pestering Heaven to decide in their favour? In our great American quarrel did we not on both sides appeal to the skies as to the Justice of our causes, sing *Te Deum* for victory, and boldly express our confidence that the light should prevail? Was America right because she was victorious? Then I suppose Poland was wrong because she was defeated?

Is it Fate that awards successes and defeats? Is it the Just Cause that ever wins? How did the French gain Canada from the savage, and we from the French, and after which of the conquests was the right time to sing *Te Deum*? We are always for implicating Heaven in our quarrels, and causing the gods to intervene, whatever the *nodus* may be. Does Broughton, after pummelling and beating Slack, look up a black eye to Jove, and thank him for the victory? And if ten thousand boxers are to be so heard, why not one? And if Broughton is to be grateful, what is Slack to be?

Correspondence.

The Jury System.

To the Editor of the Midland Evening News.

SIR,—A fertile subject for discussion is supplied to lawyers and students of social science in the operation

of our jury system, and the difficulties of working it which arise from the general disinclination to serve on juries. This reluctance, gentlemen of the long robe are, for the most part, unable to account for, though we conceive that a little personal experience as jurors might considerably enlighten them. Theoretically, a jurymen represents the judicial opinion of the community, just as a member of Parliament does its political opinion; and, in point of fact, the jurymen discharges some of the very highest duties of citizenship. The property, the reputation, and even the lives of his fellow subjects stand on his verdict; and he is bound under the most solemn obligations to the exercise of insight, discretion, intelligence, and integrity. One might, therefore, perhaps not unreasonably assume that such functions would afford some title to respectful consideration; and, indeed, so far as mere words go, jurors generally have little, reason to complain. The charges of judges are, in their way, models of courtesy, though when compared with the actual treatment dealt out to jurors, they sound little better than a mockery. Relegated to the custody of a sheriff's officer or "bobby;" thrust into a room which is too often cold, bare, dark, dirty, and cheerless, their position is only, perhaps, one degree preferable to that of prisoners under trial. How, therefore, can it be a matter of surprise that aspirants for such treatment are few, and that a fine is regarded as the lesser evil?

But the mere discomfort to which jurymen are subjected is a trifle compared with the intolerable and seemingly reckless manner in which their time is wasted. It may be a matter of ascertainable certainty that a case will not be reached until hours, or even days, after the opening of the court. Still the attendance of the jurors is insisted on from the first. Then again, punctuality is expected from jurors, and if late they are liable to be fined. But who ever knew of an instance of a judge taking his seat at the prescribed hour? If anyone, then his experience has been pleasanter than mine; for, whether attending as suitor, witness, or juror, I have always had to endure a waste of time ranging from half an hour to an hour and a half. To judge from what usually takes place one would infer that punctuality was incompatible with the dignity of the bench—a species of condescension out of place as applied to "all sorts and conditions of men." Yet this homely virtue is deemed "politeness" in kings; and, if so, may surely be accepted as a plain duty by everybody else. Employers rigorously insist upon its observance by those in their service; and it is hard to see that it is any less obligatory on the part of public servants towards that public which employs them and pays them. The time that each individual jurymen, suitor, or witness is compelled to waste in awaiting the judge's arrival is as valuable to him as his honour's time is to the judge—indeed, possibly more—for the judge's salary goes on whether he is late or early, whilst the business of private individuals often declines to conduct itself properly during their absence. But there is another, and a still more important aspect of the case, for the loss of one hour's time to fifty men is practically equivalent to one man's wasting fifty hours, which represents a particularly good week's work. If, therefore, we suppose 100 persons on an average to be in attendance on a court, it results that every half-hour by which the judge is late represents an entire week wasted to the community, or that the daily wage of one man is destroyed by every five minutes of needless delay. Englishmen, however, are proverbially a long-suffering race, and the fact of abuses having long subsisted is too often accepted as a sufficient justification for continuing them for ever. Still, I cannot but think it befitting that decent accommodation should generally be provided for jurymen, and that persons having to attend courts should be protected against all avoidable waste of time.

—I am, &c.,
Cassius.

The Evening Star

Friday, November 6, 1885.

The Government's Immigration Policy.

THE last number of 'Hansard,' which has quite recently been published, contains a full report of the very interesting debate which took place in Committee of Supply on the immigration vote. The Minister for Immigration, Mr BALLANCE in explaining the intended purposes of the amount asked for, made a really excellent speech; and we can only regret that, if he expressed, as we must presume that he did, the opinions of the Cabinet, these opinions were not given more practical effect to than by the miserably insufficient sum proposed for appropriation. Including £10,000 for the introduction of crofters, which was struck out on a division, the total was only £30,373, inclusive of departmental expenses. The reduced vote taken—£20,373—was on the 15th of August, with the exception of about £5,000, either actually spent or

hypothecated in payments or liabilities on account of nominated immigration. It will be remembered that early last year the late Minister of Immigration, on the pretext of the state of the labor market in the Colony, suddenly suspended nominated immigration. The order was sent Home in a cablegram to the Agent-General; but at that time numerous engagements had been entered into to bring out persons for whom money had been paid in the Colony, and provision had accordingly to be made in the Estimates of the year to redeem those promises. Since then the Government have, it appears confined themselves entirely to immigration in the case of divided families. The general system of nominated immigration had been, as we have shown, abandoned; but where families had been divided, and there was a desire on the part of the head of the family in the Colony to bring out the members of his family, the nominations have been accepted. In the aggregate a very considerable sum was expended during the last financial year in bringing out nominated immigrant. The amount of money thus carried to account within that period was £60,082; and the expenditure, partly estimated and partly ascertained, from the beginning of the present financial year to the 31st August, was £8,885, whilst there were further liabilities to the extent of about £4,000 to be provided for, since the immigrants are still coming and old nominations cropping up. The long and short of it is that the Minister must have found himself with somewhere about £5,000 for such purposes of immigration, outside existing engagements, which the Government might design. It may be noted that the number of people introduced from the 1st April, 1884, to the 31st August, 1885, was 2,381 adults, and the passage money amounted to £31,795. The amount received for the same in the Colony was £3,048. The nomination money up to last year was £5 for each adult and £1 towards outfit. But when the system was brought to a close, except so far as divided families were concerned, the proportion of passage money to be paid in the Colony was raised to £7 10s for each adult in addition to the £1 for outfit. In thus restricting and throwing difficulties in the way even of this decidedly desirable kind of immigration, the Government, it must be conceded, only acted in accordance with the expression of opinion in Parliament, which fairly enough at the time represented a very general feeling among the working classes that immigration of any description would tend to glut the labor market and lead to a reduction of the rate of wages. Believing, as we do, from a careful consideration of the economic history of the colonies, as well as from the special circumstances of New Zealand, that no such results will accrue from judiciously-conducted immigration, we regret exceedingly that so narrow-minded a policy was adopted, and we are convinced that really good times are not to be anticipated until our population is materially increased. It should be the first object of New Zealand statesmen to bring this about in a manner which shall increase the vital energy and the material wealth of the Colony; and we need scarcely say that this cannot be done by the importation of unskilled pauper labor, or by swelling the numbers of artisans, who are already more than sufficient for the reasonable requirements of the country.

Mr BALLANCE, in the speech referred to above, expressed himself with much good sense. It must be conceded, he said, that the great want of the Colony was population, and "if they were to continue to execute public works on a large scale it appeared to him that they should provide for the introduction into the Colony of a constant flow of immigrants of the right class." What he meant by "the right class," he proceeded to say, was that class which was not to be found in the ranks of the unemployed, and was in request by capital. It would not be advisable, he thought, at any time to introduce artisans or any class of people who, instead of going out into the country, would stick to the towns; but, on the other hand, it was exceedingly desirable to bring in agricultural laborers of the right sort and single Women adapted for domestic service. "He believed they could, if immigration were confined to these classes, introduce into the Colony at least 3,000 people a-year without in any way increasing the number of the unemployed, without reducing the scale of Wages, and without injuring or impairing in any degree whatever the comfort of the working classes." He knew, he said, that there was a very strong prejudice against the continuance of immigration, but he thought it was the duty of men in public life to lead the people instead of being led by them. "He thought it was their duty to inform the people on this question, and show them that population was required for the country. The introduction of the right class of people into the Colony did not mean the depression of a class—the lowering of wages; it did not mean taking away from the people any of the comforts already enjoyed. On the other hand, in his opinion, if they introduced the right class, it would greatly add to the comfort of those people by increasing the general prosperity of the country." Mr BALLANCE proceeded to declare that they should introduce every year say 3,000 people, but should increase the amount of money to be paid on nomination to about half the cost of an immigrant landed in the Colony—namely, £10. There is nothing unreasonable in this, since it must be presumed that colonists who desire to bring out relatives or friends are doing fairly well, and should in most instances be able to pay the sum named; thus relieving the Colony to an extent which, in the aggregate, would be material.

We are not able in the present article to discuss with the thoroughness which the importance of the subject demands the scheme initiated by Mr BALLANCE for the introduction of small capitalists of the agricultural class. We may, however, say this much: it commends itself in principle, whilst doubts suggest themselves as to whether the proposed terms are sufficiently liberal and attractive to divert the stream of this class of

immigration from Canada and the United States. It is a great point, however, that Mr BALLANCE should so fully recognise, as he appears to do, his responsibilities; and we are inclined to believe that, as Minister for Immigration as well as of Lands, we have the right man in the right place. It is to be desired in the interests of the Colony that he should hand over the portfolio of Native Affairs to some one who understands them, and devote his whole energies to the departments of Land and Immigration.

Evening Herald.

The newspaper is the great educator of the nineteenth century. There is no force compared with it. It is hook, pulpit, platform, forum, all in one. And there is not an interest—religious, literary, commercial, scientific, agricultural, or mechanical—that is not within its grasp.

TALMAGE

Dunedin, November 16, 1885.

THERE is a phrase used by the Catholic Church to describe the state of mind of some persons which aptly characterises the attitude of the *Otago Daily Times* towards the Ministry. The phrase is "invincible ignorance," and, according to Catholic theology, there is hope in the hereafter for the person who is "invincibly ignorant," because he sins without knowledge. Of course if newspapers will employ as leader writers disappointed politicians, whose sole object may be office, no one can expect either fair or candid criticism of Ministerial actions. For months past—if not since they took office—the Ministry have had as one of their most persistent opponents the *Otago Daily Times*. Sometimes the paper appeared favourable to the Ministry; it even, on certain occasions, would go the length of praising some members of the Ministry; but there was always a "but" in the article, which was followed at no distant date with some faint praise or damning criticism. The last outburst of anti-Ministerial zeal has been in reference to the treatment of what is called the North Island Main Trunk Railway loan. Regarding it, the *Otago Daily Times* has waxed wroth, and it is lamentable to see a journal that has hitherto occupied a leading position in Otago so "invincibly ignorant" of the statutes passed by the New Zealand General Assembly. It says that if any portion of the North Island Main Trunk Railway loan is used for general purposes it "will be a breach of faith, and a violation of the *express will* of Parliament." A journal which makes such a statement is, to keep to our phrase, "invincibly ignorant" of what Parliament has done. Let us state briefly, what has been explained in more than one newspaper in the colony, how our loans have been managed. In 1882, when the three million and the North Island loans were both sanctioned, votes were taken for railways and other public works, and there was passed the same year a statute called "The Immigration and Public Works Appropriation Act," and in that Act—in its fourth schedule—the whole amount of the New Zealand Loan Act of 1882 was treated, to use the words of the statute, as "ways and means" to provide for expenditure "as detailed in the third schedule" of the Immigration and Public Works Appropriation Act; so that the Public Works Minister could treat, and did treat, the loan that was raised under the authority of the Act as moneys to be applied by him according to the general votes of Parliament. The money was not ear-marked, and the Auditor-general, in more than one memorandum, pointed out to Major ATKINSON that by passing a general Loan Act, ear-marking money, and immediately afterwards declaring, as the Public Works Act did, that the moneys are not ear-marked, was hardly treating Parliament fairly. In fact, we notice that our contemporary the *Evening Post* published the other day a copy of a memorandum from the Auditor-general, which we now reproduce:—

The Controller and Auditor general has had reason on former occasions to point out that much confusion has been introduced into the law by the appropriation of money, both by way of permanent Act and also by the annual appropriation he begs now to call attention to a statement attached, showing the sums appropriated by the Loan Act of 1882, which declares that the moneys raised shall be applied to the purposes specified in the schedule to the Act, "and to no other purposes what-ever," whilst the subsequent Appropriation Acts of 1882 and 1883 largely vary the amounts allotted by the Loan Act to each class of expenditure, I would also point out that the total sum appropriated exceeds the whole amount of the loan, together with the unexpended balance of the former loan—about £800,000.—(Sd.) JAMES EDWARD FITZ-GERALD.

And there are other memoranda written by the Auditor-General to the Treasurer so far back as 1875 which point out that the Audit Department will not allow expenditure on the authority of a Loan Act. Unless there is a specific appropriation over and above what appears in a Loan Act no money can be paid. In other words, suppose the North Island railway loan had been raised, the Ministry could not apply the moneys so raised to the making of the North Island railway. There must be an appropriation in addition before the Audit will allow the money to be spent. To say that the Ministry can do anything in reference to finance against the "express will" of Parliament is to say there is no audit control, and no honesty in the Treasury officers. The fact is that the schedule to the Loan Act of 1882 was entirely disregarded, and, to take Otago railways alone, there was no less

a sum than £214,200 of Otago Central money, £14,300 of Mararoa-Gore-Kelso, Switzers, and Seaward Bush railways; £5900 of Catlin's River, £2800 of Swift Creek, £8400 of Livingstone, and other small amounts that were not expended, though specially appropriated by the Loan Act. What became of the money? Of course the money was spent on other public works; and this was done in accordance with the "express will" of Parliament. Now all that is proposed to be done with the North Island Main Trunk railway loan is this: The loan will have to be raised, and when raised the money that has been expended and will be due on the North Island Main Trunk railway loan, some £150,000 or £200,000, will be repaid; that is, it will come into credit to the public works fund, and then if any money is required before another loan is raised by the public works account the loan will be taken temporarily to tide over the difficulty until a new loan is floated, That is all the Ministry propose to do, and that they can do by the "express will" of Parliament, for, in the Immigration and Public Works Appropriation Acts of 1884 and 1885, the North Island Main Trunk railway loan appears in the fourth schedule to those Acts, which enables it to be used for general ways and means for public works expenditure. We hope that no journal not "invincibly ignorant" will again say that anything proposed to be done is against the "express will" of Parliament. Indeed, to make such a statement is to cast an undeserved slur on the audit department of the Government. The question has been asked, however, is it necessary to raise the loan? Indeed, our "invincibly ignorant" contemporary says the loan is not wanted. In this it shows not only ignorance of Public Works Acts, but of New Zealand finance. The position is simply this: At the end of the year, if no more than a million and a quarter is spent, there will be in hand perhaps about six or seven hundred thousand pounds; but there will have to be large payments made in April, May, and June, and if they be at the same rate as in April, May, and June of 1884, when the ATKINSON Government was in office—and they will be heavy, because a considerable number of contracts will have then to be paid, as well as road-money, &c.—the result will be that most of this balance will be expended, say by the end of July or middle of August. Suppose Parliament has met and the loan were not raised, what is to happen? Ail public works expenditure would have to cease; because even if Parliament met in May, it would be impossible to raise the loan at once. Even to raise the loan in the month of September would be a great hazard, and might mean our raising the loan as a colony at a considerable discount. The safe financial thing to do, therefore, is to raise the North Island Main Trunk Railway Loan in the beginning of next year, and when Parliament next session authorises further borrowing, Parliament can by Act declare that the North Island Main Trunk Railway and also the three million loan moneys shall be restored. Where is the wrong in such a course of proceeding? We ask would it be financially sound or safe to leave the raising of a loan until Parliament met, with the probability—nay, with the certainty—that in midwinter all moneys payable out of the Public Works fund would have to cease, or else the colony to go at a considerable increase of interest and considerable expense to the banks for accommodation? And going to the banks for accommodation would mean this—that the banks would have to restrict their advances to our merchants, our manufacturers, and to our settlers, and that again would mean not only restricting commerce, but intensifying the depression and causing perhaps a great number of commercial failures. We do not think that any person who desires to criticise fairly the action of the Government can find any fault with their proposal to raise the loan; and we are glad to see that the *Evening Post*, representing, as it does, Wellington feeling—and Wellington has more interest in the construction of the North Island Main Trunk Railway than Auckland or any other part of the colony—says, in its article of Wednesday last:—"Ministers are acting prudently and wisely in providing against the possible occurrence of a most serious crisis, which would not only endanger the credit of New Zealand abroad, but bring about widespread ruin and dire distress within the colony if the loan was not raised." As for the hints, or rather the base insinuations, thrown out against the Government—that there is something behind which they wish to conceal, or that their expenditure has been greater than Parliament has authorised—these do not require notice, for they can only be made by persons "invincibly ignorant" of New Zealand politics and New Zealand finance, and of the routine which exists in dealing with Government moneys by the Audit Department.

The Evening Star

Monday, November 16, 1885.

Farewell, Sermon by the Rev. Dr Roseby.

At the Congregational Church; Moray place, last evening, the Rev. Dr. Roseby preached his farewell sermon to a congregation which densely crowded every part of the building. His text was—2 Corinthians, xiii., 2, Finally, brethren, farewell." We append some selections from his discourse:—

I have kept on the whole to the great broad lines of vital godliness and practical religion, The natural bent of my own mind has made my ministry rather practical than dogmatic. Indeed, the more theology I read the more I am disposed to emphasise the distinction between theology and religion, I formed the resolution very early in my ministry to preach the few things that I did really know—things that I did assuredly believe—and to leave the rest. The refinements of theology, the controversies of divines, the doubtful disputations which St. Paul so deprecates in the Epistle to the Romans—I determined to perplex the souls of my people with none of these things. And all my deeper and wider experience of literature and of men has had the effect of confirming that resolution. I might easily have bewildered you and gained a cheap reputation for myself by plunging into the doctrinal controversies of the churches; to show, of course, that all other definitions were unsound except that of my own school. I might have made this pulpit the mere echo of the popular cries and catchwords of the hour. But my horizon has been wide enough, I trust, to save me from the provincialism of thought which mistakes "the cackle of one's burg for the voice of all the world," and I have read history to better purpose than to be caught by every new Eureka. Besides, I dared not do that thing. I fear God, and I love truth too well to unloose my tongue in mere party or sectarian or polemical battlement. One cannot help the objects of controversy much by modestly saying "I do not know." Yet in half the fierce polemics of theology that is the wisest and truest answer one can give. It has always seemed to me to be a grave and serious thing to be a public teacher; and the most solemn of all teaching is that which concerns the soul and its God.

I have preached God as the Father of men. I have tried so to present Him to the conscience as to make the soul sensible of its sin; but so to present Him to the heart as that the child, however erring and sinful, might feel drawn towards its great and loving Father. I have not shunned to speak plain words concerning the vices and follies, the vanities and meannesses of the world. If any man here has found it possible to say of himself: "Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men are," it has been in spite of a ministry whose hardest words have been aimed (us those of Jesus were) against the sin of Pharisaism. At the same time it has been the joy of my ministry to preach to my brothers the unsearchable riches of Christ, the everlasting Gospel of God's forgiving grace. Christ Himself has been the central point of all; only, I have endeavored to preach Christ in the large, full sense of the New Testament presentation of Him. I have preached Him in the exceeding breadth of His commandment, in the many-sidedness of His teaching, its penetration, its wholesome sharpness, its reproof and tenderness, *each bestowed where most deserved and least expected*; the woe and warning; the mildness and sweet reasonableness of Christ. I have preached Him as the power of God, and the wisdom of God. I have preached Him as the Son of man. I have preached him in the nature and wonderfulness of His great atonement—"God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," and in the majesty of His long-suffering mercy, "not imputing unto men their trespasses." So have I preached Christ in the greatness and many-sidedness of His life and work. But "the well is deep."

Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts,
Thou Fount of Life, thou Light of men,
From the best bliss that earth imparts,
We turn unfilled to Thee again.

Thy Truth unchanged hath ever stood,
Thou savest those who on Thee call;
To them that seek Thee, Thou art good
To them that find Thee all in all.

Our restless spirits yearn for Thee
Where'er our changeful lot is cast,
Glad when Thy gracious smile we see—
Blest when our faith can hold Thee fast.

Then, turning to the Christianity of which Christ is the source and inspiration, I have preached a Christianity not formal or sacramental; not consisting in rite or ceremony, but inward and spiritual; yet manifesting itself as by the sacrament of outward conduct. And I have preached a Christianity inclusive of all sects, and of much beyond them—a Christianity *always* above them.

And from first to last I have sought to make the whole thing practical. I have spoken *freely* of many things often narrowly and mistakenly supposed to lie outside the sphere of the pulpit. I have spoken of money; of the tongue; of business; of home; of recreation; of the bearing of Christian principle, and of the Christian spirit, in all that belongs to the worker-day life of man.

Of all this to-night I put you in remembrance. You allowed me to lead and accompany you through a series of Old Testament studies, only now completed. And a most fruitful series of meditations we found in the events and characters reviewed. And I hardly ever had occasion to raise or notice a difficulty. Not but what there were difficulties of exposition enough if one had chosen to look for them or to make much of them. I never did make much of them either one way or another. My object was not to find *bones* for my people to gnaw, but meat on which for them to feed. And what we sought we found. Then we went together into "the green pastures and beside the still waters" of the Four Gospels—the great Biography! How interesting it was. It is wonderful. The Blessed Book only needs to be reverently read for men to discover how great and wise a book it is. How it throbs and pulsates with a divine life! How it breathes on every devout student of it its holy inspiration!

Of all this I put you in remembrance. There is a *futile* and there is a *fertile* method of using the sacred volume. I have tried to show how it can be used in a spirit of reverent freedom, so as really to feed and nourish the life of the spirit.

I cannot speak of these things without feeling how far short I have fallen of my own ideal and of my own purpose. To err is human. But I have honestly aimed at the highest well-being of my people; to turn the sinner from the error of his ways; to build up this Church in faith and holiness and love; to persuade men to the higher life; to "speak the truth in love"; to get God's will done on earth as it is done in Heaven.

But still, as one looks back, as one thinks of the greatness of the work, of one's own weakness and unwisdom, failure, and fault, the feeling that overwhelms all others is this: "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O Lord, for in Thy sight shall no flesh living be justified."

And now I bring all to a point in the closing salutation of this epistle.

Old friends, farewell. We have been long together in sunshine and in stormy weather. Our very differences in some cases, the very freedom of our friendship, has made it all the stronger—how strong I never knew till now. Keep the tie, and in the better land we shall find it unbroken still.

And newer friends, yet well-beloved—I grasp your hand as it were to-night, and bid you God speed. Hold on your way. Let the word of Christ (if I have ever spoken it) dwell in you richly in all wisdom. Let the spirit of Christ be in you to bring forth the fruits of righteousness and true holiness.

Ye Christian families, into whose inner circle I have ever been so warmly welcomed, whose sons and daughters I have received at the font of baptism, whose youths and maidens I have joined together in the bands of marriage, and the very dust of whose graves is sacred from the commingled sympathy of friendship—peace be with you! may the overshadowing wings of the blessed God encompass you! May the tender ties of family kindred never be broken either in life or death!

The reverend gentleman concluded with a fervent exhortation, of which the concluding sentence was: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith; quit you like men; be strong;" but balance all that with the next exhortation of St. Paul, contained in the line which immediately follows: "Let all your things be done with charity." Keep unbroken "the brotherly covenant" in Christ. "Finally, brethren, farewell; be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace, and the God of love and peace be with you. Amen,

The Evening Star

Wednesday, November 18, 1885.

Mr Buckland's Speech.

MR J. C. BUCKLAND was elected, it may be remembered, as a determined opponent of the then Government, and having assisted in placing the unfortunate coalition in office, afforded them, although with evident misgivings, a general support in 1884. We are not at all surprised that, as a reasonable man with some amount of political conscience, the member for Waikouaiti felt himself forced into opposition last session, although realising that the Premier was very popular in Otago on the grounds of an honorable past, whilst the Ministry were presumed by the constituencies in these parts to be representative in a greater degree of the South Island than any Ministry in recent years. In his speech on Friday evening at Waikouaiti, Mr BUCKLAND owned up to having been, in the initial state of his parliamentary career, influenced by such considerations; but he was obliged, he says, to throw these to the wind when the Government not only disclosed a mischievous policy, but

demonstrated that they had not the courage of their opinions, and swallowed their principles wholesale ill order to the retention of office. He makes, it must be admitted, a completely satisfactory explanation of his change of front; but he must, we should imagine, feel to some extent humiliated in having to make the avowal that the position he took up as a candidate was based altogether on a set of delusions. He has since discovered that Major ATKINSON is not fairly to be stigmatised as a political bugbear; that he has, in fact, served the Colony well for many years, and is that *rara avis* in these days of pseudo-Liberals and trading politicians, an "honest man! This does credit to Mr BUCKLAND'S discernment; but is hardly by implication complimentary to his former friends, for whose existence as a Ministry he is in degree responsible. The honorable gentleman is yet young in parliamentary life, and has already learnt by the teachings of experience a very useful lesson as to the necessity of thinking for himself. Had he done so when he came forward for Waikouaiti at the general election, he would never have talked the nonsense he did, retailing as indisputable statements of fact the calumnious misrepresentations of an unprincipled party, determined to grasp place and power by fair means or foul.

"It is never too late to mend," and the member for Waikouaiti has certainly mended his political ways in good time, and we must fain give him credit for an address in which sound principles are expressed in an effective manner and with practical application. Mr BUCKLAND has the business sagacity to see that the financial policy of Sir JULIUS VOGEL is bringing the Colony to grief, and that his ideas of unlimited borrowing and indefinite taxation cannot with either prudence or safety be entertained. He hits Ministers very hard when he compares their professions with the measures actually proposed, and taunts Mr STOUT with having declared at one of his election meetings that if he could not reduce taxation by at least £80,000 a-year he would consider that he was not fit to hold his place in Parliament. Calmly, however, as Premier, he became accomplice to the devices of the Treasurer, and is equally responsible with his colleague for the grinding tariff which was submitted to, and wisely rejected by, the House of Representatives; for the more than doubling the property tax, which he had denounced as altogether iniquitous; and for the enormous increase in the stamp duties, which are beginning to be felt as a 'grievous burden by the community. Mr BUCKLAND expresses the conviction, from which we have never wavered, that the way to make ends meet is not by raising additional revenue from taxation, but by real stern retrenchment—not the mere pretence at economy by which the earnest desire' of the House of Representatives has been again and again from time to time diverted. The ordinary public expenditure has, without doubt, outgrown the means, of the Colony, whilst the taxation, even previous to last session, was about as heavy as could well be borne. The Government, however, insisted on "piling on the agony." Borrow, tax, and spend are the solo principles on which their financial policy is based.

Mr BUCKLAND was extremely happy in his treatment of the question of Free-trade and Protection, which we believe him to be correct in asserting will have to be fought out at the next general election—at all events, in the town constituencies, where the manufacturing interest makes up by noise and agitation for the preponderance it lacks in numerical importance. The argument of the hon. gentleman displays breadth of view and logical acumen, and should, we think, be distinctly intelligible to the popular mind. New Zealand, he says in effect, requires, above all things, to be peopled, but people such as are wanted will not come if the Colony is not to be a land of cheapness and plenty. Whatever may speciously be; maintained to the contrary, it is demonstrable with almost the exactness of a mathematical truth that Protection raises prices all round, the working classes being necessarily the most direct and heaviest sufferers. The fact, which it seems so difficult to drive into some persons' heads, is well put by Mr BUCKLAND, namely, that imports are paid for by what is produced in the country and exported. Diminish the imports, and as a necessary consequence the exports will be proportionately less. This is a law of economics as certain in operation and apparently about as little generally understood as the precession of the equinoxes. The member for Waikouaiti has undoubtedly given the local advocates of Protection several hard nuts to crack, and we especially commend his remarks on the subject, which we published in our issue of Monday, to general attention.

The Premier at the Provincial Hall.

There was a very large meeting at the Provincial Hall last night, both the floor and the gallery being crowded there being in the latter a large number of ladies. On the motion of Mr J A. Harley, the chair was taken by Mr Haddow, who briefly introduced the Premier.

The hon. Mr Stout on rising was received with [*unclear*: loud] and continued cheers. He commended by saying that one of the most noted American writers had said that when two people met and talked together there were at least six people present. There were A and B; there were A's A and B's A.; and there were B's A. and A's B. Now he thought that much misunderstanding between politicians and colonists, and perhaps between politicians and pressmen might, be avoided by their meeting and talking together occasionally. At the request of several of their citizens he had met them that evening, when he had the opportunity of seeing a Nelson

audience, and they of seeing him and looking at the political position from his point of view. As they were aware, he had recently been addressing his constituents, and he had since been much amused by the criticisms his speech had evoked. For the first time he had learned that pressmen were thin-skinned, for he certainly had made them very angry. He was not altogether sorry for this as he thought it might do good, and in future perhaps the journalists who criticised would remember that there were other thin-skinned people besides politicians. Not only did he recognise the power of the press, but he admitted its great influence upon the welfare of a democracy, for without it they could have no pure government. On a late occasion he had pointed out the need of journalists being thoroughly equipped for their profession. That profession was one which should not be looked upon as a commission agency, into which business, it was once said, that the man who had broken down in overemployments, and had no credit, usually catered; but journalism should be entered upon only by those who held the profession in high esteem and were keenly alive to its duties and responsibilities. Had New Zealand always had such journalists they would have had better government in the past and better newspapers. In future he would ask the press to remember that if it criticised politicians, it must expect to be criticised in return. He was not on that occasion going to trench upon party politics, but he wished to carry his hearers with him while he talked on what he considered should be their colonial policy, for he thought they ought to be able to lay down some broad lines on which this should be based.

The Present Ministry.

He would first say one word as to the *raison d'etre* of the present Government. Why did they exist as a Government? Prior to the last session there was a feeling abroad that a change was necessary. Enterprise generally was dead, and in some districts the people had altogether lost hope, and it was felt that the Executive rather deepened than relieved the feeling of despondency, and therefore that there should be a change of Government. Whether this was so or not he would not say, but there was one thing he must say, that it was not good for a democracy to be trained to the belief that there was only one set of men that could govern it. The ancient Greeks knew better than that, for if in their day a man became too powerful or popular he was ostracised from political life and banished from Athens, for they thought that if he became too popular he weakened the Government. They should bear this in mind in this democracy and be careful not to train the young men of the colony to believe that there was but one set of men who could conduct its governmental affairs. He was not going to refer to the past or to any blunders of administration, but would merely say that when the Government took office they did so with a full sense of their responsibilities, and in the hope that the people too would recognise *their* responsibilities and assist them with their support. Finding that enterprise was so dead, upon what lines was his Government formed? They considered that the first thing to do was to inspire the people with hope, and encourage them to carry on the work of colonists. Their duty in this respect was not yet half accomplished but they had introduced certain measures which had already had the effect of awaking hope and enterprise, and even the people of Nelson had got up an enthusiasm over their railway line which had been dead for years past. They also recognised that too many industries had proved unprofitable, and they recognised it to be their duty so to stimulate enterprise that those who had failed in one might be induced to enter upon another, and thus to lead to the accretion of wealth which meant the promotion of happiness. Nor had they neglected social matters and reforms, and he was glad to say that one important measure, introduced originally by Mr J. C. Richmond, forgiving married women control over their property, had become law. Another very important Act was that giving workmen a lien on their work as security for their wages. But as he had said before, he did not wish to touch on party politics, but he would say a few words on democracy. A democracy they were and a democracy they must remain, and that they should always keep in view, for even if they had the will they had not the power to make the form of government anything else, the people must rule, and they must rule for the good of the people. But they must not shut their eyes to the

Besetting Dangers of a Democracy.

There were three dangers which beset every democracy:—(1.) The danger of war. (2.) The danger of the absorption of power into the hands of one man or set of men. (3.) The danger of the wealth, which should belong to the State, being absorbed into the hands of a few. These three dangers had beset every form of government the world had ever seen and they must not suppose that they were free from them, but it was their duty to lay down broad lines of policy, on which the people and statesmen of New Zealand should so conduct their actions as to make this a great nation with a strong and stable democratic Government.

The Danger of War.

This was a question with which Confederation was closely connected. The day dream of some of the

earliest settlers including Sir George Grey, who had shown great foresight in the matter, was that New Zealand should be a great centre of commerce and enlightenment in the Pacific; that to it should be sent the sons of the chieftains of the various Isles, who should be educated here and carry hence the torch of enlightenment to spread abroad the light of civilisation. It was with this end in view that the British Government had been asked to annex this and that island. Look too at the enormous extent and wealth of the Australian colonies. Was it to be wondered at if they were anxious to know who should be their neighbours? To genuine colonisation by the European Powers he did not object, but to the mere establishment of coal depots here and there it was time to offer resistance, for we should certainly become involved in European quarrels, and the seat of war would be transferred from Europe to the Pacific. With this terrible danger menacing us how could we be too earnest in our endeavors to avert it? Then again were we to have the convicts of Europe turned out near our shores and free to come to them when their sentences were expired? Whether they believed in the doctrine of evolution or not, all must admit that there was such a thing as heredity in crime, and that the children of the criminal, the drunkard, and the immoral were tainted with the vices of their parents. It was with a view to the prevention of this, and of the annexation of islands to be useful to the annexers merely in time of war that confederation was advocated, and Mr Service, the Premier of Victoria, was entitled to great credit for the position he took up in the matter, and the steps he took to ascertain the views of the various Australasian colonies.

So the Premiers met and agreed to a draft Bill which was to be submitted for the approval of the Colonial Parliament. This was a question which was very much misunderstood. The provision was that there should be a Federal Council established for Australasia to deal with certain questions specified, and also with others if referred to it by two Colonies. But whatever laws were made by the Federal Council were not to be enforced in any colony until approved by the Legislature of that colony. Unfortunately both the House of Representatives and the Legislative Council did not view the confederation proposals with much favor, apparently being fearful lest New Zealand should be deprived of some of her power and so the Bill was not passed. Since then some of the European nations had attempted to seize certain of the islands of the Pacific, and this brought him to the recent action of the Government with regard to

Samoa.

This has been recognised as an independent State by England, America, and Germany, but there existed in the country a dread lest Germany should annex it to which the people themselves were very averse. And here he would say that he had no objection to German colonisation. In New Zealand they had gone further than any other foreign nation, and had actually paid the passages of German emigrants to the colony. If Germany desired to colonise Samoa and would give it the power to enter into treaties of amity with us as fellow colonists, and so save us from all embroglios arising out of an Empire war, there could be no objection to her doing so. But Samoa was recognised as an independent State, and therefore ought to have the power to determine to what nation it should be allied. In that country even there were two parties, and, while on the one hand a petition was prepared for presentation to the Queen asking for union with Great Britain, on the other, they heard that a treaty for five years had been forced on the King by two German men of war, giving to Germany vast powers in connection with the government of the country, all this being quite inconsistent with the idea of independence. So the Government thought it was time to interfere in the matter, and they were prepared to send a steamer to ascertain the real feeling in Samoa with regard to annexation, but in order to avoid creating any complications between the Home and German Governments, they cabled to Lord Derby telling him their intentions, and saying that the steamer would sail in a given time unless he desired to stop her. His reply was that he could not permit the steamer being sent, but he had since then despatched a man of war to Samoa, thus affirming the proposed prosecution of enquiry by the colony. This explained the Hinemoa's recent movements. It was the duty of the Government to do all in their power to prevent the interference of any nation with the independence of a State in such close proximity to our shores, and this was what they had done. This position also had reference to the danger he had spoken of, of war and he put it to them whether it was not their duty, and the duty of the Government, who were but their servants, to be so kindled with enthusiasm at the bare possibility of war as to use every effort to prevent it from coming into the neighborhood, and to keep it at a distance until the dawn of that brighter day when some other means would be found of settling national differences than those in vogue now. (Loud cheers.)

The Absorption of Power.

The second danger to a democracy was the absorption of power into the hands of One or a few. Those who had read De Tocqueville and other writers of a similar stamp would know that nothing was more difficult than to fix the limits of central and local authority. This was a problem not yet settled in England, while in France it

was still a burning question, and yet people in the colony talked as though all that had to be done was to write a few clauses in a copy book and the whole thing was settled. In France the Central Government had its fingers in everything, and the result was that true liberty was emasculated. The problem had yet to be dealt with in New Zealand, and it would be well now to glance back a little at the history of the colony. Here they once had a system of local government, and he said without hesitation that they did wrong in abolishing the provinces, though that it was done with the highest idea of doing what was best he fully believed. But he did not think that abolition was first brought about in 1875. The first nail in the coffin of Provincialism was driven when the New Provinces Act was passed. They had not recognised the fact that for New Zealand a different kind of government was required to that which was adapted for Australia and England. New Zealand was colonised from different centres, and it was a good thing that it should be so for he did not believe in one town dominating and everything else being small. That the mainspring of action in those who passed the New Provinces Act was a desire for the welfare of the colony he willingly conceded and he hoped that he and others would always be averse to asserting that a man must necessarily be a bad one because they differed from him in politics. It was feared that if the Provincial system were continued there would never be any national life in New Zealand, and it was urged that the only way to create that national life was to have one strong Government, but in this he did not believe. There was national life in America in the great civil war, and it had been evoked under the system of State Legislatures; there was national life in Switzerland under the system of cantons, for the Swiss thought far more of his country than of his particular canton, and in New Zealand there would have been just as much national life had the provinces continued to exist, but they were abolished, and what was the result? Had the Government been wiser or better since then? Take the last Loan Act and see what the General Government were called upon to do in the matter of roads and bridges. Out of the million and a half authorised there were but £700,000 available for railways, and all the rest was to go for roads and bridges. Nearly £800,000! More than was voted for the purpose by all the Australian colonies put together! How could a little half million of people stand that sort of thing? It could not possibly continue, but so long as the General Government borrowed money to be expended by the local bodies there would be no care in the expenditure. They were not to hear of roads and bridges in the General Assembly after the abolition of the provinces except for the purpose of congratulation, but congratulation was scarcely the right word to apply to the tone in which they were spoken of now. This was a great difficulty that had to be met but the papers seemed to think that he ought to have been fully prepared with a remedy, and to have come down with a Bill of some 300 clauses. But the work was a far more serious one than could be undertaken at once. There had been too much demolition, too much abolition, and now they had to begin construction a far more laborious task. There would have to be an aggregation of the various local bodies, which would have to take over much of the work that now was done by the general body, for if they had fourteen, instead of seven Ministers, they could not manage the affairs of the colony and attend to local government as well. (Cheers.) This danger of absorption of power always met them, and it was the same in the days of the provinces, for they, like the General Government, were always endeavoring to get more power. But the people must learn to recognise that without local government there could be no true liberty, and this was one of the first things to be done before they could hope to lay the foundations of a really strong democracy. (Loud cheers.)

The Absorption of Wealth.

He now came to the third danger he had mentioned. It met them in America, it met them in England. Look at the social state of affairs in England. There wealth was increasing enormously, from 50 to 60 millions being added from year to year to the capital wealth. In painful contrast to this was the grinding poverty which had been so vividly portrayed in "The Cry of Outcast London." (Hear, hear.) Then in America there were on one side the Vanderbilts and Jay Goulds, and on the other the very depths of misery, the outcome of poverty. Could a democracy exist under such conditions, with immense wealth in one scale and such terrible poverty in the other? Was this to be the case in New Zealand too, and was our government here to end in such a result? Some people said that naturalists would tell you that you had only to look into the rivers, seas, and fields, and the same thing was to be seen there, that it was the law of Nature that there should be the same terrible struggle for existence everywhere, and that it was not to be driven out of humanity. He granted it, but on the other hand he was not a pessimist and he believed that much might be done to remedy it. And to begin with, they must recognise that certain things were given for the benefit of the people as a whole, for instance the air they breathed and the land on which they lived. (Cheers.) It was with this end in view that in 1878 he had advocated a land tax long before Henry George had written a line of his now celebrated work, indeed that author had since written to him for a copy of his speech on that occasion to aid him in his work. The land must be specially dealt with and the people encouraged to get as much out of it as possible. The question was no new one. It had obtained in the early days of Rome, and it had to be faced in England now. How was it to be dealt with? In two

ways; when the land was wanted it must be leased in small areas; and there must be a land tax, which should not affect the small farmers, but would touch the large land monopolists. (Cheers.) Unhappily that Act had been rejected, and even now he was in a minority in the House of Representatives on this question, but he warned them not to think that it was settled. Far from it, for every year the question would come up and grow in importance, for the absorption of the land by a few hands must be stopped. (Cheers.) Even in the last session—the "turbulent session" as it had been called—something had been done in the direction by Mr Ballance's Small Farms Settlement regulations, and by the further provision that when runs near settlement were cut up, one man should be allowed one run and no more, thus preventing the mopping up of large estates. This was something, but not nearly enough, and to education they must look further to stop this absorption. The thoroughly well educated man was a thrifty man, and at present there was a great deal too much drinking in the colony. It might be asked what could education do in reference to that? He would reply that the educated man had resources in himself, and could enjoy pleasures which others less fortunate could not obtain. The educated man might have his "fad"—that, he believed, was the journalistic phrase—but that "fad" was a pleasure to him, and so long as it was not a "fad" for drinking whisky, he would probably be a better man for it. He had an object in life, and what a boon that was to a man. What an advantage he had over the man who lived an aimless life. But the class of education he wished to see more encouraged was industrial education. He did not deny the good of a classical education to a man who had time to follow it up or of a literary education, but along with it there should be something else, something that would make their sons and daughters better men and women, by training them to work, and, whatever it might be, to teach them to regard it as the highest kind of work. The carpenter and the bootmaker could be brought to introduce his ideal into his work, and in this respect could education be turned to far better account. Let every young man be trained not to think that work was drudgery, or that the happiest life was to write a clerkly hand in a bank office, but to believe that the work at the carpenter's bench was of quite as high a class and quite as honorable as life in an office or merchant's room. (Hear, hear.) With this advice he would turn out a far better artificer, for he would believe that into everything he did there might be introduced something that would be a credit to him just as much as the ideas that were formed by the artist whose brush transferred them to his picture. Were every artificer inspired with such a high ideal as this there would be no more slop work, and far more honesty amongst us. In this direction he intended to try to get the present education System altered, and he hoped that those who had to do with the secondary schools would look ahead and see how they could assist in the matter, for he wanted to see some higher ideal among the young people than merely getting a classical education, something that would help to make them all better colonists, for this was one way to stop the absorption of wealth by the few. He wished to see thrift and temperance encouraged in every possible way but he did not believe in Major Atkinson's scheme of national insurance, as he could not approve of a compulsory poll tax in preference to a tax on property. The result of it, if adopted, would be to teach the people to look to the State for help when sick and out of employment. In every State that had a poor law the people were discontented. Once destroy the individuality of the people and teach them to look to the State and not to themselves, and the seeds of dissolution were sown in that State.

Charitable Aid.

The question of how to deal with the poor was a burning one and would have to be faced. The vote for charitable aid last session was £90,000, and that could not last, for it was impossible for the Government to go on paying at that rate. Then what was to be done? Poor they must always have, for some would be maimed in the struggle for life, while there were also weaklings to be cared for, who perhaps owed their state of dependence not to themselves but to their parents. That it was good to have the poor with us he fully believed, for it brought out all our best and kindest and highest feelings, and it taught us that we must not live for ourselves alone but for others, and if the poor could depend for aid upon those who had the means it would be better for both, the giver and the receiver, than that they should have to go to the State for a pittance, and he sincerely hoped that they would never see a poor tax in New Zealand. It was sometimes said "Look at that man; there he is rolling in wealth and never gives a shilling to the poor. Why not tax him, and so get hold of some of his money for those who want it?" That was all very well, and he should certainly like to get some of his money, but he believed that he was doing far more injury to himself than if he gave one tenth of his means to the poor. (Cheers and laughter). In everything we did there was a reflex action upon us and in doing good to others we were doing good to ourselves, while the mean and niggardly were laying up treasure where it was doing, and could do, no good to themselves or to anybody else.

Conclusion.

To avoid the absorption of wealth by a few and to lead to its distribution amongst the community they must

frame laws which would encourage thrift, encourage home industries, encourage co-operation amongst producers, and promote kindness and self denial. He had talked to them of the three dangers to democracy, and pointed out how they might be avoided, and he would now urge upon them that it was their duty so to avoid them. Among those before him there were many who came out as colonists, and others who were born here. What did they come out for? To make money, they might say, and quite right too. But he hoped that some of the older colonists had a higher aim than that. They had seen the social state of Europe and determined to come to a new land where there were no vested rights, or should he say vested wrongs. They had formed an ideal of a, new social state free from the evils of the older countries, and they had sought to attain that ideal. And the younger ones who were growing up here and to whom we must look for guiding the future policy of the country, what was their ideal? Was it not to see a prosperous colony from which all vice, all crime, and all immorality were stamped out? And this they might do by procuring a better system of education in every way, by promoting kindness of disposition and self-denial in all, by cultivating self respect, and strong individualism—and here was the blot in Major Atkinson's scheme. They must learn to be true to themselves and to respect both themselves and others, He did not believe in a community which would boycott a man because of his belief (loud cheering) but he would strive to create in all the strongest manhood and individualism. That was the way to make good men, and to make good men and good women was to make a great and a good nation. Let them cultivate friendship and good feeling, and justice—justice to the Maori, and justice to the European. If they would guard against the three clangers he had specified let them exercise their political functions with a due sense of their seriousness and importance, not swayed by beer on election days, not actuated by partisan feeling. Let them fully recognise their responsibilities, and remember that in exercising their political rights they were performing a solemn duty, and doing that which affected not only themselves and their families, but the destiny of the nation for perhaps fifty or one hundred years. Let them form this ideal of their responsibilities, and always keep before them the three great dangers against which he had warned them, and determine to do all in their power to avert them, and they would thus be doing their share towards producing a finer social life, and a finer type of manhood than the world had ever seen. (Loud and continued cheering).

MR. PITT said that he considered that the citizens of Nelson were under a very great obligation to Mr. Stout for addressing them on this occasion, when with so little time at his disposal he might well have excused himself from doing so. He had commenced by saying that he would not enter the domain of party politics, but in a deeply interesting and instructive speech he had laid before them his own views on questions deeply affecting the welfare of the colony, namely federation, local government, the nationalization of land, and education. No doubt his speech would be criticised throughout the colony, but, as he told his Dunedin constituents, he had devoted so much attention to public affairs, that he could afford to be criticised. To only one word in his speech did he (Mr Pitt) take exception. Mr Stout had said that his Government had tried to kindle enthusiasm throughout the colony, and they had succeeded in doing so *even* in Nelson. (Laughter.) Perhaps when he knew the people of Nelson better, as he hoped he would, he would recognise that, although it was the fashion to apply to this place the misnomer "Sleepy Hollow." the people here were wideawake enough when occasion required. He would propose a hearty vote of thanks to the Hon. the Premier for his excellent and instructive speech. (Loud cheers.)

MR. ROUT seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

The Hon. MR. STOUT thanked them sincerely for the hearty vote of thanks. He was not aware of the mistake which Mr Pitt had pointed out, but he supposed there might be occasionally a slip of the tongue as well as a slip of the pen (Laughter). He himself never did think Nelson sleepy, and he certainly should not do so after this evening. He wished to express his thanks for the kind reception he had met with, and the close attention bestowed upon his address. He might add that he had been thoroughly pleased not only with their city and its surroundings, but with the country where he had seen the settlers hard at work in their harvest fields and he hoped their reward might be great. He then proposed a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was carried and the meeting broke up.

The Otago Daily Times

Monday, November 23, 1885.

The Otago Daily Times

AMIDST the prevailing depression there are two or three bright gleams which, if they do not justify sanguine anticipations of an early return of a period of prosperity, at least afford elements of hope for the future. Foremost among these is the partial recovery which has set in at the current series of wool sales in London. An advance of 5 to 10 per cent., if maintained, is in itself of importance, but at this juncture the announcement is of

all the greater importance, inasmuch as it indicates that great as has been the increase in production the demand is overtaking it. Though the November sales are generally the best in the year, we could not have expected any improvement if stocks in the hands of manufacturers were heavy. We may infer from the fact that any advance at all has taken place that the previous accumulations have been, or are rapidly being, worked off. We do not see any ground to anticipate a rapid return to high prices, but it is something if the downward course of the market has been arrested. We may at least hope that the bottom has been touched, and that any change will be for the better. Another favourable circumstance is that the last sheep returns show that for the year ending 31st May last there had been an increase in the number of sheep in Otago of about 100,000. This shows that the export of frozen mutton has had the effect of stimulating breeding, and that so far from diminishing our flocks, it is helping to increase them. We suspect the returns from Canterbury and Hawke's Bay will be even more favourable, as there was greater scope for increase in those districts, and the previous year's returns showed a very substantial advance on those of 1883. It is probably not too much to say that in two years the sheep of New Zealand have increased by a million and a-half, besides the million or more of carcasses shipped Home. The recent reduction in freights will in some slight degree compensate for low prices in the London market, and at least has indefinitely postponed the runholders' last resource—boiling down. There are also some signs that the wheat market has reached its lowest. The world's supplies this year are estimated at a far lower figure than for several years past, and the shipments afloat at latest date were not more than a third of the maximum. We fully expect to see a rise of at least 10s a quarter before our next harvest is reaped. There are also, as we recently pointed out, many signs of revival on our gold fields. Some undoubted finds have been made in various parts of Otago and Southland which promise to give profitable employment to a good many men, and these have started others prospecting. It is only a question of time. The gold is there, and sooner or later will be unearthed, and will be a source of wealth to the Colony. The pressure of the lender on the borrower is one of our greatest evils, and must lead to great changes in the ownership of property, but ultimately it must have the effect of bringing down the rate of interest, and then, with prudent management, there will be a margin. We must in this respect get worse before we are better, but a remedial process is already setting in, and it is by no means an unmixed evil that land values have come down. It is well sometimes, while not disguising from ourselves the seriousness of our position, to look at the other side of the picture and estimate our resources fairly. These are undoubtedly very great, though we have discounted them so much by excessive borrowing. We believe it will take two years to pull us round, but a recovery in wool and wheat would do much to hasten the process.

Evening Herald.

The newspaper is the great educator of the nineteenth century. There is no force compared with it; It is book, pulpit, platform, forum, all in one. And there is not an interest—religious, literary, commercial, scientific agricultural, or mechanical—that is not within its grasp. TALMAGE.

Dunedin, November 26, 1885.

Otago University.

Presentation of Mr Macandrew's Portrait.

In the library of the University on Wednesday a full-length portrait of Mr James Macandrew, M.H.R., was presented to the Council on behalf of the subscribers by Mr John McLean. The Chancellor (Rev. Dr Stuart) presided. Among those present were noticed the following gentlemen:—Messrs W. D. Stewart, J. B. Bradshaw, John McKenzie, and J. Hislop, M.H.R.'s, Professor Macgregor, Hon. John Bathgate, Lieutenant Colonel Stavelly, Messrs G. Turnbull, J. Barnes, J. T. Mackerras, H. J. Walter, A. R. Ure, J. Sibbald, W. Stuart, D. M. Stuart, A. D. Lubecki, Colin Allan, W. M. Hodgkins, W. Hutchison, J. Gore, Robert Wilson, T. M. Wilkinson, J. Armstrong, A. Wilson, J. P. Jones, A. Mercer, and T. Bracken, Drs Alexander, Coughtrey, Macdonald, Scott, the Rev. Dr Salmond, Rev. Mr Borrie, and Captain Thomson.

The CHANCELLOR read apologies for absence from Professors Sale and Shand, Messrs V. Pyke, J. C. Buckland, and A. H. Ross (M.H.R.'s), Hon. Mr Shrimski, and Mr G. G. Russell. Professors Black, Ulrich, and Parker were also unavoidably absent.

Mr McLEAN said that on the occasion of the presentation of Dr Hislop's portrait to that university, more than two years ago, Dr Stuart, whose duty it was as Chancellor to acknowledge the gift on the part of the

university, suggested the desirability of forming a gallery of portraits of early settlers and others who took an interest in the great work of forming and promoting the educational institutions of Otago. Acting upon that suggestion, a number of gentlemen thought it would be a fitting and lasting recognition of the long and useful public career of Mr Macandrew, particularly in promoting the cause of education in this Province, to have a portrait of that gentleman placed in that gallery. They formed themselves into a committee with the view of giving effect to that idea. Their presence there that evening, and the portrait in front of them, testified as to how well the committee had carried out what they had undertaken to do he understood that this work had been executed by one who had not perhaps, up to this time, been well known, for he understood the artist was a young lady—Miss Sperrey—who had received her early art education in this city. He was very well sure from the specimen of her work they had there that she would be very well known hereafter he had been asked to come there that evening and make a presentation to that university of a portrait of Mr James Macandrew, to whose influence and exertions, both as Superintendent of the Province, and as a representative in the General Assembly of the colony the institution owed much of its present position, if not its existence. Why he should have been asked to do this he really did not know, for sure he was that he had little or nothing to do with helping on the institution or the procuring of that portrait, but the committee had thought proper to offer him that civility. That institution owed much to Mr Donald Reid, who had urged its claims in the matter of granting degrees. This right of granting degrees must be conferred upon the university, for the institution would not be what it ought to be without it. It was withheld when first asked for, on the alleged ground that the institution was not sufficiently organised or competent to exercise such a right, but the real cause for withholding it was a certain amount of jealousy on the part of other parts of the colony. The people of this province thought, wisely, that the best use they could make of a portion of the land that had been handed over to them to make provision for properly educating the rising generation. The land was as useful to the colony in this way as if it had remained in possession of the Crown, the only difference being that the support of our educational institutions was made a first charge on the proceeds of it. The colony could not without a breach of faith prevent them thus allocating the land, but it did what it could to prevent them completing their excellent system of education, by refusing the right to grant degrees to their university, and in order to palliate this act of injustice the figment or the New Zealand University was set up. He believed—he spoke subject to correction—that it was the first instance since the term university came to be applied to educational institutions that a non-teaching body, without location or habitation, simply a "board of examiners," had been called a university. It was absurd to suppose that the colony would rest content with this. What they should have eventually to complete their colonial system of education was a university in each of the four large cities, having power to grant degrees. The right to grant degrees must be obtained for our university, and it rested with the people of the Province to get it; A strong petition to the Legislature praying for the right to be granted, numerous and influentially signed, and backed up by the force of our members in Parliament; and no Ministry, whoever they might be, would feel themselves justified in refusing so reasonable a request, particularly as the granting of it would cost the colony nothing, and would be a graceful compliance with the wishes of the people here, who, as things were, had reason to be dissatisfied country was receiving great advantages from having able and learned men like the Professors in its midst. The speaker concluded as follows:— And now for a few remarks upon the subject of our meeting here this evening, Mr Macandrew, as everyone knows, is a large-minded man and an advanced thinker, and he has been more fortunate than many men like him. One of the patriotic movements to which he applied himself was the liberal and excellent system of education in this province, and he will live to see it completed by the right to grant degrees being conferred upon this institution. The other leading idea of his was steam. The second time I visited this city—then a very small one—was in 1859, I think in the month of September. There was then in the harbour a steamer called *The Queen*, brought by Mr Macandrew from Melbourne, and placed on the line between here and Melbourne by Mr Macandrew. I believe that was the first trading steamer that ever came to New Zealand. Well, we have not been without steam communication with Melbourne since. As to his idea of direct steam communication with the United Kingdom, he has lived to see that accomplished, and whether it will prove a financial success to the present companies or not, the colony will not be again without it. The service will be continued by some one. And now, Mr Chancellor, that I have said what I had to say, let me perform what I came here this evening to do. I have now the honour and pleasure, on the part of the committee of subscribers, of presenting to this University, through you, Sir, as Chancellor of it—and with whom the idea of this presentation originated—this portrait, an excellent one, of Mr James Macandrew, the institution's best friend and benefactor. May the institution long prosper and enjoy this suitable and valuable gift, and may Mr Macandrew be long spared to give us and the colony the benefit of his wise counsel, and live to see the degree of the University of Otago, in which he has taken such interest, the credential of the scholars all over the world.—(Cheers.)

The CHANCELLOR said it was with great pleasure that on behalf of the Council he received that excellent portrait of Mr Macandrew, the leader of the noble band who founded the University of Otago. He begged to

assure the last speaker, and the subscribers through him, that the authorities of the University would give this picture of its founder a permanent habitation beside the fathers of Otago. It had occurred to him that that would be a suitable occasion to give them a short historical *resume* of the story of their University. Some eighteen years ago' the Rev. Mr Simmons, then rector of the Otago High School, petitioned the House of Representatives to encourage general education in the colony by the establishment of colonial exhibitions tenable in British or other universities. The House of Representatives appointed a select committee to consider this matter. The committee consisted of the Hon. Mr Fitzherbert, Sir David Munro, Messrs Houghton, Jollie, Ormond, Dillon Bell, G. M'Farlane, and Dr Feather-stone, with Mr Jollie as chairman. The committee selected some sixty gentlemen all over the colony who were supposed to be a practical representation of the wants and interests of the colony in the matter of education. To these gentlemen they remitted several questions, but the two following included almost the whole of them:—(1.) Do you recommend the foundation of colonial exhibitions to British and other universities? (2.) What is your opinion as to the propriety of establishing a New Zealand University? After consideration the committee reported to this effect—that while they could not recommend any attempt being made at present to establish a New Zealand University, great as the advantages of such an institution would in some respects be, yet they felt disposed strongly, in accordance with Mr Simmons and the majority of the gentlemen who had favoured them with their views, to recommend colonial exhibitions, "which," they added, "if properly established and cared for, are fitted to exercise a very perceptible and beneficial influence, direct and indirect, upon the whole course and character of education in New Zealand." It might interest them to know that in the majority who held these views were two judges of the Supreme Court, statesmen, clergymen, schoolmasters, and country gentlemen. But, fortunately for Otago, there was a substantial minority which hold that the best way of promoting higher education in the colony would be by the establishment of a university. Amongst them was Mr Macandrew, whom he might term the guest of the evening. In his evidence he said: "I am of opinion that the whole object contemplated by exhibitions for sending boys from New Zealand schools to universities in Britain or elsewhere can be best attained in every respect by the establishment forthwith of a New Zealand University." He added: "The large educational endowment in the Province of Otago, which is daily accumulating, and which is intended ultimately to be applied towards the maintenance of a collegiate institution, with a sum equal to the cost of the proposed exhibitions, would be amply sufficient to maintain not less than five chairs. A number," he adds, "which would be sufficient for some years to come, or at all events to begin with." In suggesting the new post office for the accommodation of the university he said:—"The mere fact of its being lodged in such an imposing structure would tend to give it a position not only within but without New Zealand, which could no fail to be highly beneficial." The idea of a New Zealand University did not go to sleep in Mr Macandrew's teeming brain, for in his address to the Provincial Council on the 8th of April, 1868, he said:—"It appears to me the time has come when measures towards obtaining a college and New Zealand University should be commenced, and there is no part of the colony in a better position to make the commencement than Otago." The Council showed the most commendable zeal in the matter, for the address-in-reply contains the following paragraph:—"The establishment of a college and a university is a subject worthy our most careful attention, and we will not fail to give it cordial consideration." A select committee was appointed, consisting of Messrs Reynolds, Vogel, Robertson, M'Indoe, Driver, Sibbald, and Turnbull (Mr Turnbull chairman). After taking evidence, they reported—"That the time has arrived when it is desirable that steps should be taken to establish a college in this city;" and they also added, "That the institution should be under the management of a council of eight or ten, who shall not be subject to political control." The university was established in due course by an ordinance of the Provincial Council, and clothed with power of granting degrees in arts, medicine, and law. Its speedy collapse was predicted, and when that did not come to pass it was said that the students would be raw lads. Some of the first students were raw lads, but they felt the stirrings of a noble ambition, and had given a good account of themselves. He referred to the present position of these whose names appeared on the class-list of the first session, the first-mentioned being Mr Robert Stout, the Premier. At the instance of Mr Macandrew the Provincial Council undertook to pay one half the cost of the Chair of Chemistry, and it was established. It was also from Mr Macandrew that the proposal to provide a library of reference for the University came. In his address to the Council on April 30th, 1872, he referred to the subject, and on the motion of Mr Tolmie £500 was voted to supplement subscriptions pound for pound. In suggesting the establishment of law and medical classes, Mr Macandrew rendered great service. A committee appointed reported so favourably that the House voted an endowment of 100,000 acres of pastoral country. The services of Mr Macandrew in connection with the University were great and successful, not only because he was dead in earnest, but because he was enthusiastically supported by settlers of all classes he was sure they would rejoice with him that the University was striking its roots deep into the national life—as was evidenced by the steady increase of its *alumni*, which numbered last session 141, and of its teachers, which now numbered eight professors and seven lecturers, and more to follow. He believed that if Mr Macandrew lived for many years they would obtain the power of granting degrees which would carry students throughout the world. For

himself he had come to acquiesce to some little extent in the compromise which was forced upon them when the New Zealand University was started, but he looked forward to the time when that University would be a complete corporation, with power to grant such degrees as their students would value, and when the ample education given would be valued the world over.—(Applause). He called on Mr Macandrew to say a few words.

Mr JAMES MACANDREW, M.H.R., said all he could state was that he felt very grateful indeed to see so many old identities gathered together on such an occasion,. He confessed he was not prepared for it. However, he would not indulge in the sham modesty which some men on such occasions made a display of by declaring their own unworthiness he thought that was a matter which they must leave to their friends to decide he begged to repeat that he felt very grateful for and very deeply sensible of the distinction which had been conferred on him that night, and he only wished he was gifted with language wherewith he could express these feelings. His friend the Chancellor had completely taken the wind out of his sails with regard to any remarks he might have made. He thought while coming there that night it might not have been out of place for him to have recalled some reminiscences in connection with the early history of the University, but Dr Stuart had done that so well and so fully that it would be in bad taste for him to go over the ground again. It was said that sometimes good arose out of evil, and he believed that aphorism was to some extent true in regard to the university. He would tell them what he meant. Some 20 or 21 years ago Centralism, which he need not say had been from first to last the curse of New Zealand—(applause)—took it into its head to erect a magnificent building in Dunedin as a post office, the cost of which structure was £27,000. That money the people of Otago, *nolens volens*, had to pay, and he might say that this was done in the teeth of the protestations of those who had to pay the money, and their representations that the building was altogether beyond their requirements. The fact of the matter was, they all knew it, that the structure would have done very well for Liverpool, Glasgow, or Manchester, and perhaps even for the metropolis itself. The building which preceded it was of a very modest character. It might be asked what had all that got to do with the University? He would explain that to them. He felt that this building might with advantage be devoted to some other purposes, amongst which a university was one he accordingly addressed a circular individually to each member of the Provincial Council on the subject. That was really, he believed, the first official action that was taken in connection with the actual establishment of the University. By and bye, as Dr Stuart had said, when the Provincial Council met in the session of 1863, he alluded to this circular in the opening speech he had just made an extract of it that day, and would read them what was said. [The speaker here quoted from the speech in question, in which he recommended the carrying out of the scheme for establishing a university and setting aside of land as an endowment.] A committee was appointed, a report was brought up by Mr Turnbull, and the Council approved of it. Then no time was lost as far as the Executive Government was concerned in getting the land Crown granted, and in exchanging the buildings. Here he might be permitted to say that it was at this point that he deserved credit, if credit was due to him at all. Few could have any idea of the mountain of red tape and more questionable Objections that had to be got over before the actual Crown grant for the land was issued. The correspondence that took place on the subject, if it ever came to light, would certainly show what these difficulties were, and he had often been surprised himself at their having got the land at all. There was no doubt, however, that having got it, and having started the University, which was done by ordinance in the following session, that this was a very great event, and his own belief was that it would yet come to be looked upon as the greatest epoch in their history. He believed that the names of those who had a finger in that pie would receive honourable mention in generation to come. Although it so happened, from his position, that it fell to his lot perhaps to take the most conspicuous part in initiating the institution, still there were other gentlemen, some of whom he was glad to see there that night, who were quite as deserving or a niche in the University's table of fame as he was. Of course, it would be invidious to make a comparison as to what this or that or the other man did, besides, they might lay themselves open to the charge of being a mutual admiration society, but he could not refrain from alluding to one gentleman to whom the University was very deeply indebted, and that was to Mr John M'Lean, of Redcastle. As the Chancellor had said, it was on his motion that an address was presented to the Superintendent requesting that 100,000 acres of land should be set aside for a university. The Superintendent did not let the grass grow under his foot, but very soon got this land out of the fire. His friend, Dr Stuart, was in error in saying that Mr Tolmie was the mover of the motion requesting that a sum should be put on the Estimates towards a library. His friend there (Mr M'Lean) was the mover of that motion. As the Chancellor had said he (the speaker) had always been a strong believer and taken a great interest in having a proper reference library. The University was not properly equipped without it, and he was sorry to see that the library was still in the future. He recollected calling a private meeting of friends on the subject, and a committee was appointed of which he was one, to endeavour to collect subscriptions. One of those to whom he applied for a subscription was their friend Mr M'Lean, and he well remembered the readiness with which he at once gave a cheque for £100, or one hundred guineas, he forgot which. He had a very distinct recollection of the kindly and genial way in which Mr M'Lean

said as he was going away—"Mr Macandrew, if more is wanted you know where to come."—(Applause.) He thought it was to be regretted that further steps had not been taken towards getting this library, and he believed that but for abolition they would have had a library worthy of the place long ere now. He might say that had the Provincial Council met the year 1876 it was his intention to have proposed a vote of £10,000 by way of subsidising a fund pound for pound for procuring a suitable library. Unfortunately, the Provincial Council was debarred from meeting that year. Had he anticipated that that would have been so, he would have proposed the vote in the session of 1875, and there was not the slightest doubt from the generous way in which the Provincial Council always dealt with matters appertaining to education that they would have agreed to it. Although the Council had its difficulties at times—it was all they could do to make ends meet—yet if the money had been voted they would have found it by hook or by crook. At all events it would have been a provincial liability recognised by the Abolition Act. He earnestly hoped that the newly elected civic king on his left would distinguish his reign by endeavouring to get the citizens to put the Public Libraries Act into operation, and that under that Act there would be a reference library here, either connected with the University or otherwise—he thought the City and University Library should be combined—of which the province would be proud. Such a library should be free and open to all, the only condition being soap and water and clean hands. Talking of this condition he was not without hope that he would live to see at no distant date every class-room of the University open to rich and poor alike without money and without price. That was what they wanted to aim at, and looking at the very valuable endowments which the University had got there was not the least doubt that if the country prospered, as it was sure to do, that it was only a question of time until the University would be in a position to carry out that idea. There was no doubt whatever that they had got a most valuable endowment, and in that endowment there were the means he believed of providing university education on a scale equal to that of the most advanced universities in the old country, and even in America, Thai, was perhaps blowing a little, it might be said; but he would scarcely like to estimate what would be the revenue of the University Council if all went well—if the country did not sink, as he did not suppose it was going to do. He thought it was very gratifying to them to think that they had laid the foundations of an institution which in the future was capable of conferring such advantages. There could be no doubt that in the future of this world mind was going to exercise a greater influence than ever it had done before. It was coming to the front fast, and as a celebrated French writer said. "You may depend upon it that the nation who does most to educate its people will be the greatest nation; if not today, at all events to morrow." What he desiderated was a university on lines laid down by Dr Lyon Playfair in a recent address, which they would all do well to read. He was sure they would find it exceedingly interesting, and if he might be allowed to make a suggestion to his friends of the Press, he would say that they might do worse than give their readers the benefit of that admirable address. It would at least be as good reading as "The Land of the Golden Fleece."—(Laughter).—There was just one other word he would like to say before sitting down, and that was that if anything could be an additional gratification to him in seeing that portrait of himself lunging there it was the fact that had been adverted to by Mr M'Lean, that it was the work of a New Zealander—one who was raised, he might say, in their own School of Art under Mr Hutton. That was an exceedingly gratifying fact to his mind. He was no judge of art, but he was told by those who were that Mina Sperrey gave promise of great ability, and he believed they might yet see her occupying a very prominent position in the profession which she had adopted. The old identities might well be proud to know that there was a great deal of latent talent in New Zealand, and they must feel proud that they had made provision by which that talent would be developed and exercise a great power for good on the whole of the human family, compared with which the powers of kings and kaisers was as nothing. It had been well said that "the power of princes soon passes away, but the power of genius, that is eternal."—(Loud applause.) By the-bye, he had omitted one thing, and that was about degrees. He deplored as much as anyone that that University sold its birthright for a mess of pottage. It was not his fault that it had no power to issue degrees, and he hoped now that a new view on the subject was arising that they would yet get the power. He assured them that it was their own fault or they would have had the power long ago,

A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the proceedings.

Our Commercial Depression

At a public meeting under the auspices of the New Zealand Manufacturers' Association, held last evening in the Chamber of Commerce Hall, Mr Charles Daring read a paper on "Manufactures: their relation to Agriculture." There were about 70 persons present.

The President of the Association (Mr G. P. Farquhar), who occupied the chair, regretted that there was not a larger attendance. The Association had chosen that evening for the meeting with a view of reaching the country people who are in town for the agricultural exhibition.

Mr DARLING said:

Sir Julius Vogel, speaking recently at Christchurch, is reported to have said; "That any representations tending to show that the fostering of local industries was detrimental to the agricultural interests were not only mischievous, but ill-founded." This, although to many a self-evident truth, is nevertheless a timely recall to our remembrance of a most important fact, and one to which too great an attention cannot be given, as it is upon its truth or falsity that the question of a Free-trade or Protective policy, so far as this colony is concerned, must be decided. Already a leading organ of the Press has declared that the agricultural interest has nothing to gain and everything to lose by a higher tariff; nor are there wanting signs that this question will be used to create and foster a feeling of hostility between town and country. Sir, the object of this paper will be a humble endeavour to show, I hope clearly, but with no pretence to originality, and in no dogmatic spirit, that there can be no possible antagonism of interests between the manufacturing and agricultural industries, but that they are mutually dependent one upon the other, and that whatever tends to the increase of our industrial centres, and the enlargement of our manufacturing population, must react beneficially upon the agricultural community.

I do not think it is possible to refer to any purely agricultural nation that has risen to wealth and power. Agriculture—the tilling of the soil—is necessarily the first occupation to which men turn in a new country. But the very attempt to rise above the more level of "hewers of wood and drawers of water" also necessitates the introduction of some manufactures upon however rude or humble a scale. Unless men are content, as they have been in the past, and still are in some countries, to rest satisfied with the simple gratification of appetite and the wearing of apparel of a most modest description, manufactures are imperative; without them there will be found a people steeped in poverty and ignorance. Such countries have not even learnt the use of those improved implements modern ingenuity has brought to bear upon the soil in more advanced communities. The United States Consul at Rio de Janeiro, in writing to his Government a description of one of his journeys inland, says:—"The soil is a fertile red clay mixed with gravel, the fences ditches like rifle-pits or rails laid on crotched sticks, not a twentieth part of the land under cultivation, and some worn out and abandoned. The hoe is the sole implement of field cultivation, and wooden-wheeled ox carts drawn by mules are farm waggons. The houses are huts of unburnt brick, having wooden shutters, but no glass windows.", This is an instance of the condition to which it is possible for a nation to sink unin vigorated by the activity and stimulus of manufactures.

Turkey, a nation once dreaded and powerful owing to the vastness and strength of her armies, is gradually becoming effaced from the map of Europe. Utterly without inventive genius or manufacturing skill, content to grow wool and grain, importing far more than she exports, and complacently plunging into debt for the balance of trade. But it is unnecessary to cite the further examples of India and Egypt, as it has long since been fully recognised, more especially during the present century, that not only can no nation become great which devotes its energies entirely to pastoral or agricultural pursuits, but that manufactures are absolutely essential both to the nation as a whole and to the farmers individually. Thomas Jefferson, the third President of the United States of America, writing in 1816, said: "He who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependence upon Great Britain or to be clothed in skins and live like wild beasts in the field." Later on John Quincy Adams, the sixth President, stated in a message to Congress: "The great interests of an agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing nation are so looked in union together that no permanent cause of prosperity to one of them can operate without extending its influence to others." Similar sentiments to these were uttered by the great Sir "Robert Peel, and that at a time when all England was agitated by Mr Cobden and his fellow-workers in the Anti-Corn Law League. Sir Robert made a speech at Tamworth in 1843, in concluding which he said "that the interests of agriculture and manufacturers were inseparably united, and that whatever supports the vigour of manufactures must open markets and keep up the demand for agricultural produce. But not only have statesmen clearly expressed their convictions as to the interdependence of agriculturists and manufacturers, but we have further evidence in the writings of the German political economist, Herr Friedrich List. This author, who, in the interests of his fellow countrymen, advocated a Protective policy in respect to manufactured articles, says: "Under the influence of manufactures agriculture itself is raised to a skilled industry, an art, a science. Agriculture, which hitherto merely supported landowners and their servants, now furnishes the commonwealth with the most independent and sturdy defenders of its liberty. In the culture of the soil, also, every class is now able to improve its position. The labourer can raise himself to become a farmer, the farmer to become a landed proprietor. The capital and means of transport which *industry creates and establishes* now give prosperity to agriculture everywhere." I think we may fairly assume, without undue presumption, that both agriculture and manufactures are necessary to a nation's prosperity, and that their interests are not opposed or divergent, but indissolubly bound together. I would, however, here venture to remark that whilst no nation purely or largely agricultural has attained a high position, on the other hand, neither can a people devoted almost solely to manufacturing pursuits so continue save at the expense of their agricultural interest. This will be made apparent when I refer to England. The position taken by List is that there should not be a preponderating influence either one way or the other, but without drawing any

impossible hard-and fast line, there should be such a judicious proportion as would result in, the mutual benefit of both. When thou are some of the most apparent advantages the agriculturist will derive from his proximity to a manufacturing centre? In the first place, it will manifestly increase the value of his land. The smaller the industrial centre, or the greater the distance from that centre, so in proportion will be its effect upon land values. A non-agricultural population in all countries has the effect of raising the land values of the agricultural portion of the community. It would be needless to do more than refer to the enormous price to which agricultural land has risen in England owing to the marvellous growth in late years of her manufacturing towns. Suffice to say that from 1853 to 1878, a period of 25 years, the agricultural rental of England had increased by £10,408,822, or fully 25 per cent., and in Scotland, during the same period, it had increased by £2,254,908, or nearly 42 per cent. But take by way of illustration the various land values of the United States. Now many of the States are, as you are aware, devoted principally to manufactures, whilst others are given to the production of corn, wheat, and cotton, and it is established upon reliable testimony that those farms nearest the centres of the non-agricultural population are infinitely higher in value owing to this favoured position, although the land in other States is often superior, and the means of transport and communication equally advantageous. To show this is no mere assertion I will give the figures as furnished by Mr J. R. Dodge, statistician of the Department of Agriculture, Washington. This gentleman, taking the census of 1830 as his basis, divides the entire acreage under cultivation in the States into four classes. First, those States having less than 30 per cent. of their population engaged in agriculture. Second, those having 30 per cent., but less than 50 per cent.; third those having 50 per cent, and less than 70 per cent.; and fourth, those having over 70 per cent. so engaged. What is the result? Why, that in the first class, where only 18 per cent. of the population are engaged in agriculture, the land value per acre is 38dol 65c; in the second class, with 42 per cent, engaged, the value is 30dol 55c; in the third class, with 58 per cent, engaged, the value is 13dol 53c; and in the fourth class, with 77 per cent, of the population engaged, the value is only 5dol 18c per acre, clearly showing that the advantage accruing to the agriculturist from his proximity to a non-agricultural class is in the important item of land values, comparing first with the fourth class, as eight acres to one. In other words, the fortunate farmer in these States has, and that from no merit of his own, reaped his full share of the benefits arising from America's industrial progress. He is, in fact, the possessor of an "unearned increment" of at least 20 dol per acre. Nor can it be said that this high value is due solely to the excess of population in those States. All classes of population are not advantageous to a country. Paupers, tramps, and sun-downers are population, but I do not think they enhance the land values either of farm or city. No! Farmers would not benefit either by such an invasion nor from an undue proportion of their own class. The men wanted are those who, by their skill and ingenuity, will be not alone consumers, but wealth producers—in short a larger manufacturing population. But Lot only will the farmer reap the full benefit of an increased land value, but his land, under the stimulating influence of a greater demand for its products, will yield an increased amount of those products. Professor Thorold Rogers has said that 50 years ago nearly the entire population of England were engaged in agriculture, and yet they only succeeded in producing an average yield of eight bushels of wheat per acre. The additional stimulus, however, of large industrial centres has wrought such a wonderful effect upon the productive power of the land that it now yields 28 to 29 bushels to the acre. Herr List, in his "National System of Political Economy," recognises this fact. He says: "The demand which now springs up for milk, butter, and meat adds a higher value to the existing pasture land, and leads a to the breaking up of fallows and the erection of works of irrigation. The demand for fruit and garden produce converts the former bare agricultural land into vegetable gardens and orchards." So, too, in the United States. Taking the four classes as previously given, we find that although he States, boasting a larger industrial population, cannot boast the possession of more fertile land. The yields stand thus: States of the first class, 15 bushels per acre; of the second class, 16.4 per acre; of the third class, 11.1 per acre; and on the fourth class, 5.8 per acre; or, in other words, so great is the effect upon the farmer of a large demand, a near market, and an increased price for his products that, though the owner of the comparatively poor soil of the first class, he stands as three bushels to one against the class which boasts such fertile States as Alabama, Georgia, and the Mississippi. It will, I believe, be dearly seen that among many of the welcome advantages accruing to the agricultural interest from a fair proportion of the non-agricultural element are—an increase in land values, increased production, and that groat desideratum, a home market. But another point has yet to be considered, All agriculturalists are not proprietors, nor have, all farms of their own. What about the agricultural labourer? Does he reap any benefit or participate in the enhanced profits of the farmer? Undoubtedly! In fact, if the position of the owner has improved, the labourer also has shared in his improvement. There is probably no more wretched being upon earth than a labourer in a purely agricultural country. Florence Nightingale, as quoted by Mr Henry George in his "Progress and Poverty," has said: "The saddest sight to be seen the East—nay, probably in the world—is the peasant of our Eastern Empire." Contrast, therefore, the condition of the Indian agricultural labourer, the man who toils for 6c a day the man who is likely to become not only America's, but the New Zealand farmer's most formidable competitor in the world's corn market; contrast his

condition with that of the labourer in lands where an industrial and manufacturing population have been found necessary to their greatness, and there you will find that the advance in his wage and his well-being has been commensurate and concurrent with the rise and development of their great industries. Forty years ago the cash wage to agricultural labourers in the United States averaged 13dol 25c per month. In 1866, owing to an inflation of the currency, values were high, and his wage was 26dol per month. Then followed a time of depression, bringing the inevitable fall in prices, and the wage paid was only 16dol 16c in 1879. The reaction speedily came, and in 1888 the average wage was 18dol 58c per month, or an increase of 40 per cent, during the period of America's industrial progress. But statistics bearing more immediately upon the relation of agriculture to manufactures are to be found in the fact that the wages paid for farm labour are always highest in those districts near the industrial centres. The wages paid in the Eastern States in 1882 were 26dol 61c per month, in the Western states 23dol 63c per month, in the Middle States 22dol 24c per month, and in the almost exclusively agricultural States of the South only 15dol 30c per month—a difference in favour of the manufacturing States of 11dol 31c. Now let us examine the condition of the English agricultural labourer. He has not reaped, like his American tother, the full advantage of his country's progress, but for all that his present condition, bad as it is, will bear out the position assumed. In 1770 Arthur Young, the well-known traveller and agricultural writer of the last century, gives the wage of the farm labourer at that date as 7s per week. After a lapse of 80 years—viz., 1850, when England's manufactures were using rapidly, Sir James Caird states the labourer's wage to have been 10s per week, although the Right Hon. John Bright gives it somewhat lower. However, the increase in the labourer's wage is the more noticeable upon comparing the northern, or manufacturing districts, with the southern, or agricultural counties. In the former the wages had risen to 11s 6d per week, in the latter to only 8s 5d, or, in Sir James Caird's own words, "The influence of manufacturing enterprise is thus seen to add 37 per cent, to the wages of the agricultural labourers of the northern counties as compared with those of the south." "Nothing," he adds, "could show more unequivocally the advantage of manufacturing enterprise to the prosperity and advancement of the farmer." Coming down still later, we have it upon the authority of Professor Lene Levi that in 1867 the agricultural labourers' wages averaged 12s per week, and in 1884 they were 13s 4d per week. Not a groat sum it is true; and why? England is essentially an industrial nation; and no nation, either purely agricultural or industrial, can continue so unless at some great sacrifice. England, the first to reap the advantages of nineteenth century invention and the power of steam, has become the world's market, but she has paid for that position at a cost which has virtually ruined the British farmer. To supply the world with her manufactures she required cheap labour; but labour, however cheap, must be fed—bread was imperative; meat, a luxury, might be dispensed with. Now, inasmuch as the British farmer, crushed down by the most iniquitous land system the world has ever known, could not meet the demand for cheap bread, the ports were thrown open, and the vast fields of America, where the men not only "till the soil, but own the soil they till," were placed in competition with the English farmer, and he, so heavily, handicapped, has been well nigh driven out of the market. The agricultural classes of England are decreasing rapidly. Professor Levi gives the number in 1867 as 2,700,000, and in 1884 as only 1,900,000. Her proportion of population engaged in industrial pursuits is 57 per cent., against 12.4 per cent. engaged in agriculture—a figure altogether disproportionate to England's need. In the United States the proportion is 22.1 per cent, in industrial pursuits, against 44.1 per cent, in agriculture, and this latter figure is considered by some as disproportionate. America is now turning her attention to diversity of employment. The honour of "feeding the nations" may be bought at too high a price, and with the serious competition of India "looming up," the outlook is not pleasant. States, such as Minnesota, which once devoted their energies entirely to wheat-growing, are altering their procedure. She is diversifying her industries. She is recognising the truth of that 20s earned in a home market is a better, surer, and as equally profitable transaction as 20s earned in Liverpool, and which latter 20s have to undergo the unsatisfactory but highly necessary process of deduction for commission, cost of transport, &c. It is stated, and it can easily be verified, that the entire food products of the States, less the products now supplied her by other nations, would only give a surplus of 3 per cent, over and above her own home consumption. The tendency in America appears to be a lessening of those engaged in agricultural pursuits, and the increase of those engaged in manufactures. It has been said that manufacturing depression can have little or no effect upon the agricultural community. This assumes the complete independence of the one from the other. But we have seen they are not so. A large industrial population means a flourishing and prosperous agricultural community. The Hon. Alexander Del Mar, writing from Chicago, under date September 1, to the editor of the *Pall Mall Budget*, says: "The crops are good, but the prices of wheat and other farm products have been steadily falling." Why? The writer himself gives the answer in his next words, which are: "Manufactures are greatly depressed." No, gentlemen; it is impossible to separate the two. Their interests are one, and indivisible; no line can be drawn between them. The agriculturist cannot say to the manufacturer "I have no need of thee," nor can the manufacturer say to the agriculturist "I am independent of you." And he is no true patriot who, in deference to his pro-conceived opinions, and in opposition to the history and experience of other nations, endeavours to create an antagonism

between these two great sources of their prosperity. Gentlemen, what policy is it desirable we should pursue in order to establish native manufactures? Will that policy which says "Leave capital and labour alone to discover the best and most profitable means of investment do" it? Can you, under your present tariff, induce capital to your shores and expect it to build factories when you place that capital in competition with the greatest, wealthiest, and cheapest-paid white labour markets in the world? Capital is proverbially a shy bird. Its first necessity is security, its second an adequate remuneration for its investment. Can you guarantee either one or the other? This colony is not concerned as to the soundness or unsoundness of Free-trade so far as England may be affected. We have nothing to do with that view of the question. What concerns us, as a young colony, is: Are the same economic laws which govern England's commercial policy applicable to our own condition? if not, by what policy shall we be governed? What is the evidence as furnished by other countries? I will not refer to the older nationalities of Europe, but to those who are at one with us in language and sympathy. Take the oft-referred to example of the United States. Those whose opinions are in favour of Free-trade have a remarkable way of giving prominence to all the weak points of America's commercial policy, and concealing the marvellous results to which that policy has led. With the English farmer they are doubtless disposed to exclaim, "I wish your cursed country had never been discovered." I am not here, however, to defend the tariff of our American cousins. I believe that under such a tariff there has been, and still is, room for the creation of rings, monopolies, and unions, whose sole object, under the sheltering ægis of the needlessly high duty, it is to keep up the price and pocket enormous sums of money. It is not a tariff which will permit of such doings we require here. But, making full allowance for the evil, unscrupulous, and dishonest men may indict upon a community by such combinations, the benefit conferred upon America generally by her tariff is plain and undeniable. A century ago, in the words of Lord Chatham, "America was not permitted to make so much as a horseshoe for her own use." At the present day her manufacturers and their rapid growth are the astonishment of the civilised world. Excluding gas and petroleum refining manufactures, her increase in the ten years from 1870 to 1880 has been very large. Seventeen hundred and four new establishments have been erected, £220,000,000 is the increased capital invested; the value of additional materials used is £281,000,000, the increased output £397,000,000, and the additional number of hands employed is 679,000. Here then we have progress of a most satisfactory character. Nor were the States favoured with continuous prosperity during this decade. On the contrary, from 1873 to 1879 was a period of the most severe depression, arising chiefly from a depreciation of the currency; commerce was disorganised, great distress prevailed, and large numbers were thrown out of employment; but America as a nation never for a moment contemplated adding to her misery by the opening of her ports and flooding her markets with foreign manufactures. You are continually being told that America's present depression is the outcome of her Protective tariff. Such a statement is far from being within the limits of strict accuracy. A Free-trade policy might with equal justice be charged with the over-existing deplorable condition of England's lower classes. Man for man, the American worker is in an infinitely superior position to that of his English fellow. What are the facts as furnished by English statisticians? Mr J. S. Jeans in a paper read recently before the Statistical Society on the comparative earnings of labour at Home and abroad, arrived at the following conclusions:—"That in a number of selected occupations which may fairly be regarded as typical of the whole, the wages paid in the United Kingdom are 45.4 per cent *under* these paid in the United States; also, that from 1850 to 1883 the wage-earnings in a number of *typical* occupations advanced by 40 per cent, in the United Kingdom; and that between 1860 and 1883, ten years less, the average wages ascertained to have been paid in the United States to *all* occupations (except professional) increased by 39.9 per cent." Another gentleman, Mr D. Pigeon, in January last read a paper before the Society of Arts upon "Labour and Wages in the United States and Great Britain," in concluding which he stated that the result arrived at, from a study of his tables, was "that a workman earning £60 in Great Britain would receive £99 for the same work in the United States, from which amount he estimated £17 would have to be deducted for excess cost of living," thus leaving a balance of £22 per annum in favour of the American. Again, how does America stand in respect of paupers? According to the census of 1880 there were 67,000 indoor, and 21,600 outdoor paupers—or a grand total of 88,000 in a population of 51,000,000 people. How does England stand in this matter? Mr Goschen, in his speech to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, stated the number in 1883 was 798,000, out of a population of 26,750,000. So that, with a little over half America's population, England has *nine* paupers to America's *one*. But, gentlemen, statistics of this kind have always a largo element of unreliability about them. I believe America has far more, and I am equally certain that in England the numbers are understated. The proportion, however, will not be altered to America's disadvantage. Miss Edith Simcox, speaking at the Industrial Remuneration Conference, held in January last, under the presidency of Sir Charles Dilke, estimates, and her statement has been borne out in a recent speech of Mr Chamberlain's, the actual or virtual paupers in England, in the year of grace 1885, at 5,000,000. Gentlemen, can we wonder at the working man leaving Free-trade England for Protective America?

Let us now look for a moment at the industrial progress of Victoria. Twenty-one years ago, under a low

tariff, Victoria did not possess a single woollen mill, boot factory, waggon factory, or hat factory. In 1884 she boasted seven woollen mills, 165 boot and shoe factories, 132 coach and waggon factories, and 22 hat factories. During the last decade—that is, from 1874 to 1884—974 new factories have been established, £5000,000 additional capital invested, and 22,500 increased number of hands employed. Paupers, I am thankful to say, are not, as yet, indigenous to the soil of these colonies; but we have, unfortunately, large numbers of "unemployed." How does Victoria compare with New South Wales in this respect? Mr Hayter, taking the census of 1881 as his basis (and he states no fresh cause has arisen to alter the relative position of the two colonies), gives the number in Victoria at 4500, and in New South Wales at 9800; or one man unemployed in every 76 of the population in New South Wales, and one in every 191 in the population of Victoria. At the present time upwards of 109,000 are engaged in agriculture in Victoria, and 47,000 in industrial pursuits, the latter "turning out" in the year 1881 goods to the value of £13,500,000. In Canada we find additional evidences as to the effect a judicious tariff has upon native manufactures, and the advantages accruing to the agricultural community from their establishment. Prior to the year 1859 the tariff of this country was low; her manufactures, of necessity, poor, feeble, and scattered; but in this year the tariff was increased to 20 per cent., with the result that young industries grew, thousands of additional hands were employed, and the first to reap the full advantage of this revival were the farmers. Their land rose in value, their products increased, and they obtained a higher price for them. Although, for political reasons, the tariff in 1868 was lowered to 15 per cent., Canada was still under the protection of a high tariff to all intents and purposes. And for this reason: A fierce and sanguinary war was raging in the States of America, all trade was in a state of chaos and confusion, prices were high, and the commerce of the nation paralysed for a time. America's weakness was Canada's opportunity, but when the manufactures of the former country began to revive and rise on every hand, then poor 15 per cent. Canada was flooded with American products. She could not stand against it. Farmers threw up their land—many became bankrupt, or worse—and her manufacturers were actually compelled to pay the Americans either a lump sum or a heavy percentage upon their sales to keep them out of their market. How did England prosper in this transaction? Statistics show that protected America "beat her all along the line." England could not compete with her. In 1873 Canada's total imports amounted to 127½ million dollars. England's share was 54½ per cent.; America's only 37½ per cent. Take the year 1878: Canada's import trade in this year was only 91¼ million dollars, of which England's share was 41 per cent., and America's 53½ per cent. The positions had changed. Clearly, then, a protective tariff against America was not only Canada's, but England's gain. This can be proved. In 1882, after five years of a 30-per-cent. customs duty, England again held the premier position, she then exporting to Canada 50½ millions' worth of goods against America's 48½ millions of dollars. Nor did Canada adopt her 30-per-cent. tariff without full consideration. I would refer you for a short history of the contest leading to the return of those who advocated this increase to a work recently issued entitled "Imperial Federation," by the Marquis of Lome. Who is the Marquis of Lome? Well, gentlemen, he is not a "selfish manufacturer," but one who, notwithstanding his high birth and connections, belongs to that body of men called "advanced liberals;" and as a late Governor-general of Canada, he may be allowed to speak with some little authority. At the end of six years the Finance Minister, Sir Leonard Tilley, in the course of his financial statement of March last, thus briefly summarised the effect of a high tariff upon Canada's progress:—"The number of new factories established was 595, the increased capital invested was 29½ million dol, the increased output 79¼ million dol, increased yearly wages paid 10½ million dol, and the additional number of hands employed 84,500. Add," continued the minister, "50 per cent, to those figures, and a reliable estimate of the total result will be obtained." Nor has the! total yearly volume of trade, either in the States, Canada, or Victoria, been decreased by the operation of their tariff—on the contrary, it has largely increased, save with rare exceptions, arising from causes universally felt throughout the civilised world. What, then, are the objections raised to the adoption of a policy capable of producing such beneficial results? It is not within my province, nor indeed would time permit me, to examine them all. To one only would I refer. It is stated, and very frequently stated too, that the cost of an article to the consumer is its imported cost plus the full amount of the Protective duty, and which amount must therefore be taken from the consumer's pocket and slipped into that of the manufacturers'. This statement has always appeared to me to be a fundamental article of a Free traders' creed—the "diapason of their policy." Do facts bear out this assumption? It follows that if an article in a protected country is increased in value to the extent of the duty imposed, that its manufacturer cannot hope to compete in the open market with the unprotected manufacturer. How then do we account for the enormous exportation of manufactured articles from America right into the heart of Free trade England? American cutlery is sold in the very streets of Sheffield; boots are exported in large quantities. Yankee clocks and Waltham watches are sold in Dunedin at prices equal to, if not below, those of English make; agricultural implements, axes, wringers, mangles, and the hundred and one clever products of American industry are imported into these colonies at prices which cannot be competed against. In 1853 iron of American make cost 36dol 12c per ton; owing to the enormous advances made in its manufacture in 1883 the same iron could be bought for 22dol 37c

per ton. Bessemer steel rails in 1867 cost 166dol per ton, in 1884 they could be purchased at 34dol per ton. Take an example from our own experience. There is a 15 per cent, *ad valorem* duty upon drapery. The consumer, so we are told, must therefore pay 15 per cent, more for his goods than he would were drapery goods admitted free of duty. I do not think, Sir, there is a business housewife in Dunedin who has been accustomed to London shopping but what will tell you that she can purchase those articles in every day use as cheap, sometimes cheaper, but sometimes higher than the same articles would cost in the Old Country. Competition will always reduce prices to the lowest possible point at which a business can be successfully conducted, if then manufacturers do not want high prices, what do they want? The question was asked ten years ago, and the answer appears dear and conclusive. It is: "The manufacturer is not interested in the percentage of profit exclusively which he makes, but in the aggregate amount of it, and a largo trade may be more profitable to him on a small percentage of profit than a small trade on a large percentage. Production on a large scale gives opportunity for more effective division of labour, and hence to economy of production; and to this may be added the lessened proportionate burden upon fixed expenses.

Gentlemen, if we can trust history, farmers have nothing to fear from the encouragement of native manufactures. They have but to examine the position of their brethren in those lands to which I have referred to be convinced of this. The Cobden Club some time ago flooded the Western States of America with Augustus Mongredien's "Western Farmer of America." The supposed deplorable condition of this worthy person, the injustice under which he laboured, and the crushing nature the Protective, tariff had upon his industry, were all vividly portrayed. But were the statements true? A reply is unintentionally furnished by the American correspondent of one of the evening papers, who, in a recent letter stated that Augustus Mongredien's injuriously-oppressed farmer of America "can produce more wheat and sell it at a lower price than any other farmer in the world." If our farmers are of opinion that a high tariff is net conducive to their interests, if they are prepared to rely almost solely upon a foreign market, and thus compete with the millions of our Indian Empire, with Egypt, with Southern Russia, and America; if in other words, they prefer to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the cheapest market, then they cannot justly complain at the low price their products bring them. Other lands have decided in favour of a higher tariff, and, spite of Carlyle's dictum all men are mostly fools, or utterly blind to their own interests. Nor does the final decision rest with a few individuals, but with yourselves, and that decision, whenever given, will, I doubt not, be a just one. Aristotle, the wisest of the Greeks, is credited with saying: "The decisions of the masses are invariably right because impartial." One thing is, however, certain, that every year the struggle for existence becomes keener and more keen every year the necessity for men in factories and workshops becomes less, all the ingenuity of the highest skill is brought to bear upon the introduction of labour-saving machinery, and these wonderful pieces of mechanism, propelled by the mighty power of steam, are reducing the employment of human labour to a minimum. Thirty years ago, and the words are even truer now than then, a poet represented steam as singing:—

*I blow the bellows, I forge the steel,
And in all the shops of trade,
I hammer the ore and turn the wheel
Where my arms of strength are made.
I manage the furnace, the mill, the mint
I carry, I spin, I weave,
And all my doings I but in print
On every Saturday eve.
I've no muscle to weary, no breast to decay.
No bones to be laid on the shelf;
And soon I intend you may go and play
While I manage the World myself.*

Yes, gentlemen, the tendency of the age is to largely supersede human labour, and to a lower level of prices for the product of that labour. It is for you to say, in view of such competition, what policy shall be pursued in order that this colony, so bountifully endowed by nature, may be enabled to establish her industries upon so solid a basis, and under the combined influence of a healthful and vigorous manufacturing and agricultural people, eventually attain a prominent position among the great civilisations of the earth.

Discussion was invited, but the invitation not being responded to,

The CHAIRMAN proposed a vote of thanks to Mr Darling, and also made a brief speech touching upon some of the arguments advanced by Freetraders against Protection.

Mr M. SINCLAIR seconded the motion, which was carried by acclamation.

North Otago Times.

Friday, November 27, 1885.

Secondary Education: Proposed Amendment of Constitution.

To the Editor.

SIR,—This letter is re-written after your intimation that "J. A. Fenton" is the venerable Archdeacon. The representations, that the yearly cost per pupil to the nation is either L50 or L70, was referred to by me as having been made by two gentlemen, one saying L50, the other, L70, and pooh-poohed. I made such use of it in my speech as to show I did not think these gentlemen likely to make a gross blunder in their estimate in such a case. But it was pooh-poohed by Mr Hislop as ridiculous; and now it is spoken of by the Archdeacon as "amazing." It happens that three days ago I obtained from the gentleman who had said L70 the detailed ground of his estimate; and I will give it to your readers. But I must first call attention to the lie of the land in relation to this matter.

The Archdeacon criticises this whole movement as if it had been simply mine, and favors the public with his views of what he supposes likely to be the amendment of the educational constitution sought by the promoters. The movement, in fact, is on behalf of a Conference completely representing the public interests of education connected with Oamaru and Waitaki County. The only point fairly raised at present in connection with it is that made by the unanimous resolution of Conference (6th Nov.), "that in the interest of Secondary education it is indispensable that the Waitaki High School be transferred to or near Oamaru under such a constitution as Parliament shall direct." The interest in view was that of the people of the locality in having "secondary education within easy reach of both sexes and all classes." To that resolution every householder in the county will soon have an opportunity of saying either "yes" or "no" for himself. In the meantime let it be marked that what the Archdeacon is opposing is a unanimous resolution, in the vital interest of the people's education, of the publicly recognised representatives of the people.

As to the new constitution, to be formed in the event of that resolution taking effect, the Archdeacon may have an opportunity of making suggestions to Parliament: the resolution speaks of that new constitution as what "parliament shall direct." Why he now gives his opinions about what he supposes to be my views or intentions, I really do not know. The detailed matters of which he speaks here may, when the time comes, be considered by parliament "directing." In the mean time such matters may perhaps be taken into view by the Committee of Conference, which consists of the two statutory governors of Waitaki High School, three representatives of local School Committees, and a member of the Otago Board of Education. What the committee's views may be regarding a new constitution, they can report to the Conference or to the general public as they see cause. But any discussion of such details at present is obviously fitted to withdraw public attention from the one point of there solution of Conference, and is not obviously fitted for any other purpose.

In relation to the cost per boy of Waitaki School as now constituted, the representation which has "amazed" the Archdeacon had reference to the cost "to the nation." He makes this to mean, what the Government is contributing yearly," and apparently understands it as meaning, what the Waitaki Governors are actually laying out on education. Whether the two things are one, can be ascertained In due time. For the present let it be kep in mind that the question raised by that representation is, and is only, about the cost "to the nation."

The purpose of the representation was, to show the amount of an alleged abuse. The alleged abuse is, waste of public educational funds in paying for the education of the comparatively wealthy class, whose children would be well-educated though there were no Waitaki School in existence, so that the effect of the said payment is, not to educate the children, but to enrich the parents. The Archdeacon's estimate, of L25 per pupil, instead of either L50 or L75, Is really as straight to the purpose as if we should take the higher estimates. When the argument is, Here is waste of public money which ought to have been educating the children of the people, then to answer, The amount is only L25, not L50 or L75, Is like in a murder case pleading "not guilty" on the ground that the murdered person was not a giant. But now is to the amount of the waste.

Here is the estimate of my informant who said L70. The value of the endowments is L68,000; to which, in order to keep well within the limit of safe calculation he does not add the L5000 (?) with which the estate has been burdened for building On the same account he reckons the interest on that L68,000 at only 6 per cent. The yearly cost to the nation is thus L4080. To this he adds the L500 of Parliamentary grant last year: total L4580.

Taking the number of pupils at 45, he makes out the whole cost per pupil to be L101, Deducting L10 per pupil for fees (which are made somewhat lower than the ten guineas to families having several boys in attendance), he finds the net cost to the nation to be L91. A result no doubt "amazing"—as on every favored pupil it makes the nation's outlay to be about half the whole cost of secondary education for mankind and womankind in the Oamaru Grammar School.

Since the above was first written (yesterday), I have been told that another estimate of the value of the endowments is 1.42,000. This at 6 per cent, gives L2520 a year of cost to the nation. Along with the L500 of grant last year, it makes up L3020; which, with deduction of an average of L10 for fees, would leave a net cost to the nation of L67 per pupil. If the L500 be added to the endowment instead of to last year's outlay, the net cost to the nation per pupil will be L83 upon the estimate of L68,000, and L47 upon the estimate of L42,000. The matter of these calculations, regarding amount of national wealth set apart for Waitaki School, is now being inquired into by men who will obtain exact and verified information. In the meantime the Archdeacon has done good service to the movement for an amended constitution by recalling attention to the amount of waste under the existing constitution.

Let it however be observed and kept In mind, that his reasoning has reference only to the amount of the waste. The essential contention, that it is all waste, with drawn f om the people's eduction, he does not touch. The national means of secondary education of the sons and daughters of the people are made practically inaccessible to them; and, it is reasoned, this costs the nation only L25 per pupil, not L50 or L70. Why should the nation pay anything for withholding secondary education from the sons and daughters of the people?

I now again call attention to the question, regarding the Waitaki School as now constituted: What is the use of it, what purpose does it serve? It does not and cannot educate the sons and daughters of the people. What it does is, to relieve the comparatively wealthy class of the expense of educating their children, at a cost to the nation, from public funds in ended for the people's education, of L50 or L70, say some; or, as the Archdeacon concludes, of only L25 per pupil.

Your own suggestion, In yesterday's leaderette, regarding the right manner of providing for girls under a new constitution, is very important. The matter of it ought, to be carefully considered in "such a constitution as the Parliament shall direct." Perhaps the Committee of Conference may be expected to consider, and in due time report upon, such matters from the Conference point of view. But at present we must carefully guard against allowing discussion of details from clouding men's view of the main essential point at present, namely, that the national establishment for secondary education ought not to be allowed to remain unfit for the purpose of educating the people. Let us not be led aside into debating about the best manner of making the provision for girls: that will only tend to the continuance of a system which "makes no provision for girls," and provides for the boys only of the comparatively wealthy class.

James Macgregor.

November 26th.

The Statutes of New Zealand,

It was on the 9th of November, 1881, that we last printed a *resume* of the sessions of the General Assembly with a tabulated statement of the statutes and ordinances of New Zealand, in the same form as the one now subjoined, which is corrected up to date.

The eighth Parliament of New Zealand was opened by the Governor in person on the 19th May, 1882; the first session closed on the 22nd September, 1882; the second session opened on 14th Jane, and closed on 8th September, 1883; the third session was opened on 5th June, and dissolved on 27th June, 1884. The ninth Parliament was opened by commission on 7th August and the speech read by his Excellency, Sir William Jervois, on 19th August, 1884; the first session of it closed 11th November, 1884; the second session was opened on 11th June, 1885, and ended 22nd September, 1885. It was in the year 1878 that the great clearing of our statute books took place, by the repeal of 758 acts and ordinances. The effect of legislation on the number of our laws since then has been as follows, no allowance being made for obsolete acts:

Otago Daily Times,

November 28, 1885.

Protection, or Freetrade?

By Henry George.
(From the Argus.)

I.—Introductory.

Near the window by which I write a great bull is tethered by a ring in his nose. Grazing round and round, he has wound his rope about the stake until now he stands a close prisoner, tantalised by rich grass he cannot reach, unable even to toss his head to rid him of the flies that cluster on his shoulder. Now and again he struggles vainly, and then with pitiful bellowing relapses into silent misery.

That bull, a very type of massive strength, who, because he has not wit enough to see how he might be free, suffers want in sight of plenty, and is helplessly preyed upon by weaker creatures, seems to me no unfit emblem of the working masses.

In all lands men whose toil creates abounding wealth are pinched with poverty, and, while advancing civilisation opens wider vistas and awakens new desires, are held down to brutish levels by animal needs. Bitterly conscious of injustice, feeling in their inmost souls that they were made for more than so narrow a life, they, too, spasmodically struggle and cry out. But until they trace effect to cause, until they see how they are fettered and how they may be freed, their struggles and outcries are as vain as those of that bull. Nay, they are vainer. I shall go out and drive the bull in the way that will untwist his rope. But who shall drive men into freedom? While men do not use the reason with which they have been gifted all else is vain. For them there is no special Providence.

Under all forms of government the ultimate power lies with the masses. It is not kings nor aristocracies, nor landowners nor capitalists, that anywhere really enslave the people. It is their own ignorance. Most clear is this where governments rest on universal suffrage. The working men of the United States may mould to their will legislatures, courts, and constitutions. Politicians strive for their favour, and political parties bid against one another for their vote. But what avails this? The little linger of a corporation must be thicker than the loins of the working masses so long as the corporation knows how to reach its ends and the masses do not. And how far even those who most feel the injustice of existing conditions are from any agreement as to practical reform may be seen in the labour organisations. Though beginning to realise the wastefulness of strikes and to feel the necessity of acting on general conditions through legislation, these organisations when they come to formulate political demands seem unable to unite upon any measures capable of wide results.

This political impotency must continue until the masses, or at least that sprinkling of more thoughtful men who are the file leaders of popular opinion, shall give such heed to larger questions as will enable them to agree on the path reform should take. But it is a hopeful sign of the times that thought is being aroused, and that in workshop and on farm social problems are engaging attention they never had before.

There is, however, one vexed question which must be settled before there can be among working men any efficient union for political action—a question important in itself, but more important still in what it involves—the question whether a protective tariff is or is not to the interests of those who get their living by their labour. For more than 30 years the slavery agitation, the war to which it led, and the problems growing out of that war, have absorbed political attention in the United States. The era has passed, and a new one is beginning in which economic questions must force themselves to the front. First among these questions, upon which party lines must soon be drawn and political discussion must rage, is the tariff question.

It behoves not merely those who aspire to political leadership, but those who would conscientiously use their influence and their votes, to come to intelligent conclusions upon this question, and especially is this incumbent upon the men whose aim is the emancipation of labour. Some of these men are now supporters of Protection; others are opposed to it. This division, which places in political opposition to each other those who are at one in ultimate purpose, ought not to exist. One thing or the other must be true—either Protection does give better opportunities to labour and raises wages, or it does not. If it does, we who feel that labour has not its rightful opportunities and does not get its fair wages should know it, that we may unite, not merely in sustaining present Protection, but in demanding far more. If it does not, then, even if not positively harmful to the working classes, Protection is a delusion and a snare, which distracts attention and divides strength, and the quicker it is seen that it cannot raise wages the quicker are those who would raise wages likely to see what can. The next thing to knowing how anything can be done is to know how it cannot be done. If the bull of which I speak had wit enough to see the uselessness of going one way, he would surely try the other.

My aim in this inquiry is to ascertain, beyond any peradventure, whether Protection or Freetrade best

accords with the interests of those who live by their labour. I differ from those who say that with the rate of wages the state has no concern. I hold with those who deem the increase of wages a legitimate purpose of public policy. To raise and maintain wages is the great object which all who live by wages ought to seek, and they are right in supporting any measure that will attain that object. Nor in this are they acting selfishly, for, while the question of wages is the most important of questions to labourers, it is also the most important of questions to the nation. What improves the condition of the lowest and broadest stratum of society must promote the well-being of all. Where the wages of common labour are high and remunerative employment is easy to obtain, prosperity will be general. Where wages are highest there will be the largest production and the most equitable distribution of wealth. There will invention be most active and the brain best guide the hand. There will be the greatest comfort, the widest diffusion of knowledge, the purest morals, and the truest patriotism. If we would have a healthy, a happy, an enlightened and a virtuous people, if we would have a pure government, firmly based upon popular will and quickly responsive to it, we must strive to raise wages and keep them high. I accept as good and praiseworthy the ends avowed by the advocates of Protective tariffs. What I propose to inquire is whether Protective tariffs are in reality conducive to these ends. To do this thoroughly I propose to go over all the ground upon which Protective tariffs are advocated or defended, to inquire what effect the opposite policy of Free-trade would have, and to stop not until conclusions are reached of which we may feel absolutely sure.

To think this may be done may seem presumptuous. For a century no question of public policy has been so widely and so persistently debated as that of Protection *versus* Free-trade. Yet it seems as far as ever from settlement—so far, indeed, that many have come to deem it one in which no certain conclusions can be reached, and many to hold that it cannot even be properly understood by those who have not equipped themselves by long study.

This is indeed a hopeless view. We can safely leave many branches of knowledge to such as can devote themselves to their pursuit. We can safely accept what chemists tell us of chemistry, or astronomers of astronomy, or philologists of the development of language, or anatomists of our internal structure, for not only are there in such investigations no pecuniary temptations to warp the judgment, but the ordinary duties of men and of citizens do not call for such special knowledge, and the great body of a people may entertain the crudest notions as to such things, and yet lead happy and useful lives. Far different, however, is it with matters which relate to the production and distribution of wealth, and which thus directly affect the comfort and livelihood of men. The intelligence which can alone safely guide in these matters must be the intelligence of the masses, for as to such things it is the popular opinion, and not the opinion of the learned few, that finds expression in legislation.

If the knowledge required for the proper ordering of public affairs be like the knowledge required for the prediction of an eclipse, the making of a chemical analysis, or the decipherment of a cuneiform inscription, or even like the knowledge required in any branch of art or handicraft, then the shortness of human life and the necessities of human existence must forever condemn the masses of men to ignorance of matters which directly affect their means of subsistence. If this be so, then popular government is hopeless, and, confronted on one side by the fact, to which all experience testifies, that a people can never safely trust to any portion of their number the making of regulations which affect the distribution of wealth, and on the other by the fact that the masses can never see for themselves the effect of such regulations, the only prospect before mankind is that the many must be always ruled and robbed by the few.

But this is not so. Political economy is only the economy of human aggregates, and its laws are laws which we may individually recognise. What is required for their elucidation is not long arrays of statistics, nor the collection or collocation of laboriously-ascertained facts, but that sort of clear thinking which, keeping in mind the distinction between part and whole, seeks the relations of familiar things, and which is as possible for the unlearned as for the learned.

Whether Protection does or does not increase national wealth, whether it does or does not benefit the labourer, are questions that from their nature must admit of decisive answers. That the controversy between Protection and Free-trade, widely and energetically as it has been carried on, has as yet led to no accepted conclusion cannot therefore be due to difficulties inherent in the subject. It may in part be accounted for by the fact that powerful pecuniary interests are involved in the issue, for it is true, as Macaulay has said, that if large pecuniary interests were concerned in denying the attraction of gravitation that most obvious of physical facts would have disputers. But that so many fair-minded men who have no special interests to serve are still at variance on this subject can only, it seems to me, be fully explained on the assumption that the discussion has not been carried far enough to bring out that full truth which harmonises all partial truths. The present position of the controversy, indeed, shows this to be the fact. In the literature of the subject, I know of no work in which there has been attempted what in these papers I propose—the carrying of the inquiry to its proper end. As to the effect of Protection upon the production of wealth, all has probably been said that can be said, but that part of

the question which relates to wages, and which is primarily concerned with the distribution of wealth, has not been adequately treated. Yet this is the very heart of the Controversy, the ground from which, until it is thoroughly explored, fallacies and confusions must constantly arise to envelope in obscurity even that which has of itself been sufficiently explained.

The reason of this failure is not far to seek. Political economy is the simplest of the sciences. It is but the intellectual recognition, as related to social life, of laws which in their moral aspect men instinctively recognise, and which are embodied in the simple teachings of Him whom the common people heard gladly. But, like Christianity, political economy has suffered from the warpings of institutions which, denying the equality and brotherhood of man, have enlisted authority, silenced objection, and ingrained themselves in custom and habit of thought. Its professors and teachers have almost invariably belonged to or been dominated by that class which tolerates no questioning of social adjustments, that give to those who do not labour the fruits of labour's toil. They have been like physicians employed to make a diagnosis on condition that they shall discover no unpleasant truth. Given social conditions such as those that throughout the civilised world to-day shock the moral sense, and political economy, fearlessly pursued, must lead to conclusions that will be as a lion in the way to those who have any tenderness for "vested interests." But in the colleges and universities of our time, as in the Sanhedrim of old, it is idle to expect any enunciation of truths unwelcome to the powers that be.

Adam Smith demonstrated clearly enough that protective tariffs hamper the production of wealth. But Adam Smith the university professor, the tutor and pensioner of the Duke of Buccleugh, the prospective holder of a Government place either did not deem it prudent to go further, or was prevented from seeing the necessity of doing so by the mental atmosphere surrounding him. He at any rate failed to carry his great inquiry into the causes, which from "that original state of things in which the production of labour constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labour" had developed a state of things in which natural wages seemed to be only such part of the production of labour as would enable the labourer to live. And following Smith came Malthus to formulate a doctrine which throws upon the Creator the responsibility for the want and vice that flow from man's injustice—a doctrine which has barred from the inquiry which Smith did not pursue even such high and generous minds as that of John Stuart Mill. Some of the publications of the Anti-Corn Law League contain indications that if the struggle over the English corn laws had been longer continued the discussion might have been pushed further: but, ending as it did, the capitalists of the Manchester school were satisfied, and in such discussion as has since ensued, English Free traders have not advanced, while American advocates of Free trade have stopped with the Cobden Club.

On the other hand the advocates of Protection have evinced a like indisposition to venture on burning ground. They extol the virtues of Protection as furnishing employment, without asking how it comes that any one should need to be furnished with employment; they assert that Protection maintains the rate of wages, without explaining what determines the rate of wages. The ablest of them under the leadership of Carey, have rejected the Malthusian doctrine, but only to set up an equally untenable optimistic theory which serves the same purpose of barring inquiry into the wrongs of labour, and which has been borrowed by Continental Free traders as a weapon with which to fight the agitation for social reforms.

That, so far as it has yet gone, the controversy between Protection and Free trade has not been carried to its logical conclusions is evident from the positions which both sides occupy. Protectionists and Free traders alike are "men-afraid-of-their-horses." If Protection have the virtues claimed for it, why should it be confined to the restriction of imports from foreign countries. If it really "provides employment" and raises wages, a condition of things in which hundreds of thousands vainly seek employment, and wages touch the point of bare subsistence, demands a far more vigorous application of this beneficial principle than any Protectionist has yet proposed. On the other hand, if the principle of Free trade be true the substitution of a revenue tariff for a Protective tariff is a ridiculously inefficient application of it.

Like the two knights in the allegory, who halting one on each side of the shield, continued to dispute about it when the advance of either would have revealed a truth the would have ended their controversy, Protectionists and Free traders stand to-day. Let it be ours to carry the inquiry wherever it may lead. The truth is, that fully to understand the tariff question we must go beyond the tariff question as ordinarily debated. And here, it may be, we shall find ground on which honest divergences of opinion may be reconciled, and facts which seem conflicting will fall into harmonious relations.

II.—Clearing Ground.

Protection has the weight of general acceptance. A short time ago universally accepted by civilised Governments, Great Britain is yet the only considerable nation that has discarded it, while her own Colonies, as soon as they have obtained the power, have shown a disposition to revert to it,

But the presumption in favour of any belief generally entertained has existed in favour of many beliefs now

known to be entirely erroneous, and is especially weak in the case of a theory which enlists the support of powerful special interests, as Protection obviously does. The history of mankind everywhere shows the power of special interests, capable of organisation and action in securing the acceptance of the most monstrous doctrines. And we have but to look around us to see how easily a small special interest may exert greater influence in forming opinion and making laws than a large general interest. As what is everybody's business is nobody's business, so what is everybody's interest is nobody's interest. Two or three citizens of a seaside town see that the building of a custom-house or the dredging of a creek will put money in their pockets; a few silver miners conclude that it will be a good thing for them to have the Government stow away some millions of silver every month; a navy contractor wants the profits of repairing useless ironclads or building needless cruisers, and again and again such petty interests have their way against the larger interests of the whole people. What can be clearer than that a note directly issued by the Government is at least as good as a note based on a Government bond. Yet special interests have sufficed to institute and maintain a hybrid currency for which no other valid reason can be assigned than private profit.

Those who are pecuniarily interested in Protective tariffs find it easy to believe that Protection is good for the whole country. The directness of their interest makes them active and efficient in spreading their views, and having control of large means—for the protected industries are those in which large capitals are engaged—and being ready on occasion, as a matter of business, to spend money in propagating their doctrines, they are able to exert great influence upon the organs of public opinion. Free trade, on the contrary, offers no special advantage to any particular interest, and in the present state of social morality benefits or injuries which men share in common with their fellows are not felt as intensely as those which affect them specially.

I do not mean to say that the pecuniary interests which Protection enlists suffice to explain the manner in which its theories have spread, and the tenacity with which they are held. But it is plain that they do constitute a power of the kind most potent in forming opinion and influencing legislation, and that this fact weakens the presumption the wide acceptance of Protection might otherwise afford, and is a reason why those who believe in it merely because they have constantly heard it praised should examine the question for themselves.

Protection has, moreover, always found an effective ally in those national prejudices and hatreds which are in part the cause and in part the result of the wars that have made the annals of mankind a record of bloodshed and devastation, and which have everywhere been the means by which the masses have been induced to use their own power for their own enslavement.

For the first half-century of our national existence American Protectionists pointed to the Protective tariff of Great Britain as an example to be followed; but since that country, in 1846, discarded Protection, its American advocates have endeavoured to utilise national prejudice by constantly speaking of Protection as an American system, and of Free trade as though it were a British invention. Just now they are especially active in endeavouring to utilise in the same way the enmity against everything British which long and bitter oppressions and insults have engendered in the Irish heart, and, in the language of a recent political platform, Irish Americans are called upon to "resist the introduction into America of the English theory of Free trade, which has been so successfully used as a means to destroy the industries and oppress the people of Ireland."

Even if Free trade did originate in Great Britain we would be as foolish in rejecting it on that account as we would be in refusing to speak our mother tongue because it is of British origin, or in going back to hand and water power because steam-engines were first introduced in Great Britain. But in truth Free trade no more originated in Great Britain than did the habit of walking on the feet. Free trade is the natural trade—the trade that goes on in the absence of artificial restrictions. It is Protection that had to be invented. But, instead of being invented in the United States, it was in full force in Great Britain long before the United States were thought of. It would be nearer the truth to say that Protection originated in Great Britain, for if the system did not originate there, it was fully developed there, and it is from that country that it has been derived by us. Nor yet did the reaction against it originate in Great Britain, but in France, among a school of eminent men headed by Quesnay, who were Adam Smith's predecessors and in many things his teachers. These French economists were what neither Smith nor any subsequent British economist or statesman has been—true Free traders. They wished to sweep away not merely Protective tariff taxes, but all taxes, direct and indirect, save a single tax upon land values. This logical conclusion of Free trade principles the so-called British Free traders have shirked, and it meets as bitter opposition from the Cobden Club as from American Protectionists. The only sense in which we can speak of "British Free trade" is the same sense in which we speak of a Certain imitation metal as "German silver." "British Free trade" is spurious Free trade. Great Britain does not really enjoy Free trade. To say nothing of internal taxes, inconsistent with true Free trade, she still maintains a cordon of custom-house officers, coastguards, and baggage-searchers, and still collects over a hundred million dollars of her revenue from import duties. To be sure, her tariff is "for revenue only," but a tariff for revenue only is not Free trade. The ruling classes of Great Britain have adopted only so much Free trade as suits their class interests, and the battle for Free trade has yet to be fought there.

On the other hand, nothing can be more absurd than to talk of Protection as an American system. It had been fully developed in Europe before the American Colonies were planted, and during our Colonial period England maintained a more thorough system of Protection than anywhere now exists—a system which aimed at building up English industries not merely by Protective duties, but by the repression of like industries in Ireland and the Colonies, and wherever else throughout the world English power could be exerted. What we got of Protection was the wrong side of it, in regulations designed to prevent American industries from competing with those of the Mother Country, and to give to her a monopoly of the American trade.

The irritation produced in the growing Colonies by these restrictions was the main cause of the revolution which made them an independent nation. Protectionist ideas were doubtless at that time latent among our people, for they permeated the mental atmosphere of the civilised world, but so far from there being any disposition to embody them in a national policy, the American representatives in negotiating the treaty of peace endeavoured to secure complete freedom of trade between the United States and Great Britain. This was refused by England, then and for a long time afterward completely dominated by Protective ideas. But during the period following the revolution in which the American Union existed under the Articles of Confederation, no tariff hampered importations into the American States.

The adoption of the Constitution made a federal tariff possible, and to give the Federal Government an independent revenue, a tariff was soon imposed; but although Protection had then begun to find advocates in the United States, as compared with what the British tariff was then, or our tariff is now, this first American tariff was almost nominal. And in the Federal Constitution State tariffs were prohibited—a step which has resulted in giving the greatest extension to the principle of Freetrade that it has had in modern times. Nothing could more clearly show how far the American people were then from accepting the theories of Protection which have since been popularised among them, for the national idea had not then acquired the force it has since gained, and had Protection then been looked upon as necessary, the various States would not easily have given up the power of imposing tariffs of their own.

Nor could Protection have reached its present height in the United States but for the civil war. While attention was concentrated on the struggle, and mothers were sending their sons to the battlefield, the protected interests took advantage of the patriotism that objected to no taxation to secure for themselves protective taxes such as had never before been dreamed of, taxes which they have managed to still keep in force, and even in many cases to increase.

The truth is that Protection is no more American than is the distinction made in our army and navy between commissioned officers and enlisted men. This distinction is historically a survival of that made in aristocratic Europe between the noble and the peasant, and has been copied by us in the same spirit of imitation that has led us to copy other undemocratic customs and institutions. Though we preserve this aristocratic distinction after it has been abandoned in some European countries, it is in no sense American. It neither originated with us nor does it consort with our distinctive ideas and institutions. So it is with Protection. Whatever be its economic merits there can be no doubt that it conflicts with those ideas of natural right and personal freedom which received national expression in the establishment of the American Republic, and which we have been accustomed to regard as distinctively American. What more incongruous than the administering of customhouse oaths and the searching of trunks and hand-bags under the shadow of the statue of "Liberty Enlightening the World?"

As for the assertion that "the English theory of Freetrade" has been used to "destroy the industries and oppress the people of Ireland," the truth is that it was "the English theory of Protection" that was so used. The restrictions which British Protection imposed upon the American Colonies were trivial as compared with those imposed upon Ireland. The successful resistance of the Colonies aroused in Ireland the same spirit, and led to the great movement of Irish Volunteers who, with cannon bearing the inscription "Freetrade or—1" forced the repeal of those restrictions and won for awhile Irish legislative independence.

Whether Irish industries that were unquestionably hampered and throttled by British Protection could now be benefited by Irish Protection, like the question whether Protection benefits the United States, is only to be settled by a determination of the effects of Protection upon the country that imposes it. But without going into that, it is evident that the Freetrade between Great Britain and Ireland which has existed since the Union in 1801, has *not* been the cause of the backwardness of Irish industry. There is one part of Ireland which has enjoyed comparative prosperity, and in which important industries have grown up—some of them, such as the building of iron ships, for which no pretence of natural advantages can be made. If the very men who are now trying to persuade Irish-American voters that Ireland had been impoverished by "British Freetrade" were privately asked the cause of the greater prosperity of Ulster over other parts of Ireland they would probably give the answer made familiar by religious bigotry that Ulster is enterprising and prosperous because it is Protestant, while the rest of Ireland is sluggish and poor because it is Catholic. But it is not worth while to attempt to disprove this stupid assertion. The true reason is plain. It is that the land tenure in Ulster has been such as to

leave there a far larger proportion of the wealth produced than in other parts of Ireland, and that the mass of the people have not been so remorselessly hunted and ground. In Presbyterian Skye there exists the same general poverty, the same primitive conditions of industry, as in Catholic Connemara, and to talk about the want of a Protective tariff or religious opinions being the cause of the backwardness of industry among a people who are steadily stripped of all they can make above a bare living, is like attributing the sinking of a ship with a hole in her bottom to the want of a figure-head or to the colour she happens to be painted.

What, however, in the United States at least, has tended more than any appeals to national dislike to dispose the masses in favour of Protection has been the difference of attitude towards the working classes assumed by the contending politics. The strength of Protection in its beginnings in this country was in those sections where labour had the largest opportunities and was held in the highest esteem; while that of Free-trade has been greatest in the section in which, up to the civil War, slavery prevailed. The political party which successfully challenged the aggressions of the slave power also declared for a high Protective tariff, while the men who tried to rend the Union, in order to establish a nation based upon the right of capital to own labour, prohibited Protection in the constitution they formed. The explanation of these facts is that in one section of the country there were many industries that could be protected, while in the other section there were few. But in many minds the effect has been to associate Protection with respect for labour, and Free-trade with its enslavement.

Irrespective of this, there has been much in the presentation of the two theories to dispose the working classes towards Protection and against Free-trade. Working men generally feel that they do not get a fair reward for their labour. They know that what prevents them from successfully demanding higher wages is the competition of others anxious for work, and they are naturally disposed to favour the doctrine or party that proposes to shield them from competition. Protectionists at least profess regard for the labourer, a desire to use the power of Government to raise and maintain wages, and as presented in politics this is the avowed aim and end of Protection. Protection is popularly urged as the protection of American labour.

On the other hand, the opponents of Protection have, for the most part, not only professed no special interest in the well-being of the working classes, and no desire to raise wages, but have denied the justice of such attempts declaring it no part of the province of Government. The doctrine of Free-trade has been entwined with teachings that throw upon natural laws responsibility for the results of human injustice, and foster a callous indifference to the sufferings of the labouring classes. On the same grounds on which they have condemned legislative interference with trade, Free-trade economists have condemned interference with hours of labour, with the rate of wages, and even with the employment of women and children, and have united Protectionism and trades unionism in the same denunciation, proclaiming supply and demand to be the only true and rightful regulator of the price of labour as of the price of pig iron. While protesting against restrictions upon the production of wealth, they have ignored monstrous injustice in distribution, and have treated as fair and normal that competition in which human beings, deprived of their natural rights and opportunities, are compelled by biting want to bid against each other.

All this is true; but it is also true that the interests of labour are more than a matter of soft words such as we address to a horse when we want to catch him that we may put a bit in his mouth and a saddle on his back. Let me ask those who on this account are disposed to regard Protection as favourable and Free-trade as hostile to the aspirations of labour, to think whether it can be true that what labour needs is Protection.

There is something in the very name of Protection that ought to make working men cautious of accepting anything presented to them under it. The protection of the masses has in all times been the pretence of tyranny—the plea of monarchy of aristocracy, of special privilege of every kind. The slaveowners justified slavery as protecting the slaves. British misrule in Ireland is upheld on the ground that it is for the protection of the Irish. But whether under a monarchy or under a republic there never has been an instance in the history of the world in which the protection of the labouring masses has not meant their oppression. The protection which those who have got the law-making power into their hands have given to labour has, at best, always been the protection that man gives to cattle. He protects them that he may use and eat them.

There runs through Protectionist professions of concern for labour a tone of condescending patronage more insulting to men who feel the true dignity of labour than frankly expressed contempt could be an assumption that pauperism is the natural condition of labour, to which it must everywhere fall unless benevolently protected. It is never intimated that the landowner or the capitalist needs Protection. They, it is always assumed, can take care of themselves. It is only the poor, helpless working man who must be provided with employment lest he starve.

What is labour that it should so need Protection? Is not labour the creator of capital, the producer of all wealth? It is not the men who labour that feed and clothe all other orders of men? Is it not true, as has been said, that the three great orders of society are "workingmen, beggars, and thieves?" How, then, does it come that workingmen alone should need Protection? When the first man came upon the earth who was there to protect him or to provide him with employment? Yet he managed to get a living and raise a family.

When we consider that labour is the producer of all wealth is it not evident that the impoverishment and dependence of labour are abnormal conditions resulting from restrictions and usurpations, and that instead of accepting Protection, what labour should demand is freedom? That those who advocate any extension of freedom choose to go no further than suits their own special purpose is no reason why freedom should be distrusted. For years it was held that the assertion of our declaration of independence that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights, applied only to white men, and to mere political rights. But this in no wise vitiated the principle.

And so, that freedom of trade has been advocated by those who have no sympathy with labour should not prejudice us against it. The road to the industrial as to the political emancipation of the masses must be that of freedom.

The Evening Press, November 30, 1885.

Petone Woollen Factory,

The Foundation-Stone Ceremony.

Interesting Proceedings.

To use the words of Mr T. Kennedy Macdonald, Saturday's proceedings in connection with the laying of the Wellington Woollen Manufacturing Company's Mills at Petone mark a "white-stone day" in the annals of this provincial district, for the benefits to be derived from the establishment of such an important enterprise in our midst it is impossible to over-estimate. Elaborate preparations had been entered into in order to ensure the successful carrying out of the arrangements for the occasion, and, generally speaking, this desirable result was creditably attained by those to whom was allotted the responsibility. Punctually at the appointed hour—a quarter to one o'clock—a special train, containing the directors and a number of the shareholders of the company and their guests, left the Wellington station in carriages placed at their disposal by the Wellington-Manawatu Railway Company, the Government rolling-stock being otherwise engaged owing to the unusually heavy traffic caused by the Hutt races. A pleasing feature of the excursion was the large number of ladies who adorned the occasion with their presence. On arrival at Petone, which wore quite a gala appearance, bunting flying in all directions, the party disembarked and walked to the spot where the foundation ceremony was to take place on the banks of Te Korokoro stream. Here a temporary platform, with tiers of seats for the ladies, had been erected. The site selected it may be mentioned, is beautifully situated irrespective of any advantages it may possess in connection with the new industry, and the presence of about 500 or 600 persons on the ground on such a fine day, surrounded by a lavish display of flags and artistic designs in flowers and evergreens, lent a gay and animated aspect to the scene. The Garrison Band, under Mr S. Cemino's able conducting, accompanied the party to Petone, and took up their position close at hand, playing a capital selection of tunes at intervals. Very little time was wasted in commencing the proceedings, which from first to last were attended with the utmost *éclat*, and passed off with a degree of success that reflects the highest credit on the directors and officers of the Company, especially Mr St. Barbe, the Secretary, who was most assiduous in his endeavours to study the comfort of the guests.

At the stone, Mr T. K. Macdonald, the Chairman of Directors, addressing the Premier, the Hon. Mr Stout, said he desired to heartily welcome that hon. gentleman on that occasion on behalf of the Directors, and to express their satisfaction at seeing him present. As there was a lunch awaiting them it was not his intention to make a speech. He might, however, point out that this would be the first Woollen Mill erected in the North Island of New Zealand and he was sure all present would join in wishing the Company success. We had been far behind our Southern neighbors hitherto in respect to manufactures they had many years ago solved the problem of manufacturing woollen goods in the colony and selling them at a satisfactory profit. So much so, that it was only the other day that the Mosgiel Company sent a representative to establish agencies in the other colonies. He believed the people would encourage this enterprise by supporting the Company when they were ready to put their goods in the market.—(Applause.)—Referring to Mr Stout, he said that hon. gentleman, as

much as any man in the colony, had been identified with the growth and development of industrial enterprises.—(Applause.)—Throughout his long political career, he had given great attention to this question, which was known not only in this colony but throughout the length and breadth of Australasia. He, therefore, took it as a good omen of the Company's future that Mr Stout was connected with so important an event as the laying of the foundation stone. He trusted the Company would go on and prosper, as he believed it would. In designing the plant and the mills great care had been exercised, and the experience of other mills in New Zealand had been examined; and he believed that the building, when completed, would be found to possess every modern improvement and advantage that could be secured. He would now ask Mr Stout to perform the important ceremony of laying the foundation stone of the first woollen mill in the North Island of New Zealand.—(Loud Applause.)

Presentation to the Premier.

Mr Stout was than presented with a handsome silver trowel, suitably inscribed, also with a mallet, made of black *waive*, containing an appropriate inscription, as previously recorded.

The Premier on Industrial Enterprises.

Mr Stout said: Mr Macdonald, ladies and gentlemen,—I have to declare that this corner stone of the woollen mills has been well and truly laid. Before I make a few remarks upon this occasion, I have first to thank very sincerely the directors of the Woollen Company for the honor they have done me in asking me to perform this most interesting ceremony; and I can assure them that the most valuable presentations they have made I shall ever retain and hand to my children as a memento of this occasion. (Cheers.) Now let me say one or two words first about the site of the works. I have been warned by Mr Macdonald that the day is so fine and the lunch is so fine that this is not a time for much speaking. I cannot forbear, however, from saying that of all the sites of the woollen mills I have seen I do not think there is any site, not only in this colony, but in any of the colonies, that can at all compare with it. I don't need to speak of the natural scenery with which it is surrounded, although even that, I believe, should not be neglected in our homes or manufactures; but here everything that is possible Nature seems to have given, suitable for this enterprise. We have not only a situation near the sea, making drainage easy, so that there can be no injury to any of the inhabitants, but we have here a never-failing supply of most magnificent water, which is of considerable importance in an industry like this. And now, let me say one or two words as to what the purport of this ceremonial is. You have been told that this is the first woollen mill in the North Island. I think that the fact of our having woollen mills in our midst marks an era in our industrial progress. There are on this platform gentlemen who came to this colony before I was born, and who can remember when the chief outlet for the employment of the population was whale-fishing, and perhaps bartering goods with the Maoris. But we soon passed that stage. We began afterwards the agricultural era and the pastoral development which has attained to such very large proportions. Then we had our mining, our gold fever, and after that decreased somewhat, although we still had with us not only our whale fishery and our pastoral and agricultural development and mining, we began to pay attention to industrial enterprise. And this is, in Wellington, I hope the beginning of further industrial enterprise, and the beginning of what may truly be called a new economic era. And now, let me say one or two words as to what is implied in that. First, there is this implied—and I hope we will never forget it—that there can be no true greatness in a nation unless it has industrial enterprises. (Cheers.) Let us look at the thing from a purely educational point of view, and from its intellectual side, casting away from us the economic effects and its wealth-producing effect. We find that in history in the present day, where are the countries where there is the greatest mental activity? That it is to be found not in those countries which depend on their raw products, not in those countries which only pay attention to agricultural or pastoral pursuits, but we find the greatest intellects and the highest scientific advancement only in those countries where there are many industrial enterprises. Where are the countries that have developed in Science and Art in recent years? Where they have developed industrial pursuits; and if New Zealand is to have any standing among the nations of the world, she must pay attention to them and have many manufactures in her midst. (Cheers.) She will be a poor country, not only in regard to wealth, but mental energy and intellect, if she is simply to ship away wool and grain and gold. She must be far different in her development. Then there is another point of view, even if you look at it from its wealth point of view. The old maxim tells us that we should never put all our eggs in the one basket, because if anything happens to the basket the result will be that the eggs will be smashed, and we should have to go without our eggs for dinner. (Laughter.) It is just the same with industrial pursuits. In what position are the countries that have to depend on one or two industries alone? The more you separate your industries the better you will be from a material happiness point of view. Then there is another thing in reference to this question that we also

should not forget, and that is this: it may be said that notwithstanding the existence of this colony for so many years, we are only beginning to realise that we are founding a new nation. We have heard it asked, "What are we to do with our sons and the youth growing up among us?" If you wish to promote an outlet for the employment of the race of New Zealand you must have industrial enterprise. They cannot remain here if New Zealand is allowed to continue a country where only raw products are produced. I don't undervalue the production of raw products, but we must cast our eyes into the future, and remember that after all the nation is something like a family; and where would the pathos be in a family, where would be its happiness if you had not in the family circle the young, the weak, and the inexperienced? So it is in national life, and if you are to have true national life in the future you must look to these weaklings and these weak industries amongst you that require Government care just as the weaklings in a family require the care of the father of the family. (Cheers.) That is the only way in which industry has been promoted. Let us go to history. Can you point to the history of any nation where it has not paid attention to its industrial resources which has progressed? Take England, take Germany, take any nation that has risen to any height of national life, and you will find that it was the continual care of that nation to look after its industrial enterprises, and do what it could to foster them. (Cheers.) So we must do now if we are to progress at all in [unclear: tional] life and national wealth. Now, there is another thing that we must remember, and that is this, that all our population may not be suited to the mere production of wool or grain, and we must also recollect this, that as we promote manufacture and enterprise we create, as has been pointed out by an American writer, not extensive farming but intensive farming, which means that every industrial enterprise you start you call into requisition more farmers and more small farmers, and you at once provide employment, which you would not otherwise do, that is if you have the whole country parcelled out into sheep farms. So don't imagine you are interfering with fanning, which will increase tenfold, Where, after all, are the best farmers? If you take the records of New York State where there are large manufactures and enterprises, you will find that the average size of farms is small, and the average wealth of farmers is large; so that side by side with manufacturing development you will have agricultural development; and I hope no one in this country will imagine there is any such thing as a disparity of interest between the agricultural interest and manufacturing enterprise. The one goes along with the other, and if you have the one you will have the other even to a larger extent than you have had in the past. (Cheers.) Now, from ceasing to look at this question from a national point of view, let me say one word in reference to it from a Wellington point of view. I don't think there need be any quarrelling or any undue competition between the various woollen companies in this colony. I hope the time will come when what has happened in England and Scotland will happen here. They each have a mill with its own specialty. There are Scotch tweeds and West of England tweeds; and just as you have in this Province of Wellington very few merino sheep, you are distinguished for crossbreds, and you will find that just as you have a difference in pastoral pursuits so you will have a difference in industrial enterprises, and each manufactory will have its specialty in the future. (Cheers.) Then I have heard some people say that Wellington, from its magnificent harbour—and it has a magnificent harbour—and from its being placed so to speak, in the centre of this colony, giving it a chief position for a chief distributing port, is specially designed by Nature for being the commercial *entrepot* of this colony. The very fact of its being placed in the centre of the Islands ought to make it *par excellence* the seat of manufactures instead of the people looking to commerce alone. If you do that you make the mistake of putting all your eggs in one basket. You have here all the things that tend to make manufactures easy. You have water and you have climate, and the latter is of enormous importance. You neither have it too hot in summer nor too cold in winter, and I believe that circumstance will render New Zealand the home of industries for the whole of the Pacific and even Australasia, because we can do the work here with less physical strain than the manufacturers in other parts of Australasia. The only thing you want, perhaps which you have not got is a coalfield close to you. But, as Mr Travers has pointed out, if you have a railway running in a direct line from Westport to Picton you will have a coalfield quite close to your doors, and can compete successfully with any portion of this colony. Let me ask those who are young, and those who are strong, to look upon industries in the same way that men used to look upon fighting in the past. In the past it was thought there was no glory except in fighting and in war. If a person wished to distinguish himself in glory it was only by fighting. But why should we not have captains of industry and industrial development as well? (Cheers.) If we train our youth to look to industry as something in which they could excel, and if, when we give any mission to our offspring we told them that to strive to do something for the industries of the colony was the highest thing to look to, we would have a far different colony than in the past. (Cheers.) If the people of Wellington would think of the grand future yet before this magnificent harbour and the advantages from the situation of the city, as the Corporation motto says, I believe they would go with more heart and hope into their work; and I need not tell those present here to-day that if the early settlers had not been tired with hope, and had not had faith in the future of the colony, the country would never have reached the development that we have reached to-day. (Cheers.) And I ask those who have recently come to this colony not to be down-cast for any temporary depression or want of work there may be. Let them

look into enterprises like this, and if they do they will be doing something for their adopted country. (Cheers). I ask the ladies and gentlemen here to take an interest in our colonial industries. I was much struck with a certain meeting of the Trade Union held recently in Dunedin. They passed a motion in favor of protecting local industries, and afterwards they went as a deputation to Mosgiel, to the Woollen Factory, and represented their views. The manager, who is a countryman of mine, after looking at them very carefully, said, "Men, nane o' your clathes are colonial tweeds." (Loud laughter). I say you can put this matter to the test. If you are to aid colonial enterprises think of the family relationship, and even if you have to pay a little more for it you ought to aid our local industries; and our ladies, instead of importing fine clothes can get what they require here, and if we all bought our colonial tweeds we should not need, as Mr Macdonald tells us has been done, to establish agencies in Australasia for the sale of our goods, because there would be sufficient demand for them in New Zealand. Let me tell you what happened in Australia. The Geelong factory started and made very good tweeds. I remember myself getting some tweed from there. The cloth was sent Home to Yorkshire, and the mills there imitated it that the people of the colonies could not tell but what it was real Geelong tweed. (Laughter). This may be likened to the tribute that Vice paid to Virtue, but the cloth was not equal to the genuine article; and I know that in the case of the Mosgiel factory they are afraid to send exhibits to the Colonial Exhibition lest the manufacturers at Home should copy their goods and send inferior articles to this colony. That is an enormous disadvantage which we in the colony have to meet. I ask you, therefore, who wish to see industries supported, to think of the family question, and do what you can by encouraging the use of colonial manufactures, to give support to those men who have expended their time and money in starting the enterprise, so that neither their labor nor capital may be wasted for nought. (Cheers). Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very much for the exceedingly patient hearing you have given me in spite of the lunch that we are reminded has been waiting. (Loud and prolonged cheers).

Three hearty cheers were afterwards given for Mr Stout, also for Mr Turnbull, the architect.

The Lunch.

An adjournment was at once made to the adjoining woolshed, which had been most artistically decorated for the occasion, and where long tables laden with appetising things were placed across the floor. Unfortunately, there was not adequate accommodation for the large number of guests who were present, and two relays had to be provided. The repast was a most sumptuous one, and was provided by Messrs McEwen and Churchill, successors to the late Mr Peter Laing, upon whose catering abilities it reflected the highest credit. The chair was occupied by Mr T. Kennedy Macdonald, who had on his right the Premier, and on his left Mrs Stout, who, it should have been stated, was presented on her arrival at Petone with a superb bouquet, the gift of the directors through Mrs Macdonald.

The usual loyal toasts having been duly honored.

Mr J. Goutts Crawford proposed "The Ministry" in a felicitous speech.

Mr Stout responded. He thanked them for the manner in which they had honored the toast. He said there were ample opportunities of discussing politics at another time. Nor was he going to speak of the Ministry and its doings. The Ministry know that from Wellington they got very little support, and he recognised that he was addressing a Wellington audience. (Laughter and applause.) But the Ministry was not going to be judged by the people who were in the colony to-day. If a Ministry was worth anything it ought to stand the brunt of criticism and they could safely leave it in the hands of those who came after them for their judgment. He believed the calm historian would say, not that the Ministry was immaculate, not that it had not committed any blunders, but that they had striven as colonists to do what benefit they could for the nation, and that their aims and desires and wishes and intentions had been devoted to the colony as a whole. (Cheers.)

Mrs Epuni, a Maori, here rose, and, in English, asked the Chairman to promise that she should be presented with the first dress made by the new mill, a request which Mr Macdonald, on behalf of the directors, unhesitatingly complied with.

Mr W. T. L. Trevors proposed "Local Industries," Incidentally he read a letter received that day from Mr J. H. Wallace of this city, descriptive of the landing of the early settlers. Mr Travers made so excellent and practical a speech that it is to be exceedingly regretted that space forbids its reproduction in these columns.

Mr Kitchen appropriately responded to the toast, which was well received.

Mr E. Wakefield, M.H.R., in proposing "The Wellington Woollen Manufacturing Company," said that previous speakers had already said a great deal that he should have liked to have said if it had not been said for him. He would like to say, however, for him self at all events, that he did not agree with Mr Kitchen and others in the opinion that the encouragement of industries like this was a political question. He was convinced it was almost entirely a financial question, and what would send the industries of this colony ahead more than anything that Governments and Legislatures could do for them, was for people to invest boldly in industries

instead of lending out their money on mortgage at the highest rate of interest they could obtain. (Cheers.) He considered that the Wellington Woollen Company were deserving of public gratitude and admiration for having taken a hold departure in that direction. He was convinced that if in other directions the people of this colony were to show their confidence in their country and in themselves and their fellow-countrymen and fellow-workers in the labour of life, by investing their money and trusting to make a fair profit out of a business like this, they would soon see a body of manufacturers established in the colony, not needing any assistance from Government whatsoever: (Cheers.) Had it not been so from the very beginning? In a new country like this they must advance step by step, and they ought not to think little of those who came before them because they were not in a position to do what we were to-day. In the old days they had to import everything. He could remember perfectly well when they had to import mutton from Australia, and now we exported 800,000 sheep a-year to England. They had to creep before they walked, and that was the reason that we now found important local industries like the present being established in the colony. The time was close at hand when New Zealand would be a very great woollen-manufacturing colony, because it had special advantages which perhaps no other country in the world possessed in that respect. And the reason why for his own part he congratulated the country upon what they were doing—and his whole sympathy went with them—was that they were engaged in an industry which was natural to New Zealand, and which would be established with the greatest success. He believed New Zealand was destined to be one of the principal clothing-producing countries in the world, and also that it would produce woollen materials which would rival those from France and Belgium. He failed to see why they should not produce carpets here. He confessed, however, that he would not like to see the ladies dressed in the stuffs which were now being manufactured here, because they would not look so charming. (Laughter). For all their patriotism they were not going to make guys of themselves for the sake of any local industry, and they could not be expected to do so. But he hoped the time would come when our factories would produce material which would tempt the female eye, and when they would wear the locally-manufactured goods in preference and not from any sentiment. He had often wondered that the colonists had put up with the imported rubbish as they had done. (Hear, hear). When he heard the Premier narrate the anecdote about the man at the Mosgiel factory he looked him (the Premier) up and down and wondered whether his clothes were made in the colony or not. (Roars of laughter), [A voice: "Are yours?"] No, his were not, but he had no doubt that the Premier's dress from head to foot consisted of colonial fabrics, and that was the best proof that these were good and handsome and worthy to be worn by the colonists. (Cheers) he looked upon this as a very important occasion, because he believed that Wellington was going to be one of the greatest manufacturing places in Australasia. The Premier had ably pointed out the reasons for that. They were natural reasons, and operated above any artificial consideration whatsoever. If the people would only have confidence in themselves and the future of the place, there need not be a bit of fear, because there was plenty of capital in the country, and plenty of English capital ready to be invested, In conclusion he thought everyone must be gratified with the handsome treatment that the Company had given them, and he hoped that the publicity which had been given these proceedings would have an important effect. (Loud cheers).

Mr Macdonald, on rising to respond was received with enthusiasm. He narrated an incident which took place in the early days on the site of the new woollen mills. Two sons of Caledonia brought over a thistle with them, and, in the presence of a clergyman, planted it, prayed over it, and blessed it. (Laughter and applause). The present occasion, he said, would be marked as a "white stone" day in the annals of Wellington.

These were all the toasts, and the company afterwards separated, strolling up the banks of the Koro Koro till it was time to return to town in the special train. This reached its destination shortly before 6 o'clock, and everybody was well pleased with the treat they had enjoyed, and full of wishes for the success of the Wellington Woollen Manufacturing Company.