To my son Robert

With his fathers kindest regards

Robert Stout

1 May 1936

The Peace of the World PROGRAMME OF THE PEACE CELEBRATIONS

Give Baby Glaxo and after the first two or three feeds see the difference. See bow satisfied he is—how peacefully he sleeps—how contented be is! The characteristic cry of the non-thriving baby ceases, the wrinkles on the little forehead disappear; the frightened, pained look in the eyes is replaced with a look of bright happiness and contentment. the Food that Builds Bonnie Babies

Telegraphic & Cable Address : Telephones : " DREDGER," Wellington 1932, 3125 P.O. Box: 863 Richardson, mcCabe & Co., Ltd. ENGINEERS, IMPORTERS, MANUFACTURERS' AGENTS AND COMMISSION MERCHANTS 11 Grey St., WELLINGTON AGENTS FOR MANUFACTURERS AND SUPPLIERS OF Machinery and Machine Tools of every description. Dredgers, Grabs, Air Compressors, Pneumatic Tools, Rock Drills, Water works Fittings, Filtration Plant, Sewage Sprinklers, Septic Tank Fittings, Railway, Tramway and Electric Light Requirements, Electric Welding Sets, Copper and Aluminium Wires and Cables, Aluminium Ingots, Rods, Sheets, etc., Telephones, Insulators, Poles, etc.. Stone Crushing and Road Making Machinery, "ERA" Maganese Steel, Tramway Track-work, High Speed Steel, Steel Castings, Steel Rails, Joists and Girders, Bolts, Spikes, Pulverising Plant, Refuse Destructors, Gravity Runaways and Conveyors, High Speed Engines, "DIESEL "Engines, Locomotives, Road Rollers, Wire Ropes, Cement Making Machinery, Cranes, Electric Pulley Blocks, Pumps, Rams, Steam Heating Apparatus, Laundry Machinery, Boilers, Man-hole and Sludge Doors, Boiler Tubas, Steel Structural Work, Gasometers, Rod Benders, Cast Iron Pipes,' Surveying and Mining Instruments. Australian Hardwoods, Carbide Calcium, Bitumastic Paint, etc., etc. Quotations given for any of the above lines and similar Merchandise

Townsend & Paul, Ltd. THE BUSY AUCTIONEERS OLD ESTABLISHED : AND RELIABLE : Consign Your Produce to TOWNSEND & PAUL, LTD. and You will be Satisfied WHOLESALE FRUIT, PRODUCE, GRAIN & GENERAL MERCHANTS Allen Street, WELLINGTON

Lessons from the War.

By Robert Stout.

La vraie lumièré
Qui eclaire tout homme
Est venue dans le monde,
A tous ceux qu'il out reçue
Ella a donné pouvoir
De devenir enfants de l'humanitié
Parce qu'ils croient en elle.

ALFRED LOISEY—LA RELIGION.

THERE are many glorious pages in the history of our people. They tell us that on many occasions there have been outbursts of joy on the receipt of the news of victorious battles won by our Empire, and of the declarations of Peace. Life, it has been said, is like a chequered or chessboard pavement. It has an equal number of black and white squares. Our race has had many dark days—days of suffering and of grief. It has also had many white, bright days—glorious occasions when the people were full of joy. In no period of our history have there been so many bright and dark days experienced in the same space of time, as during the past live years.

Some of us can remember the Crimean War, and the news coming to the Home land of the battles of Alma. Inkerman, Balaclava, and Sebastopol. And when the news of Peace came, what demonstrations of joy there were; every hill-top had its blazing bonfire. We can also recall the sad news of the massacres in the Indian Mutiny of Cawnpore and others, and also the cheering news of the defence of Lucknow and Delhi. All these reminiscences pale into insignificance before the names of Mons, the Marne, Passchendale, Gallipoli, and many

more. These fights, and others, will go ringing down through coming centuries as the records of the work of heroes. It is well for our race, and for our successors, who have to maintain the name and prestige of the Empire, that we should treasure these deeds of renown, so that our descendants may never forget "the brave days of old" and the deeds done by their progenitors in the name of Liberty, Righteousness, and Peace.

Has the war, with all its sad and all its glorious events, any lesson for us here and now? Peace has come; but even if we desired it, the memory of what has so recently happened cannot be forgotten. Can these events be any inspiration for higher ideals and a nobler social life? By reference to the past we may obtain much assistance in dealing with our social problems. Records of the battle of life, in days long past, may help us to fight our present battles. While reading lately a recent notable book. "The Folk Lore of the Old Testament," by Dr. Frazer, the eminent professor of Anthropology at Cambridge, this thought came home to me: What interesting and beautiful stories there are in the Hebrew literature!

"ABDULLA" CIGARETTES VIRGINIAN :: EGYPTIAN :: TURKISH AN ENGAGING SMOKE. "Hearts and Rings, Abdulla brings. PACKED IN BOXES OF 10's, 25's, 50's and 100's OBTAINABLE FROM ALL TOBACCONISTS

Elijah the Prophet.

There is one that, either as a parable or as an allegory, may help to inspire us: it is the story of Elijah the Prophet, in the First Book of Kings, ch. xix. What a telling picture it is! A great Hebrew prophet, a true patriot, appears before us. He is ready to sacrifice his life the people will not listen to him, and he is threatened by the is no one in all Isreal who listens to his message. He has to flee for his life the people will not listen to him and he is threatened by the Government. He has preached what he believes to be a true religion, but all the nation—King, rulers, and people—have abandoned their religion and followed what he believes to be a false God.

His countrymen had declared for the continuance of the religion of Baal with all its attendant wickednesses, and if "slang" had been used in ancient Israel, no doubt there would have been hurled at his head, by unmannerly Baalites, some Semitic word meaning "wowser." He flees to Mount Horeb and hides in a cave, and for forty days and forty nights he is without food. Then there came to him what the Hebrew historian calls the "Word of the Lord." Some other human beings have had similar messages, but they have called the bearer of them by other names. There were Quakers who had the "inner light," and others have spoken of "a compelling conscience" and of "a Divine Spirit." The "Word," it is said, spoke to him and told him to go forth from the cave and to stand upon Mount Horeb. He obeyed, and the story continues:

"And behold, the Lord passed by and a great and a strong wind rent the mountains and broke in pieces the rocks before the Lord, but the Lord was not in the wind; and after the wind an earthquake, but the Lord was not in the earthquake; and after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a still small Voice."

Our translators say that this Hebrew phrase, literally translated, means "a sound of great stillness." What a beautiful phrase! There was Peace! The story continues and tells us of a conversation between the "Voice" and the prophet. Elijah, however, felt that his mission had not entirely been a failure, for were there not in the small and thinly-peopled kingdom seven thousand who thought as he thought, and who had not bowed the knee to Baal? What an uplift was that to a discredited prophet ! His life-work had not been a failure. There were still many left who were upholders of truth and righteousness. If there are any Social Reformers who have lost heart, let them ponder over Elijah's story.

Elijah and our Mission.

We are like Elijah. We also have ascended our Horeb. We have Seen terrible destruction by storm, earthquake, and fire. Never in the history of the world have so many people been slain in war; never have so many cities been laid waste; never has so much capital been destroyed. Millions upon millions of men and women have lost their lives. To Elijah, the destruction worked by storm, earthquake, and fire was not the most important thing; it was the "sound of great stillness"—the "Voice"—that cheered him, enthralled him, and inspired him. It was the "Voice" that gave him his message, that told him

his duty and his mission. But he was a prophet. We are not prophets. What, then, is a prophet? Carlyle told us that the present-day prophets were our newspaper men; they were the deliverers of messages to humanity. Is not, then, any and everyone a prophet who has a high ideal of life, who has a compelling inspiration to devote his life to the people, and who has utterance? If we can only get an ideal enshrined in the hearts of men and women, we will have, as has been said, an irresistible power in the world greater than fleets or armies. We would have then a live people stirred by enthusiasm, devoted to duty, and whose aim would be to uplift

humanity. Did not Elijah impress and inspire Elisha to such an extent that he abandoned his farm and went forth to save his nation? And history's records of martyrs, of missionaries, of humanitarians, of prophets since the time of Israel's Kingdom are long and glorious. They obeyed the "Voice"; they strove to redeem the world. At one stage in human history it was thought that there could be no priests except those who belonged to a special order. Nowadays we realise that anyone, and everyone, may have a duty to perform and a message to deliver. We are living in a Democracy—the people rule.

PEACE AND HARMONY Will Reign in Your Home IF MEN WILL WEAR CAMBRIDGE Brand Clothing . . Shirts . . Pyjamas IF LADIES' WILL WEAR CLASSIC Brand Costumes Blouses . Underclothing ALL MADE IN NEW ZEALAND

The New Zealand Problems.

The problems we have to solve are not the same in name as those which the people in Elijah's time had to solve, but they are not different in character. He strove for truth and righteousness, and we have the same struggle before us. How is humanity to be redeemed? How is the land to be made a pleasant land fit for human habitation? A modern American prophet has said:

"We live in order to finish an as yet unfinished universe—unfinished so far as the human—that is, the highest—part of it is concerned. We live in order to develop the superior qualities of man, which are, as yet, for the most part latent. . . We are to go out as teachers among the people, discarding the limitations imposed by the theologies of the past, and holding up the moral idea, pure and simple, as the human ideal for all men, embracing all men, binding on all men—the ideal of a perfect society, of a society in which no men or class of men shall be mere hewers of wood and drawers of water for others; in which no man or woman, or class of men or class of women shall be used as tools for the lust of others, or for the greed of others; in which every human life, the life of every man, women, and child, shall be esteemed a sacred utterance of the Infinite."

This is ever the true prophet's message whenever and wherever delivered—three thousand years ago, or three years ago, in Palestine, or in New Zealand.

Have we heard the voice? The burden rests on us individually, and the message must be delivered by one and by all. There can be no substitute and no delegates. The duty is not to be performed by associations, or teachers. Each one who hears the voice must obey it. Let us also realise that regarding the many problems we have to consider we cannot remain neutral. There can be no neutrality on a moral issue. If you find anyone who desires to act as a leader of men, or to perform a prophet's function, saying that on a moral question—on an issue of life—he is neutral, or if we see a political

party, or a church, or a social organisation declaring that it is neutral on such an issue, we must conclude "the voice" has not been heard.

PEACE IN THE HOME IS ASSURED WHEN RELIABLE ELECTRICAL APPLIANCES ARE USED All Hotpoint Goods HAVE PROVED THEMSELVES SATISFACTORY BEAUTIFUL FINISH, EFFICIENT & ECONOMICAL jHotpoint Irons with Cord Protector and Thumb Rest Hotpoint Kettles Hotpoint Percolators Hotpoint Ovenettes. Hotpoint Grills . . CALL AND INSPECT OUR SHOWROOMS: TURNBULL & JONES, LTD. 19, 21 and 23 BLAIR STREET Branches: AUCKLAND, CHRISTCHURCH, DUNEDIN, NAPIER, OAMARU

Self-Sacrifice.

What, then, is the first equipment of the Prophet or the Social reformer? It is, what surely this war has taught us, and 'of which we have had so many and sucli notable examples, self-sacrifice. Without it we can deliver no message. Our flag must bear the motto, "Live for Others." It is that message the world needs. And why should we not listen to it? We have many weak people who are shirkers, whose world outlook is narrow; but shirking is not confined merely to abstaining from enlistment, or not responding to a Defence Officer's call. Every man or woman in our social life who is not dominated by high ideals of life must bear that dyslogistic name. If all our people were inspired with the ideal of social service, with the feeling that they must live for others, our social evils would vanish like a morning mist before the rising sun.

Restitution.

There are many practical and pressing problems that can only be solved by the self-sacrifice of our citizens. Many portions of our earth have been ruined so far as suitability for human life is concerned. Wo have had terrible losses of property. Our savings have been depleted; vast storehouses of capital have been left bare. We have incurred vast liabilities. Civilisation has never advanced without savings and the husbanding of resources. How are the empty garners to be refilled? There are only two means we can employ. We must work hard and

save, so that want and poverty, which have generally—I might say always—followed every war, may not injure our people. We ought at the very commencement of the war to have taken as our motto the words, "Waste not, want not." We did not do so, and the waste and extravagance that we have witnessed since the war have been a disgrace to us. Instead of saving we have gone en spending. In our eating and drinking, in our clothing, in our pleasures there has been no sign of frugality, nor of thrift. Our waste has been unpardonable. It has to be recognised that the human being requires change of scene, perhaps, and change of occupation, that amusement and pleasure should not be denied. No one desires to enforce asceticism, but we have been extravagant in our pleasures. In rushing out of our houses for amusements we have acted as if we could get no pleasure, and had not any pleasure in our homes. We have wasted our money on that which profitetli not.

Labour Unrest.

There is another problem that is looming large in the social life of almost every State: it is what is called "Labour Unrest." Here, again, let us consider how this question must be dealt with. Last winter on many occasions in New' Zealand coal was difficult to obtain, and many people and their children suffered. The coal-miners would not work. Strikes were resorted to in the struggle between Labour and Capital. Now, strikes are civil war. Is it not strange that while we are acclaiming the League of Peace between nations we should not be insisting on social peace? International peace is to be maintained by providing a judicial tribunal to which disagreeing nations must leave the determination of their disputes, and if they do not agree to arcupt

the decision of the tribunal all the other nations will enforce its decision. Why should we not, then, insist on social peace by referring all labour disputes to our labour tribunals? It may mean the giving up by employers of their right to fix wages, hours, and other conditions of labour, and it may mean a like surrender by workmen; but are these two classes to exercise no self-sacrifice for the sake of industrial peace? Has the "sound of the great stillness" not pierced their ears?

RUN NO RISKS TAKE CARE OF YOUR PROPERTY Yorkshire Insurance Company, Limited Established 1824 'Phone 1497 FIRE,. MARINE ACCIDENT :: LIVE STOCK TOTAL FUNDS EXCEED £7,000,000 VERNON IRVING MANAGER.

The Needs of Workers.

Besides and beyond leaving labour disputes to a judicial tribunal, we must recognise the needs of those who labour. These have been summarised by various writers. May I make a summary?

- The workers must have a living wage.
- Work must be performed in healthy working conditions; over-fatigue must be prevented and every care taken of the lives and health of the workers.
- There ought to be continuous employment. Unemployment is a curse.
- The self-respect of the workmen must be encouraged and maintained. If fault has to be found with them, let it be done courteously and quietly.
- Loyalty to industrial needs should be encouraged.
- Collective bargaining—the trade union agreement—should be fully recognised. It is about 41 years since I prepared and introduced into Parliament the first Trade Union Act, which is still law.
- A happy home-life for the worker should be the aim of the employers.
- True idealism of life should be encouraged so that work could be looked upon as a social service—in fact, as worship—"Laborare est orare" : work is worship.
- The mental development of the worker should be attended to by adult education, by proper amusements, and by encouraging an interest in social life.

It has been well said that human life—and that is the worker's life—is a harp of many strings. We should not, therefore, expect the worker to thrum on one string only: he must pray on all the strings.

Education.

Perhaps in all our concern about the reconstruction of the nations no one subject is occupying the mind of our people more than education. A Special Commission has been sitting in England dealing with the education of the adult, and we have special organisations helping our soldiers to obtain a higher and better knowledge. Why this sudden outburst of educational fervour? Is it not that the people have realised that without education civilisation cannot go forward? It is the road to efficiency. The old proverb is true: Train up a child in the way he should go, and even when he is old he will not depart from it. The young must be trained to civic life and to have a civic conscience, so that there may be civic peace and efficient citizens. Would it not

make for both these aims if all our youths were trained in one school? Differences of creed, of points of

view, will arise, but should not the children all meet together in one school so that they may thoroughly realise that they are members of one family? If their parents desire to teach them their theology, give them every opportunity to do so—that is required where freedom reigns. But why could not this special teaching be given in special classrooms by teachers of religion? All the children—whatever wealth their parents possess and whatever work their parents may do—should meet together and attend the one school. There are many things that make for division amongst us, but surely we may train and teach our children without the aid of denominational schools. These do not, surely, make for either civic peace or brotherhood.

EMPIRE HOTEL WELLINGTON The Most Luxurious Hotel in New Zealand Patrons may feel assured of most comfortable accommodation Tariff 15/- per day RICHARD DWYER, Proprietor

The Dominance of Truth.

The demand for higher education is growing. In the last fifty years we have seen many new Universities started in England, and in the Dominions we have recognised their necessity. A writer on Ethical Psychology has said that if the full and free development of the individual is not permitted—if the human groups are treated as communities of bees or beavers—if human souls are hemmed in by castes, or classes, or institutions, degeneration will set in. Let those who promote class feelings think of these things. Happily, in our University Colleges the wind of Freedom blows. The higher education teaches us the value and the necessity of Truth. The whole of scientific education is based on Truth. Neither creed, nor class, influences the man of science. He searches for the truth. There may be objection and opposition to the results he proclaims to the world; a Darwin or a Lyell may be denounced, but the men of science go on, careless of the hubbub of the uninformed. Should we not, in all our thoughts and in all our criticism, be dominated by Truth? Have we obeyed the prophet's injunction, "Speak ye every man the truth with his neighbour"? Are contracts and treaties deemed sacred? Do we speak the truth, careless of the opinions of our fellow-citizens? Have we carefully thought out all the complex questions of our social life that come up for discussion and decision? If we have not, we have not done our duty as citizens. Dr. Bonar has said:

"Think truly, and thy thoughts
Shall the world's famine feed;
Speak truly, and each word of thine
Shall be a fruitful seed.
Live truly, and thy life shall be
A great and noble creed."

If Truth alone were worshipped by us, the bitterness of theological and political discussion would be much modified.

The Future Race.

Have we spent any time in thinking what the future race is to be? We know from history that many distinct races have ceased to exist. Many of the races of the stone age have apparently left no successors. If we go to our nearest colonial neighbour—Tasmania—we find that there are now no Tasmanian aboriginals. They have a11 passed away. There are many and powerful peoples in the world not closely related to our race. The yellow race is, perhaps, the most

numerous of all races. The members of that race are industrious and generally peaceable. In late years, in some of its branches, education and general development have advanced rapidly. It promises to be an industrial rival of the white race. Are we preparing for such rivalry and struggle?

Be satisfied with A really comfortable place to stay R ing or wire. R est asssured your enquiry will receive prompt attention Easy of access to Wharves, Trains, and Post Office The tariff is reasonable. The table is of the best. Sociability and civility Have always been 0ur aim That is why Everyone Likes Barrett's Hotel

Will Our Race Last?

Recently an article by one of our citizens—Mr. Elsdon Best—was published in the Polynesian Society's Journal on "The Land of Tara." The article is really part of the ancient history of Wellington, its harbour, and surrounding district. It tells us that there are over thirty places in the district where there were once Maori villages and residences All have now vanished. Where are the brave, stalwart hapus that welcomed our first settlers to Wellington? I let Mr. Best reply. He says:

"Of all the scenes familiar to the men of yore in the Land of Tara, nought remains unchanged save the contour of the great hills and the rippling waters of the great Harbour of Tara. No more are seen the hamlets that girt the Red Lake round, the cultivations that fringed the Awa-a-Taia, the paddling of many canoes to the fishing-grounds. No longer are the fortresses of Motu-kairangi crowded with fierce fighting men as of old, ready, at the sign of signal fires on the Ranga-a-Hiwi, to grasp spear and dub in defence of their homes. Never again shall the chief tain's war canoe swing across the waters of Tawhiti-nui, and never more shall the hills of Tara re-echo the roaring chorus of the war-song.

"And the children of Awa, where are they? Of a verity are their numbers few in the land. Of all these stalwart, war-seasoned migrants who welcomed our fathers, none are left. Anon, you may see a brown-skin descendant in our streets, a lone figure from the age of the Neolithic—a descendant of Sea Kings who ranged the great ocean when our forebears were hugging coastlines, a lone figure gazed at curiously by passers-by. He is not one of us or of our time; in the words of a survivor of the days of the levelled spear, 'Me te mea te wairua tangata a haere ana'—'like a human spirit moving abroad.' "

Are the Maoris to pass away as the Tasmanians have passed? If they cease to exist it will be because they have fallen before diseases we have introduced, because of social habits to which we have accustomed them, and because they have not remained industrially efficient. And our race may fail from the same causes. Disease, drugs, and inefficiency will destroy any people. We have greatly improved our industrial machinery, but we have still much inefficiency in our midst. Many examples are apparent to us if we keep our eyes open. Is it a sign of efficiency that it now takes five men to do the same work that was done by three some years ago? And do you think it makes for skill or efficiency that men when engaged in arduous work are smoking pipes or cigarettes? We have had in our midst two evils during the war—"going slow" and "exploitation." Neither makes for efficiency. It is this clamant need for efficiency, that has led the

Imperial Government, to constitute Commissions of Inquiry to investigate the need of new industries, and of small agricultural settlements, and also the needs of our industrial workers.

EMPRESS THEATRE Week commencing SATURDAY 19th JULY. A Triangle Feature—Belle Bennett and Barney Sherry in "RECKONING DAY." A Rousing Story of the Heroism and Pluck of a Young Woman Lawyer pitted against German Trickery and Propaganda. Funds Contributed to Charity Turned into German Coffers. A Startling Exposure. Revealed by Secret Service Investigations. The Innocent Girl who Paid the Price of Hun Ferocity. She recognised the Mark of the Beast but Too Late. EVERYBODY'S THEATRE Week commencing SATURDAY 19th JULY. A Triangle Feature Roy Stewart in " THE BOSS OF THE LAZY Y." A Roarin' Rough Ridin' Drama of the Western Plains. Adapted from the novel by Charles A. Seltzer. A Heritage of Hate. A Sullen Cowboy. Some Rough Riding. A Pretty Girl. A Duel with 2 to 1 odds. A Tiger tamed by a Petticoat. See Roy Stewart Rope and Ride a Buckjumper. KING S THEATRE Week commencing SATURDAY 19th JULY. A First National Feature—Herbert Brennon presents Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson in " THE PASSING OF THE THIRD FLOOR BACK." By JEROME K. JEROME. A Dramatic Classic with the Power and Charm of a Great Personality. The Greatest Living English Actor in the Character he Created and most loved. The message of "THE STRANGER". The Passer-by who brought Love and Understanding to a Wretched, Sordid Home. Every Man or Woman needing Courage, Hope, or Strength should see this Picture.

An English Commission's Report.

One such Commission has dealt with adult education. No more forcible and eloquent statement of the needs of the coming new era has ever been published, and I reproduce for you the closing paragraphs of one of the reports. This report has been recently presented to the Imperial Parliament. It reads:

"For no one can doubt that we are at a turning-point in our national history. A new era has come upon us. We cannot stand still. We cannot return to the old ways, the old abuses, the old stupidities. As with our international relations, so with the relations of classes and individuals inside our own nation, if they do not henceforth get better they must needs get worse, and that means moving towards an abyss. It is in our power to make the new era one of such progress as to repay us even for the immeasurable cost, the price in lives lost, in manhood crippled, and in homes desolated.

"Only by rising to the height of our enlarged vision of social duty can we do justice to the spirit generated in our people by the long effort of common aspiration and common suffering. To allow this spirit to die away unused would be a waste compared to which the material waste of the war would be a little thing; it would be a national sin, unpardonable in the eyes of our posterity. We stand at the bar of history for judgment, and we shall be judged by the use we make of this unique opportunity. It is unique in many ways, most of all in the fact that the public not only has its conscience aroused and its heart stirred, but also has its mind open and receptive to new ideas to an unprecedented degree.

"It is not the lack of goodwill that is to be feared. But goodwill without mental effort, without intelligent

provision, is worse than ineffectual: it is a moral opiate. The real lack in our national history has been the lack of bold and clear thinking. We have been well-meaning, we have had good principles; where we have failed is in the courage and the foresight to carry out our principles into corporate life.

"This corporate life itself has only been made visible and real to us (as on a fiery background) by the glow and illumination of the war. We have been made conscious that we are heirs to a majestic inheritance, and that we have corresponding obligations We have awakened to the splendid qualities that were latent in our people, the rank and file of the common people who before this war were often adjudged to be decadent, to have lost their patriotism, their religious faith, and their response to leadership; we were even told they were physically degenerate. Now we see what potentialities lie in this people, and what a charge lies upon us to give to these powers free play. There is stirring through the whole country a sense of the duty we owe to our children and to our grandchildren to save them not only from the repetition

of such a world-war and from the burdens of a crushing militarism, but to save them also from the obvious peril of civil dissension at home.

"We owe it also to our own dead that they shall not have died in vain, but that their sacrifice shall prove to have created a better England for the future generation."

These burning words are like the utterances of a Hebrew prophet.

And now, may I ask, de we hear "the still small voice," and are we prepared to obey it? Has the mantle of Elijah fallen on our shoulders? Are we prepared to struggle for a higher life, for truth, for righteousness, for the uplifting of humanity? If we are, let us put on our armour and march forward.

"Forward! the day is breaking;
Earth shall bo dark no more;
Millions of men are waiting
On every sea and shore.
With trumpets and with banners
The world is marching on,
The air rings with hosannas,
The field is fought and won.

"Forward! the world before us
Listens to hear our tread,
And the calm heavens o'er us
Smile blessings on our head;
Hope, like an eagle, hovers
Above the way we go;
The shield of patience covers
Our hearts from every toe.

"Forward' as nearer and nearer
Draw we unto our rest—
Joyous, the light shines clearer
In every faithful breast.
The past has ceased to bind us,
Its chains are hurled away,
The deepest gloom behind us
Melts in the dawn of day."

vignette

J. & E. ATKINSON, LIMITED LONDON BRITISH FOR 120 YEARS MANUFACTURERS OF PERFUMERY, POWDERS, TOILET SOAP, etc. Kempthorne, Prosser & Co.'s New Zealand Drug Co., Ltd. SOLE AGENTS ATKINSON'S POINSETTA PERFUME, POWDER, SOAP CALIFORNIAN POPPY POWDER, SOAP RAMBLING ROSES POWDER, SOAP No. 24 COLOGNE BLUE LABEL BATH SALTS, etc., etc.

VISITORS! YOU WANT THE BEST IN SCREEN-CRAFT? THEN YOU SHOULD VISIT Artcraft de Cuxe (Facing New Parliament Buildings) macMahon's (Manners Street) OR Paramount (Courtenay Place) Cheatres These Three Theatres show exclusively PARAMOUNT & ARTCRAFT PHOTO-PLAYS And a, you know THIS MEANS THE "BEST & MOST" REMEMBER- The proprietors of these Theatres hold the exclusive rights for screening Paramount and Artcraft pictures in Wellington and it is at the Paramount and Artcraft Theatres where these pictures are shown for the first time in New Zealand.

Saturday, 19th July, Sports At Newtown Park

Peace Celebration Committee.

- President: J. P Luke, C.M.G., Mayor of Wellington.
- Sports Committee: A. Marryatt (Chairman), R. W. Shallcrass (Hon. Secretary).
- Organiser and Secretary: J. Lewis.

Sports Officials.

- Starter: T. W. Leslie.
- Referee: R. W. McVilly.
- Stewards: A. Marryatt, W. F. Larkin.
- Judges: R. A. Guise, C. E. Bridge, M. Burnett.
- Field Events: J. Doyle, T. S.Ronaldson, H. Murray, W. H. Jones, L. McKay.
- Marshall: J. C. Cusack.
- Timekeepers: W. N. Tucker, W. H. Ludwig, W. H Pollock.
- Call Stewards: C. Turnbull, F. Hodson.
- Press Stewards: H. McKeowen, W. Auld.
- Handicapper: A. C. Kitto.
- Number Steward: J. Lundon.
- Ground Committee: W. Auld, G. Frost, A. E. Wells, N. A. Grant.
- Directors in Hairdressing and Millinery Competitions: A. J. Bloxam, A. Hogg.

Competitors Numbers.

- Hayvice, H.
- Stone. H. B.
- Barker, N. A.
- Tracy, L. A.
- Moss, H.
- Thomson, H. G.
- Heley, G.
- Lusk, G.
- Jackson, H.
- Aiken, G.
- Cotterill, E. E.
- Brett, G.
- Peart, E.
- Kennedy, A.
- Dickson, C. B.
- Gillespie, G.
- Dealey, C.
- Wilkins. H.
- Whyte, H. S.
- Finch, E.
- Wilson, A. B.
- Wilson, T.
- Wilson, P.
- Futter, J. C.
- Christie, R. A.

- Burk, W. J.
- Wiren, S. A.
- Robinson. H.
- Todd, L. C.
- Harlen. F. G.
- Todd, D.
- Sutherland. E. G.
- Munro. P.
- McHolm, J.
- Brown, J.
- Kay, R. J.
- Bell, J.
- Thorpe, F.

All Events run under N.Z.A.A.A. Rules.

FRESH FISH WHOLESOME FISH And Plenty Of It Hurcomb & Son HIGH-CLASS PURVEYORS 138 Willis St, Wellington 'Phone Us—No. 239 For Your Order

List of Events.

Commencing at 2 p.m.

- Highland Fling (open for those who have never won a prize). Highland Fling (under 12 years of age).
- Highland Fling (open).
- Sheauntriubbhas.
- Irish Jig (open).
- Sailor's Hornpipe.
- Reel Tulloch.

Steward: D. Campbell.

Prizes for the above dances, first and second.

Other Events.

Punch and Judy Show.—Stewards: G. M. Julius and B. Keesing. All Post Entry Events Free.

REX Luncheon Cheese Is an Appetizer Aids Digestion . Wholesale from— THOMPSON BROS., LTD. Blair Street, Wellington

Drink Everybody's Favourite Wholesale from THOMPSON BROS., LTD. Blair Street, WELLINGTON

Phoenix Confectionery and Biscuits Wholesale from— THOMPSON BROS., LTD. Blair Street : : WELLINGTON

Programme.

Event No. 1—Association Football.

- To Start at 2 p.m.
- Six-a-side—Semi-final.
- Petone v. Marist Bros.' B.
- Y.M.C.A. Marist Bros.' A.

Event No. 2.—100 Yards.

- To Start at 2.10 p.m.

First Heat.

- Barker, N., scr.
- Lusk, G., 2 yds.
- Peart, E., 4 yds.
- Moes, H., 5 yds.
- Aiken, G., 5 yds.
- Dickson, C. B., 6yds.
- Kennedy, A., 6 yds.
- Cottrell, E. C., 6 yds.

Second Heat.

- Heley, G., 1 yd.
- Tracy, L. A., 2yds.
- Stone, H. B., 3 yds.
- Dealey, C., 3 yds.
- Hay vice, H., 4 yds.
- Gillespie, G., 4 yds.
- Jackson, A., 4 yds.
- Thomson, P. G., 5 yds.
- Brett, G., 5 yds.
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- Time
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- Time

Event No. 3.—high Jump Handicap.

To Start at 2.15 p.m.

- Munro, P., scr.
- Whyte. H. S., 3 inches.
- Sutherland, E. G., 3 inches.
- Thomson. P. G., 3 inches.
- Brett. G.. 4 inches.
- Wilkins. H., 6 inches. 1st 2nd Height

Event No. 4.—Sack Race.

To Start at 2.20 p.m.

- 1st
- 2nd

Event No. 5.—Puttinc the Shot (Handicap).

To Start at 2.20 p.m.

- P. Munro, scr.
- J. Brown, 2ft. Gin.
- J. Me Holm, 6ft.
- J. C. Futter, 12ft.
- H. Jackson, 12ft.
- 1st
- 2nd
- Distance

Event No. 6.—Boys' Half-Mile Walk.

To Start at 2.30 p.m.

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd

Event No. 7.—Ladies' 50 Yards Race.

To Start at 2.40 p.m.

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd

Event No. 8.—100 Yards Final.

To Start at 2.50 p.m.

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- Time

Event No. 15.—Pillow Fighting Competition.

To Start at 3.30 p.m.

- Winner

Event No. 16.—Long Jump Handicap.

To Start at 3.35 p.m.

- Brett, G., scr.
- Barker, N., scr.
- Heley, G., scr.
- Sutherland, K. G., 6 inches.
- Gillespie, G., 1 foot.
- Thomson, R. G., 1 foot.
- Whyte, H. S., 1 foot 6 inches.
- Moss, H., 2 feet.
- Futter, J. C., 2 feet.
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- Distance

Event No. 17.—Final Association Six-A-Side Tourney.

To Start at 3.35 p.m.

- Winners

Event No. 18.—Hat Trimming and Hairdressinc Competition for Ladies and Soldiers.

To Start at 3.35 p.m.

- Winner

Event No. 19.—50 Yards Returned Soldiers' Handicap.

To Start at 3.40 p.m.

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd

Event No. 20.—880 Yards Relay Race.

Teams of four. Each competitor to run 220 yards, carrying football, in football costume.

To Start at 3. 45 p.m.

- Hutt—Gold and Black.
- Petone—Blue.
- Athletic—Blue and Black.
- Selwyn—Green and Black.
- Victoria University—Green.
- Marist Bros.—Green and White.
- 1st
- 2nd

Event No. 21.—Rugby Football Seven-A-Side.

To Start at 4 p.m.

- Poneke v. Selwyn.
- Winner

Event No. 22.—220 Yards Handicap.

To Start at 4.15 p.m.

- Barker. N., scr.
- Heley, G., 1 yd.
- Lusk, G., 2 yds.
- Tracey, L. A., 5 yds. 2. Stone, H. B., 6yds.
- Dealey, C., 6 yds.
- Gillespie, G., 7 yds.
- Hay vice, H., 8 yds. 13. Peart, E., 8 yd*.
- Jackson. H.. 8 yds
- Aiken, G., 8 yds.
- Wilkins, H., 10 yds.
- Moss, H., 10 yds.
- Whyte, H. S., 10 yds 12. Brett, G., 11 yds. '
- Cotterell. E., 11 yds. 15. Dickson. C. B., 12 yds
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- Time

Event No 23.—Potato Race.

To Start at 4.20 p.m.

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd

Event No. 24.—Throwinc the Hammer.

To Start at 4.25 p.m.

- McHolm, J., scr.
- Munro, P., scr.
- Biown, J., 20ft.
- 1st
- 2nd
- Distance

Event No. 25.—Ecc And Spoon Race for Ladies.

To Start at 4.25 p.m.

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd

Event No. 26.—Three-Lecced Race.

- To Start at 4.30 p.m.

Event No. 27.—Two-Mile Handicap.

To Start at 4.35 p.m.

- Bell, J., scr.
- Flitter, J. O., 60 yds.
- Thorpe. F., 50 yds.
- Harlen, F., 120 yds.
- Robinson, H., 140 yds.
- Todd. D., 140 yds.
- Todd, L. C., 150 yds.
- Wilson, P., 160 yds.

- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- Time

Event No. 28.—440 Yards Handicap.

To Start at 4.45 p.m.

- Lusk, G., scr.
- Wilson, A. B., 2 yds.
- Jackson, H., 8 yd.
- Aiken, 6., 8 yds.
- Kntter, J. C., 14 yds.
- Christie, It., 16 yds.
- Wilkins, H., 16 yds.
- Whyte, H. S., 16 yds.
- Finch, K., 18 yds.
- 1st
- 2nd
- 3rd
- Time

Petone Rungs Unrivalled

CHEVROLET MOTOR CARS are built to earn and retain the approval of particular people. They are provided with every accessory of established merit that would add to the convenience and comfort of their owners. The Prime Factors of CHEVROLET CAR Value are :— (1) Durability, (2) Economy in Operation, (3) Mechanical Simplicity and Efficiency, and (4) Price DEMONSTRA HON? Dominion motor Vehicles, Ltd. COURTENAY PLACE TORY STREET WELLINGTON

Robert Martin, Ltd. THE PREMIER WALLPAPER HOUSE OF WELLINGTON Established 1860 EVENT NO. 9.—ONE MILE HANDICAP. To Start at : 38. Bell, J., scr. 21. Wilson, A. B., 15 yds. 27. Wiren, S. A., 45 yds. 28. Robinson, H., 65 yds. 20. Finch. E., 65 yds. 29. Todd, L. C., 65 yds. 22. Wilson, T., 80 yds. 1st 2nd 3rd Time EVENT No. 10.—LADIES' HOCKEY. To Start at 3 p.m. Feilding v. Ramblers. Feilding Team.—Misses Davidson, Balcroft, Worsfold, Rush, Baker. Sew el, dark, Hostick, Bowater, Healey, Ellern. Emergencies: Misses Bell. Burns, Pettigrew, Cross. Ramblers Team. Misses H. Farell, Watt, Williams, Dick, Ayling Nolan, Wilkins, Simon, Williams, Lamberg. Iang. EVENT NO. 11.—THREAD THE NEEDLE RACE. To Start at 3.10 p.m. 1st 2nd 3rd "Rust Ruins your Roof, Ruin the Rust" Use "GALVO" Red Roof Paint. Phenomenal Resistance to Atmospheric Conditions Great Covering Power - - Capacity Unsurpassed No Substitutes for "Galvo" are Obtainable 10/6 Per Gallon, at ROBT. MARTIN LTD., Manners Street, Wellington

ROBERT MARTIN, LIMITED THE PREMIER WALLPAPER HOUSE OF WELLINGTON (Established 1860) OFFICIAL PROGRAMME SATURDAY, SUNDAY & MONDAY 19th, 20th and 21st JULY, 1919. SATURDAY. Grand Procession, leaving Government Buildings at 10 a.m. Proceeding along Lambton Quay, Willis St., Manners St., Cuba St., Vivian St., and Kent Terrace to Newtown Park. Military Display and Sports from noon until 1.45 p.m. Amateur Athletic Sports. Football and Hockey Programme, starting at 2 o'clock. Torchlight Procession, leaving Government Buildings at 7 p.m. preceded by an illuminated car, proceeding through Lambton Quay. Willis St., Manners St. to Oriental Bay. Fireworks Display at Band Rotunda, Oriental Bay at 8 p.m. The signal for the starting of the processions, morning and evening, will be the discharge of six rockets. PostponementIn the event of the day's programme being postponed a signal will be given at 8.30 a.m. by the firing of six rockets from the Town Hall. SUNDAY. Thanksgiving Services at the Town Hall, at 3 p.m. and 8 p.m. The Grand Peace Celebration Choir will render a musical programme. MONDAY—Children's Day. Procession of children leaving Clyde Quay and Post Office Square at 9 a.m. for the Parliament Buildings, where short addresses will be given and the children will render Patriotic Songs. Monday Night Grand Patriotic Concert at 8 p.m. at Town Hall. Open air concerts at Post Office Square, Mercer St., Boulcott St. and Courtenay Place. WALLPAPERS AT MARTIN'S are selected from all the leading English and American Manufacturers BEING ALL NEW AND UP-TO-DATE DESIGNS - - - SAMPLES POSTED FREE Box 630 R. MARTIN, Manners Street, Finds Us "Phone 144

The Favourite Whisky— "D.C.L." What is the Popular Cry? "D.C.L." D.C.L. stands for a Decent Colonial Liquor and the Distillers Company, Limited see to that ... HAROLD BROWN & CO., LTD. Agents JOHNSTON STREET WELLINGTON

ROBERT MARTIN, LTD. THE PREMIER WALLPAPER HOUSE OF WELLINGTON Established 1860 EVENT NO. 12.—BOOT AND BARREL RACE. To Start at 3.15 p.m. 1st 2nd 3rd EVENT NO. 13.—220 YARDS HURDLES HANDICAP. To Start at 3.25 p.m. 10. Aiken, G., 15 yds. behind. 9. Jackson, H., 13 yds. behind. 32. Sutherland, E. F., 12 yds. behind. 19. Whyte, H. S., 10 yds. behind. 36. Kay, R. V., scr. 12. Brett, G., scr. 1st 2nd 3rd Time EVENT NO. 14.—50 YARDS SCRATCH RACE. To Start at 3.30 p.m. 3. Barker, N. 4. Tracy, L. A. 7. Holey, G. 8. Lusk, G. 1. Hay vice. H. 9. Jackson, H. 10. Aiken, G. 5. Moss, H. 6. Thomson. H. G. 2. Stone, H. B. 1st 2nd 3rd Time ESTIMATES GIVEN FOR PAINTING, PAPERHANGING and DECORATING Phone 144 R. MÂRTIN LTD., Street First Class Tradesmen Employed

—J. FANNING & CO.. ... TUP I ICt House and Estate AgentsCan Sell Your Premises or Buy for YouoWe have hut one Jlddress—74 MANNERS STREET telephone 650

George & Kersley, Ltd. MEN !—Here's Underwear to Keep You Warm & Snug ! MEN'S SINGLETS in Wool and Cotton Mixture; of reliable English make. Prices—4/11, 5/6, 6/6 and 7/6. MEN'S UNDERPANTS of good quality Wool and Cotton Mixture; English make. Prices-6/6, 6/11 and 7/6. FINEST NEW ZEALAND UNDERWEAR, cosiest in wear, and most dependable in quality. Kaiapoi and Mosgiel makes. SINGLETS, Prices—9/6, 10/6, 13/6, 15/6. UNDERPANTS, 9/6, 10/6, 13/6, 15/6. WARM ALL-WOOL HALF HOSE, .Price—3/6 per pair. BLACK WOOL-AND-COTTON HALF HOSE, Prices—1/6, 3/6, 4/11 per pair. ALL WOOL CASHMERE HALF HOSE, Best English make. Prices—5/9 and 7/11 per pair. FLANNELETTE PYJAMAS, in neat designs, and comfortable styles. Price—12/6. Better grades at 14/6, 18/6, 21/-. George & Kersley, Ltd. LAMBTON QUAY WELLINGTON MAIL ORDERS. We Pay Postage and Guarantee Satisfaction.

Abraham & Williams, Ltd. Head Office : PALMERSTON NORTH Branches at— Wellington Levin . Palmerston North Marton . . Taumarunui Hamilton . Auckland . Agencies at—All Principal Centres on Main Trunk Line STOCK, LAND and SHIPPING AGENTS AUCTIONEERS, etc. WOOL, SKIN, HIDE and TALLOW BROKERS. GRAIN, SEED and PRODUCE MERCHANTS. Agents for— ALEX. ROBERTSON & SONS' HIGHLAND SHEEP DIP. Chief Agents for— THE SOUTH BRITISH INSURANCE COY., LTD. Wool Stores at— WELLINGTON and AUCKLAND. ABRAHAM & WILLIAMS, LIMITED

The Bristol Piano Co. Ltd. _ BRITISH PIANOS JOHN BROADWOOD & SONS, LTD. o The Oldest Established Piano Manufacturers in the British Empire. WILLIAM SAMES, LTD. O O A House noted for the Magnificent Tone and Exceptional Durability of its Pianos. THE BRISTOL. PIANO CO. LTD. WELLINGTON M. J. BROOKES North Island Manager Many other reliable English Pianos are obtainable at the Bristol Piano Co., and by taking advantage of this Firm's liberal Hire Purchase System one can enjoy an excellent Piano at home while paying for it.

Military Sports.

The following programme of military sports, upon to Territorials, Rifle Clubs, Returned Soldiers and Senior Cadets, will precede the Sports Programme, and be held at Newtown Park on Saturday, 19th July, 1919, let ween noon and 1.45 p.m.

Directors: Captain Bell, Captain Davis, Lieut. Christopherson.

- Tug of War.
- Boot Race.
- Potato Race Wheelbarrow Race.
- Sack Race.
- Pillow Fighting.

Punch & Judy Show.

The real Old English Punch and Judy Show will be showing at Newtown Park all the afternoon, Peace Day, Saturday, 19th July, 1919.

Admission 3d.

Roll Up! Roll Up! Both Young and Old to see the Grand Old Show.

Black and White Whisky SPECIAL BLEND OF OLD SCO rCH BY WARRANT OF APPOINTMENT . . DISTILLERS TO 1)1$ majesty Cbc King JAMES BUCHANAN & CO., LTD. The Sure it is Black and White

What we have Done.

IN 1913 Mr. James (now Sir James) Allen arranged with the War Office the composition and arrangements for despatch of an Expeditionary Force. This force was, roughly, 7,000 to 8,000 men of all arms.

On announcement of this on the return of Mr. Allen to the Dominion, this arrangement to provide this force was assailed by certain sections of the community, the general tone of the complaint being that it was an undertaking by the Government pledging the Territorial Force, recently formed under General Godley, for service outside New Zealand. This plea was immediately contradicted by the Government, who explained that the Expeditionary Force would be voluntary.

On the threatening for war (not the outbreak) the Government of New Zealand, with the great consensus of public opinion behind them, offered the services of a New Zealand Expeditionary Force. This was accepted by the Imperial Government, and the first party to leave New Zealand (approximately 1,400) sailed on 15th August, 1914 (eleven days after declaration of war with Germany) for German Samoa. At that time the German cruisers Gneisenau and Scharnhorst, with light cruisers, were in the Pacific. Arrangements were made by the Imperial authorities for the Australian Navy (one battle-cruiser and several light cruisers) to escort this force. This fleet was eventually reinforced by the French cruiser Montcalm. On arrival of the British forces the authorities in German Samoa surrendered without resistance, and this German colony has since been occupied by a New Zealand garrison under Colonel Logan as Administrator.

The Main Body of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force comprised 351 officers and 7,410 other ranks, total 7,761, and with the 1st Reinforcements (comprising ten per cent, of the Main Body)—90 officers and 729 of other ranks, total 738—under General Godley, sailed from New Zealand on 15th October, 1914. They were carried in ten transports and were escorted from New Zealand by four of His Majesty's ships and a Japanese cruiser. Later the Australian cruisers joined the escort, and during the voyage the German cruiser Emden was fought and finished by H.M.A.S. Sydney.

From the commencement of the war the military authorities, after the despatch of the Main Body and 1st Reinforcements, laid down a definite aim of training for each reinforcement draft. Recruits were called in during the first year of war at intervals of two months, and men were not allowed to go in when they pleased, but had to wait until a draft mobilised. This, of course, gave rise to a great amount of criticism of the Defence Department, but the Department's scheme proved solid in the end, as men coming in one draft could bo trained

together and despatched in one draft at regular intervals, whereas in case of men coming in at odd intervals a draft would have been in different stages of training, and on arrival at the base the whole draft would probably have to wait for the least-trained soldier.

During the earlier stages of the war, when recruiting meetings were held all over the country, a nuisance was created with what was called the professional recruiter—i.e., a man, say, with one eye or some disability which prevented his being accepted, coming up before a crowded meeting, receiving cheers, and ongoing to the doctor, especially if he had been there before, getting bumped hard into the street.

Everybody drinks Usher's Green Stripe Whisky Except me I'm an ass MAN is never too old to Learn Things WOMAN is never too young to Know Things TEA is the Test—"Suratura's" the Best! BUY IT! TRY IT! 2/4 and 2/6

Gallipoli Campaign.

Our troops were engaged in the Gallipoli Campaign from 25th April to 19th December, 1915. The casualties in that campiagn were approximately 8,000.

During that campaign the original force—i.e., the Main Body—was raised by reinforcements and new units to approximately 14,400.

From October, 1915, in consequence of an increased number of reinforcements being required, owing to increased percentages being required to reinforce the different arms and to the numerous new units added to our Expeditionary Force, drafts were called up and despatched every four weeks, instead of two months, as hitherto.

The Military Service Act to use compulsion where volunteers were insufficient became law on 1st August, 1916. At that time there was no shortage of volunteers, but a general feeling prevailed throughout the country that compulsion for all alike was more just.

In January, 1916, it was decided to form a New Zealand Division consisting of 676 officers and 19,369 other ranks, total 20,045. (Owing to new units asked for by the War Office and approved by the Now Zealand Government, the establishment of the New Zealand Division and subsidiary units was at the date of the armistice 853 officers and 23,051 other ranks, total 23,904).

The Division was shortly afterwards transferred to France, and the New Zealand Mounted Rifle Brigade—93 officers and 1671 other ranks, total 1764—remained in Egypt and proceeded on service with the Anzac Mounted Corps until the date of the armistice.

Much censure was made at times against the Government during the war respecting the number of reinforcements sent. It has often been stated in Parliament and outside that the Government were piling up reinforcements in England. Especially the formation of the Fourth Brigade came in for much criticism. This brigade was formed out of reinforcements in March, 1917, during a period when the Division had few casualties. Immediately it was required it was again broken up and used as reinforcements. It was never reinforced and was only formed into a brigade during a lull in the fighting. In connection with the cry that too many reinforcements were accumulated at Home (never

more than 5,000 effectives at most), the following table of casualties at main engagements may be of interest:—

The New Zealand Division has never suffered from lack of reinforcements such as some of the Australian divisions have. It was the only division in the field, including British and Australian, that was not reduced in strength. The policy of the Government in refusing to send a larger original force and higher reinforcements, as was urged very often in the beginning of the war by the public press, has been justified by results, as, had this been done, a constant stream of reinforcements could not have been sent.

The s.s. Maheno was chartered on 25th May, 1915, and the s.s. Marama on 3rd November, 1915, from the Union Steam Ship Company of New Zealand and were fitted up as hospital ships, the former having a capacity of 340 cot patients and the latter 592 cot patients. These ships have performed splendid service during the war.

Reinforcements were trained chiefly in Trentham and Featherston Camps, the former having a capacity of 4,500 and the latter about 7,500 (exclusive of Tauherenikau and Papawai subsidiary camps). Maori and Rarotongan troops, as well as Tunnellers, were trained in Narrow Neck Camp near Auckland, and Medical Corps in Awapuni Camp near Palmerston North.

A camp for men classified "Cl"—i.e., men likely to become fit after receiving special training—was established at Tauherenikau in September, 1917. It has been alleged in Parliament and outside that this camp was not justified by results, in so far as few men became fit for transfer to reinforcements, and that the majority of those so transferred were discharged as medically unfit before their drafts embarked on active service. An analysis showed that excellent results were obtained. Of a total of 7,187 men sent into Cl Camp from September, 1917, to date of the armistice, 3,528 (representing 49.1 per cent.) were transferred to reinforcements, 2,899 (or 40.3 per cent.) discharged, and 760 (10.6 per cent.) remained undisposed of at the time of the armistice. Of the 3,528 transferred to reinforcements, only 330 were discharged before their drafts sailed from New Zealand. A large number, although classified unfit for active service, had their general health much improved by their sojourn in camp.

The New Zealand Army Nursing Service was formed at the commencement of the war. In all, 550 nurses were despatched from New Zealand. Of this number ten were drowned in the wreck of the Marquette and three others died.

Maori troops to the number of 2,227 and 461 Rarotongans and Niue Islanders proceeded on active service.

From the outbreak of war to the signing of the armistice New Zealand despatched 100.444 troops and nurses, and on the latter date there were 9,924 troops in training in the various camps in New Zealand. This constitutes a splendid record from a country with a total population in 1914 of 1,089,825. The number of males of military age was 243,376.

Murray, Roberts & Coy., Ltd. WELLINGTON And at— DUNEDIN, NAPIER and GISBORNE Merchants and Stock and Station Agents. Regular Auction Sales held atWellington, ofWool, Skins, Hides andTallow. Consignments solicited and correspondence invited. Full supplies ofStation andFarm Requisites, including: Fertilizers, Grass and Fodder Plant Seeds, kept in stock. Full Particulars upon application— MURRAY, ROBERTS & COY., LTD.

George Thomas & Co., LTD. Auction Sales of Fruit . Vegetables and Other Produce held Daily . . Prompt Account Sales Rendered Auctioneers & Merchants . Allen Street, WELLINGTON . . Telephones : 78 & 1592 G.P.O. Box 26 Bankers : Bank of New Zealand WE INVITE CORRESPONDENCE FROM PRODUCERS AND OTHERS WISHING TO CONSIGN TO THE WELLINGTON MARKETS

War Events.

The Principal Dates.

A full diary of the war, doing justice to all the important events, would be of inordinate length. The following are some of the most important dates:—

1914.

- June 28.—Assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and the Duchess of Hohenberg at Serajevo.
- July 23.—Austrian ultimatum delivered to Serbia.
- July 28.—Austria declared war on Serbia.
- August 2.—Germans entered France and Luxemburg; Russians entered Germany.
- August 4.—Britain declared war on Germany.
- August 9.—British army landed in France.
- August 23.—Battle of Mons.
- August 26.—Battle of Le Cateau. Battle of Tannenberg.
- August 28.—Battle of Heligoland Bight. Samoa occupied.
- September 6-10.—Battle of the Marne.
- October 9.—Fall of Antwerp.
- October 15.—Front extended to English Channel.
- October 21.—First battle of Ypres.
- November 1.—Battle of Coronel.
- November 3.—First shelling of Dardanelles forts.
- November 7.—Fall of Tsingtau. British landed in Mesopotamia. November. 9.—Destruction of the Emden.
- December 8.—Battle of Falkland Islands.
- December 25.—German defeat in second battle of Warsaw.

1915.

- January 1.—Turks routed in Caucasus by Russians.
- January 24.—Battle of the Dogger Bank.
- February 2.—First Turkish attack on Suez Canal.
- February 18.—German "blockade" of England begun. Naval attack on the Dardanelles.
- March 18.—End of Dardanelles naval attack.
- April 14.—First Zeppelin raid on England.
- April 22.—Second battle of Ypres; poison gas used.
- April 25.—British landing on Gallipoli.
- April 28.—Macken sen's great offensive in Galicia began.
- May 7.—Sinking of the Lusitania.
- May 31.—First Zeppelin raid on London.
- June .4.—Attack on Krithia and Achi Baba.
- July 2.—First battle of the Isonzo.
- July 9.—Surrender of German South-West Africa.
- August 5.—Fall of Warsaw.
- August 6.—Lone Pine taken; troops landed at Suvla Bay.
- August 8.—New Zealanders reached Chunuk Bair.
- September 23.—Allied offensive at Vimy, Loos, and the Champagne. September 29.—British entered Kut-el-Amara.
- October 3.—British landed at Salonika.
- October 13.—Murder of Nurse Cavell.
- November 12.—Germans in control of Sofia-Constantinople railway British reach Ctesiphon.
- November 22.—Battle of Ctesiphon.
- December 3.—Townshend besieged in Kut.
- December 5.—French succeeded by Haig as Commander-in-Chief. December 8.—Evacuation of Gallipoli begun.

DUNLOP GOODS INCLUDE DUNLOP CYCLE TYRES OCEANIC CYCLE TYRES MOTOR TYRES SOLID MOTOR TYRES VEHICLE TYRES PERAMBULATOR TYRES CARDEN, SUCTION, STEAM, BREWERS' AIR DRILL, DELIVERY, POWER SPRAY HOSES ETC DUNLOP RUBIER HEELS AND

SOLES KROMHYD SOOT SOLE ENGINEERS GOODS—CONVEYOR BELTING DRIVING BELTING SHEET RUBBER PACKINGS STUDS INSERTIONS CORD MILKING MACHINE REQUISITES WATERPROOFS. RUGS. CUM BOOTS ETC WRINGER ROLLERS MATS AND MATTING HOT WATER BOTTLES PLUMBERS-SUNDRIES STATIONERS-SUNDRIES DENTAL RUBBER SPORTINC GOODS-FOOTBALL BLADDERS TENNIS BALLS LACROSSE BALLS ETC. ETC ALWAYS ASK FOR "DUNLOP" BRAND ITS YOUR GUARANTEE OF SERVICE AND SATISFACTION. DUNLOP RUBBER CO.

"THE OLD ORDER CHANGETH YEILDING PLACE TO THE NEW " Adjust your office with up-to-date Equipment, Time and Labour-Saving Devices Edison's Latest Invention -THE— EDISON-DICK MIMEOGRAPH Call and have a Demonstration UNDERWOOD TYPEWRITER " The machine you will eventually buy " CORONA PORTABLE TYPEWRITER The busy man's machine TYPEWRITER SUPPLIES REPAIRS A SPECIALTY The Legrove Typewriter & Importing Co. Ld. 199 Lambton Quay, WELLINGTON And at-14 Victoria Arcade, AUCKLAND :: 15 Tennyson Street, NAPIER

BALLINGER BROS. Wholesale Plumbers I Manufacturers Of Lead and Compo Pipe, Traps, Bends, Syphons, etc., obtainable from all Wholesale Houses in the Dominion. Importers Of Gas Fittings, Baths, Lavatories, Sanitary Earthenware, Brass Manufacturers, Corrugated and Plain Iron. etc.. etc. Proprietors and Manufacturers of Wade's Patent Skylights. Offices and Showrooms - WARING-TAYLOR STREET Factory and Store - MAGINNITY STREET WELLINGTON Telephone : Warehouse, No. 99; Office, 3416. P.O. Box 18

JOHN TANN'S ANCHOR. RELIANCE SAFES and STRONGROOM DOORS . British Manufacture SOLE AGENTS FOR N.7. Sargood, Son & Ewen, Ltd.

"STANDARD" BOOTS BEST . For . HARD Wear LONG . Sold by All Retailers . New Zealand Manufacture

New Zealand's Part

In the War

By F. M. Hickey.

ON the first day of August, 1914, very few New Zealanders imagined that within a few hours practically the whole world, and particularly themselves, would be plunged into the most desperate war ever conceived. We in this lonely outskirt of the groat British Empire were living the tranquil life, ignorant of the terrible plots being hatched in Hunland. We knew nothing and cared less. We were prepared for nothing, in the major sense. Then the bells rang out. The peals came like a thunderbolt upon the peaceful people of this Dominion. On that fateful fourth of August the news went round that Great Britain had declared war on the strongest national combine the world knew then—Germany and Austria.

Quick as a flash the situation was sized up here. The Hun territories near us were the first thoughts of the legislators, and in next to no time an army was formed and despatched to win a bloodless battle in German Samoa. The significance of that victory can be imagined when the exploits of the Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, Emden, and Wolff are recalled. Had Samoa remained in the hands of the Huns, it ran readily be conceived what immense damage could have been inflicted on our transports by raiders who would have sheltered, coaled, and victualled at Samoa, besides being able to keep in touch with each other per wireless, using the island as a rendezvous. Two of the enemy ships mentioned above did visit the island, but sailed away again without entering into a conflict.

Meantime arrangements were in train here to assist in the great struggle at the other end of the world. The military intelligence of the Dominion was organised, and camps filled with eager patriots were soon in full swing. Men sold up their businesses and farms and rushed to the colours, fighting and scheming to cheat the medical examiners if they possessed any physical defects that would debar them from being accepted for service. No one who witnessed the sight will ever forget that memorable morning when some eight thousand men sailed out of Port Nicholson under the escort of men-o'-war of the Allied Fleet.

Here we are, twelve thousand miles away from the scene of the conflict, and with a population of but a million; yet we sent to the great war one hundred thousand fighting men—warriors who have earned undying glory for our country by their magnificent deeds of valour, by their courage, and particularly by their discipline and self-restraint. Those men knew naught of war or soldiering: they were from the office and the farm; from behind the counter and from the bush. But what soldiers they made! The world to-day rings with the deeds of

the New Zealanders. One has only to note the fact of the late visit of that great French military genius, General Pau, and remember what he said, to see the great name New Zealand now has in the world. And General Pau is not given to saying things he does not mean. He is the personification of sincerity.

We had our ups and downs in the war. We met adversity fairly often, as the Roll of Honour denotes, some eight thousand of the flower of our manhood remaining behind on the sacred battlefields, silenced forever, but heroes still. We have also the maimed: he who has lost one or more limbs; he who has lost his sight, or his hearing, or his reason. It is our duty to tend those men, and not grow callous with the waning of the war excitement. They cannot forget their troubles.

During the great conflict there were doubtless many blunders committed by both sides. There always will be. What one has to do in these circumstances is to sit down and consider just for one moment the immense amount of responsibility resting on the shoulders of the head of the fighting forces. If he attempts a coup and brings it off successfully he is a magnificent hero; but if his effort fails he is a blundering idiot who should not be in charge of a handcart. So says the man in the street. As a rule that gentleman is somewhat intolerant.

Various arguments have been propounded and expounded regarding Gallipoli, where we were hit so hard, but not defeated. We came within an ace of winning, but the plum was thrust from us at the last moment. But we were not disgraced. Gallipoli was always declared impregnable, and the only way to win it was the way it was won—starve out the Turk. It is less expensive than an assault, from the point of view of man-power, munitions, and finance. The names of

New Zealand and Gallipoli will ever he associated, just as the coined term "Anzac," the letters of which stand for Australian-New Zealand Army Corps, will for ever remain an illustrious item in British history.

Throughout the four years of strife our trade continued with the Motherland; and although we lost a ship or two, it could nearly be said that we escaped scathless. Not one of our transports was lost, which fact was undoubtedly due to the everlasting vigilance of the great and grand British Navy, about which sufficient can never be said or written.

The part played by the New Zealand Government in the war has been criticised in various circles for political reasons; but when it is considered where we are, how small we are, and what we have done, the Government of this country can, to use a colloquialism, pat itself on the back. The military heads of the Dominion throughout the war wore mainly drawn from civil life, but few being professional soldiers, and the magnificent material they turned out to fight for the preservation of the rights of the weak will redound to their credit for evermore. Schoolmasters and merchants, farmers and lawyers, clerks and labourers, all combined to equip a force second to none in the whole world. And they were eminently successful in the great mission they undertook.

God Save the King!

LAERY & CO., LTD. Auctioneers, Fruit, Produce, Grain and General Merchants Allen Street, WELLINGTON Consignments of all descriptions of Fruit, Vegetables, Produce & Grain disposed of to the best advantage BANKERS: Bank of New South Wales, Wellington CODES : ABC. 4th and 5th Editions, Western Union and Special Private. CABLE & TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "Laery," Wellington Representatives for Leading Exporters in Australia, Fiji, Tasmania, California and the Mediterranean

ART Is more in evidence to-day than ever before To make the home complete and attractive, There must be Art THOMAS McNEE WOODWARD STREET will assist you in the renovation of your house, if you consult him. 'Phone 808.

Personal Satisfaction is assured When wearing a Suit of Clothes MADE BY EXPERT BAILORS Kelburn Avenue

THE LAMBTON QUAY MILK SHOP Mrs. LITTLER MILK—CREAM—BUTTER—EGGS and BOXED CHOCOLATFS Wellington Publishing: Co. Print.—12666 60

NEW ZEALANDERS PLEASE BEAR IN MIND THAT A Holiday once a year is a good investment. THAT After a Holiday you think better, work better, and live better. THAT New Zealand has the grandest and most healthful Holiday Resorts in the World. THAT If thousands come from overseas to visit New Zealand's Resorts, it must be worth your while to visit them. WHEN YOU TRAVEL on Business or Pleasure avail yourself of the Government Tourist Department's popular and up - to - date system of booking. Avoid all worry and inconvenience, and book at the GOVERNMENT TOURIST BUREAU Corner of Grey and Featherston Streets (Opposite G.P.O.) Telephone No WELLINGTON 1908 THE CHEAPEST AND BEST ROUTES SELECTED NO EXTRA CHARGE FOR BOOKING SERVICES The GOVERNMENT TOURIST AGENT will tell you WHERE to go, HOW to go, WHEN to go, and WHAT to pay LITERATURE SUPPLIED FREE

The following is the full text of the address on "Civilisation," delivered by Sir Robert Stout at the Municipal Theatre, Napier, on March 17, 1918:—

We are met to-night to consider what we mean by the term "civilisation." It is a word we are continually using and our dictionaries give us its meaning. It has many definitions. Edmund Burke said that the basis of

civilisation was the "spirit of a gentleman and the spirit of religion." Before this saying could be appreciated we would have to define the terms "gentleman" and "religion." Another eminent man—Matthew Arnold—said that civilisation was the "humanisation of man in society." Leaving aside these definitions, in the meantime, we can approach the consideration of the term by remembering what man is. We have in nature many diverse living things. They are differently constituted and their lives differ. There is one class of living things that is called "uni-cellular"—that is, the life is represented by one cell only. This one cell serves for their brain, their stomach, and everything else that many-celled animals have. Many illustrations may be given of one-celled living things. There is one called "Pleurococcus vulgaris," one of the Algæ. You have, no doubt, seen green layers or green slime on the bark of trees or on stone walls. That may be the "Pleurococcus vulgaris." Its little cell can take in all the food and drink it requires, and it can get rid of certain substances. To quote the words of a recent essay by Professor McLeod, in the "Hibbert Journal," "it grows, it can secure itself against dangers, it can for example make its outer wall thicker when it is threatened with withering in dry weather; it can multiply itself." There are many other one-celled living things. Yeast is one, and the living thing which causes the phosphorescence in the sea is another, These one-celled beings never help each other. They are individauls, and each is for himself alone. You may find them together in crowds, but they are not in society, for the one docs not depend upon the other.

As we examine living things higher in the scale of life we find a union of cells, and the one cell helping the other. Society has begun. One illustration may be given. There is one of the Algae called "Ulothrix," which we find in ponds. It clings to some submerged object, a bit of stone, for example, one cell having the power of clinging to the object and remaining fixed to it during life. This holds the plant in position while the other cells secure food and drink, and the plant lives. The root cell aids it, and the root cell itself is aided by receiving food from the other cells. There is never any trouble between them; both live in unison. If the root cells were to "strike" it would die, and the living thing of which it is a part would also die.

Let me take another illustration of mutual aid in nature, showing how the life of some things may be helped by beings of other species. You will no doubt remember what Darwin says about the growth of red clover. The bumble bee, in its trips from flower to flower of the red clover, fertilises it, and Darwin says that without cats in England there would be no clover! How is this? The bee nests are raided by the field mice, and if the mice are numerous there will be few bees, but if the mice are killed off by cats the bees will be numerous and clover will flourish. Here is, then, an example of mutual aid in society from a source other than the species benefited.

"Man is a Social Animal."

Now man is a social animal. He has been so from the beginning of his existence, which some people put as far back as a million and a half years. He is not the only social animal in the world, but there is something about man that is not to be found in any other individual in animal society. He has a capacity for progress. A bee-hive is a society, and its life prevails according to what we may term laws or rules. The bees act in the same way to-day as they did hundreds of years ago. There has been, so far as we know, no change in their life. So with ants. Had we not an ancient Hebrew writer saying: "Go to the ant, thou sluggard, consider his ways, and be wise."

Man's social life has changed. His mode of government has changed, and there has been a change in his outlook, and in his beliefs, even in fifty years. The marvellous development of inventions, and the growth of knowledge amongst men, are almost beyond belief. From the Cave Man to the man of the Twentieth Century the progress has been continued and continuous. A man must, if he is to live, live in society. He cannot stand alone. If man is separated from his fellow-men he degenerates, and would, after a long term of years, cease to have the qualities of a human being. There are many animals, also, that would perish if they did not live in communities—bees, wasps, ants and others. Even the ordinary cattle in the fields and the sheep on our hills would deteriorate if they did not live in society. If you separate some of the lower animals from the herd, you will find that they will degenerate. Of course, in the case of domesticated animals, such as the cow and the sheep, they may be kept in contact with human beings only, but I am speaking of one animal being entirely dissassociated from other animals, and living alone.

Order and Progress.

If, then, man can exist as man only in society, we have to ascertain what kind of society is the best fitted for his development. There must be a society—we call it a state, and its preservation and defence, it has been properly said, must be every man's concern. We must have no shirkers when its existence is threatened. We

speak of "civilisation" as the state of society where progress is possible. If we have a community in which there is no order, we say that that society is not civilised. There may be diverse civilisations, just as there are different races, but in every civilised society two things must be present. These are, first, "Order," and second, "Progress." Without these civilisation is impossible. What do we mean by "Order" and "Progress?" We mean by "Order" that the rights of the individual members of a society are recognised. They have rights; they have duties, they have freedom. If it should happen that members of a society differ or quarrel, then if the society is civilised these differences or quarrels must be settled by some tribunals which the society appoints. Peace must be imposed. There is no room for War in a civilised community. Order, it is said, is Heaven's first law. Without order there is no possibility of a society existing in any civilised form. If we look at the past we will find that just as society has advanced in civilisation there has necessarily been a restriction of the individual. It is not left to him to punish those who do him wrong. But though he is thus restrained, society in another way gives him freedom and liberty, for without order ho would be at the mercy of those stronger and less scrupulous than himself. We say—to take an illustration from today—that a certain nation is ruled by military autocracy. That implies that there is not equal freedom for all classes of the people that exist in that society. In the past we know that there was a so-called civilised society which permitted duels. That is, if people quarrelled they had a right to redress their grievances by combat. Indeed, at one time in England there was power to appeal from a Court to the order of battle, and that right was only abolished by law in the last century. But even when such combat was permitted it had to be conducted according to certain rules, and so even in duels there was, therefore, in a sense order. We recognise, however, now by order that no individual has a right to redress his own grievances. If the individual had such a right, then an association of individuals would have such a right, and civil war would inevitably eventuate. Civil war means that the most powerful can oppress and murder the weaker. It is true that an appeal to arms may have to be made where there is an autocracy, and where the people have no power of redressing a grievance, and where many are oppressed. That, it has been said, is the ultimate right of humanity—to defend itself against oppression, but that appeal to this ultimate law is made only where true democratic civilisation does not exist. Where civilisation exists there is order, and that necessarily implies that quarrels, disagreements, differences between members of a community must be settled by some tribunal recognised by the community. It may be well to notice that when the nations nowadays speak of a "permanent peace" the suggestion made by all those who ask for a permanent peace is that there should be some tribunal amongst the nations which will settle national disputes, and which will have the right to appeal to the force of all the parties to the international agreement, to compel the awards or decrees of the tribunal to be respected. There is no possibility of bringing about a permanent peace unless there is some power of enforcing it, first, by the decrees of tribunals, and second, by a police or military force at the back of those tribunals. What is this but applying to a series of nations the rule of a civilised nation?

In America and in England associations have been started to bring about this Enforcement of Peace, by the creation of international tribunals and the creation of an international force to see that the decrees of the tribunals are obeyed.

We thus will gather that, lying at the root of civilisation there is the need of order. Wherever in a community you find people resorting to force, punishing people without recourse to judicial tribunals by personal violence, or by destruction of personal property not their own, or preventing people having equal liberty to the rest of the community, then that society or that community which permits such actions has ceased to be civilised. To say that the world is thoroughly civilised will be to state that something had happened that has not yet been realised. Wo see in our own community instances, for example, of what are called strikes, and what are called riots. These are proof that the community as a whole is not thoroughly civilised. Strikes and riots, are, in a civilised community, outbursts of savagery, and if that community has, for example, a tribunal for the purpose of settling, say, a labour dispute, and if either employers or employees choose to flout the decisions of that tribunal, and to engage in lock-outs or strikes, and to prevent work being carried on, and to threaten or engage in personal violence, then civil order is not present. Civilisation is being destroyed and savegery reigns.

Reason and Truth.

Again, there must exist differences of opinion amongst the people of every intelligent community. No two people may be able to see every question of morals, or politics, or science, or religion from the same point of view. You can see this illustrated even if you notice two or three photographers on the top of an eminence taking photographs. You will find that their photographs may differ; they have taken a different point of view, and the camera gives a different result to each. If this takes place in such a mechanical operation as the taking of photographs, what is likely to occur when we are dealing with past history, when we are dealing with

personal opinions, when the people are of different branches of the human family and trained in different ways, and when passion perhaps obscures the judgment? We cannot expect unity of thought or action. Have we not known people to exalt the faiths of their ancestors above reason and truth?

We have to remember that in a civilised community each is entitled to do what he likes provided that his doing so does not interfere with the like rights of others. That is true freedom. A man may express what opinion he pleases as long as the opinions are not inciting to disorder, or slandering or libelling other members of the community, and that such expression is not for the purpose of creating riots, or disturbances. There must also be Progress. To obtain Progress there must be the dissemination of knowledge. You cannot expect that people can be wise, or act reasonably, if they are ignorant. Wherever you have ignorance prevailing you are likely to have a low state of society, and disorder. Russia would not, in my opinion, have been plunged into her present unhappy position were it not that perhaps eighty per cent, of the adults of Russia are unable to read.

All civilised States have recognised the need of knowledge, and that is why we have State systems of education. Without knowledge progress is impossible. There have in the past been endowments made for schools, for colleges, for universities, and just as a State has advanced in civilisation so has there been greater attention paid to the education of the people, and that nation that has had education most disseminated amongst its people has been the nation that has made the greatest progress, and where the people have had the highest ideals of life.

What, for example, in the dim past, differentiated Greece from Persia, or from other nations that existed 2500 years ago? It was that in Greece there was a high degree of culture amongst many of the community. Greece had men like Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, and many others, and these men were continually questioning each other and trying to find out what the duty of the citizen was to the State in which he dwelt, and the duty of the State to him. I do not know that if to-day one could have a better statement of the duty of a man to a State than Socrates is said by Plato to have uttered before his Judges at his famous trial. May I quote one or two sentences from "Plato's Apology" to show you his idea of the duty of a citizen?—" My life throughout (he said) I allowed myself no rest, "but neglected what most men prize, money-making, family interests, military commands, public speaking, and all offices of the State, as well as plots and factions, deeming myself, in truth, too good a man to be safe if I entered into such things. I did not go where I could be of use either to you or to myself, but wherever I thought I could do most good to each one of you in private, thither I went, and tried to persuade each one of you not to take thought for his interests before he had taken thought how he might improve himself to the utmost in virtue and in wisdom; nor for the interests of the State before taking thought for the State itself; and in all other concerns to proceed in the same way." And after his condemnation to death, he thus finally addressed his Judges:—

"Wherefore I bear no malice at all against my accusers or against those who have condemned me; but as it was not with this idea, but rather with the intent to do me injury, that they accused and voted against me, it is right that they should be blamed. This favour, nevertheless, I ask of them: When my sons are grown up, avenge your-selves, fellow-citizens, upon them by tormenting them just as I have tormented you, if they appear to care for riches, or for anything else above virtue; and if they pretend to be something when they are really nothing, then reproach them, as I have re-proached you, with not caring for what they ought, and with thinking themselves to be something when they are worth nothing at all. If you do this I shall have received justice at your hands—I as well as my sons. But now it is time for us to go away, I to die, you to live. Which of us is going to the better fate is unknown to all save God."

You will see, therefore, from what Socrates said, that about 2400 years ago there were men so civilised that they exalted virtue, and held it to be the duty of the good citizen to engage in the service of man. Alas! that in the ages that such virtues were often punished. And alas! that the progress of mankind in civilisation has been so slow.

The struggle must ever be for more knowledge. We are showing that we believe it to be our duty, by the efforts we are making to popularise education, to promote education, so that the people may have more knowledge. We believe that if the people have more knowledge they will be able to reason—they will be able to view every question as wise people. Without knowledge there will be little chance of reason ruling. A man does not become a reasoning animal without training, and perhaps a training of centuries has made reasoning an inherited habit. We ought to know all that has been done in the world before our era, so that we may be guided by human experience: and we ought to know all we can about the wonders of nature with which we are surrounded, and we ought to know of the conquests of man over his surroundings, so that we may fully recognise our place in the universe. A true civilisation is based on intelligence and morality, and not on mere material things. In our search for knowledge we must, ever aim at ascertaining the truth: nothing must ever come between us and the truth. Mankind must continually struggle to maintain truthfulness. There are so many things that are constantly preventing us from striving for the truth; such as present associations, present surroundings, past alliances, what our fathers did, etc. It has been truly said that the hand of the past often

strangles the struggle for veracity. We cannot have a civilised people if truth is not exalted. Archbishop Whately said: "It makes all the difference in the world whether we put truth in the first, place or in the second place." Without the love of truth civilisation cannot advance.

Morals and Citizenship.

There is another characteristic of a civilised community: Righteousness and Justice must exist therein. What is meant by Righteousness and Justice? We must obey the moral law. Without such obedience we stand condemned. Everyone has his rights. We must sec that no individual and no association of individuals is oppressed. Differences of opinion amongst our people must not affect the rights of our citizens. The community must ever act according to the highest dictates of morality and of justice, and must recognise and applaud all who, "with whatever imperfections of doctrine, or even of conduct, contribute materially to the work of human improvement." If we find a nation or a people repudiating their contracts, breaking their word, acting dishonourably, what must we say about them? We must say that they are uncivilised.

Have I then exhausted all the characteristics of a civilised community? No, there are others. Love, Brotherhood, and Affection must be found amongst the people. People in a civilised community feel for the sorrows of others. If you had a community that had no hospitals, gave no aid to the poor and to the weak, that community would not have attained a high state of civilisation. It has been suggested that having hospitals may tend to the physical injury of the race, because it may keep alive those who will ever be weak physically, and in this way the race may suffer. This has been said by some philosophers, and they have said that in order to preserve the race, to uplift it and make it efficient, you have no right to give aid to the weak; you must allow them to die. There is something in humanity besides mere physical strength. Man is a composite animal; he has such a thing as what we term a soul, and if you have a community that looks merely after physical strength, and neglects what is termed the finer feelings of humanity, that community will cease to be civilised. It will lapse into savagery and barbarity. Perhaps what has happened during the past three years in Europe is an illustration and a lesson to us, that unless a nation, in addition to physical strength and intellectual training, has endowments of kindness and good feeling, has love and brotherhood, it has not attained to what may be termed a civilised state. The invaders of Belgium, of Northern France, of Servia, of Poland, have by their inhuman acts shocked all civilised people, and all such people proclaim their deeds to be the acts of savages.

And as a corollary to Love and Brotherhood, human life will be deemed sacred. Anything that makes human life cheap, that tends to lead us to believe that in our social life or under our Individualism the death of the young or of the aged is of little or no concern, so long as wealth, or comfort, or pleasure is obtained—destroys civilisation.

A community that does not look with horror on the destruction of human life is on the downward road, and it will end as the society that made human sacrifices to Moloch ended. Do we now rate human life higher than successful manufactures, or speed in travelling? I hope some of us do.

Last of all, in a civilised State the citizens will show by their actions that they are prepared for self-sacrifice, that they are willing to do what they can for order and for progress in the community that they are prepared to live, not for themselves alone, but for the community and for humanity. In fact, the true test of whether a nation is civilised or not is found in the conduct of its people. Given a nation where the people are orderly, are obedient to the laws they themselves have made, and are just, where the people are truthful, where they love each other, where human life is sacred, and where they are ready to make sacrifices for the benefit of the community, and for the benefit of humanity, that nation is civilised, by whatever name it is called. Self-sacrifice is one of the best proofs of civilisation that perhaps can be adduced.

Duties.

If this question is put to us: "What is Civilisation?" I think I may adopt as the short answer to it Matthew Arnold's definition, which I have already quoted, namely, "The humanisation of man in society." If we are agreed as to what civilisation means, let me follow an old Scotch custom that used to prevail amongst clergymen of Scotland in the olden days. When a sermon was given in Scotland, towards its end, there was always what was called "the Application." If we as a people realise what civilisation means, are we ready to apply its principles to our own life? Are we ready to fight for knowledge, to fight for truth, to fight for righteousness, to fight for justice, to fight for liberty, to fight for freedom, to struggle for the spread of Love and Botherhood, and to show by our lives that we are prepared for self-sacrifice?

May I appeal to the young amongst us? The Pioneers of New Zealand are passing away. This came home to

me when I looked over the list of the Members of Parliament of 1875; that is only 43 years ago. There were then 44 members in the Legislative Council and 80 members in the House of Representatives—124 members in all. How many, think you, of that list of 124 are alive to-day? There are only Four. They are: The Hon. Captain Baillie, Mr. Donald Reid, Mr. Thomas Kelly and myself. Alas! the scythe of the ever-present conqueror has laid many low. It is you young people who have to stop forward, to maintain order, and promote Progress—to keep the banner of Loyalty, and Justice, ever flying over your community. The Pioneers have done much. I cannot go as far back as many, but I can speak from personal knowledge of 54 years of life in the Dominion. What an advance there has been! Our Government has been democratised, Education has been promoted, and the amenities of civilised life wonderfully increased. When I first remember New Zealand it had few and poor roads, hardly any bridges. There was not a single large bridge in New Zealand. It had no railways, no telegraphs, no gasworks, no trams, no electric lighting, little drainage, no city with waterworks or drainage systems, no public libraries, no museums, no university colleges, few newspapers, cultivation was meagre, cities were small and buildings poor. And now we have all the luxuries of life as if New Zealand were an old community. We have also tried to solve some social problems, and in our material prosperity we have exhibited kindliness and consideration. We are a generous people, and in the nation's work our Pioneers have shown a loyalty, a devotion and a courage that might inspire a thousand epics. Who can adequately appreciate the self-sacrifice and heroism of so many of New Zealand's brave daugnters and sons? Do we not feel our souls stirred within us when we think how cheerfully they have laid down their lives to preserve us and to save humanity from savagery? All honour to the brave who have died for us! And to those also who, loyal to the Empire, loyal to New Zealand, loyal to humanity, are still fighting for truth, for righteousness, for honour and for justice! Will their conduct not inspire us to step forward to help civilisation onward? Did I hear the question coming from our youths, "What can we do?" I speak first to the young men. I gave you what Edmund Burke said was the basis of civilisation—"the spirit of a gentleman, and the spirit of religion." Let us consider how these two phrases may be defined. A man may be a gentleman who is poor in worldly goods, who may have neither land nor money; he will, however, so act that his actions will ever be a rule to humanity. He will consider the feelings of others, he will be kindly, he will be honourable, he will fulfil his engagements, he will be honest, truthful and loyal. He will be prepared to sacrifice himself to help his country and to help humanity.

The Power of Education.

And what is meant by the Spirit of Religion? It is not the mere repetition of a creed; it is leading the moral and the civilised life, and so acting that if all others were to do likewise, vice, crime and misery would be unknown in our land. John Morley once said: "Religion has many dialects, many diverse complexions, but it has one true Voice, the Voice of human Pity, of Mercy, of patient Justice." Will you help forward civilisation in our midst? We have many enemies in our midst. We have habits and customs that are not favourable to civilisation. Do I need to specify them? Are you young men, and I may put in my question, young women, educating yourselves? Are you reading the best books? I do not think our young people are such readers as some of my companions were in my youth. Let me give an illustration. During the holidays I was for two days away in the south-eastern corner of New Zealand, at Wai-kawa, a little township with an Accommodation House in a no-license district. I happened to take up a book that, lay on the table. It was an early volume of the Cornhill Magazine—the Fifth, I think. I opened it; it contained an article on a famous murder trial, the trial of Jessie McLachlan, in Glasgow. This trial led to a great deal of controversy. Was she or was an old man named Fleming the murderer? It recalled to me an incident that occurred one winter night in my native place. About ten young lads, none of us over 20 years of age, were together on a cold winter night, with snow falling, standing in the shelter of a stone dyke discussing the murder trial and that article in the Cornhill Magazine, which we all had read. We were workers; some were coopers' apprentices, some carpenters' apprentices, one or two clerks, and others. And what Lord Deas did and said we were discussing. Do you young men in New Zealand who are engaged in like employments read the better class of magazines and try to appreciate and understand what you read? I cannot answer the question. I hope I may be able to say "Yes." Is there a love of literature amongst our young men and women? No doubt the students in our colleges will hand the torch of learning on amongst you, but every one of you should spend some time every day in reading what the best men have said in the best books.

May I put this to you? Suppose there were in New Zealand one of the great thinkers of the world—Thomas Carlyle, or Matthew Arnold, or Edmund Burke, some great literary man, would you not feel honoured by meeting him and listening to his conversation? Well, by reading his works you get into touch with him. He is telling you his inmost thoughts; he is laying bare his soul to you. He is communing with you. Why will you not commune with him and listen to what he has to say of world problems? of the things in the world in which we

dwell? You have that opportunity in books. You young people have vastly more opportunities than we who are past the so called limit of life—three score and ten years—had in our young days. Quite recently there has been started what is called Workers' Educational Associations. Why do you not form what is called Reading Circles? Suppose thirty young men employed in work in your city and suburbs formed a circle, met twice a week, got a tutor to meet them to help them to understand some branch of learning—Economics or History, or some author—Tennyson, or Browning, or Milton. The tutor would give a lecture and prescribe books. Once a week they would meet to hear the lecturer discuss the subject. It would be a students' class with a Debating Society. You would derive more real enjoyment from such an undertaking, you young men and young women, than from any other thing we could recommend to you. And you would be fitting yourselves for your position in the community and for your duty as citizens willing to do some service to your country. John Knox laid down in his day this proposition—that every man who had a son who was capable, if he could afford it, should be compelled to send his son to a university, in order that he might be able to effectively serve his country. John Knox's educational ideas have made Scotland and Scotchmen what they are to-day.

There is another thing we must always remember. Work is our duty. The world has no place for idleness. Labour is our function. Do some work and do not idle away your time. As a poet once said:

Work! it is thy highest mission!
Work! all blessing centres there!
Work for culture, for the vision
Of the true, the good, the fair.
'Tis of knowledge the condition,
Opening still new fields beyond.
'Tis of thought the full fruition,
'Tis of love the perfect bond.
Work! by Labour comes th' unsealing
Of the thoughts that in thee burn;
Comes in action the revealing
Of the truths thou hast to learn.

Everyone should have some employment, and everyone should feel it his duty to do some service for the community and for humanity. And when you work, "do your work as well as you can, and be kind." That is a motto for all of us. People who go slow at their work who idle when they should be working, are not civilised. They are not honest, and are not fulfilling their engagements. The foundation rules of civilisation are broken, and he or she is an enemy to the people. There is one enemy that our young men have to fight and conquer; it is this slavish cigarette habit that pervades all our towns. It is destructive to industrious habits; it is injurious to health; many young men have what is called a cigarette heart. During the Boer War, in some cities in England 30 per cent, of the recruits had to be turned down on account of this cigarette heart. So it was in the United States of America in the Cuban War. An eminent doctor who was on one of our hospital ships said that grave injury has been done to many sick and wounded soldiers by cigarette smoking. In many instances it has prevented their speedy recovery. You can tell a slave to the cigarette habit, not only by his brown fingers, and the smell of tobacco that lurks in his clothes, but by his pale face and his nervousness. I am told some young people smoke as many as two boxes, each of ten or a dozen cigarettes, a day. The cheapest are, I believe, about 6d. a box; some cost 1/-. Suppose the cost is only 1/- per day, 7/- per week, that is £18 4s. a year. What a waste! Just consider what that amount of money could do? If you invested that money in a Savings Bank, or in an Insurance Policy, payable 20 years after investment, what a different position you would be in than if you had spent your money on cigarettes. You would be stronger physically, you could educate yourself better, you would have more enjoyment in life. The cigarette habit will be a curse to you. Will you help forward your country by abandoning this vicious habit ?

Then we have amongst us the alcoholic habit—a curse to our race. It does just as much harm as cigarette smoking. Think you that the great Republic of the United States of America would have prohibited the manufacture of spirits if the use of spirits were not rendering its people inefficient? That is a lesson and an example for us. Is it any wonder that the United Kingdom has not won the war when it spent in 1916 about £230,000,000 in intoxicating liquors and lessened the efficiency of hundreds of thousands of its people? On the two drugs, alcohol and tobacco, the people of the United Kingdom spent in 1916 £252,619,000: that is, £203,989,000 on alcohol and £48,630,000 on tobacco, and the expenditure in 1917 on alcohol alone mounted up to £259,000,000. And if we consider that this was not merely a waste of money, at a time when every penny was required to maintain our Empire, but that the effects of these drugs was to cause inefficiency in every

department of our Administration ana industries, may we not exclaim, in the words of a character in an old play, "What fools these mortals be!" Have you heard of the memorial presented to the Government by 2448 of the most distinguished citizens of Britain asking for the prohibition of the drink trade during the war? It was signed by Principals of Colleges, Mayors of Cities, Generals, Ambassadors, Fellows of the Royal Society, Judges, Magistrates, Artists, Poets, Scientists, Doctors, and hundreds of others. I cannot quote it all to you, but I quote two passages. First, it says of the Drink Trade:

"It hinders the army; it is the cause of grave delay with munitions; it keeps thousands of men from war work every day, and makes good sober workmen second-rate. It hampers the Navy; it delays transports, places them at the mercy of submarines, slows repairs, and congests docks. It threatens our mercantile marine; it has absorbed during the war over two hundred million cubic feet of space, and it retards the building of ships to replace our losses.

It destroys our food supplies. During the war it has consumed over 3,500,000 tons of food, with sugar enough to last the nation 100 days. It uses up more sugar than the army.

It diverts the Nation's strength; it uses 500,000 workers, 1,000,000 acres of land and 1,500,000 tons of coal per year; and during the war it has involved the lifting and handling on road and rail of a weight equal to 50,000,000 tons."

The fact is that in the United Kingdom 8246 tons of barley are being wasted every week on brewing beer, and 2,240,000 lbs. of sugar are being wasted every week on the same purpose. And alcohol is not food. I ask you to read the Royal Society's Report to the Board of Trade on "The Food Supply of the United Kingdom." Professors Waller, Noel Paton and W. H. Thompson say:

"Unlike foodstuffs more strictly defined, alcohol exerts effects as a drug which cannot be ignored in appraising its value as a food. These effects become more important when the individual is called upon to do strenuous work or to endure exposure . . . . . We may point, for instance, to the results exhibited by troops on the march. Repeated experience has shown that regiments not supplied with alcohol marched farther, and were in better condition at the end of the day, than others to which it had been given. Experiences in mountain-climbing have given similar indications, the total work done being smaller under alcohol and the expenditure of energy greater. In particular the records of American industrial experience are significant in showing a better output when no alcohol is taken by the workmen."

But we cannot cast stones at our kin beyond the seas. We in New Zealand spent in 1916 about £5,000,000 in alcohol and tobacco, and we talk about the rise in the cost of living! Why should that £5,000,000 not have been saved? I appeal to you not only for your own health's sake: I appeal to you to help forward our civilisation. Grant it, if you will, that you can take alcohol and tobacco and sustain no damage. Many cannot do so. Will you not then, for their sakes, show some self-sacrifice? It is the highest action that a man or woman can perform, to sacrifice something for humanity. You are, I know, loyal; you will be loyal to our laws as civilised people; you will not seek private vengeance, nor do what is properly called take the law into your own hands. Will you be still more loyal to our nation by so living that your example may encourage others to live the true, the ideal life, the life that will bring no sorrow to yourselves, nor to anyone? If you do, gambling, another curse in our midst, will cease, cigarette smoking will cease, and alcoholic drinking will cease.

"Act well your part,
There all the honour lies."

Civilisations have passed away in the earth. Where are now the civilisations of Assyria, of Egypt, or even of Greece? Races have disappeared from the Earth and Nations have perished. Is our Nation to go forward and become great and noble? If it is, it rests on you young people; you must step forward into the van of the army, now that the Pioneers are falling, Will you obey the call? The trumpet and drum summon you! I hope you will step forward with this ringing in your ears:

"If we are lost no Victor else has destroyed us,
It is by ourselves we go down to eternal night."

And that you will live:

"In pulses stirred to generosity,

In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn
For miserable ends that end with self."

vignette
Napier:
G. W. Venables & Co. Ltd., Printers & Bookbinders.
Art and Society Their True Relation Address *Delivered by* Sir Robert Stout, (Chief Justice of New Zealand) *At the* Opening of the Annual Exhibition of the New Zealand Academy of Fine Arts *on* Saturday, October 5th, 1918 vignette New Zealand Times, Print.

Address By

Sir Robert Stout.

At the opening of the annual exhibition of the New Zealand Academy of the bine Arts on October 5th, 1918, Sir Robert Stout delivered an interesting address. He said:—

We are met to-night to open our annual Art Exhibition, and it is usual on such occasions for a few remarks to be made about art. We arc recognising, though the recognition is not yet universal, that in all our actions we should never forget that we are citizens, and we ought to consider what the effect of our actions on the community should be. What may be termed the "community feeling" is growing. "For Ourselves Alone" is not a worthy motto for any true citizen. We are living a social life, and we have duties to each other that must be respected and performed. Have the fine arts any influence on the community as a whole? That is best answered in considering what the community should be. Should it be a collection of people split up into several classes, each class fighting for itself alone—for its own interest—careless how its actions may affect the other classes of the community? If this be the ideal state, then the motto "For Ourselves Alone" is an excellent motto, and properly defines the social aim of such a state.

An Ideal State.

In one of the best poems of Tennyson, and one perhaps of the best poems of the past hundred years, there is a picture given of what a community should be, and though the poem and the canto of the poem I am going to refer to may be well known, it is, perhaps, not inadvisable to refer to it in this connection. I refer to the Canto 106 of "In Memoriam," where the poet deals with the coming in of the New Year. It begins thus:

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The flying: cloud, the frosty light;
The year is dying in the night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let him die.

This canto is really a sketch of what a good and true community should be.
It is to be a place in which the bells will

Ring out the false, ring in the true.
Ring out the feud of rich and poor,
Ring in redress to all mankind.

That is, it is a community in which
there is to be peace, and in which there
is to be justice. Life is to be noble:

Ring in the nobler modes of life,
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Poverty is to go, and sin is to vanish:

Ring out the want, the care, the sin,
The faithless coldness of the times.

We are to have the love of truth and of right—

Ring in the love of truth and right,
Ring in the common love of good.

And when these are present all the
ghosts of a low civilisation will have vanished.

Ring out old shapes of foul disease,
Ring out the narrowing lust of gold;
Ring out the thousand wars of old.
Ring in the thousand years of peace.

Ring in the valiant man and free,
The larger heart, the kindlier hand;
Ring out the darkness of the land,
Ring in the Christ that is to be.

Room for the Fine Arts.

This is Tennyson's picture of the ideal community. Have the fine arts any place in this ideal state? They have a most important place. Tennyson's description is really of a community where there are the good, the beautiful, and the true. Without the good, no proper social life is possible. If sin, and want, and care, and party feeling are present, there is no brotherhood; there is an absence of citizenship feeling, and without a worship of truth there is no foundation for any real ethics—we are in the depths of darkness—and without a love of the beautiful we cannot expect to have "sweeter manners" or "purer laws." One test of our civilisation is, how are

the fine arts—architecture, sculpture, painting, music, and poetry—esteemed in our community? In reading the past history of man, we recognise that when the cave men were able in a poor way to scratch on a stone or on a horn, or paint on the sides of their cave-dwelling some picture of the animals that dwelt near them, that the cave men had taken a step forward in an upward path towards the good, the beautiful, and the true. They were marching to civilisation. Thousands of years have passed since the beginning of pictorial art, and mankind has made great progress; but even in that branch of the fine arts we have not readied the goal. We wish that each year and every year that the New Year bells may bring amongst us the sense of goodness, of beauty, and of truth. It is only when these things are "rung in" and become part of us that we have brotherhood and peace.

Past and Present.

This is, after all, the mission of the tine arts, and the object of having Fine Art Galleries amongst us. It is to create the artistic or aesthetic sense. We are still surrounded with unlovely things that might be made beautiful; we are surrounded with false things that might be made true, and with bad things that might be transformed into good things. In our Dominion our artistic outlook is good. We are only a young nation; we are only seventy-eight years old, and yet what improvement in art has taken place amongst us! I can remember what was, I suppose, the first general exhibition in New Zealand—the Exhibition of 1865. It was a very fine Exhibition. It was beautifully arranged and well organised, and the late Sir Janies Hector deserved every credit for its success. But compare our nation now with our nation then. In reference to architecture, what had we then? Very few buildings of beauty, sculpture was rare, paintings scarce; there was some music, but hardly any poetry or high literature. What was termed the "soap-box" pattern of a house has been replaced by the beautiful bungalow that you may see in all parts of the Dominion. We have now Art Galleries. A magnificent one is now being erected at Wanganui through private munifi- cence; we have a good one in Auckland, we have one in Dunedin, one in Christchurch, and we have our small institution here. We have also sculpture in various parts of the Dominion, and we are getting a literature—poetry and imaginative literature—that is not to be despised. It is true that, in the old days—in the time of the Exhibition of 1865—we had amongst our pioneers some who were able artists. I need only mention the pictures of Gully, Barraud, and J. C. .Richmond, and the beautiful sketches of Sir Dillon Hell, Sir William Fox, and others that were in the 1860 Exhibition. In the Art Gallery of the Exhibition the exhibits were mainly sketches and landscapes. There were few portraits, and we had not yet developed what may be termed the dramatic in art. That has come now, and what will be the effect of our advance in the fine arts on our future people? We must realise what has been often pointed out, that the environment, as it is termed, has a great influence on our social life. If one is trained in a beautifully-kept city, we expect greater things from the citizen than from one brought up in a slum. We must hope for a further development of culture in our Dominion, and this hope will be realised if our fine arts are encouraged and extended. We have lots to do. We still have poor streets, poor buildings, and ugliness where there might be beauty, even at little expense. We have not yet the universal worship of the good, and the beautiful, and the true. Ladies and gentlemen, when we see an Art Gallery, we should think of its mission, think of what its fruition may be, and realise that to make our nation great we must have idealism, and ever remember that the race lives not by bread alone.

A Plea for Beauty.

We are in the midst of a great [*unclear:* wai], and its aftermath will soon be with us. We have heavy burdens to bear, and there is, I fear, much economic trouble ahead of us. We shall have to struggle to produce more wealth, but do not let us imagine that that is our only duty May I take an illustration from a Hebrew poem. Psalm CVI. describes the journey of the Israelites from Egypt to Palestine, and what they endured. They desired, as we desire, pleasure and material things, but the Hebrew poet said (I quote the Scots metrical version):

He gave them what they sought, but to
Their soul He leanness sent.

It is ever a poor exchange, even, as we are told, if we gain the whole world if the soul of the nation is slain. Let us, therefore, take care that in our struggle for material things—and that struggle is needed—that the things of the spirit are not overlooked. If the beautiful, if the good, if the true are not desired and not longed for, and

struggled for, then we have got leanness of soul, and all our wealth will profit us little. Our Art Galleries should raise our desires to high and noble things. Sursum corda. Let us lift up our hearts. We live in a beautiful world: let us appreciate beauty, and surround ourselves with those things that count and last, which neither moth nor rust can corrupt, and which thieves cannot steal—for we have made them part of ourselves.

Index to Pamphlets Written by the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Stout K.C.M.G.

- Address to the Grand Jury at Masterton
- Address in the House 1895
- Address at Marton 1887
- Annexation and Federation, Address on, 1884
- Abolition of Provinces Bill, Address on. 1875
- Address at Otago University, 1913
- Brotherhood', a vision of the Future
- Church of England Reserve at Porirua, statement
- Court of Appeal .of N. Z. and comments of the Privy Council
- Crime in N.Z. 'Address to jury at Nelson
- Christmas, 1914.
- Crux of Ritualism.
- Can Morals be taught in secular Schools
- Caversham Electoral District, Address to electes
- Dunedin East Election
- Discharged Prisoners' Aid
- Evolution of Mind, The
- Evolution and Origin of Life
- Education, Address on.
- Future, The
- Financial Statement delivered in the House 1893
- Financial Debate, Speech in the House 1894
- Irish question, The
- Impressions and Recollections of a visit to Europe and the United Kingdom
- Leasing State Lands, Speech in the House 1875
- Legislative Council, Memo regarding powers of
- National Council of Women of N.Z.
- New Zealand
- Notes on the progress oj U.Z.
- Our first Premier-James Edward Fitzgerald
- Public Education in U.Z.
- Politics and Poverty
- Peace or War
- Religion and the state
- School journal
- State Education
- Speech in the City Hall, Auckland 1896
- Social Future of Labourers
- Technical Education, Address on, 1885
- Trip from Dunedin to Samoa
- True Democracy
- University Education
- University Reform, Address on 1917
- Wanganui Astronomical society, Annual Meeting 1967
- Wellington Patriotic Society, Speech at Dinner

Progressive ..Masterton.. The District's Freedom From Crime. An Address By The Chief Justice (Sir Robert Stout) To the Grand Jury At the opening of the Supreme Court in Masterton on September 10th, 1917. Masterton Printing Co., Ltd.

Comments by Chief Justice.

I N his charge to the Grand Jury at the opening of the criminal sittings of the Supreme Court in Masterton on September 10th, 1917, His Honour the Chief Justice (Sir Robert Stout) said:—

The last time I presided at the sittings of the criminal court at Masterton was on September 20, 1915, I then referred to the great progress your town and district had made since I had previously visited it in 1912. I am glad that I can again congratulate you on the progress of Masterton and its surroundings. I have visited the outlying parts of your town and I see many signs of progress. Many neat and artistic cottages have been built. Your streets are well kept, many of them asphalted, and many more have asphalted footpaths and sidewalks. I am also much impressed with the cleanliness of your town. In no town have I seen more attention paid to the keeping of the streets clean.

I do not know what your social conditions are, but your district has made a name for itself in the large sums you have given to help our Empire in its great struggle for freedom. The state of your district so far as crime is concerned, merits hearty congratulation. I have been examining the records, not only of convictions but of charges brought before the courts, and that is, some criminologists consider, the best test of the crime in a community. But whether the charges that have been made or the convictions of those who have offended against our laws are considered, the result is equally gratifying.

I have taken the charges of all kinds brought before the Magistrate's Court at Masterton for the years 1906 up to December 1916. In the first 2½ years your district was a licensed, or, as it is popularly termed, a "wet" district. Since June, 1909, the Masterton electoral district has been a "dry" district, and whatever the cause of the decline of criminal charges may be, the fact is, and cannot be gainsaid, that offences have greatly lessened. In the figures I give first the year, then the total charges made, including all offences, both large and small, then the cases of drunkenness, then all other charges not of drunkenness.

(a) Of 26 of these 8 were arrested off the Homewood and Tenui coaches, 12 at the railway station, and 6 on arrival of motor car from Carterton.

I have the charges made and heard in the other towns situated in the Wairarapa electoral district during the past five years, and I give them:—

So that there may be a fair comparison the returns from Eketahuna must be added to the Maston totals. The result, then, will be total charges in five years in the dry district of Masterton, in—

- 1912—198, drunkenness 39
- 1913—196, drunkenness 61
- 1914—160, drunkenness 53
- 1915—143, drunkenness 50
- 1916—133, drunkenness 70

In wet district, Wairarapa electorate:

- 1912—406, drunkenness 403
- 1913—471, drunkenness 120
- 1914—505, drunkenness 163
- 1915—750, drunkenness 316
- 1916—758, drunkenness 303

It will be noticed that drunkenness has increased in the Wairarapa electorate. The increase is mainly in Featherston. It has increased from 13 in 1914 to 141 in 1916. This may have been caused by the fact that two military camps are near Feathers ton. That does not imply that the soldiers were charged. It may have been the camp followers. Seeing what has happened, and what has happened in Wellington, might not the Defence Department give leave to the soldiers in Masterton? The cost of the railage from Featherston to Masterton will be much cheaper than over the Summit and due provision could no doubt be made in Masterton for the entertainment of the soldiers here, and for giving them amusement and pleasure. I feel sure Masterton would make every proper provision for them.

To sum up, in the wet Wairarapa district there were 2890 cases brought before the Courts, and in the dry 830. Of drunkenness the charges were in Masterton for the five years 273, in the wet Wairarapa 1005. Suppose we eliminate 1915 and 1916 when the soldiers' camps were in the Wairarapa, we have for 1912, 1913, and 1914 the charges of drunkenness in the dry Wairarapa district 153 and in the wet Wairarapa 386. It is also, I believe, correct to state that many soldiers who have indulged in excess in liquor have not been charged.

Another consideration is that many charged in Masterton have come from wet districts and have become intoxicated before reaching Masterton. I have given details for the year 1916. Out of 68 charges in Masterton for 1916, 8 were arrested off Homewood and Tenui coaches, 12 arrested at the railway station, and 6 arrested

on arrival of motor cars from Carterton. If these were deducted, and it may be others also must be deducted, the 68 charges of drunkenness would be reduced to 42 or a lower number.

The lesson that can be drawn from these figures need hardly be stated. Where liquor is openly sold offences against our laws in a population about the same size are about four times as numerous as in a district where there are no licensed houses.

I may give some further figures regarding serious crime, that is crime that comes before the Supreme Court at Masterton. I have not the cases that have been sent from the Wairarapa districts to Wellington for trial or sentence, but there are few eases.

Taking the last 7 years 1910 to 1916, only one person residing in the Masterton Electoral District in all these years has been sentenced to imprisonment by the Supreme Court sitting at Masterton, and that was a native of the Celestial Empire in 1910. There have been two other convictions, but one was fined and the other granted probation.

Now Masterton Electoral District has about one eighty-seventh of the population of the Dominion. In these seven years there have been over two thousand persons sent to prison by the Supreme Court. If all the Dominion were like Masterton, one gaol would be all that would be necessary for the Dominion, instead of eight large gaols and several police prisons.

It may be asked, what are the charges of serious crime for the past seven years that have come before the Supreme Court sitting at Masterton? There have been in all 26 persons charged : 6 came from Masterton, 4 from Pahiatua, and 16 from the other Wairarapa Electorates. In whatever way the criminal statistics are viewed they speak well for the dry district. I am sure no distinction can be made between the people in the Masterton Electorate and in the Wairarapa District. Both are of good stock. In the one district, however, there is the temptation of the open saloon, in the other the temptation is not present, and it is for our people to consider whether that fact explains the figures T have given.

The fall in the crime in the Masterton District I have already alluded to. There were in the licensing days of Masterton, that is in the two years 1907 and 1908, 956 charges, whilst in 1915 and 1916 the charges numbered only 264—a little more than one-fourth. The people have not so changed in 8 years to cause this difference in charges. How, then, is the change to be explained ?

I have thought it necessary to pass these remarks as it is the function of a Judge in addressing a Grand Jury to deal with the position of the district from which the Jury comes, sc far as law and order are concerned. And you, gentlemen, and your district, may be congratulated on the good position you hold amongst the many Judicial Districts of our Dominion.

Address in Reply.

Speech delivered by the Hon. Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G., M.H.R., in the House of Representatives, 25th June, 1895.

Sir R. Stout.—Sir, I think it is to 4.30. be exceedingly regretted that in an important debate like this none of the members on the Government side of the House have anything to say. I think it was Mr. Gladstone who said that this formed a convenient and proper opportunity for discussing the administration of the Government during the recess, and of any policy if such was sketched in the Speech from the Throne. I regret that the autocratic rule that a so-called democratic House has laid down prevents one from discussing as one would like these subjects which I have mentioned. We are confined to an hour's limit. It would need more than that time to adequately discuss the subjects which I have referred to. But, before referring to the Speech of His Excellency, I must first congratulate the mover and seconder on their speeches. There was in both of them a breezy independence that every one must admire, and I feel sure that if any person had watched the attitude of the Premier and the Minister of Labour during the speech of the honourable member for Rangitata they would have seen that neither of them admired that breezy independence. They seemed exceedingly uncomfortable—one gentleman taking notes which were never used; and the other seemed so restless that he did not know very well how to keep in his seat. Sir, I am not surprised at that, because there were some truths given utterance to by the honourable member for Rangitata which I hope will be laid to heart by the Ministers. I do not know, Sir, whether the honourable member for Rangitata ever attends the theatre, but, even if not, he must have read, I feel

sure, of a very old play that is still a very popular play; and ho must have had in his mind's eye the history of the two Surfaces. The Speech, he himself says, is full of most excellent sentiments. He tells us that the general policy of the Government is magnificent : their general principles are so high; their ideals are so good; but their practice is all bad. Whenever you come to details, everything is wrong. Sir, Joseph Surface had most noble sentiments. Now, if one had time, there is a comic element in the Speech that might be referred to. It begins with the fur-seal, which the honourable member for Palmerston says is a very important animal; and it ends with juries, which I suppose also are very important animals. And the thing which struck me as most amusing in the Speech is this: We are told the Ottawa Conference was a meeting made memorable by the Imperial Government despatching to the gathering the Earl of Jersey on behalf of the Mother-country. Why despatching the Earl of Jersey to a Conference would make the Conference memorable I cannot make out, and have not yet heard explained. Perhaps the mover, in his reply, may bo able to tell us. But, Sir, the Speech seems to me, after all—to come to the serious part of the business—to bo a very lamentable performance. There is no ring of enthusiasm in it. There is no aim in it; there is no earnestness in it, and no ideal held before a party, or before the country, that is to be struggled for or sought after. Old Bills are refurbished up again in the Speech. On the whole, there is nothing notable in the proposals. I have used the word "notable," but I should rather say "remarkable," because there is something notable—namely, the omissions from the Speech, and what might be termed the admissions in the Speech. Of course, it is struck in what might be called an optimistic vein; it might have been written by Dr. Pangloss. But let us look at just one or two things. I would take the question of the depression. Last year we were told that we were in a better position than almost any other country, and now this year we are informed that the depression is abating. Then we come to what may be termed the omissions, and I venture to say there is no single branch of the policy on which the Government prided themselves last session but what practically has now to be admitted to have been a ghastly failure. Let me take, Sir, the question of the New Zealand Consols. What was to be the object of the New Zealand Consols? The New Zealand Consols were to be a means of raising money in this colony. We were to have teapots emptied here, and old stockings emptied, and we were to bring into the Treasury all their contents. Sir, have they come? I suppose honourable members will not say that the £150,000 that came from the Bank of New Zealand came out of the teapots; and yet that is what was to happen. The reason why the New Zealand Consols Bill was passed was that we were not to bo dependent upon the foreign money-lender; we were to utilise our own savings, and these savings were to be spent in the promotion of public works in this colony. Has this £150,000 been so spent? It is true we have not had the law obeyed, because there ought to have been laid on the table on the very first day of the session a return showing how the investments under the New Zealand Consols Act have been made; but that return has not been laid on the table. It ought to have been laid on the table. But, if rumour be correct, this £150,000, instead of being utilised in the colony in the prosecution of public works, has been sent to London—I suppose, to follow our unpledged securities which are lying there in millions. And, then, not only has the Consols system failed. Let us come to the scheme of advances to settlers. Has that been a success? Why, Sir, the sharpest criticism used against the Government was used by the honourable member for Rangitata in seconding the Address, and I can hear almost a chorus from the whole of this House that the impression of members is that the advances-to-settlers scheme has been a failure, and the House is asked, it seems to me, to alter the scheme. If there is any meaning in any phrase, I can imagine that the statement that the matter will "receive careful consideration" implies that the Government themselves have to admit that, so far as the advances-to-settlers scheme is concerned, that also has been a failure. And if it be the case that we are to have the Board altered, we shall be doing something that will be deceiving those from whom we have borrowed the money. The money has been lent to us upon the faith that this was to be a non-political Board. It was upon the faith not only of what was said in the speech made to the London Chamber of Commerce, but also in an explanatory circular of the Agent-General: it was stated by both that this Board which was to lend money was to be a non-political Board—a Board which had been most successful in years past in lending money; and yet the Government actually cast a slur upon the operations of this Board, which had been praised by the Treasurer and praised by the Agent-General, and invites the House to alter its constitution. And the members of the Government party—at all events, the majority of them—are, I understand, clamorous that some alteration shall take place. Then, Sir, is not that an admission that this scheme also, as well as their Consols scheme, has been a ghastly failure? And then, what about the land-for-settlements scheme? Has that been a success? I am sorry to say, so far as I can judge from the returns published in the papers, that scheme has also broken down. I am exceedingly sorry for that; and I am sorry that honourable members, before proceeding with that scheme, would not take my suggestion. I am sorry the Cheviot scheme of settlement has also broken down. I do not blame the Minister of Lands. I believe he did what he thought was right. I do not cast the slightest reflection upon him. I supported him in what he did; I believe, under the circumstances, he did what he thought right; but it is our duty to face the facts as we find them, and, so far as the Cheviot settlement scheme is concerned, it has been a mistake from a financial point of view. The same may be said of Pomahaka and the Studholme Junction settlements, and I do

not believe there is a single estate bought by the Government which, from a financial point of view, has not been a failure. Therefore I am not surprised that in this Speech there is no reference to the success of the land-settlement scheme. Then, their dealings under the Native Land Act have not been a success. We are told there are many Natives signing deeds, but we know the actions of the Government in this matter have not been attended with success, because the Natives have not been approached in a way they should be. I believe in the Crown not allowing private individuals to buy land from the Natives; but the Natives should have been approached in a different way. A suggestion was made in the Act of 1886, under which, if carried out, the Natives would have been much more likely to have fallen in with the Government, and made the Act more workable. Wo hear nothing about the railways. I do not wonder at that, because with a falling revenue there is not much reference to be made to them. Then we come to a most important question—the question of the unemployed. Sir, as I said, last year we were told that we were better off than any other colony. Can we say that this year? Why, Sir, instead of its being recognised, as it was by almost every member who stood on the platform, that it was a function of the State to give work to the unemployed, to whom is that duty delegated now? It is not even delegated to the local bodies; it is delegated to the Charitable Aid Boards. The unemployed now are told that they are to go begging for work in exactly the same position as the people under the poor-law have to go and ask for work, and that is a position which I think the unemployed of this country should not be placed in. Can that be said to be a success? I am exceedingly sorry that our co-operative system should have broken down. I thought there were hopes in it that we might have got over the "unemployed" difficulty, but we have not got over it, and we are now in face of the "unemployed" difficulty just as much as ever, and all the schemes of the Government in reference to it have proved utterly futile and utterly unsuited. Then, the only suggestion that has been made in regard to it is that the same great success attended the mission of the Minister of Labour to Victoria, to New South Wales, and to South Australia about the labour settlements there. That suggestion in the Speech only puts me in mind of an historical Biblical event: When Noah was in great trouble he sent forth a dove. The Minister of Labour was the first dove sent out by the Noah of to-day. He went out, but it would not appear he was very successful, because we are told they have had to send out a second dove in the person of Mr. March, Superintendent of Village Settlements. Mr. March is sent over to Australia to see if any idea can be got from Australia as to how to deal with this question. Is not that an admission of failure? I thought we were to set an example to other colonies. And what is the admission now? That we have to go to Australia to get an idea to enable us to deal with this vexed problem. What about the State farms? Have they been a success? I venture to say, if any farmer went and inspected them, he would have to come to the conclusion that the State farms in this colony have been, like all the other schemes of the Government, a huge failure. There is nothing, in fact, which the Government have touched that has been a success. Their sentiments are excellent, but their details are all bad, and their administration is entirely faulty and a failure. We have had a reference made in the Speech to the Tuhoe Tribe. When I heard His Excellency pronounce that name, knowing that he did not speak Maori, I thought he meant Tohu. I thought he was referring to the visit to Te Whiti and Tohu; but that is not referred to in the Speech. Why? Is it because they think it of no importance? I venture to say the Natives deem it of importance, and I venture to think the attitude the Premier was placed in was most lamentable. He was certainly not maintaining the dignity of this colony and the dignity of his office when he went to these chiefs and was told that he was an intruder and that his presence was not desirable. Then, Sir, as to what is taking place in the Uriwera, why should we go to the expense of making roads or surveys? I am told, by one who knows all about the land, that it is utterly valueless; that it consists of steep precipices, of hills that cannot be clothed with grass if the small stunted bush and scrub be cut down; that the land is utterly unsuitable for settlement: and here we have hundreds of thousands of acres of Crown lands, good bush-land that could be utilised for settlement, where roads are required to be made, surveys to be made—lands that would make homes for people. Instead of utilising the funds of the colony for that purpose, we have got Armed Constabulary and unemployed sent up to Uriwera in order to have roads and surveys made through lands which will be unsuitable for settlement perhaps for another hundred years to come. It is done without the sanction of Parliament. I am not aware of any vote being passed for opening up the Uriwera either by roads or by surveys. Why, then, this waste of money? It seems to me to be done only for one purpose. The Premier wont to the Uriwera. He was to publish a book about it. We have not yet seen it; and to say that he could force this settlement this armed force has been sent there—to show that his mission was of some value. There is no other reason I can think of why this Uriwera campaign should have been commenced at all. Before I refer to the policy portions of the Speech I may say a word about two matters which I exceedingly regret to see in the Speech. I do not wish to comment on them. I refer to the cyanide question and the Midland Railway. I do not deny that the Government was perhaps bound to say something about the Midland Railway; but I deny that they have any right to say anything about the cyanide patent. That is, perhaps, to be fought in a Court of law, and it is unwise and unfair to discuss beforehand that which is to be discussed before a judicial tribunal. We know that if matters which are *sub judice* are discussed by the Press the papers are liable to be proceeded against for contempt. I exceedingly

regret, and I feel sure the Government will regret when they come to think, that reference has been made in the Speech to these two matters. I leave them there because I think it unwise of the House to discuss them at the present time. We have to remember, as far as the Midland Railway is concerned, that we are dealing with a foreign company, and, if this House is to discuss beforehand what may have to be decided by a Court of law, we are putting this colony in an entirely false position. Therefore I will not discuss the matter, and I hope honourable members will not. What are some of the remedies that are proposed in this Speech? The first is that we are to have an additional Minister. This is certainly most peculiar. Why, Sir, if the administration of the affairs of the colony required an addition of Ministers they might have been in Wellington more than they were during the recess. There were hardly ever two, or more than two, Ministers in Wellington together. I do not deny the right of Ministers to go over the colony; it is their duty, and it may be their necessity, to do so; but no one can say that necessity required that, out of seven, only two Ministers were to be found at their administrative duties in Wellington, and directing the administration of the colony. The consequence of their absence is well known. Work had to remain, and be piled up, until they came back, and the administration of the colony was not carried on properly. I am amazed now that it is proposed to appoint an additional Minister. We have seven Ministers. We had only seven when there were ninety-four members in this House. Now we are going to have an additional Minister when there are only seventy-four members in this House. Why should that be necessary? What has changed the opinions even of Ministers themselves? I can remember reading the division-list in 1887 or 1888, when the Act was passed reducing the number of Ministers, and, if I recollect rightly, two or three of the present Ministers voted for the reduction to only six, which they have increased by one already. Some of them actually voted for only five Ministers: and now we are asked to have eight Ministers. What I say is that this colony does not require eight Ministers, and I say that seven Ministers are quite able enough to carry on the business of the country if they will attend to it. It would be entirely unfair to have an additional Minister placed in this House, considering the number of members of the House; it would be entirely unfair and improper. If the administration of affairs requires an additional Minister you will have to increase the number of members of the House as well as the number of Ministers. What is the next remedy suggested? We are to have our Representation Act altered. We are to permit what has been the curse of every country—what is called gerrymandering. We are not to allow after every census an impartial tribunal to fix upon the boundaries of our constituencies, but are to have that law altered or interfered with. I do not know there is much more I ought to refer to. We have got a Fair Rent Bill. I do not know that such a Bill is not necessary under present circumstances, considering the low prices that have been ruling for some time past. The rents at Cheviot, at Pomahaka, and many other places should be reduced, and I believe, that being so, it is better to leave that to a judicial tribunal than to Ministers, because Ministers, however fairly they may try to act, will be accused of improper action. I see no objection to a Fair Rent Bill, but, if Ministers are going to extend the functions of this tribunal beyond that of dealing with Crown tenants, they must put in a word interpreting what is "fair." I do not know what is to be termed "fair" if there be no competition, and if the Minister is going to put in "fair" with regard to rents he will have to insert what is "fair" with regard to interest. He cannot limit it to rent; and it is possible the Advances to Settlers Act may have to be amended. We may have a tribunal set up to say if 6 per cent, is fair interest if the prices of wheat and other crops continue low. The mortgagors may not be able any more to pay interest than rent. Where are we to draw the line? If you have the right to deal with Crown tenants, as you have, then I cannot see how you can help dealing with the question of 5.0. interest on loans. Well, the other thing that is referred to is this—and there comes, I think, a touch of my honourable friend the Minister of Education: He says, "For the third time in succession you will be asked to pass a Bill extending to local bodies the right of levying rates upon land-values." It has a literary flavour—" for the third time One can see it must have been penned by him. I think he must have been reading Macbeth It puts one in mind of what happened round the witches' caldron,—

Thrice the brinded cat hath mew'd.

I do not know otherwise where it was borrowed. But why should he refer to this only as thrice? The Noxious Weeds Bill, I think, has been brought forward thrice; the Apprentices Bill, I think, we have had three or four editions of. Why should this one Bill—the Rating Bill—only have "for the third time"? I think almost all the policy Bills of the Go vernment might be headed "for the third time"—there is nothing new in regard to them. That seems to be the whole policy of the Government. And now I must come to deal with what I term some of the administrative acts of the Government during the recess, because really, Sir, this is the only opportunity we have of discussing this matter. The first thing wish to refer to is the rumour that I have seen in the papers that the Colonial Treasurer has agreed to arbitration, if Parliament approve, as to certain claims of the New Plymouth Harbour Board. Sir, that is a most monstrous proposal—a monstrous proposal—and I am amazed at the Government having undertaken such responsibility—a most monstrous proposal, if we consider the history of that loan. On every bond issued by that Harbour Board there was a declaration that, so far as the General Government is concerned, it is not concerned with the loan. Just the same as in the prospectus of our

loans, when we issue our loans in London, the investors are warned that the Imperial Government has nothing to do with our loan, so we warned those who should deal with the New Plymouth Harbour Board loan that the General Government had nothing to do with it. And yet we have had the Treasurer pledging the honour of this colony to submit some claims of the bondholders to arbitration, and that too after the emphatic letters that have passed between the late Mr. Ballance and the bondholders. Nothing could be more emphatic than the attitude he took up; yet all that has been departed from, and this colony has agreed, through its Ministers, to agree to arbitration. Sir, I submit that this is entirely unwarranted. The Treasurer had no business to make any such arrangement; he passed beyond his powers, and I cannot understand why such a thing should have been done. Now, coming to two other things that I think require consideration from this House : I come first to this question of our new loan; and if there had been no reference to the loan in the Speech, if there had been no reference to the loan by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, I do not know that I should have referred to it; but we are invited to discuss it. We were told by the mover of the Address in Reply, the honourable member for Palmerston, that this is a bright spot in the history of New Zealand—this floating of the 3-per-cent. loan. Sir, does the honourable gentleman wish comparisons? Does the honourable member know how we stand in comparison with the other colonies? Why, Sir, we will take, for example, the small colony of Western Australia. That small colony of Western Australia has only about a tenth of our population and only about a tenth of our exports. So far as everything that may be considered a security for the money-lender is concerned, it is nothing compared with us.

An Hon. MEMBER.—What about its territory?

Sir R. Stout.—It has got a desert territory. I am not aware that desert territory is of any value, even to those who reside on the West Coast. Sir, how does it stand? I say that the price and the conditions under which the Western Australians have raised £750,000 are more favourable than those of our million and a half, and I will show it. Western Australia floated their 3½-per-cent. loan at £103 1s. 4d. We floated our 3-per-cent, loan at £94 8s. 9d. But, in considering that we have to take what were the interest concessions. If honourable members will look at our prospectus and the Western Australian prospectus they will see that large interest concessions were given by us—interest concessions that at a rate of 3¼ reduced our price to £93 13s. 3d., because we are paying interest on money we have not received. Our interest dates back from the 1st April, and part of our money is not paid till the 1st August, so that practically the price we got for our loan, allowing for interest concessions, was £93 13s. 3d. The Western Australian people did not give the same interest concessions. They only gave a small amount of interest concessions, which reduced their price to £102 12s. 5d. If we include the interest concessions, you will see the interest we pay was about 3¼, or a shade over 3¼, and theirs was, I make it out, £3 7s. 6d. It might be supposed that we paid less than they by about 2s. 5d. per £100; but they have an enormous advantage over us, and I will show how. I stated last year in the debate on the Financial Statement that able financiers laid down this proposition : that in borrowing money and converting loans you ought to take your loans on a short term; that, considering interest is falling all over the world, and has been falling for a century, it is bad finance to have a long-termed loan. Now, what have we done? I pointed out last year—I quoted an extract from a leading French economist, in which it was pointed out—that ten or fifteen years ought to be the longest term that a State ought to take a loan for if they wished to be prudent in finance. But what have we done? We have taken our loan for fifty years. We cannot alter the rate of interest for fifty years. But what has Western Australia done? She has only taken the loan for forty years, but with the option at the end of twenty years of paying it off; and I therefore submit that, so far as the price of the loan is concerned, Western Australia has better terms than we have for our 3-per-cent. loan. The honourable gentleman talked also as if this was the first 3-per-cent, loan any colony had ever quoted. Why, at the very time we sold it—I have here the returns of the Stock Exchange for May—at the very time we sold our loan for £94 8s. 9d. I find that the Canadian 3-per-cents were standing at 99½ to 100½. The Canadian 3-percents were at 100½ at the very time when we got £94 8s. 9d. for our loan. Then, if you take the Ceylon 3-per cents, you will see that they were fetching in the London market a higher price than we got for our 3-per-cent, loan, fetching £102 to £103. Then, there is a Mauritius 3-per-cent, loan, and a British-Columbian loan. I therefore say, considering the money-market in London at the time, that we have not made a great bargain; and, if honourable members will look at the Stock Exchange lists for what 3-per-cent, loans brought at the time, they will find that the 3-per cent, securities of the Corporations, such as Bath and Reading, were fetching £3, £5, and £6 above par at the very time we sold our loan for £94 8s. 9d. Therefore I do not see, especially considering what Western Australia did, where this great glory, these bright spots, come in. And now I must refer to some statements that have been made in reference to the issue of this loan; and I refer to the explanatory circular issued by the Agent-General in reference to the loan, and I say that there is no person reading that explanatory circular but must feel sorrow for the honour of the colony, because there are statements in that explanatory circular which are not true, and statements that are so placed that if true they must deceive any person who knows nothing about New Zealand finance. Why, to begin with, the first suggestion made in the first paragraph is that all this money is to be lent

on freehold security. There is no suggestion that it is to Crown tenants or on leaseholds. On the contrary, the suggestion is the other way; it is only to be advanced to three-fifths of the value of the land. That is all that is said in the circular. Then we come to the second paragraph, where it deals with the financial position of New Zealand; and what does it state? Why, instead of taking the surpluses as certified by the Auditor-General and the officers of the Treasury—the actual surpluses—there has been put down what is mischievously called the gross surplus. That is put down on the table here, and then the Agent-General goes on to say, "There have been spent out of revenue certain sums of money for public works." That is true; but I say that any person reading this circular will assume that all those moneys that have been allocated to public works have been expended, and that we have all the surpluses remaining over this expenditure. That is an entirely misleading statement. Then, the next misleading statement comes in the next paragraph. It is this: "New Zealand has not raised any loan in this country, excepting those for conversion purposes, since 1888." Sir, that is quite true, and it is quite false. It is quite true in the sense that there has been no loan raised directly; but what has been done? Let us take an example of what was done with the Cheviot loan. We had for that a loan of £250,000. Where did we raise that money? We raised that money on the London market, and since 1888. But how did we do it? We called it a conversion operation. What we did was this : We issued that loan in this colony, and then took it to England and converted it there, after it had been in existence only a few months. And that is not raising a loan in London ! Why, this is simply playing with words. And so with various other loans. We have converted loans for the purchase of Native lands, and have converted other loans; and it is absurd and ridiculous and unfair to go to the London money-lender and say that we have had no loans but for conversion purposes since 1888. Then he goes on in the next sentence and says the gross amount of public debt in 1889 was £38,375,050; and then that the gross amount of public debt in 1894 was £39,826,415; leaving any person to assume, in reading the paragraph, that the debt has only increased by £1,451,365. But what is the fact? Instead of giving them the net public debt, he gives the gross public debt; and the difference is this: that, instead of our debt having increased by the difference between these sums, he has left out the sinking fund, and part of the sinking fund has been absorbed, and the result is that the debt has increased about half a million more than appears by this system—has increased by £443,465 more. Here again, I submit, is a most misleading statement. Then, take the next misleading statement of the case, in which the honourable gentleman stated that we had £800,000 at 4 per cent., that he could use, as he believes, for public purposes. Why, surely he cannot have had forwarded to him Return B. 29 of last session, in which it appears that the only amount left clear was £476,000; the balance of the £800,000 was in the Post-Office Savings-Bank, and belongs to that institution. To say, therefore, that he held that amount at the command of the Government is an entire misstatement. Then I come to another point: The honourable gentleman stated that, so far as our railways are concerned, they earn over 3 per cent.; but that is not true. The earnings of 1893-94 were only £2 17s. 9d. In 1894-95 it might be expected to be about 1s. under the year before, as far as I can calculate—£2 16s. 9d. Here was another entirely misleading statement; and I say that it is a shame and a disgrace to this colony, when it goes into the market to ask for money, that it should put before the money-lender what is simply a bogus prospectus, such as some companies are sometimes in the habit of making. Here let me say one or two words with respect to other statements that have been made about the colony. The question was asked the other day of the Premier as to whether he agreed with the speech made by the Colonial Treasurer to the London Chamber of Commerce. A copy of that speech has now been circulated through the colony; it comes from the Agent-General's office, with the Agent-General's stamp on it; and it has been forwarded to members of the House. What do you find in it? You find that the statements in it are not true—and there is no other name that can be applied to it. You have, for example, this excuse given for the collection of the land-tax—namely, that "it was simply done not because we wanted the money, but to stop the issue of Treasury bills." But the London Chamber of Commerce did not hear the speech of the Premier in this House, or the speech of the Colonial Treasurer, in which both honourable members declared that it was absolutely necessary, for the safety of the colony's finance, that funds should be raised at an inopportune time. What was the excuse given by the Colonial Treasurer? He did not say the same thing before the Chamber of Commerce. No. This is what he says:—

"Instead of being hard up for cash at that time, we had lying in London, and we have got them still, three millions' worth of unpledged securities of New Zealand, against which at any moment we not only could have raised the interest falling due, but could have got twice or three times the amount if it had been necessary to do so."

What are the facts? This is not a thing that admits of any dispute. We have got the returns laid on the table last session. They are signed by our auditors, and by our own officers; and what do they show? They show that last year the total amount of securities we had in London of every kind amounted only to £2,168,500. We had not £3,000,000 of that sort, either pledged or unpledged. Of this amount of £2,168,500, £476,000 was unpledged, and only that amount; and it is therefore a misstatement to say we had £3,000,000 in London. They were pledged to the Government Insurance, to the Public Trust Office, to the Sinking Fund Commissioners, and

to the Post-Office Savings-Bank; and it is most injurious to the Government Insurance Association if it be thought for one moment that their moneys, invested as the law directs, are to be treated as unpledged securities. There are other statements in this speech that I submit are not in accordance with fact; but I am not going to deal with them at present, in the absence of the Treasurer. I have only dealt with this one point, and it is so clear that I hope the Premier and others will see if they cannot give some explanation of it. It cannot be put down to mis-reporting. There have been some occasions when the Government, when they have said an inconvenient thing in their public utterances, put it down to the reporter; but that cannot be said in this case. This speech is a carefully-revised speech made by the Colonial Treasurer to the London money-lender, and issued by the Agent-General to the various members of this House; and I say it is exceedingly unfortunate that such a speech should ever have been made, and it is exceedingly unfortunate, when we are going to London, that wo should fail to state the truth. I believe the credit of this colony is such that we do not need misstatements; we .do not need untruths to be uttered; and this misleading explanatory circular of the Agent-General's is exceedingly unfortunate. But this speech of the Colonial Treasurer's is still more unfortunate; and I ask those who care to do so to look at a few of the Press comments on this utterance, and they will see that in those Press comments they make a great deal of this fact of the three millions of unpledged securities. We have no such unpledged securities; we never have any unpledged securities of that class; our securities, both pledged and unpledged, were under three millions, and, taking the two millions we had, they were so pledged that, if you are to say, regarding the men, women, and children who have funds in the Public Trust Office, that these funds are to be at the beck and call of the Colonial Treasurer to be dealt with as he thinks proper—what is the value of your Public Trust Office, your Government Insurance, or your Sinking Fund Commissioners? I say that it is a most unfortunate utterance; and the other reported utterances about the surplus are also unfortunate. The London money-lender is told that we have a surplus of about £400,000. Our surplus is £180,000; we have got it certified to by the auditors; and therefore, why should this gross surplus be mentioned? You might just as well deduct any other amounts as deduct the amounts spent on roads, railways, and bridges, or the sums paid to the Public Works Fund. What is the lender to assume from these misleading statements regarding the surplus? It is not a surplus at all; the money has been spent, and the surplus must present itself as the difference between revenue and expenditure—than is, what is left. I shall not refer further to this speech delivered by the Colonial Treasurer before the London Chamber of Commerce, but I must say this : that when I read it I read it with pain, because I believe that the honour of this colony is at stake, and it is not for the honour of this colony that any person should be misled. It is not for the honour of this colony that people in London should imagine for one moment that the Agent General and the Colonial Treasurer should go to London and make statements that are not true. Now, what is the position in which we stand to-day? I was very much struck with a speech made by the honourable member for Ashley during the recess. He said, dealing with clause 21 of the Alcoholic Liquors Sale Control Bill, that the Government was not responsible for that, but that the blame rested upon the shoulders of the Liberal party, and that he was glad to take a share of that blame. He must also take a share of this blame. This is a slur cast upon the party; it is a slur cast upon the colony; and, if the Liberal party choose to carry this burden about with them as they have carried the 21st section, I say that they are welcome to do so. I am, perhaps, an older member of the Liberal party than the honourable member and others that call themselves such; but I have not lost faith in Liberalism; I am still a believer in social and political reform; but I say this: that no party can ever succeed in the end unless it has a high moral ideal and a high moral aim, and I believe it is the duty of every man in this House—even at the risk of being called unpatriotic—to speak the truth. Has New Zealand descended to this low ebb: that a man is to be called a traitor if he dares to say what is true? Has New Zealand reached this low ebb? I believe in speaking the truth, whatever happens. It is better for us to have no money to advance to our settlers, it is better for us to have no public works, better for us to keep our consciences clear and our morals pure, than to have all the millions there may be in London. What have we done? We have gone to London and got the loan of money from the money-lenders on such a circular and on such a speech; and when I thought of this question of patriotism and unpatriotism there came to me a few lines I think I might quote of what true patriotism means. It is from a modern poet with whom I have no doubt the Minister of Education is acquainted—one of our best modern poets. Speaking of this very charge of being unpatriotic, he says this:—

The ever-lustrous name of patriot
To no man be denied because he said
Where in his country's wholeness lay the flaw;
Where in her whiteness the unseemly blot.

* * * * *

Be this the measure of our loyalty:
To feel the noble, and weep thy lapse the more.
This truth by thy true servants is confessed:
Thy sins, who love thee most, do most deplore.
Know then thy faithful! Best they honour thee
Who honour in thee only what is best.

Mr. E. M. Smith.—That's me.

Sir R. Stout.—I say that in dealing with this question of patriotism, and of what is unpatriotic, I do hope that this colony, whatever our opinions may be, whatever our personal views, our political opinions are—I hope that this party, the party of the majority in this House, will repudiate as one man the tactics employed in misleading the English moneylender.

SAMUEL COSTALL, Government Printer, Wellington.

Political Address By the Hon. Sir Robert Stout, Premier, N.Z. Delivered at Marton *On* 11th March, 1887 Reprinted from the Evening News Napier.

The Premier at Marton.

11th March, 1887.

Introductory

Mr Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—"When I received a requisition from your town to address you on political subjects, I felt it not only to be my duty, but a great privilege to meet you, because I recognise that there can be no good government in any country unless there has been a sound political education amongst the people, and I felt that no person could be politically educated unless he has looked at politics from both sides of the question. In fact, I wish you to-night, knowing that you are not perhaps of my way of thinking, to go with me and look with me at some political questions, and at the action of the Government from my point of view. You know the old story—I have often referred to it, and you have perhaps more frequently heard of it—of what happened once at the corner of two roads. There was a shield exhibited, and two wayfarers approaching the shield from different standpoints, began to describe it. One said it was a silver shield, and the other was equally emphatic in insisting that it was made of gold. And they quarrelled, and instead of approaching the view of the shield from the same standpoint—one going to one side, And one to the other,—they began to fight, and it was only after the fight was ended that they did what they should have done before—turned round, and they would have discovered that they were both right, because on one side it was silver and on the other side it was gold. Now in dealing with political questions, there is sometimes a danger in every community of so viewing one set of questions from one side only. I warn you to-night that I am going to ask you only to look at the one side. I shall leave to those who are politically opposed to me to set before you the beauties and glories of the State from their point of view. I hope, however, during the time I shall address you to say nothing unfairly; and I think; I may say this—that, however you may disagree with me in any inferences I may draw from facts, the details that I will give you will be historically accurate, Now, we approach political questions in this colony from quite a different standpoint to what they are approached from in England. In England we have two historical parties, and when a man says he is a Whig or Liberal, and another man says he is a Tory or Conservative, you at once know in what school of politics he is trained, and you can predict on each particular question how he will vote. In New Zealand we have not had this division, The questions that have caused differences among our politicians are new questions, many of them unknown to the Old World, and these new questions have arisen quickly, as the circumstances of the colony change quickly. Hence, you will find that some men who have voted on one side one session may be found in the opposite division next session. You will find some men who have been perhaps historically allied with each other for years suddenly diverging and appearing on different sides of the House. Now I ask you when that occurs not to assume that either of them have changed their opinions. They may have been true to each other, and true to the principles they professed whilst they were ranging themselves under different banners. Take for example this question that agitated the whole of this colony some thirteen years—twelve or thirteen years—ago. I mean the question as to whether Provincial Councils were to exist or not. You found the Pro-vincialists, and you found those that were termed Centralists, but as soon as that question of Provincialism and Centralism was ended and the decision

pronounced by the House and by the country, you found that those who were in the Provincial camp were often friends of those who were in the Central camp, and a new readjustment of parties had to be brought about. Remember this, however that if you will take the trouble to carefully analyse the division that took place in the House of Representatives, and if you carefully scrutinise the history of the opinions of the various representatives, yon will at the bottom find perhaps just as strong a guiding principle as may be found in Home politics. There are not in this colony, as there are in older countries, two main parties in politics—one what are termed Liberals, the other what are termed Conservatives, and so long as the world lasts there must necessarily be these two camps. You find them not only in politics, you find them in science and you find them in theology; in fact, there is almost no realm of speculation, no question of opinion about which you can speak, but what you find there are two classes of minds, because there are men so mentally constituted that even though they are the most conscientious and sincere, and the most earnest in their attempts to master the various political questions of the day,—they are so mentally constituted that they will necessarily select one or the other of the camps, either the Liberal or the Conservative camp. And if you will take the trouble to read through all the division lists that appear in your own *Hansard*, you could almost predict—I could from knowing the members—when a new question arises how that man will vote, if he votes according to his conscience, and is not influenced in his vote by party requirements or party bidding. Now so far as I am personally concerned, I am not here to discuss my own personal views, but I may say that I claim to be, as I have always claimed to be, on what may be termed on the extreme wing of the Liberal party. I claim to be a Radical in politics. And I claim that in almost, I may say, in every vote I have given I have been influenced by, it may be my mental constitution, to vote in a Radical division, and I wish you tonight to say in reference to what the Government have done, whether you think the legislation they have attempted, and the administration they have carried out, have been progressive or retrograde. Now there are various ways of approaching political questions. Though we are a small colony, we have just as great problems to work out, and problems that have and will have just as great effect on our present and future as they have in England, and as the politicians in other countries in the world. To-night I propose to deal with only a few of these questions, and to bring before you what the Government nas attempted to do, in order that you may consider when you go away from public meetings—perhaps in your calmer moments—that you may consider the various political problems of the day. Then it will be your duty, as men having a vast responsibility cast upon you, as founders of a new nation, in considering what the policy of this nation shall be, to say whether you think the Government is entitled to credit or discredit. Now the first subject I shall deal with shall be that in regard to the native question. I propose then afterwards to deal with regard to the land question, with regard to local government, taxation, political reforms, including representation and administration of the Government, and then I shall deal with future policies, of public works, borrowed money, and other matters, so far as my time and yours will allow.

Native Question.

It has been said, "Oh, it is all very well for the Premier to address a meeting in Dunedin where the Maori is as rare as a comet, but if he will only go to a North Island audience and talk about the Maoris there, he will learn a lesson that he will not forget." Well, I am here before a North Island audience, and I am before an audience that in times past I know has taken an intense interest in politics, and I cannot forget the many facts of which I have read as to what has taken place in this town of Marton. I like to approach the Maori question before an audience that knows something of it. (Cheers). I believe the Marton people know something of it, and if there is any one of them that can point out a single fact that I shall state that is inaccurate, I shall be glad of correction, because I want to know the history of my adopted country. (Cheers). Now, let me sketch what our policy has been in dealing with the natives—let me point out the position the colony was in, so far as the Maori question was concerned when we took office, and, in doing so, I wish to reflect nothing on individuals. If I have even to mention individuals' names, I shall only have to do it to illustrate a point I care more for a right view of politics than dealing with persons, (Cheers). Now, what was the position of the Maori question? I say when we took office there was peace. There was no war; nothing was threatened, but I appeal to anyone who was acquainted with the Maori mind,—not in one isolated district of the colony alone, but throughout the colony—were the Maoris in a state of contentment and happiness so far as regards the whites? And I venture to say this : that if you had gone to almost any district in this colony, or even if you had gone to districts in the South Island, where the Maoris were few, and may have been said to have little cause for complaint against the Europeans or the European Government, you would have found this feeling existing among the Maoris. I am not saying whether this feeling was justified or not, but that this feeling did exist I chal-lenge contradiction, and it was this : That though there were no signs of war, no signs of any uprising against the colony, the Maoris were not only dissatisfied, in many districts they were more; they were sulky, and in none of the native districts, so far as I could ascertain, was there any feeling of kindness and amiability towards the Government of this

colony. (Cheers). Throughout the length and breadth of the colony there was unrest amongst them, there was discontentment. Now, I have already said, I do not care whether this feeling was justified or not, but I say that if the Government of this colony is such that a large number of people as the Maoris are in this colony are in a state of discontent, then there is something to blame besides the Maoris, because I apprehend it is the duty of the Government so to govern the colony that every one in the colony, be his skin white or brown, shall think of the State as his Government, and have feelings not of enmity but amity towards it. And if you found the Maoris profoundly discontented with their position—afraid that their lands would be taken from them—that the chiefs were to be, some of them, degraded, and their pensions lost. If you had this feeling of discontent amongst them, then I say the Government in the past has been at fault that that feeling had not been altered. Now, what did we propose to do? We proposed as far as we could, to impress upon the Maoris this : That we should not only treat them with justice, but treat them with kindness, and that we should also see and preserve to them the rights that this colony and that the Queen had guaranteed to them in days gone by. For you must remember the rights of the Maoris do not merely depend upon what is termed the Treaty of Waitangi; but the rights of the Maoris depend upon the Maori Rights Act, 1865, whereby it is declared by the Parliament of this colony that the Maoris were to have equal rights with Europeans. Of course some people may say they were not entitled to equal rights. Those people who aay that would not have voted for the emancipation of the African slaves. It is the same feeling that exists amongst a dominant race. "You are not equal to us, and therefore we shall not give you equal rights." I say that it would be a great blot upon our history as a nation that if towards this race, that I am afraid is dying—that I am afraid is condemned—-it was to be said by the future historian that we, as men, had forgotten all those lessons of the brotherhood of humanity that we hear preached, and that we were to say to our brown brothers you are not entitled to the rights we possess, and we shall treat you differently, Well, we found the Maoris profoundly discontented. How was this discontent to be remedied? It had to be remedied by kindness, by considerate treatment, and it had also to be dealt with in another way. Their lands had to be dealt with, because to a primitive race not accustomed to the industrial arts, having practically no property, no personal property of any value or amount, the land is the Maori's all. And if you will read the history of this colony, those who are young amongst you, and if the old will only recall it to themselves, you will see that in the past almost all our Maori troubles have arisen in reference to our dealing with their land, or their dealing with their land. We had, therefore, in dealing with the Maoris to be kind and considerate and just to them, and, at the same time, we had so to proceed in dealing with the native lands legislation that whilst we saw means of providing for the settlement of this country the Maoris' rights had to be protected and not invaded. Well now, how did we proceed? I say we proceeded in dealing with the Maoris, to show them consideration, to show them kind treatment. We went and met them. The Native Minister met them and argued with them; was not cruel, was not domineering to them. He argued with them as he would argue with Europeans, and tried to get them to come to his way of thinking. And when we came to deal with their land we showed them that not only did we wish to discuss with them the proposed measure of native lands legislation, but that we wished it fully discussed by them. We gave them every opportunity to discuss it, and we also showed them that we were at the same time anxious to preserve their rights, (Cheers) Need I go into the history of Maori land legislation with you? Do you not know that private individuals have obtained land in this colony unrighteously? Do you not know that Maoris from time to time have been unrighteously robbed of their land? ("Yes.") Do you not also know that even when the Government has had to deal with Maori land and has even had to purchase Maori land,—that the records of the past show that even when the Crown itself was the purchaser the Maoris had been dealt with most unrighteously as to their land? And is this not a fact also? That in so far as dealing with native lands, if the existing law were to remain on the Statute Book there would be no provision for the proper settlement of this country; but, on the contrary, if dealings in Maori land were to go on as they had gone on before, the Maoris would have to part with their land in large blocks. No proper settlement of the land could be effected. The result would be, as was going to be the case in many districts of this colony, tl at the only person who could get an acre of Maori land was the person who had a long purse and a dozen agents and interpreters in his employ to hoodwink the natives. Now all that had to be altered, And how was that to be altered? Mr Bryce tried it. He introduced a Bill to deal with this Maori question, and unfortunately before I came into the House, but the records of Hansard will show that many of those who supported him were not his political supporters, and that those who opposed him and opposed his bill were those who were supporting his Government. The result was that from time to time demands have been made to put the land laws on a proper footing, and nothing had been done. Now what does our bill do? Our bill does this : It first says that there shall be no more of this private trafficking in Maori land as has existed hitherto—that if Maoris wish to sell their land—I shall come to a different part of the business by and by, but I am taking it in a wide way not wishing to omit anything—if a Maori wishes to sell his land, or a hapu wish to sell their land, or a large number of owners wish to sell their land, then they must sell it through a Government officer, and this Government officer also must proceed to sell the land the same as the waste lands of the Crown are sold. Now what does that do for the Maori? First, it

prevents those disgraceful and degrading scenes that alas we know have been seen in this Colony, of Maoris made drunk to sign deeds and do other acts that I will not refer to at present. And it also provides this : that all people in this Colony shall be put on a level so far as the purchase of Native land is concerned—that it shall not be left to a Maori doctor, Maori interpreter or agent alone to obtain land, but if the Maori has to sell his land the sale of the land shall be open to all the people of this Colony. They shall be put on a level so far as the leasing or purchase of Maori land are concerned, so that in this Colony small settlements as well as large can be adequately provided for. And it does this for the Maoris : It not only preserves them from improvident bargains but provides a means by which they will be enabled not only to preserve some land for themselves but also preserve some of the money that they obtain for the land for themselves, so that in years to come they shall not be left in destitution or beggary. Now I am not aware of any objection that has been urged to this bill but one. It has been said—"Oh you have made the Maoris trustees, and having made them trustees they are unable to fulfil the trust." There is no such provision in the bill. What has been done is this: There may be committees appointed, and what was the object of appointing these committees? I will tell you. We will suppose that there are 500 Maoris owning a block of land. You cannot deal very well with the 500, but these 500 may appoint seven of a committee and those seven of a committee can then authorise the Commissioner to sell. So far as the committees are concerned, they are not trustees of the land, because the Commissioner is practically the trustee,. He has to deal with the whole question of the sale of the land. These committees are simply in the nature of attorneys or appointees to determine whether the land is to be sold or not. And if that is the only blot in the Bill, all I have got to say is that it is one of the most perfect pieces of legislation that the Assembly of New Zealand has ever passed, (Cheers.) Well I have said we dealt thus with the Maori land question; and we also insisted that whilst we were kind and considerate to the Maoris, they also must obey the law. And hence it was that when there was trouble up the Coast here, and when the Maoris committed an offence by assembling in large numbers and interfering with lands that did not belong to them, we put the machinery of the criminal law of this country in motion, had the Natives brought before the Supreme Court, tried, and sentenced, so that the Maoris would see that so far as we are concerned as a Government—that whilst we were prepared to deal kindly and considerately with them—whilst we were prepared to meet them in every way possible in dealing with their land—whilst we were prepared to consider the suggestions they made in the passing of the Native Lands Bill, we also said this—"There is one law for you and one law for the Europeans, you must obey the law, we cannot allow any riot or unlawful assembling amongst you anymore than we can amongst Europeans," (Cheers). Now I say again that here I shall only briefly refer to the past. That is the policy that should have been followed out in 1879, and that was the policy that was followed out in 1879 up to the time I left office. It was on my advice that policy was adopted in 1879, for I was then At-torney-General, What happened in 1879 you know. Then the Waimate Plains trouble arose, and the result was ploughing began, and a large number of natives—I forget the exact number; it was upwards of a hundred—were arrested and committed for trial. The question arose—had they offended in law? Most certainly they had. It was only after I left oflice, for I resigned before the session of 1879, that a bill was introduced—that I term a most unfortunate bill—by the Grey Government, Mr Sheehan as Native Minister, which did this; Postponed their trial. I say that was an illegal step that was inaugurated then in 1879, and that illegal step was followed up in 1880, and again followed up in 1882, and again followed up in 1883, I said that there was no need for this law—that there should be the same, law for the Europeans and the Maoris—that if a man has committed an offence he should be brought to trial and punished for it, and that there should be no special bills of acts passed to say that he should not be brought to trial and kept in confinement without trial. It was said, however, and it has been said by my friend Mr Bryce about our policy—"Oh you did a fine thing when you were in office in 1879. There was Hiroki who committed the murder of Mr M'Lean, the surveyor. You had a force on the Plains under Sir George Whitmore, I think in April 1879 or June, to arrest Hiroki, the murderer; why did you allow him to remain under Te Whiti's influence at Parihaka—why did you allow a murderer to be at large ?" Well, I will deal with that by and by; but I think that was an unfortunate illusion of Mr Bryce. I went out of office in June 1879, and the Grey Government went out I think about September 1879. Mr Bryce came into office then, and if you look up the blue books you will find that he himself wrote a memorandum on the 27th December, 1880, in which he stated that Hiroki was still under Te Whiti's keeping at Parihaka, So that for more that twelve months his Government did not take one step to arrest Hiroki, the murderer. Wnen we took office in the end of August or beginning of September, 1878, we had no armed force to back us up. It was not until April. 1879, that Sir George Whitmore said that he could have no force on the Plains that would have been sufficient, if the Maoris were to break forth in rebellion, to preserve the lives of the European settlers, and see that there was no needless bloodshed. But we were told, as the Blue Books will show, that the natives were willing that Hiroki should be arrested even in September, 1878. (A voice—"So he was.") Well he was not. (Laughter). No doubt the reason we did not act in 1879 up to the time I took office was this: That we thought it was not wise then, for the sake of the arrest of one murderer, that we should practically declare open war on the Plains until we were prepared. And I apprehend the reason why

the Hall administration did nothing for more than twelve months afterwards, for eighteen months afterwards, for nearly two years afterwards, was the same reason, that they did not think them-selves warranted, in the state of the colony, to at once engage in a Maori war for the arrest of one murderer. To therefore cast a slur on the Grey Government that during the time I was in office they did not arrest Hiroki, the murderer, under the protection of Te Whiti, when the Government that succeeded us were far more than a year in office before they took any steps to arrest him—I say that could only have been made use of by my friend by lapse of memory, forgetting facts that had taken place so many years ago. "What is the position now of the Maoris after our administration? And remember this also, that our administration has only been a little over two years. I ask you to go from the North Cape to Stewart Island—I ask you to go the various *Kaingas* of the Maoris and see them, and I undertake to say that if you do so conscientiously and fairly yon will admit this : That nine-tenths of the Maori people—I believe almost all, but I put put it that nine-tenths of the Maoris at least, are not only favourably disposed to Ministers, but that they are favourable to the acts of the Government. Any persons acquainted with Maori affairs will see that. We see four intelligent Maori members voting with the Government, supporting the Govern-ment—entering with, I may say, considerable ingenuity, considerable ability, into the various political questions in the House, and supporting the Government. To see the Natives from the North Cape to Stewart Island quite a different; people to what they were in 1884, contented, peaceful, and anxious to stand well with the Government, is a sight that has not been seen in New Zealand for many a day. And I claim this credit at all events, that during our administration, if we found peace we also found suspicion—if we found no open rebellion we found discontentment, and if we go out of office tomorrow we shall go out with the Maoris not only peaceful but contented; and with the Maoris having this feeling, that at all events both the Government and the Parliament are anxious to deal righteously with them, are anxious to do them justice, are anxious to deal fairly with them in the eye of the law, and to treat them with kindness and generosity. And I say for our Native administration, even if we did not pass this important Native Lands Administration Bill, which would, I believe, for the first time in the history of the colony, put the disposal of the Native lands on a satiafactory footing—even if we did nothing more than leave the Maoris as we leave them at the present time, if we go out of office—our Native administration deserves the utmost consideration, and I say more, the highest gratitude at the hands of the people of this colony. (Cheers.)

Crown Lands.

Now, I shall leave this native lands administration question. The next question I proposed to deal with was in regard to Crown lands. Let me say this, because I shall never fail to repeat it, that I regret to say that as yet there is neither a majority in the House nor in the country that agree with me, but I believe the time must come when the State will be deemed the owner of the land. From that opinion I do not flinch. Do not think, as some people seem to imagine, that when the State becomes the owner of the land the tillers of the soil would be in a worse position than they are now. I believe they would be immensely benefited. I believe—and I say that this is the way to test this policy—that if this colony from the earliest days had laid down this principle that the State was to be the owner of the land, giving to the person who got land from the State not only the utmost consideration, but the utmost security of tenure, it would have been far better for our small farmers than their position to-day. What is the position of many of them to-day? Their land is not their own. Many of them are working for an absentee whom they never saw. They are working for the mortgagee, and many of them have been placed in this position : They have got their land, many of them, at a high price. All their little capital, all their little savings, have been absorbed in the purchase of the land. When they come perhaps to stock the land, or when there come one or two bad seasons, what happens? Why this happens : They were short of money; they had to get money somewhere; they had to put their land in pledge, and some of them instead of getting better, as the years rolled on, after working hard morning, noon, and night, have lost their land, and have had to go out of possession, having no home for themselves or their families. If, on the other hand, they had kept their capital—if they had not had to pay away their capital for the purchase of the land, but had got their land on a secure tenure—on such a tenure as is now given in the Land Act of 1885, and given also in a previous Act passed by Mr Rolleston—the tenure known as the perpetual leasing system—they would have had this security: The land would have always been their own; if they improved the land they could not have been put out of possession of the land unless they were paid for their improvements. There would have been ample security for them. I believe if you had had that land system in operation among the small farmers in New Zealand they would have been in a far better position than they are in to-day. Now, what does our Land Act provide? We found it was absolutely necessary that there should be a Land Act passed, and one of the first things we set about doing was to frame a new Act to liberalise the previous existing land laws. That was done in various ways It was done by extending the perpetual leasing system, which provides that a man gets a lease for thirty years and pays a certain rental to the State. At the end of that time his improvements are valued, and what is

termed the value of the land with improvements is also valued. He has only to pay a small per centage—4 per cent, on the value of the land minus improvements, and then he gets the lease for another 21 years, and so it goes on and on perpetually, so that practically his tenure is always secure to him. We thought that required extension. We also thought that the village settlement scheme, which, in fact, had been originally proposed by myself when Minister of Lands in 1878, the bill for which had been introduced by Mr Thomson, the member for Clutha, when Minister of Lands in 1879, and which had been elaborated by Mr. Rolleston, should be further extended. We also thought that this should be done, namely, that there should be introduced a provision for people not only having agricultural land on the lease system but that there should be security of tenure given to the small runs. Now you in this district have not had so much to do with runs as we have had to do down South. What do we find happen down South? We find a whole country side extending in one place for forty or fifty miles, all under the domination of one company, sometimes of one foreign company. There will be more than 100,000 acres belonging to one company. A few shepherds may be scattered about, but that was not settlement. We believe that there can be provision made for settlement and provision for the growth of wool; in fact, that along with our increased settlement there wo a Id also come an increase in our product of wool. It would be well if we could cut up large territories like these into small runs, providing two things : First, that no man should hold more than one small run; second, that we should provide for a certain term of residence to that man—that he should get the value of hi a improvements if he went out of the run, and that he should get certain security of tenure. That was introduced into the small run system, which first became law in 1885, because the provisions of the former Act were unworkable and were not able to be carried out. That was one of the provisions in the Act of 1885. I believe it will be taken advantage of not only in the South Island, but it will be taken advantage of in the North Island. And here comes in the principle which will have to be acted upon, whether a man is a Liberal or a Conservative, in dealing with land. We wish to see that land shall not be monopolised, I hold that the State has to hold the land, and it has so to hold the land that it shall not permit any individual to unduly monopolise it, I regret to say that there is not sufficient liberal sentiment in the Assembly to see the land question carried out properly, and I will give you an example of it for which you can refer to *Hansard* for 1885, You will find that when we proposed to limit the holding of runs even to 20,000 sheep—that is, outside the small run system—that even in so far as the large runs were concerned, no man and no company should hold Crown land of a larger area than could maintain 20,000 "sheep—that even though that was proposed in the Assembly the Conservative element was so strong as to negative that proposal. Well I am showing you how we have proposed to deal with the land question. We have proposed to deal with this question of small runs by splitting up large areas of country into small runs, believing that that will encourage the production of wool.

The Unemployed.

There has also been the question that has vexed us, that has vexed previous Ministers, that has vexed Governments not only in New Zea-land, not only in the neighboring colonies, not only in England and the United States—you can hardly name a country in the world where it is not periodically vexatious—that of having men able and strong to work demanding work because they say they are unemployed. It is a serious question. How is it to be dealt with? We said it was only to be dealt with in two ways. We must try, so far as we can, to prevent men from crowding into the towns and depending upon stray work there, to see if they will not make permanent homes for themselves in the country. Though they may not be able to keep themselves and their families on pieces or patches of land that are given to them, yet they will always have a home, and if they can get employment for two or three months in the year outside their homes they will "be able at all events to keep themselves and their families from want, keep them in comfort, and not be called "the unemployed," Hence we saw the need of encouraging what was called village settlements, to meet this unemployed agitation. I am glad to say that especially in the north, in Auckland, and also indeed in many parts of the middle Island, and also in Wellington, and up north of Wairarapathese village settlements are likely to become a great success. Of course no 'one imagines that every settler who goes to a village settlement is going to be a successful settler. There will be a percentage of failures just as there is a percentage of failures amongst big runholders and farmers, however small they may be; but we saw that that was one way of dealing with this unemployed agitation—that it was one way of fixing people to the soil; and it was one vay also, we hope, of helping those who needed assistance, who said they were ready and willing to work, but who had not either the opportunity or ability of attaching themselves to any permanent employment. That is how we proceeded to deal, not only with the passing of the Land Act, 1885, and the various amendments, which would take me too long a time to go into, but also in administering the Act in our Lands Department. And I say this: that the whole tendency of modern thought now is towards this goal. We may put it off here as we please, but we have got to meet this question in the future, and it would be better for New Zealand if her people would justly and calmly consider

whether it is wise that we should as a State allow the lands to pass from us, and as the lands pass from us have no control over them for future settlement. Do not imagine, as some politicians hare understood it, that once you sell all the land the land question is settled, That is when the land question begins. Go to Ireland : What is the trouble there? It is not so much about political opinion. The land question has been at the bottom of all the agitation in Ireland. Go to some parts of Scotland, and what is the agitation there about? All about the land question. And the time will come when that land question will be the question in other countries where it is apparently unknown at present. I ask the people whether it would not be wise for them now, when they have the chance, and when they have millions of acres—whether something should not be done so as to provide that in the future we should not have those dangerous agrarian agitations, those dangerous revolutions that we see afflicting other countries, but that the State should hold such a possession over the land as to provide for its future settlement, and as to prevent its undue monopoly. What do we find even in this colony? We find from many parts—especially in the Middle Island, the cry coming up to us : Here we have a township almost wiped out; here we have almost a district wiped out. Why? Here you can go for miles and miles upon one man's property with perhaps a solitary shepherd's hut—land that could grow the finest wheat in the world. Is that state of things to be allowed to continue? What has been demanded from us? It has been demanded from us that the State should repurchase back the land. I say is that creditable to us as a colony ?—to us as a people who are to found a new nation?—is it creditable to us that so soon in our history as a colony—to us as a colony that is not yet fifty years old—that we should be asked to buy back for the State for the settlement of people on the land, land that has been alienated within fifty years? The very fact that there is such a demand for a bill of that character is sufficient to show that our land legislation in the past has not been on a proper or satisfactory basis, And I said at Invercargill this: that it was misleading public opinion for any person to go through the length and breadth of this colony and say the one thing needed in this colony was a bill for purchasing back the large estates, whilst we had so many millions of acres still in the possession of the State. Aye, to purchase back by the bill proposed without any guarantee that this land would remain the State's. On the contrary the provisions of the bill of Sir George Grey were such that within a few years the land became private property, and there was no provision to stop the accumulation of estates—no provision whatever to stop the adding thousands of acres and thousands of acres until within twenty or thirty years we would be thrown back to the same position as we were in before. Now believe that this question of purchasing large estates in some districts in the colony will have to be dealt with. I believe that we will be able perhaps at the next meeting of Parliament to submit a bill that will deal with this question, and in this bill we shall take care to provide for this : That the land shall not become private property; it must remain in some way State land, and the State must have control over it. I ask those who demand this bill for the purchase of large estates, and I ask the people of this Colony, what the very mention of such a bill means? I say the very mention of such a bill is to condemn for ever the idea that the fee simple, as it is termed, in land can be a permanent tenure where there is democracy. And what has an eminent Belgian economist said, Laveleye. He says that if these new democracies were only wise they would take care to provide that the State at all events should have its hand over the land—that there should be no undue monopoly—that the land should remain for the people and not remain for a few. We say that that is the object of our administration of the land. We say at the same time it was the object of a former administrator of the land, Mr Rolleston, and I only regret that as yet those people in this Colony who ought to be our best supporters in dealing with this question—those people who ought to see that it affects them and their children—the small farmers in this Colony, have not risen to a conception of what this question means; and unfortunately many of them are found voting along with the land-sharks and monopolists who hold so much of the fertile lands of this Colony in their hands. (Cheers,) I have now done with the land question,

Local Government.

I wish to point out to you how we have dealt with the question of local government. The question of local government is not only a difficult one in this Colony; it is even a difficult one in England, When Abolition took effect it was seen that if this Colony was to remain a true democracy you must bring the people face to face with their Government, and that the people could not be brought face to face with their Government if all power was centred in departments in Wellington. There was need of local government. Every one said so. Unfortunately the need still exists, and it is only bit by bit that you will get your local government built up. I believe that it was a mistake abolishing the provinces. I have never wavered from that opinion. I do not say that the Provincial Governments should not have been altered, should not have been improved, but I say the very idea of the provinces should not have been destroyed—that we should have worked on the basis that we had in existence to something better, more popular, and more democratic. Unfortunately, however, the majority of the people thought that if they once got rid of the Provinces they were going to enter upon some Elysian field, which I am afraid is still out in the Pacific Ocean. (Laughter and cheers.) Well, we had to deal with the question

of local government when we took office. What did we purpose doing? We proposed strengthening them. We have passed Bills this last session consolidating the Counties Act and consolidating the Municipal Corporations Act. We have also dealt with the question of Hospitals and Charitable Aid. Some local governments say—"But what does that mean ?—it is simply calling upon us to pay more money than we did in the olden days," Quite true. It also means this-—calling upon the people to manage their own affairs; and if those people who think that it means taking more money out of their pockets would only realise this; that every pound spent by the Government in Wellington comes out of their pockets; and would only realise this: that the only chance of economy is that they manage their own affairs locally, they would see that, even though it means a greater tax upon them, it is really the means of getting carried out hospital and charitable aid at a cheaper rate than heretofore, and more effectively. That is what local government means. Do not run away with this notion, as many people do, that there is existing in Wellington—I do not know what you can call it—some huge box or chest of sovereigns, into which, if the Colonial Treasurer only puts in his hand, he can draw out all the money to spend. They do not stop to think that they have to put the money there, and that they cannot get any money out except they put it in. If you ask the Colonial Government to pay away money for charitable aid, hospitals, and other requirements in local districts, it means that the Government must tax you to fill that chest The meaning of the Hospital and Charitable Aid Act is this:—First, it gives you local management; second, it gives you, I believe, a cheaper management. I am glad to say that we have found from actual working that once you have placed the hospitals and the distribution of charitable aid in the hands of the local bodies—made them responsible to find part of the money—made them responsible for the administration—these two things,—it has been more cheaply done than it had been done in the past, through the central office at "Wellington having offices in the various provincial districts. And so it always is with local bodies. Do you imagine that if you abolished your Borough Council here and your County Council, and you had your roads managed from Wellington, and your rates managed from Wellington, that your roads and rates would be as well managed and as cheaply managed as by the local bodies? Not a bit of it. Of course you may say that the local bodies are always quarrelling amongst themselves, and if you want a road to your door, or a street lamp erected, you must get into the Borough Council first. (Laughter). Well, you always hear that sort of thing. I am afraid, however, that if you had no Borough Council, and no County Councils to find fault with, the number of depu-tations that would be coming by railway to Wellington would be so numerous, that the Wellington-Mana-watu Railway Company would be able to pay 2 per cent straight away. (Laughter). Do not imagine that because you have local government, and because you are brought face to face with the expenditure that you require for your local government, that you are paying more money than if you left everything to be dealt with by the Central Government. Now, I say that is the way to strengthen local government, and I say it is not to the credit of a previous administration that Sir John Hall brought in a Hospital and Charitable Institutions Bill in 1879, drawn on similar lines to our Bill in 1885; that that administration remained in 1879, remained in 1881, 1882, 1883, and part of 1884, and that Bill was left in the waste paper basket. We said it is our duty to try and do all we can to decentralize, and it shall be our endeavor, so long as we are in office, to cast all local works on local bodies, so far as possible, giving them the assistance that the finances of the colony will allow, and at the same time leaving the administration of local affairs to local bodies. It is only in that way that a true democracy is created, and grows up. If you read the history of any country it will tell you this : That if you find any colony, if you find any country in the world that manages the whole of its affairs from the Central Department, that colony, or that country, just in the degree that it manages everything from a Central Government, and gives no power to the local bodies, ceases to be demo-cratic, and becomes autocratic. And if we are to have in this colony a true democracy, we ought to give such an opportunity to the people to be so educated as to manage their County Councils, Borough Corporations, and other local bodies, that each one will feel that politics are his inid- vidual concern, that he is part of the State, and that he is not fulfilling his duty as a citizen unless he takes part in the administration of the State, unless he helps to build up the nation in which he dwells. (Cheers).

Taxation.

Now I come to a question that is going to be discussed no doubt next session, and will often be discussed—that is the question of taxation. A voice: By Jove, you want that.) of course, there are some people who pay very heavy taxes already, by taking things that are not good for them, (Laughter.) Now, let me say what my view on taxation was. I believed that direct taxation was necessary—that if you do not have direct taxation, you do not cast upon the people the feeling of the need of economy; and so far as direct taxation is concerned of the proper kind, I was one of the Ministry that first introduced it in the colony of New Zealand, in the Land Tax Act of 1878. And what was that Land Tax Act? That Land Tax Act provided that the land was taxed, but improvements were not taxed. And it has been said by some people that that land tax was more injurious—that, in point of fact, it cast a greater burden upon the small settlers than the present property tax. I

confess I cannot understand that. Why the Land Tax Act said that if a man had, we shall, say a farm of 500 acres, or a small farm of 100 acres, all that he had to pay a tax on was the bare value of the land. His house, his furniture, his stock, his implements, his improvements, his garden, his plantation, were all deducted; he paid no tax on them. (A voice; How about the mortgages?) I am going to come to mortgages by-and-by. I am very sorry to think that that gentleman knows anything about mortgages. (Laughter.) Now it has been said by some people that under the property tax which taxes a man's house, which taxes a man's watch, which taxes a man's books, which taxes a man's improvements, which taxes everything that he possesses I think, except agricultural impe-ments—that everything is taxtd, and that that is an advantage to the small farmer. Well, I never could understand that. And I would put it to the small farmer who knows anything about mortgages, and who has got any mortgage on his place, whether he was better under the old Land Tax Act. Which is the best for him? He pays, we shall say, the same rate of tax he pad under the Land Tax Act, only on the bare value of his land, but under the Property Tax Act he pays on every improvement he has made. What is the advadtage to him? I never could understand what the advantage is to him. It was said the mortgagees escaped under the Land Tax Act. When we proposed our Land Tax Act we proposed what amounted to an income tax, That would have dealt with banks, and they were the Maori mortgagees, but that was put out But do you imagine that when a mortgagee lends you money he does not calculate the interest he is to get for it? You are very much mistaken if you think he does not, I will tell you what actually happened; it is not a question of belief. It actualy happened that when the property-tax was put on the interest in many parts of this colony was raised ½ per-cent. And if it were not that he mortgagees have to pay property tax on their money, you would get your interest I believe 1 per cent. cheaper. So that practically though you may be said to deduct the value of your mortgage from your property, you are simply paying for it in another way by having dearer money, and in a roundabout way. If you wanted the mortgagees taxed directly then you should have provided for that without taxing the improvements of small farmers or the machinery of the manufacturers. In our Property Tax Act of 1885, we made that very exception. We proposed this to the House,—and you will find how the voting went if you go to *Hansard*—we proposed to except all farms up to £300 and ma-chinery up to £300, and that all improvements should be free from taxation. The mortgagees remained taxable, We were not able to carry it; so that you see in dealing with this question of taxation we tried in 1885 to keep this in view—we tried in dealing with taxation, as I say any practical politician will have to deal with it in the future—we tried so to shape our taxation that what you term the working bees of our hives were helped and not hindered—I mean the farmers and the manufacturers.

Freetrade and Protection.

I will now come to deal with the question of Freetrade and Protection, because it is a branch of this same question of taxation that has caused considerable agitation in the colony, and perhaps may causa some more—I mean this question of dealing with the customs revenue. Some people say what about protection and free-trade? Well, I don't know how this colony can be called a freetrade colony with 16½ per cent ad valorem duties. Nor can I understand how many of those people—I do not allude to gentlemen on the platform, I mean persons outside altogether—how many of those who are now loudest in proclaiming themselves freetraders can well do so, for if you will turn to *Hansard* you will find that they voted for an additional duty of 5, and also 1 per cent, and all the time proclaimed themselves freetraders. Let me say this : that this freetrade and protection question has to be looked at from quite a different stand point from what it has been looted at for many years, and in many books on political economy. I have not time to read to you a very instructive extract from a paper that appears in the *Contemporary Review* for January this year, called "Contemporary Life and Thought in the United States." I would ask you who have time to try and read that paper, In it President Adams, president of one of the colleges in America, shows that at one time in America there was only one kind of opinion held by the professors of political economy in the universities,—the University Colleges of America—and that that kind of opinion was what was termed the free trade opinion—that was that the Professors were all followers of Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," and Mill's "Political Economy." But he points out that the younger economists,—he means the professors of Political Economy in America, have studied in Germany, and that now the majority of the Professors of Political Economy in the States do not follow that school, and are not what are termed freetraders; that is, they belong to what is termed "the historical school." Now you will pardon me if I do not refer at length to my position on this question; in fact it would take me fully more than an hour to explain my position, and, therefore, I can only hint it to you, suggesting to you perhaps to read some works where that position in more fully dealt with, I have been—I do not wish to say it in the way of boasting—I have been a student of Political Economy from my earliest years. I spent, when I was at the University, two years specially studying it and mental science, and it has been almost my hobby all my life; but I am not pretending to say that that would make my opinion worth any more than that of any person in the audience. I may say that I have been to the trouble to read not only two but all sides of the question, I look upon free trade and

protection as entirety a side issue, or a half issue of a far larger question, and that that larger question is—What is the duty of the State? Now just only think, when you come to consider this question of free trade and protection—what is the duty of the State? Are the State's functions, as some people contend, limited to more police duties? If you once say that, then the State has no right to make a road, no right to make a railroad, no right to erect a telegraph post or telegraph wire, no right to provide telephones, no right to endow a school, no light to subsidize direct steamers, no right to have a mail service; in fact no right to deal with trade, no right to deal with settlement—that the State's functions are to be what Huxley calls "a police-ocracy"—purely police duties. If you limit the duties of the State to that, and say that so far as the State's duties are concerned it is to be a race, and "the devil take the hindmost;" and that the State has simply to stand up and see fair play that everyone is to bo allowed to race and jostle his neighbor as he likes—if you say that is the function of the State—that it is not really an association, but that it has simply to look at life from the individualist point of view—then, of course, you are Freetraders, and the State has no right to interfere with manufactures. But if you once step forward, and say that the State is a growth—that the State is an association that it has got, to use a word used by the positivists, to be alturistic and that it has to look after the wellbeing of men, not only to provide that there shall be fairness in the race, and that one shall not kill the other,—that its function is to look after even the weak ones in the community,—and hence it is that it aids hospitals, establishes lunatic asylums, and dispenses charitable aid, helps the settler in the outlying district by making roads and railways for him, and gives conveniences in the country districts to the settler that his own means cannot provide—if you say that the State is an association that should be used to raise mankind, to help forward the race—if you once fix the function of the State in that way, then you cannot draw the line fast and say—Yes, it is right that the State should look after education, and it is right that the State should provide conveniences for the merchants, in cable subsidies and direct steam, and aid commercial enterprize, that it is right for the State to aid the small farmers in various enterprizes—right that the State should carry their grain at less cost than would pay the interest on the money sunk in railways—right that the State should make roads for which it gets no return—if you once say that it is right for the State to do that, then I ask what right have you, as soon as you come manufactures, to say the State must not touch manufactures, to say you may deal with the big farmers, the small farmers, but you must not touch manufactures; the rich merchants may do this that and the other thing with impunity. If you say that you take up an illogical position. Before you can deal with this question of free trade and protection, you must answer the larger question—what is the duty of the State? It is no use simply to begin and talk to people about the glories of freetrade—what freetrade has done for England, what enormous advantages freetrade has confered upon England. Why, I do not know what cannot be attributed to freetrade in England. When I hear a mm talking about education, he will get dp and say: Come, and I will show you what education has done for England. Everything that England has got is by education. If you attend a Bible meeting, the clergyman will show you what the Bible has done for England—that everything that England has possessed during the present century is due to the Bibe If you go to a Freetrade meeting the speakers will show you what Free-trade has done for England. What does it mean? You cannot isolate one factor in England's progress, any more than you can abstract your thumb from your arm, and say the arm did this and not the thumb You must face the question—what's the duty of the State? I tell you this, that except you are prepared to limit the franchise of the State to mere policeocracy—that the State is to abandon education, abandon its common schools, allow the people to grow up uneducated if they please—except the State is prepared to abandon everything of that kind, you have no right to say the State has no right to recognise manufactures. Here is a thing that comes in to hamper this question, and it is like almost every question of social science. You are beset, so to speak, with what beset the navigator in ancient times you have Scylla on the one hand and Charybdis on the other; you have danger on both sides. If you extend the functions of the State unduly, and allow the State to interfere in every enterprise—if you allow the State to meddle in everything a private individual can do, you will destroy the individuality of the race, and the State instead of procuring the independence of the community does a great deal of mischief. Hence it is that a man who is a wise politician will have to take up a large question when it comes before him and discuss it on its merits, and he will not attempt to go by any drawn line without reference to his surroundings. Now when we come to deal with manufactures the freetrader and the protectionist are agreed on this point: that no country obtains any position in civilization unless the arts arise, and the arts only arise after you have the primary products of the country such as your wheat, your wool and your gold, and that you have also your secondary products, namely, manufactured articles. How are they to arise? I do not invite the State to begin and provide for industries, but what I say is this: that if the State is to have indirect taxation—and that you must all acknowledge, because the people are not sufficiently politically educated to deal with direct taxation, nor do I think it would he possible to so frame a scheme of direct taxation that it would fall with proper equality upon all—if the State is not able to do that, it must deal with indirect taxation, I claim to belong to what President Adams calls "the historical school" of economists. When you come to deal with customs revenue,—when you come to see what has happened in New Zealand, namely, that

the Customs tariff has fallen mainly because the goods are a great deal cheaper; the total bulk of goods has been as great as it was in years past, but the total value of the goods, through their cheapness, has been a great deal less, and hence the duties have been less, and there must be a greater increase of taxation in some way, and it may have to arise from Customs sources—I say when you come to deal with the question as practical men you recognise, as the most ardent freetrader will recognise, that you must have industries in the country—that even the small farmers will be injured if you have not industries in the towns. If you have no home market, you will also be injured, If you recognise that, you must take up each individual item of the tariff, and consider it carefully, and see how an increased duty will bear on manufactures in this colony—see what manufactures are suitable in this colony, and how far indirect taxation can assist them. That is how I believe this question can be dealt with; and if not dealt with in that way, I believe an injury will be in flicted upon the industries of this colony which may take years to redeem. (Cheers)

Political Reform.

I have now dealt with the question of taxation. Let me now deal with the third question I mentioned—political reform. We live in a progressive age, and questions of the past are not to be binding upon us. But we have to take care that in the reforms we may make we shall not unduly strain the past; we must allow for what is termed evolution. Now there are a great many political reforms I would like to speak to you about. It has been said : you promised that we should have the Legislative Council reformed and you have never done it. Well, it comes with rather peculiar grace from those people who know that we tried, but failed. But let me say this: we failed because the Council would not pass our bill. In dealing with the Legislative Council I at once assert that I believe the time will come when one Chamber will be sufficient for this Colony, and when that one Chamber will be able to elect perhaps a revising committee to deal with measures after they have passed through one process, so that hasty legislation shall be prevented, and that at all events the legislation that we pass will be creditable to us. Some people say, "Oh, the Acts you pass are not well drawn," and all that. I can only say this, that if you compare them with those of other colonies, we do not take a secondary position. Now, how should the Council be altered? I say that I think it would be fatal to make the Council have constituencies the same as the House. What would be the result of that? You at once have the Council created an elective body with constituencies, and wherever you have had that in the past you have had continual quarrels between the two as to who is to rule. So long as you keep the Council a nominated body you have control over it, the Ministry have control over it, and that means the House of Representatives have control over it, and it is more amenable to what has been termed the Democratic sentiment of the country. It seems to me, as I thought before and still think, that it requires amendment in this direction, that the offices should not be for life, but that the tenure of the offices should be limited. If the only way of getting that carried out is, as some have suggested, that the Parliament, I mean the House of Representatives, instead of the Government, should nominate them, I would not so much quarrel with that if I got the other concession, namely, that life appointment should cease and that the term should be, I think, seven years. That is one political reform I should like to see carried out.

Representation Bill.

I now come to a question about which there has been a great deal of talk on the part of the Opposition. Of course one does not find fault with the Opposition criticising the Government. It has been properly pointed out that the function of the Opposition is to criticise, and not propose a policy. Of course some people will say, you must not mention it, but the reason why the Opposition do not propose any policy is they have none to propose. We will not say anything about that now. But then say the function of the Opposition is criticism. I quite admit that is a function of the Opposition. Nov, let us see what their criticism has been on the Representation Bil. Why, it has been said the Govenment was not sincere in regard to the Representation Bill. It has been further said the Government should have passed the Representation Bil last year. It has been further said: Why, the Opposition were all in favor of the Representation Bil, and with their assistance the Representation Bill could have become law. That seems to me very peculiar. What were the two principles underlying the Rep resentation Bill? The two principles in the Representation Bill were—first that we were not to have constituencies mapped out to please either political parties or political men, but that we were to have a Board independent of political influence that would consider the extent of the population and the surroundings of the districts,—that this Board should fix the" constituencies throughout the Colony. That was one principle in the bill. The second principle in the bill was that the whole population was to be the basis of representation. Now what would you think of this: what would you think of the people denouncing the Government for not passing this Repreaentation Bill and in the next breath saying—Oh but we don't believe in population being the basis—you must not fix only 5000 for

a country constituency, and 7000 for a town constituency. I do not care to use a harsh phrase, but was anything more absurd ever heard in the history of politics in this world? Here are men standing up before their constituents—not one, not two, but more,—and denouncing the Government for not passing a Bill on which they said they disagreed. I cannot understand such a position as that, I can understand a man standing up and saying: "Here is the Representation Bill which the Government brought in. I cordially supported it, but they would not pass it" But I cannot understand a man saying: "Here is the Representation Bill the Government brought in, the main principle of which I entirely dissent from; and yet the Government deserve severe censure that they did not pass it." I ask you to take up the speeches of every member of the Opposition who has spoken since the session, and you will find the same thing running through them. Then they say another thing. They say we do not believe in representation based on population. What will they base it on? Will they base it on area?—will they base it on rates or on the property tax they pay? What are they to base it on if not on population? They say in the next breath—and here comes the absurd inconsistency—the South Island members would not listen to giving three additional members to the North Island. They say; why should the North Island get three additional members? They say, "Oh, the population has increased, but we do not believe in representation being based on population; we do not say anything about that just now." I will undertake to say this : that if I had time to prepare a political cathecism, putting the questions and taking the answers from their speeches, and sent it to London *Punch* he would put it in as the biggest joke of the day, (Laughter) Well I ask the Opposition to say, is it honest of them to go about the country saying the Government is to blame for not passing the Representation Bill, and in the next breath saying—" Oh, it is all wrong; they based representation on population and that is all wrong; we will never assent to that." I charged them in the House and I charge them now with having voted for that bill when they were not prepared to, adopt its principles, I tell them, more. That if they do not base representation on population, and if they wish to give constituencies of 7000 to towns and constituencies of 5000 to country, what is desired by some will not be attained, They talk of country districts. What is a country district? Is Marton a country district? I should think not with the Mayor in the chair. (Laughter) Why, it is an insult to your Borough. (Renewed laughter.) What then is a country district? I say if they are going to have the matter settled in this way that you are to have 7000 for a town constituency—and I understand that Marton has only 700—and that you would have a 5000 constituency in the country districts, the reeult will be that the North Island will not get three additional members. We are not going to have the islands divided and treated differently; we must have the whole colony dealt with as one country. People clamour and say the North is entitled to three additional members. So it is; I am in favor of that. When they come to make the calculations—I have made them—they will find that the North Island won't get three additional. members if they say representation is not to be based on population. Since the last census there has been an increase of 18 per cent. in the population of the North Island. There has been an increase in the city and suburbs of Auckland of 53 per cent. And that increased population is not to have a fair share of representation because the re-presention in the country districts is to be different from that in the towns. And though the population in the city and suburbs of wellington has increased 30 per cent, it is not to have a fair increase of representation, what will be the result? The South Island will not lose a single member. I ask the North Island members to see what they are about. Now as to what I stated in Dunedin it has been said by Mr Bryce—I refer to him as he is present and I hope he will pardon me for doing so—I find Mr Bryce saying this—I know he would not say anything that he did not think was correct—he said "Sir Robert Stout, he noticed, had stated thus some advantage should be given to country districts, but this appeared to have been an afterthought; it was not alluded to in the Debates as far as he knew." I believe the last volume of *Hansard* had not been circulated when Mr Bryee made the statement. If he will refer to volume 56, p. 569, he will see what I said about the country districts, and what I said about the country districts in Dunedin was similar to what I said in the House. I said this :—" Taking six thousand as a quota, a country constituency could have five thousand five hundred, and a town district might have seven thousand. I think the provision in this respect is fair. As to this quota it has been suggested to me that it ought to vary as the population of the colony varies Possibly that is a matter which might be so varied," I recognised this question, so far as area and surroundings are concerned, in the Bill and in the House. I said in the House what I say now, that you may have to consider the question of scattered population, You must consider this question—That the principle of the Bill is that population is to be the basis of representation. And why not? How are you to define a country district? Do you mean to say that because a man lives on a farm he has got more intelligence than the man engaged in other employment? Do you mean to say that the shepherd has more intelligence than the bootmaker? This question has to be considered. You may have a small population over a large and scattered area, as was pointed out by Mr Pyke in the course of the debate. There should be some slight variation owing to the scattered area of the country districts. All I can say on the Representation Bill is this, that I shall do my best in the coming session of Parliament, if I am spared to be there, to get this Bill passed. I believe it is a fair Bill. I look on this colony not merely with a Cook Strait division. I look on this Cobny as a new nation, and I think we should lay down some principles to guide us in

dealing with our laws that will be fair to all parts of the community. I do not know in dialing with political representation any fairer basis than this: that you recognise one man as one, and one man as good as every other man That is the basis of our Representation Bill. But if you choose to say the country settler is equal to a town settler, and a half more, then I am afraid you will be laying down a principle that you will find it very difficult to work out in practice and it certainly if worked out in detail, will not give the North Island the three members it expects. (Cheers.)

Administration.

Now, I must deal with the question of administration—a subject that would in fact almost need a speech to itself. It has been said that since we took office we have been spending more borrowed money than ever, Well, that can only have been said by people who had not the figures before them. In 1883-84, before we toot office, the expenditure out of loan monies was £1,409,588 18s 1d. When we took office in August 1884, we found that the expenditure for April and May had been at the rate of about, I think, £1,700,000 a year. And when we took office, instead of letting new contracts we tried so far as we could to reduce the expenditure, so that at the end of twelve months—at the end of March 1885—the total expenditure had only been £1,336,727 4s 11d, or about £70,000 lees than the preceding year. In the next year, 1885-86, there was an expenditure on district railways of £188,300 in their purchase, and if you add that to the loan monies expended under public works, the expenditure only came up to £1,475,386 6s, For this present year the expenditure for eleven months has only been £999,580, and the expenditure for the remaining month, that is the present month, will not bring up the expenditure to £1,100,000; it will be less than that. So that you will see if we had left out, as we had a right to leave out, the normal expenditure on public works, we would have reduced the expenditure to £1,287,086 6s, You will see that actually since we took office we have decreased the normal public works expenditure at the rate of £100,000 a-year. Why then talk about our expending: more money than previous Governments. There are the figures; I have given them to you, and they may be examined at your leassure. I say this, that looking at the attitude England has taken—that the English money lender has taken, of this colony, and of Queensland and other colonies in reference to their loans—looking also at the heavy taxation we have to bear, it is the duty of the Government—I have said this in Invercargill, I have said it in the Dunedin Drill Shed, and I say it here—it is our duty to do what we can to stop borrowing. And I believe that we ought to do that as speedily as possible. I do not say that we have not our engagements to meet. I never said that there are to be no more loans, but what I said was, that so far as we can, honestly carrying out our engagements, we ought to have no new works; we ought also to bring the works now going on, I do not say to the paying point of completion, but what I may term to the working point of completion. Of course, we have yet to expend the loan which has been already pledged to the North Island Railway, beginning at Morton and going to Te Awamutu. "We must carry that out, but we must not enter upon new works upon other new lines. I hear it said by some people that all this land up the Waimarino is no good—nothing but pumice and bush, and that the Government have been buying useless land. Well, if this costly railway is to go through land that is not fit for settlement, we must stop the railway at Hunterville. I have heard, on the contrary, from gentlemen who have been over it recently, that the Waimarino land is most excellent land; that the Government has obtained it at a cheap rate, and that it will be most suitable for settlement. If that be so, it will be the duty of the Government to press on the railway, and carry out the instructions given by Parliament before we took office. Now, what I think I have to find fault with is what Mr Bryce said in his speech at Waverley. He spoke to this effect; Why, he speaks against borrowing for public buildings, and yet is laying the foundation stone of a new block of buildings for the Lunatic Asylum at Christchurch, and he is going to put up the library at Wellington. I was speaking of the future policy in dealing with buildings, and not of buildings already authorised by Parliament. The Lunatic Asylum in Christchurch has been a disgrace to the colony. The Government had put up two wings, and they left the central administrative building incomplete. There was no kitchen in which to cook the pa-patients' food except a wooden building at a distance which was a disgrace and should have been burned down long ago. The meals had to be carried across a court yard in summer and winter, exposed to all weathers. On wet and cold days the patients could not get their meals in a warm and comfortable state. I recognise it to be the duty of the State to those in affliction, such as poor people suffering from mental affliction, to treat them with the utmost kindness and the utmost consideration. As to the library in Wellington that had been already authorised. It was a disgrace to the Colony that such a valuable treasure as we possess in Looks at Wellington had not been put in a fire-proof building long ago. When I was speaking of buildings I was especially referring to wooden buildings. I said I did not think it fair that we should go on borrowing money and putting up wooden buildings which will only last 25 or 30 years, and leaving the loan we put them up with to be paid by the people coming after us. I suggested that there should be a terminable annuity that would wipe out the debt on wooden buildings and that stone buildings should if possible be erected, so that people coming after us would have a chance of having the buildings paid

for. I believe that is a mode of getting rid of depending upon borrowed money—that will have to be adopted by the Assembly.

Loans.

Now some people say—in fact, I think it has been said by Mr Bryce—that the reason why our loans were depreciated was that we took and seized the sinking fund—a most unfortunate expression. First, there was no seizure of the sinkingfund, and second, so far as our loans were concerned, the loan that was floated after the passing of the amended Consolidated Stock Act, which dealt with this question of the sinking fund, which I shall explain in a few minutes—Sir Dillon Bell explained it in London by publishing letters and by circulars; he explained it to the Bank of England Directors, he explained it to the Stock Exchange, and after his explanation,—after this act called "the seizure of the sinking fund" took place, our loan in 1885 fetched a higher price than the loans of Victoria, Queensland, and South Australia. You will find it detailed in the Financial Statement of 1885, so that I give you book for everything. The loans fetched—Victoria, £99 4s 3d; Queenslond, £97 3s 10d; South Australia, £99 5s 6d; so you will see that this question of the sinking fund and Consolidated Stock Act had nothing to do with the price of our loans. The sinking fund was paid to the present time. The sinking fund is an absurdity so long as the colony is borrowing. All sides of the House recognised that—all sides of the House said so; there was hardly a member in the House but said so. Therefore, so far as the sinking fund is concerned they said you do not need a sinking fund if we are continually borrowing money. What then did the Colonial Treasurer? The Colonial Treasurer, with great ability, made this provision : He kept on paying the sinking fund as before. He never touched a penny of the sinking fund, but he created bonds equal to the amount he paid into the sinking fund. When the bonds became due they were paid, and the drawn bonds were converted into permanent stock. Mr Bryce said that what we did in reference to the sinking fund was an immoral act. Let me read you the figures. The total amount of the New Zealand 4 per cent, inscribed stock is £22,493,255. That is the amount of our debt that has no sinking fund. Now how much of that is the late Atkinson Government accountable for? They are accountable for a little over the half of it. Because in 1879 they raised a loan of £5,371,200 for which stock at 120 was issued. And that had no sinking fund. Then there were £1,832,000 of Treasury bills inscribed without a sinking fund, and the following loans were also inscribed, viz.:

And £3,053,900, four and a half per cents in February, 1884. I have given the amount of the loan, but the stock issued exceeded that amount somewhat. And then they had to pay considerably for the inscription; the total amount was something like £40,000 or £50,000. We may say that practically if you add up the figures you will find that the Atkinson Government are accountable for more than one-half the inscribed stock. If therefore the having to lose that sinking fund is an immoral transaction they seem to have have thrived very well in immorality. I do not think it is immoral, and I am glad that in this respect Mr Bryce thoroughly agrees with me. We are at one on this question, because Mr Bryce very ably and very properly pointed out when this Consolidated Stock Act was before Parliament in 1884, that it was an absurdity for us to talk about a sinking fund when we were going on borrowing money—that if we wished to pay off our debts we ought to pay them—that it was absurd to be paying off with the one hand and borrowing with the other. I cordially agree with him; on this question we are at one. This question of sinking fund could have nothing to do with our bonds. There was no such thing as a seizure of the sinking fund. But I will tell you what did affect our bonds. Unfortunately for New Zealand there is a habit of absentees when they get out of the Colony to look very blue on the place they left. Perhaps some of them have been unfortunate, or perhaps some of them have political animosities. It is extraordinary when Colonists return to England that many of them—three-fourths of them, beoome conservatives as soon as they land in England. I do not know how that is, whether it is because it gives them the entree into aristocratic circles which they could not get otherwise, or whether the climate or soil of England has such an effect upon them that they become Conservatives immediately. I do not mean the colonists of New Zealand alone. Mr Heaton has stated that the colonists from Victoria, although Liberals and Radicals in the colony, as soon as they reach England suddenly become Conservatives. Well, these Conservative colonists at Home apparently pass their time in abusing the colony that has helped them and done them some service. There is also a class of people who have political animosities when they get Home. They avenge themselves of political wrongs by denouncing the colony. There there are some writers like Froude, who have visited Auckland have seen some sweetbriar growing, and declare that the colony is going to be ruined by sweet briar. We have also again the London *Standard*, a powerful paper continually denouncing New-Zealand. They have been denouncing Queensland, which has a most able politician at the head of affairs. Had not New Zealand come to the rescue the last loan to that colony would not have been floated at all. It is not a question of the soundness of the security that affects the floating of loans in the English money market, but the English money lender has got afraid to lend to the colonies further loans. I only hope the mining companies that seem to be in

favor just now will be as safe an investment as the English bonds. If we are wise we should try and do without borrowed money so that the English money lender may see that as a colony we were not depending upon him either for our national existence or our continued progress. Now, I am afraid I will be unable to deal with all the subjects I intended to bring before you. Let me, however, say one word; it is that out Government is to be conducted economically. Now, I believe that the Government can be conducted economically only by care being exercised, and by proceeding on some well defined lines.

Civil Service Reform.

We did not overlook this question. The Civil Service Reform Bill which I introduced was to be the first step towards a true and permanent reform of the Civil Service, Now, I will undertake to say that there is hardly any person in this hall who has taken any interest in politics who has not continually heard of Civil Service reform for the last ten years in New Zealand, and yet nothing was done. Our Bill has been the first attempt to put it on a permanent footing. Let me tell you what the Bill proposes to do. The Bill proposes to do this : It provides that the only avenue to the civil service shall be by cadetships; that is, we were to take in young people—and we were not to exclude girls, even if they were suitable—we were to take young people into the Civil Service, and we were also, as the new regulations will show, so to frame the entrance examination as to make it competitive. I think that wag a mistake. I wish to see the principle applied to the Civil Service in New Zealand that has been applied, for example, to the Civil Service in the United States : That each representative of a district should have one nomination, and as soon as every other member had a nomination his turn would come round again. This would have ensured that you would have got a Civil Service from all over the colony. But by leaving it to competition this may happen : that those districts that have had the best schools and the best educational advantages in the past may be able to send np and get all the prizes. That I thought was unfair, and I, therefore, wanted the examination not to be too stiff and at the same time give the members the nomination. However I was defeated, and it is put now on a competitive basis, and being put on a competitive basis we have only to hold examinations once a year, because the openings to the Civil Service are few. We have also to provide for this: There are some experts required in the Service and you cannot get them from the ranks. For instance we may require a navigator, a doctor, a lawyer or accountant-men with special knowledge and you must go out side of the Service to get them. But as I said, in establishing a Civil Service you must begin with cadets. It will tend to make your service cheaper, and it will tend to destroy Ministerial patrenage. For what has happened in that respect? I do not say that one Government is to be blamed more than another. Political pressure may have influenced all Governments. I am not stating that one Government is immaculate more than another; I am not [*unclear:* calling] any slur on any Government. This is what has happened to all Governments. They have often had to put in the service, perhaps over the heads of others, men of no particular occupation, and who perhaps had not much [*unclear:* clam upto] the colony at all. All that will be put an end to, and you will possibly have a cheaper service. Well, we have tried to do what we can to amalgamate offices, and we are now trying to [*unclear:* continue] together departments, so that an officer in one department, say in the Post-office or Customs, and so on, may in small districts be able to do the work for three or four departments without getting extra pay for it. In that way we hope to cheapen the service. We hope to be able to show a large saving in the expense of the service. You can expect no large saving in the service if each outlying district demands. every convenience that is needed in populous districts. The root of economy lies here. If the people wish cheap government they must get the Government to do less for them than it is doing now. It is all nonsense fot the people to say—"We want economy in government, and at the same time we insist on the Government doing as much for us in the future as in the past." (A voice : Let the Government tender for it.) I am afraid you would have very little chance. (Laughter.) You cannot expect cheap government if you wish all the conveniences of what may be termed the most civilised community, and I quite agree with what has been said by more than one speaker in other places; that the fact is the Government of New Zealand has done and does really more for the people, especially within outlying districts, than the Government of other colonies, the Government of England, or the Government of the United States; and so long as the people, having been accustomed to thes requirements demand them, you cannot expect the expense of your Government to be much reduced. However, I give this pledge : that we have reduced expenditure; we have amalgamated many offices, and we will have perhaps still to consider how further amalgamations and retrenchment must take place, because we do not wish to see, more than we can help, any additional taxation put upon the people at the present time. Because we recognise that with the price of produce and the difficulties the small settlers and manufacturers have to contend with, that they are not in a position in which we can call upon them for further taxation—for more taxation than is absolutely necessary for the wants of the community. And I feel sure that in this colony, as in other colonies, when the people of the colony see that further taxation is required to fulfil the obligations of the Government, they will do as their fathers have done, and as they have done in the past—they

will be only too ready to give all assistance in that direction to any Government that may be in office—(Loud Cheers.)

Conclusion.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I find I have spoken beyond the time I intended to speak, and I am afraid I have wearied you. ("No") Let me only say one or two words. I have sketched for you not so much a grand policy for the future, but I have sketched for you what we have done in the past, what we are purporting to do in the same direction in the future, and how we have dealt with the Government of this Colony. I do not ask you to say you agree with everything I have said; it would be a strange meeting if you did. But what I ask you to say is this: whether you do not think—and if I have succeeded in doing it that is all I wish—whether,—when you hear Opposition speakers making out that they are the only people apparently who have any care for the interests of this Colony—I am not entitled to say that I have proved to you that we are just as national in our sentiment, and as anxious for the well-being of the colonists as they are. And if we have done that as a Government, and if our sole aim has been to help forward this colony, to look after its industries, to look after its settlement, then when we retire from office we will be entitled to this credit—not that we were immaculate, not that we did not commit some blunders,—that at all events we have done what we could to help forward this colony. (Cheers). And I will tell you how you can help it forward. By your taking an interest in politics, by your discussing every political question in this colony as if it was a life question and affecting you. By your showing, as you have done in asking me to address you, that you take an interest in political questions, you help forward the politician far more than you can imagine. There is nothing more disheartening to any man than to be engaged in any struggle or in any contest when those who are outside the arena do not care how the struggle goes on; but if he thinks that there are warm hearts, that there are generous people, looking on, and that they will hereafter, if not at the present time, at all events give him credit for this : that he did what he could in the position he was called upon to fulfil, then I say he is cheered on to still further exertions on behalf of our common weal, of our common state. And I would only like to see this political education so intelligent, so sought after in this colony, that every political question was discussed down to the root—not afraid to discuss because it may offend this person or that person, but that every elector, that every colonist, would imagine when he goes to the ballot-box that he is going in the performance of a sacred duty, not thinking simply how this will affect him, or how this bit of railway or that bit of road will affect him, or how it may affect his personal feelings, but that he is casting his ballot so that we may have in this colony in the future such legislation as will make this colony a great nation, and that the people who come after us will live to bless us because we have laid down such lines for the administration and and the good government of this colony—that we will make this colony a greater and better country than we found it, and that we will give some lasting and enduring possession to our children, namely, the possession of such wise and beneficent laws that they will be able to live under them—that they will be able to get rid of the evils that oppress us, and that they will be able to say when we are dead and gone : Truly our early settlers were wise in their day and generation—that they did their duty to themselves and they did their duty to us, And if each me of us can get that said of him, I do not know any higher honor and glory that can be bestowed upon any human man. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

vignette

Printed at the EVENING NEWS OFFICE, Emerson Street, Napier.

Annexation and Federation.

Speech delivered by the Hon. the Premier in the House of Representatives, November 8, 1884.

Mr. Stout.—In moving these resolutions in regard to federation with the Australasian Colonies, I regret very much that I have to bring them forward at this time of the session; but, as honourable members are aware, the session has been of such a nature that it was almost impossible, if we were to get our Bills passed, that this discussion should have been begun sooner. Seeing, also, that we have not, perhaps, a long time to consider these resolutions, I shall have to make my remarks as brief as possible. The resolutions may be divided into two

heads. There are, first, the resolutions which deal generally with what was done at the Convention; and, secondly, the resolutions dealing with the establishment of a Federal Council. As far as I am able to learn, and judging by the amendments of which notice has been given, there does not seem to be objection to any of the resolutions that deal generally with the duty of the Australasian Colonies towards the Pacific Islands and towards the Mother-country. The only difference of opinion is in regard to the Federal Council. I have, however, one or two words to say about these general resolutions. They deal, first, with the question of foreign Powers acquiring dominion in the Pacific, and I apprehend that the House will at once agree with the first resolution; the second follows, necessarily, from the first; and the third deals with the question of New Guinea. It will be noticed, that the second resolution, which I ask the House to agree to, as carrying out the general resolutions, commits us to pay a share, according to our population, of the sum of £15,000 asked for by the Imperial Government. Honourable gentlemen who have followed the correspondence which has been laid upon the table are already aware that Lord Derby said to the colonies that, if they desired a protectorate over New Guinea, they must be prepared to pay the expense of a High Commissioner, and also to aid in providing him with a steamer, or some other accommodation, for getting about the islands. He proposed that they should contribute £15,000; and I think all the colonies have consented to pay their share of the £15,000—I mean all the colonies to whom the question has been put—Tasmaniat South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, Fiji, and Queensland, In fact, most of the colonies have passed special Acts providing for the payment of their proportion of the amount. Since the question came up at the Convention, as honourable members are aware, the Home Government have proclaimed a protectorate, not over New Guinea, but over a part of it—the southern portion, of it; and, after that was done, a telegram was sent to the colonies by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, stating that General Scratchley had been appointed Special Commissioner to control the British Protectorate in New Guinea, and that he would sail about the 20th November, He goes on to say,—

"Please inquire, and state by telegraph, whether your Government, and other contributing Governments, agree to be represented in the Council. It is intended that Special Commissioner, who will be independent of High Commissioner, shall have jurisdiction over all, persons within British Protectorate; and that no land shall be acquired there, except through him. He also will be Deputy-Commissioner for portions of New Guinea outside British Protectorate, Admiralty recommend purchase in England, steamer for Special Commissioner; estimated cost, arrive in Sydney, £16,000 or £18,000. To make him efficient, £15,000 guaranteed must be considerably increased."

It will also be noticed that several of the colonies which agreed to pay their proportion of £15,000 have refused to give the second contribution asked; and, so far as the Government of New Zealand is concerned, we do not see our way to advise this Parliament to give any further aid than the proportion of £15,000 according to population, because wo feel that, so far as New Guinea is concerned, New Zealand has practically little interest in its Protectorate. We hope, however, that if a Protectorate is established for New Guinea that will only be the beginning of a further Protectorate that will include many Pacific Islands not now under any settled Government; and our object in asking tho House to agree to this resolution to pay a proportion of £15,000 is to see, if a proper Protectorate is created for New Guinea, whether the English Government will not extend the Protectorate over other islands. This question touches on the relationship in which we should stand to the Pacific Islands, and how the Pacific should in future be governed. That may be termed the first question which arises before I come to deal with the question of the Federal Council; and I apprehend that to New Zealand, more than to the Continent of Australia, the future government of the Pacific Islands is of immense importance. It was pointed out long ago, by a celebrated geographer—Guyot—that New Zealand was, strange to say, the centre of what he termed "the Water Hemisphere;" and it was pointed out by him that, if New Zealand made the most of her opportunities, she would come to be looked upon as the centre of the Pacific Islands, giving to them her manufactured goods and receiving from them their raw products, being looked upon as their commercial depot. And I may point out that, in the older days, this was seen by many in New Zealand. The honourable member for Auckland East, in the grants of land which he made to various Churches for the purpose of education, put a provision in his grants that the endowment was to be held for the purpose of educating, not only the people of New Zealand, but children from the Pacific Islands; and I believe it was his intention that the sons of chiefs from many of the Pacific Islands should receive education in New Zealand, and, after they left New Zealand, carry with them the culture obtained here, and thus help to civilize the Pacific Islands. I may go further and say that this colony has enormous interest in the question how the Pacific Islands are to be governed in the future. There are three points of view from which this question of the future of the Pacific Islands may be looted at. There is, first, the danger of a foreign Power having control in the Pacific Islands, in the—I hope far remote—contingency of any troubles or war arising in which we may become implicated, There is, then, the question of danger to us through any of the Pacific Islands being made depots for European crirninals. Then, there is the third point of view, to which I have slightly referred—namely, the need of closer trade relationship. As to the first danger, of foreign dominion in the Pacific, I apprehend that we, who are laying the foundations

of a new nation, must look far ahead into the future and remember this: that even a slight thing may alter what is termed the tide of history. And if we so provide that the whole of the Pacific Islands shall be united together in some bond of friendship, and that, whether they are peopled by one nationality or another of Europe, the whole of the islands shall be bound together by some tie, so that, whatever European troubles might arise, we might see no war in the Pacific—if we could lay down the lines of such an agreement, we should be doing a great deal for our future, and for the future of the race. Then, as to the further question Of criminal depots, we are met with this question now. We see what has passed lately—even since the Convention met in Sydney—in the Senate in France, where a very able report has been presented—a *precis* of which has been sent out by the Agent-General—pointing out that the French must make New Caledonia, at all events, a depot for her worst—her relapsed—criminals. Of course these relapsed criminals are to be sent a thousand now and a thousand again, and they may not harm us in one sense. That is, few of them may come to New Zealand, and the few who do come may have very little influence on our population. But we must look at it from this point of view : If you have one of the Pacific Islands set apart as a depot for the relapsed criminals Of Europe, what does that mean? You have, so to speak, a centre of infection. No one, I am sure; would object to France, Germany, or any of the great European Powers having an outlet for their surplus population as well as England has. It would be a very selfish policy if we tried to prevent any European Power having colonies in the Pacific Islands. But if we have New Caledonia and perhaps other parts set aside as depots for criminals, we cannot overlook the effect of such a policy. We are to have the worst kind of criminals—not merely political criminals; they are *rÉcidivistes* or relapsed criminals; and all history shows that there is a great deal of truth in the doctrine of heredity, We have not merely a savage race, but the worst kind of race—the criminal one—placed in the Pacific Islands to be a centre of infection for the whole of the Pacific; and, if this is allowed to go on without protest, we may have Germany and other European nations looking upon the Pacific Islands as a proper place to get rid of their criminals. Some may say that there has been too much made of this question; but I do not think so, and I think the Convention in Sydney, and the Hon. Mr. Service, of Victoria, deserve great credit for the stand they have taken in protesting against the French possessions being turned into more criminal dÉpots. I only regret that perhaps it was not pointed out to the French people that the making of their colonies mere depots for criminals injures their colonies, and injures the French possessions. I do not know if enough was made of that in the discussion that has taken place in regard to the *rÉcidiviste* question. The other question is that of trade relationship, I shall not take up time by dwelling upon that. We have had some slight discussion on that already this session in reference to the South Sea Trading Bill, and the providing for a subsidized mail service for Samoa, Tonga, and other islands. I do not think I need refer to the New Hebrides question, because honourable members will remember that in 1878 that question was taken up by the then Government; a memorandum was written by Sir George Grey, and a short note by myself, which were sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, pointing out that the New Hebrides ought to bo a British possession; in fact, it once was included in the boundaries of New Zealand. I now come to the question of the Federal Council, because, as I under stand, it is on that question there is most difference of opinion. I wish to point out that this question of a Federal Council for Australasia is not new. In 1856 the question was agitated in New South. Wales, Victoria, South Australia, and amongst colonists temporarily residing in London, It is useful to refer to what took place twenty-seven or twenty-eight years ago for this purpose : to show how our ideas on federation have grown during past years along with the growth of the colonies. In those days the question of federation was considered a small matter compared with what it is now. Take, for example, one of the speeches made by Mr. Deas Thomson, of Sydney, who pointed out what was meant by a Federal Council. To him a Federal Council meant a Council dealing with seven subjects: tariff, postal communication, intercolonial railways, electric telegraphs, lands, gold fields, and lighthouses. I find that the newspapers of that day—the Melbourne Argus, for example—thought that the other questions that would be involved in the question of a Federal Council would be the formation of Courts of Appeal, and the question of defence for the colonies. A memorial was prepared by Mr. Wentworth, of Sydney, then in London, setting forth the need of a Federal Council. I cannot do more than refer honourable members who desire to get up the history of this subject to the report dealing with the question, prepared by some of the ablest men in Victoria in September, 1857. I may simply point out that they raised the question whether there should not be a Federal Council or a Consultative Councilt or something between the two. I refer to this simply to show the changes that have arisen in our circumstances, and the changes that have arisen in the ideas of the people on this subject of federation. Twenty-seven or twenty-eight years ago New Zealand was not deemed a colony interested in the question, and there was no idea of bringing New Zealand into the proposed federal bond : in fact, Federation was looked upon more in the nature of what may be termed a continental union. What I ask this House to-night to consider is this question of union: I earnestly ask the House not to do anything that will put a stop to the idea of union. It may be that we are not ripe for federation. I do not think we are. But, whether we are ripe for it or not, we should take up this attitude: that every step we take should be taken with care, and should be taken, I believe, in a direction towards unity

and towards greater amity existing between the colonies. I am forcibly reminded of this : that even we in New Zealand have no idea of what the Continent of Australia is. I do not think we have even an idea of the vast resources of one colony, looked at merely from a national point of view. I do not think we have realised what the future of Australasia must be, and I think that a few words of Tennyson are applicable to us in our position. We do not sufficiently realize—

The vast republics that may grow,
The Federations and the powers
Titanic forces taking birth In divers seasons, divers climes;
For we are ancients of the earth
And In the morning of the times.

I wish to-night to give a few statistics just to bring before honourable members what the Continent of Australia is. As honourable gentlemen probably know, I have never lived in Australia; but even passing through it as a traveller, and seeing the vast extent of its resources, makes me think that we in New Zealand do not recognize the extent of that continent. Let me give a few statistics—and I shall only give a few—showing what Australia is. Take even the Colony of New South Wales. Would any one believe that New South Wales, in extent, is as large as the whole of Germany and half of France combined? Would any one believe, again, that the Colony of Queensland is more than three times the size of the German Empire? And then, if we take South Australia, with its vast extension north wards to the Gulf of Carpentaria, it amountst in fact, to about four and a half times the extent of the whole of Germany. If you take, now, the whole of the area of Australia, including Tasmania, you will find that it means, the enormous territory of 3,053,156 square miles. The area of France, in round numbers, is about 204,000 square miles, and of Germany 208,000 square miles; while even the United States, with Alaska and all those territories added, has only an area of 3,501,404 square miles. Bearing these facts in mind, we can appreciate how enormous the territory of Australia is. And, then, one must also remember how small the United States were when they became the United States. They were not as large even as Queensland when they became States, on the Declaration of Independence day. If in addition we consider the enormous mineral resources of New South Wales and Queensland, their agricultural products, and the vast future that must lie before them, with the vast population they will sustain—if, I say, we remember these things, we should weigh carefully how we, as a colony, declare to stand aloof from the Continent of Australia. Keeping that in mind, I shall now briefly point out what this Federal Council means; because it seems to me that there has been some misapprehension as to the proposals of the Convention. I may say at once that it will be seen from our resolutions that we propose something intermediate between Federal Councils and Conventions of Delegates consulting, because we recognize that no Parliament should pass any law which goes too far in advance of public opinion, and, if it be that public opinion in this colony is not ripe for federation, it would be unwise for this Parliament to pass any law which did not carry with it the sympathies of the people. Now, what is this Federal Council Bill? Let me, in as few words as possible, bring before the House what may be termed a bird's eye view of the Bill. The Bill provides that a Federal Council shall be constituted, and that the sessions shall be held once in every two years in some colony; but the Governor may call a special session, and the representatives of the different colonies are to be chosen as each colonial Parliament may decide. Then, there is to be an elected President, and only one Chamber; and there must be a majority of the whole number of the members of the Council for the time being, representing a majority of the colonies present, before there is a quorum. This is a very important provision. As to its legislative authority, it is to deal with the following matters:—

- The relations of Australasia with the islands of the Pacific;
- Prevention of the influx of criminals;
- Fisheries in Australasian waters beyond territorial limits;
- The service of civil process of the Courts of any colony within Her Majesty's possessions in Australasia out of the jurisdiction of the colony in which it is issued;
- The enforcement of judgments of Courts of law of any colony beyond the limits of the colony;
- The enforcement of criminal process beyond the limits of the colony in which it is issued, and the extradition of offenders (including deserters of wives and children, and deserters from the Imperial or colonial naval or military forces);
- The custody of offenders on board of ships belonging to Her Majesty's colonial Governments beyond territorial limits."

It will be observed that these are all matters over which this Legislature has practically no control, because we cannot deal with them without the consent of the Home Government granting us authority to do so by

special Imperial Act. With regard to our relations to the Pacific Islands, we have no jurisdiction beyond three miles outside our waters, without special delegation from the Home Government. Therefore this Bill confers a power on New Zealand, for it gives it a share in legislating on matters with which at present it cannot deal. Then, as to the prevention of an influx of criminals, we have power to pass laws on the subject, but there could be no general law, and therefore this gives us greater power. In the same way, additional power is given with regard to dealing with fisheries in waters beyond territorial limits; and so it is with the subjects treated of in the remaining subsections. All these provisions confer on the Federal Council a legislative authority which we do not possess, and therefore it does not take anything away from this Parliament, It really gives to New Zealand a greater legislative power than she has at present. The only matters in which legislative power is given to the Federal Council which might be said to weaken our present legislative power are contained in subsection *(h)*; of the same clause of the Bill:—

"General defences, quarantine, patents of invention and discovery, copyright, bills of exchange and promissory notes, uniformity of weights and measures, recognition in other colonies of any marriage or divorce duly solemnized or decreed in any colony, naturalization and aliens, status of corporations and joint-stock companies."

It will bo noticed, however, that none of these things can be dealt with by the Federal Council unless remitted to it by two colonies, and the law passed by the Federal Council is only operative in the colonies which ask for the interference of the Federal Council. Now, we ask, in these resolutions, to limit the power of the Federal Council to this extent: that a law passed by the Council shall not have effect in this colony, even if remitted to it by our colony, until it is sanctioned by our own Legislature. If, therefore, the resolutions which we ask the House to pass to-night are passed, it will be seen that there can be no interference whatever with our Legislature, and it would not in any way weaken our legislative power. As I pointed out before, this is a ease in which we ask for something intermediate between a purely Federal Council and some convention of delegates consulting together for some common purpose. And, now, having stated what the object of the Federal Council Bill is, and what its provisions are, I hope I have said enough to show that it does not, as has been represented by some persons, take away any legislative powers from New Zealand. The only legislative powers that could be taken away are those contained in subsection (it), and for none of those objects can a law be passed which will have effect in this colony until the colonial Parliament has assented to it. We should not be weakened; on the contrary, we should have a voice in legislation which we do not possess now, and cannot possibly possess under our present Constitution, That being so, I now come to meet some of the objections that may be raised to this question of federation. First of all, I would impress upon the House that, if we stand aloof and pass some amendment to the effect that, because we are insular, we should have nothing to do with the Continent of Australia, we shall be taking a fatal step as regareis New Zealand. Even on the narrow ground of common defence, we cannot stand aloof from Australia; and I go further and say that, if we stand aloof from Australia and break off relations with it, as some honourable members propose, wo shall have no voice whatever in the future of the Pacific Islands, and in the various questions that must arise between England and her colonies, and between these colonies themselves and the islands of the Pacific. To stand aloof and take up an isolated position will not strengthen us, but will rather tend to weaken us; and I ask the House to look upon the question as it will affect our future. No doubt if we did anything to destroy our individuality we should be doing a wrong to the colony. I admit that, at once; but, as far as this Bill is concerned, I see no risk of merging our individuality in a large Australasian Dominion, or Losing any of our power. The only danger lies in subsection (*h)*, and that we have guarded against by the limitation we have put in requiring that any law passed on those subjects shall not have any force until sanctioned by our Legislature. That would give us immunity from any peril of losing our individuality. Now, there is another objection which has been urged to this federation, and it is this: I find on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with the wider question of Imperial federation, The honourable member for Auckland East thinks that, if we take this step in Australasian federation, that may tend to destroy any hope of what is termed Imperial federation; and the honourable member for Wairarapa asks that we should add a resolution pointing out the need of Imperial federation. Sir, I believe the closer we can make the alliance between the Mother-country and the colonies the better, I believe also, with the honourable member for Auckland East, that, if we could get a close alliance amongst all English-speaking peoples, it would be an immense advantage to the race, and would perhaps prevent future wars and troubles. But I am forcibly reminded of a passage which I have met with in one of the Epistles, which I shall paraphrase. If we cannot love our Australian neighbours, who are near to us, and with whom we are acquainted and in intimate trade relationship, how can we love those of our race that are so far distant from us? I say, if we can show that we can ally ourselves with those who are near to us,—if we can come to an amicable arrangement or agreement with them,—it will be a proof that there is some chance of this Imperial federation, and this greater English-speaking federation. But, if we show by our action that we cannot unite even on such elementary matters as these provided in the Federal Council Bill, then what is the use of talking about Imperial federation? In one sense wo

have now Imperial federation. We are part of the British Empire; and, although we have no voice in her foreign policy, yet I do not know that it would be wise for this colony to attempt to have any voice in her foreign policy, because we must take, along with that, a corresponding responsibility, and we must pay for it out of our taxes, and wo must be liable to all the incidents that bind one part of the Empire with the other. There is one passage in one of Mr. Gladstone's speeches, delivered something like seventeen or eighteen years ago, pointing out the strong position the colonies occupied—something better and stronger than Imperial federation—which I think appropriate, and will quote. Speaking on a Canadian Loan Bill in the House of Commons, he says,—

"We have for a full quarter of a' century acknowledged absolutely the right of self-government in the colonies. We do not expect the laws of Canada or o£ Australia to be modulated according to our own ideas. We grant them a greater freedom from interference than, as amongst the three kingdoms, the Legislature grants to the peculiar ideas that may happen to prevail in one of those three. We have carried it to this point: that, as far as regards the Administration, I believe it may be said that the only officer appointed by the Colonial Secretary is the Governor; and I believe there cannot be a doubt that, if it were the well-ascertained desire of the colonies to nave the appointment of their own Governor, the Imperial Parliament would at once make over to them that power,"

That shows the enormous power that the colonies have been given—a power such as no colonies of other empires ever possessed—a power, I may say, unique in history. And I say, with regard to this wider question of Imperial federation, that we are not ripe for that. If we are ripe for anything, we are only ripe for this Australasian federation, we are not even ripe for complete federation with the other colonies, because that would go further than this Federal Council Bill goes. But we are ripe for what is stated in the resolutions—namely, for bringing us into closer and mora intimate connection with the Australian Colonies, But how is this Imperial federation to bo brought about? How is it to be managed? The House of Commons will not give up its power; and I think that, if wo are not ripe for Australasian federation now, we shall not be ripe for Imperial federation perhaps a century hence. The objection that has been urged—namely, that this will, in some way or other, prevent Imperial federation—I think I have sufficiently answered. And, now, let me look at some of the dangers of federation. I admit that there are dangers in federation. There is always a danger of a strong Government overriding weak Governments. We saw that in Provincialism. We saw what may bo termed the federal States of Now Zealand being wiped out by the central Government as soon as there came a strong financial pressure; and I regret to notice that some Australian statesmen, who are advocating this federation, are continually using the word "dominion," as if this Australasian dominion, as they term it, is to be akin to Canada. I think we are not ripe for that. The question of dominion goes far beyond federation, and the proposals contained in this Federal Council Bill, That is one danger. There is always the danger of the central Government overriding the weaker Governments; but I do not see if we agree to this Federal Council Bill, that any danger can arise from that, because this Council is exceedingly limited in its jurisdiction; and I apprehend that the Imperial Government would never for one moment hesitate to give the right to any colony to leave this Federation, If there was any doubt about that, there could be a clause inserted in the Bill, so that on, the face of its charter there should be the right of secession granted to any colony in the event of its desiring to leave the Federation, As far as that question is concerned, I do not see that any danger can arise from it; but, if there be a danger from union with Australia, because of the Federal Council overriding us, how much greater would the danger be if the federation were Imperial and if we were united to England I That would be a danger tenfold greater. I think I have said enough to show that it ought not to be the policy of New Zealand to at once break on negotiations with the Australian Colonies, and to pursue a policy of isolation. Of course in this respect we aro placad under a great disadvantage in discussing this question by the New South Wales representative Chamber declining, by one vote, to even discuss this Federal Council Bill. Those who know the history of New South Wales politics can, however, tell the reason why. I believe that the feeling amongst the New South Wales people for federation, for union, is far stronger than in the Parliament of that colony. Political parties ate divided there; old feuds exist; and the feeling against Victoria, and the City of Melbourne especially, is so strong with some of the older New South Wales politicians that they will have nothing to do with anything that is pressed forward by Victoria. I believe that had a great deal to do with the non-success of the resolutions in the Sydney Parliament. I have said that in that respect we are placed at a disadvantage. The representative Chamber has not concurred in these resolutions, though in the Council they have agreed to them and passed them by a considerable majority. What, then, should we do in this matter? I again urge the House not to pursue a policy of isolation, and the resolutions are so framed as to prevent this. I do not care much about Resolution *(e)*—whether it be put or not; and, to allow the most ample opportunity to the members to record their opinions, I shall ask that the resolutions be put separately. This Resolution *(e)* may be in one respect unnecessary, for the resolutions go on to show what alterations should be made in the Federal Council Bill, and, if the alterations are to he made in the Bill, then that simply says that, before the Federal Council Bill is passed, there must be new negotiations, or, rather, negotiations must be continued, and that we cannot agree with the Bill as at present

prepared. But let me say one or two words generally about this question from a general point of view, I pointed out that, if we are to have any voice in the future of Australasia and of the Pacific Islands, New Zealand by herself can do little or nothing, I know that we have passed a Confederation Bill—I mean the Act of Sir George Greyes—which enables the Government, if it had received the Queen's assent—and we pressed the Agent-General to ask that the Queen's assent should be given to it—to deal with any island that chooses to annex itself to New Zealand. But New Zealand would require the sanction of the Imperial Government to any annexation or union of any island with us; and, if New Zealand was standing aloof from the Australian Colonies, it is not likely the Imperial Government would listen to many of our recommendations, What is to be gained by this question of federation? I ask this House to look into the future. I ask this House to remember that we have a national feeling in New Zealand weak, exceedingly weak, at present, but yearly getting stronger. There is a far stronger national feeling in Australia than in New Zealand. One cannot be in Melbourne, for instance, without realizing that there exists a feeling of Australia for the Australians such as does not exist in New Zealand, There is a far stronger national life there, no doubt caused by there being a metropolis, for wo have no centre like Melbourne. I was exceedingly struck by this in Melbourne when the Irish informers attempted to land; I was struck with the strength of feeling amongst all classes that Australia was a nation that had national life and feeling. What will the future of Australia be, if its scattered population has that feeling now? Fifty years hence how many millions of people will be there 1 And what will bo the future of New Zealand if we are to stand aloof and not live on more than terms of amity with our Australian neighbours by being allied to them, in case of war and a dozen things that may occur? At present we are on the best of terms with the Australian Colonies. For example, to show the feeling that exists between us and Victoria, there has not been a singlo casa of small-pox in Melbourne and the suburbs but the Premier of Victoria has wired across to tell us of it, so that we might take all necessary precautions. There is, from the telegrams that pass between this and the other colonies, a strong feeling of friendship existing; and I say we ought to foster it in every possible way we can. Even from a selfish point of view, we ought to encourage a friendly feeling. They have products which we have not, and we have some that they do not posseas, These we can exchange, and trade will increase. We shall not he benefited by isolation. What we require is some such alliance as is here proposed, some kind of Council, not quite federal, but yet more than consulting. And now let me say one or two words more about a general federation. It may be from my early training, but I have always had a horror of war. I look upon all war as criminal; and I have always looked with hope to the time when nations, like individuals, will be able to settle their grievances and differences without an appeal to arms. It seems to me that the very existence of war shows that our civilization is not far advanced beyond the savage state Well, how is war to be prevented in future? It is only by extending federation. Instead of war conferences we should have peace conferences; and we ought to be careful, in founding our new nation, to lay down some broad lines for our future guidance. How can we lay those better down than by having some such arrangement as is sketched forth in these resolutions? I quite agree with the honourable member for Auckland East in his aspirations for a wider union. I should like to see, in one respect, a stronger bond even between the colonies and the Mother-country. I should like to see that bond not extended to England alone, but I should like to see it extended to the United Stages. I do not see why there should not be a federation between the colonies of other countries and ourselves. If we are to have French and German colonists in the Pacific, why should we not have some kind of federation recognized with the colonies of these countries? Whilst the colonists do not deny their allegiance to their Mother-country, they should ho united, and there should be some agreement among them, some common meeting-ground among them, on which they could discuss their grievances and their relationship, so as to prevent all war in the future. I see no difficulty in that. If there is a difficulty, then it simply means that this system of standing armies, this system of big navies, of having large sums, shall I say, wasted for the defence of our seaports—that all this is to come upon us, and that, instead of having peace in these new lands, we are to have introduced all the terrible evils of war. What has been the curse of Europe? The enormous standing armies have crushed the population. The expense of the armies and navies has had to be borne by the workers. We are, as yet, merely a handful of people; but if we could, by uniting with the other Australian Colonies, lay down some line—namely, the line of federation—to show to the older countries that, so far as we are concerned, we were to settle our future grievances, not by appeals to arms, but by mutually meeting and discussing our differences, we should be doing something for our race, and something to make us known in history. If it be that the world is so constituted that there is to be nothing but war, war, in the future, then the energies and resources of the people will be fettered. But I believe that there is progress in the world. I believe that the progress of the world is only consistent with peace—consistent with a greater diffusion of education. If you get peace notions diffused, that is, perhaps, the highest kind of education; so that what a modern poet has predicted may come true,—

There shall come a time when brotherhood shows stronger
Than the narrow bounds which now distract the world;
When the cannons roar and trumpet blare no longer,
And the ironclad rusts, and battle-flags are furled;
When the bars of creed and speech and race, which sever,
Shall be fused in one humanity for ever.

Sir, I move the resolutions standing in my name.

Motion made, and question proposed,—

"Whereas, at a meeting of delegates from the following colonies—namely, Fiji, New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, and Western Australia, held in Sydney, during November and December, 1883, the following resolutions were agreed to:—

- *That further acquisition of dominion in the Pacific, south of the Equator, by any foreign Power would be highly detrimental to the safety and well-being of the British possessions in Australasia, and injurious to the interests of the Empire:*
- *That this Convention refrains from suggesting the action by which effect can best be given to the foregoing resolution, in the confident belief that the Imperial Government will promptly adopt the wisest and most effectual measures for securing the safety and contentment of this portion of Her Majesty's dominions :*
- *That, having regard to the geographical position of the Island of New Guinea, the rapid extension of British trade and enterprise in Torres Straits, the certainty that the island will shortly be the resort of many adventurous subjects of Great Britain and other nations, and the absence or inadequacy of any existing laws for regulating their relations with the native tribes, this Convention, while fully recognizing that the responsibility of extending the boundaries of the Empire belongs to the Imperial Government, is emphatically of opinion that such steps should be immediately taken as will most conveniently and effectively secure the incorporation with the British Empire of so much of New Guinea, and the small islands adjacent thereto, as is not claimed by the Government of the Netherlands :*
- *That, although the understanding arrived at in 1878 between Great Britain and France, recognizing the independence of the New Hebrides, appears to preclude this Convention from making any recommendation inconsistent with that understanding, the Convention urges upon Her Majesty's Government that it is extremely desirable that such understanding should give place to some more definite engagement, which shall secure those islands from falling under any foreign dominion; at the same time, the Convention trusts that Her Majesty's Government will avail itself of any opportunity that may arise for negotiating with the Government of France, with the object of obtaining the control of those islands, in the interests of Australasia :*
- *That the Governments represented at this Convention undertake to submit and recommend to their respective Legislatures measures of permanent appropriation for defraying, in proportion to population, such share of the cost incurred in giving effect to the foregoing resolutions as Her Majesty's Government, having regard to the relative importance of Imperial and Australasian interests, may deem fair and reasonable:*
- *That the Convention protests, in the strongest manner, against the declared intention of the Government of France to transport large numbers of relapsed criminals to the French possessions in the Pacific, and urges Her Majesty's Government to use every means in its power to prevent the adoption of a course so disastrous to the interests of Australasia and the Pacific Islands :*
- *That the Convention expresses a confident hope that no penal settlement for the reception of European criminals will long continue to exist in the Pacific, and invites Her Majesty's Government to make to the Government of France such serious representations on this subject as may be deemed expedient:'*

"And whereas, at the said Convention, a draft Bill to constitute a Federal Council of Australasia was also agreed to: And whereas, in pursuance of the undertaking given by the delegates from the Colony of New Zealand, it is desirable that the resolutions of the said Convention should be submitted to this Legislature :

"This House resolves,—

"That it agrees generally with the resolutions of the said Convention; but, in order that' its views may be specifically expressed, it resolves as follows:—

- *That it approves of the steps taken by the British Government for the establishment of its rule over New Guinea, and hopes that like measures will be taken for a Protectorate over the islands of the Pacific Ocean not under the dominion of any stable Government:*

- *That this colony is willing to pay, in proportion to its population, a share in the sum of £15,000 proposed by the Imperial Government :*
- *That it desires respectfully to protest against the transportation of criminals to the French possessions in the Pacific :*
- *That it requests the British Government to make such representations to the European Powers as will prevent the maintenance of penal establishments in any of the Pacific Islands:*
- *That the establishment of sucha Federal Council as is proposed in the Convention's draft Bill is premature :*
- *That, so far as the Bill aims at enabling the colonies to jointly initiate legislation on questions of common interest and importance to the several colonies, it has the cordial support of this House:*
- *That, to place the proposed measure in I accordance with these opinions, it will be necessary to vary the Bill, so as to provide—First, that the Federal Council shall not make representations to the Imperial Government direct, but to the several Colonial Governments; second, that any measure it initiates shall not have any force within any colony, nor affect any colony, until it is adopted by the Legislature of such colony."—(Mr. Stout.)*

Wellington; GEORGE DIDSBURY. Government Printer.

Abolition of Provinces Bill

House at present to make all these charges local. We can resolve that they shall be local, but it is for a future Parliament to say how long they will remain local. These changes must come in time. We cannot bind the future in regard to them. It is my intention to vote for the Bill passing through the House this session in all its stages, because we cannot have anything like good government in this country until the provincial institutions are abolished. There are some portions of the Bill which I would like to see amended in Committee. There is no doubt about that, I will endeavour to have some amendments made; but I will not do anything to imperil the passing of the measure. If I cannot get the alterations I wish made in Committee, I will not on that account vote against the third reading of the Bill. I consider that it will be a great public advantage to get the Bill passed through this session. Any defects that may be discovered in the working of the measure can be remedied in a future session; and the new Parliament will be in a better position to judge of what is best adapted to the wants of the country. I venture to hope that, at the next meeting of Parliament, both parties in this House will join together to give such a measure to the country as will be most advantageous. I will vote for this Bill because it will tend to the unity of the colony, and tend to improve the public credit of the colony; and in face of the large amount of colonial works we have undertaken, in making trunk lines of railway throughout the country, I think it very desirable that the credit of the colony should be maintained at the highest point possible, so that we may be able to enter the money market to raise fresh loans for finishing our main trunk lines. I think we cannot get money to finish those lines of railway while Provincial Govern ments are in existence. I think the passing of this Bill will do more to advance the interests of the colony in the United Kingdom than any other measure one can possibly conceive. I shall also vote for this Bill because it will bring this Legislature face to face with the people. They will see what legislative body taxes them, and what body expends the money; and that if they wish to have any grievance redressed, whether public or private, they must come to this Legislature. So long as the provinces exist, they will make this Assembly their tax-gatherer; and I think it is desirable, in the interest of the colony, that this should be remedied, and that this Legislature should be brought face to face with the people. I shall vote for this Bill because I believe that by passing it true liberty will be secured to the people, and not the sham liberty which is offered by Provincial Governments. I shall vote for the Bill because the members of this House will be held in higher regard by the people as their representatives, A great number of members come here at present merely as supporters of the Provincial Governments and Superintendents. Now, on this account the people look towards the Superintendents only, instead of to the members representing them in Parliament; and I think it is time this system should cease, and that the constituencies should look to their own representatives instead of to Superintendents and Provincial Executives. And I believe that when provincial institutions are abolished this Legislature will become a real school for statesmen. It has been said that Provincial Councils are schools for statesmen; but I entirely deny that. It is utterly impossible to exercise true statesmanship in Provincial Councils. Then feelings are so local and narrow that it is impossible for a man, whatever his ability, to rise to the position of a statesman. When these local legislative bodies are done away with, this Legislature will become a true school of statesmanship. And I shall vote for the Bill because it will enable the Government of the day to deal with large questions—to deal with the inequalities of taxation, now felt all through the colony, and with which, under the present system, it is impossible for any Government in this House to deal When a Government is always fighting for power with rival governing bodies during the

session and during the recess, it is impossible for them to direct their attention to the large questions pressing on the country, and which require a remedy at their hands. When the Bill passes, I feel certain that a system of government will spring up in this country more suited to its requirements, and more conducive to its progress; and that it will be utterly impossible, while Provincial Councils are in existence, for that system of government to spring up which is necessary for the true progress and development of the resources of the colony. Believing that this Bill will give effect to these views, I shall support its passing through all stages this session.

Mr. Stout.—Sir, it is with some diffidence that I rise to address the House on this occasion, and for two reasons : first, because I am new to this House, and it may perhaps be considered presumptuous on the part of such a young member, knowing so little of the forms of the House and of its members, to speak on such an important subject; and, second, because I had not the privilege of listening to the debate upon the Bill. Had I not regarded the present occasion as a crisis in the history of New Zealand, I should not have addressed the House at all; but at the same time, from the manner in which the debate has been conducted, and from the persistence which the Government have manifested in forcing the Bill on this session, whatever may be the result of the present debate this will be regarded as a crisis in our history; and it therefore becomes every member to express his views, whether he be with the minority or with the majority. There is one part of this subject which I wish to brush away at the outset, and that is the legal aspect of the question. With all due respect to this House, I do not consider it the proper forum to decide purely legal questions. I do not desire to cast any reflection upon its members, but I think they will recognize this: that, in a House composed of members having different sympathies, different feelings, and dif ferent sentiments, it would be almost impossible for them to approach the purely legal question unbiassed, or to decide upon it in a thoroughly impartial manner. And even if this House had to decide this question, I do not know that its decision would be of much avail. Any one who reads the Declaratory Act, upon which the powers of this House are founded, cannot but be struck with this: that, at all events, the Act, in its spirit, was never intended to sanction an Abolition Bill such as that now before the House. In whatever way the letter of the Act may be twisted, one has only to refer to 25 and 26 Victoria, cap, 3, and 31 and 32 Victoria, cap. 92, which is not a new enactment, but one framed to declare the intention of the Imperial Parliament—any one looking at that Act will see that the Imperial Parliament meant to give the Legislature of this colony power to alter the boundnries of provinces, power to create municipal government where there were no provinces; but did the Imperial Parliament, when this Act was passed, mean that this House should sweep away the Constitution granted to New Zealand? I look upon this legal question as one of really little moment, for I should be sorry to hear it said that the people of New Zealand were not competent to frame a Constitution for themselves. If this Bill is passed,—and I judge from the tone of the House that it is likely to pass its second reading.—I can only tell the House that this is only the beginning of the constitutional changes which the people of New Zealand will demand, There are other constitutional changes as great as this Bill proposes to effect, which the people of New Zealand have been asking for for years, and which this House has not yet taken up, There are many phases of this constitutional question which will no doubt be raised; but I intend to pass them by, and address myself to the question before the House. And, Sir, I hope those who are in the majority on this occasion will be prepared, notwithstanding some of the remarks made during the course of the debate, to grant to the minority that right of opinion which a minority ought to have granted to it. The minority may be sincerely desirous to advance the welfare of New Zealand, although they are the minority, and what are called Provincialists. In speaking against this Abolition Bill, I do not intend to take the ground which other honorable members hare taken—namely, that this is a Bill that should be referred to the constituencies. I know that if I were compelled to vote upon it, even if the constituencies should declare in favour of it, I should be found in the lobby voting against it, and I shall, before I sit down, attempt to point out why I think that the practice and the theory of central government set forth in the Bill are unsuitable to the Colony of New Zealand. There is one other remark I wish to make before I proceed further, and that is with reference to the observation of the honorable member for Clive, who characterized the Opposition as a party without a policy : they were divided upon all kinds of subjects; the only point upon which they were agreed was their opposition to this Bill. I am not aware that it is even the duty of the Government, the Ministers of the Crown, to be united on all subjects. Why, if I look at *Hansard* this session, what do I find? That on a question which roused the sentiments of a large number of members of this House, three of the members of the Government voted one way and three another, That Bill was the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill So there must be even amongst Ministers of the Crown a free expression of opinion, and sometimes a large difference of opinion. It is not to be expected, because the Opposition are united In opposing this Bill, that therefore they must be united in everything else. I believe that the Ministers of the Crown are not united on questions of as great importance as the change in the Constitution of the colony. I would ask, if each of the members of the Ministry were put into a separate room and asked to draft a Constitution for New Zealand, do you think any two of the drafts would agree? And so in reference to the members who at present support the Government. Are they united in opinion? I will undertake to say that there are not greater divergences of opinion amongst the members of the Opposition than there are amongst the

supporters of the Government. If, however, it should be as the honorable gentleman said, that there is no organized Opposition in this House, what does that signify? Is it not a proof that parliamentary government in this colony has failed? If, after the trial we have had of parliamentary institutions in this colony, a leading supporter of the Government gets up and says that, notwithstanding the length of time that form of government has been in existence, we cannot even frame a Parliamentary Opposition, that would be an admission that parliamentary government is unsuitable to the people of New Zealand. Instead of being a slur upon the opponents of this Bill, it is a slur upon the people of New Zealand and upon this House. There are various ways in which this question has been approached by different speakers; and I will first point out that the onus of proof that change is necessary does not rest with the Opposition, although that seems to be the leading argument of those who support the Government in this measure. They say that the Opposition should be prepared with a form of Constitution for the country; but I say that that is not a function of the Opposition. The function of the Opposition, as I understand the matter, is to critically examine the measures brought forward by the Government, and especially great constitutional measures such as this. I have yet to learn that the highest aim of the highest statesman is to frame a paper Constitution for the country; and I have yet to learn that it is the duty of an Opposition to come down and frame a Bill to carry out a change. The Opposition means this; that the present change is undesirable; and therefore they do not wish another Constitution for the country. What are some of the grounds on which this Abolition Bill is founded? One of the first is the charge thai there has been provincial mismanagement. That, I think, has been advanced by every speaker whom I have heard address the House in favour of the Government Bill. It has been the beginning and end of every speech that I have beard from that side of the House. What, then, has been the provincial mismanagement complained of? First, as was stated by the honorable member for Invercargill, and repeated by the honorable member for Clive last night, that the Provincial Governments have been selling large blocks of land. Is that a crime? Is it wrong to sell large blocks of land? Has this House ever declared how much land one man shall hold, or how much he may purchase? If this House chooses to say that the purchase of large blocks of land is an injury to the colony, why is it that, in every Act passed by it, there is no limit to the quantity of land that may be purchased by a single individual? And if the big block system is wrong, why do not these opposed to it insist that the quantity shall be limited, and also that hereafter those who have got beyond a certain quantity must either give up their land or pay additional taxation for it? That would be putting their principles to a test. If this big-block system is wrong, I should like to see honorable gentlemen bring down a fair limit of what should be held, and then insist that no person in the colony shall hereafter hold more. But I am afraid that those who say that they are opposed to this big-block system would be the last to support such a Bill. It is a very curious thing, as far as Otago is concerned, that the gentleman who opposed me at the last election was a gentleman who purchased the large block of land so much referred to, and who is a supporter of the abolition of provinces. It is a curious fact in regard to Otago—and I believe the same thing will be found in other parts of the colony—that those who wish to see the provinces abolished are those who hold large blocks of land. Therefore, to make it a charge against the provinces, that because they have sold large blocks of land they have mismanaged their affairs, seems to me to be a very peculiar thing. I heard a cheer given in this House to the assertion that the provinces ought not to have any discretion in the sale of land; but I ask, if this House gives the Provincial Governments no discretion in the matter, how are they to prevent a person who comes with the money in his pocket from purchasing what quantity of land be pleases? What right have honorable members to cast blame upon the provinces if large blocks are sold under these circumstances? There is something further in this matter that has still to be brought out; and I say that, if large blocks of land have been sold in the Province of Otago, it is not the Government of that province but this House which is to blame. It has not only no control over its land, but it is on account of the action of this House, taken without consulting and against the wishes of the Provincial Council and people of Otago, that that very block of land which has been so much referred to, the Moa Flat block, was disposed of. I need only refer to what took place in Otago in 1868, when the runholders, in consequence of the fall in the price of wool, appealed to the Provincial Council, and begged that the arrangement or compact of 1866 should be so far modified that they might receive compensation for the abandonment of their leases. The Provincial Council of Otago did not see its way to granting that, and so they came to this House and got an Act passed which gave them compensation to the extent of 2s, 6d. an acre. That Act was passed against the wishes of the Legislature of the province, who did their utmost to prevent its passing. What did the people do? They fought against it, for they saw thatt it contained iniquitous provisions, and that, if they acted in accord anee with it, vested rights would be created; and so they determined that nob one acre of land should he thrown open for salo until a new Act was passed. I do not wish to detain the House at any length upon this point, but I should like to point out another Act by which almost three-fourths of the land in Otago was taken out of the hands of the people, without their having been consulted in the slightest degree upon the matter. I mean the Gold Fields Act, which practically gave, and gives to this moment, unlimited compensation to pastoral tenante to such an extent that even with-in the last month or two a pastoral tenant, one of a class who are only paying 2d. per acre for

their land, and 7d. a head on his sheep, and 3s. 6d. per head for cattle, actually applied for £1 an acre compensation for giving up his run! That is the sort of thing which the province has to fight against. I say that every move taken by the Provincial Council, and every attempt made by that body to provide for the settlement of the country, and to introduce what I may term a democratic principle into the land laws, has been met with rebuff after rebuff. It is wrong, therefore, on the part of members of the House, who have brought this state of things about, to turn round now and throw it in the teeth of the Provincial Government that they have mismanaged their affairs. Another charge of mismanagement made against the provinces is that they have not made roads into the outlying districts. I should like to ask any honorable member of this House to consider the amount of money which the General Government has got from the Province of Otago, and the quantity of money at the disposal of the Provincial Government, and then say which has done the most benefit to the country, I am willing to take that test, I would ask the honorable member for Wakatipu, who alluded to this question of road-making, how was road-making to be done in Otago? Any honorable member who knows anything of Otago, or the way in which small rushes take place in that province, must know that no Government worthy of the name of a Government would say, "Here is a level piece of land, let us make a road through it; "but they must accommodate their road-making to the rushes that are taking place. At first they had not the money; and when they had, I do not think it would have been a wise thing to make a road to the interior, careless of the Location of the miners. Another peculiar thing is, that those who charge the Provincial Councils with centralization at the capitals should be those who by this Bill propose to give to the centres of population in capitals far more money than the Provincial Councils give them. I need only take as a practical example the city of Dunedin, which will be benefited to the extent of £10,000 a year by the proposals in this Bill. Is that decentralization? If this money is given to the capital it must come from somewhere, and I presume it will come from the outlying districts.

Major Atkinson,—No.

Mr. Stout—The honorable gentleman saya "No;" but the money must come from some where, and if it does nob come from the outlying districts it must be out of moneys lying unused in the bank. I shall show hereafter that this proposal La no earing whatever to the Province of Otago; bat I shall not dwell upon that question now. The charge, therefore, that the outlying districts hare been neglected seems be me to be a peculiar one, at all events so far as the Province of Otago is concerned. I have yet to learn that, even if there has been provincial mismanagement, abolition is the proper remedy. Has there been no mismanagement in this House, or by this Government? Reading the speech of the Hon. the Treasurer himself, what does he admit in his concluding remarks? Those remarks contain a charge against this House, and plainly say that in the past it has not been able to manage its finances properly; for he says,—

"The continued existence of the provinces means the continued and constantly increasing pressure upon the Government and upon this House for money, in the interest of a locality, without any reference to the neceasities of the colony as a whole."

What does that signify? To put it in plain terms, this House has been in the past in the habit of giving public money, without reference to the interests of the colony, simply to please a few persons because of their locality. Sir, I do not think I could point out a graver charge ever made against any House than the honorable member has made in his Financial Statement. If I take up the statement of the Minister for Public Works, what is there disclosed? It discloses this: that because the fullest local information was not obtained, and the surveys were not properly made before the railway works were commenced, there has been great loss to the colony, That is the substance of the 4th and 5th pages of the honorable member's Statement. What does that mean? Does it not show that there has been gross mismanagement in the matter of the colonial railways? Why should this House, that can do nothing wrong, hare sanctioned the construction of railways before the fullest information was obtained, and before detailed surreys were made? Why have they sanctioned yearly votes for railways, yearly additional votes? The Minister for Public Works has come down and asked for a vote for works on the gold fields to the amount of £10,000 one year; next year he comes down and asks for £20,000; and the third year says the cost will amount to £30,000. Is that management? Is that the way in which the affairs of the colony are to be conducted? But, Sir, because this is the case, because there has been mismanagement in colonial matters, is that any reason that the people of the colony should have it said to them, "You have mismanaged colonial affairs; therefore you ought to have no colonial government, and we must manage you from London"? That is the exact argument—as far as this Abolition Bill is concerned—brought before this House. Suppose I admit to the full that there has been gross provincial mismanagement: is that any reason why the provinces should be abolished? What does this Bill propose to do? Those who support the Bill, and amongst others the Commissioner of Customs, whose very lucid speech I listened to last night, say that this Bill is to give greater powers. But if the Bill is to give greater powers to the people then, because the people have mismanaged their own affairs in the past, they are to have greater powers in the future. That seems to me a most extraordinary argument to address to this House. If the people have mismanaged their affairs in the past, and have shown

themselves utterly incompetent to conduct their affairs under the provincial system, will you make them more competent in the future by giving them greater power? That is the kind of argument addressed to this House. I have yet to learn that this is a proper way to teach the people to govern themselves. I may say I do not care which way it is put. If those who have proposed this Bill say it is to give the people great power, they say they do that because the people have mismanaged their affairs in the past, There is an absurdity on the face of it which I shall not argue. If this Bill gives them less power because they mismanaged their affairs in the past, what follows? Are we to step into use a phrase of an honorable member—and put a sort of buffer between the people and their rulers? If the people have mismanaged their affairs in the past, how is it to be remedied? Not by taking power from the people. Surely we do not expect there can be any good government in any country if, so soon as the people make blunders and mistakes, we take the control of affairs out of their hands, and make something over the heads of the people—a sort of protecting structure. Sir, it is said that provincialism is to be abolished because it is costly. I first dispute that is costly. There is, I believe, a Provincial Council in Taranaki, and if that Provincial Council is abolished they will have, I presume, a Shire Council in Taranaki. I have yet to learn that a Provincial Council could not be conducted just as cheaply as a Shire Council. Where is the distinction? A Provincial Council requires a chairman, and he is called the Speaker; a Shire Council requires a chairman, and they call him Chairman. Where is the difference to be? The Shire Councils may not have such great powers of special legislation, but I will deal with that aspect of the question by-and-by. So far as any explanations have been given, I have yet to see where savings can be effected. If you expect Shire Councils to perform the same functions as Provincial Councils, you cannot get them performed more cheaply. But if you get them done more cheaply, do you think the people who have mismanaged their affairs in the past, and have been at useless expense, by merely calling a Provincial Council a Shire Council will suddenly become more economical? And this is one of the arguments also addressed to this House. I have yet to learn that there will be any saving. Unfortunately perhaps all those honorable members who have addressed themselves to the question of saving hare reviewed it as relating to their own districts. The honorable member for Manawatu addressed himself to it as affecting "my district," and another honorable member—I forget the district he represente—also addressed himself to it as affecting his district. In New Zealand it perhaps must necessarily be so, because in New Zealand we have no common centre. I will take this question as it affects one of the largest provinces in the colony, the Province of Otago. Honorable members may not know the cost of what may be termed "Provincial Council para-phernalia" in Otago. The cost of everything, including the honorarium, the Speaker's salary, printing, &c., is £4,000 a year. That will all be swept away, and there will be a primary saving; but some persons must perform the duties of the Provincial Council. The work must be performed. We cannot be stopped altogether. Some persons must pass the Ordinances the Provincial Council used to pass. Estimates of revenue and expenditure must be prepared as the Provincial Council used to do. All that will be done, I presume, by this House and Shire Councils; but will they do it for nothing? Will it cost the people of Otago nothing? What the saving will be I cannot conceive. I have yet to learn where the saving can possibly be, for no honorable member who has addressed himself to the question has pointed that out. So long as the people desire certain certain governmental work to be done for them, it must be done at their expense. You cannot save expense by merely changing the form of government. It may be said that you are getting rid of Superintendents, Provincial Secretaries, and Provincial Treasurers. Granted that you do: it will be a further saving; but some persons must perform their functions. Yon can call them clerks, nominated Superintendents, or nominee officers of the Government, or what you, will, but some persons must perform those functions, and, so far as Otago is concerned, instead of being a saving it will be a positive loss. I think I can show the House that in a very few minutes, In Dunedin there are only three clerks in the Provincial Government offices that deal with executive matters. I exclude those in the Land Department, because that will be kept up as long as there are waste lauds for sale, whether they be under the control of the General Government or the Provincial Government. And so long as you have separate accounts in the Provincial Treasury, you must have separate clerks to look after them. There are only three clerks besides these, and one of them, who attends to the General Government immigration matters, has a very great deal of time taken up with them. You have only two clerks left, and any one that sees the amount of correspondence that has to go through their hands relating to the gold fields and various other matters, must feel that, instead of there being two clerks, you will require at least half-a-dozen if this Bill pasees, for they will have to be in constant correspondence with Wellington, where everything is to be managed. So, instead of the number of clerks being decreased, it will be increased. Where then, I ask, can the saving be? I have referred to the question of saving money; but, after all, I consider that, if you put to the people of Otago the interrogatory, "Will you have the administration of your own revenue, and the administration of your own waste lands, and pay £4,000, or oven £10,000, a year extra ?" I should not be afraid of the decision they would come to. But, Sir, leaving the question of saving, I approach the subject from another point of view; and that is, the way in which the government is going to be carried out in the future. I am not going into the details of the Bill, and will only point out that this House is asked to do a most peculiar thing. This Abolition

Bill is not, strictly speaking, an Abolition Bill at all; and it does not go the length of real centralism. Can it be an Abolition Bill, when it keeps up the old provincial boundaries? Why are these provincial districts still preserved? Not only are these provincial districts preserved, but the Bill provides that every year the House shall be asked to vote the annual surplus that may remain over of the land fund of Otago, after payment of charges against it—that is, to vote purely Otago money for Otago purposes. Surely that is not a principle that this House should go upon. I will ask this House, how it would be if some Shire Council had a surplus—if the Shire Council of Taranaki had some surplus funds amounting to £20,000 or £30,000—it may be so, for, according to the honorable member for Sew Plymouth, Taranaki is to become suddenly rich by the Bill—after providing for their pressing wants would it be a proper thing for this House to say upon what road or bridge the money that purely belonged to Taranaki should be spent? If there is any surplus over in the Otago land fund, this House has to determine what is to be done with the surplus of purely Otago revenue. That seems to me a most peculiar thing to ask a central Government to undertake. There are, however, one or two principles in this Bill to which I desire to allude, the first of which I have only casually referred to. The granting of subsidies to towns seems to me a most peculiar system of decentralization. Towns in the leading provinces of New Zealand, that have never had anything from the provincial revenue at all, are suddenly to become rich by subsidies or doles out of the Consolidated Revenue. That is a very peculiar principle in this Bill. Another peculiar principle is this: I understand it has been laid down by the Colonial Treasurer and other honorable members that one of the main reasons why this Bill was introduced was that some of the North Island provinces required aid from the colony. And because those North Island provinces required aid from the colony, therefore this House ought to see how this aid is expended. It ought not to leave it to the provinces to expend funds raised by this House. I think I am correctly stating the arguments used by the honorable gentleman. But what does the Bill do? It introduces a localizing system of subsidies. Is that allowing the locality that raises the money to spend the money? What is the distinction between a sub-sidy to a Road Board and a subsidy to a province? The latter is made, it is true, by vote, and it may be varying in amount: it was fixed by capitation allowance, and afterwards there were special grants. Grants under this system will be made to the Road Boards out of the Consolidated Revenue, which they can spend without this House having a voice in the matter If the principle is now to be introduced into the colony that this House, which raises the money, is to spend the money, this subsidy to Road Boards cuts at the root of the whole. An honorable member, in alluding to the evils that would be got rid of by this Bill, used the term "law-making machines." One honorable member said in my hearing, "Surely a colony of 300,000 people does not require nine Legislatures," But, Sir, if this Local Government Bill is carried out in its integrity, it will create 2,000 Legislatures. Are you to deny to the Road Boards the power to make by-laws? And what are the powers to make by-laws but simply legislative functions within certain defined limits? And what are the provinces doing? Are they not performing the same duties and functions? I say that, instead of provincial legislation being abolished, it ought to be encouraged; nay, not only encouraged, but something more should be done; it ought, Sir, to be distinctly limited and defined, so that there would not be, as in the past, overlapping between the General and Provincial Governments. What do I find? I have here before me a list of Bills, which the whole of the representatives of the colony are supposed to debate, and are supposed to understand. What do the one-half of these Bills refer to? The honorable member for Newton referred to this last night, but I had taken a note of the same point before the honorable gentleman spoke. I say that one-half of these Bills are Bills that could be very well dealt with without coming to this House at all. Is it necessary, in order to abate a nuisance at Napier, that the people of Otago should come and assist the people of Napier to do so? Is it necessary, before an Athenæum can be incorporated in Wellington, that the people from Auckland, Marlborough, Nelson, Otago, Canterbury, and other provinces should be asked to aid in having that done? We have got an Athenæum in Otago, an Athenæum in in Dunedin—as good an institution of the kind as there is in any of the colonies. We have a Provincial Ordinance, and we are able to deal with that Athenæum without the aid of the General Assembly at all. Why could not the one-half of the Bills now before the Assembly be as well dealt with by the Provincial Legislatures as this House could deal with them? Is this, then, the saving we are to have under the proposed new system? Is not this a greater waste of power than having even nine Legislatures? Here you have representatives drawn from various parts of the colony, and who are expected to Stop in Wellington four months. To do what? To pass local Acts about local matters of which the representatives can have no possible knowledge, and which they must take on trust from the honorable members who introduce those Bills. This is not the way to create a nation in New Zealand—to ask what I may call its Imperial Parliament to spend its time in abating a nuisance at Napier, or incorporating the Athenæum at Wellington. What do I find with regard to the matters that are brought before this House? One of the first questions I heard put in this House—and which so struck me with amazement that I asked myself, Is this the kind of questions that are to occupy the attention of the central Legislature?—was this : Whether the Government were to have a clock-tower erected on a public building at Invereargill. Is this then to be the way we are to create a great nation in New Zealand? is this the way in which the time of this Imperial Parliament is to be taken up? in abating a

nuisance at Napier and erecting a clock-tower at Invereargill! Is this to be a sample of the central legislation that is to be in the future, when, the provinces are to be abolished? I ask honorable members—I ask honorable members the Centralists in this House, why the people of Invercargill could not be left to take care of this thing without taking up the time of the representatives of the colony about it? That is a sample of the kind of central administration we are to have in the future. I go further, and say this: I assume so far that this Local Government Bill confers a boon upon the people that has not been conferred hitherto. Well, as has been already pointed out by some honorable members who have addressed this House, this Local Government Bill is almost a copy of the Otago Ordinance with its blunders. The word "not"—and I see the papers have noticed it—is where the word "not" ought not to be. This is section 27 of the Local Government Bill, which the Government are about to introduce, I need not read the clause; it refers to the power of voting, and provides that anyone having property of the annual value of "not lees" than fifty pounds is to have one vote. I assume it means "less." Before this central Legislature or Government could confer a boon upon, the people of the colony, they had to go to a trumpery Provincial Council and copy its Local Government Bill—I mean the Otago Ordinance, with all its errors. Now, so far as the Province of Otago is concerned, what power of local government does this Bill of the General Government give to the people there that they do not now possess? How did it happen that before this House thought of Road Boards—before this House had its attention directed to real local self-government—the people in Otago, through their Provincial Council, had passed their Road Ordinance, which provided for their local and municipal government before this House ever thought of conferring local government on the people of the colony? I say, that so far as this Local Government Bill is concerned, it does not confer a single boon upon the people of Otago that they do not already enjoy; but it takes away the privilege they possess—the privilege of dealing with their revenues according as they think proper. That is all that the Abolition of Provinces Bill and the Local Government Bill do. It has been said that this Bill is not an infringement of the liberties of the people. Well, it depends entirely on how you use the word liberty. If liberty means the liberty to do with your own as you please, then this Bill is an infringement of your liberties. What are some of the arguments which have been adduced on the other side? It has been said by the Minister of Justice—I will not quote his exact words : I will give the substance of them—that this colony should be reduced to what one might term a dead level. He said that one district in the colony has no business to be rich and another district poor; that that would be an injury to the colony. That was the kind of argument he used. I am not quoting the exact words; I am quoting the drift of his argument fairly.

Mr. Bowen,—I did not make use of any such argument.

Mr. Stout.—I think the honorable member put it in this way : He said the people in Auckland had not education, and they ought to have education, the same as Otago and Canterbury, and that this House ought to provide the funds. What does that mean? I ask the honorable member, if this be the new principle of government which is to be carried out in the future, why have local government at all? If every-thing is to be reduced to one purse—if every city and every town and every Road Board is to have but one distribution of the revenue, not caring whether it will be a poor town or a wealthy Road Board—why have this local government at all? Why not have one purse and one dictator to distribute the funds as he thinks proper? I also ask him to carry out this principle in private life. This, Sir, is a specimen of what I might call political communism. Let him apply it to private life. There are a large number of people who are very wealthy, and there are a large number of the community very poor. What would be thought of the Minister of Justice passing a Bill to make those people who were very wealthy give it up, so that they might divide their all with those who were very poor? I do not think the honorable gentleman would approve of that kind of what I might term justice. And if the Bill really means anything it means this, for those honorable members say that because one or two provinces happen to be rich at present they are to divide their riches with those provinces that are poor. The North Island provinces, when the Maori question is settled and the railways are made, may perhaps become as wealthy as the Middle Island provinces, for they have a fine climate and resources that may hereafter make them as great as, if not greater than, the Middle Island provinces. But would it be fair to say to the Middle Island provinces, "You are wealthy now; you must give up your wealth and share it with us?"—because this is the new kind of justice which is to be introduced in regard to our political institutions. I ask those honorable gentlemen—and I speak for the Provinces of Otago and Canterbury and their constituencies—I ask the supporters of the Government from Otago and Canterbury, who think that under this Bill our land fund is safe, to consider this : Let them look at what this Abolition Bill means. It may be said that this is a local view of the question. I find that all those honorable members who have spoken in favour of this Bill have grounded their support of this Bill on not only a local feeling, but on a small local feeling, because they have asked for this constitutional change not so much because it would be a great benefit to the colony is because it would benefit their own districts. The honorable member for Dunstau has spoken in favour of the Bill because his district has not got roads; the honorable member for Wakatipu will vote for the Bill because his district had not roads; the honorable member for Manawatu said his district had been neglected; and an honorable member from some

part of Auckland—the East Coast—said he was in favour of the Bill because his district had been neglected. Is this the kind of national feeling that is to be aroused by this Abolition Bill—that every out-district is to outbid its neighbour, and we are to say, "I want the Constitution of the colony changed because my district is neglected? "I may therefore be pardoned for looking at the question from an Otago land-fund point of view, and not from any district point of view, I say this Bill is no conservation of the land fund at all. If this Bill becomes law, and if this alteration of the Constituting the effect of which in to create a great nation, takes place, I ask those honorable members who look upon this national feeling which we are to have in New Zealand in future, and which I shall touch upon presently—I ask them to be consistent and sincere, and to wipe out these provincial districts altogether, because they are a delusion, a sham, and a snare. What is the reference to the land fund? It is true that the land fund is given under this section of the Bill, as the Commissioner of Customs very clearly explained last night. What are those provinces to do which have no land fund? The honorable member for Grey Valley stated last night that Westland would have to receive £25,000 a year—that that amount would have to be got somewhere for the Province of Westland, The Colonial Treasurer acknowledged that he had made provision for the payment of the £25,000. Who is to pay the £100,000 Treasury bills which the Colonial Treasurer is to raise annually? Who is to pay them? Will it not come from the revenue? It is the same thing as going to a wealthy man who has got a large amount of money out at interest, and has a large amount of money from land—you go to him, and say: "You keep your rents as long as you please, but you must pay all the interest at once." That is what this Bill means. The Treasury bills may go on at £100,000 a year, but at the end of the year it must come out of the Consolidated Revenue at once. It is simply saying to the Province of Otago: You may take your land revenue; but out of your Consolidated revenue we will give assistance to all those provinces that have got no land revenue at all. This is a very peculiar system of conserving their land revenue—such a peculiar system of conserving their land revenue that, if it was applied to social life, there is no man, however rich, who would see or recognize the justice or the necessity of it, That is the kind of security that is being given to our land fund. I shall now deal with another question—and that is, what is termed the national point of view. Reference has been made to the speeches of a man whom I consider to have been one of the greatest men who ever lived in New Zealand, I allude to Mr. Godley. I intend to quote Mr. Godley to show that, if we were honored by his presence in this House, he would be found in opposition to the Government. But before I quote from some of Ms speeches I wish to ear this: that I have yet to learn of a national feeling having ever been created in a country by a majority in it doing an injustice to a minority. That is not the way to create a unity of empire. We have only to look at history to see that, instead of a bond of unity being created by such a couse, it has only been the cause of dissensions and bickerings which have existed up to the present day. If the people of Ireland considered that they had obtained full justice from the English Government, should we have any agitation at the present time for Home Rule? That is a standing warning, I may say, to those who want to be framers of Constitutions, to beware of wounding the feelings and sentiments of the people, and not to rashly go in for what may be termed central legislation. Now, I shall quote Mr. Godley to show this : that after all, Governments, so to speak, are only relative, That is, no one has yet been able to say: "This is the form of government which I believe to be best, and all other forms of government are wrong,"

Mr. Bowen.—Hear, hear.

Mr. Stout.—I am glad to hear a cheer coming from that quarter, because it is an admission that even their ideal of government is only an ideal that can be fitted to the surroundings in which they wish to plant it. What does Godley say? I wish to point out one or two remarks made by him, showing that, if he were in this House, he would say the time for abolition has not yet come. It is true he looked forward to a time when the provinces would be merged; but it was a merger by growth, not a merger by extermination. He says,—

"As commnnications become more frequent and easy, and as in the progress of wealth and civilization a leisured class come into existence, able and willing to make politics a profession, and to devote their whole time to such pursuits, it becomes possible and desirable to abolish provincial distinctions, and to centralize governmental power. The extent, therefore, to which political subdivision should be carried in any particular case is quite arbitrary; it is a question not of principle, but of degree, and one on which I hesitate to speak with any degree of confident assurance."

I ask, can any honorable member stand up and say we have a leisured class in this colony, who are able to follow polities as a profession, and spend six or seven months of the year in attending a session of this Parliament? I speak as coming from Otago, and I say, if you pass such a measure as this, you will only have two classes coming to this House: first, the wealthy capitalist, the monopolist class; and, secondly, those who go into politics as a last resort, not being able to succeed in anything else. These are the kind of men you will have coming to this House, and not men who are fearless and independent, able to form a strong Opposition in the face of an all-powerful majority—able to form an Opposition which will speak what it believes to be true. You will sweep away all the independent men in the House. It is true that payment of members may remedy the evil to some extent; and of course you will have to increase the honorarium given to members of this House to,

I suppose, double or treble its present amount; but I am afraid that that will take away a great deal of the saving to be effected by abolishing provincial institutions. But there is another thing that Mr. Godley pointed out, and to which I ask the careful attention of those who look upon Mr. Godley as a leader of public opinion. He pointed out this : that before you can get good government—a Government that truly represents the people—you must have a Government present, as it were, face to face with the people. He says,—

"If I were asked what is the main lesson that I have learned from my colonial experience, I should say it was the blighting and ruinous effect of distant government. I stand here, myself the agent of a distant and irresponsible governing body, to say that I think no amount of abilities, no amount of theoretical knowledge, no amount of zeal and disinterestedness, can even approach to compensating for the enormous disadvantage of being without personal interest in its local affairs. It appears to me as indisputable as an axiom in Euclid that a country governed from a distance wilt either be jobbed and tyrannized over or altogether neglected,"

I ask honorable members who vote for this Abolition Bill whether this will not be government from a distance? An honorable member says "No;" but if that honorable member will go down to Otago—I do not know what is the case in Auckland—what will he find? He will find the people there more agitated over a Road Board election than over an election to this House. I came to this colony when a lad, and consequently I speak of a comparatively short time, but I have seen a seat in the House of Representatives going a-begging, when Sir Julius Vogel himself was nominated by a clerk in the Registrar's Office, without a single voter being present at the poll And why was that? One has only to go to Dunedin to see that every election, even for municipal bodies, is sharply and hotly contested; while, when an election for the House of Representatives takes place, there is a great difficulty in getting any one to stand. And why? It is simply a sample of distant government, and a sample of this, that in Otago, at any rate, we have not got that leisured class that can go into politics as a profession and neglect their own business. I shall only refer to one other quotation from Mr. Godley, and it is with reference to what has been in my opinion the weakness of the Constitution of New Zealand; and I put it simply, as stated before, as the want of specialization of the functions of Provincial Governments. If we had laid down, as Mr. Godley pointed out it should have been laid down—a strict line of demarcation within which Provincial Legislatures should have full power to legislate, and within which this House should have no power to veto—we should never have had this interminable conflict and continual overlapping that is going on. That is what Mr. Godley pointed out in one of his speeches when he said,—

"It is essential, therefore, that when the Central Legislature shall have formally abandoned certain powers to the provinces, from thenceforward all questions of jurisdiction be referred to the Supreme Court of the colony; and that this Court, moreover, shall be so constituted as not to be, nor even to appear, dependent or partial."

As a remedy, he pointed out that there ought to have been a strict line drawn, if I may so speak, of demarcation within which Provincial Councils might legislate without the fear of the Central Government coming in and disturbing their decisione. If we had that, we should have had none of this overlapping, and this waste of energy, as it has been termed, in the past. And, coming to this question of waste of energy, I ask honorable members to look at this ideal that has been chosen. We are to look on this as a great national question; we are to look on New Zealand as a nation; and this Bill is to create a national feeling in the colony. I fad to see that, I would ask the honorable members who introduced the Bill, what is their ideal? I presume, when they introduced a Bill of this character, they had some ideal towards which they are tending. What is their ideal? If I am to judge by this Bill, they admit in their speeches that it is only tentative—liable to be amended—and therefore at present they are incompetent to put their ideal on paper. I am willing, of course, to admit that they have some ideal, and that this is especially the case in reference to One honorable member who has always taken up.this national feeling, and whom I think a great many young men in the colony like myself have always regarded as a great statesman—I mean the honorable member for Timaru. We have always looked upon him as a leader. What is his ideal? That this colony is to be a great cation, But I have yet to learn that a great nation necessarily means one centre of administration. It is against all history to suppose so. When is this national feeling needed? This national feeling is only needed when a country has reached the military stage. That is when you require a national feeling. As Macaulay put it,—An army requires a commander. Even under a bad commander an army may prosper, but no army hoe ever prospered under a debating society, No doubt the debating-society stage of existence is higher than that of the bad cummander; but, as I said, this national feeling is only necessary when you have some nation outside yourselves to fight. That is the time you require to create a military feeling, or national feeling. In reality, this idea of making a nation is only a reviving of the idea which made Englishmen look down upon Frenchmen; it is the old military notion, the feudal notion of national feeling. I have yet to learn that this is the highest ideal of a nation. The highest ideal of a nation, I presume, is that of an organization—a social organization. What is the highest ideal? It is not that of an undivided unity. The highest organization must be one that has limbs, and motion in its limbs. It requires, in fact, not only one structure, but a specialization of functions. It has been said in one of the ablest articles that have appeared lately

on this question of the functions of the State—one written by Herbert Spencer,—

"It is a law universally illustrated by organizations of every kind, that, in proportion as there is to be efficiency, there must be specialization, both of structure and function—specialization which, of necessity, implies accompanying limitation."

So that I do not take it that the argument for Provincialism is merely a question of outlay; and I go further, and say, if you view Provincialism as a theoretical system of government, it takes a higher stand than the ideal of a central Government—of central legislation and administration. We are taught by political economy that if you want good articles you must have specialization of functions. To use a homely illustration, if you want to have a good bootmaker you do not make him at the same time a tailor, a baker, and a grocer. And so with reference to questions of government. If you wish for good government you must have specialization of functions, and that is exactly what the provincial form of government professes. It professes to do this: To leave to this General Legislature certain functions, and to the Provincial Legislature certain other functions to perform; let not the general laws interfere with the provincial laws, nor the provincial laws interfere with the general laws. Each has its specialized functions, and each its specialized structure. That is the only way in which you can hope to get complete efficiency in government or in anything else; and that is the ideal, I contend, that those who are in favour of Provincialism really desire. Of course all theories of government are subject to limitations: a theoretical form of government is only fit for a theoretical people. You cannot set up a fetish of government—a political fetish—and fall down and worship it. You cannot so set up a Central Legislature and Central Administration, and say of it, As soon as you introduce this into the colony, all financial extravagances will cease, and strict economy will soon be established. You cannot expect that, because a Government must grow with the people; and if a Government is a Government of the people, it will be a Government reflecting the vices as well as the virtues of the people governed. And so it is that the greatest men of all eras have propounded different theories of social advancement. We have had Plato's Republic; we have had More's Utopia; we have had David Hume's idea of the ten thousand county representatives; and we have had Comte's idea of small communes. These are forms of government fitted for a theoretical people. But what is this national idea? It is simply an exalted fetish—a fetish of nationality asking the people to bow down to it. If they will only worship this golden image, economy will come in, extravagance will vanish, and the people will be well governed. But if we examine this provincial system from a theoretical point of view, we shall see that it is just as perfect and as suited to the requirements of this colony as any system yet propounded. I have yet to learn that the provincial system is not national. If this pro- posal had been made in Italy, where there is no central Legislature, or in Germany, where there was no central Legislature until the States were federated, I could understand it; but here we have a central Legislature. We have a national feeling, and in order that that feeling should not be destroyed—in order that it should be fostered—we must guide it into national channels. And it is by the retention of these institutions which you wish to sweep away that we ask to have the national feeling cultivated. Some of those honorable members who have spoken during this debate have sneered at Provincialism. They ask what is the good of it. Others have argued that it is a good training school for our young men. That is a great deal to be said in its favour. If we were to expect the young men of this colony who have made their homes here, and who, whatever laws may be passed, whatever schemes may be propounded, do not intend to quit this country—if you expect these men to be educated politically, how can you do it by taking the opportunity from them, by depriving them of the chance of mixing in the councils of the nation? What young man can afford to come up here to spend half the year? What tradesman, what merchant, can afford to remain away from his business to attend this Assembly for many months? What professional man, if he has to depend upon his profession, can afford so much time away from his office? Then what must be the consequence? You must create a class of men who will make politics a trade. I am not a man of leisure, and possibly may not return to this House after this session; and if you centralize the legislation, you will deprive these young men who desire to take part in the affairs of the nation of the opportunity. You are ostracising them, and leaving politics to become what it has become in many other countries—a refuge for the destitute. If you sneer at provincial institutions, why have local government at all? The simplest form of government, if you want the simplest, is the autocratic. There is simplicity; there is cheapness; but the people of New Zealand do not desire that. They desire to have government of the people by the people, and educating the people in their own affairs, believing that, after all, even if they make mistakes, and even if it costs a little more, they have the privilege of arranging their own affairs without outside interference. If those honorable members who sneer at Provincialism wish to have no training school for the politicians of the colony, why do they wish to retain any form of local government? Why is local government to be kept? Is it because of its cheapness? Local government may not even be so cheap as central administration. You may have, for example, a map of the colony, and mark on it a main road that must go this or that way, and send out your subordinates, saying, "You must make a road to so-and-so." But that would be a form of government that would not suit the people. And why is this local government left to the people? It is because they wish to manage their own affairs, even

though it may be more expensive. De Tocqueville has been mentioned as furnishing strong argument in favour of the proposed change; but here is a passage from that author which I would recommend to the attention of those who desire to take away local management of their own affairs from the people. De Tocqueville (vol ii., p. 384) says,—

"To manage those minor affairs in which good sense is all that is wanted, the people are held to be unequal to the task; but when the government of the country is at stake, the people are invested with numerous powers: they are alternately made the playthings of their ruler and his masters—more than kings, less than men."

That applies exactly to this case. Those who favour this proposal say, "In the provinces the people have mismanaged their own affairs; therefore don't let them do it in the future." Then, on the other hand, they say, "We'll then have local government," In conclusion, I wish to say that I have spoken on this question knowing that there will be a majority in this House in favour of abolition. I might, though a young member, be permitted to warn that majority of the effects of the change. I do not desire to *Hansardize* honorable members, as it is termed, and to point out the wonderful change of opinion that has come over many of them, I do not desire to do that, because I recognize this, that my honorable friend the Commissioner of Customs would not have become a leader of the Centralist party had he not been convinced by the very able arguments that have been addressed to him. Let me ask the House what has been the cause of all the mischief that has fallen upon France? What is it that has always been held out to the French people? They have been told, "Look after your plans of government; there your salvation lies." We have been told only to look after our Constitution, look after This doctrinaire principle, and that will be the salvation of your country. This, Sir, is the second thing that has been placed before the people of New Zealand to tempt them to believe that they could get a good form of government by some hocuspocus. There is no such thing. The only hope of getting a good form of government is by educating the electorate to look after their own interests. It will be a very evil day for this colony when the people are taught that they can get rid of misgovernment by changing their Provincial Councils into Shire Councils. That is not the way to get good government. It is all very well to say that you are bringing the people face to face with the Government. Do you not bring the people face to face with the Provincial Governments more even than you do in this House? It is nonsense to say that you do not; but you are bringing them up to this French system, and making them believe that they will obtain some great benefit for the country by a continued series of surprises. The whole of the legislation which has token place in this House for years past has been a succession of changes. There has been some new scheme propounded to every Parliament that has assembled in this chamber We have had scheme after scheme propounded: and what has been told to the people to induce them to vote for it? I am sorry such a phrase has been used to the electorate, but they have been told, "Oh, you vote for this scheme, and you will get some of the money spent in your district." That is the kind of bribe that has been held out. Not only that, but what does this Bill propose to do? It gives the provinces certain grants, and it puts a member at the peril of his seat if he does not vote for it, because his constituents may say, "You are depriving us of an annual expenditure of £10,000." I ask, is that a fair way to submit a constitutional change to the people? Is it a fair way to put a constitutional change before any people? It is unreasonable to expect that from a change put in this manner you can get a good form of government, On the contrary, you are only leading up to troubles in the future, because, as in the case of ancient Rome, when the proletariat were led to believe that they would get largesses and bounties, when these largesses and bounties were not forthcoming, a revolution came about,—so it will happen here. If you train the electorate to believe that the duty of the General Assembly consists in propounding some new scheme to give to the masses in the cities some additional public money to spend, you are doing away, I think, with all chance of obtaining good government for New Zealand. You are not educating the electorate to loot after their own affairs, You are degenerating them, and teaching them to look to the form of government for redress, instead of teaching them to rely Upon themselves, and that a good form of government is a thing of slow growth. It is a thing that must come by gradual evolution. It is not by a leap in the dark that you can hope to get a good form of government, I am not one of the leisured class. I have come here this session, and perhaps only for this session, because I saw that a great danger was about to befall the colony. I came to it when quite a lad, and have watched the progress of events with ever-watchful interest, and I believe there is something at stake now of far greater importance than the form of local government—than the question of shire Councils. There is underlying this Bill another sample of that vicious system introduced into this colony—the system of change. The people are led to suppose that they will obtain some great boon simply by changing the forms—the paper Act—under which they live. I trust honorable members will look at this question fairly. I do not plead for delay. It is quite possible the Ministry may have a majority, but it will not be from amongst the settlers of the colony—the true colonists—that they will obtain that majority. They will be backed, as they have been backed, by whom? By the monopolists and capitalists of the colony. They will not only be backed by the monopolists, they will also be backed by that section of the Press which is under the thumb of the capitalists. I know, as a matter of fact, in what manner the politics of a portion of the Press of this country has been determined. What will honorable members think when I tell them

that, at a meeting of the directors of one of the leading papers in the colony, the decision Arrived at by a majority of one was, "Oh we must go against Provincialism"? Is that the kind of way in which public opinion is fostered in the colony in favour of a change like this? I warn honorable members to look carefully at this proposal, and to bear in mind the well-known adage, "Timeo Danaos, et dona ferentea." I warn those who think that this Bill will give a great boon and vast liberties to the people to look carefully at this matter. I shall not speak of other provinces, because there is not yet in New Zealand a warrant for good government and public opinion throughout the colony; but, speaking for Otago, I say that those who are supporting the Bill are not the miners and the scttlers; but they consist of two classes: those who rely on the General Government for having money spent in their districts on public works, and those who have got millions of acres of the best lands of the Crown, and decline to give up one acre for settlement by the people. I do not wish to name persons to this House; but I say it is that class, and not the people of the country, who are supporting the Government in this proposal, I warn those honorable gentlemen, who look forward to New Zealand taking its place and stand amongst the nations of the world that they will never bring that to pass by a measure of this kind, but they will make this colony become a nation of feudal lords and feudal slaves. It will only become a great colony by true democratic—I do not mean demagogic—feeling. That is the only way in which it will become a great nation, and not by passing such a Bill as this, and leading the people to believe that you can, by a simple alteration of the Constitution, give them some great boon and some great advantage.

Mr. Wales.—Sir, in addressing this House after the honorable member for Caversham, who has just sat down, I appear before you at great disadvantage, in consequence of not having had that training which the honorable gentleman has had during the whole course of his career in this colony. I shall not attempt to follow the honorable gentleman through his speech, which has been altogether a tissue of sophistry and special pleading. I can only say I am sorry that he has attempted to stir up the class feeling in the colony which was about being abrogated. It would, perhaps, be unbecoming of me if, before I proceed to make other remarks, I did not congratulate the House on the accession to its numbers of such a distinguished citizen of the colony, and so eminent a member of the profession of the law which he follows, and in which he has already, although a mere youth, carved for himself a nicho in the temple of fame. I will even say more, that if he does remain in this House he will, I doubt not, take a position as prominent in it as he holds in the profession of which he is both an ornament and a leader. But, notwithstanding his learning, I would warn honorable members not to be led away—shall I say by the strong prejudice he showed in favour of Provincialism? As he says himself, he came to this colony a mere lad, and has been reared in Otago as a Provincialist Now he looks at every thing through provincial spectacles. I came to Otago some few years ago, at a time when that province was flourishing from very similar causes to those under which the colony is now flourishing. It was flooded with emigrants, not brought in with borrowed money as they are now, but paying their own passages; not coming here as poor men, but bringing with them large sums of money; coming, of course, to benefit themselves, but coming nevertheless to assist in developing the resources of the colony, and to found homes for themselves and their families, I thought at that time that this state of prosperity was the result of Provincial Governments, and I said to myself, "Here is a country whose extremities are as likely to be attended to as its centres of population are, and whose outside interests will be fostered and cherished by these local Legislatures." But by-and-by I had an opportunity of visiting other parts of the colony and centres of population, and what did I find there? Not the same state of prosperity, but a state of discontent prevailing throughout—feelings of jealousy in every breast, the cry for change echoing from shore to shore, from town to town, from hamlet to hamlet, from mind to mind, until it found expression in the separation of Hawke's Bay from Wellington, and Southland from Otago, and in the passing of the Westland County Act and the Timaru and Glad-atone Board of Works Act. The honorable member for Timaru has, we all know, worked assiduously for years with his party to bring about the system proposed in this Bill to abolish Provincial Governments, to give local government and administration to the outlying districts, and to do away with the anomalous legislation which existed in the provinces, I do not wish to detract from the good the provinces have done, because I believe that when the colony was in an infantile state they were needed. I have no doubt that if the affairs of the different provinces in the North Island had been administered by men of ability—men of broad views, or, to use a favourite expression of the honorable member for Port Chalmers, "men with souls above sixpences"—if they had been administered by such men as have had the charge of affairs in Otago, there might not have been a necessity for this change. I believe there is not so much in the form of government under which we live as there is in the men by whom the Government is carried on. I will not take the honorable gentleman's speech m detail, or follow him through the various theories he has propounded, for after all there has been nothing practical in his speech, although it has been the most able one delivered from the point of view which Provincialists take; but there are one or two matters in it to which I must refer. It was not my intention to address the House upon this subject; but as it is expected that each member should give reasons why he supports this measure, I suppose I too must do so. Before coming to that, however, I may perhaps be allowed to glance at one or two of the statements made by the honorable gentleman.

Prominent among these, and affecting myself as a representative of the constituency of Dunedin, is bis statement that that city will benefit to the extent of £10,000 if this Bill passes. Alt I can say is, that I do not know the feelings of my constituents in this respect; for before I left dunedin this matter was not before the constituents, and it was not expected that the whole of the provinces would be included in the Bill. Nevertheless, when addressing my constituents after last session, I gave them distinctly to understand that, if proposals were brought in for the extinction of the Provincial Legislatures and form of government throughout the island, and if the provisions of the Bill met with my approval, I should support it. I have not heard a single opinion from my constituents in opposition to that view, and I am therefore free to act according to my belief and common sense. From what I have seen of this measure, although I do not think it is a perfect one, I mean to support the Government in passing it into law, not because Dunedin will gain £10,000 a year by the change, if it be so, but because I believe it will result in a more extended local form of government for the whole colony. The honorable gentleman also stated that the saving to the country by the abolition of the provinces would be very trilling, and he estimated that the amount in Otago would be about £4,000 a year. Let us consider, then, what that £4,000 is expended on at the present time. I ask honorable members to look at that point. It is expended in making some forty or fifty laws each session of the Provincial Council, the majority of which have to pass under revision of this House, and to be assented to by the Governor, That is an anomalous state of things, and I do not know what is the necessity for it, but there it is; and it requires to be rectified, During the recent sitting of the Provincial Council of Otago, something like forty-seven Ordinances were passed through, six of which were not assented to by the House, and two were disallowed. One of these disallowed Ordinances was in force for a considerable time—about two months—and affected about seventeen other laws, some of which it repealed. Then suddenly the Ordinance itself is disallowed, and these seventeen others come into force again. I do not know that any serious consequences will result from that; but there is the fact, and it is a most anomalous state of things. That is what this £4,000 is expended on, and it gives more work to the profession of which my honorable friend the member for Caversham is a member than anything else in the country. Another point he made was that Provincialism is economical, and that only three clerks were required in the Superintendent's office of Otago to conduct all the correspondence; and he argued that, if Provincialism were abolished, a greater number would be required for the correspondence between the General Government and the authorities in the new districts. I would ask the honorable gentleman how many clerks are employed in the various provinces, and how much of the time of these clerks is taken up in carrying on angry and unpleasant correspondence between the General and Provincial Governments, which it would be a very good thing to do" away with? The honorable member made a great point in proving that the land revenue would not be localized; and that should cause the honorable member for Parnell to vote for the Bill. The mainstay of that honorable gentleman's opposition to the Bill was, that it did not generalize the land revenue from all parts of the colony; but the honorable member for Caversham has declared that the Bill does generalize the land revenue, and each district will get an equal share of it; consequently, as that is what the honorable member for Parnell wants he should vote for the Bill. The honorable member for Caversham quoted from Mr. Godley's work, and I think the sentiment contained in the portion he read has been over and over again given expression to by Superintendents in this House, and it will be given expression to by them for all time should they continue to exist. They will never agree to the abolition of Provincial Legislatures. I would reply to other arguments of the honorable member who has last spoken, but they have been anticipated by honorable gentlemen who spoke earlier in the debate, and I will not take up the time of the House. There will be ample opportunity for discussing the Bill clause by clause in Committee, and I shall there give my best assistance in improving it. I call upon the honorable member for Caversham to give this House the assistance of his ability in making this measure as perfect as possible, so that we may not be open to the charge of passing an Act through which a coach-and-six may be driven. Since the honorable gentleman has come amongst us we shall be able to make our laws perfect. One thing the honorable member for Port Chalmers laid great stress upon was bis surprise that representatives from Otago should support this Bill, in consequence of the manner in which it distributed the land fund. I took occasion to ask the Government a question with regard to this matter. There is no question that the Bill is not perfectly clear on that point; but the assurance of the Government was that they would assent to any amendment that would make that matter as secure as it could be. I now challenge the honorable member for Caversham to prepare an amendment which will make this question more secure, and I believe the majority of members for the North Island will consent to it, and the Government will not oppose. It now rests with the honorable member for Caversham and the Government to make that matter right.

Mr. J. C. Brown.—Sir, it appears to me that, on this occasion, it is perhaps more necessary for me than for some honorable members to explain the reasons for the vote I intend to give upon this occasion. It will be recollected that, on the division which took place last session upon the proposals from which this Bill emanated, I voted with the minority. On this occasion I intend to support the second reading of the Bill: not that I approve of the Bill now before the House, but simply to affirm the principle that a change is desirable, and

looked forward to by the people. I expected, when the Government brought down the Bill containing proposals of such magnitude, that they would have included in it some reform of the Legislative Council, In making the few remarks I intend to offer on the other branch of the Legislature, I will not cast any reflections upon them, for I am one of those who believe that they have done very good service, and hare frequently checked hasty legislation, which would, I have no doubt, have had a very injurious effect upon the colony. I object to the nominee system, and think that all legislative bodies ought to be elected. I have a proposition to make, respecting the Legislative Council, which I hope will be acceptable to the Government. The nominee system may have done well in the past, but that is no guarantee that it will continue to do so in the future. The Council should be more of a representative character. When the Government wish to nominate persons to it, they invariably choose men who will support their proposals, and thus gentlemen have been brought from the Civil Service and foisted upon us as our rulers, with seats in Cabinet. We have had three cases of the kind since I have had the honor of having a seat in this House. Fortunately the gentlemen so nominated are men of known ability, and from what they have done in this Assembly they have proved that the selections of the Government were wise and good. That, however, is no security as against any future appointments. In all representative institutions, we should be ruled and governed by the representatives of the people, and not by the Civil Service, We have found in one case—and possibly it may be so in others—that, as soon as any danger threatens the Government of which, they are members, they find shelter and refuge in some snug appointment, which has been kept warm for them. The House will certainly agree with me that it is anything but desirable that honorable gentlemen occupying positions as nominee members of the Government should upon the Government being defeated, retreat into some snug corner, and be the recipients of large sums for life from the public purse. Sir, the present Premier, whom we all acknowledge to be, perhaps, the best administrator in the colony (I know tittle of him, but from the little I do know I admire him in every respect), had since I have been a member of this House to retire from his position in the Legislative Council, owing to the passing of the Disqualification Act, and go back into his quiet solitude. In the absence of Sir Julius Vogel—whom all acknowledge to be an able man—the Hon. Dr. Pollen was selected by his colleagues as the most fit to occupy the position of Premier. I do not wish it to be thought that I am speaking personally; but I believe, and the public thinks with me, that there ought to be a change. I think the Government would do well to bring down proposals by which the constitution of the Upper Mouse may be altered. We are almost on the eve of an election, and I know there are several Otago members who do not expect to be in the House next session. They know they will not be returned, however desirous they may be of coming back, but they have expectations for services rendered to the Government, and will urge their claims to be called to the upper House. It is in order to prevent anything of that kind coming to pass that I propose changes which I hope will be Acceptable. Whether the Government Accept the proposals Or not, the country wilt look upon this question with perhaps greater interest than even the question now before the House. If we are going to change our Constitution let us do something worthy of the name. In Victoria, as here, there are two legislative bodies. The Upper House is purely an elective body, and the number limited to thirty, In the Upper House in New Zealand there are at present forty-four, without any limit. I should like to see the number limited to thirty, and one-half of that number nominated as at present. The proposal I would make is not of a revolutionary character. When any vacancy occurs, it should be filled up by election, In 1869 there were forty-one members in the Upper House; at the present time the number is forty-four, and the number is going on increasing. During the last six years seventeen vacancies have occurred, and twenty members have been nominated by the Government. I think we should pass a Bill with the object of creating a Legislative Council half elected from the different provinces, say,—Otago, 4; Canterbury, 3; Nelson, 1; West Coast, 1; Wellington, 2; Hawke's Bay and Taranaki, 1; Auckland, 3. As each vacancy occurs it would be filled up by an elected member until fifteen were elected, and so formed one-half of the Legislative Council. This proposal would, I am sure, meet with the concurrence of members of the Upper House, as I know that many of them would much prefer to have a representative position, and would experience no difficulty in being elected. During tbis debate we have heard much from some honorable members about the maladministration, loose legislation, and wasteful expenditure of Provincial Governments, I would ask the House to consider by whom these charges are made. I know well the honorable gentlemen who have made these charges. I know their antecedents, and I know the positions they endeavoured to put themselves in. It appears to me that one of the reasons these charges have been made is this: that those honorable gentlemen have failed to find a constituency to return them to the Provincial Council. From my knowledge of those gentlemen, I am not surprised at their constituencies refusing to reelect them; I am not at all surprised at the action they have taken in Supporting this Bill. They took an active part in the recent Provincial Council elections in Otago, and were rejected by very large majorities. Their constituents took the first opportunity of sending those honorable gentlemen about their business. There are twelve members from Otago supporting this Bill; seven of them have been rejected by their present constituents at the late provincial elections. These members are known as the authors of Rejected Addresses. I challenge any of those honorable

members to deny the statement I am now making. If any one denies the accuracy of the statement, then I will give the names of the honorable gentlemen I allude to. It is these men who have misrepresented facts. The question has been brought before this House, have the Provincial Governments faithfully fulfilled the functions they were intended to fulfil? I believe to a certain extent they have. I have the honor of being a member of the Otago Provincial Council, and have represented the same district for over ten years. I have never received any emolumente, nor would I accept any, for services given in connection with the government of that province. I am sure I speak the views generally of my constituents upon this question. I have not communicated with them in any way in reference to this question. I know their wants and requirements, and I believe the action I intend to take will be satisfactory to the great majority. I would not take up the position I do upon this question unless I felt I was fully justified. Seeing that gross misstatements have been made in regard to the expenditure in the Province of Otago. I have gone carefully into the matter. It has given me a good deal of trouble, but it was a very pleasant duty indeed, because I have been able to arrive at facts which otherwise it would have been impossible for me to have obtained. I have taken the actual and proposed votes of expenditure of the Provincial Council of Otago for six years ending March 3rd, 1876, upon roads and works, immigration, and various other public matters; and I have also collated the receipts for the same period. The result of my labours has been this, and I challenge any honorable member to question the accuracy of the figures. The result is as follows:—

Gold Fields Expenditure During Six Years Ending 31st March,1876.£776,88l Roads and Works on Gold Fields, £1 17 10 per Head.—Dunstan Tuapeka Waikaia Wakatipu Mount Ida Gold Fields, 44,783 40,814 30,200 35,881 27,005 24,316Gold Fields Revenue, Assessments against Leases, Rents, Licenses, Miners' Rights, Fees, Fines, &c, Gold Duty Balance of Expenditure over Receipts£ 108,061 103,296Gold Fields Department Expenditure .. r202,998 46,752 211,357 38,393249,750 249,750

We have had charges made against the Provincial Governments that all the funds raised have been expended in the large centres of population; but I think the figures given in this return will meet those charges. With reference to the expenditure in the Taieri district, I may explain that the main road through that district is also a main road to the interior, and the expenditure upon it is therefore, to a great extent, for the benefit of up-country districts. With reference to the Tuapeka District, which I have had the honor of representing continuously for over ten years, it has been described as a pet district—a district that has received more than its fair share; but, on looking over the figures, I do not see any justification for the statement, I find that we have not received a fair share—not at all equal to our requirements, My remarks with respect to the Taieri district also apply to the Waikouaiti district, because a main road to the northern districts goes through it. The district of Port Chalmers, in addition to what is given to it as appears in those figures, has also had the advantage of a great deal of prison labour. The districts of Roslyn and Caversham have Road Boards, and consequently receive special subsidies, which make their receipts considerably larger. Of course, I am only showing the amount expended by the Provincial Government, and the proportion received by the various electoral districts. I think this return is useful in its way, and shows there has been no maladministration, and that the funds have been legitimately expended for the purposes for which they were intended. I am sorry I have not got a pamphlet which I have read, and which was published at Home, with the view of showing the advantages conferred on people who emigrated to Otago, and showing that all the money the first settlers paid in purchasing land came back to them in the shape of expenditure on roads, education, and so forth. We have expended the whole of our land revenue in Otago on public works, surveys, and departments. We have also, during the same period, expended for immigration, without any assistance from the General Government, the sum of £42,743; schools and public buildings, £82,887; education, £137,778; charitable institutions, benevolent asylums, hospitals, and lunatic asylums, £90,244. And, besides all this, we have paid a sum of £207,430 for interest on loans, and £169,047 for the maintenance of police and gaols. I simply quote these figures to show that provincial institutions, as far as Otago is concerned, have done good work. Of course I am aware that a cry has been raised against those institutions by some of the Otago members, who assert that the gold fields have not received a fair share of revenue, J think the figures I have read will dispel that illusion, and place the House and province in possession of facts which cannot be refuted. One of the Otago members, the member for Mount Ida, I think, made a strong point of the fact, or he put it forward as a fact, that a splendid piece of country in Otago, known as the Island Block, which ought to have been thrown open for settlement, had been turned into a sheep-walk, and that it remained a sheep-walk to this day. Why, Sir, the land to which the honorable member referred was put up to public auction, and every one who thought proper to bid for it had the opportunity to do so. I should not perhaps have taken much notice of the statement had it not been made by the honorable member who is familiar with the circumstances; but, Sir, the honorable member knew that he was stating what was untrue. He has gone over the ground as often as I have, and he must therefore be perfectly well aware that there has been as much as £10 an acre spent in fencing, ploughing, draining, and in otherwise improving that land. The owners of it have laid out so much money upon it that no land in Otago produces better crops; and can that be called a sheep-walk? However I did not, nor do I now, approve of the action of the then Government in disposing of this

land in the manner they did. Now, Sir, we have heard a great deal about provincial legislation. We have been told that this House can make much better laws for the government of the people than the provinces can. Well, I admit that we have had a good deal of what I may term ineffective legislation in the pro- vinces, but this House has been the barrier to useful legislation becoming effective. You, Sir, have taken part in the debates in the Provincial Council of Otago, and you must he aware of the obstruction the Council met with in their desire to set aside the lands of the province for settlement. We have sat in that Council and this chamber night after night, indeed I might say morning after morning, en-deavouring to frame resolutions ami pass land laws to facilitate settlement; and what was the result? After a great struggle we got what was called a compromise. And what was that compromise? It was a compromise of this nature : that those who had possession of the lands—the pastoral tenants—should keep as much as they Could; and that the people who wished to settle on the lands should have as little as possible. Then I am told that local matters could be better attended to in this House than in the Provincial Council. That I say, is not possible, because there is a combination in this Assembly which will prevent the people obtaining their rights, in respect of the lands at least. Now, let me come to the honorable member for the Dunstam He said that it was through the inaction of the Provincial Government of Otago that the gold duty was not abolished or reduced. To that statement I now give a denial. Session after session the Provincial Council passed resolutions on the subject, asking that this House would either abolish or reduce the gold duty. And what do we find? We find that, on every occasion upon which the subject of reduction came before this House, the Government sitting on those benches—I say the present Government, because though there have been changes in its *personnel* it is to all intents the same Government—voted to a man against it. They had no excuse for their action. The gold duty is not colonial revenue, although it is collected by the Colonial Government. It belongs to the province, and the province was desirous to reduce it; but this House prevented its reduction. In that matter the Government acted as obstructionists—they merely desired to conciliate their supporters, the opponents of liberal measures. Yet we are asked to intrust the management of our local affairs to gentlemen who so utterly disregard local opinion. When I look back upon such action as this, I do not feel surprised that provincial legislation was ineffective and rendered inoperative, because this House ignored it, as it ignored the wishes of Otago miners and their local Legislature in regard to the gold duty. The honorable member for Wanganui also referred to provincial legislation, and said it was the laughing-stock of the colony. It is easy to make assertions, but it is sometimes difficult to prove them. Now let us see if there is any truth in the statement that the provinces neglected local requirements, and passed useless legislation. I find that during the period extending from 1853 to 1875, a range of twenty-three years, the Provincial Council of Otago passed 562 Ordinances, or an average of twenty-four a year, These Ordinances dealt with purely local matters, They refer principally to the formation of district roads, loans for District Road Boards, road diversions, compulsory land-taking, counties, bush fires, cattle trespass, &c., birds protection, cemeteries, dog and goat nuisance tax, education, schools, hospitals; endowments, charitable, social, municipal; athenæums, management of reserves, fencing, ferries, impoundings, jetties, wharves, dock trusts, licensing auctioneers, hawkers, &c., Municipal Corporation loans and Town Boards, neglected children, town and country police, scab and sheep, thistle prevention, town lands, roads and streets, turnpikes, glebes, and a variety of other Ordinances. That, I think, is what may be called purely domestic legislation and such matters of detail are scarcely likely to receive proper attention here. Then in regard to these 562 Ordinances, we find that only 43 were disallowed by the Governor, 20 were not assented to, 3 were vetoed fay the Superintendent, and in the case of 2 no action was recorded. Nearly 500 of them became law. It has been said that these Provincial Ordinances are constantly requiring amendment, but I think if we come to the legislation of this House we shall find that nearly half the Acts we pass are amended Acts. Look at the number of these Acts we pass every year. How is it possible for any member to study them, and make himself acquainted with them? Out of these 562 Ordinances passed by the Provincial Council of Otago, only 81 are amending and 6 repealing Ordinances. That is the number of Ordinances passed by the Provincial Council in 23 years. In this Assembly we passed, during the six years from 1869 to 1874 inclusive, 510 Acts, or very nearly as many as were passed in 23 years by the Provincial Council of Otago, which expends fully one-third the amount of revenue this House has charge of, and which legislates for a population that is spread all Over the province and has many different requirements, Out of these 510 Acts passed by this House in the the time I have mentioned—and about 200 more came before us, and never reached the third reading—I find that 195 were amending and 8 repealing Acts, making a total of 203. This shows, or ought to show, the hasty legislation which is carried on in this Assembly. A great deal has been said of lobbying. Year after year proposals are made by honorable members to get something for their constituents—as in the case of the reduction of the gold duty, for instance. When that question was first brought up, we failed—I may say, miserably failed—to get what we wanted. To prove that, it is only necessary to look at the division which took place on that occasion: it was on 13th September, 1871, and the numbers in favour of the reduction were 14, and those against 52, or a majority of 38. On that division every member of the Government in the House at the time voted against the

reduction, although they had received from the Provincial Council of Otago resolutions in favour of the reduction. Well, Sir, when I set my mind upon any matter, I always endeavour, as far as I can, to carry it out successfully. I was determined that the duty on gold should be reduced, and in the next year, 1872, I convened a meeting of gold

Address by Sir Robert Stout

(Chancellor of the New Zealand University),

Delivered at the Annual Ceremonial and Presentation of Diplomas to Otago University Students, in Knox Church Sunday School Hall, Dunedin, on Friday, July 11, 1913.

(Reprinted from Otago Daily Times, Saturday, July 12, 1913.)

I must first congratulate not only those connected with the Otago University, but the Provincial district of Otago and South-land, that the good work begun in 1871. when the University opened, is still continued. This year the record, of honours obtained is high, and the fact that in the department of science it transcends that of other colleges shows that the Otago University is well equipped with teachers of science. One of the students has obtained the Rhodes Scholarship; and, it was, I may say, unanimously awarded. I am sure all of us wish every success and prosperity to Mr Miles, not doubting that he will uphold his own honour and the honour of the Otago University, and that he will be a credit to the dominion. And to those students who are leaving the halls of learning behind them and entering into those larger halls, the halls of the world, may I be permitted to convey the best wishes of all.

I hope, however, it is not necessary to impress on those who have entered upon what may be called the real struggle of life that we look to them not to forget the past. All University matters should ever remain of interest to them, They should consider that its management and its welfare are their concern in an especial manner. When the foundations of Scottish education were laid by John Knox and the other Johns, the relationship of the student to the community was emphasised. The wealthier men were to send their sons—if they had capacity—to the University, not for their own welfare, but that they might better serve the State. And surely that is the highest ideal of education—that every youth according to his capacity—and capacities vary—should be so trained that be might do the State some service. To each and every student the State is in fact calling: "I have need of thee." See that you obey the call. Is our education system, that has trained and helped you to be maintained and improved from time to time as circumstances require? Or, is it to be put in the "melting pot," as it is termed, by those who know little of us, or of our history? To some people a suggestion that we should alter our system is favourable if it comes from one abroad. In fact, I have in my mind's eve one enthusiast who, after a two weeks' stay in Wellington, thought our education system was out of joint, and that he could set it right. His knowledge of even our geography was scant; of our history he had but a modicum of knowledge; and he knew nothing of the institutions which he had not seen, but his courage was great. Happily in university matters we have been preserved from theological controversy. We have believed in the wisdom of the following words of an eminent Anglican divine, the Rev. J. C. R. Ewing. D.D.. LL.D., vice-chancellor of the Punjab University, and principal of the Formen Christian College, Lahore: "In a universitv open to all creeds the compulsory teaching of the tenets of any particular creed is neither desirable nor possible. ... The principle of non-intervention in religion renders it imperative that there should be no teaching of the tenets of any particular faith in these schools and colleges maintained and controlled by the Government."

It is not necessary that I should point out to you how some of the less-experienced and youthful professors have depreciated and defamed our University. They apparently do not understand that charges made against the University are grave reflections on the graduates and on the professors. An able educationalist said that the teachers make the university, and if its teaching institutions have failed to train and teach their students the blame rests on the teachers, and not on the examiners. It would not be edifying to pointedly refer to all the vapourings to which during the past few years one has had to listen.

The fact is that the present government both of our colleges and of our University is threatened. Can we depend upon [*unclear:* the] graduates of the Otago University to do their duty to their Alma Mater in this crisis? If they think that the professors ought to examine their own students—if they think that such a method of examination will really be a fair test, and one that will give confidence to the public—then let it be so resolved. We live in a democracy, and we must bow to the will of the people, and what will be best for them and their institutions. But let us all clearly understand what is meant by the proposed changes. The demand for change is not confined to the question of appointing the teachers as examiners. The professors are to rule. The Senate is to do nothing unless by leave of the professors. That is, so far as I can gather, the idea of the leading reformers, and is their objective. I hardly think that any citizen of self-respect would care for a seat on the Senate under such conditions.

Our present University is controlled by a representative body. That body is representative of the graduates, of the affiliated bodies, of the professors, and of the Government of the State. The State is represented by four, the professors by four, the graduates by eight, and the affiliated bodies by eight members. If the State, the professors, the graduates, and the affiliated institutions choose to elect none but professors, that can be done. The professors are under no disabilities—they are eligible to be chosen. As a matter of fact, out of 24 senators, nine are at present professors, there are two other members who have been on the University staff, two others distinguished secondary school teachers—one of these being now Inspector-generals of schools, and one is head of colleges, The "lay element," as it is termed, is, therefore, not in predominance. In comparison with the constitution of legislative bodies of newer universities, the system of our Universitv occupies no mean position. The Senate has never refused to consider any suggestions from professors. As a general rule it has never made a programme of studies or altered the existing programme without consulting the teachers of the subjects affected. Of course, it would he idle to ask of one who is merely an expert in mathemathics about the programme in classics, or to ask an expert in chemistry to criticise the requirements of a pass in mental and moral philosophy. Specialisation has to be recognised in education as in other things, and a conference of professors might be no more competent to draw up, for example, a programme of studies than a conference of laymen. The majority might be ignorant of the subject. A committee of the Senate has sent proposals for an alteration in the constitution of the University to the councils, the professorial boards, and the convocations for the districts. At present the Senate, the four councils, the four professorial boards, and the four district convocations constitute the University-governing bodies. There has not been a meeting of general convocation for some years—not since the four district convocations were constituted. The Senate is representative of all these bodies and of the Executive of the Dominion. This is to be continued, but it is proposed by scheme A to create the following new bodies—a Board of Studies, consisting of 26 members; and five Boards of Faculties (arts, science, law, medicine, technology). The faculties include all the professors and lecturers who are member of the professorial boards. In the Arts Faculty there will be about 30 members; and if any effective consideration is to be given to matters before them they must meet at least once a year. And the Board of Studies will, I suppose, meet once a year, and the Senate will meet at least once a year. Under these conditions some of the professors will need to be travelling a good deal. There will then be 20 bodies to deal with university education, and the professors will dominate 10 of these bodies, or no outsiders will be members of any one of the 10. Another proposal—Scheme B—is a senate, four councils, four professorial boards, and a conjoint professorial board, and eight boards of faculties and four con vocations of graduates—altogether 22 bodies.

Under both these system, all power is vested in the professors, for nothing can be done by the Senate regarding degrees, diplomas, scholarships, prizes, courses of study, examinations, or the appointment of examiners, etc., without a recommendation front the Board of Studies or the conjoint Professorial Board, or without referring the matter to them. Under Scheme B the graduates will have to welcome to their convocations the graduates of other universities recognised by the Senate when they have been six months on New Zealand, judges and stipendiary magistrates, mayors of boroughs, presidents of learned societies and who is to define a learned society?—members of Parliament, and of education boards, governing bodies of Secondary schools, chairmen of school committees, head masters of secondary schools and of primary schools above a certain grade, the Council of the Accountants' Society, presidents of law and medical societies, of agricultural and pastoral societies, and of chambers of commerce, and such other classes of persons as the Senate, with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, may from time to time determine! It would take up too much time to

detail to you other amendments suggested.

Why not frankly face the position? If the professors are to rule, have a constitution accordingly, instead of having 20 to 22 bodies to manage our University. Politicians often talk of the bi-cameral system, and some advocate a uni-cameral system. Or, if you view it from the University point of view, leaving out the affiliated bodies and their councils and their boards, we have dealing with University matters alone a Senate, a Convocation, a Board of Studies, or a Joint Professorial Board, and five to eight Boards of Faculties; this is, seven or 10 bodies to deal with purely University work. I do hope the graduates will in their convocations consider whether it would be an improvement to destroy our present University system, as would be done by handing it over to professors, excluding all extramural students, and making degrees obtainable by the grace of the professors. If the graduates decide for the reformers, then the dominion should not have to meet the expense and trouble of 20 or 22 bodies—for under Scheme B the councils as independent bodies will vanish,—and it would be better to have one chamber ruled by a constitution of professors exclusively.

The struggle in England during the past 50 years has been to get the older Universities placed under democratic control. Commission has followed commission, and committees of the Privy Council have framed statutes to liberalise their management. It is a pity that those who want the changes suggested in Schemes A and B had not been consulted. If we are to have a change in the constitution of our Universitv and its affiliated institutions it should be in the direction of more and not less popular election and control.

In an address I delivered in Christchurch I dealt with the question of external examinations, and explained that if the system proposed is introduced the State will have no guarantee that its highest educational system is efficiently conducted. We need independent examination to maintain the status of our University in the eyes of the public.

May I add one word in conclusion? I was one of the first, if not the first, to enter myself some 42 years ago as a student of Otago University. Who that was present then in what are called the Stock Exchange Buildings will ever forget the addresses of Macgregor, Sale, and Shand at the opening of the University and the enthusiasm of those days? Macgregor has passed away, but his memory is kept green by all his students. Sale happily is alive and in his native land, and may he live long! Those who were under him ever regard him with the highest respect. We hear now that the last of the three—Dr Shand—is to give up his work this year. He is present, and I know his nature; I therefore restrain myself. He does not ask and does not desire praise. But I know I am voicing the feelings of all those who have had the inestimable good fortune to be his students when I say that they wish him well, and they recognise his great services not only to them but also to education in this country. And in his retirement he has their esteem, their gratitude and their love. We all wish him many happy years of well-earned ease and rest.

Brotherhood A Vision of the Future. Address Delivered :By Sir Robert Stout, Chief Justice of New Zealand. In the Unitarian Free Church, On Sunday, June 3rd, 1917.

Address by Sir Robert Stout.

At an Empire Dav service held in the Unitarian Free Church last night an address, entitled "A Vision of the Future," was delivered by Sir Robert Stout (Chief Justice). Sir Robert said:—

"One of the oldest and most interesting of books of Hebrew literature is the book or the prophet Joel. He graphically details a great plague of locusts that afflicted his country, and he utilises it for the moral and religious instruction of his people. In stating what is to happen when the people direct their minds from their terrible trouble he says: I will follow Ewald's translation, 'Your old men will dream dreams, and your youths see visions." Is this to happen to us after our war troubles cease? It has been said without visions the people perish. On every occasion our old men should dream dreams and our youths see visions. What does the Phrase mean but keeping the ideal ever before us? Emerson says 'Hitch your wagon to a star.' Keep your ideals high. Let your outlook be vast and your views broad as the universe.

"We are surrounded by mysteries. Our lives are however, cast in pleasant places, wherever we dwell. We are [*unclear:* girt] round with the good, the beautiful and the true. What beautiful surroundings we have. The earth teems with beautiful obiects; there is ever the changing sea, the glorious sky with its orbs of light, the sun, the moon, the stars in all their loveliness. No one who has seen some star clusters through a telescope has ever seen anything more beautiful or glorious. To see Saturn hanging in its ring, what more beautiful? Then the trees, the flowers, the animals. All are, if we only have eyes to see, most beautiful Nevertheless all we can see on earth and sea and sky pale before the dreams and visions we may have. The poet sees often a light that never was seen on sea or land. And if we have the poet's imagination we may create a city ot beauty for exceeding the Golden City pictured in the book called the Revelation of St. John.

The Brotherhood of Man.

"What are some of our dreams and visions? There is one that has captivated the great men of the earth. It is the brotherhood of man. Kindness everywhere peace reigning war unknown, all struggling and working for all, and to tribe vexing another, and no man looking with unkindly eye on his neighbour. What a glorious vision! Is it any wonder that prophets nave foretold and poets pictured this gllorious vision? Do we realise its beauty or its grlory? I read the other day in a Wellington paper the report of a meeting called by the Church of England Men's Society to discuss: The present crisis and Christ's message of peace.' I wished to see what dreams or visions our fellow-citizens of the Anglican persuasion had, and this is what I read in the words of the only bishon or overseer who seems to have spoken: 'Bishop Sadlier proceeded to urge that the Church must become closer and more compact. It must be a body of spiritual mind. We shall never be strong as a church until we are smaller in number. The census figures alleged that a great mass of people belonged to the Church of England. The majority of those people appeared in actual fact to belong to no church until they were dead, when their relatives asked that a church burial service should be read over them. The Church of England was not benefited or helped by mere census members. He would like to see a clear cut line between the Church aud non-Christians. He would like to see the Church made a compact organised body containing only real members. When that was realised the Church could establish its own schools for its own children.' This does Lot look much like a vision of brotherhood. The goats and the sheep are to be divided and church schools are to be the mainstay of the vision.

"What church schools have meant to England I will call upon a former English president of the Board of Education—the Hon. Mr Pease—to state. I believe he is an orthorox Christian, He said: 'The defects of our so-called national system of education are in the main two. The first is that it is not national: the second is that it is not a system. On the one side we find our educational activities hampered by considerations some of them sectarian and some of them social—difficulties with denominations and difficulties of class feeling which have or have nothing to do with education at all. On the other side we find, at point after point, gaps and deficiencies which prevent us getting the full value of the education which does exist: there is in fact a back of co-ordination and of completenets in our educational system which I am convinced must be taken in hand if we are to avoid stagnation and reaction, and if we are to meet on fair terms our better educated foreign competitors,' It is surely very peculiar that the denominational system which has failed in England is to be introduced here. Will sectarian schools train our children to love one another? As to the value of theo-logical instruction in our primary schools we know what has happened in Ger- many The Government of Germany insisted on theological instruction being given to German boys and girls compul-sorily up to. I think, six hours a week, and the records of this war do not show the progress of love and brotherhood amongst the German people nor do they indicate that honesty or honour is revered. Further we may take the opinion of Hugh Miller as to the effect of theological education in Scottish Parochial Schools, He said;—"Though I now hear a good deal said, chiefly with a controversial bearing, about the excellent religious influence of our parochial seminaries. I never knew any one who owed other than the merest smattering of theological knowledge to these institutions, and not a single individual who had ever derived from them any tincture, even the slightest of religious feeling."

"It is not in the past the men who have wanted watertight compartments in our social life, a clear-cut line between a church party and a non-church party, that have won the lovo and admiration of the best of our race. Let me take two names, one a native of Palestine and one of India. Jesus Christ took his meals with publicans and sinners. He did not desire a clear-cut line between his apostles; and those who were not his followers. The High Priests of those days were shocked at his conduct, just as much shocked as Bishop Sadlier is at Church of England men fraternising with men not under the rule of his Church. There was, Buddha, who was careless of caste and who associated with all kinds and classes of his fellow people of India. Both of these great men went about preaching love and kindness, and they are revered to-day throughout the word. Mahomet, it is true, wished to have nothing Jo do with infidels—is his religion to be the dominant religion of the world?

"No your vision of things that are to be must be of a brotherhood of men, when all creeds and no creeds have equality in the eye of the law, and when no one separates from his neighbour and joins a close corporation or trade union because he does not see eye to eye in the mysteries of life. Let me quote the view of a French philosopher, a follower of Auguste Comte, M. Buisson, as to what freedom means. He said in 1902—(I translate it into English)—"Free thought is not a school, a church, a sect or a chapel. Free thought is open to all, it is open to all opinions, it is open to all countries, it is open to faith and to disbelief. If it had a lav pope he would be the most odious of all popes if that were possible. In the name of free thought let us demand that no opinion is suspected or privileged, that one can be an athiest without being treated as a scoundrel, and be a believer in God without being treated as a fool." That is the attitude of the man who has a vision of the

brotherhood of men.

The L.W.W. and Brotherhood.

"The coming of the brotherhood will bring about not only peace between different faiths religious and non-religious; it will give us peace in our social life. We will realise that no man can live for himself alone, but that he must so live and so act as to raise the ideals of life and so promote brotherhood. How is this vision to be accomplished? Can we help to bring about its realisation? The first step is that we should strive to have brotherhood among ourselves before we seek to promote brotherhood throughout the world. 'Civilise the heathen at home' was a message once delivered at a meeting to promote foreign missions, and it is very useful for us not to forget the duties we have to those who live near us. We must therefore raise the banner of brotherhood amongst ourselves. We have no doubt observed that some people who wish international understandings, who proclaim themselves desirous of peace, do not show many signs of brotherhood. For example, we have been told that in Australia there is an association. Called the I.W.W. This association is violently opposed to war. It denounces conscription, and it has not aided in voluntry enlistment. And yet it seeks to enforce its will on the people of Australia by force, by what is in fact civil war, sabotage, threats to assassinate, even in some cases by grave assaults. This conduct makes neither for peace nor for brotherhood. Even amongst ourselves have we not seen a few of our fellow-citizens who proclaim themselves lovers of peace resorting to strikes and to threats of civil war, to force their employers to give them the terms they ask. It may be that in some countries strikes are the only weapon that labourers have to force employers to give them their due. That is not our position. We have a judicial tribunal to determine labour disputes, and no honest man who is a lover of peace, and who proclaims himself an auti-conscription-ist and a conscientious objector to defend his country by fighting, can resort to strikes or other means that organised labour has sometimes adopted when there is a tribunal to settle disputes between employer and employed. If we love peace, if we are in favour of the brotherhood of men,. let us live in peace, and love as brothers our fellow-citizens. It is not honest to say we are for peace and brotherhood and to engnge in un-brotherly contests.

Class Feeling.

"We must do what we can to destroy class feeling. Unfortunately class feelings are found in all communities: in countries under despotic government, and also in countries under democratic rule. As the form of government, or the men composing the rulers of the Governments, change, so is one or other class-rule witnessed. We know what happened in the French Revolution, and we know a little of what is happening in Russia, Those in power often have no regard to the rights or freedom of those opposed to them. Such conduct indefinitely postpones the coming of brotherhood. In the conflict of Labour and Capital there is great need of lovo and brotherhood. I shall not attempt to apportion the blames. In my opinion both capitalists and Labourists are to blame. I believe that as yet the one way to end this much to be regretted conflict is to have the disputes between the two settled by judicial tribunals. We have attempted to do so, and it is much to be deplored that we have not as yet succeeded. But if we cun promote a growth of love and brotherhood, then the success of our Labour tribunals will be assured. No other possible fair remedy has been proposed. Another duty that lies on us is to be righteous and truthful. What will be the use of peace or brotherhood if honesty is not found in our midst and if no one can rely on our word or on our agreements or contracts? People who treat agreements as mere scraps of Paper, or who condemn agreements to Hades have not mastered the first duty of social life. They are barbarians and are not fit for human brotherhood, If a man agrees to work for another and does not do his work as well as he can, or if an employer thinks and acts as if only his own interest was involved, then the one who so acts has not realised what brotherhood means.

Self-Sacrifice Wanted.

"The next step in trying to get the vision of peace and brotherhood realised is to show self-sacrifice for our fellows and to engage in the service of men. We may do this in many ways. Let me give one or two examples. We know-that the supply of food in our Mother Country is short and that it may be short here. Commonsense and justice not to mention love and brotherhood require that there shall be no waste of food. Do we all husband our food products? We know that in order to obtain alcohol much food has to be wasted; barley, rice, sugar and other foods are used in its manufacture. The waste of food and labour is very great In this Dominion alone

between three and four millions of pounds is spent in one year on alcohol. What would not that money do to help the poor and the sick? What would it not accomplish in making our social life more joyous and on a higher plane And if we remember that this is not only mere waste but that the use of alcohol degrades man-kind, that hundreds of our people are every year injured by its use and that its victims are found in our gaols, in our hospitals, both mental and general, and in our benevolent asylums, can we in permitting this waste to continue be said to be inspired with brotherhood? We cannot at times walk through our streets without seeing many of our valiant soldiers under the influence of drink. It is true that, by prohibiting 'shouting' this evil has been lessened, but it is not yet ended. Owen Seaman has written some verses that should appeal to us on this point:

He came obedient to the call;
He might have shirked like half his mates
Who, while their comrades fight and fall,
Still go to swell the football gates.

And you a natriot in your prime.
You waved a flag above his head.
And hoped he'd have a high old time.
And slapped him on the back and said;

"You'll show em what we British are!
Give us your hand, old pal to shake":
And took him round from bar to bar.
And made him drunk—for England's sake.

That's how you helped him, Yesterday.
Clear-eyed and earnest, keen and hard.
He held himself the soldier's way—
And now they've got him under guard.

That doesn't hurt you; you're all right:
Your easy conscience takes no blame:
But he, poor boy, with morning's light,
He eats his heart out, sick with shame.

What's that to von? You understand
Nothing of-all his bitter pain :
You have no regiment to brand:
You have no uniform to stain;

No vow of service to abuse.
No pledge to King and country due;
But he had something dear to lose,
And he has lost it—thanks to you.

If we have a vision of the brotherhood of man let us begin to make a brotherhood in New Zealand possible,

and if we are influenced and inspired by love of our country and its people alcohol must go.

"We must not confine our outlook to ourselves, We must think of humanity. How can we hope to see peace in the world? If we can show a community in which peace dwells, where all our disputes are settled by judicial tribunals, where revolt or warfare of any kind is unknown, that will be of advantage to the world. It would prove the possibility of peace. But we must go further. We must show kindness to those not of our own family, of our own hapu or tribe or nation. Love cannot be confined to even race or nationality. We have in the past helped those we were in distress though they were not of our nationality. We sent gifts to the Italians when many were sorely injured through earthquakes, and we have aided Chinese when floods devastated part of their country. And have not some of your sons and daughters gone forth to civilise the world? We remember the touching story told in Palestine nearly 2000 years ago, how a certain man who started on a journey from Jerusalem to Jericho fell among thieves, how the heretical and unpopular Samaritan bound up his wounds and acted towards him as a brother when the priest and the Levite passed on the other side and gave him no assistance, and we know what one Jesus christ thought of the one who acted the part of the brother. We have often remembered his injunction, 'Go thou and do likewise." We have helped the ruthlessly treated Belgians, the Serbians, the Roumanians and the Poles. But some of our people stop at such nelp. An American in a very interesting speech I lately read has asked whether it is not our first duty to rid the road from Jerusalem to Jericho of the thieves. Now that is the international problem that faces us in dealing with the brotherhood of man : Have we a duty to make the road between Jerusalem and Jericho safe? How can that be brought about? That goes to the root of the question, and so many people calling themselves pacifists decline to face it.

A League for Peace.

"Well, it has been faced and the only adequate and seemingly possible solution is to unite the nations in a league to enforce peace. Just as behind our peacable, judicial tribunals there stand the policeman, and if necessary the military to enforce peace, there must stand armed force at first to enforce the League of Peace, The time may come when the calling in of armed force will be as rare as the calling in of armed force to carry out the decrees of our local tribunals. The proposals are as follows:—First: All justiciable Questions arising between the signatory powers, not settled by negotiation shall, subject to the limitations of treaties, be submitted to a judicial tribunal for hearing and judgment, both upon the merits and upon any issue as to its jurisdiction of the question, second : All other questions arising between the signatories and not settled by negotiation, shall be submitted to a council of conciliation for hearing, consideration and recommendation. Third : The signatory powers shall jointly use forth with both their economic and military forces against any one of their number that goes to war, or commits acts of hostility against another of the signatories before any question arising shall be submitted as provided in the foregoing. The following interpretation of Article Three has been authorised by the Executive Committee : The signatory powers shall jointly use, forth with, their economic forces against any of their number that refuses to submit any question which arises to an international judicial tribunal or council of conciliation before issuing an ultimatum or threatening war. They shall follow this by the joint use of their military forces against that nation if it actually proceeds to make war or invades another's territory, Fourth : Conferences between the signatory powers shall be held from time to time to formulate and codify rules of international law, which, unless some signatory shall signify its dissent within a stated period, shall thereafter govern in the decision of the Judicial Tribunal mentioned in Article One.

Here then is a move forward towards peace, and just as armed men in the past have been necessary to uphold freedom and righteousness, which could never have been upheld by men who talk peace and do nothing to enforce it, so this League of Nations may be able to bring nearer to us that vision of brotherhood and peace for which the world has longed and has waited. That it is necessary to have some sanction such as armed force behind any league, or treaty, or agreement between nations so that peace may be maintained is now recognised by statesmen and political philosophers all over the world. We have as I have pointed out the policeman or military behind our courts that maintain the peace in nations and civilised communities. In a speech made some time ago. M. Briand, the eminent French Socialist and Statesman, has pointed out how peace may, nay must come. He said;—"Peace will come out of the victories of the Allies. It can only come out of our victories, peace must not be an empty formula: it must be based upon international rights guaranteed by 'sanctions' against which no nation can take a stand. Such peace will shed a radiance upon humanity; it will bring security for those who work, and will be evolved according to their own genius: our hands will never again be stained with blood. It is this ideal which makes the grandeur of our task. It is in the name of this ideal that our soldiers fight, and give themselves so valiantly to death; it is in the name of this ideal that mothers, wives, daughters, sisters—mourning—force back their tears knowing that a sacrifice of a son or husband, father, or brother, will not have been in vain for the country and for humanity. This is the only peace towards which we must work. It

is by this peace that our nation will grow in nobility and beauty,"

True Brotherhood.

"And I do not know why around this scheme of peace and brotherhood there should not be entwined the highest religious sentiment, higher far than the veneration we have for what has happened in the past. Are We optimists or pessimists? Do we believe with Lewis Morris:

'We are part of an Infinite Scheme,
All we that are;
Man the high crest and crown of things that be.
The fiery-hearted earth, the cold unfathomed sea,
The central, sun the intermittent star.
Things great; and small,
We are but parts of the Eternal All;
We live not in a barren, baseless dream;
No endless, ineffectual chain
Of chance successions launched in vain,
But every beat of Time,
Each sun that shines or falls to shine.
Each animate life that comes to throb or cease,
Each life of herb or tree
Which springs aloft and then has ceased to be
Each change of strife and peace.
Each soaring thought sublime,
Each deed of wrong and blood.
Each impulse towards an unattained good,—
All with a sure, unfaltering working tend
To one Ineffable. Beatific End.'

"If we do, then we will be inspired to go forward scattering seeds of knowledge, and seeds of kindness by the way, and working all we can in the service of man to hasten the day when, as Thomas Paine pictured, we should see countries in the world of which it could be said: 'My poor are happy; neither ignorance nor distress is to be found among them; my jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars; the aged are not in want, the taxes are not oppressive: the rational world is my friend, because I am a friend of its happiness.' When that day arrives true Brotherhood will be seen in operation; for Love will have conquered Hate, and Kindness will huve banished Force. The vision will have been realised. The millennium has come for 'all men's good.' has become 'each man's rule, and Universal Peace

"Lies like a shaft of light across the land,
"And like a lane of beams athwart the sea."

May I say:—

"My vision was of shadows thrown before
Coming events things that shall surely be
Nor now delayed, but until man, no more
Wholly on blinding last intent shall see—
That his own interest and his kind's are one
Blended in individual destiny.' "

vignette
"N.Z. Times" Co., Ltd.. Print.
Front Cover

Church of England Reserve at Porirua for Educational Purposes. Statement By the Trustees and Judgments of the Supreme Court. Wellington N.Z. TURNBULL, HLCKSON & PALMER, GENERAL PRINTERS JERVOIS QUAY. 1900.

Porirua College Crust.

I.—History.

The Porirua College Estate consists of 500 acres of rough undulating ground situated at Witireia, which is the north extremity of a slip of land forming the west arm of Porirua Harbour. Here stood in 1848 the principal pah of the Ngatitoa tribe, which at that time numbered nearly 1000 persons, most of whom were settled in this district. Two young chiefs of the tribe, Matene Te Whiwi and Tamihana Te Rauparaha, had studied at St. John's College, Auckland, where, in accordance with the charter, English and Maoris were educated together. Desiring that a similar institution should be established near their own home, which should serve as a centre of education for the southern part of the Island, they and other chiefs made a proposal to Bishop Selwyn. They offered, and he accepted, a piece of land as a site for a "College for the English and Native youth, to be brought up together in the new principles of obedience to the Queen, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ," (See Tucker's Life of Selwyn, Vol. II., p. 342). In August, 1848, they wrote as follows to the Governor of New Zealand:—

Otaki,

16th August, 1848.

"Friend, Governor Grey,

"Greeting. It is a perfect consenting on our part that Witireia shall be given up to the Bishop for a College. We give it up, not merely as a place for the Bishop for the time being, but in continuation for those Bishops who shall follow and fill up his place, to the end that religion or faith in Christ may grow, and that it may be, as it were, a shelter against uncertain storms-that is, against the evils of this world. This is the full and final giving up of that place as a College for the Bishops of the Church of England,"

(Signed by
Te Rauparaha,
Tamihana Te Rauparaha,
Matene Te Whiwi
and five others,)

In reply to this the following minute was written:—

"Acknowledge this, and say that I shall have much pleasure in sanctioning this giving up a portion of their reserves at Porirua for the benevolent and useful purpose of founding a College, and that I will communicate their offer to the Lord Bishop,

"Such laudable and generous conduct will be made known in England, and cannot fail of insuring the commendation of all good men; and the Queen will rejoice in seeing her Maori subjects setting go good an example to the Europeans.

"When they wish, I will send out a surveyor that they may indicate the quantity and boundaries of the land they wish to transfer to the Bishop, that a plan may be made, and the arrangement completed.

"E. EYRE,

"7th October,

Lieut.-Governor.

Two years later a grant from the Crown was issued to the Lord Bishop of New Zealand, It recited:—

"Whereas a school is about to be established at Porirua under the superintendence of the Right Reverend George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons, being inhabitants of Islands in the Pacific Ocean. And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same, which piece or parcel

of land has by a Deed from the Natives been ceded for the support of the same school," and expressed the Trust as follows:—

"To hold unto the said George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, and his successors, in trust nevertheless to and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school, so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

It is plain that the land thus made over to Bishop Selwyn was intended to be a site, and to serve as an endowment, for a school or college to be used primarily by English and Maoris, but also by Her Majesty's subjects of all races, and by poor inhabitants of islands in the Pacific which did not belong to the Crown; that it was to be under the control of the Bishops of the Church of England in this Colony, and that emphasis was laid on religious teaching.

Bishop Selwyn on the 24th August, 1859, in pursuance of "The Bishop of New Zealand's Trust Act, 1858," transferred the Trust to the General Synod "of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, commonly called the Church of England," which has since that time appointed Trustees and required reports from them.

Attempts were made to raise funds to erect and maintain the College, but failed. The Bishop himself contributed £200 which was expended on clearing the land and carrying a fence from the harbour to the sea coast. But the College was never built. The land was leased but the rental was small. From 1853 to 1865 it did not amount to more than *£50*; until 1882 it was £75; until 1889, £100; until 1896, £150; it is now £200.

From 1865 to 1874 grants were made from the accumulated rents for the education of Maori boys and girls at an Industrial School at Otaki, distant forty miles from Witireia. With this exception, the whole of the rents before and after that period have been invested. The amount which has thus accumulated was on the 30th June, 1897, £6,480 18s. 4d.

The Trustees have carefully husbanded the fund in the hope that a time might come when it would be possible for them to fulfil the Trust in spirit if not in letter. Witireia has now become an obviously unsuitable place for a school. It is near no Settlement whence supplies could be obtained for a boarding school, and there are too few persons inhabiting the district to make it advisable to build a day school. The Ngatitoa tribe has dwindled, if it has not entirely disappeared; twenty years ago it numbered less than forty persons, who were scattered over the North Island.

In 1895 the Trustees sought advice. Was it absolutely necessary according to the terms of the Trust, that the College should be built at Witireia? When this question was answered in the affirmative, it was decided to ask for direction from the General Synod at its next session in February, 1898. The Synod considered the matter very carefully. They held that £6,000 of capital together with the annual rental was a small sum where-with to erect and maintain a College. Further, it seemed to them that although the Crown Grant recites that children "of all races" were to be benefitted by the Trust, yet inasmuch as the income has been derived from a gift of the Maoris, it was fair that the children of that race should receive the advantages. The Synod accordingly directed that application should be made at once to the Supreme Court for power to expend the net rents and profits arising from the said Trust, and the net income of the fund, representing accumulated rentals and interest in the following manner, viz:—

"In the provision of exhibitions, enabling the children of parents residing in the provincial District of Wellington to be educated free of cost, at such schools of, or belonging to the Church of England, and situate in any part of New Zealand, as the Trustees shall select,

"Provided—

- —That such children shall receive religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language.
- —That in awarding such exhibitions, preference shall always be given to Maori applicants.
- —That Maori children who are unable to receive primary education shall not be debarred from the benefit of the exhibitions.
- —That scholars attending Government schools, whether for Europeans or Maoris, shall not become qualified to obtain exhibitions until they have passed the fourth standard.
- —That the General Synod shall have power to make Rules and Regulations, not inconsistent with any foregoing portion of this Resolution, under, and subject to which the exhibitions shall be awarded,"

In July, 1898, the Trustees petitioned the Supreme Court that the Trusts might be varied in the manner above mentioned and the application was opposed by the Government on the ground that it was their intention to introduce legislation dealing with all Maori School Reserves. The hearing was then adjourned and nothing further was done until after the Session then commencing.

On the 25th November, 1898, as the Session had not been availed of by the Government, the Trustees commenced proceedings by writ in the Supreme Court, making the Solicitor-General Defendant, The above was the scheme submitted by the Trustees for adoption by the Supreme Court. The Solicitor- General, on behalf

of the Government, filed a counter-scheme as follows:—

II.—Scheme Filed by Solicitor-General.

- The said land, and the rents, issues, and profits thereof shall be held and administered by Trustees appointed by the General Synod in trust to provide instruction and industrial training for members of the Maori race in manner hereinafter provided.
  The Trustees in office, being the plaintiffs, shall continue in office until the appointment of their successor by the General Synod.
- Of the accumulated rents, issues and profits now in the hands of the Trustees, five thousand pounds shall be deemed to be capital and shall be invested upon such securities as, with the approval of the General Synod, the Trustees think fit.
- The residue of the said accumulated rents issues and profits amounting to one thousand four hundred and eighty pounds or thereabouts as also the future rents issues and profits arising from the said land and from the investments of the said capital shall be deemed to be income.
- The Trustees shall out of the net income available after payment of all proper expenses connected with the administration of the trust property establish equip and maintain a school at Otaki or at such other suitable place within the Provincial District of Wellington as is selected by the General Synod and approved of by the Governor in Council in which school industrial training shall form an especial feature of the education therein.
- The school shall be maintained for the instruction and industrial training of members of the Maori race (including their half-caste descendants.
- The cost of establishing and equipping the school shall not exceed one thousand pounds and the annual cost of its maintenance shall not exceed four hundred pounds.
- The residue of the net income shall be applied in granting scholarships for the purpose of enabling Maori students from the school to attend classes in science at the Victoria College or such other institution providing the higher industrial training, as, with the approval of the Governor in Council, the General Synod appoints.
- The value, tenure, terms and conditions of the scholarships shall be such are fixed by regulations to be made by the General Synod.
- No religious test shall be imposed in respect of either the teachers or pupils or of the persons obtaining scholarships and in every case a preference shall as far as practicable be given to members of the Ngatitoa Tribe (being the original donors of the said land) and to Maoris resident within the Provincial District of Wellington.
- If the school is not duly established and equipped before the first day of June one thousand nine hundred the Trustees shall thereafter and until it is duly established and equipped pay over to the Education Board of the Wellington District out of net income sums at the rate of four hundred pounds per year by equal quarterly instalments, and the said Board shall apply the same in providing instruction and industrial training for Maoris in such manner as it thinks fit.
- The Government Audit office shall be the auditor of the Trustees and shall have the same powers and duties in respect of the moneys and accounts of the Trustees, and of every person dealing therewith, as if the Trustees were a local authority within the meaning of section six of "The Public Revenues Act, 1892."
- Within twenty-one days after the close of each financial year ending the thirty-first day of March, the Trustees shall cause to be prepared and submitted to the said Audit office a statement of accounts showing:—
  The total receipts and disbursements for the year; and also
  Such other particulars as are from time to time prescribed by regulations as herein provided.
- Such statement shall be audited by the said Audit office within twenty-one days after receipt thereof, and shall, together with the certificate of the Audit office and a general report of the position of the trust property and the work of the school, be forwarded by the Trustees to the Native Minister within sixty days after the close of such year, to be by him laid before both Houses of the General Assembly if Parliament is sitting, or if not, then within ten days after the commencement of the next session thereof.
- The Trustees shall also cause a copy of such statement certificate aud report to be submitted to the then next ensuing meeting of the General Synod.
- The General Synod may from time to time make regulations for any of the following purposes:—
  The appointment of Trustees, their term of office, and the events on the happening of which they shall cease to hold office;

- The powers, duties, and functions of the Trustees;
- Any other purpose for which regulations are contemplated or required by this Scheme.

Provided that they shall not come into operation unless and until they have been approved by the Governor-in-Council.

The case in due course came on for argument (Mr. Quick and Mr. Tolhurst on behalf of the Trustees, and Sir Robert Stout and Mr, Gully on behalf of Defendant the Solicitor-General) the Judge being Sir James Prendergast, the late Chief Justice.

On the 19th May, 1899, judgment was delivered by which it will be seen that neither scheme was adopted but important law points were disposed of, and leave was reserved to the Plaintiffs to apply again.

The following is a copy of the judgment. The italics of course are not in the original.

III—Judgment.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND, Wellington District.
THE BISHOP OF WELLINGTON *v.* THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.

THIS is an action brought by the Plaintiffs alleging themselves to be the present Trustees of 500 acres of land at Porirua, granted by the Crown in 1850 to the Bishop of New Zealand and his successors in trust for the use and maintenance of a School mentioned in the recital to the Grant so long as religious education, industrial training and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth "educated therein or maintained thereat." The Grant recites that a school is about to be established at Porirua under the superintendence of the Right Reverend George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of subjects of the Queen of all races and of children of other poor and destitute persons inhabitants of Islands in the Pacific Ocean. It also recites that it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece of land in the neighbourhood thereof (that is of the intended school) for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same and that the land had by deed from the Natives been coded for the support of the said school.

It appears doubtful whether a school answering at all to the proposed school as described in the recital to the Grant was ever established. It would appear that many years ago a schoolmaster was placed at Porirua for the Natives by the Bishop but was not long maintained there, the reason being that the attendance of Maori children was irregular and the number small. Whether this was before the grant or after does not appear. At any rate for very many years the land has been let at a rent—the accumulation of rents received and invested amounts to £6,480. The Plaintiffs allege that the accumulated fund and the 500 acres of land let at £200 a year are insufficient to establish and carry on such a school as is contemplated by the trusts in the Grant: but that the principal obstacle to the proper maintenance of such a school is the small number of Maori children residing in the neighbourhood.

The Trustees therefore desire to obtain from this Court its sanction to a modification of the trusts and to that end ask that a scheme they propose be adopted; the principal feature of that scheme is that instead of a school being established and maintained either at Porirua or elsewhere the accumulated funds and the rents in the future be applied in granting Exhibitions to Maoris and others to be held at one or other of several existing schools connected with the Church of England and in which there is, as alleged, some technical instruction and instruction in English.

The Solicitor-General is made defendant to this action.

In the defence filed in his name he contends that the endowment reverts to the Crown.

At the argument Counsel for the Solicitor-General applied to amend the defence by raising the question as to the validity of the Grant. I refused the application; it was contended, however, that without the amendment the question was raised in the case. I thought It was not and so decided. It is true that no Statute or Ordinance or provision in any Governor's instructions could be mentioned authorising the Grant, but it seemed to me that such a question could not be raised in a defence to a suit notwithstanding that the Solicitor-General was the Defendant.

As to the question of reverter to the Crown the terms of the grant do certainly raise a considerable doubt whether a general intention of charity is shown so as that the doctrine of my *Pres* could be applied if there was a failure of the particular object. It is to be observed that the terms of the grant are that the gift is for the use &c. of the school "so long as "religious education etc. shall be given to the youth educated and maintained thereat. The Grant is not in terms for the use etc. of a school or the specified school at which religious education shall be given: and the question is whether either because the specified school never did comply with the requirements of the gift or if it ever did that it has long ceased to exist at all, and therefore the gift has reverted to the Crown, the real donor. In Attorney-General v. Pyle 1 Atk 435 the case was that A devized a freehold

messuage at a place to the Charity School there and directed the rents and profits to be applied for the benefit of the said school "so long as it shall continue to be endowed with charity" and the Lord Chancellor Hardwicke observed that "where a sum of money is given to a charity so long as it shall continue to be endowed with charity, it is only given quousque and when it ceases, if it is a gift of real estate it shall fall into the inheritance for the benefit of the heir, if personal into the residuum," *1 do not think however that the true construction of the Grant is that if the particular charity—a school at Porirua was not established, but a school was established somewhere else in the same District, and in all other respects carrying out the objects of the charity that the gift would fail and the land revert. I think that it may be inferred that the general object was charitable—a school for the religious education and industrial training of children of youth especially of youth of the Maorirrce If therefore it hud been made to appear that a school of the description found in the Grant could not reasonably in the altered circumstances of the Colony and the Maori people be established I should have concluded that a case had been made out for the application of the doctrine of Cy-Pres and that a scheme should be adopted for the future*. Upon the evidence at present adduced I am not satisfied that a school corresponding with the description found in the Grant cannot now be established and carried on with advantage to the community. *It seems to me clear that the Trustees are right in their objection to the scheme proposed by the Solicitor-General. An object (I am inclined to think the* principal *object) undoubtedly was that there should be" religious "education, and that as the Bishop of the Church of England was the Trustee, the intention was that the religious education should at any rate be of such a character as he could approve of.* I do not at all infer that the School was intended to be confined to persons professing to be members of the Church of England. If in the end it should appear that there has been such a change in circumstances that the Court finds it permissible to adopt a scheme authorising some change in the mode of carrying out the intention such scheme might provide with regard to the religious instruction to he given. I *cannot however doubt that the intention was to endow a Church of England School;* but nevertheless a school open to others: this was effected in the scheme approved of in A.G. *v.* Clifton 32 Beavan 596 a case cited by Sir R. Stout, and in many other cases. I understand but do not approve of the leading idea of the scheme produced by the plaintiffs—the Trustees, The notion is that primary education is sufficiently provided for by the State and that it would not be a wise application of the funds of the charity to apply them in providing for teaching what is as efficiently taught at the common schools; but I do not think that it would be a proper appiication of the funds of the charity to expend them in the maintenance of youths at a Church of England Grammar School though there might be some slight instruction in some mechanical art there obtainable. *I think that what is necessary is a training school for children of both sexes of the poorer class—of such children who have progressed to some substantial extent at the common schools or their equivalent, and are then prepared to take full advantage of some industrial training either, for instance, in farming operations or farming and some other art or arts*. To carry out this idea the charity would have to be to some extent modified, for it would not be necessary to make instruction in English a principal feature.

At any rate I am not satisfied that with an endowment equal to ten thousand pounds a very useful school cannot be established and maintained in this District capable of training a sufficient number of young people in some industrial art, sufficient in number to make the school economically a wise application of the funds.

I therefore decline to adopt either of the schemes proposed and reserve the matter for further consideration *if then it is made manifest more certainly than I think it has at present that the idea of a school at Porirua should be abandoned and that some modification of the charity is necessary then a new scheme can be proposed and dealt with*.

The next step taken by the Trustee was to file a fresh scheme.

There are two Reserves held by Trustees on the same Trusts as the Porirua Reserve, excepting that they are for the benefit of a College to be erected in the Wairarapa Valley. The law points decided by Sir James Prendergast, C.J., equally apply to the Crown Grants of these two Reserves. Moneys had also been accumulated from rents and investments appertaining to them, but (as in the Porirua case) not sufficient to permit of the Trustees erecting a College and maintaining students, They have however purchased a farm of 120 acres with buildings suitable for such a College or school as is contemplated by the above judgment.

The Plaintiffs (some of whom are Trustees common to both sets of Trusts) considered that if they could strengthen their evidence and convince the Court of the impossibility of carrying out their Trusts at Porirua a scheme which provided for the appropriation of the revenues to maintaining scholars at the Wairarapa institution would be as nearly as possible in accord with the Trusts of the different Grants.

The Trustees of the Wairarapa Reserves gave their consent and the Plaintiffs filed the following amended scheme.

IV.—Amended Scheme for the Application of

Rents

Accruing from a piece of land, comprised in a Crown grant dated the 28th day of December, 1830, to George Augustus Bishop of New Zealand of a piece of land granted for the endowment of a School at Porirua and also for the application of the interest accruing from the investment of such rents.

That the Trustees of the said land be empowered to expend the net rent and profits arising from the said land and the net income of the fund representing accumulated rentals and interest in the following manner:—

- To assist in the maintenance of an Institution about to be erected in the Wairarapa Valley by Trustees consisting of the said Frederic Wallis, Thomas Fancourt, Edward William Lowe, John Elisha Smith, William Henry Quick and George Edmeades Tolhurst, in whom are vested certain lands in the Wairarapa District, originally granted to the Right Reverend George Augustus Lord Bishop of New Zealand by two Crown Grants, bearing date respectively the 14th day of June, 1853, which lands were granted for the purpose of the use maintenance and support of a College to be established in the Wairarapa Valley "so long as Religious Education, Industrial Training and Instruction in the English Language should be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat, being subjects of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen of all races and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of Islands in the Pacific Ocean" (provided such Institutions be conducted in accordance with the Trusts of the said Grants and that youths of the Maori Race be preferred for admission thereat
- That the General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand commonly called the Church of England, or by its consent the Diocesan Synod of the Diocese of Wellington or its Standing Committee, shall have power to make rules and regulations not inconsistent with the foregoing portion of this scheme under and subject to which the same shall be carried out.

This scheme was submitted to the Court and Counsel were heard by Sir Robert Stout C.J. and Mr. Justice Edwards. As before the Government opposed but on this occasion did not produce an alternative scheme.

The result of the application will be gleaned from the following judgment:—

WALLIS AND OTHERS *V.* THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL. Hearing

16th August.

Judgment

7th September, 1900.

MR. QUICK for the Plaintiffs. MR. GULLY for the Solicitor-General.

In this case the Plaintiffs have since the matter was before the Court, on 19th May, 1899, submitted a fresh scheme to the Court differing in some respects from the scheme that was filed on the 25th November, 1898.

In the amended scheme they ask that the Trustees be empowered to expend the net rent and profits arising from the land and the net income of the Fund representing accumulated rentals and interest in the assisting in the maintenance of an Institute about to be erected in the Wairarapa Valley. This new institution is to be for the religious education and industrial training and instruction in the English language of youths being subjects of Her Majesty, youths of the Maori race being preferred. The General Synod of the Church of the Province of New Zealand commonly called the Church of England or by its consent the Diocesan Synod of the Diocese of Wellington or its Standing Committee is to have power to make rules and regulations to carry out the scheme.

The objections that were urged by the Counsel for the Solicitor-General were the same as those urged before the Court last year and on which a decision was given on the 19th of May, 1899.

This Court is bound by its previous decision and what has now to be considered is (1) Whether it has been shown that the Trust can be carried out in its entirety and (2) If not whether the scheme submitted should be approved.

The evidence is conclusive that it would be a waste of the Trust moneys to erect a school on the Reserve and if such a school were started there it would fail to fulfil the purposes of the Trust.

The scheme proposed seems to us to go beyond what is necessary in utilising the Trust, It practically proposes to absorb the Trust Moneys for the support of a similar institution in the Wairarapa. The Trust may be carried out without allowing the absorption,

If the scheme were amended so as to provide:—

- For the maintenance of such a number of scholars in the Wairarapa Institution as the rentals and income would permit—a fair sum being charged for maintenance and education.
- That preference should be given to children belonging to the Ngatitoa tribe, failing them preference to

children of the West Coast tribes.

- That the proposed system of education be approved, as appears in the original Trust.
- That no youth be refused a scholarship on the ground of religious belief—no religious test whatever being applied to the the applicants the Court would be prepared to approve of it.

It was urged by Counsel for the Solicitor-General that the Government intended to introduce into Parliament a measure dealing with this and similar Trusts. The Court is aware that there are several Trusts similar to this one and held by various Church organisations. The approval of such a scheme as is here suggested cannot in any way hamper either the Government or the Parliament in dealing with this Trustor the Trusts referred to.

The costs of these proceedings if a scheme such as has been suggested is carried out will be paid out of the income of the Trust.

This Judgment has been approved of by the Plaintiffs who are prepared to act upon it.

vignette

Proceedings in the Court of Appeal of New Zealand With reference to comments made upon that Court by the JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL In the case of Wallis and Others, *Appellants*, and His Majesty'S Solicitor-General for the Colony of New Zealand, *Respondent*. Together with the Judgments of the Court of Appeal and the Privy Council in the same Case. Dunedin N.Z. THE EVENING STAR CO., LTD. BOND AND CRAWFORD STREETS. 1903.

Proceedings in the Court of Appeal of New Zealand
With reference to comments made upon that Court by the JUDICIAL COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL
In the case of Wallis and Others, *Appellants*, and His Majesty's Solicitor-General for the Colony of New Zealand, *Respondent*.
Together with the Judgments of the Court of Appeal and the Privy Council in the same Case.

Table of Contents.

Proceedings in the Court of Appeal.

AT an adjourned sitting of the Court of Appeal of New Zealand, held at Wellington on Saturday, the 25th of April, 1903, at which Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G., Chief Justice, and Mr. Justice Edwards were present, the Chief Justice indicated that he had something to say regarding the recent judgment of the Privy Council in the Porirua Case. What he was about to read had been prepared before he saw the protest on the same subject prepared by Mr. Justice Williams. His Honour proceeded to read as follows:—

IN the judgment in a recent case before the Lords of the Judicial

Protest of the Chief Justice.

Committee of the Privy Council—Wallis and others v. the Solicitor-General—a direct attack has been made upon the probity of the Appeal Court of New Zealand. Though it is, I believe, unnecessary to make any reference to the criticisms of their Lordships to those who know the facts, and the Appeal Court, yet there are many who are ignorant of both, and it may therefore be expedient to refer to the attack.

What the Action Was About.

In 1848 there had been reserved out of a block of land ceded by certain natives to the Crown, inter alia, a parcel of land called Witireia. This the Ngatitoa tribe, by a letter dated the 16th August, 1848, addressed to His Excellency the Governor, consented should be given to the Bishop of New Zealand (Dr Selwyn) for a college. The Lieutenant-Governor accepted this consent, and on the 28th December, 1850, a Crown grant of this land was issued to the Bishop of New Zealand. The main parts of the grant are as follows:—

The recitals are:

"Whereas a school is about to be established at Porirua under the superintendence of the Right Reverend George Augustus, Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean: And whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same, which piece or parcel of land has by a deed from the natives been ceded for the support of the same school."

The trust is as follows:—

"To hold unto the said George Augustus Lord Bishop of New Zealand and his successors in trust nevertheless to and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so long as religious education,

industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

An attempt was made to open a school on the land soon after the grant was made, but though a schoolmaster was appointed a school was not maintained.

In 1858 an Act was passed by the General Assembly called the Bishop of New Zealand Trusts Act 1858, which enabled the Bishop to transfer to trustees any land vested in him in trust. In pursuance of this statute Bishop Selwyn, on the 24th August, 1859, transferred the Witireia land to trustees. Since that time it has been under the management of trustees.

In 1898 the trustees had accumulated £6480 from rents and the investment of rents. They asked the Government to approve of the utilisation of these funds and the future rents of the land in founding scholarships or exhibitions at church schools, with preference to Maori children, etc.

The Government refused to agree to such a proposal.

In order to get judicial sanction to the scheme, the trustees began an action in the Supreme Court, making the Solicitor-General the defendant in the action.

The Court of Appeal, before whom the action ultimately came, decided that the land had reverted to the Crown, and the Privy Council overruled this decision.

Object of Statement.

It is not my purpose to canvass the decision of the Privy Council. My object is to show that the comments of the Council on, and its criticism of the Appeal Court, were alike unwarranted.

Education in New Zealand.

From some remarks made in their judgment it is plain that their Lordships were unaware of the provisions for education in New Zealand in 1848. They assumed that the Government had a system of schools. The Education Ordinance of 1847 provided that the Government might assist schools by public funds, but the superintendence and management of such schools were placed under (see section 4) (1) The Bishop of New Zealand, (2) the Bishop or other, the head of the Roman Catholic Church, (3) the Superintendent of the Wesley an Mission, or (4) the head or minister of any other religious body who shall have engaged in the education of youth in the colony of New Zealand. It was provided (section 3) that in every school to be established or supported by public funds "religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall form a necessary part of the system to be pursued therein."

The Grant Conforms to the Ordinance.

It will be observed that the trust in the grant is identical in language with the words in the ordinance, showing that the grant was to the same class of school that was supported by public funds.

The Privy Council Judgment.

I propose now to show that many of the statements of face and of law in the judgment of the Privy Council have been made without a knowledge of our legislation.

At page 3 of the judgment it is said:—

1. "As the law then stood" (that is, in 1848), "under the Treaty of Waitangi the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and the respective families and individuals thereof, were guaranteed in the exclusive and undisturbed, possession of their lands so long as they desired to possess them, and they were also entitled to dispose of their lands as they pleased, subject only to a right of pre-emption in the Crown."

It is an incorrect phrase to use to speak of the treaty as a law. The terms of the treaty were no doubt binding on the conscience of the Crown. The Courts of the colony, however, had no jurisdiction or power to give effect to any treaty obligations. These must be fulfilled by the Crown. All lands of the colony belonged to the Crown, and it was for the Crown under letters patent to grant to the parties to the treaty such lands as the Crown had agreed to grant. The root of title being in the Crown, the Court could not recognise native title. This has been ever held to be the law in New Zealand. (See Regina v. Symond, _decided by their Honours Sir v. the Bishop of Wellington, decided by their Honours Sir J. Pren-William Martin, C.J., and Mr. Justice Chapman, in 1847; Wi parata dergast and Mr. Justice Richmond in 1877, and other cases.). Nor did the Privy Council in Tamaki v. Baker (1901) entirely overrule this view, though it did not approve of all the dicta of the Judges in Wi Parata's case. There are three ordinances of the New Zealand Parliament dealing with the subject. These enactments are in accordance with the judgments in the New Zealand cases referred to.

The Land Claims Ordinance, 1841, enacted, inter alia:—

"That all unappropriated lands within the colony of New Zealand, subject, however, to the rightful and necessary occupation and use thereof by the aboriginal inhabitants of the said colony, are, and remain Crown and domain lands of Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, and that the sole and absolute right of pre-emption from the said aboriginal inhabitants vests in, and can only be exercised by Her said Majesty, her heirs, and successors."

The Lands Claims Ordinance of 1842 went further. Even if the Maoris had validly sold land the land still remained demesne lands of the Crown. Section 2 says:—

"All lands within the colony which have been validly sold by the aboriginal natives thereof are vested in Her Majesty, her heirs, and successors, as part of the demesne lands of the Crown."

In 1846 the Native Land Purchase Ordinance was passed, and section 1 provides:—

"If any person shall after the passing of this Ordinance, purchase, or by writing or otherwise agree to purchase, any estate or interest in land from any person of the native race, or shall by writing or otherwise agree with any such person for the purchase of the right of cutting timber or other trees, or the right of mining, or of the right of pasturing, or for the use or occupation of land; and also if any person who shall not hold a license from the Government for that purpose shall after the passing of this Ordinance, be found using or occupying any land not comprised within a grant from the Crown, either by depasturing any sheep or cattle thereon, or by residing thereon or by erecting any house or building thereon, or by clearing, enclosing, or cultivating any part thereof, or who shall be found without such license as aforesaid to have cut timber or other trees thereon, or to have gotten any mineral therefrom, every such person shall upon conviction of any of the offences hereinbefore mentioned forfeit and pay any sum not less than £5 nor more than £100, to he recovered in a summary way," etc.

There were further provisions for a second penalty if the person remained in possession after conviction, and that nothing in the Ordinance was to be construed to take away or to affect any other proceeding that might be taken against persons purchasing or using land not granted by the Crown. The Royal Charter of 1846 and the Instructions issued therewith, which were both authorised by the Imperial Statute, 9 and 10, Vict., Chap. 103, contained provisions similar to these New Zealand Native Lands Ordinances. See section 14 of the Charter, and Section 11, of Chapter 13 of the Instructions.

If their Lordships had known of these New Zealand statutes and Instructions, they would not, I believe, have stated what I have just quoted from their judgment. They would, on the contrary, have said that the natives were not entitled to dispose of lands that had not been granted to them by Crown Grant or Letters Patent.

Their judgment continues:—

"It was not until 1852 that it was made unlawful for any person other than Her Majesty to acquire or accept land from the natives; 15 and 16 Vict., 72, s. 72."

This also has been [*unclear:* o]enned without knowledge of the statutes and instructions already quoted. The wrong section of the Constitution Act is referred to. It was not 15 and 16 Vict. c. 72 s. 72 that prohibited dealings in what were called Maori lands, but sec. 73.

The judgment continues:—

"The founders of the charity therefore were the native donors. All that was of value came from them. The transfer to the Bishop was their doing."

No doubt the Crown had agreed to reserve Witireia for the Ngatitoa tribe, and the letter quoted was a consent of the tribe to give up the occupancy of this reserve. In that sense, and in that sense only, was it the tribe's gift. The fee-simple was in the Crown, and the Crown gave that to the Bishop. The legal title came from the Crown, and in that sense the Crown was the donor.

The judgment continues:—

"When the Government had once sanctioned their gift, nothing remained to be done but to demarcate the land and place on record the fact that the Crown had waived its right of pre-emption. That might have been effected in various ways. The course adopted was to issue a Crown grant. That perhaps was the simplest way, though the Crown had no beneficial interest to pass. After all, it was simply a question of conveyancing as to which the native owners were possibly not consulted."

Here, again, their Lordships are not aware of our statutes dealing with the natives' occupancy of lands. The title, being in the Crown, could not have been conveyed to the Bishop save by the Crown.

The Solicitor-General.

Their Lordships then refer to the Solicitor-General thus:—

"He seems to have thought it not inconsistent with the traditions of his high office to attack a charity which it was prima facie his duty to protect."

This is hardly a fair statement. The position was that the suit was commenced not by the Solicitor-General, but by the trustees of the endowment against him. He led no attack. He defended the suit by saying inter alia—(1) that the trust had ever been impracticable; (2) that the Court could not deal with the trust; (3) that if it could, he submitted a scheme. He put it in a further defence—that the Crown had no power to issue the grant. This last defence was ruled out. It was argued on his behalf that the land reverted to the Crown. Was it not his duty to raise this defence if it had reverted? Their Lordships appear to think not, but they quote no authority for such a statement of law.

The judgment proceeds:—

"The Solicitor-General then appealed to the Court of Appeal upon the following grounds:—1. That the funds and the lands have reverted to the Crown either absolutely or as trustee upon a failure of the objects, and purposes of the Crown grant and are not subject to administration by or under direction of the Court cy-pres. 2. That no general charitable purpose existed or is proved either in the native donors or the Crown, but only a purpose of creating a specified school at a specified site, and the funds and lands are therefore not subject to administration by or under the direction of the Court cy-pres. The learned Judges of the Court of Appeal allowed the appeal and entered judgment for the Solicitor-General. They did not, however, adopt or even notice either of the grounds put forward by the Solicitor-General. They were of opinion, they said, that the laud and money had become the property of the Crown for two reasons. In the first place they thought 'the grant had become void on the ground that it sufficiently appeared from the evidence that Her Majesty was deceived in her grant.' In the second place, assuming that a school satisfying the terms of the grant had been at one time established, they held that the duration of the trust must have come to an end, because the trust was only to last 'so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language should he given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat.'"

The ground on which the judgment of the Appeal Court proceeded was involved in the first ground—namely, that the land had reverted to the Crown. Dealing with the question whether the Appeal Court was justified in saying the Crown was deceived, their Lordships say:—

"What evidence is there that the Crown was deceived? Absolutely none. The evidence is entirely the other way. The Governor undertook to complete the arrangement proposed by the native donors as soon as he received their letter. He did not even wait to communicate with Bishop Selwyn. It is not suggested that he communicated on the subject with anybody else. Now, it would be absurd to found a charge of misrepresentation on the letter of the native donors. But if the native donors were innocent, with whom is the blame to rest? The evidence which the Court of Appeal said was sufficient to prove misrepresentation was discovered by them in the introductory recitals of the Crown grant. But the grant is not a deed inter partes. The statements in it are the statements of the Crown. The statement that a school was 'about to be established at Porirua' is just as consistent with an intention on the part of the Governor to establish the school by the aid of public money or an expectation on his part that the announcement in England of the generosity of the native donors, coupled with the approval of Her Majesty, would bring in ample funds for the object in view, as it is with the supposition of misrepresentation made to the Governor by some unknown persons interested in procuring this grant from the Crown."

The ground on which the Crown acted in granting the land is stated in the grant. The Bishop accepted the grant, with that statement. Could he, or the trustees his successors in title, deny the preamble of the grant under which they held? If so, they could deny all the statements in the preamble, and deny that the school was to be "for the education of children of our subjects of all races and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean." Could the Bishop have ignored this intention? What had been represented to the Crown appears in the grant, and there was no evidence that the preamble in the grant was untrue; and surely it rested on those who said in 1900 that the statements in the grant of 1850 were untrue, to prove it, and not for those who said that the grant was reciting a fact to prove the recital was correct. Further, it was never even hinted in the Appeal Court by the plaintiffs that the preamble was untrue. It was reserved to their Lordships, without the assistance of counsel, and without the slightest evidence, to make such a suggestion.

I have already referred to the Education Ordinance. Its provisions show that the superintendence and management of schools were conferred on the heads of the Churches in New Zealand. The Governor could not therefore intend to establish a school himself. That duty was left to the Churches, and the grant of Witireia is only one of many—in almost identical terms—giving lands to the heads of Churches to help in the establishment and maintenance of schools. (See the two grants set out in the cases of lands near Manihera and Kaikokirikiri.) If the Government had intended to establish a school at Porirua, the land to support such a school would not have been granted to the Bishop. The suggestion made in the judgment could not have been made by any counsel at the Bar in New Zealand, nor by any one conversant with our history.

Their Lordships continue:—

"If the representative of Her Majesty was unduly sanguine—if he did not think that the hopes and aspirations of the native donors would attain a speedy consummation, that is no ground for suggesting that the Crown was deceived. And, indeed, expectations which may now seem to have been over-sanguine, or even unfounded, might not improbably have been fulfilled if it had not been for the Maori War and the removal of Bishop Selwyn to an English see before the war was finished."

This last suggestion is even more far-fetched than the former one. There has been no war at Porirua, or near Porirua, since 1850. The Ngatitoa tribe have not been at war with the Crown since the grant was issued. It is true that in parts of the colony far distant from Porirua—in Taranaki, in the Waikato, in Wanganui, etc.—there were wars down to 1870; but these could not have prevented the Maori youths near Porirua from receiving the education mentioned in the grant. It might as well be said that a riot in the County of Inverness, or in Yorkshire, would prevent a school being opened in Kent.

The reference to Bishop Selwyn's translation to the See of Lichfield is equally unfortunate. The district was not in his diocese after 1858. It was about two hundred miles from the nearest part of his diocese. Porirua was and is in the Wellington Diocese, and Bishop Abraham was Bishop of that diocese in 1858. Further, Bishop Selwyn gave up the trust in 1859, and since then it has been managed by independent trustees. Bishop Selwyn did not leave New Zealand till 1868. What possible relation could his going to Lichfield have with the non-performance of this trust?

If a person were to tell the Crown that he is about to open a school, and got an endowment on that understanding, and no school was ever opened, would the Crown not be deceived? Does it make any difference as to deceit if this person makes no statement, but receives the endowment on the statement in the grant that he is about to establish the school? If the statement in the grant on which the Crown stated it was relying, in making the grant, was not true, would not an honest grantee have so informed the Crown and rot have taken the grant till the statement was deleted or amended? I have no doubt that if the Bishop had been asked in 1850 whether he did intend to start the school at once, he would have said he did so intend. He would not have accepted the grant with a false recital.

Perhaps if their Lordships had known that this trust is only one amongst, many granted to different churches left for generations unutilised for school purposes, they would not have deemed it to be their duty to search for excuses for its nonfulfilment.

The Reasons for the Court of Appeal Judgment.

Their Lordships say it is too narrow a view of the transaction to say "that there was no general purpose of charity, but only an intention to erect a specific school on a specified site." They add that that view of the transaction "is at variance in their Lordships' opinion with the express terms of the gift, and opposed to principles laid down in recognised authorities such as the Attorney-General v, the Bishop of Chester, 1, B.C.C., 444, and the Incorporated Society v. Price, 1, J. and H., 498."

The two grounds on which the Court of Appeal relied were (1) the Crown was deceived, and the following quotation from the judgment of the Court of Appeal will show how it dealt with that branch of the case:—

"The Crown is informed that something is going to be done, and that a grant of land will assist what is going to be done. A grant is made in anticipation of this something being done, and because it is going to be done. Then the thing is not done. The Crown is thus deceived in the consideration for the grant. The law is thus stated in Barwick's case, 5 Co., 94, Bacon's Abridgement F.: 'It is a maxim that if the consideration which is for the benefit of the Queen, be it executed or executory, or be it on record or not on record, be it not true or not only performed, or if prejudice may accrue to the Queen by reason of nonperformance of it, the letters patent are void,'" etc.

Their Lordships get rid of this branch of the judgment by denying that the Crown was deceived. They do not state that the law laid down by the Court of Appeal is wrong. (2) The other branch of the judgment is founded on the use of the words in small capitals in the following extract from the grant:—

"In trust nevertheless and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so Long As religious education, industriad training and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

Were the words so Long As words of limitation, and did the grant lapse if its purpose were not fulfilled? The case of Attorney-General v. Pyle, 1 Alk., 435, was a somewhat similar case. It was there held the gift was only given "quousque," and when it ceased, the gift returned to the owner or his heir. This branch of the case is not dealt with in the judgment of their Lordships, further than by saying:—

"Now as it is common ground that no school was ever established at or in the neighborhood of Porirua, it would seem to follow that the occasion on which the trust according to the construction placed on the grant of the Court of Appeal was to cease and determine never arose, and never could have arisen."

I must assume, coming as it does from the highest judicial tribunal of our country, that this is the law. The results are somewhat peculiar. If the Bishop had established the school in 1850 and continued it up till 1858, the land might have reverted to the Crown, but as he never did establish the school, it never could revert.

Charges Against the Court.

Their Lordships say:—

"So far their Lordships have treated the case as if the order under appeal had been made on a proper application and in a suit properly constituted. In fact, however, the application was entirely irregular, and the suit was not one in which such an order as that obtained by the Solicitor-General ought to have been made. It is contrary to the established practice of the Court to permit a defendant to an action for the administration of the trusts of a settlement not void on the face of it to impeach the settlement in his defence to that action. If he thinks he has a case for setting aside the settlement or having it declared null and void, he must attack it openly and directly in an action or counter-claim in which he comes forward as plaintiff. Any other course would be inconvenient, embarrassing, and unfair."

There are no rules of procedure in our Courts that prevent a defendant raising any defence to the claim of a plaintiff, though adcquate relief may be denied him unless he begins a suit. If, as the Solicitor-General contended, the land had reverted to the Crown, then the jurisdiction of the Court to act as if it was a general charity and to apply the cy-pres doctrine was ousted And he had a right to raise this contention. No rule of our Supreme Court or of our Appeal Court is quoted in defence of the decision of their Lordships, and it is by the rules of the New Zealand Courts that such a question must be determined.

I may further add that both in the Appeal Court and in the Privy Council this point was not raised by the appellant counsel. If the defence pleaded had been no defence in law to the plaintiff's claim, that point should have been specially raised in accordance with our code of procedure. The shorthand notes of the argument in the Privy Council show that what was argued there was not that the Solicitor-General could not rely on the defence he raised, but that the gift was a general charity; that the Crown was not deceived; and the gift was not to a school on a specified site, and for the education of children therein.

The point of practice referred to—for it does not touch the merits of the controversy between the parties—was not relied on by the appellants' counsel either before the Appeal Court, or before their Lordships; and it would seem that, the rights of the Crown in such a case could have been discussed in a suit instituted to obtain judical sanction to a scheme. (Attorney-General *v.* the Ironmongers' Company, 2, M. and Keen, 576. Note on p. 578).

But if the suit was not properly constituted, to raise the legal questions argued by both parties (and on that, matter, I need express no opinion), was it expedient for their Lordships to deal with merits which were not, on this assumption, properly before them?

Their Lordships further comment on the defence:—

"Then on the hearing of the appeal the Solicitor-General applied for and obtained leave to amend his defence. A formal order for the amendment was necessary 'to more clearly define the grounds of defence of the Crown.' But the amendment only made the confusion worse. It was a medley of allegations incapable of proof and statements derogatory to the Court."

Their Lordships seem to have overlooked that the amendment referred to was made "by corsent." The plaintiffs had no objection to the further statement of defence. And it is unusual in New Zealand for a Court to refuse an amendment of a pleading to which both litigants agree.

This new defence is declared to be a, "medley of allegations incapable of proof and statements derogatory to the Court," It is better to set out this so-called "medley." The further defence was as follows:—

"The defendant by Hugh Gully, Crown Solicitor for the Wellington District, further amends his statement of defence filed herein by adding thereto the following paragraph:—That the terms of cession to the Crown by the aboriginal natives of the lands comprised in the grants were such as to preclude the Crown from consenting to the application of the said lands and rents and profits thereof to any other purposes or objects than those expressly mentioned in the grant. And that the Crown has a duty to observe the terms of the cession to itself and the trust thereby confided by the aboriginal natives in the Crown. And that the Executive Government has determined, so far as the matter is one for the determination of the Crown, that any departure from the precise terms of the grant by the application cy-pres of the said lands and funds without the consent of the Parliament of the colony would contravene the terms of the said cession and be a breach of the trust thereby confided in the Crown."

Whether the defence was well or ill founded, it did not want in lucidity. It sets up, first, that the terms of the cession by the natives precluded the Crown consenting to the funds going in support of a school in Wairarapa; second, that the Crown was bound to observe the terms of the cession; third, that the Executive Government so

far as it could determine it, and so far as it was for the Crown to determine it, declared that any departure from the terms of the cession must be made by Parliament.

I do not understand what the allegations are that were "incapable of proof." The first two defences are statements rather of law than of fact, and the third—a statement of fact—could not be disputed. What, then, were the "allegations that were in- capable of proof"? Such disparaging phrases as their Lordships have used do not, it appears to me, tend to the elucidation of the important questions they were called upon to decide.

Their Lordships in still critising the defence say:—

"But the Court accepted it and treated it with extreme deference. The learned Judges intimate pretty plainly that if they had not been able to find satisfactory reasons for deciding in favour of the Crown, the amendment would of itself have prevented their making an order in favor of the trustees. The amendment divided itself into two parts. In the first place it asserts that the Crown has come under some undefined and undisclosed obligations to the natives. The Court seems to think that this assertion must place the Court in a considerable difficulty. Why? Why should a Court which acts on evidence, and not on surmise or loose suggestions, pay any attention to an assertion which, if true, could not have been proved at that stage of the proceedings, and which evidence in the cause shows to have been purely imaginary? According to the evidence, the only obligation which the Crown undertook was to waive its right of pre-emption."

These sentences do not correctly describe the attitude of the Court. The Court said:—

"If the true construction of the grant;s that the land included is to be held by the Bishop and his successors in perpetuity for charitable purposes, notwithstanding that the particular school has ceased to exist, then in the absence of any special circumstances we think the Court has jurisdiction to approve of a scheme for the management of the trust property, notwithstanding the grant is from the Crown." Etc., etc. . . .

And again—

"The Court by virtue of its general jurisdiction over property held by trustees for charitable purposes can give the trustees authority by approving of a scheme."

The question then was, Were there special circumstances which made the question of exercising the jurisdiction difficult? The Court held there were.

It is to be noted no representatives of the natives were before the Court, and it was therefore the duty of the Solicitor-General to guard any rights they might possess. The Crown stated that the terms of cession prevented the cy-pres doctrine being applied, and that it had duties toward the natives. The Court held that the cession was an act of State, and that it was difficult, if not impossible, in 1900 to enquire—if it had jurisdiction to do so—into the act of State in 1850. How is this contention of the Court met by their Lordships? By asserting that the only obligation the Crown undertook was to waive its light of pre-emption. The assertion is, as I have shown, based on a fallacy. I repeat the Crown stood in quite a different position. It had the occupancy or possessory rights of the Maoris ceded to it that it might endow a school, and it was in a sense a trustee to give effect to that cession. Further, it gave up its title—the title in fee-simple—to the Bishop.

It was not the Appeal Court that was acting on loose suggestions or in ignorance of the Statute law of the country. Their Lordships reiterate their inaccurate statements about the Treaty of Waitangi. They say:—"At the date of the cession to Bishop Selwyn the rights of the natives in their reserves depended solely on the Treaty of Waitangi." This has been written through want of knowledge of our Statutes and the uniform practice of the Crown in dealing with the demesne lands of the Crown in the colony. (See the charters and Royal Instructions before referred to). They continue:—"There is not in the evidence the slightest trace of any cession to the Crown or of any bargain between the Crown and the native owners."

My remark just made applies to this sentence also. What the Maoris did was deemed a cession, otherwise the Crown grant could not have been issued, as the land had been reserved for the Maoris. What the bargain was and what took place were not proved, and the Court so held. These questions were not in issue in the suit, and the Appeal Court doubted its power to enquire into this act of State, namely, the cession of Witireia.

Just before the conclusion of their judgment, their Lordships Say:—

"'We see great difficulty,' say the learned Judges, 'in holding that in such circumstances the Court could or ought to interfere.' The proposition advanced on behalf of the Crown is certainly not flattering to the dignity or the independence of the highest Court in New Zealand, or even to the intelligence of the Parliament. What has the Court to do with the Executive? Where there is a suit properly constituted, and ripe for decision, why should justice he denied or delayed at the bidding of the Executive? Why should the Executive Government take upon itself to instruct the Court in the discharge of its proper functions?"

The passage quoted from the judgment of the Appeal Court was a statement made after the Court had determined the lands had reverted to the Crown, and was in answer to the question argued at length as to what the Court could or would do if there was no reverter. The Court had not declined jurisdiction. It had decided the main question that had been argued, and was involved in the suit adversely to the plaintiffs. And the remarks quoted were meeting arguments that were only relevant to a state of things the Court found did not exist. Any

person reading their Lordships' remarks and being unacquainted with the judgment of the Court of Appeal, would assume that this Court had declined jurisdiction, had denied justice, and had lost its dignity and independence through dread of the Executive Government. These imputations are baseless, and I hardly think it is becoming in the highest tribunal in the Empire, to make such charges against any Court, unless they are conclusively proved.

I have already explained the attitude of the Appeal Court. Their Lordships, when they made the imputations I have quoted, knew the position the Appeal Court took up, for in the judgment of the Court there is this passage:—

"The position appears to be somewhat as follows: The Crown, as parens patriæ, through the instrumentality of this Court, sees that, property devoted to charity shall be applied for the purposes of charity, and that where no purposes are specified the Court as representing the Crown is to define the purposes. The Crown also as parens patriæ is under a solemn obligation to protect the rights of native owners of the soil. "When, therefore, the Crown as parens patriæ asserts that in that capacity it is under an obligation to natives in respect of a property, can this Court representing the Crown as parens patriæ, say to the Crown, 'You shall not carry out this obligation, but the property you have created shall be devoted to charitable purposes to be determined by the Court irrespective of your obligations?' We see great difficulty in holding that in such circumstances the Court could or ought to interfere."

It will be noticed that this last sentence, as quoted in the Privy Council judgment from the Appeal Court judgment, is dissociated from its context. Any one reading the Privy Council judgment, and not knowing the Appeal Court judgment, must inevitably be misled by the way the quotations are made. Their Lordships do not attempt to answer the pertinent question the Court of Appeal asked, or to meet the arguments used, but indulge in language that is happily rare in judicial judgments pronounced in this colony.

The Privy Council's Aspersions.

Whether it is a fitting thing for the highest Imperial tribunal to make such unfounded aspersions, it is not for me to say. I feel the aspersions under the circumstances in which they have been made are a greater reflection on the Privy Council than on the Appeal Court of New Zealand.

I have not ventured to say that this grant was not one of a general charity. That is a legal question that may yet come before the Courts. I have dealt only with the attacks made on the New Zealand Appeal Court by the Privy Council when over-ruling the decision of that Court.

A Personal Statement.

I may add that I was no party to the judgment of the Appeal Court. The Court was dealing with an appeal from the late Chief Justice, and from Mr Justice Edwards and myself, and the attitude I took up when the matter was before Mr Justice Edwards and myself was approved of by their Lordships in their judgment. I feel, however, that when the Court of which I have the honor to be President, is attacked by such a body as the Privy Council, it is my duty to explain the position to my fellow colonists.

Other Privy Council Judgments.

Unfortunately this is not the only judgment of the Privy Council that has been pronounced under a misapprehension or an ignorance of our local laws. I may briefly refer to three in which personally I was not in any way concerned.

In the case of Plimmer v. the Corporation of Wellington (L.R., 9, A.C., 699), the judgment of the Council was mainly based on the following statement:—

"It is not necessary to follow minutely the legal title to the land. It is sufficient to say that, under whatever form, it has been continuously vested in Government for public purposes, that the use made of it by Plimmer was consistent with these purposes, and that Plimmer 'might by contract with the Government have acquired a perpetual interest in it for such purposes.' "(See 9 A.C., pp. 705-706).

The Privy Council did not refer to, and were apparently ignorant of the fact, that the Superintendent, in whom the reserve was vested, could neither sell, nor mortgage, nor lease the reserve for more than three years unless an Act or Ordinance of the Provincial Council authorised him to do so. (See the Public Reserves Act 1854, sections 5, 6, and 7.) The reserve was granted under this Act. Section 7 says:—"No lands so . . . granted . . . shall be alienated by way of sale or mortgage or by lease for any longer term than three years, except by the authority of some Act or Ordinance of the Provincial Council of such province to be passed in that behalf, nor except by deed signed and sealed with the proper seal of the province," etc.

No such Act or Ordinance was passed, and it was therefore inaccurate to say that Plimmer could have

acquired by contract a perpetual interest in the reserve. All he could have got was a lease for a term not exceeding three years. Had the Privy Council been acquainted with the Public Reserves Act of 1854, there is, I think, no doubt the judgment of the New Zealand Appeal Court would not have been reversed.

In Eccles v. Mills (L.R., 1898, App. cases, 360), it was plain that the Privy Council did not understand the system of conveyancing in New Zealand, for their Lordships did not know what was meant by the usual declaration in New Zealand transfers, conveyances, and leases, regarding "implied covenants." If they had understood what "implied covenants "meant in New Zealand, I believe their judgment would have been different.

And in Tamaki v. Baker (L.R., 1901, A.C., 561), the Council was ignorant of the date when we became a self-governing colony, and of the Ordinances, Acts, and Charters regarding native lands. If the dicta in that case were given effect to, no land title in the colony would be safe.

The Outlook.

The matter is really a serious one. A great Imperial judicial tribunal sitting in the capital of the Empire, dispensing justice even to the meanest of British subjects in the uttermost parts of the earth, is a great and noble ideal. But if that tribunal is not acquainted with the laws it is called upon to interpret or administer, it may unconsciously become the worker of injustice. And if such should unfortunately happen, that Imperial spirit that is the true bond of union amongst His Majesty's subjects must be weakened. At present we in New Zealand are, so far as the Privy Council is concerned, in an unfortunate position. It has shown that it knows not our statutes, or our conveyancing terms, or our history. What the remedy may be, or can be, for such a state of things, it is not at present within my province to suggest.

The Chief Justice then read the following protest received from Mr Justice Williams:—

FOR an inferior Court to criticise the judgment of a superior Court which reversed its decision would he in general alike,

Protest of Mr. Justice Williams.

unprofitable, and unseemly. But where the decision of the in feriorCourt has been not only reversed but has been reversed with contumely—where the inferior Court has been taunted with want of independence and subservience to the Executive Government—it is right that the members of the Court who pronounced the decision in question should come forward and defend the honour of the Court they represent. In order that they may do so, it would become necessary for them to refer to their own decision, and also to criticise to some extent the decision of the superior Court. They would do this not so much with a view of justifying their decision as to show that the aspersions cast upon them by the superior Court were unjustifiable. Arguments which might fall far short of showing that the decision of the superior Court was wrong might well be sufficient to show that the comments it made on the inferior tribunal were unjust and unreasonable The decision of the Court of Appeal of New Zealand in the case of the Solicitor-General v. Wallis (19, N.Z., 665) has recently been reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Their Lordships have thought proper, in the course of their judgment, to use language with reference to the Court of Appeal of a kind which has never been used by a superior Court with reference to an inferior Court in modern times. The judgment of their Lordships has been published and circulated throughout the colony. The natural tendency of that judgment, emanating as it does from so high a tribunal, is to create a distrust of this Court, and to weaken its authority among those who are subject to its jurisdiction. The Judges of the Court of Appeal of New Zealand who decided the case in question, have therefore thought it right that, I, who was the Judge who presided on that occasion, should on their behalf protest publicly against the attack made on the honour of the Court they represent, and should endeavour to show that whether their judgment was right, or wrong there is no ground whatever for the attack their Lordships have thought fit to make. To that end I propose to refer to and comment on both the judgment of the Court of Appeal and the judgment of their Lordships. To properly appreciate these remarks, it would, however, be desirable for those who hear cr read them to read carefully both of these judgments. The judgments start with a fundamental disagreement. Their Lordships' judgment asserts that the Maoris were the donors of the land and the founders of the charity. Our judgment asserts that the Crown was the donor and founder. Their Lordships say (speaking of the year 1848): "As the law then stood, under the Treaty of Waitangi the chiefs and tribes of New Zealand, and the respective families and individuals thereof, were guaranteed in the exclusive and undisturbed possession of their lands so long as they desired to posses them, and They Were Also Entitled to Dispose of Their Lands as They Pleased, Subject Only to a Right of Preemption in the Crown. It was not until 1852 that it was made unlawful for any parson other than Her Majesty to acquire or accept land from the natives (15 and 16, Vict., c. 72, s. 72). The founders of the charity, therefore, were the native donors. All that was of value came from them." This statement of the law is a surprise, and is, moreover, incorrect. It was certainly not the case that if the Crown did not wish to buy, the Maoris could sell their land to whom they

pleased. Section 1 of the Native Land Purchase Ordinance, 1846, which was in force until 1865, is as follows: "If any person shall, after the passing of this Ordinance, purchase, or by writing or otherwise agree to purchase, any estate or interest in land from any person of the native race, er shall by writing or otherwise agree with any such person for the purchase of the right of cutting timber or other trees, or of the right of mining, or of the right of pasturage, or for the use and occupation of land; and also if any person who shall not hold a license from the Government for that purpose shall, after the passing of this Ordinance, be found using or occupying any land not comprised within a grant from the Crown either by depasturing any cattle thereon or by residing thereon, or by creeling any house or building thereon, or by clearing, enclosing, or cultivating any part thereof, or who shall be found, without such license as aforesaid, to have cut timber or other trees thereon, or to have gotten any mineral therefrom—every such person shall, upon conviction of any of the offences hereinbefore mentioned, forfeit and pay any sum not less than £5 nor more than £100, to be recovered in a summary way; provided that no person shall be convicted of any of the offences aforesaid, except on the information or complaint of the SurveyorGeneral or of some other officer duly authorised in that behalf by His Excellency the Governor." This Ordinance has evidently been overlooked by their Lordships. So also have they overlooked the Royal Instructions of 1846. Paragraph 11 of chapter 13 (Domett's Ordinances page 62) is as follows:—" No conveyance, or agreement for the conveyance, of any of the lands of or belonging to any of the aboriginal natives, in common as tribes or as communities, whether in perpetuity or for any definite period, whether absolutely or conditionally, whether in property or by way of lease or occupancy which may be henceforth made, shall be of any validity or effect, unless the same he so made to or entered into with Us, our heirs, and successors." In the case (Nireaha Tamaki v. Baker, 1891, A.C., p. 567) their Lordships say: "In the year 1852 New Zealand, which up to that time bad been a part of New South Wales, received a Constitution as a self-governing colony." The statute 15 and 16, Vict-, c. 72, was the Constitution Act. It was probably the erroneous impression that New Zealand remained a part of New South Wales till 1852, when a Constitution was granted that led to the omission to consider New Zealand legislation prior to that date. In fact, New Zealand became a separate colony in 1840. Their Lordships in the present case go on to say: "When the Government had once sanctioned their gift, nothing remained to be done but to demarcate the land, and place on record the fact that the Crown had waived its right of pre-emption. That might have been effected in various ways. The course adopted was to issue a Crown grant. That, perhaps, was the simplest way, although the Crown had no beneficial interest to pass. After all it was only a question of conveyancing, as to which the native owners were possibly not: consulted." Apart altogether from the above quoted Ordinance and Instructions of 1846, all these statements arc at variance with the law as hitherto understood in New Zealand. Furthermore, they seem at variance with tile law as laid down by their Lordships in the case of Nireaha Tamaki v. Baker. Their Lordships there say (1901, A.C., p. 567) that the Lands Claims Ordinance of 1841 was a legislative recognition of the "rightful and necessary occupation of land by the aboriginal inhabitants, confirmed and guaranteed by the Crown by the Treaty of Waitangi." They go on to say: "It would not of itself, however, be sufficient to create a right in the native occupiers cognisable in a court of law." At the time of the transactions in question there was nothing else to create such a right. There were no statutes regulating the extinction of native title. The Native Rights Act referred to in the case of Nireaha Tamaki v. Baker was not passed till 1865. If the native occupiers had no right cognisable in a Court of law, it is difficult to see how they could transfer such a right to the bishop. A man cannot give what he has not got. The case of Nireaha Tamaki v. Baker was decided by their Lordships shortly before our decision in the present case, but the judgment had not then reached the colony. In their judgment in that case their Lordships comment on the case of Wi Parata v. the Bishop of Wellington (3 N.Z. Jur., N.S.S.C., 72), and disagree with certain of the dicta contained in it. Their Lordships, however, go on to refer to it as follow:—." As applied to the case then before the Court, however, their Lordships see no reason to doubt the correctness of the conclusion arrived at by the learned Judges." Now, the case of Wi Parata v. the Bishop of Wellington was decided in 1877 by Sir James Prendergast and the late Mr. Justice Richmond. It was an action brought by the chief of the Ngatitoa tribe to impeach the Crown grant to the bishop of this same land as being a fraud upon the native donors, and in contravention of the arrnngement between the bishop and the natives. The case was decided against the plaintiff on demurrer. The learned Judges, in concluding their judgment, say: "Lastly, we are of opinion that in law the Crown is to be regarded as the donor, and not the Ngatitoa tribe." The same view was taken by this Court in a case decided last year, after our decision in the present case. In Hopepa Wi Neera v. the Bishop of Wellington (21, N.Z., 655), a native again attempted to impeach the bishop's title. The present Chief Justice, in a judgment concurred in by Mr. Justice Edwards, gave a lucid historical exposition of the law as to the relations of the Crown and the natives in respect to native lands, and the Court followed the decision in Wi Parata v. the Bishop of Wellington. Further, the trustees in their statement of claim in the present action rest their title as trustees not on any gift from the natives but on the Crown grant only. Whether, however, we were right or wrong, there was certainly an unbroken current of authority. First, that the native occupiers had no right to their land cognisable in a court of

law, and that having no such right themselves they could not transfer any right to others. Secondly, that the Crown grant was not a mere piece of conveyancing, but was essential to create any right at all of which this Court could take notice, and that any such right was derived from the Crown grant, and by virtue of the grant, and from the grant alone. Thirdly, that as the natives never had any rights cognisable in a court of law they had no locus standi to impeach the grant, and were neither necessary nor proper parties in any proceedings between the Crown and its grantee in relation to the subject matter of the grant. We therefore held that the charity owed its existence to, and that the bishop derived his title to the land from the Crown grant alone, and that the intention of the Crown in making the grant, and the conditions on which the land was held by the grantee, were to be determined by the language of the grant without any reference to anything that had taken place between the grantee and the former native occupiers. Had we not so held we should not only have had to over-rule all previous decisions, but should have differed in opinion from every Judge who has ever sat in this court. Their Lordships, however, have taken the view that the natives were the donors of the land, and the founders of the charity, and that the Crown grant was merely used for conveyancing purposes, and might have been altogether dispensed with. Then Lordships' judgment seems to have been based in the main on this opinion. This Court, having come to the conclusion that The Crown grant was the foundation of the title, proceeded to endeavour to ascertain its meaning from the words used in it. The grant was dated the 28th of December, 1850, more than two years after the original transactions between the natives and Bishop Selwyn. It is important to observe that the terms of the grant show that the land was not given as a site for a school or to establish a school. The grant states that a school was about to be established at Porirua. This land, which is described as being in the neighborhood of the proposed school, was given for its maintenance and support. This Court came to the conclusion for the reasons given at length in our judgment (19, N.Z., p. 675). First, that the grant was made upon the representation and in anticipation that an institution was to be founded and for the sole purpose of assisting such institution, and that as no such institution had been founded the Crown had been misled, or, in legal language, deceived in its grant, although there was, of course, no suggestion of any intention to deceive or mislead. Secondly, that as the grant was upon trust for the use and maintenance of the school so Long As religious education, industrial training, and so forth should be given thereat, and as no education at all had been given, because no school had ever been established, the trust by its very terms had ceased to exist. Their Lordships suggest that the recital in the grant that a school is about to be established at Porirua under the superintendence of the Bishop of New Zealand is consistent with an intention on the part of the Governor to establish the school by the aid of public money, or with an expectation on his part that the announcement in England of the generosity of the native donors would bring in ample funds for that object. The suggestion that there might have been an intention on the part of the Governor to establish the school by the aid of public money is strange and novel. The evidence shows that it was intended to be established by the bishop. In interpreting the grant we did not consider it material to inquire into what was passing in the mind of the person who happened to be the Governor of the colony at the time it was issued. We looked at the grant and found a statement in it that a school was about to be established under the superintendence of the grantee. The statement, no doubt, was the statement of the Crown, but the Crown must have made the statement on the information of somebody, and it certainly did not seem open to the grantee to question the truth of the statements in the recitals to the grant. We thought that the words that the school was "about to be established "had their ordinary meaning—viz., that it was going to be established in tho near future—and we considered that the establishment of the school was in effect the consideration for the grant, and that the consideration had not been duly performed. Their Lordships suggest that the school might have been established if it had not been for the Maori War and the removal of Bishop Selwyn to an English See. This district was not affected by the Maori War, and Bishop Selwyn, as appears by the record, ceased to have anything to do with the trust in 1859. If we are to take judicial notice of movements of Bishop Selwyn of which there is no evidence on the record it will be found that the land ceased to be in his diocese in about 1858, and that he did not proceed to England till some ten years later. If intentions aro to be discovered from acts, the intention of establishing the school was completely abandoned. In our view, however, it was immaterial to consider why the school was not established. The material fact was that it had not been established. Further, if we could go behind the grant and take account of what took place between the bishop and the natives, and could treat the natives as donors, it is abundantly clear that the land was given by them on the faith that a college would be established on or near it. That is shown by Bishop Hadfield's affidavit. As their Lordships say, "no fixed or definite period of time" was mentioned either in the grant or in the transactions with the natives within which the college was to be established. But surely it would be implied that it was to be established within a reasonable time, and that the establishment was not to be deferred until after all the native doners had died and their children's children had come to maturity. A church obtains a gift of land from a semi-savage tribe on the understanding that the church will within some reasonable time, out of other funds, establish a college on or near the land for the education of the youth of the tribe. Fifty years pass, and the church has not established the college. A plain man would say

that in such circumstances the church should hand back the land to the tribe. And the Crown represents the tribe for all legal purposes, and stands in its place. Their Lordships seem to make light of this lapse of time. But fifty years in New Zealand mean much more than fifty years in England. The changes political, social, and material that have taken place in New Zealand during the latter half of the nineteenth century are greater than those that have taken place in England from the time of the Tudors to the present day. All the cases cited where a fund was administered cypres seemed inapplicable. The gift was a gift "inter vivos." Whether the natives or the Crown were the donors, the gift was not to establish a charity, or simply to a charity. It was a gift in aid of a charity which was to be established from other sources by the donee. The intended establishment of that charity was the sole reason and consideration for the gift. If no such intention had been stated, the gift would never have been made. The mode of the gift was of the substance of the gift. If a man gives a subscription towards the support of a school which the person to whom he gives it is going to establish, and that person never established the school, surely the giver can recover back his money from the person to whom he paid it. Is there any difference in substance between that case and the present? The second ground of our decision does not seem to have been pressed upon their Lordships in argument. Their Lordships observe that, as no school was ever established, the occasion on which we held the trust was to determine (viz., on education of the kinds mentioned in the grant ceasing to be given there) never arcse. But it might be suggested that if the trust would have been determined if a school had been established, and the education specified had ceased to be given there, a fortiori it would determine if no school were established at all. Further, if the grant was in trust for the support of a particular school, not generally, but only so long as education of a specified kind was given there, the original contention of the Solicitor-General that the language of the grant negatives any intention on the part of the Crown to give the land in perpetuity for charitable purposes receives considerable support. We therefore declined to sanction any scheme for the administration of the trust, as we considered the trust had come to an end, and the trust property had reverted to the Crown, the donor. That was the extent of our decision. Their Lordships say that that decision would have been wrong even if the suit had been properly constituted, but that the suit was not properly constituted. The suit was by the trustees for the administration of the trust property cy-pres, and they suggested a scheme. The statement of defence alleged reasons why the property should not be administered cy-pres. According to our procedure, that could be done without it being necessary for the defendant to counter-claim. No objection was taken before us that the question as to whether the trust property ought to be administered cy-pres was not properly raised on the pleadings. We decided, on the admitted facts, that it ought not, and therefore declined to sanction any scheme. The legal result of our judgment was to dismiss the suit of the trustees asking for administration cy-pres. Their Lordships say: "It is contrary to the established practice of the Court to admit a defendant to an action for the administration of the trusts of a settlement not void on the face of it to impeach the settlement in his defence to that action." Here the grant is the settlement. But if it is shown upon any ground or for any reason that the trusts declared by the settlement have lapsed or been abandoned, and there is no general intention of charity, there is no need to impeach the settlement. The trust then to be administered under the settlement is the resulting trust in favor of the settlor. We attemped to solve what appeared to us to be a somewhat complex legal problem. We are told not only that we solved it wrongly, but to our amazement it is broadly hinted that we determined it at the instance of the Executive to confiscate the property of a charity. The question seemed to us to be a purely legal one. Has the trust determined or has it not? We thought, for the reasons we have given, that it had. If it has, the trustees would have, of course, a claim on the fund for money expended in connection with the land. No private right would be disturbed. Their Lordships have thought fit to censure the Solicitor-General in no measured terms. It is not for us to defend the Solicitor-General except so far as the censure of him implies a censure on ourselves for not having kept him to his duty. No doubt it is the duty of the Solicitor-General to protect a charity. But if there is a charitable trust created by the Crown which the Solicitor-General honestly believes has determined, is it a departure from the "traditions of his high office" for him as an officer of the Crown to assert the rights of the Crown as against the trust? Has any case ever been known to have arisen where there was such a conflict of duties? If not, how can any "traditions" apply to it. After we had given our decision on the grounds above-mentioned, we made some remarks which were altogether independent of what we had decided. We indicated that there appeared to us in any case, and apart from our decision, to be some difficulty in administering the trust cy-pres, as the Crown by its counsel had asserted that it had duties towards the natives who ceded the land which could not be performed if the Court so administered it. We gave at length our reasons for the apparent difficulty, but expressly refrained from giving any decision, on the question. It has always been held that any transactions between the Crown and the natives relating to their title by occupancy were a matter for the Executive Government, and one into which the Court had no jurisdiction to inquire. As was laid down in Wi Parata v. the Bishop of Wellington: "Transactions with the natives for the cession of their title to the Crown are to be regarded as acts of State, and therefore arc not examinable in any Court." Our remarks did not in the least affect our judgment or the reasons for it. We were considering with hesitancy how far the above principle

would have been applicable to the case before us. We considered, as every authority justified us in considering, that the root of all title was in the Crown. What the rights of any prior native occupiers might be, or whether they had any rights, was a matter entirely for the conscience of the Crown. In any case they had no rights cognisable in this Court. Nor could this Court examine in any way what their rights were. If the Crown by its representative asserted the existence of any duty to the natives, it seemed to us that the above principles might require the acceptance by the Court of the assertion, and so have placed us in the difficulty suggested.

After our judgment had been delivered an amendment was made by a Court consisting of His Honour the Chief Justice and Mr Justice Edwards, and with the consent of the parties, for the purpose of raising the point, if necessary, before their Lordships on appeal. Their Lordships criticise the amendment severely. It is "derogatory to the Court." One of its propositions "is not flattering to the dignity or independence of the highest Court in NewZealand." Then their Lordships ask: "What has the Court to do with the Executive? When there is a suit properly constituted and ripe for decision, why should justice be denied or delayed at the bidding of the Executive? Why should the Executive Government take upon itself to instruct the Court in the discharge of its proper functions?" All this with reference to a matter which had nothing to do with the reasons for the judgment of the Court, and about which the Court expressly refrained from deciding. Their Lordships say that we intimate pretty plainly that if we had not been able to find satisfactory reasons for deciding in favor of the Crown the amendment would of itself have prevented us making an order in favor of the trustees. We were, it appears, so determined to find against the trustees that if we could find no good reason for doing so we were prepared to sacrifice the dignity and independence of the Court, and, acting at the bidding of the Executive, find against the trustees without reason. I have had the honor of being a Judge of this Court for more than twenty-eight years. I have seen Governments come and go, but never have I known any Government attempt in the slightest degree to interfere with the independence of the Court. Nor have I ever heard it suggested that this Court, in the exercise of its judicial functions, has shown a want of independence or a subservience to the Executive Government. Judges in New Zealand are exposed to a public opinion as vigilant, and to a criticism as keen, as Judges in England. There exists an active and independent Press, which is certainly not tied to Executive chariot wheels. If the Court had displayed subserviency or want of independence of the Executive it would have been loudly condemned by a unanimous public opinion. No suggestion of the kind has ever been made here. It has been reserved for four strangers sitting 14,000 miles away to make it. It is to our fellow-citizens in this colony that we are responsible for our judicial conduct. If the Court retains the confidence of the people of the colony it is sufficient. One of the duties of the Judges of this Court is to review the decisions of inferior tribunals. It has happened sometimes that we have met with decisions which we considered wrong, and even unreasonable. But we have always given the District Judge or Magistrate whose decision we overruled credit for an honest desire to do his duty, and have said as little as possible to shake public confidence in him. Had we ever spoken of a Judge of an inferior court in the terms their Lordships have spoken of the Judges of this Court, it would be ourselves and not the Judge who would have stood condemned. We repeat that we have made these observations solely in order to vindicate the honor of the Court. It is to that end only that we have appeared to justify our decision. Whether the Court has or has not arrived at a correct legal conclusion is beyond the question. It is sufficient to show that our reasons for our conclusion were honest. That the decisions of this Court should continue to be subject to review by a higher Court, is of the utmost importance. The knowledge that a decision can be reviewed is good alike for Judges and litigants. Whether, however, they should be reviewed by the Judicial Committee as at present constituted is a question worthy of consideration. That Court, by its imputations in the present ease, by the ignorance it has shown in this and other cases of our history, of our legislation, and of our practice, and by its Iong-delayed judgments, has displayed every characteristic of an alien tribunal. If we have spoken strongly it is because we feel deeply. And we speak under grievous and unexampled provocation.

Mr Justice Edwards then read the following protest:—

I have read and carefully considered the protest made by Mr Justice Williams, on behalf of the Judges of the Court

Protest of Mr. Justice Edwards.

of Appeal who decided the case of Wallis v. the Solicitor-General, against the remarks made by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in their judgment allowing the appeal in this case, and I desire to express by entire concurrence in that protest.

It would be easy by reference to numerous decisions of the Court of Appeal and of the Supreme Court of this colony, and to statues which, passed after such decisions, recognising their validity, have virtually confirmed them, to show still further that the interpretation which their Lordships have put upon the laws relating to Native Lands in this colony is subversive of the law which has prevailed from its foundation; and that if that interpretation were acted upon, and carried to its legitimate conclusion in future cases, the titles to real estates in this colony would be thrown into irretrievable doubt and confusion.

This, however, is not the purpose of the remarks which I desire now to make.

The occasion upon which it has become necessary that the Judges of this Court should declare themselves in defence of their own honour, and, it may be said, of their own independence, is without a precedent.

Never before has it happened that the ultimate appellate tribunal of the Empire has charged the Judges of any colonial Court, as their Lordships have now charged the Judges of this Court, with want of dignity, and with denying or delaying justice at the bidding of the Executive.

If there were any foundation in charges so grave, then the learned Judges against whom they are levelled ought to be removed from the high office which they would have shown themselves unworthy to occupy.

It might well be supposed that the Judicial Committee, sitting as the ultimate Appellate Court from the Courts of this colony, and itself for this purpose a New Zealand Court, would hesitate long before making such charges, and would make them only upon such evidence as would justify His Majesty, upon the address of both Houses of the Colonial Parliament, in removing from office the Judges against whom they are made.

Yet such charges have been made by the Judicial Committee against the Judges of the Appellate Court of this colony; and they have been made without the slightest foundation in fact, and basad only upon assumptions of law which to every trained lawyer in the colony must appear, at the least, astonishing and absurd.

To the people of the colony these charges carry in themselves their own refutation. The people of New Zealand are people of British race, no less fearless and tenacious of their liberties than their progenitors of the Motherland—the land which they still call Home, which they delight to honor, and with whose sons they have stood shoulder to shoulder in the hour of need. There is no colonist, I dare to say, who does not look upon the independence of the Benita as the one thing of supreme importance to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people. No Government has ever attempted to influence—no Government, while the people of New Zealand are of their present, temper, and that will be as long as British blood flows in their veins, ever will attempt to influence—the Judges in the discharge of their duties.

The Judges hold the same high office, they discharge the same duties, and they respect the same traditions, as the Judges of the Mother Country. In a smaller community they live in the fierce light that beats upon public men in an even greater degree than their brethren in England.

If any Government were so base as to endeavor to pervert the course of justice—if any Judge were so base as to lend himself to such designs—retribution, swift and condign, would fall upon Government and Judge alike.

Those strike a blow at the unity of the Empire who, without any excuse whatever save such an entirely new reading of the law affords them, level such charges against the highest judicial tribunal of a great self-governing colony, and against those to whom its people llave entrusted its destinies.

But these charges have been made, and have been published wherever the English language is spoken. So far as concerns their reputation in this colony, the Judges of this Court might well pass the matter by with silent contempt.

But the inhabitants of New Zealand are but one small community out of many kindred communities, members of the same great race, and their respect we desire to retain. These, knowing the gravity of such charges, might, well believe that such a tribunal us the Judicial Committee, the importance of whose duties, and whose very remoteness make it, loom so large in their eyes, would not make such charges except upon proof conclusive, and as a grave part of its own high duty.

The Judges of this Court are not unaccustomed to have their decisions upon the statute laws of the colony reversed by their Lordships with something akin to contempt, although their Lord- ships might well reflect that trained lawyers who have spent their lives in the colony, who know and understand its genius, its laws and its customs, as they cannot hope to know and understand them; who have spent anxious days and much thought and reflection in the elucidation of the laws of their country, to which their Lordships themselves can give but a brief and hurried consideration; who have the assistance of an able and zealous Bar (many of whose members are members of the English Bar), wellversed in the laws of the colony, while their Lordships themselves must depend as a rule upon such assistance as thev can get from members of the English Bar, who know nothing of such laws—their Lordships might well reflect, I say, that the Judges of this Court are under these circumstances at least as likely to arrive at a correct conclusion as to the meaning of the statute law of the Colony as they are themselves. And, if they feel compelled to differ from the Judges of this Court as to the meaning of the statute law of the colony, they might well do so with the same courtesy and respect that the Judges of this Court invariably extend to Judges and Magistrates of inferior Courts whose decisions they are called upon to review.

These tilings the Judges of this Court have borne in patience. But when their Lordships charge the members of this Court with want of dignity, and with denying or delaying justice at the bidding of the Executive, patience persisted in would cease to be patience, and become pusillanimity.

I do not happen to be one of the Judges against whom these imputations have been levelled; but the honour of the Court is the honour of every member of the Court; I feel that the protest against such imputations should

be unanimous and unequivocal; and in the interest of justice, liberty and decency, and of the unity of that great Empire which can only be held together by the mutual respect of its kindred communities, I do protest against them.

When Mr Justice Edwards liad concluded there followed a unique, impressive incident, made more impressive by reason of the fact that it was quite unrehearsed and unexpected. Mr W. L. Travers, the doyen of the local Bar, rose and said:—" I think I am justified, without having had the opportunity of any conference with other members of the Bar" (here the large number of solicitors in court all rose, and remained standing throughout the Speaker's remaining remarks), "in stating our conviction that the feeling always entertained by the Bar of New Zealand as regards the superior tribunals before which they have the honor to practice, is not likely to be, and certainly has not in any degree been, shaken as to the integrity of the Bench. They feel that the judgments of the Supreme Court or Court of Appeal, propounded individually or collectively, have been characterised by the utmost integrity, and by that knowledge of law and with regard to the fact which are necessary in dealing with questions that come before them. Humanum est errare is common to every institution in the world, and the acts and dealings of all classes of persons, and it was not surprising if some of the decisions had not been upheld. We are quite willing that your Honours should treat the protest made by the Judges of the Court of Appeal as though it were supported in every point by members of the Bar."

The Chief Justice, on behalf of the Court of Appeal, thanked Mr Travers and the members of the Bar for their expression of opinion, and remarked that Mr Travels was probably the oldest barrister in the colony, and was a member of the first Executive Ministry in New Zealand. His Honor knew of no other member of the Bar who has had Mr Travers's long experience, or his high reputation at the Bar since he entered it.

Judgment of the Court of Appeal.

Present: Williams, Denniston, Conolly, and Cooper, J.J.

The Respondents by virtue of a conveyance under the Bishop of New Zealand Trusts Act 1858 and by divers appointments under the provisions of the Religious Charitable and Educational Trusts Act 1856, have become trustees of a parcel of land containing 500 acres at Porirua Harbour originally granted by the Crown to George Augustus Lord Bishop of New Zealand and his successors upon the trust therein mentioned.

The grant in question is dated the 28th of December 1850 and is under the seal of the province of New Munster and the hand of the Governor Sir George Grey. The grant is as follows:—

"To all to whom these presents shall come.

"Greeting.

"Whereas, a school is about to be established at Porirua in the province of New Munster New Zealand, under the superintendence of The Right Reverend George Augustus Lord Bishop of New Zealand, for the education of children of our subjects of all races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of island in the Pacific Ocean, and whereas it would promote the objects of the said institution to set apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the neighborhood thereof, for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same, which piece or parcel of land has by a deed from the natives been ceded for the support of the said school. Now know ye that we for us, our heirs and successors, Zealand all that piece or parcel of land situate and being at the do hereby grant unto the said George Augustus Bishop of New entrance of Porirua Harbor in the province of New Munster New Zealand, and bounded on the southern side by a line running from Rocky Bay near Teti Bay, at an angle of ninety-nine degrees (99deg) with the Magnetic Meridian till it intersects the base of the hills on the south side of the One Poto Creek, the foot of the hills forming the boundary from thence to the head of the creek; on the east by Porirua Harbour, and on the north and west by the sea, the contents being five hundred acres or thereabouts, and the boundaries being more particularly delineated on the plan drawn in this margin of these presents. Together with the rents issues and proceeds thereof. To hold unto the said George Augustus Lord Bishop of New Zealand and his successors in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school, so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

The grant is punctuated as above and not as in the printed case.

The Respondents commenced an action in the Supreme Court against the Solicitor-General. In their statement of Claim they set out their title to the above-mentioned land. They allege that the Bishop of New Zealand expended money on the land for the purpose of improving it and rendering it fit for occupation and reproductive that the land has been let and that the Trustees have now in their hands about £6,480 the proceeds of rents accumulated. They allege however that they have not been able to carry out the trusts. First because the funds have never been sufficient to permit of their erecting the necessary school buildings and at the same time

to have enough from interest on investments and rents to maintain the school as contemplated. Secondly because the Juvenile Maori population at Porirua has almost ceased to exist. They further allege that in consequence of their inability to carry out the trusts they approached the General Synod of the Church of England and that the Synod resolved that the trustees be authorised to apply to the Supreme Court for leave to apply the income of the fund and the rents in manner in the resolution specified. The Plaintiffs then alleged that they have embodied the terms of the resolution in a scheme filed in Court and ask that the rents and profits be applied in accordance with it.

There is no suggestion in the statement of claim that the school contemplated by the grant was ever established.

The Solicitor-General in his statement of defence alleges that after the issue of the grant it was found impracticable to give effect to the trusts that no school was ever established at Porirua that none of the trusts mentioned in the grant have been performed and that it has been long since and now is impossible to carry out the original trusts prescribed by the grant. He goes on to allege further that the Executive Government are desirous that a scheme should be adopted to enable the land and the accumulations to he administered for educational purposes but that they were advised that by reason of the failure of the trusts the land and moneys have reverted to the Crown without any trust being attached to them and submits accordingly that the question should be dealt with by Parliament and that the Court has no jurisdiction. If however the Court has jurisdiction and the Court considers it expedient to adopt a scheme he objects to the scheme proposed by the Plaintiffs and proposes an alternative scheme. The case was heard before the late Chief Justice, Sir James Prendergast on affidavits. There is practically no dispute as to the circumstances which led up to the issue of the Crown grant nor as to what had been done under the Crown grant. Any circumstances which led up to the issue of the Crown grant are manifestly inadmissable as evidence to contradict or vary the terms of the Crown grant although they may be relevant on the enquiry as to what scheme should be adopted. The affidavits filed in the Court below and here are concerned mainly with the merits of the rival schemes as no facts otherwise material to the action are in contest. His Honour considered that there was a general intention of charity shown in the grant that it did not revert to the Crown but that the trust could be administered by the Court cy-pres. He declined however to adopt either scheme and reserved the matter for further consideration. An amended scheme supported by further affidavits was accordingly filed by the Plaintiffs and was submitted to the Court. Alter hearing an argument before His Honour the present Chief Justice and Mr Justice Edwards this scheme with certain modifications was adopted by the Court. It is from the judgment of Sir James Prendergast and from the scheme adopted in pusuance of it that the Solicitor-General appeals. We are of opinion that the land and money have become the property of the Crown for two reasons.

In the first place we think the grant has become void on the ground that it sufficiently appears from the evidence that Her Majesty was deceived in her grant. The grant does not state in so many words what the consideration for it was but it sufficiently appears from the grant itself that the grant was made in consideration of the facts set out in the recitals. The recitals state that a school is about to be established at Porirua tinder the superintendance of the Bishop of New Zealand "for the education of children of our subjects of all races and of children of other poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the Pacific Ocean." The recitals further state "that it would promote the object of the said institution to set apart a piece of land in the neighbourhood thereof for the use and towards the maintenance and support of the same "and that this parcel of land has been ceded by the natives for the support of the school.

The recitals and limitations leave no doubt that the land was granted by the Crown by reason of the representation that a school was about to be established at Porirua for the above-mentioned purposes and in consequence of the intended establishment of such a school. The contemplated establishment of the school was the cause and the sole cause of the Crown malting the grant. It is to be observed that the grant is not made for the purpose of founding a school but for the purpose "of assisting" a school which is about to be established apart from the grant and which would of course require funds to be provided for its establishment other than those arising from the rents and profits of the land granted. More than fifty years have elapsed since the date of the grant and no school of any kind has been established. All that has ever been done in the direction of the establishment of a school appears from the eighth, tenth, and twelfth paragraphs of Bishop Hadfield's affidavit. In paragraph 8 he says "Bishop Selwyn expended on the land much more money than the then value. Money was paid to a Mr Servantes who occupied a house on it as compensation for the house and there were improvements effected on the land in clearing and fencing from the Porirua Harbour to the sea coast.'

In paragraph 10 he says "a schoolmaster was sent on to the land to make a beginning but the children attended so irregularly that he resigned. I was not at that time a trustee of the laud but Bishop Selwyn consulted me as to the appointment of the schoolmaster and the commencement of the school."

In paragraph 12 he says "At the time of the gift land on the west side of Porirua Harbor was of small value and the 500 acres was not worth more than the money expended on it by Bishop Selwyn for the purpose of a

building clearing the land and carrying a good fence across from the harbour to the sea coast and without making this expenditure the trustees could not have accumulated the funds now in their hands."

The late Chief Justice in his judgment in the Court below was doubtful whether the sending the schoolmaster took place before or after the grant and no date is fixed by Bishop Hadfield. We should say that it was probably after the date of the grant. It must have been however before the 24th of August 1859 the date Bishop Hadfield first became a trustee. But can it reasonably be said that merely to send a schoolmaster for a short time and then on his resignation to take no further steps amounted to the establishment of such a school as the recital in the grant contemplated was to be established or to the establishment of a school at all. The sending the schoolmaster was but a step towards establishing the school. It was evidently an experiment to ascertain whether it was worth while to establish a school there. The experiment failed and all notion of establishing the contemplated school was henceforth abandoned. This appears to us to bring the case within the principle that a grant by the Crown is void if the King be deceived in his grant.

The Crown is informed that something is going to be done and that a grant of land will assist what is going to be done. A grant is made in anticipation of this something being done and because it is going to be done. Then the thing is not done. The Crown is thus deceived in the consideration for the grant. The law is thus stated in Berwick's Case 5 Co. 94 Bacon's Abridgement Prerogative F "It is a maxim that if the consideration which is for the benefit of the Queen be it executed or executory or be it on record or not on record be it not true or not duly performed or if prejudice may accrue to the Queen by reason of non-performance of it the letters patent are void." Again in Harris and Wing's case 3 Leonard at page 248 it is said "And in some cases, a consideration personal, if it be false shall destroy the patent, if it be future and executory as if the King grants land to J. S. ea intentione that he shall pay to J. D. £10. Now if he do not pay it the patent is void and the estate given by it void also."

In the present case the benefit that the down that is the State was to derive from the grant was the establishment of a school for the education of the Queen's subjects of all races. There is a distinction between considerations past and future the former may be erroneously stated and not necessarily avoid the patent but if the consideration is future and is not performed the patent will be avoided. (Viner's Abridgement Prerogative M.c. 89.) An apparent exception is where there is a lease from the Crown in consideration of a sum down and of a covenant to do certain things. In such a case if the lessee does not do the things the lease is not void because the Crown had an action of covenant. Under the piesent grant if the school were not established the Crown would have no remedy either at law for damages or in equity to compel the establishment. Shortly the grant here was made upon the representation and in anticipation that an institution was to be founded and for the sole purpose of assisting such institution. No such institution has ever been founded. The Crown was therefore misled or to use the legal term "deceived" though of course there is not the slightest suggestion that there was any intention to deceive or mislead.

In the second place if a school was at one time established to satisfy the terms of the grant it is admitted that it has long since ceased to exist. In such circumstances we think the estate granted has ceased to exist and that the Crown is entitled because upon the true construction of the Crown grant the estate in fee granted to the Bishop of New Zealand and his successors was in the nature of a conditional limitation determinable when religious education industral training and instruction in the English language ceased to be given in the school. When therefore such education had actually ceased to be given the estate of the bishop and his successors was determined. The law on the subject of limitations of this kind is to be found in Shepherd's Touchstone, Bacon's Abridgment, Fearne on Executory Devices, and lilackstone's Commentaries, Sheppard page 125, says:—"The most apt and proper words to make a limitation of an estate are *guamdiu*, dummodo, dum, quousque, si, and the like. And therefore if A grant lands to B to have and to hold to him and his heirs, until B go to Rome; or until he be promoted to a benefice, or until B pay to A or A pay to B £20 these examples by reason of the word heirs give determinable fees." So in Bacon's Abridgment Conditions H: "Proper words of limitation are dum, dummodo, *quamdiu*, donec, quousque, ubicunque, usque ad, tamdiu, or *so long as* he shall pay such rent or be abbot or parson, etc.; and in these cases the law vests the estate in the party (i.e., the party entitled over) without entry or claim.'" Fearne (S-34) says, "A special limitation is a qualification serving to mark out the bounds of an estate, so as to determine it, ipso facto, in a given event, without action, entry, or claim, before it would or might otherwise expire by force of or according to the general limitation." And again (S. 41), "A direct limitation is a restriction couched in words which directly express a limit to the quantity of the interest created; as, to A, during etc., or till etc., or whilst etc., or *so long as* etc." Blackstone (vol. 2, p. 155) says, "When an estate is so expressly confined by the words of its creation, that it cannot endure for any longer time than till the contingency happens upon which the estate is to fail this is demoninated a limitation, as when land is granted to a man *so long as* he is parson of Dale, or *while* he continues unmarried, or *until* out of the rents and profits he shall have made £500 and the like. In such case the estate determines as soon as the contingency happens (when he ceases to be parson, marries a wife, or has received the £500), and the next subsequent estate, which depends

upon such determination, becomes immediately vested without any act to be done by him who is next in expectancy." There is sufficient authority to show that there may be such a limitation where the gift is to trustees for charitable purposes although the period of limitation may possibly be so remote that no remainder executory devise or springing use could be limited after its expiration without being void as a perpetuity. In the case of the Attorney-General v. Pyle I. Atk. 435. A testator devised a freehold messuage at Rumford to the charity school there and directed that the rents and profits should be applied for the benefit of the said school *"so long as* it shall continue to be endowed with charity." Lord Chancellor Hardwicke said, "Where a sum of money is given to a charity *so long as* it shall continue to be endowed with charity, it is only given quousque, and when it ceases, if it is gift of real estate, it shall fall into the inheritance for the benefit of the heir, if personal, into the residuum." The Attorney-General v. Pyle was not cited in the two cases hereafter mentioned but they each rest upon the assumption that the law is as was laid down in that case by Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. In re Randell: Randell v. Dixon 38 CD. 213 a testatrix bequeathed £14,000 to trustees upon trust to invest and to pay the interest to the present and future incumbents of a church *so long as* he and they permitted all the sittings to be occupied free, If, however, any incumbent demanded and received any payment for pew rents the trust moneys and interest were to fall into and be dealt with as part of the residuary estate. North, J. said "that there way a definite, particular, special charitable bequest which must have effect given to it so long as it lasts, and no longer, and that when it comes to an end there is no devotion to general charitable pur- posea at all, the intention of the testatrix being completely the opposite. On the construction of the will, it is for a particular limited purpose, and nothing beyond what is declared; as soon as that particular purpose come to an end, the fund which was subjected to that particular trust fails into the residue of the estate." It does not do so however by virtue of the limitation over directing it to fall into the residue. The learned judge says it would fall into the residue just as much as if there were no such limitation in the will. The limitation is harmless and does not fail for perpetuity because it simply directs that the fund is to go in the way in which the law would make it go in the absence of any such direction. If there had been a direction that the fund should go over in any other way the gift over would fail for perpetuity. In that case as well as in the case of there being no gift over at all the fund would fall into the residue. The residuary legatees would take it as part of the estate of the testatrix. The authority in re Randell (38 C.D. 213) is recognised by Stirling J. in re Bowen 93, 2 ch. 491. 494. The learned judge there says: "' As property may be given to a charity in perpetuity it may be given for any shorter period however long;" and the interest undisposed of, even if it cannot be the subject of a direct executory gift, may be left to devolve as the law prescribes," For this proposition he cites at length in re Randell. In the case before him the learned judge has as he says to decide whether on the true construction of the testator's will the testator had given the property to charity in perpetuity subject to an executory gift in favor of the residuary legatee or whether he had given it for a limited period leaving the undisposed of interest to fall into residue. The question in the present case is whether upon the true construction of the grant the intention of the Crown was to give the property to charity in perpetuity or to give it for a period limited by the terms of the grant. In the latter event the cases of Attorney-General v. Pyle in re Randell, and in re Bowen show that effect will be given to such an intention. We think that where in a grant from the Crown apt words are used for limiting the duration of a charitable trust the intention of the Crown must be that they shall have their ordinary legal effect. Here the grant is to the Bishop of New Zealand and his successors "in trust nevertheless and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so *long as* religious education, industrial training and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat," The words "so long as" are recognised by every legal authority as words which are ordinarily used for limiting the duration of an estate and which have the effect of limiting it. We can see no reason whatever why they should not have their ordinary meaning applied to them in the present ease. The grant is from the Crown and was made upon the faith that a particular school was about to be established and for the purpose of assisting in the support of that school. There is nothing unreasonable in such circumstances in the Crown limiting the trust created by the grant for such period as the school carried out the purposes for which it was established. The question is whether the Crown has used apt words to limit the duration of the trust. The answer is that the Crown has used the exact words which, if it has been intended to limit the duration of the trust, would have been used. The alternate construction is that the Crown although as appears by the grant the possibility of the school ceasing to exist was contemplated at the time the grant was made, intended that in such an event the land should continue to be held by the Bishop and his successors in perpetuity for general and undefined charitable purposes. We think looking at the tonus of the grant that no such intention can be presumed as against the Crown and further that any such intention is expressly negatived.

From the view we have taken that the Court has no jurisdiction because the property is now vested in the Crown it is unnecessary to decide whether the Court would have had jurisdiction if the property had remained vested in the trustees upon trust for charitable purposes generally. As however the question was argued at length we think it well to express an opinion. If the true construction of the grant is that the land included is to

be held by the Bishop and his successors in perpetuity for charitable purposes notwithstanding that the particular school has ceased to exist then in the absence of any special circumstances we think the Court has jurisdiction to approve of a scheme for the management of the trust property notwithstanding the grant is from the Crown.

The case of Wilson v. Barnes 38 C.D. 507 shows that where there was a grant from the Crown for a public charitable purposeviz., the reparation of a sea dyke and in the course of time owing to the sea having receded there was no necessity to apply the fund to the particula" object the Court directed a scheme. The authorities cited by Mr Bell on this point show only that the Court will not interfere with trustees acting under a charter which gives the trustees discretionary power. In the present case if the particular trust fails and there remains a trust for charitable purposes generally the trustees are bare trustees of the fund and of the land, and have no power to apply the rents and profits for any purpose whatever till they get a sufficient authority to do so. The Court by virtue of its general jurisdiction over property held by trustees for charitable purposes can give the trustees authority by approving of a scheme. Short of an Act of Parliament the Court is the only source from which the trustees can obtain authority. In the present case there are however circtimstances which make the question of exercising the jurisdiction more difficult. The land as appears from the grant was ceded by natives to the Crown. Mr Bell who appeared for the Solicitor-General the representative of the Crown made a statement at the Bar as from the Crown that the terms of the cession by the natives were such as to preclude the administration of the gift otherwise than in the direct terms of the grant and asked that such an allegation should be added to the fifth paragraph of the statement of defence. The Crown therefore asserts that it has duties towards the natives who ceded the land which could not be performed it the Court administered the trust cy-pres. This would place the Court in a considerable difficulty. What the original rights of the native owners were what the bargain was between the natives and the Crown when the natives ceded the land it would be difficult if not impossible for this Court to inquire into even if it were clear that it had jurisdiction to do so.

The position appears to be somewhat as follows:—The Crown as parens patriæ through the instrumentality of this Court sees that property devoted to charity shall be applied for the purposes of charity and that where no purposes are specified the Court as representing the Crown is to define the purposes. The Crown also as parens patria; is under a solemn obligation to protect the rights of native owners of the soil. When therefore the Crown as parens patrias asserts that in that capacity it is under an obligation to natives in respect of a property can this Court representing the Crown as parens patriæ say to the Crown yon shall not carry out this obligation but the property you have granted shall be devoted to charitable purposes to be determined by the Court irrespective of your obligations? We see great difficulty in holding that in such circumstances the Court could or ought to interfere. The noninterference of the Court would not disturb any private rights. The trustees, except so far as they have a claim on the fund for money expended, are bare trustees only. In the above circumstances it seems more appropriate that the matter should be dealt with by the Legislature than by this Court. This point however it is not necessary finally to decide. For the reasons we have given above we are of opinion that the funds and laud have become the property of the Crown subject of course to any rights of the trustees against the fund in respect of moneys expended by themselves or their predecessors in title and that in consequence the Court has no jurisdiction to adept a scheme. The appeal must be therefore allowed and judgment be entered for the Defendants. The costs of all parties here and in the Court below as between solicitor and client will be paid out of the funds in the hands of the trustees.

Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Present at the Hearing:
LORD MACNACHTEN.
LORD LINDLEY.
SIR FORD NORTH.
SIR ARTHUR WILSON.
[Delivered by Lord Macnaghten.]

This is an Appeal by persons claiming to be Trustees of a certain charitable endowment in New Zealand against an Order of the Court of Appeal of that Colony. The Order appealed from was made at the instance of the Crown on the occasion of an application by the Trustees asking for the approval of a scheme for the administration of the Charity.

The effect of the Order was to pronounce the endowment null and void from its very commencement and to discharge the Trustees from all active duties in connection with it, declaring the Charity property to have

become the property of the Crown but leaving it still in the hands of the Trustees and for the time being at least apparently derelict.

So far as the evidence goes there can be no dispute about the facts. The documents relating to the foundation of the Charity are on record. The earliest of those documents in point of date and the most important is an instrument not under seal 'which in accordance with the legal phraseology in use in the Colony is described in a subsequent Crown grant as a "deed" of cession. It is in fact a, letter addressed to Sir George Grey, the Governor of New Zealand, by certain native chiefs and leading men among the Maoris who were then in possession of lands called Witireia in the District of Porirua near the south-western extremity of the northern island. The body of the letter is in the following terms:—

Otaki,

16th August, 1848.

"Friend Governor Grey,

"Greeting—It is a perfect consenting on our part that "Witireia shall be given up to the Bishop for a "College. We give it up not merely as a place for the "Bishop for the time being hut in continuation for "those Bishops who shall follow and fill up his placo "to the end that religion or faith in Christ may grow "and that it may be as it were a shelter against "uncertain storms—that is against the evils of this "world. This is the full and final giving up of that "place as a college for the Bishops of the Church of "England."

It is in evidence that some of the donors and those the leading men amongst them were converts to Christianity who had been educated under the superintendence of the Right Reverend George Augustus Selwyn, then Bishop of New Zealand, at St. John's College, Auckland. That College, founded by the Bishop and named after his own College at Cambridge, was established for the purpose of providing religious education, industrial training and instruction in the English language for Her late Majesty's subjects of all races and of children of poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of islands in the South Pacific. It was a flourishing institution and regarded as a powerful factor in the civilisation of the country. The Bishop, as is well known, had acquired an extraordinary influence in New Zealand. His striking personality, his devotion to his Master's service and his zeal for the welfare of the Maori race had produced a profound impression on the native mind. It cannot be doubted that it was the object of the donors so far as in them lay to imitate the Bishop's example and to make some provision towards the establishment of an institution like the Auckland College near their own homes in the south of the island. The cession is in terms an absolute, unqualified, and unconditional dedication to charity the general purpose or end of which is declared to be "that religion or faith in Christ may grow."

The Government at the time warmly commended the action of the native donors. The answer to their letter has not been put in evidence but its tenor may be gathered from the following minute dated the 7th of October 1848, and signed by the Lieutenant-Governor which is printed in the Record:—

"Acknowledge this and say that I shall have much" pleasure in sanctioning this giving up a portion of "their reserves at Porirua for the benevolent and "useful purpose of founding a College and that I will "communicate their offer to the Lord Bishop. Such "laudable and generous conduct will be made known "in England and cannot fail of insuring the commendation of all good men and the Queen will rejoice in "seeing her Maori subjects setting so good an example "to the Europeans.

"When they wish I will send over a surveyor that they "may indicate the quantity and boundaries of the "land they wish to transfer to the Bishop that a "plan may be made and the arrangement completed.

E. Eyre,
"Lieutenant-Governor."

The Governor, it will be observed, sanctioned the proposed cession and undertook to give effect to it without attempting to make any stipulation condition or reservation of any sort or kind. As the law then stood under the treaty of Waitangi the Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and the respective families and individuals thereof were guaranteed in the exclusive and undisturbed possession of their lands so long as they desired to possess them, and they were also entitled to dispose of their lands as they pleased subject only to a right of pre-emption in the Crown, ft was not until 1852 that it was made lawful for any person other than Her Majesty to acquire or accept land from the natives, 15 and 16 Vict. 72, s. 72. The founders of the charity therefore were the native donors. All that was of value came from them. The transfer to the Bishop was their doing. When the Government had once sanctioned their gift, nothing remained to be done hut to demarcate the land and place on record the fact that the Crown had waived its right of pre-emption. That might have been effected in various ways. The course adopted was to issue a Crown grant. That perhaps was the simplest way, though the Crown

had no beneficial interest to pass. After all it was only a question of conveyancing as to which the native owners were very possibly not consulted.

In accordance with the Governor's suggestion the land intended to be included in the cession was marked out and surveyed. It was found to comprise about 500 acres. On the 28th of December 1850 the arrangement was completed by the issue of a Crown grant with a plan annexed. The Crown grant contained the following introductory recitals:—

*"Whereas a school is about to be established at Porirua" under the superintendence of the * * * Bishop "of New Zealand for the education of children of our" our subjects of all races and of children of other "poor and destitute persons being inhabitants of "islands in the Pacific Ocean. And whereas it would "promote the objects of the said Institution to set "apart a certain piece or parcel of land in the "neighborhood thereof for the use and towards the "maintenance end support of the same which piece or "parcel of land has by a Deed from the natives been" ceded for the support of the said school."*

The grant was expressed to he made to Bishop Selwyn to hold to him and his successors "in trust nevertheless to and for the use and towards the maintenance of the said school so long as religious education, industrial training and instruction in the English language shall be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat."

In the year 1859 under the provisions of the Bishop of New Zealand Trusts Act, 1858, Bishop Selwyn conveyed the charity land to certain Trustees nominated by the General Synod of the Church in New Zealand in communion with the established Church of England. The present Appellants are their successors in the trust.

The land at the date of the cession was rough land covered with scrub and apparently difficult of access. In order to improve it and make it available tor pastoral purposes (the only use to which it could have been put at the time) Bishop Selwyn spent out of his own moneys a sum of about £200, which is said to have been more than the then value of the land.

No school or college has as yet been erected on the land or in the neighborhood of it. The land has been let from time to time as grazing land and the Trustees have invested and accumulated the rents and profits.

In 1897 the accumulations amounted to a sum exceeding £6,000. The land had increased in value but owing to the falling off of the native population the neighbourhood had become unsnited for the purpose of a school or college such as that contemplated by the original donors. In these circumstances the General Synod of the Church resolved that an application should he made to the Court for directions as to the administration of the charity. In the first instance the Trustees communicated with the Law Officers of the Crown sending them a copy of a proposed statement of claim and draft scheme. The office of Attorney-General was then vacant. The matter came before the Solicitor-General. After a delay of three months he returned an misalisfaclory answer. He said that Ministers desired to consult Parliament on the general subject of such trusts dining the coming Session and that he was therefore precluded from approving the proposed scheme. He suggested that the Trustees should defer proceeding further for the present, adding by way of encouragement or warning that "the position now taken by the Government" was "not necessarily hostile" to the interests which the Trustees represented.

In deference to the suggestions of the Solictor-General the Trustees waited until the end of the Session and then, as nothing had been done in Parliament, they applied to the Court for the approval of the proposed scheme.

The Solicitor-General in the absence of the Attorney General was made a party. He put in a defence. In his defence ho took a line which must seem somewhat strange to those who are familiar with the administration of charitable trusts in this country. It is the province of the Crown as parens patriæ to enforce the execution of charitable trusts and it has always been recognised as the duty of the Law Officers of the Crown to intervene for the purpose of protecting charities and affording advice and assistance to the Court in the administration of charitable trusts. The Solicitor-General however adopted a very difierent course. He seems to have thought it not inconsistent with the traditions of his high office to attack a, charity which it was primafacie his duty to protect. He suggested that the Crown was or might be entitled to the property. In the event of his failing on that point, which was the principal ground of his defence, he submitted a scheme in which the original trusts of the charity were apparently ignored altogether.

The case came on to be heard before the late Chief Justice, Sir James "Prendergast. That learned Judge rejected the SolicitorGeneral's contention that the endowment had reverted to the Crown and declined to allow an amendment proposed at the hearing by which it was sought to impeach the validity of the Crown grant. He decided with more hesitation than the case seems to have required, that the general purpose of the foundation was charity and that the doctrine of cy-pres was applicable. He did not, however, approve the scheme proposed by the Trustees, as he thought it was not shown by the evidence before him that it was impossible for them to establish a useful school in the neighborhood with the funds at their disposal. At the same time he thought it clear that the Trustees were right in their objection to the scheme proposed by the Solicitor-General. In these

circumstances he reserved the matter for further consideration.

The case was afterwards brought up on further consideration before the present Chief Justice, Sir Robert Stout and Edwards J. Evidence was adduced which satisfied the Court that it would be a waste of the trust moneys to erect a school at Porirua. A fresh scheme was proposed and adopted with some modifications to which the Trustees assented. The Solicitor-General renewed his objections but the Court held that it was bound by the decree made on the original hearing

The Solicitor-General then appealed to the Court of Appeal upon the following grounds:—

- *That the funds and lands have reverted to the Crown "either absolutely or as trustee upon a failure of the "objects and purposes of the Crown grant and are "not subject to administration by or under direction" of the Court cv-pres.*
- *That no general charitable purpose existed or is "proved either in the native donors or the Crown but "only a purpose of creating a specific school at a specified site and the funds and lands are therefore not "subject to administration by or under direction of "the Court cv-pres."*

The learned Judges of the Court of Appeal allowed the Appeal and entered judgment for the Solicitor-General. They did not however adopt or even notice either of the grounds put forward by the Solicitor-General. They were of opinion they said that the land and money had become the property of the Crown for two reasons. In the first place they thought "the grant had become void on the ground that it sufficiently appeared from the evidence that Her Majesty was deceived in Her grant." In the second place, assuming that a school satisfying the terms of the grant had been at one time established, they held that the duration of the trust must have come to an end because the trust was only to last "so long as religions education, industrial training and instruction in the English language should be given to the youth educated therein or maintained thereat." Now as it is common ground that no school was ever established at or in the neighborhood of Porirua, it would seem to follow that the occasion on which the trust, according to the construction placed on the giant by the Court of Appeal was to cease and determine never arose and never could have arisen. It appears therefore hardly necessary to consider the second ground on which the Court of Appeal determined the case in favour of the Crown. It was not pressed at their Lordships' Bar.

The learned Counsel for the Respondent were in much the same difficulty in attempting to support the first ground upon which the Court of Appeal relied. There too the Court had recourse to an assumption which has no basis in fact. What evidence is there that the Crown was deceived? Absolutely none. The evidence is entirely the other way. The Governor undertook to complete the arrangement proposed by the native donors as soon as he received their letter. He did not even wait to communicate with Bishop Selwyn. It is not suggested that he communicated on the subject with anybody else. Now it would be absurd to found a charge of misrepresentation on the letter of the native donors. But if the native donors were innocent, with whom is the blame to rest? The evidence which the Court of Appeal said was sufficient to prove misrepresentation was discovered by them in the introductory recitals of the Crown grant. But the grant is not a deed inter partes. The statements in it are the statements of the Crown. The statement that a school was "was about to be established at Porirua." is just as consistent with an intention on the part of the Governor to establish the school by the aid of public monev, or an expectation on his part that the announcement in England of the generosity of the native donors, coupled with the approval of Her Majesty, would bring in ample funds for the object in view, as it is with the supposition of representations made to the Governor by some unknown persons interested in procuring this grant from the Crown. If the representative of Her Majesty was unduly sanguine—if he did think that the hopes and aspirations of the native donors would attain a speedy consummation—that is no ground for suggesting that the Crown was deceived. And indeed expectations which may now seem to have been oversanguine or even unfounded might not improbably have been fulfilled if it had not been for the Maori war and the removal of Bishop Sclwyn to an English See before the war was finished.

After all what does the statement in question come to? The Crown grant says that "a school is about to be established at Porirua." That does not imply that the school was to be established within any fixed and definite period of time. The Governor must have known the circumstances as well as anybody. He knew that so far nothing whatever had been contributed towards the establishment of this school but a piece or parcel of land for the present wholly unprofitable. How could he have been deceived into thinking that the school was to be established in the immediate future. Suppose someone at his elbow with more sense and foresight than he seems to be credited with had pointed out with effect, that many hindrances might arise—that there might be a native war—that the Bishop might be removed and that the school might not be established for 50 or even 100 years—would that have altered the action of the Governor? It might have modified the language of the Grant. It might perhaps have led to the omission of the word "about "or to the substitution of the expression "intended to be" for the words "about to be" or to the adoption of some other phrase not obnoxious to hypercriticism. But the substance of the transaction would not have been altered The attitude of the Governor would have remained just the same. What the Governor was looking to when he welcomed the offer of the native donors was not the

immediate establishment of a school but the effect that the action of the natives would produce in the Colony and above all in England. Why should the Court attribute to a Government of the past more than childlike simplicity in order that the Government of to-day may confiscate and appropriate property which never belonged to the Crown and which the Crown encouraged the rightful possessors to dedicate to charity?

The learned Counsel for the Respondent feeling that they could not support the Judgment of the Court of Appeal on either of the reasons assigned fell back on the argument suggested by the Solicitor-General that there was no general purpose of charity but only an intention to erect "a specific school on a specified site." But that is a very narrow view of the transaction at variance in their Lordships' opinion with the express terms of the gift and opposed to principles laid down in recognised authorities such as The Attorney-General v. The Bishop of Chester, I. B. C. C, 444, and The Incorporated Society v. Price, I. J. and L., 498. Counsel also dwelt on the length of time which has elapsed since the date of the original gift without anything having been done in the way of establishing the proposed school. But it is well settled, as stated in Tudor's Charitable Trusts, 3rd ed., p. 53, that where there is an immediate gift for charitable purposes the gift is not rendered invalid by the fact that the particular application directed cannot immediately take effect or will not of necessity take effect within any definite limit of lime and may never take effect at all. In support of this proposition the learned writer cites a number of authorities, the latest of which is Chamberlayne v. Brockett (8 Ch. 206) before Lord Selborne, L.C.

So far their Lordships have treated the case as if the Order under appeal had been made on a proper application and in a suit properly constituted. In fact however the application was entirely irregular and the suit was not one in which such an Order as that obtained by the Solicitor-General ought to have been made. It is contrary to the established practice of the Court to permit a Defendant to an action for the administration of the trusts of a settlement not void on the face of it to impeach the settlement in his defence to that action. If he thinks he has a case for setting aside the setllement or having it declared null and void, he must attack it openly and directly in an action or counterclaim in which he comes forward as Plaintiff. Any other course would be inconvenient, embarrassing, and unfair. The present case affords a good illustration of the propriety of the rule. The Solicitor-General declined his proper duty and refused to bring an information. The Trustees were compelled to come forward as Plaintiffs. The Solicitor-General put in a defence. He submitted that the Crown might be entitled. The case of the Crown was launched in a half-hearted fashion. The point was suggested rather as a difficulty in the way of administration than as a claim to property. In argument before the late Chief Justice the Solicitor-General seems to have become rather bolder, but his contention was disregarded. Then he appealed to the Court of Appeal asserting that property of which the Crown was never possessed had "reverted" to the Crown. But the validity of the charitable trust was not in issue in the suit. There could be no issue in that suit between the Crown and the Charity. There was no evidence adduced on behalf of the Crown. There was no one put forward by the Crown who could be cross-examined on behalf of the Charity. The native donors whose claim would at any rate be superior to that of the Crown and whose interest is alternately magnified and ignored by the Solicitor-General were not represented either directly or indirectly. Then on the hearing of the Appeal the Solicitor-General applied for and obtained leave to amend his defence. A formal order for the amendment was afterwards ob- tained on the ground that such amendment was necessary "to more clearly define the grounds of defence of the Crown." But the amendment only made the confusion worse. It was a medley of allegations incapable of proof and statements derogatory to the Court. But the Court accepted it and treated it with extreme deference. The learned Judges intimate pretty plainly that if they had not been able to find satisfactory reasons for deciding in favour of the Crown, the amendment would of itself have prevented their making an order in favour of the Trustees. The amendment divides itself into two parts. In the first place it asserts that the Crown has come under some undefined and undisclosed obligations to the natives. The Court seems to think that this assertion must place the Court "in a considerable difficulty." Why? Why should a Court which acts on evidence and not on surmise or loose suggestions pay any attention to an assertion which, if true, could not have been proved at that stage of the proceedings and which the evidence in the cause shows to have been purely imaginary. According to the evidence the only obligation which the Crown undertook was to waive its right of pre-emption. The view of the Court of Appeal is to be found in a passage towards the end of their judgment which runs thus: "What the original rights of the "native owners were, what the bargain was between the natives "and the Crown when the natives ceded the land, it would be "difficult if not impossible for this Court to inquire into, even if it "were clear that it had jurisdiction to do so." Their Lordships are unable to follow this observation. The land was part of the Native Reserves as appeal's from the Government Minute of the 7th of October 1848. At the date of the cession to Bishop Selwyn the rights of the Natives in their Reserves depended solely on the Treaty of Waitangi. There is not in the evidence the slightest trace of any cession to the Crown or of any bargain between the Crown and the Native donors. Of course if the Crown comes forward as Plaintiff, the transaction may assume a very different complexion. There may be in existence evidence which has not yet been disclosed. But if the Crown seeks to recover property and to oust the present possessors, it must make out its case just like any other litigant. All material allegations must be proved or admitted.

Allegations unsupported go for nothing. Notwithstanding the doubts expressed bv the Court of Appeal it is perfectly clear that the Court has jurisdiction to deal with a claim to property made on behalf of the Crown when properly brought forward It has no right to decline jurisdiction. Still less has it a right to stay its hand at the instance of a claimant who may present a case into which it may be difficult, if not impossible, for the Court to enquire, even though that claimaint be the Crown. The second part of the amendment to which also the Court seemed disposed to yield is more extraordinary still. It asserts that "the "executive Government has determined * * * that any departure from the preciso terms of the grant by the application cy-pres "of the * * * land and funds without the assent of the "Parliament of the Colony would contravene the terms of the" * * * cession and be a breach of the trust thereby confided "in the Crown." "We see great difficulty," say the learned Judges, "in holding that in such circumstances the Court could "or ought to interfere." The proposition advanced on behalf of the Crown is certainly not flattering to the dignity or the independence of the highest Court in New Zealand or even to the intelligence of the Parliament. What has the Court to do with the Executive? Where there is a suit properly constituted and ripe for decision, why should justice be denied or delayed at the bidding of the Executive? Why should the Executive Government take upon itself to instruct the Court in the discharge of its proper functions? Surely it is for the Court, not for the Executive, to determine what is a broach of trust. Then again what has the Court to do with the prospective action of Parliament as shadowed forth by the Executive? No one disputes the paramount authority of the Legislature. Within certain limits it is omnipotent. But why should it be suggested that Parliament will act better if it acts in the dark and without allowing the Court to declare and define the rights with which it may be asked to deal? The present Chief Justice, who was not a party to the judgment of the Court of Appeal, took a truer view of the situation when he said that the approval of a scheme could not "in any way hamper" either the Government or the Parliament in dealing with this "trust."

In the opinion of their Lordships the Respondent has been wrong in every step from first to last. Their Lordships will therefore humbly advise His Majesty that the Order of the Court of Appeal should be discharged except as to the direction therein contained for payment of the costs of the Trustees: that any costs paid under that Order to the Solicitor-General should be returned; that this Appeal should be allowed with costs to be paid fay the Respondent, and that the Trustees should be at liberty to retain any extra costs incurred by them as between solicitor and client out of the trust fund in their hands.

Printed by the Evening Star Company, Ltd., Bond and Crawford streets, Dunedin.

Crime in New Zealand By The Hon. Sir Robert Stout, C. J. Extract from "The Colonist", 1st Dec, 1914.

Crime in New Zealand.

A Gradual Decrease.

Remarks by the Chief Justice.

(Reprinted from "The Colonist," Dec. 1st, 1914.)

In his address to the Grand Jury at the Supreme Court yesterday His Honour the Chief Justice (Sir Robert Stout) gave an interesting review of the crime statistics of New Zealand. His remarks were as follows:—

I am glad that I am again able to congratulate your district on the absence of serious crime, and on the few cases of crime in your midst. When I met you in March. I pointed out that crime in New Zealand was gradually decreasing relatively to our population, which is increasing, and that there was especially no increase in juvenile crime. I am able to say that the remarks that I made in March can be repeated. I mention the matter again because I find that some of our citizens keep on repeating that crime is increasing amongst us. It is a pity that they do not take the trouble to read the official papers that contain the statistics of our criminals. Crime fluctuates from year to year, but if we take a series of years, and examine the figures, we will find good ground for congratulation on the decrease of crime.

You are no doubt aware that many in our community do not seem to know that there are three reports published annually by the Government which give accurate details of our crime and our criminals, namely, the reports of the Prisons Department, of the Police Department, and of the Government Statistician. If you examine the report for the year 1911 of the Under-Secretary of Justice on our prisons you will find at page 2 a copy of the report of the Inspector of Prisons. It contains a table showing the number of prisoners actually in

prison on December 3lst every fifth year beginning in 1881 and ending in 1911; also the numbers in 1912 and 1913. I shall quote the figures of the number per 10,000 of our population. They are:—

We also find in this report the figures referring to serious crime. The Inspector of Prisons' report says:—

"The decrease in the number of serious crimes as evidenced by the length of the sentences imposed, which was remarked upon in last year's report, still continues." He gives the following figures amongst others:—

The total number of prisoners received in gaol having sentences of three months of over was, in

If we were to take the number at per ten thousand of our population the number would be in or a fall within seven years of nearly one-half.

There has been an increase in prisoners found guilty of minor offences. The figures are:—

This would be at the rate per 10,000, in

Another test in the number of distinct prisoners (somo are received more than once in a year) received into gaol per year. The numbers will be found in the Government Statistician's report on Law and Crime. The figures are:—

If we take the first and last of these five years according to population, that is, the numbers per 10,000 of our people, the figures would be:—

In juvenile crime, taking all prisoners sent to gaol whether more than once in the year or not, under twenty years of age, there has been a decrease during the last year. In 1912, the number of males was 124, in 1913 109. In 1912 the number of females was 5, and in 1913 10. If the rate per 10,000 were taken the fall would seem to be greater than the numbers quoted show.

I may now refer to the third report, that of the Commissioner of Police. I have hitherto dealt only with persons sentenced to imprisonment, but that is not always the test of the criminality of the State or a district. It may be that the police are ineffective, or that magistrates do not punish when they should, or that juries sometimes acquit when they should find a verdict of guilty. I have therefore taken another test. It is what crime has been reported to the police. The Commissioner of Police in his last annual report, dated 25th June, 1914, says:—

"The criminal statistics (Appendix A) deal with all offences reported to the police during the year ended December 31st last, and show an aggregate decrease of 566 on the figures of 1912. The proportion of offences to the population was 2.21 per cent., against 2.35 the previous year."

Of serious crimes reported the number of cases was in 1912, 617; in 1913, 614. There is this note in the report: "During the last ten years the number of serious crimes as above described"—that is, arson, assault and robbery, burglary, breaking into shops, dwellings, etc., forgery and uttering, murder, murder attempted, rape, receiving stolen property shooting with intent—"has varied from 520 tO 759, the present total, 614, being slightly below the average."

If, however the average per ten thousand of the population were taken the decrease would not be so slight. The average given was on the assumption that the population had not increased. There was during the last year, unfortunately increase in indecent and sexual offences, mainly in indecent assaults, where the increase was 36.

I have referred you to three official reports. If they carefully considered you will see that whatever else is happening in New Zealand, crime is take much comfort, for if there is no regard for human life, and no regard for the rights of others, and no regard for human liberty, in any nation that nation is on the down grade.

Crime in New Zealand.

A Gradual Decrease.

Remarks by the Chief Justice.

(Reprinted from "The Colonist," Dec. 1st, 1914.)

In his address to the Grand Jury at the Supreme Court yesterday His Honour the Chief Justice (Sir Robert Stout) gave an interesting review of the crime statistics of New Zealand. His remarks were as follows:—

I am glad that I am again able to congratulate your district on the absence of serious crime, and on the few cases of crime in your midst. When I met you in March. I pointed out that crime in New Zealand was gradually decreasing relatively to our population, which is increasing, and that there was especially no increase in juvenile crime. I am able to say that the remarks that I made in March can be repeated. I mention the matter

again because I find that some of our citizens keep on repeating that crime is increasing amongst us. It is a pity that they do not take the trouble to read the official papers that contain the statistics of our criminals. Crime fluctuates from year to year, but if we take a series of years, and examine the figures, we will find good ground for congratulation on the decrease of crime.

You are no doubt aware that many in our community do not seem to know that there are three reports published annually by the Government which give accurate details of our crime and our criminals, namely, the reports of the Prisons Department, of the Police Department, and of the Government Statistician. If you examine the report for the year 1911 of the Under-Secretary of Justice on our prisons you will find at page 2 a copy of the report of the Inspector of Prisons. It contains a table showing the number of prisoners actually in prison on December 3lst every fifth year beginning in 1881 and ending in 1911; also the numbers in 1912 and 1913. I shall quote the figures of the number per 10,000 of our population. They are:—

We also find in this report the figures referring to serious crime. The Inspector of Prisons' report says:—

"The decrease in the number of serious crimes as evidenced by the length of the sentences imposed, which was remarked upon in last year's report, still continues." He gives the following figures amongst others:—

The total number of prisoners received in gaol having sentences of three months of over was, in

If we were to take the number at per ten thousand of our population the number would be in or a fall within seven years of nearly one-half.

There has been an increase in prisoners found guilty of minor offences. The figures are:—

This would be at the rate per 10,000, in

Another test in the number of distinct prisoners (somo are received more than once in a year) received into gaol per year. The numbers will be found in the Government Statistician's report on Law and Crime. The figures are:—

If we take the first and last of these five years according to population, that is, the numbers per 10,000 of our people, the figures would be:—

In juvenile crime, taking all prisoners sent to gaol whether more than once in the year or not, under twenty years of age, there has been a decrease during the last year. In 1912, the number of males was 124, in 1913 109. In 1912 the number of females was 5, and in 1913 10. If the rate per 10,000 were taken the fall would seem to be greater than the numbers quoted show.

I may now refer to the third report, that of the Commissioner of Police. I have hitherto dealt only with persons sentenced to imprisonment, but that is not always the test of the criminality of the State or a district. It may be that the police are ineffective, or that magistrates do not punish when they should, or that juries sometimes acquit when they should find a verdict of guilty. I have therefore taken another test. It is what crime has been reported to the police. The Commissioner of Police in his last annual report, dated 25th June, 1914, says:—

"The criminal statistics (Appendix A) deal with all offences reported to the police during the year ended December 31st last, and show an aggregate decrease of 566 on the figures of 1912. The proportion of offences to the population was 2.21 per cent., against 2.35 the previous year."

Of serious crimes reported the number of cases was in 1912, 617; in 1913, 614. There is this note in the report: "During the last ten years the number of serious crimes as above described"—that is, arson, assault and robbery, burglary, breaking into shops, dwellings, etc., forgery and uttering, murder, murder attempted, rape, receiving stolen property shooting with intent—"has varied from 520 tO 759, the present total, 614, being slightly below the average."

If, however the average per ten thousand of the population were taken the decrease would not be so slight. The average given was on the assumption that the population had not increased. There was during the last year, unfortunately increase in indecent and sexual offences, mainly in indecent assaults, where the increase was 36.

I have referred you to three official reports. If they carefully considered you will see that whatever else is happening in New Zealand, crime is take much comfort, for if there is no regard for human life, and no regard for the rights of others, and no regard for human liberty, in any nation that nation is on the down grade.

Christmas 1914.

(By Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G, C.J.)

"King out the thousand years of old, Ring in the thousand years of peace."

For thousands of years the "Return of the Sun" as it has been called, has been a joyous season. As Washington Irving said: "It is a great thing to have one day in the year at least, when you are sure of being welcome wherever you go, and of having as it were, the world all thrown open to you." We have followed the customs of our ancestors of the northern hemisphere and we celebrate the shortening and not the lengthening of

the day. It is not, however, necessary to enquire into the origin of Christmas. We have followed ancient customs and wo have given many explanations of their origins. The ten volumes of Frazer's "Golden Bough" afford us much information about the beginnings of many of our practices and customs. Ancient customs still surround us. I thought of this when I was sitting in Newton Park the other day watching the farewelling of our Third Expeditionary Force, Behind the crowd in the east of the Park there are swings erected and youths were using them. Swinging was once a religious ceremony. Could an ancient of three thousand years have been present, the swinging at the starting forth of an army would not have been considered a peculiar proceeding. Swinging, as Frazer says, was a magic rite, or, as we would say, a religious ceremony.

Christmas, whatever its origin, has become associated as the one day of kindly feeling, of joy, of love, of brotherhood. It has come to us in 1914 when many nations are plunged in grief. Never in history has there been such a war, as is afflicting the human race at the present time. We speak of past buttles, but they pale into significance before this horrid war. The loss of life has been immense. At Trafalgar our loss of men did not reach 2,000. And England in the Crimea War—it lasted about two rears—had, according to Mulhall's statistics, only 98,100 men at the war altogether. We sent only 20,000 at first—about half what the Australasian Colonies have sent to the present war, and our losses in two years of killed and of those who died from wounds and of sickness were only 22,182. Our losses in the first five months of this war exceed this number. Then the numbers engaged in this war far exceed the numbers that have ever been engaged in any war.

Whilst our young people are enjoying themselves in this festive season and all of us are recalling the past and remembering our friends, may we not spend some little time in meditation on the present state of the world? How comes it that Peace bus made such slow progress We have had all kinds of organisations to promote peace and goodwill to all, and yet to-day we have the most stupendous war that ever disgraced humanity. Our civilisation has broken down. The nation that claims to be the most cultured is the one that has violated its pledged word and has treated its enemies with the utmost cruelty. It not only says it is the most cultured but it can claim that it has paid more attention to religious instruction than any other nation in the world. Religious instruction is compulsory in all the primary schools of Germany. Its claim to culture is well founded if culture means merely acquirement of knowledge, but something more is required than knowledge. There must he character or what the Greeks call "Ethos" from which our word "Ethics" is derived. The events of the last few days show the need our enemies have of that finer feeling that should inspire humanity. Here is a Christian taught nation, the home of State compulsory religious instruction, attacking unfortified towns and unarmed people, killing non-combatants, even children, while the Japanese would not even attack a fortified town—Kiaacuau—till it gave warning to the inhabitants so that they might go to [*unclear:* ettee]r. What a contrast? And the Jap[*unclear:* anes]se have a religion we call pag[*unclear:* aniu]m. Neither culture nor the Christian[*unclear:* cr]eligion has helped the Germans to act as righteous men. Here is something for us to consider. If we are to assess the value of German educational systems by their fruits, what will we say?

How then are we to help to inaugurate peace? It was long ago said by a philosopher that the way to promote peace was for everyone to be peaceable. Was not that a just observation? We can see where in the Germans have gone wrong. They have acted on the assumption that "might" is "right." They have striven and are striving for "Weet macht"—"World power." They do not desire to see humanity injured. On the con[*unclear:* trr]y, thev have, convinced themselves that if the civilisation of the, world is left to their control the world will be ben[*unclear:* efi]ed. It is not to destroy the human race, but it is to improve it that they have set out in their effort to rule the [*unclear:* ni]verse. What matters to them the opinions or feelings of the people of the nations they want to rule over! Is it not for their good theyhave created vast armies and navies nd great industries? Human rights, human consciences, what are they [*unclear:* clm]pared to the realisation oi' their ideal? This is their attitude, and the end will be woe and an injury to Europe that it will take a century to retrieve. Now, do any of us ever manifest this same attitude of mind? Does the "drum ecclesiastic" ever beat to arms and call for volunteers to do as the "Overseers advise? Are there found amongst us people who think a majority may [*unclear:* even] in the realm of religion do what it likes and that to ride rough-shod ever the feelings of a minority is praise—worthy, not blame-worthy? If there is a community anywhere that upholds the idea that a majority has the right to dictate to a minority in belief, there is no brotherhood there, and there will be no civil peace there. Our ideal should be the perfect state of which Robert Buchanan sang, and it will not be perfect till we get also the [*unclear:* perfect] citizen. There can be such [*unclear:* perfec]tion without freedom—equal [*unclear:* report to] all. If we penalise any class or [*unclear:* any] individual because the opinion of the class or person is not that of the mass liberty has vanished. There must of course in every society be restrictions. There must be order, else we can get no progress. No State can permit evil to exist. Many things must be prohibited, and that in the interests of true liberty. But on matters of opinion, or of conscience, it must be recognised that there will be different views in every community, and that the winority may even be right. History [*unclear:* tells] us that the minority has been as often right as the majority has been. Let us get in our minds and hearts the feeling of brot herhood, and then we will not fail to emphasise the need of freedom and the rights of minorities.

And if brotherhood gets Strong, peace will come, and it will spread throughout the world.

When one meditates on the evils of the world, the misery in many countries, the ugliness apparent in our surroundings, on the slow progress the race has made, the hundreds of thousands of years it has taken to reach our present position, and how many things we lack, we are apt to be discouraged. But the light is breaking, brotherhood is growing, and the evils of the past are slowly being lessened. Just this week I was reading of a movement in that great Sociological Laboratory of the nations—the United States of America. It was about what had happened in the town of Davenport in the State of Iowa. It is a town that has got rid of both slums and back-yards as we know them. We have not many slums in New Zealand, though in our larger towns there are unlovely places, but all our towns have back-yards. Why, it was asked, in Davenport should a back yard be more unlovely than the front of the house? And no answer could be found. So the people of Davenport—and it has about 70,000 inhabitants—resolved to make all their sections uniformly beautiful. They could have flower and vegetable gardens however small their size. They started a "Beauty Contest." Prizes were given for the most lovely back yards, and soon there entered some two thousand competitors and thousands more determined to make attractive these unsightly precincts, though they did not enter for the prizes. And lo[*unclear:* t] the back yards of Davenport are wreathed in flowers, sweet-peas, roses, golden rod, morning glories, etc., etc., and useful vegetables are there too. The State Agricultural College helped. The college sent lecturers and experts and plenty of stereopticon slides to show how flowers should look. And the contest came off, and Davenport was made a flower garden, and the theatre was packed when the prizes were given, and films shown of Davenport before and after this "Beauty Contest," But, above all, this made for a higher civic life and for brotherhood. In Haveloek North, in Hawke's Bay, we have a Haveloek North Society which is doing a great work with its beautifully got up paper "The Forerunnel'," and its literary and musical and other entertainments. And people have caught the Haveloek Society's spirit and the town has become one of the most desirable places of residence in New Zealand. Why cannot other towns emulate its example? Brotherhood and peace have been promoted. And it has been asked, is it not better to go crazy about beautiful back yards than to run after horse races, or long for alcohol, or even to waste all our spare time at the picture shows?

The point, however, I wish to emphasise is that such societies and such a civic life make for brotherhood and, home and peace. And may we not start such societies in all our towns to beautify our dwelling places, to give civic life higher ideals, and above all to promote peace, and goodwill amongst men? The great movements of the world have begun in small ways. They have grown. Suppose every city or town had a Hague tribunal for the universe? Let us show that civic peace is possible and then we may expect international peace some day. Give our people beautiful surroundings and healthy pleasures, and peace will be promoted and we will live on a higher ethical plane. In fact, it will be a mode of moral culture that will transcend the teaching of ethics out of books. Some people seem to think that you cannot live a good life unless you examine the origin of morals, or the sanction of morals. Training is better than teaching, living the life is better than talking about goodness. Where you have slums and unlovely surroundings you have unlovely practices. Get a clean, beautiful, town where temptation to do wrong is reduced to a minimum and crime and misconduct will be rare.

Would it, then, be wrong to say that if a man made a garden in his backyard he would be doing more for peace than joining a society that caused bitterness and ill-feeling between neighbors by insisting that everyone shall have the same view of the universe.

Beauty, Truth and Love should be our motto for the coming year.

(Reprinted from the Oamaru Mail, December 26, 1914.)

The Crux of Ritualism. An Appeal to All Followers of Jesus Christ. vignette

Price Sixpence.

Wellington: E. J. D. Johnson, Printer, 21 Willis Street. 1899.

The Crux of Ritualism.

An Appeal to All Followers of Jesus Christ.

vignette

TThe whole Ritualistic movement in England is centered in the Holy Communion, or Last Supper, or the Eucharist, or Mass, or by whatever name this Sacrament of the Church is called. The doctrine of Transubstantiation, as taught in the decrees of the Council of Trent, or of Consubstantiation, as taught by Luther, or the doctrine of the Real Presence, as taught by many Anglican Divines, all have their root in the Last Supper of Jesus with his Disciples. If we can understand the significance of that Meal, the whole Ritualistic controversy will be understood and ended. Yet how few will take the trouble to understand what was actually done at that Last Meal of Jesus with his Disciples? It is with the object of drawing the attention of the people to the true question—the origin of the Supper—that underlies all the Ritualistic controversies that these few pages

are written.

The four Gospels give an account of a Last Supper. Matthew in Chapter XXVI, Mark in Chapter XTV, Luke in Chapter XXII and John in Chapter XIII. John simply records a Last Meal, and has nothing about the institution of any commemorative feast. If there was instituted at the Last Meal of Christ with his Disciples a Feast that was to be commemorated for ever, and if the words used were to have the deep meaning that almost all branches of the Christian Church say they have, how comes it that there is no record of these in John?

Matthew and Mark's account substantially agree. Luke's is different in a most important particular. Following the Revised Version, Matthew says:—

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed and brake it; and he gave to the Disciples and said, Take, eat: this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many unto the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it with you in my Father's Kingdom.

Mark says:—

"And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed it he brake it, and gave to them and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, i will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God."

Luke says:—

"And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves, for I say unto you I will not drink from henceforth the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread and when he had given thanks, he brake it and gave to them saying, This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you."

It is recorded that the twelve Disciples were present. They were Simon Peter, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Matthew, Thomas, James son of Alpheus, Simon the Cananean, Thaddeus or Judas son of James, and Judas Iscariot. Neither Mark nor Luke were present. The whole question as to the Sacrament turns on the question whether or not Jesus instituted a Feast to commemorate his impending death. Matthew and Mark have no record of any such institution. John has none either. It is only Luke that records that the words "This do in remembrance of me "were used, and that only for the bread, not for the drinking of the cup. Even if these words were used, they do not show that Jesus intended that the Feast should be kept as a commemorative one by his Church. This do—means this: do now, in my presence—in remembrance of me. These words are used when the bread is distributed. There is therefore nothing in the three Gospels inculcating that there was to be a commemorative Feast kept by the Church such as is attempted to be done in Christian Churches, and variously designated Holy Communion, Lord's Sapper, Eucharist, Mass, *&c.* And here the controversy might end, for the foundation on which the various doctrines of the Supper rest is taken away.

Before dealing with what St. Paul says about it in the Epistle to the Corinthians, let us see what the Feast was at which Jesus and his Disciples were present. Matthew, Mark and Luke agree in saying it was a Jewish Passover. How a Jewish Passover was celebrated may be shortly stated as follows:—The persons who were to join in the Feast took off their sandals, washed their hands and feet, and rested on couches. The Feast began by a goblet of wine—generally three parts wine and one of water—being passed round after the head of the family had utter a short thanksgiving prayer both for the wine and feast-day. The following was used:—" Blessed art thou O Lord our God, thou King of the Earth, who hast made the fruit of the vine and hast given us this feast-day." Bitter herbs were then served and eaten, and then biscuits of unleaven bread baked in flat round cakes almost half an inch thick, with fruit and some of the flesh of the roasted Paschal Lamb. The head of the family took one of the biscuits, broke it up with the blessing, "Praised be he who makes the bread come forth out of the earth," and handed the pieces to those present, who ate them together with some of the herbs dipped in the fruit. While the second cup was being prepared, the head of the house stated the significance of the Feast, and Psalms CXIII and CXIV were sung and then the cup went round. Then the bead of the house washed his hands again and ate the first piece of the Lamb, upon which the regular Feast began, all eating and joining in conversation cheerful and joyous. The meal was closed with a third cup of wine called "the cup of blessing," and as a fourth cup went round, the Psalms CXV and CXVIII were sung. Sometimes there was even a fifth cup.

It will be observed that Luke speaks of two cups—one before the Feast and one after the Supper. Mark implies that there was only one cup referred to—the one after Supper and Matthew agrees with Mark. Is the whole feast to be followed? Is the Paschal Feast of the Jewish Church to be kept? There is nothing in any of the Gospels showing that this Feast or the part of it—the breaking of bread and drinking of wine—was to become a permanent Sacrament of the Church. And when the Apostles were sent out as missionaries to convert the nations the founding of such a Sacrament is not mentioned. Baptism is mentioned, but not the Sacrament of the Last Supper. Are the Quakers far wrong in denying that any Sacrament was ever instituted?

St. Paul, however, will be relied on, and we may examine what he says. Two remarks, however, must be made. First, St. Paul was not present at the Last Supper, and he and Luke had both to trust to tradition. Matthew was there. Further, none of the other Apostles refer to the Sacrament. If such a rite was established, whether as a Sacrifice, as the Roman or Greek Church says; or as a Communion, such as Protestant Churches declare, how is it that the Epistles are silent? It is true that there is something in the Acts. It may be quoted.

Chapter 2, Verses 42-46:—

"And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship in the breaking of bread and the prayers And all that believed were together, and had all things in common, and they sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, according as any man had need. And day by day continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread at home, they did take their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people."

This, however, lends no support to the doctrina of the Churches. There is nothing about drinking wine, nor about anything save breaking bread in their own houses—having in fact a common meal amongst themselves just as they had common possessions. James, Peter, John, and Jude are silent about any such Sacrament. What does Paul say? It is only in I Corinthians Chapter XI that he speaks of what is called the Sacrament of the Supper. The Revised Version says (I Corinthians XI., 20 to 84 inclusive);—

"When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper; for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken. What? have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and put them to shame that have not? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said, This is my body which is for you; this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh Judgment unto himself if he discern not the body. For this cause many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few sleep. But if we discerned ourselves we should not be judged. But when we are judged we are chastenned of the Lord that we may not be condemed with the world. Wherefore my brethren when ye come together to eat, wait one for another. If any man is hungry let him eat at home; that your coming together be not unto judgment."

First it will be noted that there is no mention here of any Sacrament at all. The early Christians were accustomed to eat together and to have Love Feasts (2 Peter I, 13; Judo 12) and it is of these Paul was speaking. Some brought their own food and drink to the Church, and the poor had little to bring. There is no hint in the New Testament that the Feast of the Lord's Supper was to become a Sacrament or invested with mystery. The early Christians in meeting and eating in common no doubt looked back to the last time Jesus met his Apostles, but not until long afterwards did the idea of a Sacrament or a Holy Communion arise.

The fact is that the true representation of the Love Feasts of the Early Church is the Tea Meeting or Soirees held in the Churches to-day.

It is not necessary, therefore, to discuss even the question of Transubstantiation, or Con ubstantiation, or Real Presence, or Divine Grace, nor the meaning of "This is my body," nor how the bread could be his body when he in his body was sitting with them, nor the question of Sacrifice—the foundation for all these discussions is nonexistent if the Feast was not made commemorative. And what (to summarise) is the testimony?

Matthew does not mention anything about a Commemorative Feast nor a Sacrifice, nor does Mark. Luke only refers to it in the breaking of bread. The Acts refer to a common meal, and St. Paul is dealing with the Love Feasts, and tells the Corinthian Christians they can eat them in their own houses. There is no statement that this common meal could not be eaten without any Apostle or Minister being present. Further, neither James, nor Peter, nor John, nor Jude seem to have ever heard of a Mass or a Communion or a Sacrament of the Supper.

The whole doctrine is a growth of later times, and is when it is a Sacrifice, a copy of the Pagan and Jewish sacrifices, without any warrant from the New Testament. With the doctrine of a Sacrifice or a Sacrament will fall the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and Episcopal Ordination which some Anglican Divines favour; but which Light foot, Hort, Hatch, Stanley, Hare, &c., have shown are without historical warrant.

And with the fall of these doctrines—a Sacrament of the Eucharist and Apostolic Succession—the value of Ritualism vanishes.

A few quotations from Ritualists showing how they view the "eating together" St. Paul wrote of, may be given, and it will be seen that for these doctrines there is no warrant in the New Testament, and that St. Paul

gives no support to their views.

Canon Knox Little says:—

1. "The Communion service without an offering sacrifice would be like a marriage without a bride. The teaching of the whole Catholic Church is that there is the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, of His Soul, and of His Divinity in the form of bread and wine."

2. "By the power of His Spirit bread and wine become His Body and Blood. In the sacrament of the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ united to His Godhead is combined with the sacramental signs."

Canon Carter says:—

3. "The Holy Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ in the form of bread and wine. Therein is Christ, His Body, His Soul and Divinity. That, we take, is certain."

4. "The Eucharistic sacrifice is a necessary consequence of the Real Presence. We offer Christ Himself in form of bread and wine."

Reference might have been made to Baur's "Church History," Harnack's "History of Dogma," and to the writings of many of the Fathers as to how the doctrines of Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation and other doctrines regarding the Lord's Supper originated. Instead, however, of making an historical survey, tracing the growth of the doctrines in vogue to-day, it has been thought better to go to the New Testament to see if such doctrines can be found there. They cannot. It remains to be seen if those who take their religion, not from tradition, but from the Bible, will longer continue a practice that is without Scripture warrant and leads to such idolatry as the celebration of the Lord's Supper does.

vignette

E. J. D. Johnson, Printer, 21 Willis Street, Wellington.

Front Cover

Can Morals be Taught in Secular Schools? By the Hon. Robert Stout, M.H.R. Attorney General A Paper *Read before the Otago Educational Institute on the 24th April*, 1878. Dunedin Printed at the "Daily Times" Office Battray Street. MLCCCLXXVIII.

Can Morals be Taught in Secular Schools?

THE teacher has to deal with practical questions. No doubt proper practice presupposes a correct theory and a definite aim. But whether the teacher has a theory or has even pictured to himself the goal for which he has to strive or not, he must act. In putting this query, can morals be taught in secular schools? I am asking a practical question, and one that demands a solution. The people in this Colony have pretty well agreed that religion cannot be taught in public schools. The question is, however, being asked, now that you have excluded religion—can yon teach morals? Let me define my terms, for oft disputes are to the same word. What does one mean by morals? one definition is the science of conduct. George Grote has defined ethics as the science of human dispositions, emotions, desires, and actions in so far as they affect, or are regarded by society as affecting, either the happiness of the individual himself, or the happiness and sentiments of others. While Professor Bain's definition is a department of practice defined by its end—the end being a certain portion of the welfare of human beings living together in society, and its realization obtained through rules of conduct duly enforced. Let us take morality as conduct in society. Of course outside of society there could be no morality—for the term implies duties and actions from one person towards another, or towards the whole. Now as Bain has said that the realization is obtained through rules duly enforced, there is at once a division in moral actions. One class is differentiated from another. There is one kind that the State or political Government enforces—whilst there is another class that the State does not interfere with. The State enjoins and prohibits certain acts. It has a code of rules—it has laws, and if these are infringad it punishes the law breaker. It also classifies the offence and offender—one kind and punishment follows. I mention this to show that it may be taken as admitted that there reed be little difficulty in teaching one great branch of morality. What ia that? it may be asked. I reply, obedience to the laws of the State; and there can be a sufficient sanction pointed out—viz.. the State's punishment. But obedience to the State's laws would not of itself constitute moraluy. There are duties to be performed and precepts to be obeyed, that the State neither requires nor teaches. To comprehend these other moral rules, regarding which no one can be said to be entirely ignorant, and to obtain an understanding of the difficulties that have been raised about the teachings of morals, we must appreciate the different aspects in which moral action is viewed. It is not enough for men to debate what rules cf conduct should be observed; great discussion has arisen regarding the origin of morals. Ethical philosophers conterd that until the origin is settled the "sanction" can never be found. Stated broadly, there are two great schools of Ethical philosophers—the Intuitionists and the Evolutionists. There are what we might term sub schools of these; but most moral philosophers can be ranged under one or other of the names of Intuitionist or

Evolutionist. Mr. Henry Sedgwick in his Method of Ethics has defined Intuitionism as "a system of absolute rules prescribed by God, through conscience, for obeying which no reason is to be asked or given, except that they are so prescribed." Professor Calderwood, who has in vol. I. of Mind, criticised Mr Sedgwick's statement of the intuitional position, does not seem to me to invalidate the definition I have just given. His own is not very different It is, "Self evident laws of conduct afford the only rational basis for distinguishing the moral qualities of actions, and self-evident moral laws are intuitively known by men, that is, directly recognised by the reason;" or, as put in another form—"Moral laws are applied by all men, and are recognised as essentialy true and authoritative, though their validity has not been determined by personal induction, nor established by experience of past ages, nor by the consensus of opinion among the more intelligent and civilised nations, but it is self-evident to the reason." The position of the Evolutionists may be put thus: They admit that there are certain things that appear as right or wrong to men without a considerstion of the consequences thereof, and that the decision a man may come to on an action may not be determined by his own experience of like actions; but they say, this categorical imperative of conscience we now Lave is a growth; and Darwin's chap. IV. of "The Descent of Man" gives illustrations of how the moral sense grows, and how to men in one stage of development a different answer is given by the reason to that given in another stage. The development of conscience is thus described:—First, there is a growth of social instincts. This is seen, it ia said, in many animals. Then living in society presupposes a limitation of conduct. Hence rules, hence a moral sense, hence intuitions. In proof of his position, Darwin shows that other animals, besides men, exhibit sympathy, courage, kindness, one might say magnauimity and benevolence. I am not at present, however, concerned as to which school is right, and I need not therefore dwell on the argumente advanced by the disputants. There is also closely connected with this search after the origin of morals another question that divides philosophers—what is the [*unclear:* s]anction for a moral act? Why ought I to be virtuous? The Intuitionists have a realy reply: You must obey conscience. The Utilitarians say that you must judge of the consequences of the act. Bain puts two sanctions—external, internal. (a) The External—1. Hope of favour or fear of displeasure from men or society. 2. Hope of favour or fear of displeasure from the Ruler of the Universe, (b) The Internal.—A feeling in the mind. A pain more or less intense, attendant on violation of duty, which in a properly cultivated moral nature rises, in the more serious cases, into shriuking from it as an impossibility. "The binding force, however, is the mass of feeling to be broken through in order to violate our standard of right, and which, if we do violate that standard, will have to be afterwards encountered as remorse"—so that the Utilitarians admit a conscience, and the sanctions that the Intuitionists say exist; but they found their morality on what might be termed the moral sense of humanity, and its decisions as affecting men. Now I have pointed out the differences of opinion that exist, in order to lead up to what I shall shortly contend—viz., that the theories ao diverse need not affect the practical question we have to solve. And I may just add that there are some men like Sedgwick, who have, after their search, come to the conclusion that it has been "Nor has it appeared very difficult to marshal our common judgments both of goodness and of rightness into a system under this principle without impairing our confidence in the substantial veracity of common sense, and all particular moral sentiments, and special sympathies fall easily into their places as auxiliaries to the two supreme coincident impluses, universal benevolence, and the desire to do what is right as such. . . . But the fundamental opposition between the principle of rational egoism and that on which such a System of duty is one structed, only comes out more sharp and clean after the reconciliation between the others methods. Hence the whole system of our beliefs as to the intrinsic reasonableness of conduct must fall, without a hypothesis unverifiable by experience reconciling the individual with the universal reason; without a belief, in some form or other, that the moral order that we see imperfectly realised in this actual world in yet actually perfect. If we reject this belief we may perhaps still find in the non-moral universe an adequate object for the spec[*unclear:* ulative] reason, capable of bring in some sense ultimately understood. But the cosmos of duty is thus really reduced to a chaos, and the prolonged effort of the human intellect to frames perfect ideal of rational conduct is seen to have been fore doomed to inevitable failure." Is the teacher to remain quiescent until all the diverse schools of ethical thought agree? If the is, I am afraid he will await an impossible event. Must he delay until the science of ethics has been placed on as sure a foundation aa geometry? t do not think so. He cannot wait if he would. His school must be moral or immoral. Day by day rules of conduct must be observed. How then, as practical man, must a teacher approach this question? Morality consists of rules. There must be guidance for conduct, whatever the origin of conscience in the moral sense may be, whether it is analysable or indecompossable, a growth, or a thing planted in man by Deity, there are cerla's rules of conduct which all recognise, and which I may say must be recognised. There are certains immutable principles. Now what are these! First, we must start with this postulate: [*unclear:* Must] is a social being and for his existence as such rules are required; indeed, without some such rules life is impossible. If in the tribe murder robbery, theft, violence, were permitted, the tribe would soon be extinguished. Hence, amidst savage and semi-savage tribes it it not allowable kill one of one's own tribe. There savage recognise two things: (1) A distinction between actions—some are good, others bad; or to use another phrase, some are right others wrong. (2) And that this

distinction must be enforced. Then there is also recognised this: that certain actions are Voluntary, and that each man's consaciousness is similar to his neighbours'—in fact, that Nature is uniform.

I have said that even savage and semi- savage tribes recognise moral distinctions. Of course there are some acts they consider right that we deem wrong. But amongst them even kindness, justice, and truth are valued. And if we think upon the past, we find amongst people of different civilisstions, of diverse religious beliefs, of various races, and having dissimilar environments, certain things always extolled. Now, this is of importance, for if we discover independent of even Christian civilisation, the highest virtue, the noblest conduct inculcated, can a teacher have any difficulty in saying that these moral rules are not the offshoot of any particular religious belief? Let me cite some of the things taught by people not influenced by our Christian civilisation, I find a Buddhist, 250 B.C., giving these things as excelcellencies (Conway's Sacred Authology, pp. 12 13) "To serve the wise and not the foolish, and to honour those worthy of honour "; these are excellencies. "To dwell in the neighbourhood of the good, to bear the remembrance of good deeds, and to have a soul filled with right desire"; these are excellencies. "To have knowledge of truth, to be instructed in science, to have a disciplined mind, and preasant speech"; these are excellencies. "To honour father and mother, to provide for wife and child, and to follow a blameless vocation"; these are excellencies. "To be charitable act virtuously, be helpful to relatives, and to lead an [*unclear:* inn]cent life"; these are excel lencies. "To be pure, temperate, and persevering in good deeds;" these are excellencies. "Humility, reverence, contentment, gratitude, attentiveness to religious instruction;" these are excellencies. "To be gentle, to be patient under reproof, at due seasons to converse with the religious;" these are exceilencies. "Self restaint and chastity, the knowledge of the great principles, and the hope of the [*unclear:* cternal] repose;" these are excellencies. "To have a [*unclear:* mnd] unshaken by prosperity or adversity inaccessible to sorrow, secure and tranquil;" there are excellencies. "They that do these things are invincible; on every side they walk in safety; they attain the perfect good." These are the words of a disciple of Buddha, and they inculcate what we may term the highest morality. Take an example from China—Kwiwyin. This is what he says:—"Never will I seek, nor receive final peace alone; but forever and everywhere will I live and strive for the universal redemption of every creature throughout all worlds. Until all are delivered, never will I leave the world of sin, sorrow, and struggle but will remain where I am." Does this not show two of the highest virtues—sympathy and self-sacrifice? Mencius—a Chinese sage—thus defines divine nobility:—Banevolence, justice fidelity, and truth, and to delight in virtue without weariness, constitute divine nobility." Then take this Chinese definition of purity:—"Practising no evil way. Advancing in the excise of virtue. Purifying both mind and will. The man who guards his mouth with virtuous motive, and cleanses both his mind and will, permits his body to engage in nothing wrong. This is the triple purification—S[*unclear:* ocuplou]sly avoiding all wicked actions, reverently performing all virtuous ones, purifying this intention from all selfish ends. This is the doctrine of all the enlightened." Here is a passage from what has been called "The Iliad of of the East." Thus spake Rama:—"Virtue is a service man owes himself; and though there were no Heaven, nor any God to rule the world, it were not less the binding law of life. It is a man's privilege to know the right and follow it. Betray and persecute me, brother men! Pour out your rage on me, oh malignant devils! Smile or watch my agony with cold disuain, ye blissful gods! Earth, hell, heaven, combine your might to crush me I will still hold fast to my inheritance! My strength is nothing—time can shake and [*unclear:* cripple] it; my youth is transient—already grief has withered up my days; my heart—alas! it seems well high broken now! Anguish may crush it utterly, and life may fail; but even so, my soul, that has not tripped, shall triumph, and dying, give the lie to soulless Destiny, that dares to boast itself man's master." A few more extracts must suffice for illustrations. One of the most important virtues is truthfulness. Hear what a Hindu writer says:—" He whose mind and life are free from deceit has a dwelling in the hearts of all men. Is it asked, 'what is truth?' It is the speaking of words that are without the least degree of evil to others. He who speaks the truth with all his heart is superior to those who make from falsehood, though he practise no other virtue, it shall be well with him. Truth will lead to every virtue. Purity of body comes by water, purity of mind by truthfulness. The lamp of truth is a lamp of the wise" Another writer, writing 1200 B.C., says there are two things requisite—to be true, and to do no evil to any creature. And Confucius's summary of the rules of life is thus given: "Is there one word which may serve as a rule for one's life? Confucius answered, is not Reciprocity such a word? What you do not wish done to yourself do not to others." This was uttered 500 years before Christ. Do not all these extracts prove that in societies there must be rules for guidance, and that the great men of the past were at one in inculcating what we term virtue? Morality must have existed wherever man existed. No doubt in many details there was much difference of decision and diversity of action. One writer on socilogy. Herbert Spencer, tells us that some things at first ceremoniql afterwards became enforceable by law, and ultimately were deemed morally obligatory. Non-attendance at a ceremony was thus, after a lapse of time, considered an immoral act. But underlying all these differences these has always been a distinction between right and wrong, and a recognition of the claims of society on the individual. Now each child must become, nay, is, a member of a social and political organisation, and must be fitted for the performance of his duties as such. If he is not so fitted for the

performance of his duties as such. If he is not so fitted somewhere or somehow he will experience the truth of that doctrine which Evolutionists have taught us, the survival of the fittest, and Society may be put to the expense of punishing him. We start then with two things:—1st, The existence of a moral sense and of moral rules. 2nd, The need of the child being fitted for the performance of social duties. I have already mentioned that there is one division of the rules of conduct that the State enforces. Civilisation would end were murder and robbery, or violence, and all that we call crime not punished and prohibited. No one denies this, and I suppose no teacher would hesitate to train his pupils not to commit crime. The question will arise, How is he to train them? I do not think that question is very difficult to answer. If one go to a theatre, or attend a public meeting and watch the audience closely, he will see how much the most obdurate is moved by the tragedy or the story of a wrong done. Watch the audience during some pathetic play. See the tears of sympathy that the actor evokes. See the indications of detestation that the bad character in the play brings forth, and how some high sounding platitude on goodness receives rounds of applause. Now amongst children, even imperfectly trained, the same feelings exist, and can be evoked, though not perhaps in the same intensity. Before, however, the teacher can train children to appreciate goodness, or to learn the A B C, or to do any work, there must be discipline, order. The existence of order is of itself a moral training. Under it may be included many of the highest social virtues. Order implies obedience, It implies self restraint, self sacrifice for the good of others—for society. It is the basis of the State. That must be inculcated, and that of itself is the highest moral training children can get. Then there is another thing which the teacher must teach, and that is truthfulness. That lies at the foundation of the tone of a school. And what does not this virtue include? Truthfulness means accurate observation; it is the education the man of science requires. Accuracy and care practiced in reporting, not only the doings of schoolfellows, but in observing things. That is the foundation on which a scientific training rests. This virtue of truthfulness is often underrated; indeed, the question has been put, is it wise to always speak the truth? Professor Clifford in one of his essays thus replies:—"Truth is a thing to be shouted from the housetops, not to be whispered over rose water after dinner when the ladies are gone away." I need not point out how much that is untrue is spoken or suggested. No doubt false narration often arises from inaccurate observation. But one may act an untruth in the representation of feelings and in the utterance of beliefs; and where cloaking of opinion exists the moral sense is necessarily weakened. I mention this merely to show what may be included under the term truth-fulness. I do rot require to urge that children should be trained to regard truth in all things as something which no expediency ought ever to permit them to tamper with, for if truth is tampered with the conscience is seared.

I have stated that the teacher must maintain order, and insist on truth being spoken. Order, and truth are necessary if the school is to succeed. If they are absent not only will morals not be taught, but the rudiments of knowledge cannot be imparted. The teacher should also train his pupils to sympathy. To do this the methods are various, and amongst children it is easy to evoke sympathy, and were my paper on the methods of teaching I could point out the different means that could be employed to attain this end. The method of teaching morals would, however, require to be treated in a separate paper. I have assumed that moral training can be given, and the objection against it being obtainable in secular schools I shall presently notice. If the teacher succeed in making his pupils orderly, truth speaking, and sympathetic, and kindly to all, I imagine that as children they will be moral, for I do not know any rule of conduct that could not be brought under one or other of the three heads of Order, Truth, and Sympathy. In moral training it is necessary that the teacher be an example to his pupils; teaching them a moral catechism. Punishing them for disorder or untruthfulness will not avail. To them example is everything. No doubt home influence will often counteract school training. But if the teacher is a living expositor of his teachings, his influence will be incalculable. In fact, living the life is the best method of teaching morality. St. Paul saw this, and hence he wrote, "Be ye living epistles." If one finds a school where the moral time is low, one may at once conclude that the teacher has either shamefully neglected bis duty, or that he himself has not acted up to a high moral standard. Let me now briefly glance at an objection that had been raised against the teaching of morals in secular schools. This is what may be termed the question of a "sanction." It is said that unless there is an answer given to the question, Why should I be virtuous? and this answer shows a law-giver who will reward or punish actions, there is no basis for morality, and it cannot he taught. A moral writer who wrote more than a century ago has answered this objection. He Showed that if Religion is Necessary to Morality, no one can be Moral Who Is not Religious. But there are men who may be deemed Irreligious and yet they are Moral. Therefore, Religion is not Necessary to Morality, Though Morality may be Necessary to Religion. Now, I do not deny but that there are some men to whom the fear of Consequences Here and Hereafter acts as a Potent Motive, Keeping them in a Straight Pal B. Some are so Constituted. Of Them It May Be Said—

The fear o' he 'l's hangman's whip
To haud the wretch in order.

There are, however, others over whom the fear of punishment or the hope of reward exercises very little, if any, conscious influence. To do evil would be revolting to them, and some very strong motive would be requited to make them swerve from the path of virtue. Again, the motives that influence men are as various as the idiosyncracies of humanity. To one posthumous fame is all in all. He lives, as it were, in view of the future judgment that his successors will pass on his acts. Others look to an approving conscience as their sufficient sanction. While to many the approval of their fellows is an ample incentive to good conduct. But what, I ask, have alt these things to do with teaching of children? It is admitted by almost all that the mysteries of religion children cannot understand. The term "sanction" even they could not comprehend, and though some vague terror, such as we see caused by foolish nursery tales of a blackfellow coming, might overshadow their minds, and induce right conduct, yet this feeling of terror is not conducive to true morality. Indeed one moralist argues that to found moral action on a fear of punishment is to destroy virtue. And I need not point out the absurdity of attempting to define to school children the different ethical positions of our numerous moral philosophers. No one perusing philosophical works can be blind to the fact that almost all moralists fail to appreciate the position of their opponents. And are young boys and girls to be launched upon this horizonlees ocean of polemic morality? If so, I am afraid that no morals could he taught to children. But we have seen that no school can exist without moral training. No society can exist without laws. In a school order must be enforced, truthfulness and sympathy inculcated, and children thus trained. Then religion as a distinct branch may be left to other instructors. Indeed if a child is made to practise morality, right conduct will become a habit, and that acquired, he will not need to search for the sanction or the why or wherefore of his conduct. And after all is it not on virtue becoming a habit that ill who hope to see moral progress must rely? Indeed it is assumed that in teaching morals a habit will be created that will make wrong conduct more and more difficult. Just as in teaching writing the schoolmaster knows that the muscles must be trained, and that after a while they will act unconsciously in forming letters. At first the strokes are irregular, the pothooks straggling; but after many trials and much practice the writing will become even and in line. So in piano playing, the time arrives when the player has not to consider what keys of the piano to touch. And all that is termed intellectual training starts with the assumption that after long practice things are done unconsciously and without effort that at first required great application. We see this in learning languages, in solving geometrical problems, and in alt our varied intellectual pursuits. Work chat once cost effort is afterwards done unconsciously. So must we rely on the practice of good—of right action. We must so train the moral sense tout the doing of a right action, requires no consideration and no searching for a sanction or reason. We look upon him as the most skilled musician whose piano-playing is done without effort We regard him as the ablest linguist who has not to search for words nor rack his memory for the grammatical construction of his sentences. And must we not esteem him the most moral who does good unconsciously, and to whom the doing of an evil act becomes almost an impossibility? But indeed no teacher could teach anything if he bad to explain to his pupils the basis of his teaching. What would be thought of a teacher teaching arithmetic to seven or eight year olds, by beginning a disquisition on necessary truth, or of a teacher beginning the teaching of the alphabet by a lecture on the science of language? Well, to begin moral training by examining the foundation of morals would be as wise a proceeding. Now the bringing in of religion into moral teaching is only necessary for this:—It gives the sanction, it is said; or it is urged by some that it adds to moral training the pathos and embellishments of moral actions. We need not quarrel with such a statement. If teachers so succeed that all their pupils love good and shun evil, there can be a little delay afforded in finding the sanction and getting the flower of morality. To those who argue that faith—religious faith—and morality are inseparable, I can only again make the reply I have already made, that in humanity they are found apart. I might, however, if I chose, prove by a comparison of criminal statistics that religious faith is not always sufficient to produce right action. Religious up-bringing—the inculcation of religious dogmas—has not been sufficient in the past to induce mankind to act morally. Indeed, I think it will be admitted that a history of the race viewed in its moral aspect will show that with knowledge morality has grown. Ignorance and vice have been more nearly allied than religion and virtue. And on what is the wel- fare of the race to depend? Is it not on knowledges and on moral training. The theory of children being kept little asses, and made at the same time little saints, has fallen as low as its author fell in royal power. We must regard the teacher, then, not only an an imparter of knowledge and a developer of intellectual faculties, but as a moral trainer to his care the well being of society is committed. For we believe that the advice of the hebrew sage will have still to be followed, "Train up a child in the way be should go and when he is old ha will not depart from it." To Accomplish this training, moral rules will have to be enforced. And these are numerous from confucius's

doctrine of reciprocity—"What you do not wish done to yourself, do not to others"; to jesus's summary of the law, "therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets"—Matt. Vii. 12; James's "pure religion and undefined before the Father is this, to [*unclear:* visit] the fatherless and widows in their afflictions, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world"; to Kant's, "so act that your action may from a law for humanity"; to [*unclear:* Comter's] "live for others, live without concealment"; we may even come to Professor Chifford's "put yourself in the place of others." Do not all these maxims enforce the practice of [*unclear:* virta]—enjoin self-sacrifice for humanity? And if children obeyed them, might we not hope for the dawn of a brighter day for our race, when not only knowledge would be diffused but the moral tone of our society would be raised, and its many foul blots wiped away. And with such moral advance the necessity of asking the question? Can morals be taught in our secular schools, would be recognised as useless as [*unclear:* ii] we were now to ask, Can schoolmasters teach the abc to their pupils?

Mr. R. Stout, M.P.C., Address to the Electors of the Caversham Electoral District, Delivered in the Forbury Schoolhouse, on Friday, August 6, 1875, Dunedin: Printed by the "Guardian" Co., High Street.

At the Forbury.

Mr. R. Stout, M.P.C., addressed his constituents at the Forbury School-house on Friday, 6th inst. Mr. Rutherford was in the chair. There were about 80 electors present.

Mr. STOUT said that he appeared before them that evening because he always considered that it was the duty and privilege of a representative to address his constituents, in order to give an account of the trust which they had reposed in him. If it should happen that he and his constituents disagreed, then it would be the duty of such representative to retire from bis position. It was more particularly the duty of a politician to meet his constituents on the present occasion, in view of the impending changes which were about to be carried out. If the Provinces were abolished he intended to retire from political life, and in such case his present address might be regarded as being his farewell speech to them. He therefore thanked them now for the many kindnesses which he had received at the hands of the electors of the Cavcrsham district. He would hare to ask their attention for a somewhat longer time than usual that evening, in order that they might come to a rational conclusion on the various schemes which were at present before the public of the Colony. There was no greater course to New Zealand than apathy on the part of electorates. Many would remember the stand taken in the year 1S70 against the grand scheme introduced by Mr. Vogel; many protested against it—not that the scheme was bad in itself, but that in one involving such grave changes the people should be consulted, and calmly discuss the matter. But unfortunately they did not do so, but said, "We will have no discussion; we want the scheme, and nothing but it." This impending Abolition is the fruit of the action then taken by the electorate. Had the people shown a firm front when that change was first introduced, and told their legislators in the Assembly that they would not allow it, they would not now behold a scene in the New Zealand Parliament which was not to be found elsewhere, namely, a Parliament without an Opposition. Schemes involving the expenditure of hundreds of thousands passed in a single night without criticism or discussion. Bus was one of the many things from which the electorate had to suffer in consequence of its not discussing these measures as they should have been. If those whom the people in Otago termed obstructionists had their way, and some scheme adopted for the purpose of securing to it its own revenue, and providing for financial separation, they would not have suffered as they had done in past years, and as they should suffer in the future. Before dealing with General Government politics he would allude to what took place in the Provincial Council during its last session. When the Council met, Mr. Reid was in office. The schemes which he brought down in reference to the proclamation of Hundreds, and also the selection of blocks of land for deferred payments, were approved of. Nothing was opposed until the Estimates came on for consideration; then a cry arose about turning out the Government. The Opposition comprised many of the members for Southland, who thought that their district was being slighted. The question at issue was not one of principle, but one of the distribution of money throughout the various districts. It was this which led to the defeat of the Reid Government. He was not going to mention names, as he always wished to avoid personalities. The Reid party, however, again returned to power, and of course they all now knew who constituted the Executive. It was unfortunate that the Reid Government should have been put out on a question in which no principle was involved beyond the mere expenditure of money, as large capital was being made out of it in the General Assembly. He need not point out to them the various bills which had been passed by the Provincial Council during its last session. There was a matter which he had opposed most strongly—that was, the introduction into the Otago Harbour Bill of the vicious principle of nomineeism. He contended that its members should be elected by the people, and not by the Government. Ho called for division after division, for the purpose of having the principle of nomineeism eliminated from the bill. The Provincial Council, however, was in favour of it, and it was carried. Referring to the land question, he said that he knew many who were then in the room, and who had only recently arrived in the district, were probably ignorant of its provisions and history. He would point out what had been tho nature of the agitation which had taken place

in reference to it lie did not intend to deal with the regulation which had been made by Sir George Grey in reference to it, but would come down to the year 1865, when the runholders' licenses having nearly expired, and the Province at that time not being in u good financial position, they offered to give an increased rent for their runs, on condition of the Government granting them an extension of their leases for 10 years, they also offering to give 3s. Gd a head for cattle, and 7d. a bead for sheep, which they would depasture on the runs held by them. This was agreed to, and became the Waste Lands Act of 1866, whit h continued in force until 1869, when an Act termed the Otago Hundreds Regulation Act was carried. It provided that the runholder should be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of 2s. 6d. an acre, and also that the land opened should contain a certain portion of agricultural land. This was not approved of by the Council, which resolved not to open any land under these provisions. Mr. Stout then sketched the history of the land legislation down to the year 1872, and the changes he desired. He had advocated that the landed estate of the Province should not be sold at all, but that they should adopt a State leasing system, as this, he considered, was the only way of effectually preventing a monopoly in land. On the occasion of his speech at Caversham last year, ho pointed out some of the benefits which would result from it if carried into effect. Land was not ordinary property, as it was limited in quantity. The earth had been well termed tho mother of everything, and being limited in quantity, it must necessarily be a monopoly. Great evils had resulted from it in the Old Country, and they were beginning to make themselves felt in this Colony already. The only way to avoid the evils of landlordism was to adopt a State leasing system. When he first brought this under the notice of the public he introduced nothing new, as it had been discussed previously by political philosophers. Though he had at first met with considerable opposition in reference to it, the feeling of the people in Otago was now more in its favour. In Victoria Messrs. Higin-bot hum and Grant, and others, had, in the Assembly of that Colony, supported tho principle of the State leasing its lands. If the electors would only consider the matter they would see that the people had tho right to the use of the land, and, if put out of it, to be paid compensation for any improvements which they might have effected upon it. This was no new system, as it woe carried out by large capitalists on their private estates, are when such was the case, why could not the same thing prevail in the case of the public estate? Ten years ago the flat, there, was [*unclear:* would] but little, but it had since risen in value. This was not due to any act of the proprietors, [*unclear:* for] rather to the whole country. Why, [*unclear:* they] should the former get the whole of the [*unclear:* become] fit? The educational reserves of the P[*unclear:* rovision] were also leased. If nothing were done [*unclear:* with] check the monopoly of land the result would be that it would fall entirely into the hands [*unclear:* of] the wealthy. In coming to the Colony [*unclear:* more] of them thought that they were going out [*unclear:* to] the reach of the evils of landlordism, and [*unclear:* of] lords and dukes who dictated to people [*unclear:* have] they should vote. In Canterbury, where[*unclear:* the] price of land was £2 an acre, large tracts of country extending for 10 or 15 miles, [*unclear:* were] converted into sheepwalks. He brought [*unclear:* this] land question prominently before [*unclear:* them] because it was one of the main political questions of the day, and one which should [*unclear:* not] be lost sight of. He pointed outthat [*unclear:* they] should be warned by what bad taken place [*unclear:* in] Victoria on the attempt, in the time [*unclear:* of] Wilson Gray, to introduce a liberal law. [*unclear:* They] cry of Free-Trade and Protection was [*unclear:* raised] and the land question avoided. Many [*unclear:* squatters] joined the Protectionists in order to do [*unclear:* this]. He had touched on this question because [*unclear:* he] led up to something he intended to say [*unclear:* in] respect to the

Abolition Bill.

And if there was no other objection to it [*unclear:* this] that it took the whole administration of [*unclear:* the] waste lands of Otago out of the hands of [*unclear:* the] people of Otago, that should of itself be suficient to cause its rejection. He did [*unclear:* not] exalt the land revenue to the position of [*unclear:* from] place—the administration of our was waste [*unclear:* less] was, in his opinion, of as much importance us the revenue to be derived from them; [*unclear:* such] this bill took the administration of the [*unclear:* was] lands out of the hands of the people, [*unclear:* and] vested it in the General Assembly, in [*unclear:* coun]tion with which there was an Upper [*unclear:* House] that had done everything in its power to prevent a liberal land bill being passed. ([*unclear:* By] plause.) But that was not all the bill did he would show hereafter. It not only [*unclear:* to] away the administration of the waste [*unclear:* lands] but introduced a most vicious system, [*unclear:* the] of allowing the people to be [*unclear:* governer] by nomineeism. He was not, as [*unclear:* they] would see, opposing this nominee system because it was introduced into the Abolition Bill. He had opposed the [*unclear:* same] thing as introduced in the Harbour Board Bill in the Provincial Council, and because [*unclear:* of] he stated, he would never consent to [*unclear:* nomi]neeism having anything to do with govern- ment; therefore he was now simply asserting the same principle that be asserted in the Provincial Council before this question of abolition came up. Now, what did this bill propose? They might say they did not want a Superintendent and

Eexcutive. But this bill provided for a nominee Superintendent; and the only difference what they had now and what was proposed was this: At the present time the people elected tho Superintendent; under this bill the Governor elected him; and they would even find in the bill that there was a provision for officers in lieu of Executive officers. He (Mr. Stout) quoted the 9th section of tho bill, which provided that the functions performed heretofore by the Executive officers should be exercised or performed by any person or persons from tune to time appointed, for the purpose by the Governor; so that it would be seen they would, even if the bill was passed, have their Superintendent left, and their Provincial Executive left; but with this distinction, that they would have no voice in their election. Therefore, this was another step on tho road to this vicious system of nomineeism. With respect to the general phases of the bill, they would remember that last year, when the resolutions were introduced in the House, he addressed meetings at Caversham and at Mornington, and then said two things which were found fault with by the Press. According to the report of his meeting at Mornington he said: "To those who said that they must believe in Mr. Vogel's sincerity when he said he would not touch the Middle Island land fund or abolish the Middle Island Provinces, he would merely ask them to remember Mr. Vogel's action in reference to the capitation allowance, which showed what political exigencies compelled Mr. Vogel to do. Mr. Vogel's proposals for the abolition of the North Island Provinces must end in there being a common purse for the whole Colony. The whole of the lands will be administered from Wellington, and the proceeds of tho land will be taken to pay tho Colonial debt." Now, he would prove that everyword he then uttered, everything he said, had come to pass; but what did the *Star* say The *Star* said this: "We are told that in revenge they (that is, the North Island Provinces) will never rest until Provincialism is abolished in this island. This is the bugbear held up to frighten us, and if we allow ourselves to be terrified by it we shall deserve what will inevitably follow. If Northern Provincialism is maintained, our laud revenue will pass from us." So that the *Evening star* was so prophetic as to say that there was no intention to abolish the Provinces in the Middle Island, and that tho people ought themselves to trust to Mr. Vogel's sincerity and Mr. Reynolds' honesty, and that the abolition of the Provinces in the Middle Island would not be carried out. He (Mr. Stout), however, stated at the time that the *Star* was making a statement that would within a year be shown not to be a fact, and he now asked tho meeting whether he or the *Star* had been right in their prophetic conclusions as to the future? (Hear, hear.) The Hon. Mr. Reynolds, when he came to Dunedin, stated—and, of course, that gentleman was always very careful what he did say—that there was no chance of the abolition of the Provinces in the Middle Island. In fact, Mr. Reynolds told them that if such proved to be the case, he would retire from the Ministry. (Hear, hear.) Then Mr. Reynolds was asked what guarantee Canterbury and Otago would have that Provincialism would not be abolished in those Provinces. This was his sapient reply: "The guarantee Canterbury and Otago had that their Provincial Governments would not be abolished was, that if their members, and other strong members, opposed the project, a Government could not stand before them for an hour." Therefore, they would see that the question of Provincialism was brought before the people in the Middle Island under tho distinct guarantee that whatever happened in the Northern Provinces, in the South it should not be interfered with. That, in fact, was dinned into the people's ears daily by the Press, and by members for Otago who supported abolition in the North; and yet those men now came forward and said that the Middle Island people had never opposed the abolition of Provincialism. But they must acknowledge that the people had been misled on this question, and led to believe, also, that it would not affect the Middle Island people at all. He (Mr. Stout) had said this much to make them cautious of the promises of politicians. The promises of politicians were likened by an American to a Western road, which opened out broad and fair, but ultimately ended in a squirrel track up a tree. That was tho type of tho promises of a politician of the present day. (Laughter.) Everything was beautiful and lino; everybody was to get lollies; but when they came to guage them they were not what they pretended to be. Ho had brought forward this matter to show that what he said last year had been fulfilled to the letter. Now, it had been admitted that the abolition of the Provinces would confer a boon on the North Island. That, indeed, could not be got over; they might cloak it and endeavour to disguise it as they pleased—the funds of tho Middle Island would be taken for tho benefit of tho North. He did not care how tho matter was put. He would guarantee to show any man who would consent to discuss tho question with him—he would, he said, guarantee to show any man, by figures, that such was the fact, and some of the papers had already admitted it. He would quote from the Guardian of last year-First, the Guardian said—"There is no foundation for the rumour at all,"—namely, that the land fund would be absorbed. Then the Guardian also said—1 Would it not be better for Otago to hare a rich and prosperous neighbour living across Cook's Strait, than a needy and struggling one—a neighbour able and willing to buy its merchandise and produce, and foster and increase its trade?" Well, that certainly was a novel proposition—that in order to get a trade for the Middle Island they must provide the North Island with funds. Let them apply the same proposition to commercial life. Let them take, for instance, a storekeeper who started business on the flat. He had got a small trade, and his neighbours were not able to buy his groceries, but in order to enable them to do so, he went and furnished them with money. (Laughter.) That was precisely the position which the Guardian took up,

namely, that the Middle Island should give money to the North Island to enable them to buy their produce. No doubt there would be plenty of buyers, if a storekeeper only furnished his customers with plenty of money. (Hear, hear.) Now, there were two views of

Provincialism.

There was the money view and the political or theoretical view. He was willing to meet the Abolitionists on both grounds. He did care whether they took the mere money point of view er what might be termed the theoretical or political point of view; in respect to either, he was prepared to prove that on neither ground should Provincialism be abolished. Let them just look at what might be termed the money point of view. But first, he asked, were the Otago electors to look at every political question from a money point of view? For example, this Abolition Bill hod not been introduced as he contended a Constitution Act should be introduced, as a form of government to be placed before the people under which they were to live. It was clogged with money questions. Here the centres of population were treated as in the evil days of ancient Rome. Whenever it was desired to carry a measure in Rome the mass of the electors were bribed by some largesses or bounties. The same thing was attempted by this bill. Municipalities were to get bribes of 20s. and road boards 40s. per £1 on the rate. This system of bribery was adopted in 1870, for Provincialists were told that if they supported the scheme 40s. per head would be given to the Provinces. Next year, however, some charges were taken over by the Colonial Government and the capitation reduced to 15s., and now, if this bill were carried, there would be no capitation at all. This was the way attempts to bribe the electorate wore made. No one could read the Colonial Treasurer's statement without seeing that he had tried to bribe Christchurch is respect to the fees and fines. Christchurch did not get what Dunedin got for license fees, &c., neither had they such a large lauded endowment as Dunedin possessed. The Municipal Council asked the Provincial Council to give them the license fees and other sources of revenue, but tho Provincial Council declined to accede to their demands. The Provincial Council said, "You have got the city, and you can tax yourselves to maintain tot streets. Thersupon the Colonial Treasurer stepped in and promised that if the Municipal Council would support abolition he would give them the license fees, &c., and a bonus of £1 for £1 on the rates. That a bribe thrown out to Christchurch, and a like bribe was given to the populations of the cities, fit said that that was a conclusive argument against those who said that Provincialism in Otago or other parts had been a modified Centralism put up to the injury of the injury districts, and it was not doing the outlying districts justice. This then was the manner in which the proposal to abolish the Provinces had been introduced. It had been introduced and made a mere money question. The people had been told that if they would only support it they should get £1 for £l, the license fees, ex., forgetting what happened in connection with the capitation allowance—that this bonus for bonus cut cease; that the Colony could not afford a give this bonus all round as promised; sod next year they would hear of a proposed induction, as had taken place in respect to capitation allowance. That was the bribery to which he alluded, and that was the reason why he bad approached the question from a money point of view. Now let them see how the Abolition question affected them so far as Otago was concerned. Supposing the Provinces to be abolished, what would they save by it? He had already told them that they did not get rid of the Superintendent, nor of the Executive. The only thing they would get rid of by abolition was the Provincial Council; and by getting rid of the Provincial Council they would save some £3,000 or £4,000. All the present political offices must be kept up-First, there was the storekeeper; he had to look after all contracts, and could not possibly be dispensed with. He also acted as Secretary to the Superintendent. Then there were only two Executive Council clerks—that was all the staff of the Provincial Executive, and if the Provinces were abolished to-morrow, those clerks could not be dispensed with. Additional clerks would have to be employed to conduct the correspondence at Wellington. The Waste Lands Board Department, the Survey Department, and all the other departments of the Provincial Government would have to be increased, and not diminished, because of the additional correspondence that would ensue with the General Government. There was no simplification whatever of the Government functions by abolition; but, on the contrary, there will be a large increase of road board clerks, civil servants, &c., and the cost of the Government to the people would not be diminished, but increased. Therefore all the saving at the first glance—though it was not a saving—was the sum of £3,000 to £4,000 for the abolition of Provincial Councils; and he asserted that, even if it were a saving, it would be better to pay the £4,000 annually and keep the administration of the lands in their own hands. Now, what really did they lose? The appropriation of the capitation allowance was done away with. Their revenue consisted of the capitation allowance, gold export duty, gold-fields revenue (which was estimated at £8,000 only this year), tolls on roads, and their railways, and that was all; and the expenditure on roads and works, bridges, and buildings, exceeded the revenue from the sale of land. Therefore, when they heard people talking about the alleged wasteful expenditure of Provincial Councils, they should recollect that they could prove for

themselves by figures that the expenditure on roads, works, bridges, and buildings exceeded the ordinary land revenue.

The Conservation of Our Land Revenue

was made a great deal of; the Provinces were to be split up into shires or road districts, and the road boards were to do very much what the Otago road boards did—although he thought it would be found it meant the maintenance of main roads, too, because shire councils got no additional revenue—had to maintain the main roads. The whole revenue arising from Crown land sales was made a separate account, and out of this account the first thing taken was the interest and sinking fund on loans. That was the first charge made on the land revenue. The interest on our loans was taken out of it; the capitation allowance was formerly sufficient to pay that. The next thing that came out of the land revenue was the pound for pound on rates that were raised in the various districts. At present, 25s. was paid to road boards—part was paid by the Provincial Council and part by the General Government. The £1 for £1 for municipalities came out of the Consolidated Fund. Well, that was how the land fund was conserved to them; and this would entail an endless cost on the Colony, because there would have to be separate accounts for each Province. It was the same as if the Caversham people bad a large sum of money to spend on public works in the district, after the ordinary maintaining of the roads had been accomplished, and they went to all the road districts and asked where they should spend the money on various parts of the Flat. Now, tho land revenue was Otago revenue, and made so by the Colonial Treasurer in his Statement. He stated that the Parliament of New Zealand was to decide where public works in Otago were to be executed, and where Otago money was to be spent. Now, that was at variance with all ideas of government, because it was allowing people not interested in the Province to decide in what portion of the Province money was to be spent. But it was said that by this arrangement our land revenue would be preserved. At the first flush they might think that the land revenue was secured, but it was the seine as if they put money into two pockets and did not let one hand know what the other hand was doing. He would take Auckland, which realised from its land revenue £4,713 in 1873-4, and its interest and sinking fund amounted to £47,000. It could not pay its interest out of its loan revenue, neither would it have anything left for public works or road boards. "Oh," said the Treasurer, "that is all very well, but you must put Auckland in an independent financial position." The proposal made was something like Macawber's way of paying debts. When Micawber was in difficulty, he gave a bill; and that was what the Colonial Treasurer proposed when a Province was hard up; that Province must give a bill. The 17th section of the Act provided for the raising of Treasury bills should the land fund be insufficient to meet the land charges made on it. There were several Provinces in the Colony totally unable to pay the interest on their debts out of the loan revenue, but to enable them to do so, Treasury bills were to be raised. The Colonial Treasurer said they should be charged against the land fund, but what would be tho use of that? Where was the future land fund to come from? What they were asked to do by the bill was this: That the Provinces unable to pay for their loans, &c., and give money to the municipalities to provide for education and other purposes, should obtain it from the Middle Island. He thought that, sooner than have this system of separate accounts kept up, and different expenditures, it would have been far more honest if the Government had said the Colony was to have only one purse, and (hat all Provinces should be dealt with alike. (Hear, hear.) It was simply nonsense to say that the Middle Island revenue was not absorbed. The land fund was just as much taken away by tho bill as if the Colonial Parliament, had been honest enough to say that they looked upon the Colony as a whole, and intended to put every Province in the same position. "Whore, then, was their gain? They only saved £4,000 at the most. But it must also be remembered that if the bill was passed they would keep the Parliament in session perhaps eight months in the year, at a very considerable additional cost. Members must be paid double, or perhaps treble, what they were paid now, because they could not expect men to go to Wellington without remuneration, unless they were men of capital. They might have two sets of men—capitalists, and political Micawbers waiting for something to turn up. (Hear, hear.) That would cost an additional sum to be voted; and in consequence of tho complication of accounts, also, that would follow abolition, they would not be one whit better off—because these public works must be carried on; and there were the gaols, hospitals, and other institutions. It was simply, as he had already stated, putting tho whole Colony on the same level-Those who knew anything about tho history of tho Colony knew that some had allowed miles and miles of the best lands to pass into the hands of a few capitalists for a few shillings. They should make those persons pay taxes if the Provinces had little revenue. Ho could show that so far as tho bill was concerned, it conferred no boon—that it simply amounted to another way of taking their land revenue; and it would therefore have been more honest for the General Government to have said it was their intention that there should he one common purse, and that they should vote money independent of Provincial sections of tho Colony. But the bill was "a sham, a delusion, and a snare." There was no boon given to the outlying districts.

Did they expect the diggers were going to form road boards and tux themselves out of the rates? They had tried the county system in Westland, and had failed. The miners of Otago would have formed road boards long ago if they had so desired, and have got their subsidy at the rate of £2 to £1. Not a single digging district had formed a road board, tho reason being that, they were bettor cared for by the Provincial Councils. Where, then was the advantage they were to get from this bill? Now, let them Look at it from a financial point of view. He had the Local Government Bill there. It contained 270 clauses, but there was but little difference between it and the present Road Board Ordinance. He then commented upon the bill. There was a further view in which to look at Provincialism. It was that which had been constantly dinned into their ears, namely, that they must get the Assambly to manage their affairs because they would be better managed. He denied that such would be the case. He held that things were bettor managed by Governments when the eyes were continually on them. They did not expect, for example, when they got members to go to Wellington, that they would vote more in accordance with the desires of the people than if they had met in a Provincial Council. They had not that public opinion here which other Colonies possessed, and which was so necessary for the proper discharge of Government functions. The Otago journals were scarcely ever read beyond the bounds of Otago, and one only saw the other Provincial journals in the Athenæums or at hotels. They had not such a public opinion as tended to keep down those gross abuses to which all centralised Governments were liable—abuses such as had been perpetrated by the Assembly in the disposal of 200,000 or 300,000 acres of land in the North Island to a few individuals for a few shillings, and a monopoly of the finance of the Colony to one bank, that had the Colony's millions lodged in its coffers. The people seemed helpless to get rid of these monopolies. They would not get their affairs better managed after abolition than now. It had been stated that if they had their affairs removed from local control the greatest purity would exist. The fact was, there was the greatest jobbery and corruption in the biggest Legislatures. Local Governments can manage local affairs best of all. People on the Flat did not require to call the people of Mornington or tho Taieri to enable them to expend their road rates; but tho Colonial Treasurer admitted that in tho post it had been practically impossible for the General Assembly to distribute the matter equitably, and that the House had voted money in the interest of localities without any reference to the Colony's necessities. They could not abolish locality-feeling. Indeed, tho Colonial Treasurer perpetuated it by keeping up the present Provincial boundaries. Referring to the other point of view in which he proposed to consider the matter, namely, in its

Theoretical Aspect,

he would say this, that as far as Governments were concerned, there was no such thing as an absolutely perfect system. They should look at the various surroundings, such as the number of people and tho requirements of the country. No one had yet discovered a constitution suitable to all circumstances. Ho did not mean to assert that Provincial Governments were the best that could be had, nor the General Assembly either. Governments mutt grow, not be formed in accordance with theory. Tho Provincial Governments were more democratic than that of the General Assembly. They heard it continuously urged in favour of the General Government that it tended to unite the Colony, and create a national feeling, whereas Provincialism did not. If such were so, why preserve the Provincial boundaries, as was done in the Abolition Bill? If they desired to keep up this national feeling, why not abolish Provincial boundaries altogether? Indeed, there was nothing to prevent it being kept up under the Provincial system. An inhabitant of Vermont, Ohio, or Maine, was none tho less a citizen of the United States. The States, and State Governments, were far more independent and separate than those of the Provinces. They established their own courts, and managed the whole of their civil administration, and possessed far greater powers than the Provinces. It was nonsense to say that Provincial institutions had the tendency to destroy national feeling. To do an injustice to any portion of the inhabitants of this Colony, was far more likely to do so. Ho then referred to Ireland as being in point, and said its government was taken away by bribery, the same as was now being done with the Provinces. Did the Irish people become national in consequence of its Parliament being abolished? He believed more ill-feeling was engendered by the destruction of it than by any act which the English Government had done in regard to Ireland. (Applause.) When the people of the Southern Island would see their revenues being taken from them, a feeling would arise in it which would do for more to destroy the national feeling and unity than the existence of Provincialism ever would. If they were to sacrifice everything to centralisation, why not carry the principle to its full extent and have one Parliament in Melbourne for tho whole of the Australasian Colonies? Then, should they want a sludge-channel at the Hogburn, or a water-race at Tuapeka, they would have to apply there for it. This would simply be carrying the matter to its logical conclusion. He would ask them to look at the question from an ideal point of view. If Sir George Grey's idea was carried out, namely, that of federalism, such would lead to tho highest form of government. There was a maxim in biology that if efficiency was required, it would be necessary to have

specialisation of function. If they wished to make a man a good bootmaker, they did not seek to do so by teaching him other trades. If they desired to have able lawyers, they would not expect thorn to be doctors and clergymen as well. So, if they wanted good government, it would also require to have special functions to perform. Mr. Godley, the founder of the Canterbury Province, had even insisted upon the powers of tho Legislature being properly defined. He said: 11 It is essential, therefore, that when the Central Legislature shall hare formally abandoned certain powers to the Provinces, from thenceforward all questions of jurisdiction be referred to the Supreme Court of the Colony, and that this Court, moreover, shall be so constituted as not to be, nor even appear, dependent partial." He regretted that the Canterbury people had not paid more attention to Godley's speeches in this discussion. Speaking on the question of the probable abolition of Provincialism, ho said: "As communications become more frequent and easy, and as, in the progress of wealth and civilisation, a leisured class comes into existence, able and willing to make politics a profession, and devote their whole time to such pursuits, it becomes possible and desirable to abolish Provincial distinctions, and to centralise governmental power. The extent, therefore, to which political subdivision should bo carried in any political case is quite arbitrary." That federal government a as the best form, they need only look to America and Switzerland. In tho former country, on the occasion of the secession of the Southern States, they adopted a system of government similar to that under which they had previously lived. It was a great mistake to suppose that one large central government was the best. The larger the central government, the greater the amount of corruption which prevailed. In proof of this they need only refer to the resolutions passed by the Provincial Councils of New Zealand. These were always marked by a much greater degree of liberality than those of the General Assembly. In theory be altogether denied that a central form of government was the best, but asserted the contrary. The mischief attending the administration of distant governments was well pointed out by Godley in the following passage;—" It I were asked what is the main lesson I have learned from my Colonial experience, I would say it was tho blighting and ruinous effect of distant government. I stand here myself, tho agent of a distant and irresponsible governing body, to say that I think no amount of abilities, no amount of theoretical knowledge, no amount of zeal and disinterestedness, can over approach to compensating for the enor- mous disadvantage of being without personal interest in its local affairs. It appears to me to be as indisputable as an axiom in Euclid, that 'a country governed from a distance will either be jobbed and tyrranised over, or altogether neglected.' "What was true then was also true at the present time.' He would also tell them that with a central government possessing more power they would get more despotism as well. There were many other things to which he might refer, but he would now cut short his remarks by making a few further observations upon this question. He thought, so far as revenue was concerned, the abolition of the Provinces would not result in any gain to the Middle Island, and had also pointed out some of the evils which would result from the measure being carried out. Notwithstanding what the *Star* and Guardian had said in regard to the abolition of the Middle Island Provinces, his warning had proved true. They could take his statements against those of tho Press, with Mr. Vogel's sincerity thrown in, that if they supported the bill, they would, in return for the bribe offered them, be allowing the whole of their land revenue to be taken away from them, and power removed from their hands. The Christchurch people had supported it, so had Timaru; but the people of the latter district wanted all their own money. This idea of mixing up money matters with constitutional changes was a most vicious one. What would have been thought of it had such been done when the people of England asked for the lowering of the franchise? If they made politics merely a scramble for money, they would do more injury than all the good which national unity could confer upon them. It was degrading politics to do so. What led to political degradation in America? Simply that the Government of a State was looked upon as being a fit object of plunder. If, instead of desiring to see New Zealand progress, they simply wished to get money from the Government, then they were relegating polities to an ignoble position. If they placed confidence in what he had said, then he would ask them to use their influence among their friends, and demand, before any constitutional o ban gee took place, tail they should be calmly and rationally discussed. They should also demand from the Press that in discussing these questions it should defend its position upon substantial grounds, and not delude the people with the cry of "bonuses for road boards! "white it the same time their money was being filched from them. He besought them that, if they thought what he had stated was fair and reasonable, and not stretched in any way, they should think well before they consented to this inroad noon their Constitution, sad which, once sanctioned, they would be utterly powerless to redress. (Applause.) He spoke for about two hours, and after answering i few unimportant questions,

Mr. BARROWMAN said he looked upon the abolition of Provinces as an agitation having its origin not with the people, but with the Press. Such a proposal should have emanated from the people. This was being forced cs them. He then alluded to Mr. Reynolds' speech and to his declaration that the Middle Island Provinces should not be abolished, and moved, "That this meeting disapproves of the Abolition of Provinces Bill, as being a measure not in the interests of the people, nor called for by them." (Applause.)

Mr. M'INDOE seconded, and the resolution was carried without one dissentient.

Mr. HALLIGAN moved, and Mr. MALONEY seconded, "That the Chairman be requested to transmit the resolution to his Honor the Superintendent in Wellington," which was carried unanimously.

Mr. THOMSON moved, and Mr. EASTON seconded, "a vote of thanks to, and confidence in, Mr. Stout, as the representative of the district," which was carried unanimously.

Mr. STOUT returned thanks to the audience for the vote, and for the patient hearing that had been accorded him, and moved a vote of thanks to the chair, which was carried vita acclamation. Tho meeting then dispersed.

Printed by the "Guardian" Co., High Street, Dunedin

Mr Stout at the North Dunedin Drill-Shed.

On the evening of Wednesday, July 2, Mr Robert Stout addressed the electors of Dunedin East in the above hall, which was crowded in every part, whilst several hundreds were unable to obtain admittance.

Mr SCHLOTEL, Mayor of North-east Valley Borough, occupied the chair, and in opening the proceedings said; It is not necessary for me to make any speech in introducing such a respected resident of Dunedin as Mr Stout. All I have to ask yon, gentlemen, is to give Mr Stout a patient hearing, and I will content myself by introducing to yon Mr Robert Stoat, a candidate for the representation of Dunedin East.

Mr STOUT, who was received with much cheering, said: Ladies and gentlemen,—I do not think it is necessary that I should make any apology for appearing before you as a candidate for Dunedin East. I have held political offices in Otago on various occasions, and I am not ashamed for you to look up the record of what I have done. But this evening I

Come Forward on Party Grounds

and for party purposes. I will explain to you in a few words what that means. You are all aware that we have what is termed Representative Government. We have a Parliament that is called upon to administer our affairs, and wherever there is a Parliament elected for such a purpose party government is essential. If you do not have party government, you descend into mere cliquism, and nothing but logrolling and jobs.—(Hear, hear.) But if you have strict party lines, if you have one party with some defined principle and another party with some defined principle, then you can hope to have really good government, each fighting for what they believe to be best. No one can say, for example, that one party is all right and the other party all wrong. You must give credit to the people in different parties for having good intentions, and for doing what they believe to be best for the Colony. Bat though we give them credit for that, we have a right to examine their creed to find out what their principles are, and to vote according as we find them. And I say that, if a man go into any House of Parliament to vote alone and s and alone and to be drifted about on every motion, first on this side and then on thatside—(loud laugh ter and hieses)—he can do no ere it to himself and no credit to any constituency that elects him.—(Applause and disapprobation.) I do not say that such a man may not have his place in our political world; but I say no man has ever gone into Parliament, however high his intellectual endowments and sincere his professions and ideas, and done any good, unless he has allied himself with some party, and led others on to do what he believes to be right. Why, I could appeal to England; I could appeal to other countries; but I would rather say what an able English writer has said, speaking on this very subject. When a short time ago it was suggested that Herbert Spencer should be elected for Leicester, what did he say? He could not ally himself with either party; therefore he thought he had no right to go into the English House of Commons. He would there be standing alone, unable to influence either party to do what he believed to be right; and as an able English writer has said: "A Hebrew prophet has no business in a temple of Baal."—(Laughter.) If a man is so pure and conscientious that he cannot ally himself with any political party, then he has no business in a House where party government rules. Now it is all nonsense to say that there are not two political parties. I say

There are Two Parties

in the New Zealand Parliament.

A VOICE: There are half a dozen,

Mr STOUT; A gentleman says there are half a dozen, and I would like to know who is to blame for that? I say it is the electors, who have not elected men who could tell them to what party they belonged, but who said they were what was teamed "independent."—(Applause.) I say that one cause of the bad government of New Zealand, one cause of our depression, one cause of our jobs, one cause of our log-rolling, is this: that men have gone into the House and floated about without any defined party principles, and unable to unite with parties, and any person who flattered them for tibe moment got their vote.—(Hear, hear.) And, gentlemen, I ask you to think of this. I ask you to bear with me whilst I tell you what the party is that I belong to, and what the parties have done in the past. I can assure you that when I was in the House of Representatives—and even in the two last Houses of Representatives of which I was not a member—I could have taken up a card of the members and upon almost any question you could name I could have ticked off how the members would have voted, because

I; knew them and the political principles that actuated them; and it is only to their credit that it should be so. I say that if a man has no political principle, so that he cannot make up his mind how ho is to vote, he is of no use as a representative of the people.—(Applause.) Now, I want you to see to what party I belong, and to give you an idea—as there may be many who do not know the political history of this Colony for some years nock—of what the two parties have done. Let me show you first what I call the true Liberal party—which has been in opposition now for five years, and which was in opposition for many years before—attempted to do. When I was in the House, what did we find? You are aware that Major Atkinson's party carried the Abolition of the Provinces, and by so doing they did a wrong to New Zealand.—(Hear, hear.) What did we find? We found that we were not able to do anything for true Liberalism unless we obtained some

Extension of the Franchise;

and to that wo addressed our first efforts. I, do not intend to speak of what Sir George Grey did to get the franchise extended. When we were in office in 1878 we introduced the Electoral Bill and the Bribery Bill. We had prepared a Representation Bill; and a Triennial Parliaments Bill was introduced and lost. We found that the first thing to do was to obtain a true representation of the people, and that if we could obtain it we would bo able to carry out those political and social reforms which we believed the Colony required. Now, let me tell you what were the views of the other party on this question. And I shall read to [*unclear:* ou] two short extracts from speeches of Sir [*unclear:* hn] Hall showing what was the attitude of [*unclear:* a] party, and I say that it is the same party which is in power now. What was the attitude of his party to the extension of the franchise? This is what Sir John Hall Aid:—

I am one of those who deny that there is any abstract right on the part of any section of the body politic to any particular share of political power, deny that, because a man has to obey the laws he has necessarily a right to a voice in the making of them. That in a popular theory; but I have never been able to find that it is founded upon any substantial basis.... If I thought this Bill would cause any great extension of the franchise I should not be prepared to support it, because I think the franchise is practically low enough, and, so far as I know, that is the general opinion in the part of the Colony in which a live.

That was the opinion of Sir John Hall. It is all nonsense to say there are no Tories in New Zealand. Those men were opposing any extension of the franchise in New Zealand, and they did all in their power to burke our Bill, and they succeeded. Then I ask you to look at this question of triennial Parliaments. What was the attitude of Major Atkinson and Mr Rolleston—members of the present Ministry—on this subject of triennial Parliaments? They both voted against the Bill, and not only so, but we found that on every question in which there was anything like liberalism they were always against us. Then I want to point out to you some things which the Liberal party attempted to do.

Social Reform.

We were the first to legalise trade unions. I introduced the Bill myself. We then set about the codification of the law and the simplification of Supreme Court procedure. We also prepared and introduced a Local Courts Bill to carry out reform in the local Courts, and the present Government has not yet been able to pass the Bill. Then we also introduced the Administration Bill. The object of that Bill was to stop the aggregation of large estates, and to provide in future that there should be no such thing as land monopoly. We declared that whenever a man died without leaving a will his land should be treated in the same way as personal property, and divided among his family equally.—(Applause.) We also, by the Act or 1878, which was practically reenacted in 1879, declared that whether a man left a family or not all landed property should be treated in the same way as money or personal property. Then I had prepared a Licensing Bill, and, in my opinion, it was better than the Statute wo have at present. We also did what we could to perfect secondary schools. These were some of the attempts—and I could name many others—that the Liberal Government made in the way of social reform. Then we saw that the Colony required a

Great Reformation in Taxation.

And how aid we set about that? We introduced a Land Tax Bill, a Beer Duty Bill, and a Companies' Income Tax Bill. I intend to point out to you something about this Land Tax Bill by-and-bye, but I want first to make one or two remarks about the other two Bills. First, as to the Beer Duty Bill. Who was its most violent opponent? Its most violent opponent was Major Atkinson, but the session afterwards he introduced the same Bill and passed it into law.—(Laughter.) Then we introduced a Companies' Income Tax Bill, We saw a danger threatening the people of this Colony—which the merchants of Dunedin are now beginning to see—and that is the tendency in colonial affairs to mass everything in the hands of large companies, so that private enterprise and individual effort were in danger of being crushed out. In order that those large companies should have some additional taxation put upon them which, was not put upon private enterprise, we introduced a Companies Income Tax Bill, providing that they should pay a small income tax, so as to stop the undue formation of companies. That Bill was also opposed by what I term the Tory party.

The Finances of the Grey and Atkinson Ministries.

Then we did another thing in our taxation reforms. We eased off a great many of the duties on what we believed to be the necessaries of life. We eased off the tea duty and the sugar duty, and we tried as far as we could to make the taxation equal, as we thought it would be unfair to cast upon one section of the community the whole taxation of the Colony. These were some of the things we did. We failed in carrying several of our measures—and bow did we fail? Because we really had not a majority of Liberals in the House at our back in 1878. The Governor refused a dissolution in 1877, and we had no power really to do anything, because the majority would not keep to us whenever any important business came before the House. I have pointed out to you some of the things we did in taxation, and I do not need to tell you what happened.

The Glasgow Bank Failure

occurred, and with that crisis there came upon this Colony more than upon any other a sudden depression, a sudden falling off of money, and a cessation of our land revenue. We were getting more than a million a-year from land revenue, and it then fell down to leas than a quarter of a-million. Of course, as the finances of the Colony were based to a certain extent on the land revenue—being paid into the Consolidated Fund—the result was that our revenue fell off, and there was a deficit. Some people, because of that deficit, said that the Colony was going to the bad. Now, as the Colony kept its land, it had its assets, and I think it was a good thing for the Colony that the wholesale selling of land in Canterbury and in other parts was stopped by the Glasgow Bank crisis. But some people said that because there was this depression the expenditure of the Grey Government was more than that of the Governments which preceded and followed them. I say that is entirely false, and I challenge you to the figures. I would first point out, as far our expenditure is concerned, that every penny of our expenditure in 1878-79 was voted by the House and brought down to the House, and if the Opposition saw any extravagant expenditure proposed why did they not protest against it? I say that our Estimates in 1878 were less than those of the previous year, and that our expenditure was ess, and I shall quote to you the opinion of one gentleman as to what our expenditure was. I will tell you his name afterwards. I said, in speaking on the estimated expenditure:

I noticed that the Hon. Gentleman was very careful not to allude to the decrease in the Public Works Office and in the Railway Department.

And the reply given was this:

I specially alluded to them, and I further said that the whole of the expenditure of the Government Was quite reasonable.

This was Major Atkinson. I shall now ask you to take the figures. I shall give the total expenditure of the Ministries for five years, and we shall see how the total expenditure stands. The expenditure to the end of 1876 was L6,676,957. The Atkinson Continuous Ministry was then in office. In 1877 the Grey party were only in office for a few months, and the expenditure then was L5,743,927. That was a decrease of about a million, I was in office in 1878, and our expenditure for that year was L5,653, 144. We went out in 1879, and the expenditure for that year mounted up to L5,818,239. The Atkinson Government were in office in 1880, and the expenditure then went up to L6,248,840. Taking those five years, the expenditure was lowest during the year I was in office.—(Applause.) Those are figures quoted in 'Hansard,' which have net been controverted. I have yet in my possession the Estimates as prepared by the Grey Government in 1879—the Estimates that were prepared before I left omce—and I believe it is the only copy in print in existence in the Colony, From them I can show that the proposed expenditure on the Civil Service and ether objects was nearly a quarter of a million less than what was proposed by the Hall Ministry, They said that the Grey Government was most extravagant in public works. What did the Grey Government expend in public works? Their average expenditure was about one million and a-half per year. The average expenditure of the Hall Government was Ll,850,000, or L300,000 per year more than the Grey Government expended. The expenditure of the Hall Government out of loan was L1,750,000 in 1879-80, and Ll,950,000 in 1880-81, making altogether L3,700,000 for two years. To talk about other expenditure, what do you think has been expended out of the consolidated revenue by the Atkinson party while power for five years? Why, they have expended L17,300,000. They have added to the debt during the five years they have been in office L7,000,000, and I believe they have now a floating debt of about Ll,000,000, which the new Government will have to meet when they take office. Talk about their expenditure! Talk about their economy! Wherein have they shown their economy? What did they do? When they took office in 1879 they knew perfectly well that the Colony was not in a state of bankruptcy, and that the only cause of the temporary deficit was that the land was not sold. Under such circumstances, how should any really patriotic statesman have acted? Should he not have explained the state of things to the colonists and told the truth? But instead of that, in order to get office and to keep it, Major Atkinson went about prating of the bankruptcy of the Colony—(applause)—and I say that by doing that he paralysed all enterprise; he stopped the flow of capital to the Colony, and intensified the depression to such an extent that I believe we are suffering from it yet.—(Applause.) Gentlemen, I do not believe that the prosperity of the Colony depends upon the Government entirely; but I say, if the people think that now, who was it who preached that doctrino in 1879? The chickens,

perhaps, have come home to roost. It was the Atkinson Government who preached it in 1879; it was they who talked about bankruptcy, frightened capital, depreciated property, and did all they could to mar the future of this Colony.

Liberal Measures Passed by the Atkinson Government.

'But," it is said, "they have passed Liberal measures." But who forced them to do so? They either had to pass those measures or so out of office; and they preferred to swallow their principles in order to retain office. But what did they do? I say they did all they could to near the measures they were passing. Just let me tell you what they did. I do not need to point out to you what they did in reference even to the City electorates. They split up all the cities into small wards. Why was that done? They have boasted of it. They said it would crush and destroy the city democracies, and that was the sole object with which it was done. They were horrified that Sir George Grey should have been returned for Christchurch, and Sir John Hall boasted that he would take care it should not happen again, and hence it was that he split up the cities into different wards, giving persons with property extra votes, and doing all they could to destroy the democracy of the cities. I say no true statesman would do anything of the sort. I saw a letter about a month ago received from one whose name I hope every colonist will honor—a man who has been the Liberal of Liberals in England—I mean John Bright.—(Applause.) did he say? He said in this letter, speaking about this single electorate business in New Zealand, that he could not understand how any people were so foolish as to pass such an absurd law.—(Hear, hear.) I have only to refer to what Gambetta, the leading Liberal of France, pointed out in reference to this very question. If you go to Italy you will see it is recognised, wherever there is a true Liberal, that single electorates is a device of the Tories to stifle the spirit of liberalism. Liberal measures! What were the

Taxation Proposals

of the Atkinson Ministry? It was to have an "all-round property tax." What does that mean? The paralysing of all such things as native industries—(hear, hear)—of all such things as manufactures. I will show that. Let me first point out why it is that we wish for a land tax. I say that at the root of the question of a land tax lies this assumption: that land is not like other property. If you once say there is a distinction between land and other property, then you have a right to have a land tax, and to have State leasing. But if you lay down the principle that land is not different to other property, that land should not be exceptionally treated, then you have no right to have State leasing. When some people point to State leasing as one of the Liberal measures of the present Ministry, I would ask who began it first in the Colony?—who advocated it? It was I. When I brought the question forward in the Provincial Council of Otago it was laughed at as an absurd thing. I have had circulated amongst you a speech I delivered in September, 1875, the first speech made in favor of such leasing? in the House of Representatives of New Zealand; and I based my speech and motion on the principle that land was not like other property. My speech was made before Henry George wrote any of his books. But all recent writers in England and America are coming round to the opinions expressed by Laveleye, that democracy is to exist democracy must see that not only political conditions, but social conditions are equal; and, as he pointed out in his book on "Primitive Property," if the, democracies of Australia did not have a dif- ferent land law to that of England the result would be calamitous, and they could have no true democracy, I could go as far back as 1868 and show you articles written by me in a paper now defunct—the 'Bruce Standard '—in which I advocated State leasing, when hardly a writer in England advocated it,_(Applause.) I pointed out that if we wish this Colony to be a great nation we should take care that there should be no land monopoly here as at Home; and I; pointed to a land tax proposal. Henry George, and others who have seen our Land, Tax Bill, have described it as a Bill that other nations should copy. We founded the Land Tax Bill on this footing:; that land is separate and entirely distinct from personal property. But the Atkinson Government went on a different line. Their taxation proposals say that there is no distinction between land and personal property, and that they should all be taxed alike. The root of our proposal was that we only taxed the unimproved land. Every half-penny of a man's improvements was exempt from taxation, because we held this: that it should be the object of every true statesman to encourage by every means in his power the improvement of land, the creating of good homes for the people, and that those ought to be free from taxation. That was the basis of our Bill. Then I went on to point out also what was the meaning of taxing personal property by this all-round tax. First, every bit of improvement that a man puts on his house and garden to add to their value pays under this all-round system. Under our tax it escaped taxation. Then how docs it affect native manufactures and enterprise? What we want more than anything else is more enterprise in manufacturing industry. When I was president of the Society that held an exhibition in the Garrison Hall, which showed what we could do in manufactures, I said that any nation which depends on one industry alone is a one-horse nation and never will be great. We must have diverse manufactures established, so that we will not be dependent upon any one industry. I ask what sort of encouragement does the property tax give to manufactures? We will suppose that a man starts a new manufacture. He gets machinery and erects new buildings. He has no sooner got his capital invested in buildings and machinery than down comes the tax-gatherer and says: "You are to pay on the total value of your

machinery." He may be reaping no profit. I knew a man who started a new industry with all the capital he possesscd—L2.000 or L3,000. He started a new manufacture in one of our cities—not in Dunedin. He put every shilling he possessed into this new industry and strove to make it a success. Like all other new industries, for the first year it did not give any profit—probably it was a little to the bad. He said to me: "I consider my case a very hard one. The tax-gatherer came round I and valued my machinery at L3,000, and he said to me 'You must pay taxation on L3,000.' I replied 'I have no money; it is, all invested.' He said 'Oh, you can go to; your bank.' What was that but simply saying I should give up a piece of my machinery?" Now, there was a man trying to start a new industry in this Colony, and that was the kind of encouragement given to him—that he should at once pay on the machinery which was giving no return to him. Is that fair taxation? Can you hope for any really good manufacturing industry if that system is continued? That was the only taxation proposal that Major Atkinson made. On this subject I could refer to the highest authorities in the world. I could quote John Stuart Mill and the able American writer Judge Cooley to show that this system of an all-round property tax is an unfair thing, and especially unfair in a colony where we desire to see improvements and the investment of capital. But some people say the property tax will catch the mortgagees. Catch the mortgagees! Does it not come out of the mortgagors?—(Hear. Hear). What do we require in this Colony? Is it not more capital? Do you think you would have depression if you had capital pouring in? Certainly not. I say that if you do anything which tends to drive capital away it will also tend to cause depression and to lower wages; and to my own knowledge this property tax has sent money to other colonies that would have been here.—(Applause). And what was the other thing the Government did? I only pass it over as an amusing thing. Since this depression the only remedy the Government have had to offer was to tax the farmers by additional grain rates, and what else do you think? The only way this great financial statesman could make up the deficit was to increase the fees for litigation in the Supreme and Magistrates' Courts.

A VOICE: Quite right.

Mr STOUT: One gentleman says "quite right." I am afraid he has never read Jeremy Bentham.—(Laughter). Jeremy Bentham said this: that it the State did right its highest function was to administer justice; and that according to Magna Charta justice should never be sold. And I say also that it is a mean and contemptible thing to say to a man who wishes to get judgment for a few pounds that he shall have his Court fees increased simply through the mis- management of the Colonial Treasurer, through, whom had arisen a deficit in the finances, Now I come to another piece of management for which the Ministry has obtained great *kudos*, especially from the South Island newspapers. I refer to the

Ministerial Management of Native Affairs.

Whether I am in a majority or a minority, I declare, looking at the thing calmly, that the treatment of the Natives by the present Ministry has been unjust and dishonest in the extreme.—("No, no," and "hear, hear.") And I will tell you why. Let me just give you one or two examples. We have heard a great deal about Te Whiti. Te Whiti, no doubt, is a fanatic. Te Whiti, however, had many good points about him. Te Whiti was the man, as Mr Parris has said in the Blue-books, who preserved peace when the Natives were anxious for war. Te Whiti got up, even when a young chieftain, and warned them against fighting the Pakehaa; and consistently for more than twenty years Te Whiti has advocated peace, peace, peace, and has never attempted to create war between the Europeans and Natives.—(Hear, hear.) How was he treated? Let me give you two examples of what I call contemptible trickery. Te Whiti was arrested. You all remember the white horse.—(Laughter.) When they went in with loaded guns what did Te Whiti say? When the Native Minister came in on his white horse what did Te Whiti say? "Take care and do not tramp on the children; keep your feet off the children!" They offered no resistance. Those men were arrested; and remember that the Maori has equal rights with the colonist. That is secured not only by the Treaty of Waitangi but also by the Maori Rights Act of 1865, which says that a Maori shall be equal to a white man and have equal justice with a white man, and not be differently treated.—(Applause.) Te Whiti was committed for trial and was to be tried at New Plymouth. The time for trial drew nigh; it was to take place in the month of May. Then the Attorney-General goes to Auckland, and he produces an affidavit telling a Judge of the Supreme Court that he could not try Te Whiti in New Plymouth lest there might be a prejudice against him, and that he would like so much that the Judge should order the trial to take place at Christchurch. That would be so nice, and everything would be fair in Christchurch. Why did he not move for that in March? The Christchurch sittings were held in April, and why did he not move in March, so that Te Whiti should net be left in prison for months without trial, and waiting until July in Christchurch? As soon as that news came the papers exclaimed, "Oh, what a wonderfully kind Attorney-General!" I at once published a letter saying it was a trick—a dodge—that they dare not try Te Whiti because he had committed no crime; and that the whole meaning was that Te Whiti was to be kept in gaol until Parliament ment met, so that they could get a special Act passed to keep him there without trial—(Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, that contemptible trick was exposed, and Te Whiti has never been tried to the present day. They kept the man in gaol, but they never allowed him to be tried. Was that right? Was that just?—(No, no.) But that was not all they did. They

passed Acts that are a disgrace to our Statute Book, and that our children, when they come to read the history of New Zealand, will regret that their fathers should have passed. They kept men in prison without trial, and something even more contemptible. They passed an Act declaring that, if a dozen or twenty Maoris were seen on a main road, they were to get up to two years' imprisonment. That was called obstructing a main road. Although the road ran through Maori land which the Crow had not bought and had no title to, if the Government proclaimed the road the Maoris caught obstructing it were to get two years' imprisonment; and this proclamation was to appear in the 'Gazette,' What did they do? They proclaimed the road in the 'Gazette'; they arrested men the day after the 'Gazette' was published in Wellington and before a single copy got to New Plymouth, and before the Maoris could; anything about it. A copy of the 'Gazette had not reached the Magistrate's Court when the men were committed for trial. And what was done to them? They were sentenced by a Judge, and the sentence was a disgrace to our civilisation, That District Court Judge sentenced them to the full term of two years' imprisonment.—(Cries of "Shame!") That Judge was Judge Shaw, who afterwards supported the Ministry in Parliament. I say that any Government which could act so unrighteously will have a record against them such as I should not like to have against me,—(Applause.) But, gentlemen, that was not all. There were Maoris who fought for us at a terrible risk to their own lives. There was Major Te Keepa, of whom Sir George Whitmore said he never saw such a brave Native. He was not only brave in attack, but he was brave in retreat. Here was a man who fought for us, and who eared Wanganui and the west coast of the North Island in the evil days. This man had a small pension paid out of the Civil List Because he would not agree with Topia, and because he would not consent to the Stud-holme people getting an enormous tract of 100,000 acres, and because he would not do what Mr Bryce told him about surveys of this Murimotu block, Major Te Keepa had his pension taken from him.—("Shame.") Then, what was done to Major Ropata? Here also was a man who saved the white settlers at the risk of his own life at Poverty Bay after that terrible massacre by Te Kooti. How did the Government treat him? His poor pension is also taken from him on the score of economy, and three times the amount is given to buy a farm and house for the murderer Te Kooti,—(Hisses.) I mention these matters because I believe that justice and righteousness should guide the councils of the nation; and I say that men who defend a Government guilty of these things, and who say they are such a Liberal Government have no righteousness in their souls, or they would have taken the first opportunity of denouncing such conduct on the floor of the House.—(Loud applause.) I go farther, and say this: We hear a great deal talked about teaching morality in schools. I believe in teaching morality in schools; but I say that if you have a Government teaching such immoral lessons to the community the teaching of morality in your schools is not worth mentioning. Then it is said the Government are so liberal in

Dealing With Native Lands.

I will tell you how they have dealt with Native lands. I say that if they had any real anxiety to preserve the North Island for future colonists—if they had any real anxiety to see that there should not be enormous blocks taken up in the North Island—they would not do what they have done. The Grey Government had no sooner left office than the present Government began to withdraw proclamations over blocks, to allow big companies to mop up the land. That was done in the case of Patetere. Why did they, after the Colony had spent thousands in paying the Natives for the land, allow one or two men to get 60,000 or 70,000 acres of magnificent land in one block, on payment of a few thousands to the Government? Did that prevent monopoly? We talk about big holdings in the South. They have been acquired in the past, and the State should see that they are broken up; but I say it is absurd for any Government to talk about the danger of big holdings, when they allow such things to take place in the North island under their very noses. They have allowed block after block of Native lands to be mopped up. More large blocks have been taken up there during the past five years than during the previous ten years, and they have done nothing to stop it. Under the Native Lands Act, a Judge of the Native Land Court, when he comes to determine to whom certain land belongs, may say "This land is ina'ienable," and nobody can buy it from the Natives. This has been done all over the North Island. All that can be done with such land is to lease it for twenty-one years, with the sanction of the Governor. What did the present Government do? I say they bave withdrawn the restrictions placed on those inalienable revenues, and they have allowed friends of their own to go in and purchase. The excuse given for that by Mr Bryce was that the Natives desired it. After the Natives had been bribed with money, and some of them perhaps made half drunk to induce them to sign conveyances, Mr Bryce said "The Natives desired it.'—(Laughter.) I say that no Government, looking after the welfare of the Colony, would allow such things to be done. But now it is said we are going to get a new Native land law. I notice the Government are always promising that great things are to be doue. We are going to have native industries encouraged and locomotives manufactured here.—(Laughter.) We have heard of death-bed repentances; but it seems to me that these promises have come from the Government actually after death.—(Renewed laughter.) They are going to have all these things done, and the proposal now is that the Natives are to sell their lands by means of the Waste Land Boards. Mr John Ballance proposed that in the House of Representatives years ago and could get no support for it. Anything that this Government have done

they have only done after five or six years' agitation by the other side.—(Applause.)

Crown Lands Administration.

It is said that the Government have been been very liberal in dealing with the Crown lands. I admit at once that Mr Rolleston deserves every credit for what he has done, and I for one will be exceedingly sorry if Mr Rolleston has not a seat in the next Parliament. He is a man I respect, and mainly for this: He was in 1877, along with Major Atkinson, fighting Mr Donald Reid, Mr George Lumsden, Mr John Ballance, and myself—the Liberal members on the Waste Lands Committee—in the interests of the Canterbury squatters, and in every crucial division Major Atkinson and Mr Rolleston voted with the squatters of Canterbury. They stopped us from having special-value land in Canterbury. What did that mean? It meant that enormous blocks of land go at L2 an acre, although they were worth L8 or L10 an acre, They extended the Canterbury leases, and would not even charge a fair rental. But although Mr Rolleston fought on the squatters' side in 1877, he deserves all the more credit for having, when he saw that the circumstances of the Colony required a change of policy, come boldly forward and adopted our platform. I only hope chat if he is returned (as I believe he will be) he will be found fighting with the Liberals, as he was found fighting with the Tories in 1877, for I believe that is Mr Rolleston's proper side. But do not believe for one moment that the present Government are in favor of libera land laws. Anyone who runs away with that idea has very little knowledge of men or things. Let me give you one test of this question. You are aware that there is every year appointed a Waste Lands Committee. Now this Committee has enormous power. Every Bill dealing with waste lands has to go before that Committee, Every question relating to waste lands has to be decided by them, and on very rare occasions is it that the House will upset their decision. Now you would imagine that if the Government were really in favor of liberal land laws and administration, this Committee would have been composed of truly liberal men. The Government are in the habit of paying compliments to people who are great Liberals, and of doing them honor. Let us see the names of those proposed on that Committee. They are the following:—Mr John Buchanan, a large run holder in Napier; Mr Henry Driver—(laughter)—Mr James Fulton—("Oh! oh!")—Mr James Green—("!Oh! oh!")—Mr Hurst, Mr Macandrew, Mr Pearson, a Canterbury run holder; Mr Stevens, a land speculator on the West Coast of the Middle Island; Mr Whyte, a large landowner in the Waikato; and Mr Rolleston, This was the Liberal Committee to whose tender mercies was entrusted the dealing with the liberal land laws of New Zealand. It is absurd to talk of any such thing as liberal land laws coming from them. I will now mention one or two things which I proposed when I was in the House, I said if people are really anxious to stop land jobbery and monopoly, why not limit the area that a man should be allowed to purchase and hold? That is a simple thing, I proposed that in 1877, and got very little support—something like a dozen votes. Who helped Mr Rolleston to pass his Land Act providing for State leasing? Was it the Government party? Nothing of the sort. Mr Rolleston would cot have got his leasing proposals passed were it not for the aid given by the Opposition. What did Sir George Grey propose? He proposed that no more land should be sold, but that all of it should be leased. This was the division list on that motion in 1882 Bathgate, De Lautour, Feldwick, Grey (Sir George), Harris, Holmes, Hutchison, Joyce, Macdonald, Moss. Pyke, Seddon, Turnbull, Not one voted for it on the Government side. Not a single supporter of the Ministry voted in favor of Sir George Grey's proposal. It is all nonsense for people who really do not pay attention to politics—that is the only way in which I can explain their misrepresentations—to say for one moment that the Government have any idea of carrying out liberal land laws.

Maladministration of the Government.

Let me tell you another reason why I am opposed to the present Government. I say their administration has been an utter failure. Do I need to point out how they violated the law in granting Dr Pollen's pension, although a committee, composed of a majority of their own supporters, said it was very doubtful if they had power to grant it? They granted Dr Pollen a pension to which he had no more right than anyone in this room, and they granted it simply because he was one of their own supporters. Need I point out how they managed the telegram business? They made a great cry about L25 worth of telegrams having been sent by the Grey Government, which they said ought to have been paid for by the members of that Ministry; and they violated the secrecy of the Telegraph Depart ment in order that they might find out this charge against their opponents. But what did they do afterwards? Do you think they left telegrams in the office in order that an incoming Ministry might find out whether t bey sent telegrams which ought to have been paid for by them? No. They altered the system entirely. They send memos to the Telegraph Office, and require the Telegraph Office to return those memos., so that there shall be no records for a succeeding Ministry to see whether they sent telegrams or not. I need only point to various things they have done. I have only to point to the over-ruling of the Audit Department, when, in violation of the law, they took public money they were not entitled to touch, which action a majority of the House apparently ap proved of. I do not need to point out how they managed the Inangahua election, and how, because one member of a legal firm got returned to Parliament as their supporter, they at once put his partner into the Upper House. But I ask you to come to other things. How have they managed the ordinary

administration of public affairs? They have not conducted the public business themselves. The first thing they did was to appoint

Royal Commissions

of their own supporters, and they paid them also to go travelling up and down the country They sent round a Railway Commission to condemn he Otago Central line. The Government since 1879 have gone to an expense of L29,000 for Commissions, almost everyone of which was unnecessary and a waste of public money. —(Hear)

Civil Service Reform.

They also appointed three Civil Service Commissions. The first one was composed of Sir Robert Douglas, the Hon. Mr Pharazyn, Mr Saunders, and other Government supporters. Then they appointed a Commission consisting of Messrs Batkin and Seed, two of their own officers. And, lastly, we have the Commission consisting of Mr Seed, Mr Cooper, Major Atkinson, and Mr Batkin—known in Wellington as the "Scab Commission"—(loud laughter)—because of the initial letters of the names of the members of the Commission. I ask you in what way has the Civil Service been reformed? They have done actually nothing. Major Atkinson has told you that he sees a way by which something can be done. His great proposal—it is always of the future—is what? Why, simply to revive in New Zealand the pension system. His proposal for Civil Service reform is simply to give pensions to every member of the Civil Service in New Zealand. I say that we have had quite enough of the pension system.
—(Cheers).

Public Works Administration.

Let me now tell you something about public works. I say that their method of dealing with public works has been almost criminal. Let me take two railways, by way of example, and I take them simply because they are railways that most of you know. Let me take first the Otago Central line. Upwards of L300,000 was voted for the construction of that line. The Atkinson Government have not the credit of beginning that line. It was I who moved in the House for the appointment of a Committee to consider whether the railway should be formed, and this Committee I obtained recommended that the line should be formed. That was the beginning practically of the Otago Central line. It was while the Grey Ministry were in office that the proposal for the construction of the Otago Central line was brought down and carried, and the first sod was turned while they were in office. The Atkinson Government have had the management of affairs for five years, and what have they done for this line?—(A Voice: "Nothing.") What amount of money have they expended on it? There has been money actually spent on it, but we are losing the interest on that money. Why have they not done what the American people would have done, viz., have finished twenty miles and at once utilised it. There is some sense in that; we should not lose the interest on what has been spent. But the Government have done worse. As one of the newspapers has clearly pointed out—it cannot be denied, for the facts and figures are given in 'Hansard' and in the parliamentary papers—the Government have taken money that was voted for this line, and expended it on roads and bridges and on other things. That money has been illegally expended. What excuse has been given for doing this? The excuse made by one gentlemen—he is a supporter of the Government—is that he "has been informed that some of the money has been sent Home for plant."—(Loud laughter and cries of "Name.") Gentlemen, unfortunately for Otago we have too many credulous representatives. I say it is utterly absurd. Why if thirty miles were formed, and if we had ordered rails for these thirty miles, the rails would not have cost more than from L15,000 to L20.000. What then has become of the rest of the L300,000? Sent Home for plant?—(Laughter.) Why some of the contracts will take two years to finish yet. What need then of rolling stock yet? I repeat the things is utterly absurd. Major Atkinson would not have given such a foolish excuse as that. Not he. He would have been more manly and more honest. He would have said: "I certainly took the money and spent it elsewhere."—(Laughter.) I say that no constituency should support a Ministry that do such things. I tell you also that this election has to be fought on party grounds and not on personal grounds, and if the constituencies of Otago choose to return men who will support the present Ministry, as they have done in the past, then you have no right to complain of depression or of the wrongful appropriation of moneys voted for your railways; you will only be able to say that it is your own blame. Let us now take

The Catlin River Railway.

What have the Government done with that? In their great wisdom they have made a little bit of embankment near the Balclutha end. What do you think they did next? They made another bit of embankment sorne miles away.—(Mr James Wilson; "Twelve miles.") A gentleman who, I dare say, knows, says it is twelve miles away, but I believe it is fifteen miles by road. They have formed pieces of the line at the ends and left it untouched in the middle,—(Laughter.) Although the money has been voted for this line, nothing more has been done to it. They call this, I suppose, what Mr Oliver said in one of his statements, "keeping the construction of the Catlin River Railway steadily in view,"
—(Roars of laughter.)

Things Kept "steadily in View."

Gentlemen, the number of things that the Atkinson Government are keeping steadily in view would almost fill a book,—(Laughter.) They have got the manufacture of locomotives "steadily in view." Native industries are to be promoted, and we are to have a beautiful Native land law; but these are things that always in view—they never get any further. I tell you that the Government's management of public works has simply been disgraceful. If I wished to appeal to 'Hansard' I could poin out to you how some of their own supporters got up in the House before the end of a session and said that they wished it to be recorded that they protested against the disgraceful scenes which took place, when millions of money were voted after two o'clock in the morning, and all sorts of bribes given to districts in order to obtain support, ask you to take, for example, how they managed to give a little piece of line to please this one, and that little bit of line to please that one. I could point you to several lines in Southland which were made while the main lines were left unfinished. These lines were made simply to obtain political support. They got authority to make a line from the Waimea Plains Railway to Switzers, instead of extending the Lumsden-Mararoa line. Then they made bridges here and there to please supporters. Now, they pledged themselves in 1876 that if Abolition came about the word "bridge" and the word "road" should never again be heard in the House except for the purposes of congratulation.

The Otago Central and Settlement.

I feel very strongly on this matter of the Otago Central, and I will tell you why. The Land Board—and I may mention that I believe every member of the Board is most anxious to see the Strath Taieri land, which is some of the finest land in the Colony, properly settled—unanimously resolved that the best pieces of the Strath Taieri should be reserved under the various systems of deferred payments, agricultural leasing, and perpetual leasing. We accordingly set aside these blocks, having refused to grant the run holders renewals of their leases, and told the people who went on to this land that the Otago Central line would be pushed on rapidly in order that they might be enabled to get their produce carried into Dunedin, What have the Government done? Scores—nay, perhaps I might say, hundreds—of people have gone on this land under the promise that a railway should be constructed to where they live; yet they are without a road or a railway to their produce into market, and many very deserving settlers will be ruined in consequence. I will go further and say that if we wish anybody to take up land there and to make proper use of it this line must be made,—(Cheers.) It is criminal of the Government to force land into the market when they know that it must fall into the hands of speculators and those who will hold it until a railway is made. Their policy should be to push on the construction of the line as far: as Strath Taieri, even if the line did not come within ten miles of their holdings, so that the settlers may be able get their produce into a market. We shall then be able to obtain a revenue from the land. What has been the result to Dunedin? By bringing the Strath Taieri leaseholders as close to Dunedin as Toko-mairiro is, an enormous tract of wheat-bearing country would be opened up. The delay in constructing the Otago Central was due—first, to potty spite against Otago; and second, to almost criminal neglect in the administration of public works. Yet, gentlemen, you are told that it will be to your good to support the Atkinson Government.

The Curse of Centralism.

Let me tell you another thing. It is in reference to the centralising tendencies of the Government. I say that every taken by the Atkinson Government has been on the direction of centralising every department in Wellington. I can remember when we simply removed Mr Conyers to Christchurch. The Grey Government were not popular with the big merchants of Danedin—we were too Radical and two Liberal for them—who held weekly meetings in the Chamber of Commerce, and the Grey Government were denounced because Mr Conyers was sitting in Christchurch, and from there was managing the railways of the Middle Inland. Oar merchants said that everything would go wrong if Mr Conyers did not come to Dunedin. The Grey Government promised that Mr Conyers should come to Dunedin, and they kept their promise, as Mr Conyers did come to Dunedin. The very people who created this cry about Mr Conyers have, without protest, allowed what to be done? They have allowed Mr Hannay and his staff to be removed to Wellington, and now they manage our railways and our traffic from Wellington. I am told that a question was recently raised here about some small thing—a matter of L5 or L10, and it cost nearly as much in stationery, etc.—but nothing could be settled till it was referred to Wellington. The Government have now removed the Public Works and Engineers' Department to What does that mean? That from Wellington they will supervise and carry out the public works in Otago. I ask you whether an ordinary contractor would act like that? I am afraid you would think he was losing his senses were he to do so. Did the Brogdens act in that way? No; they had their head office in Wellington, but their engineers were on the jobs. An amusing illustration of the pass to which Centralism has come occurred the other day in connection with the unemployed. In some countries a mayor is thought something of—at all events, his word is believed; but Major Atkinson would not take Mr Street's word that there were unemployed in Dunedin; and he requested Mr Colin Allan to report on it—(Laughter.) This was one of the most ludicrous things I ever saw in print. Your Mayor (Mr Street) cannot be trusted by Major Atkinson to tell him how many men are out of work in Dunedin. Everything must be centralised in Wellington. Why, Mr Weldon cannot

employ a single policeman. What happens is this: A suitable man, who has been in the force at Home perhaps, may go to Mr Weldon and ask to be taken on, saying "I have had experience in the London force, and I can produce excellent testimonials." Mr Weldon would reply: "Yes, you are a very good man, and I should very much like to take on an experienced man like you, I will tell you what you must do. You had better go up to Wellington. There you will be inspected, and if you pass the inspection you will be sent down again to me." So the man has to pay his passage to Wellington and back. And all this has to be done before Mr Weldon can take on a single policeman. There was published in the 'Gazette' lately a by-law in reference to the police, What do you think it was? No policeman on leave—sick leave or anything else—shall approach Wellington during the time that Parliament is sitting.—(Laughter.) The object of that by-law I cannot understand, unless it be that policemen may tell some members of Parliament how things are managed, and the members may bring the matter before the House, I would ask what about

The Central Gaol.

A sum of money, something like L82,000, is being spent on a gaol in Wellington. The excuse lor it that Major Atkinson gave us was that there was no room in the other goals. But that is utter nonsense. Look at the returns of the Lyttelton and Nelson gaols, and you will find that there is more accommodation for prisoners than there has ever before been in New Zealand, and that there are fewer prisoners. Why, cell after cell is empty both in the Nelson, Lyttelton, and other gaols. Yet we are to have this L82,000 expended in Wellington. Captain Hume, in his last report, says that he has made the discovery that the proper place for a gaol is Stewart Island, in order that the prisoners may learn farming.—(Loud laughter.) Well, gentlemen, if Captain Hume knows no more about gaol management than he does about farming., I think that he had better go Home again. Sending men to learn farming on Stewart Island is even one of those things which Mr Oliver would not keep steadily in view.

—(Laughter).

The Government too Long in Office.

I shall not make any further reference to the past, though I have not time to give even a recital of the misdeeds of the Government. I say that if you allow a Government—it may be the best and the purest—to remain too long in office, you are doing an injury to our parliamentary institutions. Before you can have efficient criticism you must have men acquainted with the ropes, as it were. You cannot have efficient criticism if the Opposition really do not know what baa been passing behind the scenes for some years. How long has Major Atkinson been in office? From 1874 to 1884—ten years, with only two years' intermission. I say that if Major Atkinson were the ablest statesman ever produced by the colonies, he ought, after eight years of office, to stand aside for a while. He has held office quite long enough. If a man remain too long in office you destroy anything like efficient criticism, anything like true parliamentary government, They had this law in ancient Greece. The Greeks were as wise a people as ever lived, and they had a true democracy in Greece. They said: "We are afraid that if a man gets too popular he will get too much power; and if he gets too much power he may injure the democracy, which means that all shall bo equal: therefore, we must banish him from Greece for a few years." Isay that it would not be doing Major Atkinson any harm, and not doing the Colony any harm, if the present Ministry were to be put out of office, and Major Atkinson to stand out for a year or two and see how he liked the Opposition benches. I know, gentlemen, that some people are easily pleased, and that some people will not look at questions from apolitical point of view. Some people, it is true, are like a certain Florentine agitator, whom George in his "Social Problems" mentions. This man was a great Liberal. He was always agitating political questions, and they said that he was a true Liberal. How was he silenced? They gave him great honors, for they presented him with a new pair of boots. Then he said there was nothing more requiring to be agitated in Florence. Some men are so constituted that if you give them a little honor they will believe that our political machinery is right. If you wish to have a true democracy you must take care that there is full play given to both forces—the Liberal force and the Conservative force. You must do this if you wish to have proper criticism of your public affairs.

Federation.

I intended to have referred to Federation, and to have pointed out to you that in 1878 I wrote a Ministerial memorandum urging that the New Hebrides should be included in the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner for the Pacific. Had the ideas of Sir George Grey in respect to Confederation been carried out it would have been far better than the proposed Federation. If time permitted I could point out to you the great injury that has been done to this Colony by our not retaining the High Commissioner for the Pacific as our Governor, Had that been done the result would have been that we in New Zealand would have practically the command of the Pacific Islands, and would supply those islands with what goods they required, But through the action of the Atkinson Ministry that was denied to us. Now you see what has happened. Sydney and Melbourne have awakened to what the Pacific Islands' trade means, and this Federation scheme simply means that it will give to Victorian and Sydney manufactured goods the whole advantage of the Islands' trade. If we had had a wise

statesman in power in 1882, the Governor of this Colony, who was High Commissioner of the Pacific, would have been kept here, and the whole of the Pacific Islands would have looked to New Zealand as a centre for the distribution of our manufactured goods, and the products of the islands would have come here to be manufactured. If we lose the Pacific Island trade we shall have cause to regret the treatment that Sir Arthur Gordon was subjected to here. Unless it be through the enterprise of the Union Steam Ship Company that the trade of the Pacific Islands be diverted to New Zealand, our Island trade will decrease and Sydney will become the centre of that trade. What has New Zealand to look to in the future if she is not to become a manufacturing country? She has enormous deposits of coal, and in that respect has a great advantage over Victoria. She has enormous water-power. I do not know any Colony la the world that has such an enormous seaboard; therefore she must become a maritime power. We must look ahead. If we are to get rid of depressions such as that which now exists, we must look for new markets for our products. In the wheat markets we are threatened with the competition of India, whilst in meat we have the competition of South America, with her enormous quantities of sheep. There are something like 100,000,000 sheep in La Plata, South Brazil, and Northern Patagonia. Wool has gone down in price. What, then, are we to do? Our only chance is to become a manufacturing people, and if we are to become that we must have the opportunity of sending our manufactured goods to the islands of the Pacific. By our attitude towards Sir Arthur Gordon we have lost a great opportunity of making New Zealand the centre of the Pacific Island trade, All this nonsense about confederation means simply this: that the head of the confederation will be one of the Australian colonies, but it will be of no benefit to New Zealand except that we shall have to pay some thousands of pounds a-year. If the Bill were carried we should have a Federal Council perhaps over riding our own Acts, and that will be no advantage to us.—(Laughter.) I do not deny that we ought to cultivate the friendship of the Australian colonies. I hope to see the time when all English speaking nations will be confederated—when America and England will be confederated—and when there shall be no more war, I say that if all the English-speaking peoples of the world were united in one vast confederation we may hope to see a cessation of war. I, perhaps from my early training, have been taught to think that it is un-Christian to fight, and that the Quakers were right. I Tong to see the time coming when not only in our disputes with the Maoris, but in our treatment of disputed questions by civilised nations, there will be no resort to arms. When there is a war it is the working men who suffer, who are s aughtered every year by thousands, and who are taxed by thousands, simply to please kings and despots.

—(Cheers).

The Future.

Gentlemen, I do not wish to weary you, but I should like to point out to you a few things we have to look to in the future. We are a democracy, and nothing can make us anything else. But just as there are dangers in other forms of government, so there are dangers to a democracy. I say that there are two things which we have to watch in a democracy. These are first, the disturbance of what are termed political conditions; and, second, the disturbance of what are termed social conditions. Unless, I repeat, we have equality, there can be no hope of a permanent democracy—that is, that democracy which is based on equal rights and equal privileges, I say that the only way to obtain a true democracy, and to stop any oligarchy or any clique from getting the upper hand, is to insist on the

Maintenance of Our Education System.

I say that anything which tends to weaken: popular education tends to weaken your democracy, I tell you—and here I dare contradiction—that if you interfere with our Education Act, if you attempt to make it religious and not secular, if you attempt to destroy the free, secular, and compulsory clauses of that Act, you have doomed the Act. There is no hope.

—(Loud cheers.)

My Predictions Proved.

Now, do not think that I am predicting something which will never come to pass, I appeal to my past predictions. When I warned the citizens of Dunedin in 1874 that the North Island resolutions, viz., the proposal of the Atkinson-Vogel Government to have the Northern provinces abolished, but to leave the South Island provinces untouched—that the abolition of the South Island provinces would a!so come; was I right or was I wrong?—(Applause.) In 1875, when I told you what Abolition meant—that it meant the spoliation of your revenues, and that everything was to be centralised in Wellington—I ask you did my prediction come true or false? I ask you to think of these things. From my earliest landing in New Zealand—I had only landed here a couple of days, and was but a lad—I began to think about political questions. I will tell you why. It was during the American War; and I was intensely interested in the attitude of political parties in the Colony; I was a strong Northerner,—(Applause.) I remember that I landed on a Friday. I think, and I was engaged on the Saturday. I went to see the second-master, who was going out of the school that I was entering, on the Monday, and I asked him what were the political parties in New Zealand, He said that he did not know—(laughter)—and was surprised that one who hid just come from Home should bother his head about politics. Since then till the

present time I have watched political questions in New Zealand, and have never hesitated to express my opinions, whether they were popular or unpopular. On more occasions than one I have been on the losing side, but I have sever allowed the people to misunderstand the position I took up. When I was in the Provincial Council and in the Mouse there was no need for a whip to meet me to ask me how I would vote. All the time I have been in politics never has a whip approached me to ascertain how I was going to vote. That was well known. I only mention that—I make no boast of it to show you that I am acquainted with politics in New Zealand. You must remember that there are communities differently constituted to those in Otago. I tell you that the result will be, if you attempt to interfere with this Act m any one respect, that the Act is doomed and destroyed. How has the Act been maintained in the past? It was maintained mainly through the efforts of the Auckland people. But for them it would never have been a secular Act; it would have been a demoninational one. You must remember that there was a large voting power in favor of denominationalism pure and simple, and of giving grants to separate schools. And it is the Auckland people to whom belong the credit of making the Act unsectarian. They had a denominational system and knew its utter failure in the past. They it was who supported a secular Act; and to their credit be it also said some of the members from Auckland, who are Catholics—Mr Tole and others—strongly supported it. Not only are the Auckland people in favor of the Act, but I will undertake to say that not a single man will be returned for an Auckland constituency but will pledge himself to maintain the secular Act.—(Cheers.) They had had a denominational system, and knew it was a huge failure. If you amend the Act in the slightest degree our education system is doomed, and if you doom the Act you are; doing as colonists one thing which will injure our democracy.—(Applause.) Another thing I will say is this: We should also take care that our higher education is preserved; that is in great danger at the present time. There are some people of wealth in this Colony who have means enough, if they wish, to give their sons a University education; but they do not wish to send them to a University in New Zealand. They send them to Cambridge and to Oxford. It is these people who say: "We do not want higher education." But if you do not maintain a higher system of education the poor man's son cannot go to the University; his father cannot afford to give him a higher education than is furnished by the district schools. If you do not maintain our higher education the only people who can pay for it are rich men—you are dooming many brilliant young men in the Colony, not only to disappointment, but to living on a lower level than their more wealthy fellows. The only hope of a democracy is to maintain a higher education. Do not think that you aro spending too much money on it. Sweden is far poorer in many respects than New Zealand, bat see what she has done. Look at the large number of Universities there are in America. What has enabled Scotland to maintain her position amongst the nations of the world? Has it not been her four Universities, endowed on such a liberal scale that the poor man's son as well as the richest peer's son dan there get the best education?—(Cheers.) Remember also what one of the most cultured of Americans has said. Mr Higginson, who was at one time editor of the 'Atlantic Monthly,' says: "The high-water mark of your ablest men, it is that which marks the part he nation is to play in the world." I would point out, if time permitted it, the many dangers with which a democracy is beset. Land monopoly is ene; big companies is another; interference with our educational system is a third; centralism is another. We require a better system of local government. I say, however, much we may criticise the programme of the Otago Constitutional Reform Association, unless something like that is done you will find centralism growing up, and if it has been bad in the past it will be ten times worse in the future.

—(Applause)

Conclusion.

And now let me say one or two words in conclusion. I have come forward at this crisis believing that if I am returned to the House I shall be of some service to you, and I am willing to place my services at your disposal.—(Applause.) I come forward, also, on party grounds; and I tell you that in this, contest there is simply one question you will have to determine, and it "is this:If you approve of the Atkinson Government, if you approve of what that Ministry have done, and propose to do, then you will vote against me.—(Cries of "No.") But if you approve—(A Voice: Yes.) I am glad, gentlemen, that in this meeting there is one, man in favor of the Atkinson Government; it shows that this community is a generous community, and a forgiving community, and that we are pot hard on those who are our enemies.—(Laughter.) But I say if you, think I can be of some service to you, and if; you disapprove of the Atkinson Government, then I ask you to do what you can to place meat the top of the poll.—(Applause.) I have expressed to you my views on many subjects, but there are many subjects on which I would have liked to have addressed myself which I have to omit. I ask you in this election to remember that this is a political election, and for political office.—(Hear.) And I ask you to look at the question purely from a political point of view. There are many of you in this room to-night who have known me for more than twenty years; there are some in this room who have been pupils of mine—who have known me all the time I have been teaching, all the time I have been in politics—and I appeal to them as to my past conduct, and I say this honestly: I have never broken a single pledge I have made.—(Cheers.) I go further and I say this: What I was in politics you know. I supported the side I thought right, though I: received the most bitter

opposition. You I can remember how I stood by Donald Reid.—(Cheers). You remember the fight we: made in 1872; you remember I had the Central Committee—actually 120 members—working against me to prevent my retira for Caversham. Some of you will remember they came to me and said: "If you will' only promise not to be so bitter in fighting I for your side as you have been in the Provincial Council you will meet with no opposition." What did I say then? "If I am returned I shall not flinch one bit. Reject me if you will, but I shall not alter my opinions to please any constituency in the world." I shall do the same now.—(Cheers). Isay this: that the man to be trusted inpolitics is the man who has a political creed, and is not ashamed to profess his creed, whether it is popular or unpopular.—(Hear, hear.) I have held opinions on various subjects which have been unpopular. I took up the local option question when there were no Good Templar lodges to back me up. I took up the temperance question and fought it, as many of you know, in the Provincial (Council when it was not popular for one to express his opinions in favor of such measures. That is perhaps changed a little now. But all through I want to know what young lawyer would have done what I did. When commencing my career I had the licensed victuallers opposed to me, saying they would not give me any business, and would do all they could to prevent me getting any. Did I change my creed then? On more than one occasion they said that, and I appeal to you as to what I have done in provincial politics in the past. I have lost business often through doing these things. If I were to make public private correspondence, I could show you that I even lost the solicitorship of one of the best companies here because of my views on the land question. I have suffered more for political opinions, I believe, than any man in the Colony, and I tell you now, as I told a constituency before, I am not going to change my opinions to please any man in New Zaland. I have a political creed and principle, and I have never been ashamed, not only in politics, but in other things unpopular, as you well know, to express my views, whether they pleased the citizens or not. That I believe to be the duty of an honest man, and I say this: It would be a poot olony if we were all of one mind.—r (Applause.) I came to this Colony as a young lad, intending to make it My home, believing when I came to the place that there was freedom here, and that no man would be banished for his opinions.—(Applause.) I left a country, as you left it, where there was a State Church, and where: a man who did not belong to the State Church was looked down on, and where a clergyman, not belonging to that church, had not the same social position as one who did. I hope that will never happen in New; Zealand. I say that if you introduce religion into politics, and if you banish a man for the expression of his opinions because, they do not please, you will be doing the best you can to sap true democracy,: true liberty, and true freedom,—(Cheers.) I say that the only chance for true; democracy, for true liberty, and for true freedom is that you shall give a man credit for his honesty and for his creed, whatever it may be, and that you will support a man who will do the best he can for you and who will be honest with you—not pretend to be one thing to-day and another thing tomorrow.—(Applause.) And I ask you if you believe that I have been honest in the past and can be of any service to you—if you believe also that if I were returned to the; House I would not allow any man in that House to insult me, or the constituency through me, by saying that he did not care twopence how I voted (I would let it be felt; in the House that no man should treat me disrespectfully)-I ask you in this election that each one of you will calmly, honestly, and fairly take and think over thes3 political questions; and if you believe I can help you—if you believe that I have the ability and honesty to help you—I have no doubt that you will do as constituencies have done to me in the past, generously help me, and you will show on the voting day that I am so placed as to be of some small service to you: in the future.

Mr Stout resumed his seat amidst cheering, which lasted several minutes.

Questions.

The CHAIRMAN then invited questions.

An ELECTOR: I ask Mr Stout if he will keep the promises he has given? I would like him to give his promise that he will faithfully stick to what he has said to-night.
—(Laughter.)

An ELECTOR: Is the Liberal party in favor of leasing the land?

Mr STOUT: Oh, certainly. The best proof of that is the motion I read of Sir George Grey.

The ELECTOR: I mean in the future,

Mr STOUT: Certainly, I tell you again that I shall certainly support the leasing of lands.

The ELECTOR: Will the party do it? That is the question.

Mr STOUT: What party?

The ELECTOR: The great Liberal party you were talking about.

Mr STOUT: Well, I can only say this; that if the Liberal party do not do it then I shall leave them.
—(Applause.)

Mr DENOVAN: Mr Chairman, I would ask Mr Stout, as there is manifest inequality in the decisions of the Licensing Committees—some hotels having been granted twelve o'clock and some only ten o'clock licenses—whether he will promote equality?

Mr STOUT: I hope by next year all the wards will vote for ten o'clock licenses.—(Applause and laughter.)

Mr MARTIN: Why did Mr Stout resign from the Grey Ministry like a rat from a sinking ship?

Mr STOUT: I am very glad that Mr Martin, who I believe is an elector of South Ward—(laughter)—should have come here and asked mo that question. I did not resign from the Grey Ministry because it was a sinking ship. So far as I know, the Grey Ministry were going to keep in office, I resigned because my partner was in such bad health that the doctor advised me that if I wanted to see him alive I must come home. I resigned, though I was told by my colleagues "If you only remain in we shall not ask you to come to Wellington. You need only come up for a day or two during the session." I said "No; I have my duty to fulfil to my constituents, and if I am not able to do so I shall resign my trust into other hands."
—(Cheers.)

An ELECTOR: Might I ask is it a fact that the Government of which Mr Stout was a member spent or hypothecated L2,221,104 of the L5,000,000 loan of 1879 before that loam was authorised by Parliament?

Mr STOUT: It is utterly untrue, and I will prove it. The Hall Government spent Li,750,000 in 1879-80, and in 1880-81 L1.950,000—altogether L3,700,000. They had a balance in hand on the 31st March, 1881, of Ll,860,000, so that there was L5,556,000 to spend. The best proof also that the Grey Government were not to blame was what Major Atkinson said in his recent Financial Statement, viz., that the sole cause of the deficit was the falling-off of the laud revenue.

An ELECTOR: I might ask Mr Stout, through you, Mr Chairman, if he at any time changed his political ideas?

Mr STOUT: Well, I do not know what you mean. I can only say this: that I am in the habit before I express an opinion on any subject of thinking about it, and I do not generally change my opinion after thinking over it. If you will point out to me any subject on which I have changed my opinion I shall be glad to listen to you.

The ELECTOR: Well, I will point it out to you. Will you explain to us any party you adhered to?
—(Laughter.)

Mr H. WILSON: Will Mr Stout explain his rea on for supporting Mr Donald Reid against Mr Macandrew when they stood for the Superintendency?

Mr STOUT: I supported Mr Donald Reid for the Superintendency because he was in favor of liberal land laws, and he was supported by those in favor of liberal land laws. Mr Macandrew was at the time supported by the squatters and those not in favor of liberal land laws I would support Mr Reid again under similar circumstances.

Mr WILSON: Was Mr Macandrew in favor of liberal land laws when you sided with him afterwards?

Mr STOUT: When did I side with him?

Mr WILSON: When you changed from Donald Reid over to him.

Mr STOUT: I never did anything of the sort. I never changed my political side.

Mr WILSON: Will you explain to this meeting why it was that you left your old constituency—Caveraham—and stood for Dunedin, leaving your previous supporters out in the cold?

Mr STOUT: I left my constituency at Caversham, after consulting my main supporters there, for the purpose of doing what I could to create public feeling against Abolition, I believe if I had stood for Caversham I would have had no opposition, but I stood for Dunedin in order that the City might have an opportunity of declaring emphatically whether or not it was in favor of the Provincial system.

Mr WILSON: who was standing on a form, was here pulled down, and prevented for a time from regaining his position.

Mr STOUT: I would take it as a great favor if you would allow Mr Wilson to put his questions.

A VOICE: Are you in favor of imprisonment for debt?
—(Great laughter).

Mr WILSON: Will you tell us the reasons why you stand for Dunedin East? You are a man wo should like to see in Parliament, but why do you come and stand here in [*unclear:* per] ference to another constituency?

Mr STOUT: I am very glad Mr Wih says he would like to see me in Parliament I hope he will vote for me.—(Laughter.) [*unclear:* a] do not object to Mr Green publishing private telegrams if he thinks proper; but I wish to explain that I acted in the most open and honest manner with him. Before I pat my advertisement in the newspapers stating that I was going to stand for Dunedin East seen a special telegram to Mr Green, so that he might be forewarned. I did nothing behind the scenes. I stand for Dunedin East because there is a supporter of the Atkinson Government standing for Dunedin East, and I shall do my best, so far as in me lies, to keep every supporter of the Atkinson Government out of Parliament.
—(Applause,)

An ELECTOR: Touching the questions the falling-off of the land revenue, is it not a fact that the Grey Government, of which you were a member, increased the price of land, and that thereby there was a falling off of the land revenue?

Mr STOUT: No, The best proof of that is this: that the price of the land in canterbury was not raised one farthing, and that is where the main falling-off occurred.—(A Voice: "In Southland.") I say that tin main falling-off was in Canterbury. The I rent from Canterbury used to be L700,000, and it fell down to something like L100,000. The rise of the price of land had nothing to do with it. I can only say t is: I only hope the price of land would hare been so raised as to stop the wholesale sale of land which I was going on.

Mr JOHN BARNES: There has been so much talk about what has passed; Net us know something about the future.—(Interraption and cries of "Sit down.")

Mr GREIG: Is it not a fact that the Government of which Mr Stout was a member defrauded Otago of her Land Fund and made it colonial property?

Mr STOUT: I am glad that that question was asked, because it is not a fact; and that if some person has told Mr Greig that, must be entirely ignorant of politics. That was done in 1877, before I was connected with the Government, I joined them in March, 1878. So far as Otago was concerned there was a debit balance against it There were a number of charges against the Land Fund for education, hospitals, subsidies, etc.; and, according to the returns, Otago was a loser to a considerable extent The only gainer was Canterbury. What the Government proposed was that 20 percent, of the Land Fund should be set apart for the counties in which it was raised, so that Otago would benefit to the extent of L50,000a year instead of losing. And who took the 20 per cent, away?—the Atkinson Government.

Mr BARNES: Mr Stout, there has been a great deal said about the past; let us hear something about the future. The Harbor Board have a quantity of land over which the railway at present runs. If you are returned will you use your endeavor to get the new station built and the railway line removed?

Mr STOUT: I think one thing the Government have acted wrongly in is building that railway bridge at such an enormous cost. What they should have done, if the funds of the Colony did not allow of present arrangements being carried out, was to have shifted the station, to allow of the land being leased; and they should put up an inexpensive station. If the Colony is depressed they ought not to put up expensive buildings. And with regard to the matter Mr Barnes speaks about, they ought to have acted years ago. It was promised that it should be done, and in not doing it they have violated a written pledge. I may say I did all I could when I was in office to get that settled.

In answer to a written question, asking that, if nationalisation were carried out, what provision would be made for the earth-hungry,

Mr STOUT said: I suppose they will be satisfied with leasing. I think a great deal of nonsense is talked about earth-hunger. The sole question we have to decide is whether the State or private people shall be the landlord. Why, the best farm lands in Scotland are leased lands, and the farmers are only tenants. I wish I had time to go into this perpetual lease system. I have circulated amongst you a pamphlet on the subject. It is a reprint of a speech I made in the House in 1875, so that you will see it is no new thing with me. Suppose a man has got L1,000 and he wishes to become a farmer, what has he got to do at present? He has got to buy the land, and that means that be has not sufficient capital left to stock his farm. Probably he has got to mortgage his farm, and he has a heavy rent to pay. It would be far better if he had his land perpetually leased, and did not have a mortgage to pay. I believe that one of the greatest curses of the farmer is having to pay interest on the mortgage of his land, for he is thereby very often crippled for all his life.

An ELECTOR: Are you in favor of assisted immigration?

Mr STOUT: I am not at the present time, because I think the labor market is over-stocked. My view of immigration is this; that if we could get capital flowing into the Colony then we could have people flowing in. When I was Minister of Immigration I cot men appointed like the Rev. Mr Berry to go into the country districts of England to get farmers to come out. It is a great mistake to bring out mechanics and men accustomed to manufactories. If they cannot get work at their trades you cannot ask them to go farming. If you could get by some means small farmers with capital to come out and settle on the land you would have employment for a great many more mechanics. That is the sort of immigration you should try and encourage. I believe, however, if we had our land laws on a better footing we would need very little assisted immigration; and I think it is absurd at present for the Colony to pay money to bring any more workmen here to beat down wages to 4s 6d a day.

An ELECTOR: Was the total expenditure of the Atkinson Ministry greater per head than that of the Grey Ministry?

Mr STOUT: You mean men, women, and children?

The ELECTOR: Yes.

Mr STOUT: Yes, per head there was an increase. I will give you the figures again. Their expenditure in 1876

to the end of the year was L6,676,000. Ours was L5,653,000. L1,000,000 less. Their expenditure in 1880 again was L6,248,000. Well, there were more people in the Colony in 1878 than in 1876, and their expenditure was nearly L1,000,000 more.

An ELECTOR: Mr Stout said a little while ago that he would not support any individual who supported the Atkinson Government. How did he in the face of that send a telegram to Mr Green saying if he stood for Waikouaiti he would support him there?

Mr STOUT: The gentleman who says that I made a promise to work for Mr Green is stating what is not true. I told him to go to Waikouaiti, and I will tell you why: There was one of the Atkinson supporters—Mr James Green—standing there, and if Mr M. W. Green chose to have a fight with another Atkinson supporter it would not matter to me.
—(Laughter).

An ELECTOR: Are you not going to ally yourself with a large number of those who call the leasing system a fad and bunkum?

Mr STOUT: I shall not ally myself with any who, as a party, vote against the leasing system. The Atkinson Government could never in the past have carried the perpetual leasing into effect if it were not for the support given by the other side of the House. Why Major Atkinson himself calls the unearned increment a figment. Who opposed my motion in 1875 but the Atkinson Government? I say that any man who calls the unearned increment a figment cannot consistently vote for leasing.

An ELECTOR: How about Vogel and Fish?

Mr STOUT: I know Sir Julius Vogel has told us that he looks upon perpetual leasing as beneficial to the Colony, but as a very bad thing for the individual who leases. But if you are only going to vote for the Atkinson Government because they supported leasing, you cannot do so, because the majority of the Atkinson supporters do not support leasing. There was not a single Government supporter who voted for the motion of Sir George Grey, nor a single Dunedin member.

Mr LAWRENCE: Do you consider it consistent to come to contest this seat with Mr Green when it is open to you to oppose Mr Fish, who calls the leasing system bunkum, and will vote in the interests of the liquor traffic?

Mr STOUT: I say that so long as Mr Fish agrees to vote with the Opposition, I cannot, as a consistent party man, oppose him; and I say this: if Mr Green had pledged himself to vote for the Opposition, I should not have opposed him.—(Cries of "Oh," hissing, and applause.) I go further than that, gentlemen, and say this: sooner than oppose one of the Opposition I would have stood out altogether—(applause)—and kept in private life.

An ELECTOR: Are we to understand, then, that Mr Stout goes in solely for men and not for measures?

Mr STOUT: You are to understand nothing of the sort. I go in for party, and I say anyone who knows anything about politics knows that no parliamentary government can be carried on without party. If you choose to send in a man who calls himself Independent one session, Opposition the next session, and Government the next, he will earn the contempt of both sides.

An ELECTOR: Could you take L210 for three weeks' work and still have a conscience?—(Loud laughter, and cries of "Answer the question.")

Mr STOUT: I can only say this, gentlemen: I have always voted for the payment of members; but I must say that if I had been in Parliament, considering the depressed state of this Colony, I would not have taken L210.
—(Applause.)

Mr LAWRENCE: Mr Stout knows that the majority of this constituency wish that the Bible should be introduced into the schools.
—(Interruption).

Mr STOUT: I am perfectly straight on that question. I shall vote against any attempt to make our Act denominational.—(Cheers.)

Mr WORTHINGTON: If you are returned will you make an effort to abolish plural voting?

Mr STOUT: Yes. I am against plural voting. I may say that I was in the House when the Electoral Bill was passing in 1878. I thought we should be able to get carried a motion limiting a man to three votes—i.e., a man should not vote in more than three electoral districts. Mr Saunders introduced it, and I warmly supported it; but it was defeated. And if you look up the debate on the Municipal Corporations Act you will find that Mr Ballance tried to reduce the number of votes to three in a ward. I supported him, but he also was defeated.

An ELECTOR: Are you in favor of raising money by the "greenback" system?—(Laughter.)

Mr STOUT: I do not believe any Colony can ever become rich by issuing promissory notes, and the only individual who I hare ever read of who thought he could do so and pay his debts was Micawber.
—(Load laughter.)

Mr JOHNSTON: Do you represent the Bank of New Zealand?

Mr STOUT: I do not. That gentleman should not make any insinuations which art untrue. I am neither a customer nor solicitor to the bank. I have been oftener against the bank than for it as a lawyer.

The ELECTOR explained that he made ha remark on account of Mr Stout's answer to the previous question.

Mr STOUT: I accept your apology.

An ELECTOR: Are you in favor of allowing the City Council to take a portion of the Town Belt for a graveyard?

Mr STOUT: I am not. I do not require any vote of the people about that. I am opposed to it. The Town Belt is the poor man's garden, and if you allow it to be takes for any purpose, you are doing an injury to yourselves. I go further, and say this: This Town Council have done good work in the making of streets and other things, but I believe they ought to set about making the Town Belt the same as the gardens of Sydney and Melbourne—proper places of resort for all people, so as to give us health.

Mr BARNES rose amid tumultuous applause and said: You said you would like the City Council to begin to ornament the Town Belt

Mr STOUT: I did not say "ornament"

Mr BARNES: Would you tell me where the revenue is to come from?

Mr STOUT: I admit that you have a difficulty about that.—(Laughter.) I was about to tell you how you could have it done, and it would not cost us anything. My plan is this: We should utilise the prisoners for the purpose.

Mr BARNES: Do you not think it would be better, as was done by the City Council fourteen or fifteen years ago, to select different pieces of the Town Belt and lease them to people living in the neighborhood to improve? Are you aware that the City Council leased so much, and the tenants had to lay it down in English grass, and whenever the City Council wanted gates and roads made the tenants had to make them at their own expense? It was calculated to bring in L700 a-year for fourteen years, and that money was to be devoted solely to repairing and improving the rest of the Town Belt.

Mr STOUT: I have a lively recollection of Mr Barnes, Sir Dillon Bell, Mr Charles White, and others appearing on the platform of the Princess's Theatre to discuss this very question. I cannot recollect how many years ago that was. I do not wish to see any recreation reserve mopped up for anything. I say this: it does not matter to me or others who have a big piece of ground and who have a garden. I have seen this City grow—(Mr Barnes: Not so much as I have)—and a great many people cannot live in houses that have gardens. Therefore you ought to have, as in Melbourne, beautiful public gardens to go to. I say the Town Belt is a noble heritage. It forms the lungs of the City, and I nope the people will never allow it to be infringed on by any City Council, I admit at once that there is a difficulty about funds, but in Auckland they have beautified their reserves, There is Albert Park—why, they made it a delight to see. I found the same in Sydney and Melbourne; and, although our City Council have not means to do the whole of the Belt, they should do it bit by bit. The prisoners, instead of being sent to the Central Gaol at Wellington, would be better employed in improving our gardens. —(Applause.)

An ELECTOR: Will you support the Bill for joining the leaseholds of the New Zealand Wood ware Company in Princes street?

Mr STOUT: Do you mean the City Council leases?

The ELECTOR: Yes; that's what I refer to.

Mr STOUT: I do not know what the terms of the Bill are, and I will not express any opinion upon the terms of any Bill till I have seen it. If it will benefit the City Counoil, I do not think that any harm will result to anybody; but I will not pledge myself to support any Bill till I have read it.

An ELECTOR: If the Waimea Plains Railway question is brought forward, will you be in favor of the Government taking the railway over?

Mr STOUT: Not to take it over. What I should be in favor of would be this: I should not object to this—the Government at present pay 2 per cent., and the district has to pay 5 per cent. The Government cannot get rid of their liability to pay 2 per cent. Government may do this—they may arrange to borrow the money. It would only cost the Colony 4 per cent., and put a tax on the district of 2 per cent., paying their own interest. That would be fair, ana harm nobody. I think the Colony could do it, and it would benefit those who have to submit to very grievous taxation.

An ELECTOR: Will you support the separation of the Islands?

Mr STOUT: Of course they are separated by Cook Strait.—(Loud laughter). However, I know what the gentleman means. I do not think that Separation is possible, but what I wish to see carried out is something like what is provided by the Constitutional Reform Association, and which will give us all the benefits of Separation—viz., real local I self-government, local revenues, and local expenditure.

An ELECTOR: Are you going to follow Mr Montgomery, Sir George Grey, or Sir Julius Vogel?

Mr STOUT: I am not aware that the present leader of the Opposition is Mr Montgomery. What happened in 1877 was this: when the Opposition were successful they met and elected their leader. If the Opposition be successful when Parliament meets the Liberal party will meet and elect a leader, and whatever leader they elect I shall follow, because I believe in being loyal to a party.

—(Cheers).

An ELECTOR: Will you kindly inform us who sold the Piako Swamp block of 80,000 acres, at 5s per acre?

Mr STOUT: That was sold by the Atkinson-Whitaker-Vogel Government, and I opposed it as best I could. I consider that it was a disgraceful sale, and in violation of the law.

An ELECTOR: Can Mr Stout say whether the Opposition are prepared to support land leasing or not?

Mr STOUT: I have pointed out that the majority of the Opposition are in favor of land leasing. There is no doubt about it.

An ELECTOR: I would ask Mr Stout this question—if a Bill is brought before the House for the City being made into one electorate instead of being divided into four as at present, will ho support that Bill?

Mr STOUT: Most certainly. I consider it a disgrace to have divided the City in this way. The only thing, if we thought that four members are too many, we could easily do this: make the North-east Valley Borough, and perhaps Maori Hill, one electorate, and let the City return three members.

Vote of Confidence.

Mr A. H. SHELTON: Mr Chairman, I rise with very much pleasure for the purpose of proposing—"That in the opinion of this meeting Mr Robert Stout is the most fit and proper person to represent Dunedin East in the House of Representatives."—(Cheers). I think that there are a large number in this constituency who believe that a change is necessary.—(Cries of "Yes" and "No" and interruption). I repeat I believe that there are a large number of persons in this constituency who have looked on the action taken by Mr Green in the House of Representatives with very considerable impatience.—(Interruption). If a change is required I do not think that we can have a better representative than Mr Robert Stout.—(Cheers.) The very able and eloquent speech which he has just delivered must, I think, have commended itself to you; and I think, further, that there is not much doubt that he will be returned as our member.—(Interruption and cheers.) Gentlemen, I desire you fallow me to refer to one question that has been asked, and that was in reference to which leader Mr Stout will follow. I would suggest to you, gentlemen, is it not proper and possible that Mr Stout may be the leader himself?—(Prolonged cheering.) Gentlemen, we have not been represented for some considerable time.—(Interruption.) "Why, I say, should not Dunedin East have a Premier to represent them?—(Cheers.) Gentlemen, I shall not detain you any longer. I have the greatest pleasure in proposing that Mr Stout is the most proper person to represent this constituency.—(Cheers.)

Mr SWAN seconded the motion.

Mr JOHNSTON, amidst general uproar, endeavored to move an amendment to this effect: "That this meeting thank Mr Robert Stout for his able address, but as his views are very similar to those enunciated by Mr. Green——." (Uproar).

Mr BARNES: Mr Johnston is not an elector of Dunedin East, and therefore has no claim to be heard.

Mr STOUT begged the meeting to give a hearing to Mr Johnston, but the interruption was continued for some time; and

The CHAIRMAN intimated that the amendment, not having found a seconder, lapsed.

The motion was then put and declared carried unanimously. After the cheering had subsided,

Mr STOUT acknowledged the vote, and said: Ladies and gentlemen, let me say one or two words. I have to thank you very much indeed for the kind manner in which you have received me this evening. Of course, you know that I have a very hard fight to fight, and I ask each of you, if you think I can help you, to do for me what you can. I may also tell you this: I do not believe in personally canvassing, and I d: not intend to do it. I give up a considerable amount of my time by going into the House; I hope if you think I can be of service to you that you will do all you can to place me in a proper position on the poll on the election day.—(Interruption.) I know, gentlemen, that my opponent has some very noisy people at this meeting. I hope it will I. be something like the fable told by a celebrated brated Frenchman about the drum; when it was opened it was very empty,—(Applauses and hissing.) I ask those who will come forward at the close of this meeting to enroll themselves to help me in this election to be kind enough to wait behind. I have now very much pleasure in proposing a voted thanks to the chairman.

—(Applause.)

The meeting then closed with three cheers being called for Mr Green, which was replied to with cries of "Three cheers Stout and three groans for Green."

Printed at the EVENING STAR Office, Bond street, Dunedin.

The Wellington Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society Report Presented at a Meeting of the Dis-Charged Prisoners' Aid Society, Sept. 28th, 1916, Held in Supreme Court Chambers, Sir Robert Stout, Chief Justice, Presiding vignette

"His First Offence"

From the Painting by Lady Dorothy Stanley (Widow of Sir H. M. Stanley, the great African Explorer).

The Wellington Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society

Patron:

- His Excellency Lord Liverpool.

President:

- His Honour Sir Robert Stout. K.C.M.G., Chief Justice for N.Z.

Vice-President:

- His Honour Mr. Justice Theophilus Cooper.

Committee:

- Chairman: W. G. Riddell, Esq., S.M.
- D. G. A. Cooper, Esq., S.M.
- H. H. Ostler, Esq., Crown Solicitor
- The Hon. T. W. Hislop
- T. M. Wilford, Esq., M.P.
- E. Arnold, Esq., J.P., V.J.
- J. G. W. Aitken, Esq., J.P.
- W. J. Kellow, Esq., J.P.
- T. S. Lambert, Esq., J.P.
- P. J. O'Regan, Esq.. Barrister
- Brigadier Bray

Hon. Treasurer:

- E. Arnold, Esq., J.P., and Visiting Justice H.M. Prisons

Secretary and Officer:

- B. Cumings, Box 264

Report of The Discharged Prisoners' Aid Society

September 28th, 1916

The Prisoners' Aid Society has now been in operation in Wellington for about ten years. It has received kindly aid from private citizens and also from public bodies, and it has accomplished a great deal of good. It is necessary, we believe, that the public should be made more acquainted with its work, feeling? sure that if this is done even greater aid will be afforded to this institution.

There is no doubt that of late years the question of Prison Reform has been much discussed amongst all civilised peoples. Great steps have been taken, especially in the United States of America, to see if prisoners could not be reformed. In New Zealand this attempt reformation first received legal sanction in 1886, now thirty years ago, when the First Offenders Probation Act" was passed. Since then there have been several legislative measures, one providing for what is termed indeterminate sentences—that is, persons after two or more convictions, according to the crime, may be declared habitual criminals, and a Prison Hoard considers what shall be done with those who have been so declared. They may be let out on probation, or they may be altogether discharged from prison. There is also what is termed a Reformative sentence, and in such cases as these the prisoners are also placed under the control of the Prison Board, who can recommend His Excellency the Governor to allow them on probation or altogether to discharge them. There has also been in all the Courts a desire to deal leniently with first offenders or with those who cannot be termed habitual criminals, and if the sentences now passed on prisoners be compared with those passed, say, forty years ago, it will be noticed that there has been a great change. In New Zealand there has been now for many years a constant effort to try to reclaim prisoners. The Prisoners' Aid Society is a useful institution to effect this object. One has been established for a great number of years in Dunedin, and the services that it has rendered have been recognised by the people of Otago.

The changed attitude of the community towards prisoners is manifest. The prison is beginning to be looked upon not so much as a place for punishment as a place for the discipline and reform of the offender. There are in New Zealand several prisons specially designed with that object, such as Invercargill, Waikeria (a prison farm), another prison farm in Canterbury (Paparoa), two prison camps in the Rotorua District for tree-planting, and the prison camp, road-making, on the Waimarino Plain. All those prisons are designed to aid in the reformation of prisoners by getting them work in the open air, giving them much liberty, and not confining them in stone walls in the cities.

To aid further in true prison reform, some institution must exist that will help the prisoner when he is discharged from gaol. This is the work for which the Prisoners' Aid Society has been instituted. The Government has no institution to which prisoners can go for assistance once they are discharged as prisoners, and what the prisoners need is not so much gifts of money or aid until they are able to find work, but kindly attention and assistance in obtaining work, and some light aid by paying fares, etc., until work is obtained. The records during the past ten years of this Society show that this help has been of service to many prisoners, and has enabled them to begin to live a new life. The numbers which have been aided since the beginning of the Society are as follows Prisoners assisted, 2,806; and the following will illustrate what has been done with this large number of citizens: 1,225 had beds provided for them, numbering 2,094 beds, and also 2,446 meals; 384 received monetary assistance; 167 had clothes, boots, etc., provided; 213 had fares paid for them; 284 had lodging and food; no had their "swags" released from pawn; 73 had groceries and meat, etc., etc. Prisoners were sent to various places mostly in the South Island; two went to Australia, 29 to the South Island—in all, 250.

The kind of aid given is that of lodging, meals, fares to obtain work, clothing, etc., etc., and in many cases where the prisoner has a family out of gaol some assistance, has been given to his family during his incarceration. The Society feels that the only hope for reformation of any prisoner is, after he has undergone his punishment, to treat him kindly, and to find him suitable employment. If he is not treated kindly, and if suitable employment is not found for him, he will inevitably return to his criminal work again. It is not, however, only kindly treatment that the prisoners require in giving them slight aid and finding them work, but something must be done to impress upon them that there are people in the community who care for them.

The Society has been fortunate in having as its Secretary Mr. Cumings, who has looked after many who have come from gaol; and Mr. Arnold, the Treasurer, has placed his services unreservedly for the benefit of those who have been discharged from prison. What is generally done is that when the prisoners are leaving gaol they are seen and advised as to what their future should be and what they should do, and aid is given them if aid is required. Sometimes money has been given to send young men to their homes, and the prisoners have often

refunded the aid they have received. In other instances their relatives, sometimes in the Home Country, have been communicated with, and aid has been sent to the prisoners, who have thus been helped to start in life afresh. It would be unwise to give illustrations of what has been done in case the prisoners assisted might be identified.

The work of the Society has been mainly confined to the Wellington Provincial District. Sometimes prisoners come from other parts of the Dominion, and if they need assistance, and after investigation it is found that assistance should be given to them, the aid is forthcoming.

The Prisoners' Aid Society confidently appeal to the public for assistance in order that they may continue and also enlarge their work. In the absence of some institution to which prisoners can go after they are discharged from gaol, the Prisoners' Aid Society is a necessity if the reform work amongst prisoners is to continue.

Robert Stout, President.
W. K. Riddell, Chairman.
D. G. A. Cooper, Vice-Chairman.
Edwin Arnold, Treasurer.
B. Cumings, Secretary, Box 264.

vignette

Printed at the Evening Post Office. Willis Street. Wellington. New Zealand—63904

Front Cover

The Evolution of Mind. An Address Delivered by the Chief Justice, Sir Robert Stout, before The Hawke's Bay Philosophical Institute. Napier; Dinwiddie, Walker & Co.. Ltd., Tennyson St. 1916.

The Evolution of Mind.

In many old novels it was customary to prefix a motto or short quotation as the heading of every chapter. In Scott's Novels, for instance. I think there is no chapter without an apt quotation: and in looking over the old and original numbers of the "Spectator," published in Queen Anne's reign we will find a special quotation for every number. We have in our sermons a survival of this custom. Every sermon now-a-days has, as of old, a text. In our religion the old persists in other things besides in texts for sermons. I do not find fault with the customs of thus prefixing texts or giving apt quotations—they often define what the subject is with which the writer or speaker has to deal. To-night I wish to take as my text for my lecture those words of Professor James Mark Baldwin, who is Professor of Psychology in New York. In dealing with Psychology—the science of mind—ho uttered these pregnant words—"The first truth is that the mind is not the possession of man alone. Other creatures have minds. Psychology no longer confines itself as it formerly did to the human soul, denying to the animals a place in this highest of all sciences. It finds itself unable to require any test or evidence of the presence of mind which animals do not meet, nor does it find any place at which the story of the mind can begin higher up than the very beginning of life. For, as soon as we ask—'How much mind is necessary to start with?' we have to answer—'Any mind at all'; and all the animals are possessed of some of the actions which we associate with mind."

That is my test:—

Some people think that life was a special creation, and did not originate from what we vaguely term matter, though we do not define what the word "matter" signifies. In a lecture I delivered some time ago, I pointed out to you that matter may contain within it the origin of life, and that no matter is without life. As Bain long ago pointed out, we can only think of mind in terms of matter and of matter in terms of mind. Some say, even if life sprang or came from matter, that mind is a special creation, and that mind is only to be found in humanity. Animals other than human animals are called lower animals, and it is said that they have no mind, but they have what is called instinct, and some deny that the mind of man has been evolved from a lower state—from what is called instinct, such as the lower animals possess. Some even admit that though man has been developed from the lower animals, and that it is proved that from a physical point of view, man may be the crown of creation, evolved during many millions of years from the lowest speck of life, yet that when you come to consider his mind, this is a special creation or gift from the Creator, just as there was a special creation of life. It is not wonderful that this theory of special creation should remain with us, though Herbert Spencer, in one of his essays, has clearly pointed out that it is more difficult to believe in special creation than in evolution. We have never seen any special creations, and we are unable to say that there is any real evidence of special creation. The conception of development or evolution, as it is termed, is a greater con- ception and more glorious than the belief in a special creation, whether it is of life or of mind, but it is new to us, and our beliefs as well as our

deeds still travel with us from afar.

There are many primitive beliefs still amongst us. We laugh, indeed, must laugh at stories of the "evil eye," of "fairies," of "devils going about and maltreating animals"—even entering animals, of "witchcraft," etc., etc. These beliefs were common amongst the human-race and even amongst our own people not hundreds of years ago. The most intelligent of Englishmen two or three hundred years ago looked upon witch-craft as true. Able and learned men joined in punishing half-demented creatures as witches, and did not think it wrong to burn them at the stake; and there are amongst us to-day many old people who, if they recall the stories of their youth, especially if they lived in country districts in our Motherland, in England. Scotland or Ireland, could tell or beliefs amongst the people of witch-craft, of the evil-eye, of fairies, etc. Amongst our friends the Maoris there are to be found many of those primitivo beliefs, else Tohungaism would not be so prevalent. I can remember when a boy hearing a most intelligent farmer say that a cow that was sick had been made sick by an arrow being shot at it by the King of the Fairies, and he believed it. I think that if we examine the beliefs even of our own people in the Colonies we will find still existent, beliefs about charms, and ill-luck in numbers, etc. These aro remnants of the beliefs of our far back ancestors. I may be erring in minimising the strength and persistency of ancient beliefs still amongst people that are assumed to be civilised. Professor Frazer in his monumental work—"The Golden Bough"—a work that everyone desirous of knowing the origins of religious belief should road—gays:—"We should deceive ourselves if we imagined that the belief in witchcraft is even now dead in the mass of the people"; (he is not writing of our Australasian colonies) "on the contrary there is ample evidence to show that it only hibernates under the chilling influence of rationalism, and that it would start into active life if that influence were ever seriously relaxed. The truth seems to be that to this day the peasant remains a pagan and a savage at heart; his civilisation is merely a thin veneer which the hard knocks of life soon abrade." See preface to "Balder the Beautiful," P. viii. Recent ongoings in Europe I think show that the Professor need not have limited his remarks to peasants.

It is necessary to remember these things when we come to consider the question of Evolution. Is it reasonable to think that there were special creations? We see now distinct species of plants, of insects, of what are termed lower animals, and oven of men. Can We think, for example, that the different breeds of pigeons have all come from one pigeon; or the different breeds of dogs from one dog, or that the different breeds of horses have come from one horse? Is it not more reasonable to think that each special kind of animal was specially created—each kind by itself? Evolution cannot in the higher animals, at all events, be detected. The things that are seen uphold the notion that they have always been different things of the same class in the world, and therefore that those different things must have been specially created. This may be illustrated by considering what we see in nature. We see the sun rising in the morning and setting in the evening, and if we believe our eyes the sun is moving round the earth—not the earth round the sun. We now think it very peculiar that Galileo was punished for daring to contradict the story told by the ancient Semitic people. If we had no more knowledge than the mass of the people possessed when Galileo was alive, we would just he as insistent as they were, that it was wrong to contradict the Scriptares, and wrong to say that the sun did not go round the earth. It was what the ordinary eye saw. So in reference to the distinct kinds of plants, of birds, or insects, of animals. What the eve sees is different kinds, and each kind producing its kind. Is it any wonder then that Evolution has not been readily accepted? It required the special knowledge of geologists and of what are termed naturalists—botanists, and zoologists—to investigate the problems of present and past life before we learned the doctrine of ascent—the doctrine of the ascent of life from little beginnings to its present position. Though the records of the rocks are not complete, we can by such records and by foetal growth and other means prove that Evolution is true, and that it is the only rational explanation possible at present of the life we see. I often think that we in New Zealand, freed as we are to a large extent from the atmosphere of primitive beliefs found amongst older people in older lands, should be better able to discuss the various theories of life unbiassed, than those who live in older lands. What then are we to consider to-night? We see a man a thinker; he decides to do this, that, or the other. If he is placed in some new position he determines [*unclear:* while] to do. Do other animals so act? it is said no: they act because they are controlled by instinct. What is instinct? Is it something unique not found in man or is it only the name we employ for what we see animals doing? We say they act from instinct. Are they mere automata—that is, machines which, when once set in motion, then, whatever happens, go on performing the same acts with regularity and inevitably? Like ether problems that we have to solve, wo must first see what the facts are. It will be well to consider what animals do. I propose to deal with various classes of living things, and to see if we can discover how they act and why they act. We may take them under these heads (A) "the Migration of Birds," (B) "The acts of what are termed domestic animals." such as "Dogs," "Horses," etc; (C) The action of some animals like "Beavers" and "Birds," and (D) The action of "insects, ants, bees, beetles, spiders, and wasps."

(A). One amassing thing is the migration of birds. The change of birds from one place to another may not be strange, but the strange thing is, how can birds find their way? They have no compasses, they have no charts,

no sextants or quadrants to enable them to take observations of the sun, moon, or stars; no moans to determine their latitude, and no time-keepers to enable them to ascertain their longitude. Further, many of them have never made the journey before, and it is said that in many cases they are not guided or helped by older birds who have made the journey before. It was once believed that in the case of Arctic birds, and of swallows the flights of these birds were guided by old and experienced birds that had made the journey before, but it has been proved that this is incorrect. In several cases young birds went by themselves and migrated to other countries. Again, birds sometimes fly high and across oceans, and it is doubtful if their eye-sight could enable them to sec any marks on the earth that could guide them in their journey. Some birds are said to travel 21,000 miles in a year. We have examples in Now Zealand of migratory birds. The god wit, or as the Maoris say, the kuaka, leaves us before our winter, goes to Eastern Asia, and perhaps as far north as Siberia, and comes back to us in summer. Then we have two cuckoos, the long-tailed cuckoo (the Koekoea), and the shining cuskoo (the Pipiwarauroa), who go away to northern Australian islands and winter there. They visit New Caledonia, New Guinea, and New Hebrides. Thus we have birds gifted with what has recently been termed "orientation" or a sense of "direction.," It is surely a mental power. It is not unknown in mankind. You have no doubt met men who have what is termed a sense of locality. It used to be said in the old days when phrenology was popular, that men had the "bump of locality." I know one who, whenever be has been once in a place, even in a district in London, can apparently without thought find his way there again. I have known another who, even in some of our New Zealand cities, was always losing his way. Bates, in his delightful book "The Naturalist on the Amazons" tells how he and another European travelling in a part of the Amazon forest, lost their way and did not know how to move They be-thought themselves of asking an Indian boy who was with them and who had not been there before, and who apparently, had made no note of the journey they had made, yet he could at once inform them what was the right direction to take. I can remember an instance of a fisherman who, in thick mist, was able to make directly for his home, though other boats along with him thought he was wrong, refused to accept his guidance, and found them- selves after some hours miles from their destination. The same power of direction is found in horses and in other animals. Darwin tells a story which I may quote. "I sent," he says, "a riding horse by railway from Kent via Yarmouth to Freshwater Bay in the Isle of Wight. On the first day I rode eastward. My horse, when I returned to go home, was very unwilling to return towards his stable, and he several-times turned round. This led me to make repeated trials, and every time I slackened reins he turned sharply round and began to draw to the east-ward by a little north, which was very nearly in the direction of his home in Kent. I had ridden this horse daily for several years and he had never be-fore behaved in this manner. My impression was that he somehow knew the direction in which he had been brought. I should state that the last stage from Yarmouth to Freshwater Bay is almost due south, and along this road he has been ridden by my groom, but he never once showed any wish to return in this direction."

It was not a case, as we see from the story, of a horse getting Lack over the road by which he had come. He had not come in a direct line from Kent to the Isle of Wright. He was making to go in a way almost in a direct line to what was his original home. Many of us no doubt know of cattle and sheep returning to what was their first pasture though they had been removed from it by railway. One story is told of a little dog going from Vienna to Mentone, nearly 1,000 miles, and of a cat taken by railway from Huddersfield to London going back by itself to its home. There is, therefore, a sense of direction in some animals. Many illustrations might be given of the migration of birds. I may mention one peculiarity. It has been noticed that if the day is tine and clear, the birds are generally silent, but if it is dull and dark they keep up their conversation, and it is suggested that is done so that none may stray from the flock. How is this power of direction to be explained? In an article in the eleventh edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, it is said (see Vol. XVIII, p. 435) "inherited and unconscious experience, which is really all that can be meant by instinct, is a factor in the matter. . . yet every aspect of the question is fraught with difficulty."

(B.) There are acts done by horses and dogs and by the more intelligent animals like monkeys and elephants that seem to show mental power and capacity. I can give illustrations from my own experience. An uncle of mine, a farmer, had a pony we called "Farney," He earned his name because he was able to open the door of the born, which had a latch and a piece of string to the latch on the outside. By pulling the string he lifted the latch, and was able to enter the barn. Barney knew the barn, he knew that by pulling the latch he could with his head push the door open, enter, and get oats. Some short time ago I was sitting on a seat on the Clarine Parade, Napier. I noticed a dog jump up on the concrete wall—he had been called by his master, who was on the beach near the sea. At the place where the dog got on to the wall, the beach was a considerable distance below the top of the wall. The dog stopped, hesitated, looked, was afraid to jump the distance, ran a little to the north but the height did not vary, turned round, ran a little to the south, stopped, looked along the wall, apparently saw something to the south, he jumped on the parade, ran swiftly to the south, got on the wall again where its height above the beach was not great, and jumped on the beach and then went for [*unclear:* nis masser] Can it be said that the dog did not show intelligence and thought [*unclear:* a] haps more intelligence

than [*unclear:* a] human beings possess who jump heights and injure themselves. Another instance I remember: A banker in my native town had a very fine dog. I am not sure whether it was a pure retriever or a crossbred between a retriever and a Newfoundland; but I remember one day seeing the banker some distance from his garden—perhaps a quarter of a mile. He called his dog, pointed to his hands which were gloveless, spoke to the dog, and told him to go to the garden and bring him his gloves. The dog started off and came back carrying the gloves to him. There are many such instances. I was told the other day by a gentleman that a very fine Cumber spaniel he had, regularly when he heard the paper boy calling out "Evening Post" went to where the paper was usually deposited, and brought it to his master. Have we not heard also of dogs who have gone and stopped beside their master's grave, showing a love and devotion to their master? I might spend an hour or more in telling you of such stories that have been recorded by observers and by naturalists.

In Professor Hobhouse's book called "Mind in Evolution" there are many experiments recorded of teaching various animals to do certain acts—for example, to open a box. A dog, a cat, a monkey, an elephant, and an otter were all trained to perform this work. It would take up too much time to quote the various experiments that he made. I may, however, refer to one. He had a box constructed that was closed and locked with a pull-back bolt. He showed the various animals I have mentioned how the thing was opened. The result was that the dog after many trials, and being shown how, was abiete pull back the bolt and open the box. The cat learnt to do this more rapidly than the dog, and a young elephant after two or three days' trial was able to succeed admirably. A monkey was also able to succeed, and an otter even learnt after being shown twelve times how to pull the bolt. That after many trials the memory of animals is roused and remains was proved by another experiment that was made by Mr Hobhouse. He had a tank with water in it, and he divided the tank by glass. On one side of the glass was a perch and on the other side minnows. A perch, seeing the minnows on the other side of the glass, but not understanding the division, went butt against the glass to catch the minnows. He tried this a great number of times and naturally hurt his head. After a time the glass was removed, and he did not attempt to touch the minnows. He assumed that the glass was still there, and that if he attempted to rush the minnows he would hurt his head.

We have heard of the intelligence of beavers in the construction of their homes. For example, the beavers wish deep water close to their homes. They need this in America where the American beaver lives, and if they were on the side of a creek and the creek was shallow, they at once proceed to make a dam so as to obtain deep water. The deep water is necessary, because in severe winters the whole of the creek might freeze and they would suffer from the frost—in fact, be killed. Now it was observed that if the beavers were on a sluggish stream they made their dam straight across—and in a sluggish stream that would be sufficient; but if the stream was rapid they made their dam like a half-moon, putting the convex side towards the stream coming down. They knew apparently that a convex surface could resist water better than a straight surface, and being, as they are, capable engineers, they applied their engineering skill to deal with the force of the stream. Sometimes humans in dealing with streams have not the like intelligence. In the construction of their homes also beavers show great capacity.

We may get an example of prevision from birds. Those who have had much to do with plovers and partridges, for example, in the Motherland know that when they see strangers approaching their nest they feign to be wounded. They must expect the stranger to follow a wounded bird, and by thus feigning that they are wounded they lead strangers away from their nests and from possibly injuring their offspring. Again, some birds have feigned death, and this has also been observed both in insects and in reptiles. One case of a corncrake is thus stated by Jesse and quoted by Romanes in his book "Mental Evolution in Animals" (p. 305).

"Among birds, the Corncrake has been most remarked for this species of art. The author of the 'Natural History of the Corncrake' relates that one of these birds was brought to a gentleman by his dog, to all appearance quite dead. The gentleman turned it over with his foot, as it lay upon the ground, and was convinced that there was no more life in it. But after a while he saw it opon one eye, and he then took it up again, when its head fell, its legs hung loose, and it once more appeared to be certainly dead. Ho next put it into his pocket, and before long felt it struggling to escape; he took it out, and it seemed lifeless as before. He then laid it on the ground and retired to a little distance to watch it, and saw it in about five minutes raise its head warily, look round, and decamp at full speed."

In spiders and insects the same thing has been observed, and I may quote to you one or more illustrations of this power of feigning death. The following story of a monkey may be of interest:—"Thompson gives in his 'Passions of Animals' (pp. 455-7) the case of a captive monkey which was tied to a long upright pole of bamboo in the jungles of Tilhcherry. The ring at the end of its chain fitting loosely to the slippery pole, the animal was able to ascend and descend the latter at pleasure. He was in the habit of sitting on the to of the pole, and the crows caking advantage of his elevated position, used to steal his food, which was placed every morning and evening at the foot of the pole. To this he had vainly expressed his dislike by chattering, and other indications of his displeasure equally ineffectual; but they continued their periodical depredations. Finding that he was

perfectly unheeded, he adopted a plan of retribution as effectual as it was ingenious. One morning when his tormentors had been particularly troublesome, he appeared as if seriously indisposed; he closed his eyes, dropped his head and exhibited various other symptoms of severe suffering. No sooner were his ordinary rations placed at the toot of the bamboo than the crows watening their opportunity, descended in great numbers, and, according to their usual custom, began to demolish his provisions. The monkey now began to descend the pole by slow degrees, as if the effort were painful to him, and if so overcome by indisposition that his remaining strength was scarcely equal to such an exertion. When he reached the ground he rolled about for some time, seeming in great agony, until he found himself close to the vessel em- ployed to contain his food, which the crows had by this time well nigh devoured. There was still, however, some remaining, which a solitary bird, emboldened by the apparent indisposition of the monkey, advanced to seize. The wily creature was by this time lying in a state of apparent Insensibility at the foot of the pole and close by the pan. The moment the crow stretched out his head, and ere it could secure a mouthful of the interdicted food, the watchful avenger seized the depredator by the neck with the rapidity of thought and secured it from doing further mischief. He now began to chatter and grin with every expression of gratified triumph, while the crows flew around, cawing, as if deprecating the chastisement about to be inflicted on their captive companion. The monkey continued for a while to chatter and grin in triumph; he then deliberately placed the crow between his knees and began to pluck it with the most humorous gravity. When he had completely stripped it, except of the large feathers in the pinions and tail, he flung it into the air as high as his strength would permit, and after flapping his wings for a few seconds it fell to the ground with a stunning shock. The other crows, which had been fortunate enough to escape a similar castigation, now surrounded it and immediately pecked it to death. The animal then ascended its pole, and the next time his food was brought not a single crow approached it."

It would take up too long to give you scores of other instances.

The habits of insects are peculiarly interesting, and they have been detailed by Bates, Lubbock (afterwards Lord Avebury), Fabre, Maeterlinck, Edwards, Buchner, Latter and many others.

There are two classes of insects that show social organisation, namely, ants and bees, and I may give illustrations from the ants first. There are three families of ants. In England there are 30 kinds of ants, and in tropical countries there are many more. What the ants have been able to do has been stated in many books. Again, I have no time to do more than perhaps refer you to the authorities. Let us look, first, at the arrangement of an ant's nest. There is in Lubbock's book—"Ants, Bees and Wasps" (at p. 43) a plan of an ant's nest. It has a narrow entrance, a further narrow entrance, and it has, further, what may be called inner chambers. Into the main nest there is, first, a narrow entrance, and then a further narrow entrance into the main chamber, and from the main chambers into the inner chambers there are again narrow entrances, so that one or two ants could prevent approach. We speak about wonders performed by our engineers and military men in forming trenches and underground chambers to protect them from attack. The ants knew all about this long before the humans seem to have been aware of the value of underground thoroughfares. The figure referred to in Lubbock's book is, he says, a typical nest, and a good instance of the mode in which his ants excavated chambers and galleries for themselves, and, he adds, it seems to show some ideas of strategy. It had a narrow doorway, a hall, vestibule, a main chamber, an inner sanctum, and narrow entrance passages to this sanctum, and it had several special pillars. What enabled the ants to form this carefully guarded nest? "Was it not something akin to what men have when they form chambers, galleries, or underground thoroughfares? How ants proceed to attack other ants who have formed "dug outs" or underground chambers is stated by Bates in his interesting book "The Naturalist in the Amazons." Bates says he came upon an army of ants, and he thus describes their battle (p. 471):

"They were eagerly occupied, on the face of an inclined bank of light earth, in excavating mines, whence from a depth of eight or ten inches, they were extracting the bodies of a bulky species of ant, of the genus Formica. It was curious to see them crowding round the orifices of the mines, some assisting their comrades to lift out the bodies of the Formicae, and others tearing them in pieces, on account of their weight being too great for a single Eciton; a number of carriers seizing each a fragment, and carrying it off down the slope. On digging into the earth with a small trowel near the entrances of the mines, I found the nests of the Formicae, with grubs and cocoons, which the Ecitons were thus evading, at a depth of about eight inches from the surface. The eager freebooters rushed in as fast as I excavated, and seized the ants in my fingers as I picked them out, so that 1 had some difficulty in rescuing a few entire for specimens. In digging the numerous mines to get at their prey, the little Ecitons seemed to be divided into parties, one set excavating, and another set carrying away the grains of earth. When the shafts became rather deep, the mining parties had to climb up the sides each time they wished to cast out a pellet of earth; but their work was lightened for them by their comrades, who stationed themselves at the mouth of the shaft, and relieved them of their burthens, carrying the particles, with an appearance of foresight which quite staggered me, a sufficient distance from the edge of the hole to prevent them rolling in again. All the work seemed thus to be performed by intelligent cooperation amongst the

host of eager little creatures; but still there was not a rigid division of labour, for some of them, whose proceedings I watched, acted at one time as carriers of pellets, and at another as miners, and all shortly afterwards assumed the office of conveyers of the spoil."

"In about two hours all the nests of Formicae were rifled, though not completely, of their contents, and I turned towards the army of Ecitons, which wore carrying away the mutilated remains. For some distance there were many separate lines of them moving along the slope of the bank; but a short distance off, these all converged, and then formed one close and broad column, which continued for some sixty or seventy yards, and terminated at one of those large termitariums already described in a former chapter as being constructed of a material as hard as stone. The broad and compact column of ants moved up the steep sides of the hillock in a continued stream; many, which had hitherto trotted along empty-handed, now turned to assist their comrades with their heavy loads, as the whole descended into a spacious gallery or mine, opening on top top of the termitarium. I did not try to reach the nest, which I supposed to lie at the bottom of the broad mine, and therefore in the middle of the base or the stony hillock."

In another place he thus described what we may term these insect Huns: "The main column, from four to six deep, moves forward in a given direction, clearing the ground of all animal matter dead or alive, and throwing off here and there a thinner column to forage for a short time on the flanks of the main army, and re-enter it again after their task is accomplished. If some very rich place be encountered anywhere near the line of march, for example, a mass of rotten wood abounding in insect larvae, a delay takes place, and a very strong force of ants is concentrated upon it. The excited creatures search every cranny and tear in pieces ail the large grubs they drag to light. It is curious to see them attack wasps' nests, which are sometimes built on low shrubs. They gnaw away the papery covering to get at the larvae, pupae, and newly-hatched wasps, and cut everything to tatters regardless of the infuriated owners which are, flying about them. In bearing off their spoil in fragments, the places are apportioned to the carriers with some degree of regard to fairness of load; the dwarfs taking the smallest pieces, and the strongest fellows with small heads the heaviest portions. Sometimes two ants join together in carrying one piece, but the worker-majors with their unwieldy and distorted jaws, are incapacitated from taking any part in the labour. The armies never march far on a beaten path, but seem to prefer the entangled thickets where it is seldom possible to follow them. I have traced an army sometimes for half a mile or more, but was never able to find one that had finished its day's course and returned to its hive. Indeed. I never met with a hive; whenever the Ecitons were seen, they were always on the march."

We may learn, however, from the ants two other things that have been noticed. First, in the case of some ants there is a division of labour—certain work is done by one class of ants, sometimes termed slaves, and in one kind of ant there is a military organisation, and the militarists seem to do all the fighting. They are different in appearance from the ordinary ant; they have a hard hornet head which en- ables them to fight, and Bates noticed in one ants nest that vas attacked where so many were working making the nest and doing other work, an alarm was given. The workers left their work, went into their inner chambers, and the fighting ants at once appeared and attacked their enemies most fiercely and apparently careless of their own lives, many of them being killed, and yet they never ceased to attack their enemy, the workers having withdrawn and taking no part in the fight.

We hoar much now-a-days about socialism, and we sometimes are inclined to ask what would socialism be like if it were brought into force amongst the human species. This is a description of it amongst the bees. [quote from Dickner Edwardes' book "The Lore of the Honeybee" (Page 52):—

"In itself a prosperous, well-conducted hive appears to offer a living example, a perfect object-lesson of what Socialism, carried out to its last and sternest conclusions, must mean to human and apiarian communities alike Here is a number of individuals—counting anything from ten thousand to fifty or sixty thousand, according to their condition and the time of the year—living healthily and comfortably in the space of a few cubic feet. The principle, all for the greatest good of the greatest number, is elevated into a prime maxim, to which everyone must bow. The fiction of royalty is maintained in harmony with the perfect republican spirit. The females are supreme in everything, the males in nothing. Growth of population is accelerated or retarded, according to estimations of the immediate or future supply of food. The proportion of the sexes is varied at will. The rule, that those who cannot work must not live, is applied with relentless consistency. All the garnered wealth of the State is held in common for the common good. When the settlement becomes too populous, and the boundaries cannot be extended, a large part of its inhabitants are forced to emigrate, taking with them only so much of the State property as they can carry in their haversacks, and relinquishing all claims to the rest. The governing females have apparently agreed among themselves that only one of their number shall exercise the privilege of motherhood; and when her fertility declines, she is deposed, and a new motherbee, specially raised for the purpose, installed in her place."

I may quote another passage in which he speaks of community of government amongst bees.—

"It is easy—nay, inevitable—in any close study of bee life with the help of the modern observation hive, to

overset the ancient idea of absolute beemonarchy under a single king or queen. But it is not so easy to determine how the general government of the colony is actually earned on. Innamerable small consultations on minor matters are seen to take place on every side during each moment of the busy day: but nothing like general communication is ever visble. And yet, how aro the great natonal movements, such as the despatch of a swarm or the supersedure of an old queen, brought about? How are the various common crises of the state met, and provided for? The only rational inference seems to be that each worker is in herself the perfect evolved presentment of republicanism, in which all imaginable difficulties in collective life have their best solution, tried and proved through the ages, and resorted to unerringly as a matter of course. Thus a common need is felt, and met instantaneously by a common, recognised expedient. The judgment of one is necessarily the judgment of all. Every problem of daily life, however intricate, is solved by the one device, brought to the fine point of perfection through the experience of countless generations, and applied by each individual to the common want, just as hunger impels all mankind to eat.

Such a condition of affairs, even in a community of human beings, would imply a very high state of mental, if not of moral, development in the individual. It would mean entire negation of self in the interest of the common good. Even with all the forces of heredity at work, it would need stern ascetic training for the young, and for the transgressing adult a swift and merciless retribution, if the last dream of communism—the abolition of all law and penalty, and the establishment of a natural autonomy of well-doing were ever to be realised in fact. And yet some such state of things appears to exist in the bee-common vealth: the individual worker-bee seems to be the product of some such system carried on through an indefinite space of time. Order is preserved, public works go diligently forward, the clock of the national progress keeps time to the second, not because there is a central wisdom-force to plan, to govern, to awe recalcitrants, but because every worker-bee is herself the State in miniature, all propensities alien to the pure collective spirit having been long ago bred out of her by the sheer necessities of her case."

I must, however, not omit to point out the scientific knowledge the bee possesses. You know the honey-comb is of peculiar construction. How should the bee resolve on the shape of its colls? I cannot do better than quote Edwards again:—

"The geometric principles brought into play in the construction of honeycomb have been a favourite study with mathematicians of all ages, and especially this rhombiform method adopted by the bee in flooring her cells. The rhomb is best described as a plane-figure whose four sides are equal, like those of a square, but whoso angles are not right angles. In such a figure there are necessarily two greater ingles and two smaller, facing each other in pairs. The three rhombs composing the base of the honey-cell lean together, as has been seen, in the form of a blunt pyramid; and—treating all angles as negligible factors—the bluntness of this pyramid is found to coincide very aptly with the shape of the full-grown larvae. But this is not the only reason for the particular inclination given by the bee to the rhombs forming the base of each cell. Economy rules here, as in everything else she undertakes; and the truth that she has chosen the one and only form of cell-base which takes the least possible material to construct has received very striking confirmation."

"The story is an old and famous one, but it will bear repeating. A great naturalist once put himself to an infinity of trouble in measuring the angles formed by the rhombs in a vast number of conibcell bases, and he found that these showed remarkable uniformity. It will be clear that the hollow pyramid of the cell-bottom will be either deep or shallow, according to the shape of the three rhombs composing it. The apex of the pyramid is formed by the meeting of three equal angles, one from each rhomb; and it is plain that this apex will be sharp or blunt, according to whether the meeting angles are wide or narrow. It was, of course, impossible to ascertain the dimensions of these angles with abso- lutely miscroscopical nicety; but dealing only with the most perfect comb, the naturalist found that che two greater angles in the rhombs measured very nearly 110deg., and the two lesser angles 70deg. He also found that the angles formed by the conjunction of the cell sides with the bases had the same dimensions as those of the rhombs. Assuming therefore, that, mathematically, the angles of the rhombs and cell-sides should be equal, he was able to calculate exactly the angles for which the bees were evidently striving in the construction of the rhombs—109 degrees and 28 minutes, and 70 degrees and 32 minutes.

Another bee-lover scientist, ruminating over these figures, was much impressed by them, and determined to find out the reason why the bee made such constant choice of this particular shape of rhomb. He therefore conceived the idea of submitting the bee's judgment on this cell-base question to an independent authority. Without disclosing his object, he propounded the following problem to one of the greatest mathematicians of the day."

'Supposing.' said he, in effect, 'you were required to close the end of an hexagonal vessel by three rhombs or diamondshaped plates, what angles must be given to these rhombs so that the greatest amount of space would be enclosed by the least amount of material?'

"It was a difficult problem, but the mathematician worked it out at last, and his answer was 109deg. 26min.

and 70deg. 34min.

"Now, the difference between the calculation of the man and the calculation of the bee was an exceedingly small one. No one thought of calling into question the work of the man, who was pre-eminent in his world of figures. It was therefore accepted as a fact that the bee had made a trifling mistake—so trifling, however, that, in the matter of comb-building, it was of no importance. Her reputation was unimpaired: to all intents and purposes the honey-cell was still a perfect example of utmost capacity secured by least material. But another mathematician—a Scotsman this time—went over the whole business again and he proved conclusively that the bee was right, while the first mathematician was wrong. He showed that the true answer to the problem of the angles was 109deg. 28niin. and 70deg, 32min.—identically the figures obtained by estimation of the honey-comb."

Time does not permit me to give you illustrations from the spider family of intelligent acts done by members of that family. You are no doubt aware of the engineering skill displayed by the trap door spiders. This was brought before the Otago Institute many years ago by the late Robert Gillies, and you will find his paper in the transactions of the New Zealand institute. Then there is what we may call the diving or submarine spider. This spider is able to take bubbles of air from the surface and construct a diving bell. The acts of the water spider and the trap door spider may be said to be instinctive. They have teen repeated for perhaps hundreds of thousands of years. Is there any case of a spider dealing with special circumstances and not merely repeating the habits of its ancestors? One came is mentioned by J. G. Wood in his book. "Glimpses into Petland." I quote from Buchner's "Mind in Animals," translated by Annie Besant:—

"One of my friends, says Wood, was accustomed to grant shelter to a number of garden spiders under a large verandah, and to watch their habits. One day a sharp storm broke out, and the wind raged so furiously through the garden that the spiders suffered damage from it, although sheltered by the verandah. The mainyards of one of those webs, as the sailors would call them, were broken, so that the web was blown hither and thither, like a slack sail in a storm. The spider made no fresh threads, but tried to help herself in another way. Ft let itself down to the ground by a thread and crawled to a place where lay some splintered pieces of a wooden fence thrown down by the storm. It fastened a thread to one of the bits of wood, turned back with it and hung it with a strong thread to the lowest part of its nest, about five feet from the ground. The performance was a wonderful one, for the weight of the wood sufficed to keep the nest tolerably firm, while it was yet light enough to yield to the wind and to prevent further injury. The piece of wood was about two and a half inches long and as thick as a goose quill. On the following day a careless servant knocked her head against the wood and it fell down. But in the coarse of a few hours the spider had found it and brought it back to its place. "When the storm ceased, the spicier mended her web, broke the supporting thread in two, and let the wood fall to the ground.!"

I must however, forbear in giving you further illustrations of what I call mind in animals. We may call it instinct if we please. Does, however, what we call instinct differ from mind in human beings? Heredity sways us just as heredity sways the bee. We see that illustrated in human beings. The power of weaving, for example, well and quickly is hereditary. This is given as a reason why the Japanese aro such splendid weavers. The art of dyeing also descends. It is said if a man has had many ancestors who were excellent dyers he may be expected to make a good chemist, and it is perhaps a strange fact that the great English chemist, recently dead, Sir William Ramsay, had as his ancestors those who were skilled as dyers. We know that in seamanship, in manufacturing and in agriculture, heredity has play just as it does in literary and scientific ability. A day, however, in considering these things is as a thousand years, and a thousand years is as one day. Instinct is found in the most lowly animals, in insects and birds—even in fishes.

I have confined my paper to mind in animals. It has been asked if there is any trace of mind in plants. Some naturalists say there is. Grant Allen in several of his books has given illustrations of what he calls purposive action in plants. In fact, it has been said that the great and only difference between a plant and an animal is that a plant is rooted to one spot, whilst an animal has power of locomotion. But some plants do move, for do not bulbs increase and spread, and do not some shell fish remain rooted to the spot whore they were born? Giant Allen in his sketch of our common gorse says it is a most intelligent plant. It puts out spikes to protect itself. There are other plants, as, for example, most of our bulbs, that go to sleep, and so do plants in ponds. But this would open quite a new view of mind that I have not time to consider.

There is one branch of the subject that I have not time to deal with: it is have animals any moral sense? We see in ants and bees a wonderful social life. A social life is also seen amongst some kinds of monkeys. We know also that many animals herd together and go together and do common acts, Birds go in flocks. In all these animals we see the beginning of a community life. One extra- ordinary thing may be seen amongst wild sea-fowl. There may be, as I have seen, various kinds sitting, say on a headland. There is always at least one bird who acts as sentinel to them, and if any boat approaches, especially if guns can be seen in the boat, the sentinel gives warning and all the birds are alarmed and take to flight or to diving. This may be said to show

some kind of co-operation amongst birds. Do animals, however, do kindly things one to another? There are many instances to this effect. In Guthrie-Smith's "Birds of the Water, Wood and Waste" he gives this instance. He had a Pukeko called "Budget" which had been brought up as a chick by him, and he thus gives a story of what happened to Budget.

"The arrival of the three now chicks brought out quite unexpected traits in Budget's character. He was then about eleven weeks old, and durng his whole life had never ceased his perpetual, plaintive call when wandering about and feeding himself. His foster mother was in her coop, and he had no one to tell him the dangers of such a habit to little Pukekos, and what a summons it was to vermin. When the three new chicks arrived, beyond touching their little heads with his bill, and feeling them gently. Budget at first evinced but little interest. These chicks were at that time netted into a very small run until they took to their new mother, a staid old Buff Orpington.

In a few days they wore allowed full freedom—the hen still penned in her coop—and would then sometimes wander from her cover and follow Budget in a desultory sort of way. About the third day, to our amazement he began to feed them, and ever since has been a most devoted nurse. His is a real labour of love, for when called up and given a caterpillar or other dainty, he runs off at once and presents it to one of the chicks. Should it be too large, his bill is used for its crushing and maceration, or sometimes the morsel is held in his claw and torn up for the little one. His lonely cry too, ceased altogether, and was replaced by the gentle feeding note that calls up the cheepers. This latter cry, by the way, was not developed at once. At first Budget always carried food to the chicks, but later he expected them to come to him, though such is the dear fellow's love for his small charges that he can suffer no long delay, and should anything prevent their immediate appearance, will still carry to one of them, the blue hopper moth, the spindley daddy-long-legs, or the slimy, succulent caterpillar. Even when we know him to be hungry it is never himself who is first fed, and the distribution of the chopped meat Pukekos love is a quaint spectacle.

One of us presents it bit by bit to Budget, who duly passes it on to one or another of his little troop till they are gorged, standing round the dish replete, like sated cobras, and their small tummies tight as very drums.

'Budget!' 'Budget!' will always fetch him running across the lawn with bis funny rolling gait; an outstretched palm he knows means some dainty for his little ones, and we are careful never to deceive him."

May we contrast Budget's conduct with that of some of our citizens who call themselves sportsmen who go out and shoot poor Budget's brothers and sisters, not for food, but for what they call sport. This shooting is so persistent that Pukekos are getting rare. Well, Budget never had what we call any moral training, never went to Sunday School, and he knew nothing of Scripture lessons, yet he fed the weak little chicks, feeding them before he took any food for himself, and the sportsmen with all their moral and re- ligious training have not done that for the poor birds.

I saw many years ago a hen that had become blind having food brought to it by another hen. This lasted for at least two weeks. At first I could not believe it possible. I found afterwards, however, that similar acts had been observed by others. Darwin, in his "Descent of Man," says: "Many animals, however, certainly sympathise with each other's distress or danger. This is the case even with birds. Captain Stansbury found on a salt lake in Utah an old and completely blind pelican, which was very fat, and must have been well fed for a long time by his companions. Mr Blyth, as he informs me, saw Indian crows feeding two or three of their companions which were blind; and I have heard of an analogous case with the domestic cock."

We know that the mother of chickens will call her chicks to get food and refrain from taking any herself. Monkeys have been known to do kindly acts. Dogs have frequently been known to attack anyone who attacks their master, Darwin tolls this story about a monkey:

"I will give only one other instance of sympathetic and heroic conduct, in the case of a little American monkey. Several years ago a keeper at the Zoological Gardens showed me some deep and scarcely-healed wounds on the nape of his own neck, inflicted on him whilst kneeling on the floor, by a fierce baboon. The little American monkey, who was a warm friend of this keeper, lived in the same large compartment, and was dreadfully afraid of the great baboon. Nevertheless, as soon as he saw his friend in peril he rushed to the rescue, and by screams and bites so distracted the baboon that the man was able to escape, after, as the surgeon thought, running great risk of his life."

We may therefore say that morality is not unknown amongst animals other than humans. They have relations one with another, and they are peaceable, they help each other. If it be said that they do this automatically or instinctively, it may be said it is a pity that such instinct is not always found amongst human beings. It may be asked, but do they consciously act? Perhaps not, but unconscious acts, are they not the higher kind of actions? Take the pianist: she may, if she is a capable player, not require to look at the piano or at the music-book; she has become such an artist that we say she plays instinctively. It would be a great gain to mankind if we had our right conduct always instinctive. This question opens up, however, many considerations that I have not time to develop or consider. It may be, however, said that there is morality amongst animals,

though its development has not reached a high stage.

"The light that lighteth every man" is not denied to animals, who are not so high in the scale of life as human beings. We will have to recognise this. Of course this recognition does not solve the mystery of nature, nor unbosom the secrets of the universe. We are as yet like children groping in the darkness; none of us have fathomed the universe. Its vastness, its majesty, its mysteries, may well appal us, and perhaps it is the highest act of worship of any human being to bow his head and admit his ignorance of even what he sees. And what he has not seen may be greater and mightier than the little he has seen.

Robert Stout.

Books that should be read:—

Darwin's Origin of Species, Descent of Man, The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication. The Story of the Mind, by Prof. J. M. Baldwin. Mind in Evolution, by Prof. Hobhouse. Mental Evolution of Animals, by Romanes. The Naturalist in the Amazons, by Bates. Bees and Wasps, by Lutter. The Migration of Birds, by Coward. The Lore of the Honey Bee, by Tickner Edwardes. Ants, Bees, and Wasps, by Lubbock (Lord Avebury). The Bee, by Maeterlinck. Mind in Animals, by Buchner. Birds of the Water, Wood, and Waste, by Guthrie-Smith. Article "Birds" in Eleventh Edition of "Encyclopaedia Britannica.," etc.

vignette

Evolution and The Origin of Life,
By Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G.
vignette Napier, 1914. Dinwiddie, Walker and Co., Ltd.,

Evolution And the Origin of Life.

By Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G.

A Lecture Read Before the H. B. Philosophical Institute.

It is said that in every new country the first efforts of the colonists must be applied to the preservation of their lives; houses or shelter of some kind must be provided, food must be got, and, to find food, the land has to be tilled or made suitable for the growth of life, whether plant or animal. Then clothing must be supplied, and that must be obtained at first from countries where manufacturers exist, and something found, or created, in the new country that can he exchanged with merchants, or manufacturers, for the goods that must be imported.' This must be the first or initial stage of the colonist's life. Soon he has to set about making provision for other things. The youths have to be educated, and education cannot stop at what are termed the three R's. Man is an intellectual being, and as the colony gets older, and develops, there must be the discussion of the highest philosophy, and of those things that furnish food for thought amongst the most intellectual of our race. The problems of life will transcend many of the questions on which we have had much discussion. The Hawke's Bay Philosophical Society has, also, its practical side. Questions that are of interest to food suppliers, to those who take an interest in social life, to those also who have to supply the necessities of existence are not foreign to your society. There are, however, questions that should especially come within its ken. One is the origin of things. That and questions related to it may be separated from a discussion of those subjects that lie in what has been termed the religious sphere. Professor A. E. Taylor, of St. Andrews, in his book on Metaphysics, says: "Specifically religious emotion, as we can detect it both in our own experience, if we happen to possess the religious temperament, and in the devotional literature of the world, appears to be essentially a mingled condition of exaltation and humility arising from an immediate sense of communion and co-operation that a power greater and better than ours, in which our ideas of good find completer realisation than they ever obtain in the empirically known time-order."

Now this sphere we need not enter, in any Philosophical Society. We can deal with the origin of things and try and find out all we can about existence, and how it came about without crossing into the sphere of religion. If, unhappily, in some religious books there should be statements not verified, or not verifiable, or even opposed to our observation and experience, we must pass them by, and not cease to strive to find out the exact truth about all that is in the universe. No question of this kind can be settled by a general vote of any community. A referendum on the question of the origin of life we all, I am sure, realise would be a farcical proceeding; if even a referendum on any question touching the higher issues of life or even human wellbeing is ever a wise proceeding. Viscount Morley, in his most recent book, calls "Plebescites, referenda, and the rest, pieces of supererogation calculated to shred away the constitutional voice of a governing representative assembly." He was no doubt discussing the question from the political standpoint. Mankind must think of these higher issues of life, and not be swayed by the opinions of their ancestors, if they are not verifiable, or if they should happen to be proved to be wrong. The one thing necessary for the race is thought, more thought, and always thought. Let us spend an hour in seeing what science has to tell us of the problems of existence.

We have one word now in common use that before 1859 was not often heard in our midst I mean the word "Evolution." There were theories of the development of men and things before Darwin's work "The Origin of Species," but firmly fixed in the popular belief was the story of creation told us in ancient Babylonian and Hebrew literature. It was believed that there had been what was called "special creation." The great botanist Linnaeus thus explained it: "There are as many different kinds of species as the Infinite Being has created different forms in the beginning. These forms have later engendered other beings according to the law of inheritance, always resembling them so that we have at the present time not any more species than there were from the beginning." Trees, plants, animals, man—all were created as special beings or things. Birds did not develope from reptiles, nor man from an animal unlike man of to day. The oak tree was specially created; the horse did not come from a small animal with four toes in front and three toes behind, called now the Eohippus, or perhaps from the Hyracotherium, a coneylike creature. The Eohippus, we are told, was not more than eleven inches high, and it is said it had an ancestor, Phenacodus, with five toes. Professors Thomson and Geddes say, in their hook on Evolution that "Although we are not even now able to state the lineage of the modern horse, the chief steps in the evolutionary process stand out with clearness, and he must be dull indeed who can see the admirably arranged and convincing series in the museums at Yale and New York without a thrill of admiration, at the wonderful reconstruction of the ancient history of the noblest race of animals, and that most widely identified with man." There is now-a-days no zoologist of standing but admits that birds came from reptiles, and Professor Thomson tells us, that in our lifetime the creations of what would have been termed, if we had found them wild, ten distinct genera of pigeons all created by man's action of breeding have been produced. Evolution is admitted, and that means that all the present life both animal and vegetable, on the globe has come from prior forms, and the ancestors of the present forms would not be recognisable as ancesters were we to see them to-day. The evolution has been so gradual, and so long continued, that the difference between the far back ancestor, and the present representative is exceedingly great. Some connecting links have been found. If any of us have ever visited the British Museum we would have seen no doubt the fossil remains of the half reptile and half bird called the Archaeopteryx, which was a creature about the size of a small gull with bird's feathers and bird's legs, and bird's skull, but with reptile teeth, and the long lizard-like tail and three claws on its undeveloped wing; and it is said that this animal is an ancestor of our present birds. Nor has this change happened merely in reference to animals such as birds or what we might term wild animals. This change has happened in the development of man, and the recent discovery in Sussex of the skull of a river-gravel man is further evidence that the ancestor of man was very unlike the man of to-day. No distinguished man of science rejects the principle of Evolution. The records of the earth are sufficient, however defec- tive they may be, to prove that animals and plants have developed, and I might illustrate this from what the records of the earth show has happened, in regard to vegetable life. We have flowering plants. The name used by botanists for flowering plants is angiosperms (angiosperms mean "seeds enclosed"; gynmosperms means seed naked or exposed), and it is supposed that we have now in the world 103,000 kinds of flowering plants; of gymnosperms, 2500; of vascular cryptogams (e.g., ferns), 3500; of mosses and liverworts, 7500; of fungi and bacteria, 40,000; of lichens, 5500; and of algae (e.g., seaweeds), 14,000 making altogether 176,000 of different kinds of plant and vegetable life. It will be noticed that the flowering plants number about four-sevenths of all. Now at one time there were no flowering plants in the world. The first record we have of flowering plants appears in what is called the Cretaceous epoch, and that, as compared with the age of the world, is a recent development. There are in geological classification no less than eight older epochs, and immediately after the Cretaceous comes what is termed the Tertiary. In older formations there are found fossil plants, fossil "birds, etc., and fossil reptiles, but the flowering plants were a late development. We now have flowers covering the world. Even in the highest altitudes flowers are found—on mountains over 14,000 feet in height—flowers are also found in tropical parts, and yet at one time there were no flowers. Before the flowering plants there were pines, ginkgoles, or maiden-hair trees, and cycads. Some of those ancient trees still subsist with us; we have pines and gingkpoles. You can see the ginkgol, which is now the sacred tree of the Buddhist, growing in the Government grounds, Wellington, and I have seen two of them in the gardens at Hanmer, while no doubt a few are found in other places in New Zealand, having been imported to the Dominion, They are natives of China and Japan. If you read Dr. Scott's little book on "The Evolution of Plants" published in the Home University Library series, you will see how the flowering plants arose from these gymnosperms. It took a long while before plants had either flowers or seeds, and without the aid of insects it would have been impossible for some plants to have either flowers or seeds.

One distinguished Palaeontologist has said that "Just in proportion to the completeness of the record is the unequivocal character of its testimony to the truth of the evolutionary theory," And were it necessary I could refer to Haeckel's evidence from prenatal life, which reveals the evolution even of man. Goethe, before biological science had made any great advance, pointed out the resemblance in the structures of most animals, and Darwin gave illustrations of the striking fact that many had the same pattern in their ancestry.

How inexplicable is the similar pattern of the hand of a man, the loot of a dog, the wing of a bat, the flipper of a seal in the doctrine of independent acts of creation? But how simply explained is this similarity on the principal of natural selection, of successive slight variations in the diverging descendants, from a single progenitor. Owen had pointed out how many structures are homologous—that is, like each other, such as the wing of a bird, the arm of a man, being both fore limbs with similar muscles, and nerves and blood-vessels. Then we have some structures that are like but not similar, analogous but not homologous, such as the wing of a bird, and the wing of a butterfly, and we have some structures both like and similar, such as the wing of a bird, and the wing of a bat. If you have homologous structures, evolution or development is at all events suggested. It would take, however, much time were I to recite to you the many proofs of evolution.

How the evolution has come about is not, however, agreed upon. Professor G. H. Darwin, in his address as President of the British Association in 1905, spoke as follows about the different theories of evolution:—"We may liken the facts on which theories of evolution are based to a confused heap of beads, from which a keen-sighted searcher after truth picks out and strings together a few which happen to catch his eye as possessing certain resemblances. Until recently, theories of evolution in both realms of Nature were partial and discontinuous, and the chains of facts were correspondingly short and disconnected. At length the theory of Natural Selection, by formulating the cause of the divergence of forms in the organic world from the parental stock, furnished the naturalist with a clue by which he examined the disordered mass of facts before him, and he was thus enabled to go far in deducing order where chaos had ruled before, but the problem of reducing the heap to perfect order will probably baffle the ingenuity of the investigator for ever. So illuminating has been this new idea that, as the whole of Nature has gradually been re-examined by its aid, thousands of new facts have been brought to light, and have been strung in due order on the necklace of knowledge. Indeed, the transformation resulting from the new point of view has been so far-reaching as almost to justify the misapprehension of the unscientific as to the date when the doctrines of evolution first originated in the mind of man. It is not my object, nor indeed am I competent, to examine the extent to which the Theory of Natural Selection has needed modification since it was first formulated by my father and Wallace. But I am surely justified in maintaining that the general principle holds its place firmly as a permanent acquisition to modes of thought."

There are many who still accept Charles Darwin's Theory of Natural Selection. I should say the majority of the biologists at the Cambridge Darwin Centenary did so accept it, but it is not the only theory, and one of Darwin's theories of Pangenesis is not accepted by many. Weissmann's theory is that there is germplasm continuous in the race, that passes on from mother to daughter, and is not reproduced fresh in each. He says that this germplasm is not modified by surroundings, save by blood infection or a vague penetrative inficiente like heat or cold in small organisms (see McCabe on "Evolution'), and that therefore modifications in structure, etc., are not transmitted. Does, it has been asked, the strong arm—from use—of the blacksmith descend to his offspring? Herbert Spencer disagreed with Weismann. Professor Thomson of Aberdeen, and Professor Geddes put the matter thus:—"Yet another consideration. Although we do not know of any case of the transmission of a modification as such, or even in a representative degree, we, of course, agree with Weismann in admitting that modifications may have secondary effects on the germcells, and thus on the offspring. In this way 'nurture' may come to have a racial importance. Nor can we forget that the environment of mammalian mothers is bound to have an influence on the unborn young, which shares the maternal life so closely. Apart from the 'mysterious wireless telegraphy of antenatal life,' there is a sharing of the diffusible substances carried by the blood."

They quote what may be a bridge to connect the Darwinians with those called the neo-Darwinians: "The interesting suggestion has been made, independently by Mark Baldwin, Lloyd Morgan and Osborn, that useful 'modifications' may serve as the fostering nurses of 'variations' in the same direction: 'Suppose that a group of plastic organisms is placed under new conditions. Those whose innate plasticity is not equal to the occasion are eliminated. . . . Such modification takes place generation after generation, but, as such, is not inherited. . . But any congenital variations similar in direction to these modification will tend to support them, and to favour the organism in which they occur. Thus will arise a congenital predisposition to the modifications in question. The plasticity still continuing, the modifications become yet further adaptive. Thus plastic modification leads, and germinal variation follows; the one paves the way for the other. The modification, as such, is not inherited, but is the condition under which congenital variations are favoured and given time to get a hold on the organism, and are thus enabled by degrees to reach the fully adaptive level.'"

Perhaps the fact that the two different germs of germcells are blended—that is, different from father and mother—may prevent us getting sufficient evidence to make us accept one or ether theory of those two schools of Evolution. There is another school called the Mendelian, and Von Vries' Mutation Theory is an alteration of or an addition to Mendelism. The Mendelists reject the Modification Theory of the Darwinians; they believe in mutations of changes, but they say they do not come about by slow or small variations but that there are "leaps or saltations." McCabe, in his book on Evolution, gives an illustration of what the Mendelians mean by change.

He says that if we take a piece of wood with many sides and apply a small force to it, as it lies on one of its sides, it will tilt slightly and fall back to its original position. That would be called the fluctuation of a species. The fluctuations are, it is said, transmissible, but not the mutations. There, then, is the difference. Does evolution work by fluctuations according to Darwin, or by mutations according to Mendel? Dr Jordan says, after experimenting to discover the effect of the Mendelian Theory, that his results show inconsistencies with Mendelian laws, and that the theory is not yet proved. McCabe thus sums up the dispute:—"At the present time we can only say that a large number of instances of mutations, both among plants and animals are known, but they romain insignificant in number as compared with fluctations. It remains to be seen whether the future will materially add to them. Meantime, two facts should be borne in mind. The supposed intrinsic difference between a mutation and a fluctation is purely speculative, and we find variations of every intermediate length. It is therefore held by many that the difference is only one of degree, and that no strict line can be drawn between the two supposed classes. It is probable enough that natural selection works with both, according to the circumstances. The second fact is that we now generally recognise that the rate of evolution is by no means uniform. There have been periods of quicker and slower development, and the fossil evidence connects the former plainly with large changes in the environment. It thus appears that the conflict of fact on the new issue that has been raised is not necessarily irreconciliable. A glance down the stream of human history quite confirms this. Primitive man made astonishingly little progress for ages, and then, during the third glacial period in Europe, advanced rapidly. Since the dawn of civilisation the historical and ethnographical record is a similar chronicle of stagnation or slow or rapid advance, according to surroundings. It is, perhaps, advisable to close this survey of a world of controversy with a small summary. On the whole we have not penetrated very far or very confidently into the causes of variations—into the mysteries of embryology. We do not yet know how far the environment influences the germs, and if acquired modifications are in any sense transmitted to offspring. There is no general agreement as to the facts, which are not simple, and no theory of heredity commands anything like the general allegiance of the authorities. To base social creeds or experiments on any of them at present is hazardous; to assert, as Mr G. B. Shaw does, that 'the bubble of heredity, the inheritance of acquired modifications) has been pricked' is to ignore a very imposing array of living embryologists and zoologists; and the prevailing fashion of appealing to us to stake all on the germcells and pay less attention to environment and education is not justified in the state of science. It is true only that 'probably the majority' of the authorities do not admit the inheritance of acquired variations, but how far the environment (which in this case means everything but the germplasm) may influence the germs is still lees settled. Amphimixis, or the coalescence of two parent germs, is one admitted cause of variation; germinal selection is held by many to be a second cause. Variations may be large or small or intermediate, and its the more general belief that any of them may be selected. In fine, we have gained wider evidence that large variations exist, and some useful suggestions as to their causes, but every existing theory of heredity is sectarian and much disputed. Only the fact of evolution by the natural selection of ill-understood variations is established.

Thompson and Geddes's summary on Darwinianism may also be referred to (Evolution, p. 160): "There are here three main propositions:—(1) Variability is a fact of life. Variations are of frequent occurrence, and some of them are certainly transmissible. (2) Living creatures are very prolific. The majority die young. There is a ceaseless struggle for existence and the web of inter-relations is such that even minute variations may determine survival. (3). If variations occur in the direction of increased fitness, if the variations are transmissible, and if there is discriminate selection the possessors of the fitter variations are bound to be favoured with longer life and larger families—with survival, in short. If this is kept up consistently, then new adaptations, and, probably with the help of some form of isolation, new species, will arise."

It is therefore clear that though there is a difference of opinion amongst biologists as to the mode in which evolution works, all admit that there is evolution or development, and that the existing life, both vegetable and animal, have come from ancestors very unlike their descendants.

The question may now be asked, does this principle of evolution apply to what we call matter—the inorganic? Is there such a thing, for example, growth amongst gases or amongst metals? In dealing with this question we must see what aid we can get from astronomical physics. The telescope, and especially the spectroscope, and spectroheliograph, must be our instruments of research, coupled with the experiments chemical and physical, that may be made in our laboratories. What do the scientific men who have studied the stellar spectra tell us? First, the stars have been classified into four types or classes. The classes are:—

- Gaseous stars.
- Proto metallic stars.
- Metallic stars.
- Stars with fluted spectra, called carbon stars.

Professor Duncan, in his work "The New Knowledge," gives a list of stars from the hottest to the coldest with their chemical nature. It is as follows:—

- Argonian Stars—Predominant: Hydrogen and proto-hydrogen. Fainter: Helium, unknown substance, proto-magnesium proto-calcium, asterium.
- Alnitamiam Stars—Predominant: Hydrogen, helium, proto silicon, unknown substance. Fainter: Asterium, proto-hydrogen, proto-magnesium, proto-calcium, oxygen, nitrogen, carbon.
- Achernian Stars—Predominant: Hydrogen, helium, asterium, oxygen, nitrogen, carbon. Fainter; Proto-magnesium, proto-calcium, proto-silicon, unknown substance, silicon.
- Algolian Stars—Predominant: Hydrogen, proto-magnesium, proto-calcium, helium, silicon. Fainter: Protoiron, asterium, carbon, proto-titanium, proto-copper, proto-manganese, proto-nickel.
- Markabian Stars—Predominant: Hydrogen, proto-calcium, proto-magnesium, silicon. Fainter: Protoiron, helium, asterium, proto-titanium, proto copper, proto-manganese, proto-nickel, proto-chromium.
- (. . . .).
- Sirian Stars—Predominant: Hydrogen, proto-calcium, proto-magnesium, protoiron, silicon. Fainter: The lines of other proto metals and the are lines of iron, calcium and manganese.
- Procyonian Stars—Predominant: Proto-calcium, proto-titanium, hydrogen, proto-magnesium, proto-iron, and are lines of calcium, iron and manganese. Fainter: The other proto-metals and metals occurring in the Sirian genus.
- Arcturian Stars—Predominant: Proto-calcium, are lines of iron, calcium, and manganese, proto-strontium, hydrogen. Fainter: protoiron and proto-titanium
- Piscian Stars—Predominant: Flutings of carbon. Fainter: Are lines of metallic elements.

I have here a diagram taken from Sir Norman Lockyer's work on "Inorganic Evolution," which illustrates the growth of inorganic substances and shows the time it has taken for the hottest stars to cool. The degrees of heat (centigrade) are given on the one side and the stars on the other, and the time may be judged by this, that organic evolution which has taken perhaps thousands of millions of years is represented by the short point at the end, whilst the time taken for the growth of matter, as we know it on our Earth, has taken the enormous and unthinkable time represented by the long line.

Time of inorganic evolution compared with organic evolution.

30000° 25000° 20000° 15000° 10000° 5000° 0 Water boils Ice melts. Argonian Alnitamian Achernian Algolian Markabian Sirian Procyonian Arcturian Piscian Osm. & Irid. Melt. Iron Melts. Org. Evol. 0—Freezing point. 100—Boiling poinl;—centigrade.

Organic evolution occupies only a point in the line representing the time and temperature range required by inorganic evolution.

You will see that the stellar periods are borrowed from the names of typical bright stars, or of constellations in which such bright stars are found. There are some stars that are increasing in temperature, and some that are said to be decreasing in temperature. You will recognise the names of stars and constellations such as Argo, which is the name of a constellation, Algol, the name of a star, Cygnus the Swan, a constellation, Arcturus, a star in Bootes, Antaros, a star of the constellation of Scorpio. Arcturus is said to be about in the same state of heat as our sun, which is therefore in the third class of stars metallic. The word "proto-hydrogen" is used in describing the hottest stars, two stars in the constellation of Argo. Now the lines seen the spectrascope are not found anywhere else. Nothing we know of produces these lines, but they bear a likeness to hydrogen lines, and they are supposed to be the ancestors—if I may apply a word used in describing organic things, of hydrogen. The other lines seen with the "spectroscope are those of hydrogen when it is sparked with an electric coil in a vacuum tube. There are also faint lines of helium, proto-magnesium, and proto-calcium—that is, we may say, the helium not properly developed, and forerunners of magnesium and calcium. In the next series, the Crucian and Taurian, Argonian and Algolian, we have helium predominant, with hydrogen and spectral lines of the ancestors of proto-carbon, oxygen and nitrogen. Up to this time there were no traces of iron, copper, magnesium, nickel and other metals. In the proto-metallic stars like Rigel, and in some stars in the constellation of the Swan, we have again the ancestors or forerunners of metals such as lines akin to those of iron, copper, etc. We have to see, however, the metallic stars Polar, Procyon, Aldebaran and Arcturus, or our sun, before the true lines of iron, manganese are clear as seen in a voltaic arc, and in the last class the fluted spectra of carbon, etc. with fainter metallic lines are seen. What do scientific men make of these observations? They say that the beginnings of the constituents of matter are in the hottest stars, and that as the temperature falls this matter is formed into bodies such as metals, and by experiments made by physicists and chemists they are able to break up atoms by high tension electricity in a vacuum tube, and by the aid of the X-rays they can see a disintegration of metals, etc., into previous elements. Professor Moore, in his book on "The Origin and Nature of Life" says:—"The whole tale of elemental evolution holds together, is consistent, and leads to new discoveries. This is the distance which stellar observation and the study of radioactive matter take us on our journey; from this point the way lies amidst ordinary chemical combinations or chemical compounds. There is no breach of continuity as we enter this zone, the same laws of interaction hold, but greater specific differences in the forms

of matter arise; there is more chemical individuality, and there are new conditions of energy manifestation."

There is therefore, you will see, an evolution of what are called inorganic compounds. You will have noticed that I have mentioned helium gas stars. The history of the discovery of helium is one of the most interesting incidents in science. There were observed in the spectroscope lines from the sun a substance that was unknown on the earth—that is, that no substance had given the same lines. It was called helium, by Lockyer, because it came from helios, the Greek word for the sun. Professor Ramsay and Lord Rayleigh discovered Argon, and the professor, in searching amongst minerals for proof of the Argon group of gases, tested a mineral called Cleveite, which, when heated, gave off gases, A minute amount of gas was put in a vacuum tube sparked with an electrical coil, and the spectrum of the spark gave the lines of Lockyer's helium. Since then helium has been found in many things. If radium is disintegrated it is found that what is called the alpha particles are nothing but charged helium which had therefore been a portion of elemental radium.

There is another phase of this subject of what is matter that I must [*unclear:* alude] to. At one time we had an atomic theory. According to Dalton there were particles in matter which were indivisible, and they were called atoms; they were, it is said one and structureless. This theory is not now accepted, for what were supposed to be elements and atoms have been disintegrated, and most men of science think that atoms are built up of electrons, and that therefore the basis of all matter is electricity. It would take some time to state to you the most recent results regarding the corpuscular theory of matter, and to rehearse to you all we know of electrons and their wonderful action. May I refer you to Sir J. J. Thomson's work on the subject, to Mr Cameron's book on Radio-Electricity, and Professor Duncan's work on the "Xew Knowledge." It has been found that the element radium can can give on disintegration, another element, helium, and thus in one case the dream of the old Alchemists has come true—transmutation has been accomplished, and this knowledge has been turned to use for rubies and small microscopic diamonds have been manufactured. Now, what does all this discussion lead to but this, that there is only one primal substance from which all the inorganic substances we have and all organic life have come. In the fiery mass of, say, the nebula of Argo, there is not only the potentiality of iron and other metals but also the potentiality of life. Dr. Charles Bastian has lately reiterated what he maintained years ago against Huxley, that he can get living organisms from the inorganic. His mode of procedure was to take a mixture of inorganic constituents such as sodium silicate, ammonia phosphate, dilute phosphoric acid and distilled water, and also sodium silicate and pernitrate of iron in distilled water. He sterilised these mixtures by raising them to a temperature of from 110deg. to 115deg. centigrade—that is higher than boiling point—in hermetically sealed tubes. He then kept those tubes for six months, exposing them to the rays of the sun, etc. He says that after an examination at the end of this period he found micro-organisms such as myxo-cocci, torulae, vibriones and moulds. All these are what are termed living things. Few scientific men at present accept his experiments as proving that these microorganisms have come from his mixtures. The vast majority say that these micro-organisms may have got into his mixtures from without. Professor Moore says that further experiments are being made, and the proper attitude of scientific men must be one of patience, and waiting for further proofs of Dr. Bastian's statement. He also states that if life is to originate it may originate in what is called colloids, which are gelatinous or gluey substances such as gum arabic, and which are not unlike Dr. Bastian's second mixture. That life may have been evolved in past times, and may not now be evolved would not be surprising, because the physical state of matter that existed millions of years ago differs from the physical state of matter now as our world has cooled. A celebrated chemist, Thomas Graham, who was Professor of Chemistry in Glasgow University, and afterwards Master of the Mint, said that matter might be classified into crystalloids and colloids, and he said, speaking of matter in the form of colloidal solution; "Their peculiar physical aggregation with the chemical indifference referred to, appears to be required in substances that can intervene in the organic processes of life. The plastic elements of the animal body are found in this class. As gelatin appears to be its type, it is proposed to designate substances of the class as colloids, and to speak of their peculiar form of agregation as the colloidal condition of matter. Opposed to the colloidal is the crystalloidal condition. Substances affecting the latter form will be classed as crystalloids. The distinction is no doubt one of intimate molecular constitution. 'Although chemically inert in the ordinary sense, colloids possess a compensating activity of their own, arising out of their physical properties. While the rigidity of the crystalline structure shuts out external impressions, the softness of the gelatinous colloid partakes of fluidity, and enables the colloid to become a medium for liquid diffusion, like water itself.' 'Another and eminently characteristic quality of colloids is their mutability. Their existence is a continued metastasis. A colloid may be compared in this respect to water while existing liquid at a temperature under its usual freezing-point, or to a supersaturated saline solution. Fluid colloids appear to have always a pectous modification; and they often pass under the slightest influence from the first into the second condition. The colloid is, in fact, a dynamical state of matter; the crystal-loidal being the statical condition. The colloid possesses energia. It may be looked upon as the probable primary source of the force appearing in the phenomena of vitality. To the gradual manner in which colloidal changes takes place (for they always demand time as an element) may the characteristic

protraction of chemico-organic changes also be referred."

There is one question to be remembered, that if we examine the chemistry of our bodies we will see that the substances found in any living body are all substances found in what is termed matter. For example, the substances of sea-water consits of chloride of sodium, chloride-magnesia, sulphate of magnesia, sulphate of calcium, sulphate of potassium, bromide of magnesium and carbonite of calcium, and in the air we have nitrogen, oxygen and carbonic acid as its main elements. Now we know that in our bodies there is oxygen, nitrogen, carbon, hydrogen, sodium, potassium, phosphorous, sulpher, calcium, chloride and bromide and iron and silicate. All the substances, therefore, in our bodies are found in what is termed water and air.

There have been many suggestions as to the origin of life. It is clear that if evolution is true, varying kinds of inorganic substances can and do arise from some primitive substances, and so do different organic forms of life from primitive forms of organic life. No scientific man, as I have before said, accepts the theory that there was a special creation of every distinct inorganic substance and of every species of organic Ufe, No one says that there was a special horse, ass, dog, lion, cat, etc. created. On the contrary, all say that from small beginnings have come all these highly organised beings. How then came life? One suggestion made many years ago by Helmholtz and by Lord Kelvin in his address to the British Association in 1871 was that life came from another planet or from a meteorite. Lord Kelvin, then Sir William Thomson, said:—"When two great masses come into collision in space, it is certain that a large part of each is melted; but it seems also quite certain that in many cases a large quantity of debris must be shot forth in all directions, much of which may have experienced no greater violence than individual pieces of rock experience in a landslip or in blasting by gunpowder. Hence, and because we all confidently believe that there are at present, and have been from time immemorial, many worlds of life beside our own, we must regard it as probable in the highest degree that there are countless seed-bearing meteoric stones moving about in space. If at the present instant no life existed upon this earth, one such stone falling upon it might, by what we blindly call natural causes, lead to its becoming coverea with vegetation."

But this is no answer to the question—What is the origin of life. It is simply putting the question a little further back, for we must ask how did life originate in this meteorite or in this planet or in this sun from which it came to our world. Arrhenius has given a similar answer to the origin of life by suggesting that life of the most minute character, which was too minute to be able to be seen by the most powerful microscope may be in the form of sperms in the atmosphere and may live in ether and so reach this world, but this also leaves unanswered how did these living organisms come into our atmosphere, and from whence have they arrived. I may add that it would take over 50,000,000 years for a meteorite travelling 60 miles an hour to reach our earth from the nearest star. Alpha Centauri. A celebrated Swiss botanist, who lived up to 1869, namely, Naegeli, takes a different view of the origin, and he boldly says that it must be assumed that life has come from what we term the organic, but which is an inapt phrase to use if it be that there is one primal substance in the universe. He says (see page 173 of Moore) "If in the physical world all things stand in casual connection with one another, if all phenomena proceed along natural paths, then organisms, which build themselves up from and finally disintegrate into the substances of which inorganic nature consists, must have originated primitively from inorganic compounds. To deny spontaneous generation is to proclaim a miracle." And Huxley at Liverpool in 1870 at a meeting of the British Association said, as criticising Dr C. Bastian's experiments:—"But though I cannot express this conviction (i.e. the impossibility of organisms appearing in hermetically sealed and sterilised flasks) too strongly, I must carefully guard myself against the supposition that I intend to suggest that no such thing as abiogenesis (that is generation without life) over has taken place in the past, or ever will take place in the future. With organic chemistry, molecular physics, and physiology yet in their infancy, and every day making prodigious strides. I think it would be the height of presumption for any man to say that the conditions under which matter assumes the properties we call "vital" may not some day be artificially brought together.

All these considerations show that nothing is stable, that there is everywhere change, though time is great. What is the end to be? We do not know. At one time it was thought that our world would become, as astronomers tell us the moon has become, a frozen world without life, that is life of the kind at all events wo know in this world. Those who had the pleasure of listening, now over 30 years ago, to Proctor's lecture on the Moon, will remember the belief of astronomers then. I have pointed out to you that some stars are increasing in temperature while some are decreasing. And what of our Earth—may it not increase in temperature? Mr Soddy, the lecturer on Radioactivity in the University of Glasgow, thus sums up the position:—"It has in its known material constituents a steady source of fresh heat, which will last, not for one million, but for thousands, or tens of thousands of millions of years. It is regarded as more probable to-day, that instead of the earth becoming colder by radiation, as has been supposed, it is steadily growing hotter and hotter in its interior. The heat so generated throughout the mass, on account of the low conductivity of the rocks and materials forming the crust, only very slowly reaches the surface. At the surface, the heat generated escapes by radiation and maintains the

temperature uniform. But the interior is almost completely thermally isolated from the surface, and the temperature within, provided that the composition of the materials is similar to that on the surface, must steadily be increasing. Joly has made some interesting calculations of the inevitable results that must attend such a process. Assuming a quantity of radium, and its corresponding amount of uranium, distributed uniformly through the mass of the earth, of two parts of radium per million million, which is less than the average found for surface rocks, this would produce an increase in the temperature of the interior by 1800 degrees centigrade, in a hundred million years. So long as the earth's crust remained solid, this heat would only escape by conduction with extreme slowness. But at some time or other, a world so constituted must explode, when the increasing temperature and pressure within overpowers the strength of the crust. According to the same authority, there is no assurance that such a consummation does not await the future, nor evidence that such has not more than once been an event of the past."

This view has importance in another way. You may remember in the early days of the evolution discussion, physicists like Lord Kelvin said that the geologists demanded so much time for the growth of the world that evolution could not be true. They asked millions and millions of years, and the earth had not existed so long, for it had cooled in a certain time. But now, as will be seen, the discovery of radium had made us alter all our views of the age of the earth. Now the earth may not only have existed for hundreds of millions of years in its present condition, but perhaps for thousands of millions of years, and the evolutionists may get any time they desire.. Before radium was discovered, the greatest age the physicists would give our earth was a hundred million years; now it may be many thousands of millions. Nature is on a vaster scale than our imagination can grasp.

What then may be said is the conclusion of the whole matter? It seems to me to be this: we have discovered after many hundreds of years of search that the universe that we are in—and I include in the universe not only the sun and its planets, our earth and others, but the universe as seen by us by our astronomers through the telescope and tested by the spectroscope, etc.,—has passed and is passing through change, and that our earth records that there has been a change in organic life—a development or evolution, as we may term it. If we are to accept the results of the investigations in astronomy and in physics and chemistry, we must believe that there has also been evolution in the inorganic world—that what we now see as metals in our earth have developed from gases of a simple type, and in the end we must be driven to come to the conclusion that in the beginning of things there is one primal substance from which inorganic matter in all its varieties and organic life in all its various forms have alike come. This seems to be the message that science delivers to us to-day, and Mr Balfour in his discussion on this subject in an address before the British Association has said that is a thought that must excite even our enthusiasm and our imagination that out of one thing has come all the wonders by which we are surrounded. Of course there lies behind all this discussion a further question which may lead us into what is termed the religious sphere. Where did this primal substance come from? That is outside, really, the domain of science. If we can discover that there is one primal substance from which both matter and life and matter and mind have come, may we not get a higher idea, a more loftier conception of the universe than we have had by the stories that have been told us of special creation? That is a matter for our consideration. All that I have attempted to do is to set before you what is the answer that science at present gives to the question—What is the origin of life, and the answer is that the origin of life is the same as the orgin of matter—there must have been one primal substance from which both have been derived. We cannot get any further. How that original primal substance came into being I do not think we can ever know We will have to pro-claim ourselves in that respect ignorant. The function of science is to ascertain what we can discover and what we can verify. It seems to me that science has so far discovered that there is one primal substance and it has also suggested at all events, that life may not only have developed millions of years ago in a distant sun or even on earth but that it may be developing now, on our earth, and that amongst the colloids simple forms of life not capable perhaps of being seen by the most powerful [*unclear:* mik-roscope] may be forming. Modern science of to-day has altered our ideas of the Atomic theory; it has given us much information about what we call elements; it has given us a different view of life. Who can say that science has now come to an end of its discoveries, and that there are not many other (to use a phrase that has often been used) continents of knowledge yet to be discovered? The attitude of the scientific men is to prove all things and to be dominated with the struggle to obtain the truth. That may be to man the highest ethical education of which he is capable.

Books That Should be Referred to.

Judd's The Coming of Evolution, Cambridge Manuals; Soddy's, Matter and Energy, Home University Library; Thomson and Geddes Evolution, Home University Library; Moore's, The Origin, and Nature of Life, Home University Library; Scott's, The Evolution of Plants, Home University Library; McCabe's, The Principles of Evolution, Collin's, The Nature Library; Duncan's, The New Knowledge, Hodder and Stoughton; Thomson, The Bible of Nature; Clarke, The System of Stars; Cameron, Radio-Chemistry; Dr C. Bastian, The Origin of Life; Lockyer'a, Inorganic Evolution.

vignette
Herald Print, Napier.
Front Cover

Address on Education: Delivered by The Hon. Robert Stout, M.H.R., Attorney-General, Etc., Etc., President of the Otago Educational Institute, At the Meeting of the Institute Held on the 15Th April, 1879. Lyon and Blair, Printers, Lambton Quay, Wellington. 1879.

Address.

I BELIEVE it is considered the duty of the President, in opening the session, to take a glance at the progress of education during the past year. In performing this duty I propose to deal with

- THE HIGHER EDUCATION.
- THE INTERMEDIATE OR SECONDARY, and
- THE PRIMARY.

I may also allude to some proposed reforms in our educational system.

1st. THE HIGHER EDUCATION.

The past year has been characterized by an unwonted activity in the consideration of the higher or University education. To enable one to appreciate the position of the parties discussing the subject, a brief outline of the history of the New Zealand and Otago Universities may not be out of place. The early settlers in Otago had looked forward to the Province having all requisite educational machinery complete within itself. This could only be accomplished by the establishment of a University. The Education Ordinances had from the earliest time assumed that a High School would be established, and when reserves were set apart for educational purposes the need of a University was distinctly and emphatically recognized. The first Crown grant of land as an educational endowment, issued 28th November, 1866, stated that the land was—" In trust for the establishment and maintenance of a University in the City of Dunedin, in the said Province, and of public schools in different parts of the Province, and for the general advancement of education in the said Province."

It was in 1860 that the Education Board urged the Government as follows:—" That the time has now come for organising the High School," &c., and the early settlors seemed to have understood that prior to a University there must be properly equipped secondary or intermediate schools. How the agitation for the erection of a University came to a head I think it better to state. Mr. Bislop, seeing the provision, by scholarships, that Tasmania made for sending some of her best scholars to England to finish their education at some University, suggested that New Zealand might follow Tasmania's example:—

"A scheme of this nature, however, could be much better taken up by the Colony as a whole than by single Provinces, as its operations could then be extended to the whole of the Colony, and would thereby incite to whole-some rivalry, not only individuals and schools, but also the several Provinces. It is to be hoped that the day is not far distant when our colonial statesmen will be able to devote some small portion of their time and energies to the consideration of questions such as this, and that they will ere long adopt measures to secure that, in every succeeding year, two great New Zealand scholarships shall also be open for competition to all the youth of the Colony, and that after the first eight scholarships shall have been awarded, there shall always be eight of the most proficient of the youth of New Zealand receiving the advantage of a liberal education at the seats of learning in the mother country."

This idea was warmly taken up by the late Rev. F. C. Simmons, who, in 1867, petitioned the House of Representatives asking that scholarships should be founded. Sir Dillon Bell greatly interested himself in the petition, and a Select Committee was appointed to consider the whole question of making some provision for higher education. Several witnesses were examined, and replies to queries prepared by the Committee were elicited from colonists from all parts of New Zealand. Many of the answers strongly recommended the establishment of a New Zealand University. I may add that the Otago and Auckland people seem to have especially favoured that proposal. In Dunedin the question did not escape observation; a public meeting was held, and resolutions, afterwards embodied in a petition, were passed. This meeting urged the establishment of a New Zealand University. The Select Committee of the House of Representatives, however, reported against the establishment of a University. The report said, in effect—

"The Committee cannot recommend any attempt to be made at present for establishing a New Zealand University, but recommend Government to set apart portions of the confiscated lands for the purpose; and also

the several Provinces to set apart Crown lands for the purpose."

The Committee, however, recommended the foundation of eight exhibitions, two open every year, as in Tasmania.

The Parliament did not frame any measure to give effect to this report. Prior to the Assembly meeting, namely, in April, 1868, Mr. Macandrew had, in his address to the Provincial Council, said—

"One of the chief purposes to which I think the new building [new Post Office] might be devoted would be that of a college and a New Zealand University. It appears to me the time has come when measures towards obtaining such an institution should be commenced, and there is no part of the Colony in a better position to make the commencement than ourselves.

It is proposed that 100,000 acres of land should be reserved by way of endowment; the annual revenue from which, together with that which will be derived from other sources, will suffice to provide the living agency which will be required to institute a University worthy of New Zealand. All that is needed now to give effect to this arrangement is your concurrence."

In the House of Representatives in 1868, Sir D. Bell brought the matter of the Report of the Committee forward, and elicited that nothing had been done save the setting apart of about 4,000 acres of confiscated land as a probable endowment. The Government, seeing that something should be done to carry out the Report of the Committee, introduced a Bill to make provision for setting apart reserves for an endowment. This Bill became law, and was the University Endowment Act, 1868. Nothing very much came of that Act. The Otago Provincial Council in 1869 took up the question, and the result was the passage of the Otago University Ordinance, 1869. Up to the passing of that Ordinance the House of Representatives had tacitly assumed that the time for the establishment of a New Zealand University bad not arrived.

The passing of the Otago University Ordinance awakened a further interest in the creation of a New Zealand University, and the outcome of that awakening was the enacting by the General Assembly of the New Zealand University Act, 1870. This Act contemplated two things (a), a teaching body. Section IV says:—

Extracts from New Zealand University Act, 1870.

15. The Colonial Treasurer shall every year pay out of the consolidated revenue the sum of three thousand pounds as a fund for maintaining the said University, and towards defraying the several stipends which may be appointed to be paid to the several professors, officers, and servants, to be appointed by such University, and for the establishment of lectures in the affiliated Colleges, and towards defraying the expense of such fellowships, scholarships, prizes, and exhibitions, as shall be awarded for the encouragement of students in such University, and towards providing a library for the same, and towards discharging all necessary charges connected with the management thereof.

(b) That the New Zealand University was not to be a mere degree conferring Corporation. By sections 18 and 19 the following provisions were law:—

18. The Council of the University of Otago, established by an Ordinance passed by the Superintendent and Provincial Council of the Province of Otago, is hereby empowered to contract and agree with the Council of the New Zealand University, hereby established for the dissolution of the said University of Otago, and for the transfer of the endowments of the said University of Otago to the Council of the said University of New Zealand for the purposes of this Act, subject to such terms as may be agreed on between the said respective Councils, consistently with the provisions of this Act, and such Councils, respectively, may, in writing, enter into such agreement accordingly, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and each agreement, when so approved, shall be notified in the New Zealand Gazette, and thereupon the said University of Otago shall, on and from a day to be fixed by the Governor in Council, and notified in such Gazette, be dissolved, and the endowments of the said University of Otago transferred to the said University of New Zealand as aforesaid, shall thereupon vest in the Council of the said last-mentioned University, subject to such terms so agreed on as aforesaid.

19. If the said Council of the said University of Otago shall, within six months from the passing of this Act, enter into such agreement as aforesaid for dissolving the said University, and for the transfer of its endowments, then the said University of New Zealand shall be established at Dunedin, in the said Province of Otago, or in default thereof the University of New Zealand may be founded in accordance with the provisions of this Act at such other place within the said Colony as the Governor of the Colony shall, with the advice of his Executive Council, direct. Provided always that no exclusive privileges are intended to be hereby conferred, such as would prevent the establishment hereafter of a New Zealand University at any other place or town in the Colony, nor shall anything herein, or in such agreement, prevent the General Assembly from applying any endowments herein made, or which may have been, or may hereafter be made for the support of a University by authority of the General Assembly, or any part of any such endowments to the establishment and maintenance of any other New Zealand University.

And I think it is to be regretted that the Otago University Council did not take advantage of these

provisions, and thus have had the New Zealand University located in Dunedin.

The two bodies, however, remained apart, and in 1871 the Otago University began to teach.

The New Zealand University had no teaching staff; it had no habitation; it had no students. What was it to do? It began to affiliate Grammar Schools to itself, and thus did, what I think is now admitted to have been, a mischievous thing for the higher education—a secondary school became a University College, and, consequently (1), Grammar School work proper must have been neglected; (2), true University training was not advanced; and, what is most important (3), the highest educational authority in the colony assumed that specialisation in education was unnecessary.

And so the two Universities went on. In 1874 an agreement was come to which resulted in the passing of "The New Zealand University Education Act, 1874," and the following, amongst others, were provisions of this Statute:—

- The New Zealand University was to be a mere degree granting, and scholarship awarding body.
- 10,000 acres of land in Southland were to become the property of the Otago University.
- Certain money grants were to be made to the Otago University.

For the concessions thus given to the Otago University, it was to yield up its power of conferring degrees, and was to become an affiliated institution.

Then came the Charter to the New Zealand University from the Imperial Government.

In 1875, another Act was passed dealing with the reserves, and it contained the following provisions:—

Certain reserves in Auckland were declared to be set apart for the higher education, and other reserves were to be made in Auckland, Wellington, and Canterbury for the purpose of promoting higher education in these provinces.

I have thus far given a very brief sketch of the laws passed affecting higher education up to 1875. Since then there has been what I might term a movement in the air. It was said all was not right. Institutions had been affiliated as competent to teach the higher education, that were not fit even to provide a decent Grammar School course. The Senate allowed persons not only to open "a school and call it an Academy," but to start a school and call it a University College. There was a feeling abroad that the New Zealand University was not fulfilling its functions, and the question arose, What was to be done?

There were many suggestions; and in order that Parliament might have the fullest information, before it dealt with the subject, a Commission was appointed to inquire into and report on the higher education.

This Commission has during the past year taken evidence at various parts of the colony. It is composed of gentlemen who represent, I think, most of the Universities in the United Kingdom, and its report is looked for with considerable interest.

Another question has been raised during the past year—Why should not the Otago University stand alone? To enable it to do so a Royal Charter is thought necessary, and a petition to the Queen praying for this has been signed.

Then, to keep on with my narrative, one other question has agitated our community bearing on this higher education. You are aware that under the original scheme of this settlement, provision was made for religious and educational reserves. These were vested in the Presbyterian Church. When the Church looked to the Government to undertake education, the question was raised. What is to be done with the education reserves? So far back as 1860 this question was asked. Mr. T. B. Gillies now Judge Gillies brought the matter before the Provincial Council, and it was referred to a Select Committee of the following gentlemen—Sir J. Richardson, Messrs. Gillies, J. Howorth, T. Dick, and Dr. Purdie—to inquire into and report upon the position of the land held by the Church. I may quote part of the report:—

Taking, however, a fair and equitable view of the whole matter, your Committee are of opinion that, had the original scheme been carried out, the educational reserves were intended to be administered in connection with, and subordinate to, the religious body under whose auspices the settlement was established; that that body, now represented by the Presbyterian Church of Otago, are entitled to the benefit accruing from that portion of the trust property applicable to religious uses; but that from the altered circumstances of the province, the failure of the original scheme, the abandonment of education by the trustees to the care of the Provincial Government, who now provide for the cost of it, your Committee are of opinion that one portion of the trust property ought to be and may be made available for the cause of education. Your Committee consider the true spirit of the original trust to have been, that religion on the one hand, and education on the other, should have provision made for them, and that in the then circumstances of the colony the provision for education could be best administered by the religious body; but that in the present circumstances of the province, the spirit of the original trust would be more justly and effectively carried out by the provision for education being held sepa, rately from the religious body.

The Committee recommended a Commission still further to investigate the subject, and to endeavour to effect an arrangement "with the trustees for placing a portion of the property at present held by them in such a

way us to be especially available for *educational* purposes, with an especial view to obtain the sanction of the General Assembly to such an arrangement adding, "In this way an appeal to the Supreme Court on the subject of the trusts can alone be avoided."

The Provincial Council, on the 24th April, 1860, adopted the report by a majority, and on the 15th December, 1865, the Provincial Council passed the following resolution:—

That the resolution of this Council on the 24th April, 1860, "That the report of the Select Committee on religious and educational trust property be adopted," be carried into effect without delay.

In 1866, a Commission, consisting of Messrs. Miller, Martin, and Reynolds, was appointed to enquire into and report on the reserves held by the Presbyterian Church. The scope of this enquiry does not seem to have been limited to the reserves set apart for education, but generally to the whole of the reserves. They found by questions answered by the late Dr. Burns and by Mr. Edward McGlashan, that it was the intention of the trustees of the reserves to set apart two-thirds for religion and one-third for education purposes, and that it was also the intention of the trustees to apply this one-third for collegiate purposes. Having discovered this they reported *interalia*,

When the New Zealand Company retired, the trust had acquired twenty-two properties, and at the time the civil Constitution was granted to New Zealand these properites were retained by them in accordance with the provisions contained in clause 78 of "The New Zealand Constitution Act.

This being the position of the properties referred to, we do not conceive it to be our duty to prosecute the enquiry to any greater length, as under the circumstances we should not feel justified in making recommendations to your Honour having for their object the supplementing of any educational or religious bodies in Otago, out of the fund which has accrued to the Presbyterian body, which we consider they are entitled to under their original terms of settlement.

I may add that I do not see how the Commission could have recommended that other Churches should share in these reserves. To have done so would have been to divert the original trust.

In 1866, "The Presbyterian Church of Otago Lands Act "was passed, and in some respects it may be said effect was given to the report of the Provincial Council. In this Act was the following provision regarding the education reserves:—

One-third of the funds from certain reserves was to become an educational fund, and the trustees were from time to time to apply the education fund in the erection or endowment of a literary chair or chairs in any college or university which shall be erected, or shall exist in the Province of Otago, or for either or both of those purposes. Section 12 provided that all professors to any such literary chair should be appointed and removable by the trustees with the concurrence of the Synod.

This Act was passed before the Provincial Council had an opportunity of considering the Commission's report. The Act finally became law on the 8th October, 1866, but the Commissioners' report was not laid on the table of the Provincial Council till the 6th November, 1866. I do not, however, know if the Provincial Council would, if it had legislated on the subject, have made any different provision, save perhaps limiting the trustees' power as to the appointment and dismissal of professors.

The difficulty that has arisen is the following, viz.:—In the Presbyterian Church of Otago Lands Act of 1866, the appointment and dismissal of the Professors rests with the trustees, with the concurrence of the Synod; whilst by the Otago University Ordinance the appointment and dismissal of all Professors recognised by the University must rest with the University Council. Of course the University could not agree to accept any Professor the Trustees and Synod chose to appoint, nor could they permit a body foreign to them, and which might be swayed by motives of a religious character, to dismiss teachers from a secular institution. I know it has been said by one eminent clergyman, who is one of our members, that there is no conflict between the Assembly Act and the Provincial Ordinance, for the former overrides the latter. I am afraid that his intense application in the study of theology has precluded him from becoming acquainted with the law regarding the interpretation of statutes. Then there arose another difference. Alone, I think I may say, in Australasian Universities, a Chair of Mental and Moral Science had been founded in our University. Not content, however, with the foundation of one Chair dealing with Mental and Moral Science, the Synod desired two. On this subject the University Council differed with the Synod, and refused the proposed Professorship. The University Council was, I understand, in favour of a Chair of English History and Literature. Then the Synod passed an Interim Act, making it lawful for the Trustees to pay any Professor of Moral Philosophy and Political Economy, or such other Professor as shall be duly appointed by the said Trustees, to a Chair in any College or University in the Province of Otago, with the concurrence of the Synod, as provided by section 12 of the Otago Presbyterian Church Act a sum of £600 yearly, or such other sum as the Synod may from time to time determine, by way of salary, and incidental expenses, so long as such Professor shall continue to occupy such Chair.

I do not think it necessary to comment on the historical facts I have last mentioned. It remains to be seen

whether the Trustees will permit this portion of the Education Funds that were supposed to be devoted to purely secular subjects, to be used as subservient to the teaching of a peculiar creed.

I leave now my brief recital of some of the events of the year, and I come to ask the question, what is to be the future of the higher education?

Every one admits a change must be made. The difference of opinion begins when the remedy is suggested. What I think should be aimed at is a specialisation of University functions amongst certain collegiate institutions. First, the University should recognise as teaching bodies collegiate institutions at some distances from each other, and with what I might term a certain feeding ground. This Colony cannot afford—no country can afford—to have colleges as numerous as primary schools. A certain sum only is available for the higher education, and the problem is, how can this sum best be utilised? There is not money enough, even were there students, to have half-a-dozen fully equipped Universities in this Colony. I doubt if there is at present money sufficient for two. To have a true University there must be provision, not only for teaching the arts, but there must be special training given to our doctors, our lawyers, our engineers, and I hope our manufacturers. Has any one calculated what it would cost to provide for the teaching of physics? And what of the other sciences? To have a number of petty institutions teaching a little Latin and less Greek, and allowing their students to cram some text book to pass in science is not the way to provide for the higher education. How then is it to be done? Some propose that there should be one University with a large number of scholarships—so large indeed that almost every one desiring a University education might hold a scholarship. The University is to be somewhat removed from a town. One gentleman in 1867 suggested Porirua—a small village near Wellington, and standing in the same relationship to Wellington as Where Flat or Saddle Hill docs to Dunedin, only perhaps less accessible. Another would have located it at Lake Wakatipu. To them the idea of a University is a teaching institution, apart from our populous centres, and apart also from our social life. I need hardly state that it is not likely that many will agree to this proposal. Our University teaching, to be successful, must be near our centres of population, otherwise it will be open to the few, and the influence of a learned body of teachers will not be felt.

If, then, the University Colleges must be near the centres of population, we must make up our minds that no one of the colleges can give in every subject a complete University course. There must be specialiasation. Let me illustrate my meaning; A medical school is a necessity. I hope, also, it is recognized that a school of mines, and a class for engineering are also requisite. Could not, say, there be two colleges in the Middle Island, one taking the medical school and the other the mines and engineering; or even if it were objected to one institution having the whole medical school affiliated to it, could it not be arranged that one part of the Doctors training should be at one college, and another part at another institute. To carry this out the New Zealand University must, I think, start by recognizing that its teaching institutions must serve for a district, and then it should try and arrange, as a term or condition of its recognition, that the institutions affiliated should specialise their studies. Had the New Zealand University laid this down as its plan, and worked up to it, and not have affiliated every institution that applied for affiliation, I think there would not have been so much adverse criticism passed on its method of fostering the higher education.

There is another alternative, and I confess I do not sec so much objection to it as some see. Why should there not be more than one University in New Zealand? In Scotland there were once five, now there are four. In Germany there are many. And it was where there were many Universities that the higher education was most widely diffused. I have not time to deal with the subject, what should a University be? I would refer to the discussion that has lately taken place on the demand of the Manchester people for a charter for a University in the Midland Counties. But if we had, say, four Universities for New Zealand, they would have to specialise their work. One would, no doubt, become famous for its classics; one, perhaps for its mathematics; one for its science or its medicine; and one for its philosophy. We could not hope, as I have said, to have four complete institutions doing full University work; but if each had its speciality I do not know if there would not be a healthy rivalry that would be productive of much good. Then we would get rid of grammar schools attempting college work; and we might at the same time bring the attaining of a University education within the reach of a great number of our population. Of course, there are many objections to this proposal. No proposal can be made that has not an objection urged against it. One urged is, that the degrees will be lessened in value as the examinations will be made easy. I do not know if that will follow. The examinations fixed by the University of Otago, before its affiliation, were higher than those fixed by the New Zealand University. But this objection could be overcome by allowing, say, the Governor, as visitor, to sanction all bye-laws fixing examinations before they become law; I believe the rivalry would prevent any institution keeping its standards too low. At present the Universities whose degrees are the most sought after, are not the Universities which have the easiest examinations for their degrees. More students attend Cambridge than Durham, and Edinburgh than St. Andrews. The best equipped University—that one that has the best teaching staff—will get the most students.

If, however, we cannot have four Universities, we may have, perhaps, four or six colleges, united under one

University, with work specialised as I have said. And to complete our system there might be superadded a provision that under certain restrictions degrees could be granted, but no scholarships awarded, to anyone who could pass a certain examination wherever and how he had been trained or educated. This would make the obtaining of degrees open, perhaps, to some who, were they forced to attend one of the recognised institutions, could not obtain them, and would, I think, tend to popularise the higher education.

I had intended to say something of the relationship of the schoolmaster to the University, but that should form the subject of a separate paper, and I therefore content myself with one or two brief remarks. I believe every teacher should spend some sessions at the University, and I am glad to see that in the new classification of teachers a due position is given to a graduate in arts. Everything that tends to raise the standard of education exalts the teachers' profession, and the more schoolmasters graduate the better for the profession as a whole. Last session of the Institute Mr. Montgomery read a very able paper on the relations of mental science to education. The need of theory preceding correct practice was there urged and illustrated. Rule of thumb men sometimes succeed, just as some navigators, who know hardly how to use compass or sextant, may steer their vessel to a safe harbor. But who would go to sea with one who was ignorant of how to ascertain a ship's position out of view of land?

Then there is another consideration. The schoolmaster is the missionary of culture. He holds the torch of learning, and must keep it alight. How can he perform his missionary work if he does not take a warm interest in the higher education, and recognise that that is the ideal toward which his labors tend? More culture means more of the good, the beautiful, and the true. Give us more culture and we will have less bigotry and less larrikinism. Our Educational Institute is wisely not confined to mere primary education. It is founded to raise the standard of education, and this I believe we can never accomplish, in even primary schools, if we neglect the higher education.

I now come to

2. Secondary or Intermediate Schools.

It will be remembered that when the Education Act, 1877, was passed, it was pointed out as one of its defects that there was no provision for the maintaining of secondary schools. Some had been in existence under Education Boards; others had received grants of land and money from the Provincial Government for their maintenance. Was the State to abandon intermediate schools to private competition, and yet look after university education and primary schools? This illogical position was pointed out, and ultimately it was resolved that Grammar or High Schools should be founded in certain districts—these schools to be under the control of Boards, partly nominated by the Governor—and open to the inspection of someone appointed by the Government. I am glad to be able to state that so far the need of having intermediate schools has been recognised, and that liberal endowments have been set aside for their maintenance—a principle similar to what I have been advocating as to the collegiate institutions has been adopted, and that is, that our Grammar or High Schools should have, to repeat my phrase, certain feeding grounds. For example, one has been founded in Invercargill, one in Dunedin, one in Oamaru, one in Timaru, one in Ashburton, one in Christchurch. In the North Island, there is one in Wellington, one in Wanganui, one in New Plymouth, one at Auckland, and one at the Thames, and I yet hopo to see others founded and endowed. By having these schools placed at regular intervals and in centres of population, due provision will be made for the advancement of intermediate education, and feeders for the universities created. No doubt the district High School provided for by the Education Act will perform a useful duty, but whenever there is population sufficient to warrant it, there should be a separation of the primary from the secondary schools. Specilisation of function is required. I may add that in both Otago and Canterbury parts of the Secondary School Reserves are still unallotted, so that somewhere in the interior of Otago, and somewhere in the north of Canterbury, grammar schools can be founded.

That the Government should provide and superintend secondary education, it is not necessary, I hope, to contend. Mr. Matthew Arnold

See Porro unum est necessarium, by Mr. Arnold. Fort. Review, Nov. 1, 1878.

and others have pointed out to English people and Dr. Donaldson to the Scotch wherein in this respect the educational systems of England and Scotland are defective. In Germany in 1875, there were 1,045 secondary or high-class schools; students, 196,264; professors, 11,707; libraries containing 1,926,333 volumes. In France, says Mr. Arnold, there were in 1876, 81 great secondary schools of the first class, and 252 of the second—all of them of a public character, all of them under inspection, all of them offering guarantees of the capacity of their teaching staff; and in these schools a total of 79,241 scholars. England, alas! is far behind France. Then if we go to Germany, we find that one person out of every 300 Las obtained a good secondary education. It must be recognised that without good secondary schools, our University cannot hope to prosper; that without secondary

schools and university training, New Zealand cannot hope to have men of eminence. Before we can get a plant of rare excellence, we must have a big seed bed; so before many men of genius arise, culture must be widely diffused. In our secondary schools, I think the State should see—

- That the buildings are suitable.
- That there is an efficient staff.
- That the teaching is efficient.

This the State, considering the endowments granted, has a right to demand, even were it to yield up every other control, such as having a certain number of nominees on the Board of Management, and if the endowments set apart for secondary schools, and the other educational endowments now held by various religious associations were properly utilised, I believe in a few years every child that could pass a requisite examination for admission to secondary schools could and should have a free grammar school education. All that is wanted to accomplish this is the careful management of the education reserves in this colony.

At present the secondary schools are not in a satisfactory state. They have been divorced, so to speak, from the primary schools. Until there is a proper system of gradation—the primary leading to the secondary, the secondary to the University—our educational system will not be complete. To obtain this end every effort should be made. First, I think we should begin by insisting that every secondary school should, once a year at least, be inspected by some inspector appointed by the Minister of Education. A provision to this effect is inserted in several of the High and Grammar School Acts, but it should be applicable to all. Second, some steps should be taken to coordinate the primary and secondary schools and the University. I know that there are difficulties in the way, but there are always, it seems to me, difficulties in everything educational. If our educational system is to be successful—difficulties or no difficulties—this must be accomplished. Each grammar school should have a classic and a modern side. So far as the modern side is concerned, a pupil should be able to pass at once from the primary school to the modern side at an age of, say, eleven or twelve. Then, as to the classic side, he should do so when he is perhaps seven or eight; or, if he ever attended a District High School or learned Latin—when he is nine or ten.

With the intermediate school, guarded by examination—none admitted unless a certain scholarship were shown, and the work of the primary made to fit into the secondary up to a certain point—I believe not only would the intermediate schools be benefitted, but the stimulus would do good to our district schools.

But I must pass on to the (3) Primary Schools.

During the past twelve months the new Education Act has been getting into working order; and generally, I may say, great progress has been attained. I believe the standard of education has been generally raised; that our schools are becoming more efficient, and the teaching profession is being better recognised. One of the most important things done has been the classification of teachers. And first as to the principle on which it has proceeded. Whatever we may think of the manner in which the principle has been applied, we must, I consider, admit that the rules laid down for classification are sound. Two things are about equally placed: *(a)*, the scholarship of the teacher; *(b)*, the teaching ability and experience of the teacher. I state frankly that in some respects I think blunders have been made in applying the principle. But it is a great step gained if we can admit that the rules for the classification are sound. That is more than half the battle. And now as to their application. If the Inspector-General had wished to perform his duties in a perfunctory manner, he would not have attempted to carry out a universal classification. He might, for example, if he desired to live at ease from worry, have said, I shall keep the old classification in the present teaching staff, and I shall provide that schoolmasters entering the service for the first time must be re-classified. If he had done this he would have given himself little trouble and less care. He has, however, seen that, to perfect the education system, classification was necessary; and were it not made thorough now, it might take ten or more years before there was such a thing as unity in the classification. And I repeat, all honour to him for his boldness. Now I have said I do not think the classification in its personal details, in some few instances, has been successful. No new machine works smoothly at first. And the classification promulgated is not a Medo-Persian edict. Teachers whose scholarship has been overlooked, may have that which was overlooked reconsidered; and so far as teaching ability and experience are concerned, the rules are so framed that a teacher may obtain a higher grade.

And whilst I am dealing with the classification of teachers let me make one or two remarks about the nurseries for teachers—the Normal Schools:—It seems to me that in the training of teachers two things should be aimed at, viz., utilising the University teaching, and paying due attention to instruction in the art of teaching. In order that this may be done, care should be taken that Normal Schools are not multiplied beyond at least the number of institutions where the higher education is taught. To obtain the necessary *esprit de corps* amongst the students, a large district must look to one school as its Normal School. Create many Normal Schools and you will most probably have inefficiency in their management. Already provision is being made for Professors of Education in some Scotch Universities, and I hope we may yet see in connection with our University, a Professor whose function will be to lecture on method and to lay down some of the first principles that should

guide a teacher in pursuing his calling.

Then, as regards the examination of students at the Normal Schools, and also of teachers, care should be taken in preparing the examination papers, that, for example, the geography paper of class E should not be more difficult than the geography paper of D. This can only be done by one person carefully supervising the whole examination papers, and one examiner taking one subject in all divisions. This is, however, a minor detail that I need not refer to.

Another subject that requires some notice is the agitation for the introduction of the Kinder-Garten system. A sketch of this system has been published here by a lady who has always interested herself in education—Miss Dalrymple—and it is not necessary for me to do more than refer to her sketch, and to Mr. Joseph Payne's visit to German schools for information on the subject. So far as I know there is no real Kinder-Garten school in this Colony. One or two infant schools adopt some of Froebel's method, but none carry it out as Froebel desired it to be carried out. In Germany and America these schools have been a great success; and I am in hopes that in Dunedin some effort will be made to start one. Prof. Payne recommends that from three to six, the children should be wholly taught on Froebel's method, but that from six to nine some instruction in reading and arithmetic in the ordinary method should be given, so that a child introduced from a Kinder-Garten to an ordinary school should not find its new school entirely strange. I shall make two quotations from Prof. Payne's Book—one showing the principle on which the Kinder-Garten is founded; and another, to state his impression of a well-taught Kinder-Garten school:—

"The purpose of the games and occupations of the Kinder-Garten is the harmonious development and cultivation of all the intellectual and bodily powers of the child. They lead him to become conscious of those powers, and to make use of them; to exercise the eye in the observation (Anschauung) of suitable forms; the hand in works which he performs as plays; the ear, through simple melodies which delight him; the under-standing, through stories, narratives, and games which rouse his attention, and fix in his mind accurate (Vorstellungen) and general concepts (Begriffe). Lastly, in his intercourse with his little companions, he learns to become happy, sociable and peaceable."

(Note to pp. 10 & 11).

At page 90 he thus sums up his views:—

"If there are any of my readers who amuse themselves with the idea of a grave Professor of advanced years sympathising with these innocent sports and occupations of children, and calling that education, I cannot help it. After years of both study and practice of education, I cannot frame a definition of it, which, as including development and training, does not strictly apply to the exercises in which these little children were engaged. Their active powers, bodily and mental, were elicited by an all-sided culture, and, what is supremely important, with the continual accompaniment of satisfaction and pleasure. No harsh compulsion, no tears, no idleness, did I observe in this heyday of the Kinder-Gartens of Germany. All were busy, all earnest, all interested, and this because they were at work (for the games were work) on their own account. The labour itself was a pleasure (Labor ipse voluptas) because it was their own labour."

I now come to speak of some demands that have been made for an alteration of "The Education Act, 1877." The demands have been of two kinds:—

1. It is said the machinery of the Act is not perfect.

School committees are elected on a bad principle. Their functions are not ample enough. I do not believe there is much in these objections. The method of cumulative voting was designed to allow minorities to be represented on the school boards. It was felt that education had so long been allied to religion that the tendency would be, by mere majority voting, to make school committees consist wholly of the dominant sect or sects. To allow the sects numerically weak, some voice in education, the cumulative vote was devised, and I cannot say that the school committees now elected are worse in any respect than those chosen under the Otago Education Ordinance. No doubt in populous places the method of obtaining the vote is not very satisfactory. It has one advantage—it is cheap, and if we spent £20, £30, or £50 in taking the vote, the £20, £30, or £50 could be better applied in being expended in the school. I can remember the time when, in Dunedin, School Committees were elected and re-elected, not more than perhaps twenty persons being present; now we see several hundreds at the meeting. This does not show that the interest in education has flagged, because the School Committees have nothing to do; and it is to be remembered that now the Board is chosen by and represents the committees.

The only power taken from the Committees is the appointment of the schoolmasters, and I am not prepared to say that this is not an advantage. To allow a good teacher some chance of rising in his profession, the Board that appoints him should have more than one school under its charge. If committees elect without reference to the Board, the teacher is not, I think, placed in such an independent position. All that is wanted is that the Board and Committee strive to make the Act work harmoniously and for the benefit of education. If that were attempted, I do not think there would be any one found grumbling about the Education Act provisions. I believe the Committees have not yet risen to their duty in carrying out the Act. It was not meant that the Committee

was to do nothing. If a district wishes a good teacher, why should they not raise amongst themselves either some addition to the teacher's salary or see that the school-house and the schoolmaster's residence were the best buildings in the district. Districts subsidise doctors and clergymen, and is the teacher not as necessary? The Committees should feel it to be their duty to help themselves. I am afraid we do not do half what we should do as Committees for Education. Just consider what some towns do. Think what Boston has done for education—paid away in school buildings nearly £750,000. Hamburg spent on one building £120,000—not for a town hall, but for a school, and a trades museum. So if our Committees had an enthusiasm for education we would not have it to be said that our school buildings were defective, and we could do nothing unless Parliament voted money. I have said over and over again that I regret that for erecting schools the Road Boards, County, and City Councils should not have power to give aid. A penny in the pound on the value of all property in Otago would erect more buildings than are at present required.

2. Another demand has been made for an alteration of the Act, and this demand has assumed two forms, though in fact it is one. It is that our national system should be made sectarian—that is, that our system must be so framed as to allow religious and secular instruction to be given together. The one form is what is known as Mr. Curtis' Bill; the other, the introduction of bible-reading in the public schools.

Mr. Curtis' Bill allows a separate district to be formed so soon as twenty-five householders desire it. They are to erect their own school buildings, but otherwise the school is to be aided from the general revenue. The books used are to be approved of by the Board, and during five hours a day nothing but secular instruction is to be given. The Committee, moreover, is to appoint the teachers. This Bill would therefore do this: It would allow each sect to have its own school, and it would create a large number of small and I believe inefficient schools; and, above all, it would allow the schools to become places where peculiar doctrines of religion were taught. It is, however, very valuable for those who advocate national education to find that this Bill pleases the denominationalists. Those who advocate the handing over of the education of the young to the clergy—for really denominational schools amount to that—have hitherto asserted that it is impossible to separate religious from secular instruction. They have said the two are inseparable, and if you separate them the secular education becomes godless. Now, Mr. Curtis' Bill provides that for five hours per day the instruction is to be purely secular, or, to use the denominationalists phrase, "godless." The question really is, shall we allow our State-supported schools to be under religious sects as such or not? The denominationalists cannot hereafter say that secular instruction is inseparable from religious instruction. They have admitted it can be separated, and if it can, why then should an unsectarian state have anything to do with the inculcation of religion. I am aware that some think secular instruction must take second place. To quote an ecclesiastical document, it is said—"In popular schools the doctrines of rehgion —*relviidsa ductrina*—ought to have the first place and be dominant—*dominari*—so that every other learning should seem as if foreign or accidental —*veluti adventitiæ appareant*. The demands made by one religious sect may be found summarized in propositions XLV and XLVIII of the syllabus issued prior to the meeting of the Ecumenical Council.

The other phase of the same demand of the State to teach a religion has been made by the Bible in schools association. It is not clear whether it is desired to have a portion of the Bible read every morning or evening with or without note or comment. I shall proceed to discuss this question in its double aspect. I first proceed to ask, why is it desired to have the Bible read in schools? It must be read for three reasons—

- For the purpose of teaching religion.
- For its intellectual training.
- For its moral training.

I do not know if any will assert now-a-days that it is the duty of the State to teach religion. Clearly if it be, the State must make up its mind to teach some one religion—unless, indeed, all religions are equally true—and if it teaches one religion, I do not see a logical halting-ground short of a State Church, and something perhaps worse. Nor can I see if it be the duty of the State, to either teach or see taught religion, why the various religious organisations should not be subsidised, and their active co-operation secured by the Government. To calmly state what is involved in the position of the State teaching religion is, I think, its best refutation. Happily, in this Colony, the refutation is, I think, unnecessary. I assume that there are none here who would assert that it is the duty of the State to teach a certain religion or to provide by money grants, that all the varied religions in our midst should be taught.

I pass on, therefore, to the second branch. The Bible is to be introduced because of the intellectual training that it affords. Is this the reason why the Bible should be introduced into the schools? I do not suppose anyone would contend that children could not be intellectually trained without the Bible. They cannot study it in the original. If it be the English in which it is written that is desired to be studied, other English works could be found which would acquaint them with the beauty and grammar of their mother tongue. Is it the sacred history that would train them? I am afraid without a theological explanation that history will seem meaningless. But are we prepared to make the Bible like other books to be read for mere intellectual training? I suspect doing so

would shock the feelings of many in our community. And I assert that mere children cannot be got to appreciate the beauty of the poetry or drama of the Bible. Minds have to be matured before poetry is appreciated, or even prose literature understood. But that the Bible is not needed as an intellectual gymnastic is, I think, further shown by the fact that it is unused for this purpose in our grammar or high schools and ill our universities. For example, I have already alluded to the discussion as to whether there was to be a Professor of English Literature and History, or a Professor of Moral Philosophy and Political Economy in our University. If the Bible is suitable for intellectual training, why not have had a Professor of Biblical exegesis? But moreover, there could be little intellectual training of children in making them read, parrot-like, a Book, denying to them any explanation of the things mentioned in it—the explanation of the Creation, of the Deluge, or of the many chronological difficulties that are so easily reconciled; and if with note and comment, then I am afraid we must have the views of some particular religious sect as the explanation of that which is deemed requiring explanation. Dr. Pusey and Dr. Camming would not, I fear, agree in explaining the Prophecy of Daniel.

It will be said, however, that it is for the third reason, for its moral training, that the Bible is to be read. I again ask, with or without comment? I will assume that it is without comment. If so, how can the pupils by merely reading a book, a chapter a day, get any idea of its moral purpose. I assume that there is no teacher that ever, before any audience, would read every passage in the Bible. I pass over passages that may be deemed objectionable, and I take one apparently unobjectionable. I suppose a child was reading King David's history, and he came to the incident—Absalom's revolt—and read 2 Sam., xvi., 7 V., how one Shimei, a Benjamite, met David and called him names. The words being—" Come out, come out, thou bloody-man, and thou man of Behai. The Lord hath returned upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned; and the Lord hath delivered the kingdom into the hands of Absalom thy son; and behold thou art taken in thy mischief because thou art a bloody man." And he reads on and finds, that for this talk, the guards wished to seize Shimei and kill him. He would think a peculiar kind of society reigned in Israel. Were Shimei to act in Dunedin as he acted before David, he would be heavily punished were he fined 10s. and costs. Then David forgave him, saying—" Let him alone, and let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him." The child would, no doubt, think it was very kind of David to forgive Shimei. But suppose the child read on, and he came to 1 Kings II., 8-10 V., and he found that, as recorded in Kings, the last words of David were to kill Shimei, speaking to Solomon thus:—" Now, therefore, hold him not guiltless, for thou art a wise man, and knowest what thou oughtest to do with him; but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood. So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David." Would he not, without note or comment, be led to believe that David harboured revenge? And as there is nothing said in the Bible that what David did was wrong, a child would assume that harbouring revenge was not wrong. I need not put the question, is it a good moral training to teach children that people should be slain who call others bad names.

I have not touched on what we read in Joshua, or Judges, or the Books of Samuel, etc. Even in the Psalms there are tilings that, if read without note or comment, may have anything but a good moral influence. For example, let us read that beautifully plaintive Psalm, the 137th:—" By the rivers of Babylon where we sat down, yea we wept when we remembered Zion, we hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof." Are we not shocked, if there is no explanation, at the last verse—" O daughters of Babylon, who ought to bo destroyed; happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones or, as put in the Scottish version:—

"Yea, happy surely shall he be,
Thy tender little ones,
Who shall lay hold upon and them
Shall dash against the stoues."

Killing little children, by dashing them against stones, is re-revolting to us.

But it will be said that the reading of the New Testament would be unobjectionable. Does anyone mean to say that children reading it without note or comment will understand it? And if they do not understand it, can it morally train them? No doubt, so far as the maxims in the grand Sermon of the Mount and other passages are concerned, they may he learned and obeyed. But these maxims are now taught, and can be taught, without reading the Bible. If we compare Matthew with Luke, we find that in some things there is a disagreement. Is the teacher to show how or why they do not agree? There are many things at least appearing difficult is the teacher to explain?

Suppose it is asked why Paul in all his preaching did not found his belief that Jesus was Messiah on his supernatural birth, but on his miraculous resurrection, is the teacher to remain dumb? And I believe there have been more comments on the ninth chapter of Romans than a child could learn if he spent his whole

school-hours in poring over the volumes.

But I will assume it is with note and comment. What then? Are all the passages read to be explained? I presume so; and how? Is there one explanation for each difficulty? Unfortunately, the various religious bodies have not yet been able to agree on one explanation as the correct one. Different sects have different explanations. And what is a teacher to do? But moreover, can a teacher explain the Bible without being trained so to do? Now, there is no provision in our Normal School nor in our University where he may get the requisite training. Almost all Churches say that before one can expound the Scriptures a certain prior training is necessary. Some have to go through a four or even seven year's course before they are thoroughly equipped. And remember, it would, I think, work great evil if one explanation was given in the school and another in the church. Besides, the explanations are theological, and the State would have to at once teach one kind of rehgion—and possibly, before a schoolmaster was elected, he would have to prove to the board or the committee his fitness to perform this part of his work. In fact, Bible reading leads logically up to Bible teaching, and Bible teaching means teaching religion.

And I ask, in all earnestness, is it wise to cause this strife of sects about our schools? If those who think Bible reading necessary, would spend as much of their time in teaching the Bible as they do in agitating that schoolmasters should teach it, I think they would better carry out their views.

I ask, why should the State interfere with Bible reading? It is said we are a Christian nation, and that the Bible is recognised by the State. I deny both propositions. As a nation we have nothing to do with religion. Every religion has equal rights before the law. None are supported by the State, and our highest offices of State can be held by men not professing the Christian religion. We have had a Jew Premier. Of course, in a sense, we are a Christian nation, namely, in the sense that a majority of the citizens are Christians, but in no other sense. No Christian, as such, has any peculiar privileges; and no religion, as such, is recognised as having any privileges by the State. Indeed were the State to act otherwise, there would neither be perfect toleration, nor perfect equality before the law. One argument used to prove that the nation is Christian, and recognises the Bible, is this:—Do we not use Bibles in our Courts of Justice? Are people not sworn on the Bible? No Scotchman or Presbyterian would use such an argument as that. In Scotch Courts of Justice there is no "kissing of the book," and were any Scotchman or Presbyterian here present to attend any of the Courts tomorrow, and say that he desired to be sworn in the Scotch form—and that was binding on his conscience—the Bible would not be used. Nay, moreover, the State only recognises that which is binding on a man's conscience. If he says he declines to be sworn, and makes an affirmation instead, his evidence will still be accepted. If he be a Mahomedan, he will be sworn on the Koran, and if he hails from China he has a choice of three oaths—he may blow out a match, crack a saucer, or cut a cock's head off. I hope we have heard the last of this assertion, that the State recognises the Bible because it is used in our Courts, and that it will not again be said, if we shut out our Bible from our schools we must banish it from our "halls of justice, and swear the witnesses on their honour."

Then it is said: But the Bible maketh for righteousness. This is Matthew Arnold's argument. People who use this language forget that Matthew Arnold is not in favour of the reading of the Bible in what I may term an orthodox way. This is how he comments on one passage:—

" The mental habit of him who imagines that Balaam's ass spoke, in no respect differs from the mental habit of him who imagines that a Madonna of wood or stone winked; and the one who says God's Church makes him believe what he believes, or another who says God's Word makes him believe what he believes, are lor the philosopher perfectly alike, in not really and truly knowing when they say God's Church and God's Word what it is they say or whereof they affirm."

—Culture and Anarchy, p. 61.

But granting it makes for righteousness, still that is no reason for having it in our public schools.

It is said that it gives a sanction to morality. It is not—I think cannot be denied—that morality can be taught without this sanction. It is, however, argued, that without this sanction the moral teaching is imperfect. Now, what is the meaning of sanction? Can you teach children anything of moral philosophy? I assert no. It is only when a certain age is reached, and a certain intellectual stature attained, that the position of the various schools of morality can be understood; and young children cannot understand such an abstract thing as sanction.

And we know that there was a lofty and ideal morality—"that of the philosophy of the Porch—which was associated with "both Pantheism and Materialism in their crudest forms." (See Pollock's article, Marcus Aurelius, and the Stoic Philosophy, in the January number of *Mind).*

Besides, if the intuitionalists are correct, the sanction of morality is within, not without. If it is further said that you must teach the children that the Bible is God's word, and therefore is their moral guide. This necessitates reading with note and comment, and implies religious teaching, for the question of inspiration must be dealt with. Suppose the teacher is a follower of the late Prof. Maurice, would his view of Inspiration be deemed satisfactory to those who agreed with Dr. Candlish's criticism on Professor Maurice's Theological

Essays? Even amongst the Bishops of one Church there is diversity of opinion—such a divergence that one Bishop will not allow another to preach in his diocese because he considers the Bishops' views of the Pentateuch are unsound and detestable. Again, are we driven to admit that before Bible reading can be had in our public schools, teachers must have a prior theological training. What would a Jew or freethinker be expected to say of the New Testament? Could we ask either of them to teach that it was God's word, and therefore the only sanction of morality? Even those who advocate Bible reading see some of the difficulties with which it is surrounded, for they generously offer that the permission for Bible reading should be hedged round with a "conscience clause." This signifies that our schools are for part of the day sectarian institutions; and necessarily the honourable profession of schoolmaster is closed to every honest man who does accept a particular religious belief. In Scotland, where it was, in 1861, permitted to those who had not signed the Confession of Faith, and the Longer and Shorter Catechisms, to become Parish Schoolmasters, it was, at the same time, carefully enacted that no teaching in a Parish School was to be contrary to these documents.

There is just one other statement that has been made that I think it necessary to refer to: If you shut out the Bible from the schools you are, it is said, giving way to the secularists and freethinkers. I deny this entirely, A secularist or freethinker has no objection to the reading of the Bible any more than to the translation of Homer's Iliad or Anacreon's Odes. He, however, wishes his explanations to be given—just as the Roman Catholic desires the Douay Bible to be read, if the instruction in it is superintended by the priest.

I am glad, before I conclude my remarks on Bible reading, to be able to quote from a very able report presented to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in confirmation of my views. It is true that the part of the report I read was not agreed to unanimously by the committee, and was withdrawn by the chairman, but that a majority could agree to the following, showed that some clergymen take a wide and just view of this question:—

But the introduction of denominationalism is not the only change in the present Education Act that is proposed tobe made. With a view of influencing the members of the House of Representatives at their next meeting, and the inhabitants of the colony at the next election, there has been commenced a movement to secure the reading of the Bible and the repeating of the Lord's Prayer in the schools within school hours. But in the face of even this effort, the defence of the present Act is recommended. It is difficult to see how an attempt of this kind can escape being characterized as the same religious intolerance as that which is so loudly condemned in the proposed denominationalism. Introducing this religious element is denominationalism. It is the denomination of Protestants obtaining an advantage over the denomination of Roman Catholics: it is the denomination of Christians obtaining an advantage over the denomination of Jews. Might does not constitute right, nor does a majority justify an evil. Though the Roman Catholics are crying out loudly against the injustice of the present Bill, they have no just cause to do so, for it places all religious bodies on a level; but if the Protestant Bible is Introduced into schools, they will have a just ground of complaint. An advantage will be given to Protestants; and in this way a sympathy will be awakened in the community which may tend to bring about the denominationalism pure and simple, which we would all deplore. There is always a sense of justice in a community which must triumph in the end. The Roman Catholics say they are at present treated with injustice, but the country do not see it. Moreover, the country will see that, notwithstanding their cry for justice, they would, if they could get their will, perpetrate an injustice great and undeniable—they would teach their peculiar doctrines at the expense of the public purse. They complain of injustice, when it does not exist; yet, all the while, would commit injustice, if they could, real and great. But if you introduce to the schools the Bible in a version which they say is favourable to Protestant views and unfavourable to theirs, you furnish ground on which they may plead with more show of justice for money to advance their religious interests too. Only on the platform of non-interference with religion in the schools can the denominationalism, for which Roman Catholics and others contend, be consistently and successfully opposed. As to the reason given by those who would introduce the Bible Into the schools, namely, that no education can be complete without religion forming a part, the Committee need not say that they have the fullest sympathy with it.

This conviction deeply pervades our whole Church. But that the Government of a country, in which so many religious opinions exist, should be the party to give this religious instruction, is another question, in fact is *the* question. Besides, to call the mere reading of the Bible the religious training which complete education requires, is a misnomer. Even though the Bible were read, it would still be true that the religious teaching, without which education cannot be complete, would be wanting. To be consistent, those who use this argument would require to go further than the mere reading of the Bible. But they cannot go further, and therefore the argument as used by them is without force. The reading of the Bible would be something; but they would still, and we would all still have to look to another source for that without which education cannot be complete. That source is the Christian Church. Notwithstanding what is done in Sabbath Schools, all that is possible is far from being accomplished. The instruction imparted to those who attend these schools could be greatly improved by teachers trained for the work, while those not connected with any school might be brought in. The Christian

Church in the Colony is not doing its duty to the lapsed classes, as they are called—adults who have fallen away from religious ordinances; nor is it doing anything like what it ought to do for the children who may be outside religious instruction. Better, therefore, is it that, instead of contending for what in itself is little, and what must ever awaken contention in Government Schools, the Christian Church should seek to improve and extend its own machinery for imparting that religious instruction without which education cannot be complete. This was the recommendation of the Committee last year, and it is so this year. It was unanimously adopted by the last Assembly, and it is hoped it will be so again.

There is one aspect in which, I think, this religious question should be viewed—we need specialisation in education. In our University we have one Professor of Classics, and another for Mathematics; in our High School one master teaches Science, and another English; in our Normal School there is also a division of labour—and the better taught the school the more carefully will this division of labour be carried out. Why, it takes more than a dozen men to make a pin! And is the full development of a child more easy? Now, let us apply this principle that is recognised in education, and in all our arts and manufactures, to this so-called religious difficulty. Surely if the Stats looks after one branch of education, the church organisations and the parents may look after another. For what purpose do our church organisations exist? Is it not the spread of their religious opinions? And have we not seen noble lives freely sacrificed to carry these opinions to all parts of the globe? The church organisation is still vital and still militant. Let it be known that the State recognises the principle of the division of labour, and I have no doubt that whatever religious instruction is necessary for the youth will be given by these bodies who spend time and energy in carrying the Christian religion to heathen lands.

I have brought before you the various questions that seem to me to agitate the educational world at the present time. I cannot hope that the views I have expressed will be agreed to by all present; but I do believe that the true function of this Institute is to courageously face the difficulties that surround the Education system. If we, as members, do so, perhaps we will find that it is distance that makes them look so formidable, and that as we approach them, they melt away and get dissolved in the azure of a calm critical inspection.

Lyon and Blair,
Steam Printers,
LAMBTON QUAY, WELLINGTON N. Z.

Front Cover

The Future. A Lecture, Delivered by R. Stout, Esq., M. P. C. (Barrister at Law) In Aid of the Widows' and Orphans' Fund Of The Loyal Leith Lodge, I.O.O.F. Dunedin: Printed by the Guardian Printing Company (Limited), High Street. 1875.

The Future.

When one stands on an eminence viewing a landscape there are generally one or two things that particularly attract him. His neighbour or friend, who is viewing the same flight, is busy noticing some other thing. Is it a scene with land and sea in view? It may be that it is the ship in the distant oiling that attracts the one, while the attention of the other is arrested by watching the play of the clouds. This shows our bias. Indeed there is nothing in which it is not shown. Let two photographers take photographs of the same scene or person, and see what a difference there is. The pose, the light, the shade, all are different. And this happens where the medium is the product of the art of the optician; but where the medium is a man's senses or feelings, the distortion, or rather difference in view, is more marked. Even in astronomy the observer has to allow for personal error; that is, every one making an observation has to allow in his calculation for the error necessarily made by him in observing; and this error varies. And if this bias is manifested in ordinary things where only the senses are involved, what does it not become when love of country, early training, habits, feelings, are all factors? This bias, the patriotic bias, the theologic bias, the scientific bias, the political bias, are ever present with us. I have mentioned this tendency to par-tialness in view to guard myself and you from assuming that the way we examine and report on anything is necessarily accurate, or can be oven approximately so. And in to-night taking a glance at the future, this must be especially kept in view. Here hope comes in, and with it a rose-colouring of the over-distant. To night I shall attempt to point out the tendencies of the age, so that what our future may be and may not be, and what the goal is, we may the moro accurately determine. In doing this, I do not intend to deal with the wide subject of the immortality of man's soul, nor with the existence of a life beyond the present. I would rather confino our attention to the probable futuro of our world and race. There are many marked tendencies in the present age, and I shall deal with a few in different departments of knowledge, and show how these different departments monts are becoming as it were interwoven.

- First, the PHILOSOPHICAL

- First, the SCIENTIFIC
- First, the MORAL
- First, the POLITICAL

There are at least two marked schools of philosophers. In these two schools there are minor differences, but there are two marked doctrines—the Intuitionalists and the Experientalists would take up too much time to deal with the doctrine of perception, and of an external universe, and might not be interesting. I shall therefore on y give one brief distinction or difference between these two. The intuitionalists assert that every person has certain ideas implanted in him by his very existence, and from the Great First Cause. It is true that these ideas are admittedly few-one the idea of a God, or a first cause—the idea of space, the idea of time. The other opposing school assert that these ideas are not innate—not born with a man—that is, not in his mind ready to be developed when his body develops, but that they are the product of experience: that the idea of cause or a first causo is obtained by an observing of nature, and by seeing that everything that exists has an antecedent, or as we often term it a cause, and that we therefore infer a cause to exist for all things—a God. There are others, like Kant, who assign a different origin to the ideas of time and space, viz., that they are the forms of all phenomena of external sense, that the forms pre-exist in the mind and that we cannot conceive or observe without observing and perceiving in these forms. The experientalists denied both the Kantian and the intuitional view, as I have said, and I have mentioned these two philosophic schools to show how, by a higher law, so to speak, the two have been brought nearer than before. It is true that the experientalists had always against them the appeal to consciousness, and they therefore with this appeal were weakened. Evolution, which is simply extended experientalism, has, however, been introduced, and with it a bridge has been constructed across the chasm that separated the two schools. Evolution and hereditary trans- mission are now used to explain the products in consciousness, and to show bow they came there. The effect of this in the future, on philosophy, will be most marked, for cerebral psychology, sneered at by Martineau, will be closely examined, and though there may be something apart from the bodily organs of the mind, from the white and the grey matter in the nervous centres, still as these are how this mind is shown, is expressed, the instruments—they ought to be closely watched. In the future, therefore, physiology and psychology must go hand in hand, and with them the study of meta-physics may popularly cease to bo looked upon as a very uninteresting and uninviting one. And, indeed, whatever is new in literature in the present day really has its root in some of these philosophic conceptions, and, as I shall show further on, it tinges our science, our morality, and our politics. There are, however, two other doctrines that are having, and are still further destined to have, a wide effect in the future; and these are the doctrines of Relativity and Expediency, and I may briefly state what they imply. The word that is opposed to relative is absolute. A familiar example may bo given. It is said that twice two makes four is absolutely true, that is, that it could under no circumstances be false; but it is said that it is the duty of the State or people to punish a citizen, may be true or false. We may conceive of an occasion in which it might be true of the State's duty, and one in which it might be false. It is only relatively true. Not that this first statement that twice two makes four is held to be an absolute truth; on the contrary, many philosophers hold that it is relative only, and that it is not necessarily true, for that it is comprehended in the very definition of number. (See Mill's 'Logic,' vol. I., p. 260.) Again, however, I must refrain from entering on such a vexed question as Necessary Truth. (See 'Dublin Review,' for a statement opposed to J. Stuart Mill's, &c.) Relativity may, however, be defined as that which is only true when the circumstances and times are the same. This doctrine of Relativity has a most important bearing in morals and politics, as I shall hereafter point out; and as Expediency is really involved in it, I shall reserve any remarks till then.

The doctrine of evolution is not, as I have said before, confined to philosophy. Indeed, it is from science it has been borrowed. Now, by science I understand knowledge obtained through observation and experiment. Of the workings of evolution, of Darwin's and Wallace's researches, of Smidt's, indeed of all naturalists' and geologists', &c., I need not speak. I might point out only what has happened in geology. The Neptunists, the Plutonists, the CatastropLists—all have vanished, To understand geology we must be prepared to speak of gradual risings and fallings, the washing down of hills through ages, and not of vast cataclysms in nature. It is true earthquakes and volcanoes have been and left their records behind them, but they have been the exceptions. The evolving process has been the means by which, from a nebulous mass, this planet has risen to its present position. This evolution doctrine has, as it has been the bridge between the opposing schools of philosophy, also become the means of bringing the scientists face to with the problems of existence. Nothing is so surprising as the riso, within, I might say, the last ten years, of the study of psychology, or of philosophy. This study has assumed varied phages. With Tyndall it has gone to the question of the first atoms; with others, as to the origin of life—Huxley's Protoplasm—the protein of German chemists and physicists. With others, the union of body and mind has formed the basis of their lectures, articles, and speeches. Almost all admit an evolution. The difficulty lies in fixing Its limits and scope. Had the highest products of genius once a place in the nebulous centre of gas from which the earth arose, or is there a Divine afflatus that influenceth every man distinct from

himself? Has there been an endless progress from a monad to our present state, or what? This is science's problem—the origin of matter and of life. In the discussion of this problem a most marked change has come over the definition of matter. A dead inert substance was once its definition; but on close scrutiny the distinction between organic and inorganic is found as difficult to determine as the origin of either. Possibly the position of Spencer may be after all found the only tenable one, and it is that there is a region unknowable which, with our present faculties, we can never hope to explore. And thus evolution brings philosophy and science face to face, and shows that to each the same problem is open for solution.

In the future, therefore, we shall find that the ostracised metaphysics will assert their sway and that the problem of whence and whither will be as interesting as in the Academia where Socrates taught. I have, however, set before you, and very briefly, this doctrino of evolution and its bearing on the present and future of philosophy and science, in order to lead up to more practical matters.

And first as to morality; the duties—if there be such—we owe to each other and to ourselves. Now, you see here again exemplified the interdependence of all knowledge For this doctrino has created, as it were new duties and new engagements. Take one thing—the necessity of cleanliness, that the search for the origin of life has shown. You have all heard of the germ theory of disease. It is on this theory that all the action of our Boards of Health, our quarantine, our fumigations, our sowers, is based. That disease exists as life—niultiplying, if it has food to feed on—all now admit. This granted, the necessity of cleanliness as the basis of health is put on a scientific foundation. And hence we find that every day brings us discoveries in the science of health, so that in the future we may hope to see disease and death lessened. But this is a small matter, relatively speaking, to a larger question that evolution has opened up. You have heard of the doctrine of hereditary transmission. This is a doctrine not wholly proved yet, but which every day brings some new facts to further establish and see what a bearing this has on morals. This shows that a sin committed brings a punishment, not only on the door, but on the doer's offspring; and that good done, an intellect trained, emotions cultivated, can be, and are, also transmitted. Nothing, heretofore, had been made plainer than that excess of all kinds vitiated a man's physical nature, and also injured his mind. This new doctrine, however, shows that the drunkenness and vice of the parent are manifested in his children; and that, as was said long ago, the punishment extends to the third and fourth generation. But as the punishment extends, so does the reward. As O. Wendell Holmes says in one of his works, the New England blood counts for something. That is, the cultured classes' offspring are quicker at learning than the children of those whose minds are untrained. And then the progress; the growth of now organs; the decay of unused organs—and this the evolutionists have proved—see what a strong bearing this has on morals. It brings up and bridges the other opposing doctrines on this very morality question. You have heard of Owenism. I do not mean it in its socialistic phase, but in the moral doctrines that underlay it. These were usually summed up in the aphorism, "Circumstances make the man." This has been proved fallacious; but if you say circumstances plus hereditary descent, or plus transmitted qualities, I do not know if many would quarrel now-a-days with the doctrine. Hero again is evolution a bridge. The conscience and circumstances are joined. Morality is from within as well as from without. At one time it was thought, if this doctrine of circumstances influencing conduct—of what may be termed determinism as opposed to freewill—were believed in, that the effect would be most pernicious; but now, plus hereditary descent, it is recognised as a doctrine with no baneful consequences. I read in the *Evangelist* of this month a statement that from one morally-depraved woman 200 criminals cantrace their descent. And in the same paper is a sermon by the Bov. D. Sidey; he at once confesses that hereditary gifts must recognised. This doctrine has everything to do with moral reform, and forms the strongest argument for the existence of State education and industrial schools. It does not assert that no educated men belong to the criminal class. On the contrary, it asserts that, except men's moral, sentimental nature' be trained, the training of the intellect will not alone make them good citizens. But, while this is admitted, the fact that the roundings go to form a man's character makes it imperatively necessary that the surroundings should be improved before you can look for healthy moral action The germ theory of disease teaches us that, if we desire health and the absence of epidemic we must have cleanliness. So, if we are to expect good deeds, all immoral associations must be removed. If vice and sensuality are the association? of youth, it would be a most improbable thing were our youth not vicious and sensual. And this, I repeat, is one of the strongest possible arguments for State education, and Industrial or Reformatory Schools. There is also another thing that this evolution doctrine as applied to monk has shown, and that is, no man can neglect the training and culture of his moral nature without injury to himself. If a man be wholly given up to the world, the flesh, ortie devil, he is so much the less a man, and the evil may not end with himself. And so, its community or nation gives itself up to the search after one thing, makes Mammon its God, e.g., the result will be an injury inflicted on the nation. Habit is everything. The nation that has, as its citizens, people whose habits are reverential, prudent, careful, sympathetic, and truthful, is a great nation. It may be poor, have no resources, and be comparatively barren, but if its people an great the nation is great. But, if its people are unreliable, are selfish, are extravagant, no matter what faith they express, or whit wealth their country abounds in, the nation is

poor. "It is righteousness that exalteth a nation."

But in politics, in the practical relation of life in a State, these doctrines hare a still more marked effect. First. Evolution shows that the elevating of the people in the State cannot be accomplished by a quick process. To many the winning of the five points of the Charter was the conferring of an immense boon on the nation—would do good to the people—make them better in their actions one to another, and also raise their standard of well-being. But the extension of the suffrage has come, and the electors can vote b secret, but no great change has come with these. The power of beer, in the last English election, was greater than in any prior election. Bribery is not stamped out. The electors do not elect a man for his honesty and ability. On the contrary, some constituencies rejected the ablest candidatos, and elected the least able. The liberal ideas that were to prevail when the mass could vote are found to be non-existent, A Tory majority is the consequent of the antecedent ballot. I only cite this as an example, showing that a nation or people change slowly; one does not expect a people to become all at once wise or honest. And so with any radical reform. The change of a Ministry, the change of even a form of government, will not effect much. Some people think, only let a new Constitution be framed, and the country is saved; extravagance will cease, and log-rolling: vanish. Alas! the evil is too deep-seated for a paper Act to reach. Do you imagine, if we abolished all our colonial knights, and there was no such thing as a Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George known in our island, that we should feel any perceptible advantage? Or, if our schools were under a Board in Wellington, and Provincialism was of the past, that the political atmosphere would be thereby rendered so pure that no possible smoke or mist would ever prevent us enjoying the sweets of sunlight? Surely our hope is not so great as that. That is not what needs change. I do not say but what a Constitution may net be a hindrance to the growth of a people, but I also assert that by evolution the Constitution will alter and adapt itself to the varying circumstances of the people. Do not let us delude ourselves with the notion that if we are misgoverned it is because of our form of governments The New Yorkers have been misgoverned, and once the morel strength of the people was put in action the misgovernors were ostracised. It needed no chango of constitution. It needed what? Why, the moral tone of the people to bo raised and roused to action. For what, after all, have we in all law to depend on? Is it not on the morality of the people? If our criminal statutes by their enacted punishments shock the sense of justice in the mass, what happens? Juries won't convict. The justice in the soul, as a poet phrases, transcends the written law.

Justice is not settled by legislators and laws—it is in the soul.

It cannot be varied by statutes, any more than love, pride, the attraction of gravity, can, and, therefore, the New Yorkers did not begin and frame a new State Constitution, or abolish State Governments. They did the contrary; they elected the State party, or what we would term the Provincial party; saw that their salvation lay not in a change of the form of their government, nor in the repeal of a statute, but in each person insisting on honesty and economy. Nor can we expect that this reform will come all at once. The circumstances, the conditions must change. The people are always properly represented. When we have such a representative, who is to blame? The representative? Not he! It is the people who sent him there. If he is defective, the senders were defective; if he is extravagant, the people were extravagant; if he changed his political creed, the people changed theirs; if he was careless of how the public money may be squandered, did he not have a constituency whose continual cry was progress, and spending money in the place? The constituency in a double sense makes the members; but then it may be asked, what of great men? Is it not a fact that they create, and are not themselves the created? A Carlyle, a Cromwell, a Napoleon, a Pope Pius, a Gladstone, a Dr. Newman, a Cardinal Manning, a Bismarck, an Emerson—are they made by the age? Are they not a power within the age, moulding it to themselves, shedding their influence all round? As a pebble cannot be cast into a pool without disturbing the whole water in the pool, the circles widen to the extremities, so a great man cannot arise without influencing his fellows. Here, again, comes evolution into play. The great man is a product as much as a producer. As the great novelist of this century says—

- Our deeds still travel with us from afar,
- And what we have been makes us what we are.

The great man gives an impetus to his ago. He pushes it ahead, makes it press onward; but the force he uses, it has been stored up for ages perhaps. Carlyle can trace in himself his grandfather's traits. You cannot expect a man of culture to arise where there has been no education. We do not get our philosophers from Spain, but from Germany. Before a Fichte or a Goethe can arise there must be prior conditions. Scotland is famed for its study of mental science, and hence, considering its population, it has produced a greater number of psychologists and philosophers than any other country. The youth of America, as pointed out by Burke, turned their attention to law more than to theology and medicine, and the American lawyers' works are now text-books in England. The bent of the best students was towards law. Where do we expect to find the highest literary criticism? Why, in Germany. Where in the United Kingdom the best classical scholars? In Oxford and Dublin; and the best mathematicians in Cambridge. These things came not in a day. We see varieties of plants where there is a great number of the same kind; so before we can expect a genius there must be a big seed-bed.

But are there diverse social forces working in our midst? And whither tend they? I do not think anyone can overlook the forces that are at the surface, so to speak, of all questions—Individualism and Socialism. Here are the opposing systems. The one founded on rivalry, on competition—the other wishing society to be bound together by mutual affection—by love. The one asserts that the fittest should survive, and that this can best be obtained by a rude freedom and a kind of social warfare. Competition is Individualism's Alpha and Omega. Each must strive for himself—strive to get wealth, to get luxuries, to fulfil greater desires. Socialism, again, wishes to see competition abolished, and war—social and commercial war—at an end. These two questions are at the root of our education questions, our land questions, our poor-rate questions. If Individualism wore carried to its legitimate end, as Spencer carries it in his 'Social Statics,' there would be no State education and no Static aid to the poor. His reasoning is, that it is the duty of the State to allow Individualism its fullest play, to protect rights, and that by educating a child at the expense of the State a wrong is being done to certain individuals in the State, for something is taken from them not necessary for the protection of their rights.

Socialism again asserts it to be the duty of men to aid the weak and that a man should, out of his substance, give help to the poor and wretched. I have not time to discuss Socialism and Individualism. They are the two moving forces at present of politics. The latter is shaping the political economy of Germany, while the battle is still raging as to which shall conquer in England. Greg is perhaps the type in England of the Individualist political economist; and now that J. S. Mill is dead, few, if any, English political economists speak well of Socialism. And here comes that other doctrine I mentioned—that of expediency in politics. What should the aim of a politician be? Every man who thinks has theories. He has ideas of what is best. Ought he at once to carry his ideas into practice? Or should ho recognise that his ideas will be only useful and good when the conditions arise for them? May not a thing be good, but not expedient? Politics is a practical thing, and, being practical, we may not be able to carry out our ideas in practice. This is what is termed the doctrine of expediency. It may in the abstract in our opinion be right to do so and so, but is it expedient? This is just saying we must look at all the surroundings before we attempt to carry out our ideal. We must allow for growth, for evolution. Free unrestricted commerce is good for a people, but ought Custom-houses at once to be swept away? May there not be other and more evils attendant on direct taxation than those attendant on a customtax and a restricted trade? This is how political questions must be approached; and vet we need not sacrifice our ideal. For example, we may hold a firm conviction that all unrestricted monopoly of land is bad, and yet be not surrendering our ideal when we attempt to palliate the evil by making the monopolists numerous instead of few; or we may imagine that the training of the feudal system to the belief in the sacredness of the soil, has been so long, has borne such fruits, that the State leasing system may be impossible for ages to come. Take yet another example—direct versus indirect taxation. When we look at the question from one point of view, we shall find that, in theory, a man ought to pay taxes in accordance: first, with the safety guaranteed to his person, and then; to his property, by the State—a sort of poll-tax and property-tax But the property men, under the indirect system, pay little or nothing; if sentees, almost nothing. This is not fair, not equitable, unjust; but can we change it? "Of all debts," says Emerson, "men are least willing to pay the taxes. . . Every where they think they get their money's worth except for these." And until you get the people to understand taxation and the theory of government you may be doing less injustice by indirect taxation than you would by direct taxation. This is the expediency doctrine, and with it, "What are the duties of the State? comes up. Is the duty of the State limited, as Spencer limits it—to the giving of the like liberty to every one-each to enjoy the most perfect liberty so long as he does not infringe on his neighbour.? The answer is given. This is the Utopia for which we should strive; but in the meantime the goal is distant—evolution is recognised-and we must have benevolent institutions and hospitals supported by the Slate, and State schools, and universities, and museums, and rates, and taxes, and Custom-houses. A policeocracy is not yet the highest form of Government. As there was a time when a State Church did good, but that time has passed, so in the future the time will come when State school is as unknown as the State Church. Here, again, a recognition of this ever-present Protean-like doctrine—evolution. In every shape it comes up.

I have briefly sketched what effect it has had, and is having, on philosophy. I have shown what science must now meet, and how moral doctrines aro being shaped by it; and in politics I have hinted how the questions that call for the thoughts and votes of the electors must now be dealt with. In this I may appear to have dealt with the present rather tban with the future. But I believe that the only time prophecy nowadays of what will be is the statement of what is. This, again, you see is just evolution. I do not care to deal with the theological aspect of that question, because I believe, if true, that theology will discover that it is not opposed to its doctrines. Indeed many clergymen admit evolution in a modified way already. But this doctrine cannot fail to have a most important bearing on all our social life. It may weaken our notion of spirit; but as Emerson says, "Fear not the new generalisation. Does the fact look crass and material, threatening to degrado the theory of spirit? Resist it not; it goes to refine and raise the theory of matter just as much." Matter, a dead, inert substance, becomes a mass containing the potentiality of life-nay, of the highest possible intellectual life.

Matter and spirit are not changed; they are made one. I do not therefore fear any evil effect from this doctrine. Indeed, if *true*, it would prevent all investigation, all thought, all science, were we to assert that it could possibly be hurtful. It may not be expedient to preach it as a gospel; but there is little danger of that kind of preaching spreading. Men must have something more emotional, more stirring. Still this evolution doctrine is not without its goodness. First it states that where there are wants there will be supplies. Are people subject to accidents, the strong to sickness, the young to death? What are our Oddfellows' lodges but an organism to meet these? To meet them by independence, not by surrendering a man's manliness, by application for State alms, but by exercising prudence and care to provide for the future. And indeed Spencer contends that social evolution or growth is so strong that had our growth been negatively regulative—that is, if the Government had not interfered, had allowed each to do as ho liked, so long, as he did not interfere with another's like right—we should have had bettter railways, better post-offices, better education than the State affords. Whether that be so or not, at any rato it teaches us to look to the future with hope, with a belief that progress is the law of existence, and that, though reforms como slowly, they come surely. And it also impresses on us this fact, that no reform can come per saltern, by a leap, but that the conditions must change. And though it may appear to some to impair a man's individuality and freedom by urging the expediency doctrine, it has really no such aim. What is, as I have already said, the doctrine of expediency, but looking all round a subject? But the duty to battle for the ideally true is not one whit restrained; on the contrary, each cue is to fearlessly utter what he believes to be true, and fearlessly strive for what he believes to be best. He may be wrong, he is not infallible, but it is only by thus uttering and thus striving that his ideas can get sifted, and, if true, carried into execution. I do not believe with those who see only woe and desolation in the future. Bad times may come, reactions will intervene, but our civilisation is not at its meridian. It is rather, as has been said, only at its sunrise—at its dawn. How popular is education now! Schools everywhere, British associations, science lectures, magazines, newspapers. And will these not have a result? Are we to believe that all this force is wasted, and that its aim—simply because it deals with one or more departments of knowledge, and neglects the region of religion, of faith—is brutal and Godless? It would be strange indeed if this were so—nay, it would be a libel on Nature and on the race. This scientific investigation is a product; and it also will produce and is producing, changea in our thoughts and in our manner of looking at things such as we have not yet imagined. And this test—of what comes of it?—is, perhaps, the only one we have. If we find that education lessens crime; if we discover that the Government of the country where education is most diffused is the most stable; if we find that the finer feelings of mankind are found to have the most scope where you have good schools, good museums, good music, good picture-galleries, plenty of newspapers, and thoughtful magazines,—depend on it these things are good, and not brutal and Godless. For, after all, our test is: By their fruits ye shall know them.

And though we are products, we also aro producers. Science may be abroad, culturo may be abroad; our duty is to disseminate both. Do not let us do what Buckle (Vol. II., 53) says the Spaniards did: "They were satisfied with themselves. They wore sure of the accuracy of their own opinions; they were proud of the notions which they inherited, and which they did not wish either to increase or diminish. Being unable to doubt, they were therefore unwilling to inquire. New and beautiful truths, conveyed in the clearest and most attractive language, could produce no effect upon men whose minds were thus hardened and enslaved. An unhappy combination of events, working without interruption since the fifth century, had predetermined the national character in a particular direction, and neither statesmen, nor kings, nor legislators could effect aught against it. The seventeenth century was, however, the climax of all. In that age, the Spanish nation fell into a sleep, from which, as a nation, it has never awakened. It was a sleep not of repose, but of death. It was a sleep in which the faculties, instead of being rested, were paralysed."

And so we should discuss the present question. Don't let us be afraid to doubt. Let us get facts. Theories are useful. The hypothesis is a necessary adjunct to the investigation. If we remain blind to the present, if we neglect culture, we may retard the evolution of our colony. The country that pays attention to thought is the country that progresses. Germany, not Spain, leads Europe. It was with this idea I brought this subject forward. New truths I had none to tell. I could only draw attention to what was passing around us, in the hope that we might all see that notone thing that comes up in our newspapers, and in our everyday life, but has involved in it something deeper than what appears an the surface; and also in the hope that, seeing this, we might aim to make the world better than we found it, and strive for a future time more glorious than the golden past. This I conceived I could best do by exalting evolution. It is this which gives the fullest play to a man's faculties. It is this which clothes as with divinity a man. Not one man's life is in rain; not one action but has its result; not one evil seed sown [*unclear:* but] springs, and with it its crop; and not [*unclear:* a] good action done but also has its aim.

That nothing walks with aimless feet,
That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void.

And I believe that were we all to shape [*unclear:* a] actions by this belief we should be more [*unclear:* a] in our philosophy, more careful in our [*unclear:* sc] tific examinations and hypotheses, more [*unclear:* a] rect in our morals, and the change in [*unclear:* a] social life and political acts I do not [*unclear:* believe] we can adequately comprehend. There [*unclear:* a] some ardent, enthusiastic spirits who [*unclear:* a] damped by the coolness of opposition and slowness and apparent uselessness of [*unclear:* reform] Here is a doctrine to rekindle their fires; [*unclear:* and] with this rekindling may we not hope, [*unclear:* when] it spreads and begins to be acted on, that [*unclear:* a] future will be better than our present, [*unclear:* and] that Walt Whitman's announcement [*unclear:* may] not be extravagant:

I announce natural persons to arise;
I announce Justice triumphant;
I announce uncompromissing liberty and equality.

* * * * * *

I announce splendours and majesties to make all the previous politics of the earth insignificant.

vignette

Financial Statement. *Debate in the House of Representatives*. Speech Delivered By Sir R. Stout, July 19, 1893.

Financial Statement.

Speech delivered by Sir R. Stout, M.H.R., in the House of Representatives, July 19, 1893.

Sir R. Stout.—I understand, Sir, that the question before the House is, that you do leave the chair in order that the House may go into Committee of Supply; but I am certain that any person listening to this debate, had he not been told, would not have believed that such was the question before the House. Sir, I do not intend to allude to anything which has been said personal to myself or even personal to gentlemen who were my colleagues; but I deeply regret that the last speaker should have cast a reflection on a friend of mine who is dead. He has been in this House now for three sessions, and had the opportunity, if he chose, of attacking the administration of the late Mr. Ballance. But his mouth was shut; and now that Mr. Ballance is no more he has the good taste to rake up transactions six years old and make a charge against a deceased man. I hope that kind of thing is not going to be popular in this House. And not only has ho made a charge against his administration, but he has ventured to say that the actions ho took in buying Native land were done for some sinister purpose. I leave the honourable gentleman there. But, if this is the kind of thing we are to have in this House, the dignity of this House cannot be maintained, nor the self-respect of its members. Then, the honourable member did another ungenerous thing. Mr. Cadman is fighting an election, and is not here to defend himself. Yet the honourable member thought it right to refer to the transaction in regard to the appointment of an Assessor, and he had not the fairness to state to this House, when dealing with the assessment, that the assessment that was made three years before by the manager of the Hon. Mr. Ormond's station—and he certainly was never accused of favouring either Mr. Smith or Mr. Cadman—amounted to £5,000, whilst the new valuer raised the valuation at least 20 per cent. Is that fair to the House? Is that the sort of conduct we are to have in this House—the casting of personal reflections? I thought when the honourable gentleman rose—he is a commercial gentleman, holding a high position in the commercial world in this colony—I really expected to have heard a commercial man dealing with the finances of the colony. What have we heard? The honourable gentleman jumped from the bot-fly to three-legged horses. And this is the way wo are to discuss the finances of the colony! Sir, I leave these personal questions, and I shall now speak about what is really before the House—that is, the finances of the colony. Sir, there has been reference made to the past. I am glad of that, because I do not believe that we can appreciate the position in which the colony stands to-day, or look forward to the future, unless we do cast our eyes to the past. Reference has been made by several honourable members to the finance of two or three Liberal Governments, and it has been sneeringly said that, so far as Liberal Governments are concerned, their finance has always been weak. Let us see what truth there is in that. Let me take the House back, if you please,

to what may be termed the turning period in the financial position of this colony. The provincial I system was abolished—the provinces were ended—in 1876. In 1877 the Parliament had to prepared dealing with the colonial revenue in a way it had never been called upon to deal before. It first made the land revenue colonial revenue, and it admitted it could not deal exhaustively with the finances that session, for the colony was passing through a transition period. That was admitted by both Ministries—that in office in 1877, when the Parliament met, and that which succeeded them a month or two later; and it was left for the Parliament in 1878 to decide how the finances of the colony were to be dealt with. In what position was the colony then? There was then what was termed a land-boom. Land was selling with enormous rapidity, and the finances of the colony were in a very strong position. No one could see, then, that there was to be an end of the continued prosperity. The land revenue was then part of the ordinary Consolidated Fund, and it was thought this enormous increase of land revenue was to continue. I was Minister of Lands at the time. I dreaded this enormous sale of our waste lands, and when the Public Works Statement was made I intimated, as honourable gentlemen wilt see from *Hansard*, that we intended, in consequence of projected railways, to reserve large areas of land. We reserved hundreds of thousands of acres. I specially reserved all the land I thought could possibly be withdrawn from sale in Canterbury, because, unfortunately for that province, land was open for sale before survey. I have heard in this House once or twice this session statements that lands should not be sold before survey. I stood alone on the Waste Lands Committee, in 1877, in wishing to insist upon this doctrine being applied to waste lands—I stood alone, for I could get no support for such a doctrine. This land was reserved, and, through the land-boom collapsing, and also through this large reservation of land being made, our Land Fund suddenly de- creased; and honourable gentlemen will only have to give a brief glance at the amount at which the Land Fund stood in the various preceding years to see what the drop in the Land Fund meant—it being part of the consolidated revenue. We had in 1876 land sold to a value of £846,000—I leave out the shillings and pence. In 1877 the land-sales amounted to £1,314,000; in 1878 they fell ta £1,252,000; whilst in 1879 they only amounted to £146,000—£1,100,000 of a drop in the Land Fund in one year, that fund being in our Consolidated Fund. Well, Sir, what did the Grey Government, which were in office in 1878, do? They saw that it was unsafe to rest upon the Land Fund for finance, and they therefore came down with several measures to make their finance strong. They proposed a land-tax; they proposed a companies income-tax; they proposed the beer duty. But what was the attitude of the Opposition then? Why, they used every effort to spoil our finance. And what was done? Our Beer Duty Bill was killed. We found in the House that we could not carry our Companies Income-tax Bill; and in that way our finance was injured. We carried, it is true, our Land-tax Bill; but, whilst we altered our tariff, we did not imagine that there would be such a drop as there happened to be afterwards, through the failure of the Glasgow Bank and other causes, in our Land Fund Account. And what happened? Why, Sir, it is said we were extravagant. There never was a charge more groundless. I will undertake to say no Government that has ever been in office has been more saving in the ordinary departmental expenditure than we were during that year. If honourable members will turn to B.-1, page 5, Volume I., for the session of 1879, they will find the annual appropriations, and they will then see what the savings were in each individual item; and I challenge any Government that has ever been in office to show greater savings in the votes than we effected in that year. For example: In the Colonial Secretary's Department there was a saving of £25,000-odd; in Law and Justice, £1,800; in Post and Telegraph, £13,000; in Marine, £5,400: and so it went on; and the only excesses we had in the estimates were £95 in the Customs, £3,561 in the Native Department, and £2,111 in Railways. We had no less a sum than £244,000 of savings made in that year on the annual appropriations, after deducting the small excesses in the Native and Railway Departments, and leaving out other things that might be objected to—what might be called extraordinary savings, but which were practical savings in fact. That was our finance. And what happened? It has been said that we had an enormous deficit. Sir, we had no such thing. We had a deficit, but, though the Land Fund decreased, as I have said, by a drop for the year of no less a sum—compared with the twelve months of the financial year before—than £713,000, our total deficit on the 30th June, 1879, only amounted to £131,000. And you will find that from the statement that the succeeding Treasurer—Sir Harry Atkinson—made. He said this: "I should point out here that this deficit of £131,824 may be said to be fairly reducible by £50,000 of land-tax." So that, practically, our net deficit was only £81,000. Now, here comes in this: that was all our deficit for 1878-79, notwithstanding a diminution in the revenue of £714,000 on the Land Fund Account compared with the financial year 1877-78. And what is the Ministry responsible for? I submit that a Ministry is only responsible for the finance of the year which it has the opportunity of dealing with; a Ministry is never responsible for the revenue of the succeeding year, but only for the finance of the year in which it gets its estimates and finance carried by the House, and of which it has the administration. If the House chooses to supplant the Ministry in the succeeding session, then it becomes the absolute duty of the Ministry that takes office to accept responsibility for the finance of the year in which it holds office. But what happened? There was this tremendous drop in the Land Fund; and I admit at once that the Treasurer, Sir Harry Atkinson, was placed in a great difficulty. He found the Land Fund practically gone; and what was there else he had to

rely upon? He introduced the property-tax. And he had—because of the Public Works Fund not having been reimbursed, as we expected, from the Land Fund, and being in debt with large liabilities on public works—to obtain a loan. I make no charge against him. I admit that the Ministry that succeeded us was placed in great difficulty. We were not responsible for it; our estimates and revenue came out in every item except the Land Fund: and, as far as our ordinary expenditure was concerned, we had reduced our expenditure as far as possible. But I do blame the succeeding Government for this: I say they led the country to believe the liabilities were much greater than they really were; and I shall prove this conclusively. We have had referred to by the honourable member for Ellesmere the statement made by the Treasurer, and I shall test it in one or two particulars. And I submit that if I show that there was exaggeration, perhaps on insufficient knowledge—I am not saying that the exaggeration was deliberate at all; I only regret that the figures have not been corrected long ere now—but, if I can show exaggeration in this statement, I think I have a right to claim that the slanders which have been constantly repeated in the House about the extravagance of the Grey Ministry should not be repeated. What did the Treasurer say? You will see in his first Statement—B.—2, page 7—delivered on Tuesday, the 14th October, 1879, he made this statement: He said there was a liability of £2,220,104, and he said, "Included in this is £200,000 for the purchase of Native lands. Of this we have spent already £36,561, and we are engaged to spend up to December next £84,500 more." And in the statement quoted by the honourable member for Ellesmere here it stands, "That the liabilities to be met up to the 31st December, 1879, were—land-purchases, £84,000; and between December and the 30th June, £80,000: making a total sum of £164,500," Was that statement correct? Sir, I am not aware that the Colony of New Zealand has over repudiated its liabilities; and, as a test of the accuracy of this statement, we will see how much money was paid on these accounts. Instead of £84,500 paid up to December, there was only £41,451, and instead of another £80,000 being paid between December and June, there was only £23,715: the total amount paid, instead of being £164,000—as appears by that statement—was only £65,166. Then, let mo take another statement that was made, and this also appears in the Public Works Statement delivered by the Hon. Mr. Oliver. There is put down as a liability for land-purchases, in Table No. 12, £1,210,802 9s. 6d. It is true the Treasurer stated in the Financial Statement that some of these purchases might be got rid of; but what happened? Was, as said, £957,177 spent on Native lands? No, Sir. There were only dribblets paid year by year; and in 1882 there was actually £600,000 of this amount written off as no liability, and not a word was said about it. And yet, I venture to say, up to this time all in this colony assume that all these liabilities appearing in the book were true liabilities, were undertaken by the colony itself, and that this colony had to find the funds to meet them. They were incorrect. They were—I will not say bogus liabilities, but—liabilities that had no existence except in imagination. And honourable gentlemen can make what they like of that, for the colony was not pledged to buy these Native lands; and Ministers should have known that. Now, see what happened. This beer duty, which had been denounced in 1878 as an improper thing, bad to be imposed in 1879; and along with that there was the property-tax, which taxed everything in addition to land. I am not going to review what happened after that year; but let me say now what next happened when a Liberal Government took office. The Atkinson Government were defeated in 1884. What was their deficit? Their deficit when we took office was £152,400; but it was not proclaimed throughout the colony that their finance was bad. The Grey Government deficit was only £81,000. The deficit when we took office was £152,000, and they stated they saw no way out of the deficit except by increased taxation. We took office, and we did not impose any fresh taxation. On the contrary, we lightened the property-tax for that year. What then happened? We took office; but we saw from the state the colony was in that its finance should be strengthened, and we proposed an increase of the Customs duties in 1885. That was denied us. The party that then supported us met, and urged us to keep in office, though they defeated our Budget. In that we did wrong; we ought to have resigned and cast the responsibility on them. Well, what happened? We had a small surplus in 1886. In 1887 we had a deficit. What was the deficit? On the Consolidated Fund it was only £92,293. That was all the deficit. We then said that the finances of the colony should be strengthened, and that we ought to have additional taxation in order to maintain the credit of the colony. And how. Sir, were we met? We asked for an increase in the Customs duties of only £186,000. We asked, so far as the property-tax was concerned, that there should be a slight graduation in it—that those having over £2,500 should pay at the rato of 1d. in the pound, and that those having under £2,500 should pay at the rate of thirteen-sixteenths of a penny in the pound. But that was denied us; and we west to the country. We proposed, in the face of the country, that there should be a loan of £2,000,000 for ten years, to expend on certain special railway-lines, and that the loan should be what is termed "earmarked"; and we wen denounced for proposing further borrowing, and we were also denounced for proposing increased taxation. What happened? The country believed the Opposition. They believed that they could do without a loan, and that they could do without increased taxation. And, Sir, this House met in 1887; and what did it do? There was no stopping at thirteen-sixteenths of a penny by way of property-tax; it was all made 1d. in the pound: but, instead of putting on increased taxation through the Customs, as should have been done, what happened? There was a

loan of a million and there was a further loan amounting to half a million. And yet there was to have been no borrowing! But the Customs taxation was not imposed; and I say that the Opposition deliberately allowed the deficit to mount up to no less a sum at the end of the next financial year than £302,000 to add to the deficit of the previous year—£92,000. And then they had the audacity to say that we were to blame for this new deficit. The only deficit that we were responsible for was £92,000; and I say that, by deliberately resisting the imposition of taxation, and by deceiving the country into the belief that that taxation could be done without, they were to blame for that deficit mounting op as it did. But taxation had, after all, to be imposed, and it was imposed. In 1888 what was imposed? Let it be remembered that we proposed a moderate £186,000. But what did the succeeding Ministry do? It was not merely a fair increase that satisfied them. The duties they put on amounted to nearly £300,000: some say more, but we take that as the amount; and there was an additional three-sixteenths of a penny in the property-tax. What happened? This happened: that the Government which was not to borrow, and which was not to increase taxation, not only increased the taxation to just about double, but borrowed a sum of a million and a half as well. That, Sir, was the non-borrowing Government, and the Government that was to impose no additional taxation. And, then, how did they impose the taxation? They could not carry it with the aid of their own supporters; they had to get the aid of the Opposition. Aye, Sir, and the Opposition of those days thought more of their country, and thought more of making the finances of the colony strong, than of merely party triumph. Because they did not do as the previous Opposition had done. They did not join hands with the discontents of the Government party and defeat the taxation being imposed. They loyally supported the Treasurer of that day, and they supported him when there was a large section of the Government party voting against the increased taxation. And now we are told that we are to credit the present surplus to the Atkinsonian finance. I admit it, for if the additional Customs duties had not been imposed in 1888 there would have been no surplus. But who imposed them? And, then, let me ask those honourable members who now praise Sir Harry Atkinson's finance as the cause of this surplus, how did they characterize the taxation imposed in 1888 and the financial proposals of the Government then? They were denounced by one honourable member as "stunted Vogelism"; and if honourable members will take the trouble to read *Hansard* they will see the speech delivered by Sir Harry Atkinson, in which, I think, he was never so correct as when he characterized his own supporters in a way that I would not characterize them. That was how we came to have a surplus; it was by that imposition of taxation. And how does the finance of the colony stand now? Let us look at the new proposals: I have perhaps said enough about the past. There are various points in this Statement that I wish to deal with. There aro one or two little points—one, for example, about debentures. As it has been referred to, let me say two or three words about it. What I understand the Treasurer proposes is to repeal the law which allows a company that pays taxation on its debentures to deduct this sum from the interest paid to debenture-holders. I have been amazed to hear members of this House speak of this proposal, which was carried in 1891 and 1892 by our Land and Income Assessment Acts, as if it were a now proposal. Why, it was the proposal under the property-tax.

An Hon. MEMBER.—No.

Sir R. STOUT.—If my honourable friend here will look at the Act of 1886 ho will see that the Property Assessment Act allowed the mortgagor to pay the tax on a mortgage and to deduct it from the mortgagee. So far as these debentures are concerned, the debentures which have to pay 1d. in the pound are debentures that are secured on land: they are mortgages. If they are not secured on land they have simply to pay the income-tax. There is therefore no alteration in the law from what it was under the property-tax. We will take the case of the Manawatu Railway debentures: they are secured on the land of the company. They pay 1d. in the pound, and permission is given the company to deduct that tax from the amount paid to the debenture-holders, so that they can do as they did under the Property Assessment Act of 1886. They may not choose to do s0, but they are not compelled by law to way it themselves. Why should the law be altered? Is it to be supposed for one moment that if the debenture-holder lives in the colony he has not got to pay the tax? And are you going to strike that tax out of the statute-book simply because a man lives in London or in Tasmania? Why, the thing is ridiculous and absurd. Talk about taxing the absentees! this would be an Act to exempt the absentees from taxation. Let me come to another policy that is laid down, and that is the exemption of improvements. Sir, I disagree with that. I think that the exemption of improvements cannot be safely made. Our finances are in such a state that we ought to do all we can to conserve them and to make them strong, and I think it is dangerous for us to give up any of our finance—to give up, at a time of such a crisis in the world outside, a single penny of taxation. We ought to make our taxation and our finances as strong as possible. I have been amused at the want of memory that has been shown by some members of this House. I have heard oven to-night one honourable gentleman got up and denounce this proposal for the exemption of improvements. And he is not the only one by whom this exemption of improvements has been denounced. This gentleman to-night said he does not recognise the justice of the remission. Have those honourable members no memory? Have they forgotten what they did last year? Sir, I am perfectly amazed when I find that all those honourable members who have denounced the exemption

of improvements went with the other members who fought for the exemption last year. There were only three members of the Opposition who voted against the exemption of improvements last year.

An Hon. MEMBER.—In 1891.

Sir R. Stout.—No, last year. I am quite right. Honourable members will find that my memory is not defective. If honourable members will turn to Volume 78 of *Hansard*, pages 535-536, they will see there the division.

An Hon. MEMBER.—What year?

Sir R. STOUT.—1892. The division took place on Sir George Grey's motion. How does the matter stand? Why, the only three members of the Opposition who voted against the exemption of improvements were the honourable member for Waikato, the honourable member for Hawke's Bay, and the honourable member for Manukau. They were the only three members of the Opposition who voted against this exemption of improvements. I will give the names alphabetically of those who voted for the exemption and who paired for it: Bruce, Buchanan, Fish, Fisher, Grey, Hall, M. J. S. Mackenzie, Mitchelson, Newman, Rhodes, Rolleston, Shera, Swan, Harkness, Wright; Allen, Duthie, Fergus, Hamlin, G. Hutchison, Lawry, J. Mills, Richardson, Valentine, Wilson. And those honourable members have so far forgotten what they did last year that what they deemed to be a proper thing last year now becomes a very wrong and a most injudicious thing to do this year.

Mr. G. Hutchison.—You will see that I always supported the exemption of all improvements from taxation.

Sir R. Stout.—I understood the honourable member to say this. He said, "I see written over the taxation of the Government the words 'single tax.'" What makes it a single tax? Is the graduation tax a single tax? Then, the honourable member voted for graduation. Is it the exemption of improvements that constitutes it single tax? Then, the honourable member voted for that. If it is written there, it is in letters which the honourable member has helped to write. I say, further, that I do not think it is fair to make the progressive taxation higher than it is now. I do not believe in the single tax, and I do not believe in any taxation;being so imposed that it amounts to a penalty on any of our colonists. I do not know if honourable members see what the progressive tax really amounts to at present. Do honourable members know that, if 5 per cent, on the capital value be taken as the average return from land, the tax, upon the highest graduated scale under our present land-laws, amounts to an impost of 4s. 7d. in the pound, and that if this additional tax is put on it will amount to 5s. in the pound? I say that is a thoroughly penal tax. However, I am in favour of the principle of graduation of the progressive taxation. I believe it is based on principles which can be defended economically. In 1887 I told the largo landowners what they might expect; and if honourable members choose to refer to past speeches they will see what I said. I said, If you do not choose to accept this small progressive rate of three-sixteenths of a penny in the pound on all property over £2,500,—you denounce it on the platform and in the Conservative Press,—the time may come when you will regret not having accepted such a moderate proposal." I told them the ago was in favour of this progressive taxation, and that, if they did not accept this small modicum of justice in dealing with taxation, they would get something worse. I hope they are content now. The Opposition dare not go to the country and say they are in favour of proportional as opposed to progressive taxation. I say that progressive taxation can be defended, and I say, further, that if honourable members will choose to read the writings of some of our ablest economists they will see that perhaps there are as many of our modern economists now who are in favour of progressive taxation as there are in favour of what is termed proportional taxation. In the past there have been most able men in its favour; and one of the latest books on public finance is written by Professor Bastable, of Dublin, who says this: "This system has secured the adhesion of some eminent authorities," Read also what G. Cohn, a Prussian economist, and Sax, an Austrian economist, say in defence of progressive taxation. And take Walker, an eminent American economist, and Seligman; and if you will refer back to what J. B. Say and Gamier have said you will see that all these writers defend progressive taxation. If taxation is to be founded on ability, or to be founded on equality of sacrifice, then progressive taxation is defensible, and is right and proper, and no other system of taxation is proper or is right. I therefor say that, so far as progressive taxation is concerned, it can be defended from the purest economical standpoint, as well as from what may be termed the standpoint of justice; and, if so, I feel sure this colony is not going back on that. At the same time, I see a great danger in it. People do not see, when it is put on the capital sum, what that really means on the income, and they do not see that by the slightest addition—of a farthing or the eighth of a penny—the taxation might be made so burdensome as to stop enterprise, and a portion of our colonists might fee that they were penalised. I do not think any Government should do that. But I believe it will tend to stop the accretion of large estates. It will do that undoubtedly, whilst it will not interfere with saving. And, then, I have heard it said, "Oh I but the land-settlers are being more heavily burdened by taxation than any class of the community," I deny that. I say that, practically speaking, the manufacturers are paying as much as the landed people. Let so see what a settler has to pay on his income. The small farmer has practically only to pay on his lana. All those things that go to make his income—his improvements, his stock, his cattle, his implements—are exempt, and, so far as the small farmer is to be compared with the small manufacturer, the small farmer has the

best of the bargain; and I do not say it is improper. But I do not allow the notion that he is unjustly treated by this new form of taxation. The other question I come to is this: Some honourable members have asked that we should have a remission of taxation. It has been said that no State ought to impose any taxation except for the necessities of the people. I admit this. But, Sir, what are the necessities? I say the necessities of the people include, if we can, the payment of the sinking fund for our debt. And I say our colony is not sound in its finance if it does not attempt to pay some sinking fund, so that future generations should not be burdened with our debts. No doubt there is some excuse for our railway debt, because succeeding generations will have handed over to them a valuable property; bat the railways cannot be said to represent one-half our debt. Take what has been spent for roads, water-races, in war, *et cetera*, and there is still an enormous amount of our debt for which we can leave succeeding generations practically nothing. How is a sinking fund to be made? We have by conversion schemes abolished sinking funds. I do not say that is wrong. On the contrary, where a nation is borrowing, it is not necessary, or, perhaps, good finance, to have a sinking fund. But we ought now to begin, if we can, to have a sinking fund. How can we do so? By taking the sum that the Consolidated Fund will allow to be spent in reproductive works; and all political economists will say that is a true means of creating a sinking fund. I can refer honourable members to Professor Adams's book on Public Debts, and to various other books on public finance and political economy, in which this subject is threshed out. If this colony can afford, out of its Consolidated Fund, to set apart £100,000 or £200,000 a year for public-works expenditure, it is doing justice to future generations, by providing a sinking fund practically to enable them to pay off the debt; because you are practically creating an asset which will give them some money to pay interest on the loan, and that is as true a sinking fund as if you had the sum invested by trustees in any kind of bonds. Now, let me say one word further about what the Government has done in Liberal finance. Sir, there have been sneers cast about the increase of our public debt. What has happened? The Government has actually paid off £200,000 a year of the public debt. It paid oft £100,000 last year and the year before from revenue, and it paid £100,000 of the conversion funds, to help to wipe off our floating debt. And it has paid £230,000 into our Public Works Fund from our consolidated revenue during last year. So that honourable members will see that, practically, our debt has been reduced by no less a sum than £430,000 in two years. I say that is a handsome contribution, which no Government, I think, for the last twenty years has been able to make. Now, Sir, what are the proposals which the Opposition wish to submit to the country? Unfortunately, not two of them agree; but the only kind of definite proposal I have heard has been this; that we are to borrow a million and a half, spread it over ten years, and that of this there shall only be something like £350,000 spent on railways. £1,150,000 is to be spent on roads throughout New Zealand, and this £1,150,000, therefore, will return no interest to the Consolidated Fund. That is the proposal. Well, Sir, is that the proposal which the Opposition wish to go to the country with? What is their other proposal? They talk about a reduction of taxation; I think the colony cannot afford to reduce its taxation. Is their proposal, then, to borrow? Surely it is a peculiar proposal for the members of the Opposition to make. They got into office in 1887 on the distinct pledge of no borrowing, and they borrowed a million and a half; and now, after six years, the next proposal is to borrow another million and a half. What other proposal have they to submit to the country? Are they, as a party, going to the country without a policy and a platform? If they have a policy and platform, surely this is the time to enunciate it, in order that the people of the country may judge between the two parties when they go to a general election. Now I leave that, and go on to set forward some things that I think it will be absolutely necessary for the colony to do. Sir, I say that one of the rocks ahead of our colony at present is the question of local taxation and local finance. Our wants are increasing, and our wants will increase. We cannot stop them. If we are to have health in our cities our local taxation will increase, and as our country gets older, and as the struggle for life gets keener, we cannot expect to see our hospital and charitable-aid vote reduced. What is to happen? This methed of paying subsidies cannot always continue, for, just as the needs of the General Government increase, so will there always be an attempt by the General Government to shift the burden from the General Government on to the local bodies. We ought to have some permanent endowments to enable these local bodies to live; and in the Hospitals and Charitable Institutions Act of 1885, which I had the honour of introducing, I had a provision that there should be set apart a quarter of a million acres as a permanent endowment for these bodies. I do not claim any originality for this. In years gone by it was advocated by the Hon. Mr. Bowen and by the Hon. Mr. Stevens. At one time I was against it, because I did not think the time was ripe for setting it apart; but I believe the time is ripe now, and I believe we should set apart a million acres as an endowment for hospitals and charitable aid. I would have it on real perpetual lease, without any right of purchase whatever, and the rent adjusted every twenty-one or thirty years. I would have a Board to manage this, with the aid of the Land Boards, and I would go further and propose that all the income got from this land should be divided not according to the rates of the Boards, but according to the population in the various districts. This was a suggestion made by the honourable member for the Buller some years ago. Ho urged it very strongly. I did not agree with him then. I perfectly agree with him now, and will state my reason why. We find that, unfortunately, such is our social life that the poor congregate

together; if you go to any borough you will find almost the whole of the poor living together; and therefore, if you distribute your income according to the rates raised, you practically arc aiding the rich, and not the poor. You ought, I believe, to distribute this endowment per head, and this would enormously relieve your local finance. I believe that in a few years this endowment might be made to yield £30,000 if a million acres were set aside. That would be an enormous endowment for the local bodies. And you must have some permanence in your local finance. If subsidies are to be continued the Government will have to make them larger for the outlying districts. In the case of those districts which have small rating-areas, from the fact of Crown land or Native land being there, they will have to make the subsidies double the amounts paid to well-settled districts. Now, if that scheme were adopted local finance would be strengthened, and you would have carried out further the principle that the State should get the control over, at all events, some of its lands. I deplore that this House has destroyed the system of perpetual lease. I do not believe in what is termed the eternal lease. If I had had my own way there would not have been a single acre of land sold at all. I have been called a land-nationaliser. I had the honour of being president of what was termed the Land Nationalist Association of New Zealand. And what were our objects? We did not propose to deal with land that was sold. Our objects were three, stated in our programme: First, to prevent the further alienation of the Crown lands: second, to advocate a system of leasing in lieu thereof; and third, to direct attention to the question of landtenure. Sir, from that programme I do not vary now. I do not blame the Minister of Lands for having put the Land Bill in its present state. What was said throughout the colony? The Opposition took every opportunity they could get of preaching to the country settlers that if they allowed perpetual lease it meant taking all their freeholds. They meant to set country against town, and raised such a cry that actually the small farmers were led to believe that if the perpetual-lease system were adopted they would be ruined, and their lands taken from them. But I say the small farmers will be moro injured by the land being sold than any one else. The only chance of lightening taxation, I repeat, is in the State having large reserves of land. It is only in England and in the United States that this system of wholly parting with the public estate has been adopted. It does not exist in many of the countries of Europe. In Prussia, in Austria, even in Russia, for example, the system has not been adopted. You will find that it has only been adopted in England, in the new colonies, and in the United States of America. If I might be allowed to utter a warning, I would say this: that those very people who have urged on this freehold system will, I believe, live to regret it; for, depend upon it, the time is coming when not only will there be no more freehold, but it will be impossible to prevent the State from controlling the use and holding of land. Now that I have dealt with that subject, I come to another question which I believe will have to be faced, and that is this railway question. I regret that, so far as the Financial Statement is concerned, it does not go far enough. I believe the Government ought to have the entire control of the railways, and I have no fear whatever of this bogey called "political control." It has been stated that I was in favour of the railways being managed by a Board. I deny it. The Bill which was introduced in 1887 contained no provision for preventing responsible control by Ministry and Parliament over the railways. What did that Bill provide for? It provided for Boards of Advice—one in Auckland, one in Wellington, one in Otago, and another in Canterbury. These Boards of Advice were to be elective. They were to be elected by Chambers of Commerce, elected by the counties, elected by Mayors and Municipalities; and those Boards were to meet at certain times in the year, and to advise and hear complaints, and to deal with railway matters in the form of advice. But the Minister was to be responsible to Parliament, and Parliament was to control the railways. Why should not such control be in the hands of Parliament? Why should you hand over from fifteen to twenty millions' worth of assets practically to an irresponsible Board? Why, we have in the past honoured those of our pioneers who fought for the system of Responsible Government being given to the colonies; and now having got it, we are to show ourselves incompetent to manage our own affairs, by handing over to these irresponsible Commissioners the control of our railways. It should not be admitted that the system of Responsible Government has failed. We have not entirely done that, but we have admitted that, so far as this democracy is concerned, it is unable to manage its own affairs.

Mr. Buckland,—That is quite right.

Sir R. Stout.—Well, Sir, I am exceedingly sorry that that honourable gentleman should rate himself so low. He is a member of Parliament; and can it be said that he is unable to give advice on questions of railway managment? Can it be said that ho is not able to give that advice without being unfairly biassed in dealing with railway management? I hope the honourable member has a higher opinion of his own ability and of his own integrity than to say that ho is unfit to give advice on the question. Now, let us look at this railway question. I understand the bogey is that these railways are to be subject to political control. Sir, this is a most amusing statement. Honourable members are complaining of what is happening all over the world. Do they know that the railways that belong to private people in the United States are now being controlled politically—that there is a Railway Commission appointed by the United States Government who control these private lines? Do they know what those who owned private lines desired? Why, if honourable members would refer to speeches delivered in the Senate—if they look up and read some very notable speeches made by Senator Morgan, and by

the late Senator Leland Stanford in the Senate of the United States, they will see that they contended that the owners had the right to fix the rates and wages as they pleased, and that they could charge one town one rate and another another, and one manufacturer one rate and another another. And what answer is there to be to this if there is to be no political control? If honourable members will look to England they will see that the Board of Trade was for months considering the question of millions of rates—actually millions of rates. There were stated to be a hundred million rates; and the result was that their maximum was fixed. And even now the traders are calling out for what? For further control; not for less control, but for further control. So that, whilst we in New Zealand are parting with the control of our railways; in the United States, and in England also they admit that the State should control the private lines. They are controlling them as regards rates; they are controlling them in the pay of their servants; they aro controlling the hours that their servants shall work, then, this cry about political control? It is a recognised thing, so far as the railways are concerned. It has been laid down by one of the best writers on this subject; and he writes very strongly in favour of the private owners of railways—I mean Mr. Acworth. He says this:—

"That the railway problem, as they call it in America, is with us at this moment in an acute form is sufficiently evident. . . . That the State will be forced to interfere moro than it has done in the past with railway management may be taken for granted."

And he says, in his new work "The Railways and the Traders," "Where reduced rates means taxation, the matter is evidently one of practical politics." And he is in favour of private ownership of railways. I go further, and I say this: that if you give them up to Commissioners you admit that the State is unfit to touch railway construction, because it is not the duty of the State to construct the railways unless it be to see that no injustice is done to any part of the colony. Now, Sir, what are we to have instead? We are to have this sort of bureaucracy set up to manage the railways. Well, this has been tried before. This system of management without the control of Parliament has been tried, and it has failed. If honourable gentlemen will only take the trouble to refer to the history of the British Constitution they will get a wonderful example of it. For example, when the first Poor-law Board was established, that was not to be under political control, and the management of that became an utter failure: and, remember, it had most able members, the late Mr. Chadwick, and the lato Sir George Lewis, perhaps the ablest officials in England. Parliament had to do this: It had to take over the control, so that there should be a Ministry responsible to Parliament for the administration. And I say we see this British form of Responsible Government in the Admiralty, we see it in military matters, we see it in connection with education, and we see it in reference to the Board of Trade. So far, therefore, as this system of Boards is concerned, a free country where you can get an example of it is Prussia, and it is acknowledged to have failed there. In a free nation you must have some one responsible to Parliament, and you must have political control. It would take too long to read the number of extracts I have here, dealing with this question. I will rather refer honourable members to Bagehot's "English Constitution," where they will see that ho points out clearly that this system of attempting to manage any Government department by bureaucracy, without a Minister responsible to Parliament, has only ended, and can only end, in failure. And I should like to know where it has ever succeeded. Can honourable members not see, so far as the railways are concerned, that they have never yet been managed by what are called experts? Take the railways of France: how were they managed? Their system did not work. They had to introduce a Board of Management of commercial men who knew practically nothing about the details of railway management. Thon, if you take the management of the railways in America you will find that the management of the private companies has not been by experts, or traffic managers, or engineers, but by businessmen. And if you have Responsible Government you get this by a change of Ministry. Wherever you get the system of bureaucracy the system is a failure. It has been said—it appears in one of the extracts I have mentioned, and which I shall read, Sir; it shows the immense advantage of a change of Ministry,—

"The immense importance of such a fresh mind is greatest in a country where business changes most. A dead, inactive, agricultural country may bo governed by an unalterable bureau for years and years, and no harm come of it. If a wise man arranged the bureau rightly in the beginning, it may run rightly a long time. But if the country be a progressive, eager, changing one, soon the bureau will either cramp improvement or be destroyed itself."

In fact, Sir, I might read extract after extract in which it has been proved conclusively that this system will fail; and, if honourable members also refer to Hearn's book on the Government of England they will see the same thing—that if you are to have Responsible Government carried on at all you must have all Government departments responsible to a Minister, who is responsible to Parliament: if you have not that, you will have bad management, and it will end in injuring the country in which they are thus managed. Further, I should like to know what it is that people see in political control. Will any honourable member venture to say that the rates on our railways are to be wholly controlled by our Commissioners? Will any one say that our railway servants are not to be politically controlled? And I may say, further, that so far as the appointment of Civil servants is

concerned, I am of opinion that Civil servants should be nominated, as in the naval service in the United States, by each member of the House in turn, so that there could be no such thing as political "colour" influencing such appointments. However, the Parliament in 1886 refused to sanction that proposal, which was in my Civil Service Reform Bill of that year, but accepted the principle of competition. We can apply this latter system to cadets for employment in the Railway Department. Let us, if you please, also have a Board to which the railway servants can appeal when they consider that they have been improperly dealt with. You will, therefore, have no such thing as political interference with the railway servants. But I want to know what is the meaning of this thing called political control. I ask honourable members not to use this phrase "political" control until they can define what it means. I go further and say, and again repeat, that this system of handing over the railways to an irresponsible Board means this: that we aro afraid of ourselves; that we admit that Responsible Government has failed; and we go further and say, not only has Responsible Government failed, but the system of democratic government has failed. Now, I have dealt with all the points in the Statement that I think need referring to. I now wish, before concluding, to say a few words about what may be termed collateral matters. There has been some reference, for example, to the Cheviot Estate. Well, I cannot understand honourable members. This principle upon which the Cheviot Estate has been purchased has been in our laws for years. It has been in existence since 1879. What is the provision? Sir, it is a copy from an American Act, which provides this: that if any person rates his property too low the State shall have the right to take it over, at his valuation. Formerly it used to be with 10 per cent, added: now that 10 per cent, is abolished. The whole question turns upon this: Is the valuation to be upheld or not? I say that, if the Cheviot Estate was not to be taken over after what occurred regarding its valuation, then that provision of the Act should be wiped out. As to what is to be done with the estate when taken over, that is a different matter—it is entirely a question of finance. The Government, I understand, say that they cannot afford to have the whole land reserved for leasing. They must get some money from it, to repay the advance they have made against the land; therefore, they must sell some of it for cash: and some honourable members now admit that.

An Hon. MEMBER.—I do not agree with that.

Sir R. Stout,—If honourable members do not agree with that, then they should have insisted in the Land Bill on certain portions of our Crown lands not being sold at all. They cannot complain of this proposal, with the present Land Act on the statute-book. I think the Ministry have acted fairly when they are willing to set aside two-thirds for leasing, and only one-third to be sold for cash. I have dealt with the general Financial Statement, and I wish now to say one or two words about two things further. A great deal of reference has been made to the platform of the Government, and particularly to what has been termed "the new Liberalism "—the labour Bills, *et cetera*. Well, Sir, how do we stand? What is the meaning of this cry of "new Liberalism"? I have nothing to say against the correctness of the term "new Liberalism." Liberalism was not the same fifty years ago, not the same thirty years ago, that it is now. The world has changed. We have come into what may be termed a new era, and, as has been well said, "new occasions teach new duties." The old Liberalism was a fight for individualism—for the right of the individual to do as he liked with himself and his own. It was a fight against the power of the Crown and of the Church. The Government was looked upon as the enemy of the State. That is all changed. People are now beginning to see that the State may be made to do useful work, and are beginning to see that the organization of the State can be used for the uplifting of the people. That, Sir, is the new Liberalism. The old Liberalism insisted upon maintaining the individual against the State, and upon limiting the right of the State to interfere with individual action, except to the smallest possible extent. Sir, there was a great deal to be admired in the old Liberalism; the old Liberalism did much for the individual. But we cannot ignore the spirit of the age; we cannot ignore the trend of public opinion; and I warn those who think that we ought to be content with individualism, with the doctrine of *laissez faire* preached of old by political economy, to just look at the political economists of the day. Read the works of the late Cliffe Leslie, of Professor Ingram, of Professor Marshall, or Professor Sidgwick. They have all come to this conclusion: that the *laissez faire* doctrine is defective. I believe in what the late Arnold Toynbee said,—

"We have not abandoned our old belief in liberty, justice, and self-help, but we say under certain conditions the people cannot help themselves, and then they should be helped by the State, representing the entire people. Three conditions are necessary,—

- *It must be of primary social importance.*
- *It must be practicable.*
- *It must not diminish self-reliance."*

But, Sir, I am not aware that any of the proposals made by the Liberals of New Zealand diminish self-reliance. Let us take this question of co-operative works. Why, Sir, instead of injuring, it will afford the strongest help to self-reliance, for this reason: The men can carry on the work themselves, seeing that they have ceased to be the servants of contractors, and that they have practically become their own masters. Surely that is teaching them sell-reliance. And, if the co-operative contracts should have defects from some points of view, I

think it would be a cheap education if you can teach our men to be self-reliant, and to rise to something higher than being mere labourers for another man, because there is certainly an element of serfdom in it when a man is not his own master.

An Hon. MEMBER.—How can he rise to this state?

Sir R. Stout.—He becomes a master himself. Under this condition he is himself a master. He is a contractor, not a mere employé; and I believe he will have more self-reliance in this condition than if he merely served a master. He becomes a contractor. Such is the beginning of government. These germs of self-reliance develop into self-control. But it is an experiment, I submit, that ought to be tried. I ask honourable members to gee whither this trends. It has been said that the propriety or not of a charge of "socialism" depends entirely on how we define the term. I assume that the term means an increase of the State's functions, which is necessary as much for the elevation of the individual himself as anything else in the world. It has been said of Nature by the poet,—

So careful of the typo she seems,
So careless of the single life.

So far as society is concerned, the whole trend is to the preservation of the individual life. It is a fight against nature. What is the meaning of education, and of the extension of our efforts for public health, but a struggle to save the weak, and to preserve the individual life, and to lift humanity as a whole to a higher life? Take one illustration: We hear a cry for the abolition of party government. That is socialism. It means that individual competition should cease, and that we are to have no longer a struggle for existence between parties-that we are to have a socialistic unity instead. These gentlemen can no longer believe in this excessive individualism. Those who advocate the abandonment of party are unconsciously falling in with this socialistic spirit of the age. How is this to be met? I appeal to the wise men of this House not to attempt to oppose this feeling by senseless resistance. It is our duty as statesmen to try to see how the spirit of the age is trending, and to direct it into the proper channels. Let them show in dealing with measures before this House that, in spite of party, they can look at them entirely for the good of the country. If they did that we should have point after point of the Financial Statement taken up and dealt with on its merits. We should have the merits dealt with without personal recriminations. I ask honourable members, and I appeal to this House, if they desire to deal with this in the spirit of the age, to rise above party, to see that we do not have any taint of political feeling or personal feeling rankling in our minds in the discussion of the various matters that we have to deal with. Let me show the other two things we should keep in view, and what, perhaps, members on this side of the House have not sufficiently considered. I say that the spirit of the age is such that you must increase your State functions. I say that we have not yet got to the limit of the State's functions, I say that the State has to do a great deal more than it has done in the past. It has got to give more education, to look more after public health, to look more after social reforms And if this be so, we must sec that we have the best available servants for our purpose, and treat them well. If we are going to extend our State functions we must have the highest talent we can get to carry on the functions of the State. We must see that our Ministers are men of the highest qualifications and character. We must see that they are properly paid, and not dealt with in a grudging spirit; and we should see that they are not overworked, like Sir Harry Atkinson and Mr. Ballance, who were worried to death and died poor. I say that is a disgrace to our democracy, and I exceedingly regret that in a former Parliament Ministers' salaries were so much reduced. I go further, and I especially appeal to the members on this sido of the House that they will have to pay their Civil servants better-to give them a good tenure of office. And, so far as the administration of justice is concerned, we must have also good subordinate Judges to deal with cases especially affecting the poor. We must attract to our Civil Service our best men; and you will have to look upon them not as men to be abused, or to have accusations continually made against them, but as men to be respected. You will have to put men in the Civil Service the best, all round, that this colony can produce, and to pay them well, and also to do your best to create a healthy public opinion in their favour. If this system of co-operative works is to extend you will have to secure the best engineers, the best inspectors; because, if you have inefficient engineers, not men of high character, and if you have not inspectors who can be trusted—for upon them the fixing of the prices depends—then your co-operative works will prove a huge failure. Unfortunately, some of us who belong to the Liberal side of the House have not sufficiently considered, or have not seen, what is involved in this extension of State functions. And now, Sir, if we keep our finance strong; if we go on carefully with our public works, and lay down some rule as to our local finance and local taxation; if we make our Civil servants a credit to us and a credit to this colony, and slowly and gradually increase our State functions, I believe there is a bright future for us. We must go forward in a hopeful spirit, and not like those who go forward imagining that some great calamity is about to fall upon them. Sir, we have a noble opportunity. We stand in many ways in the

front rank of nations, and for this reason: that we are not encumbered by privileges, we are not encumbered by prejudices, and we are therefore free to make experiments. I ask the House to make these experiments. I ask the House to believe that these experiments may be made. I ask the House to think that, even if these experiments fail, still it is our duty to make them. What are we here for? We are not here merely to create a colony where there shall be wealth. Sir, we are here to build up a colony where the great body of its men and women shall be physically strong, intellectually great, and shall be of the highest moral character. What will make the name of this colony great? It will be its breed of men and women. We must use the great power of the State to accomplish these things. The honourable gentleman opposite me may sneer, and there are some honourable members who think that such is not the function of the State. I say it is known now to be the function of the State to look after the race. Are we to have the scenes that have occurred in the older countries re-enacted here? Is our race to become as the races of the old countries are in the slums of the great cities and the factory towns? Are we to see established in this colony men stunted in growth, vicious, and dying off at an enormous rate? Are we to see these things without trying to arrest them?—and you cannot do that by leaving them to individual competition. That has failed at Home, and the work is only to be accomplished by organized action. We have not only to bo careful of the type, but we must also be careful of single lives, and I believe we can do that without interfering with individual freedom. I do not wish to see that interfered with in the slightest degree, and I believe that by State action you can give more freedom, and so educate your race that it shall rise to a position as high as that of any race in the world. And how is it to be done? Not by personal re-criminations amongst ourselves; not by hunting up all sorts of small things from the past to bring them against Ministers or other members; but it is by so dealing with every measure that comes before us as to try if we cannot make it better—to look at it impartially, and see where we can do something to help forward the race-If we so conduct ourselves, and so deal with the measures that are laid before us, I hope and I believe that our social experiments in New Zealand will be beard of not only in the neighbouring colonies but through out the world, and people will learn that thaw is a vigour in our race, and a vigour in our colony, such that from us others may well take a lesson and an example.

SAMUEL COSTALL, Government Printer, Wellinllton.

Financial Debate.

Speech delivered by the Hon. Sir R. Stout in the House of Representatives on the 1st August, 1894.

Sir R. STOUT.—Sir, I have listened to several financial debates, but certainly this is the most peculiar one that I have ever witnessed within these walls. There is an old French proverb which says that he who excuses himself accuses himself. And, Sir, we have had the Colonial Treasurer doing that this evening. I feel that I am placed at a great disadvantage in speaking, because one of the results of this autocratic Liberalism has boon that one is cribbed, cabined, and confined. In attempting to discuss a Budget like this it is simply impossible to deal with over forty items in this Budget within sixty minutes, and to do it so as to do justice to the speaker or justice to the subject; and I consider it is a very awkward result of Liberalism when members are prevented in Parliament from discussing such important questions as the issues submitted to us in this Budget. There is one thing I wish to say, and It is this: that I regret indeed, and I sympathize also with, the position in which the Colonial Treasurer is placed. I feel sure that If he had bad associated with him gentlemen who were able to discuss financial questions ire should have had quite a different Budget. He has been placed at this great disadvantage : that he has no Minister who can aid him In financial matters, or, in fact, in the discussion of them. Sir, that has been proved this evening, because no one will say that it is want of courtesy that has made the Ministry not follow the usual course that is followed in debates of this character. Sir, when the gentleman who rises on behalf of the Opposition to address the House speaks on the Budget it is the universal custom that a Minister should reply to him. No Minister has done that to-night. Why? A want of courtesy? Not at all. It is a want of ability; they were not able to deal with financial matters. Then, there is another thing which I think has been very unusual in this debate, and that is, that we have had, instead of discussing this Budget—which certainly is long enough and important enough to engage our attention—we have had the Colonial Treasurer spending a whole hour commenting on things he saw in newspaper, and reading up old newspapers the whole

of the afternoon. Is that the way to discuss an important question like this? Surely it is one of the most important Budgets we have ever had, for it is a new departure in our politics and finance. But we have had an hour and a half's delivering the Budget, and have had another hour talking upon scraps of information from a newspaper. I think that is lowering the dignity of this House, if it is not lowering the dignity of the Minister. I wish, Sir, to bring before the House certain facts, and to emphasize them, before I deal with' the policy contained in this year's Budget, And the first thing I want to have a thoroughly clear understanding upon is this: Has our debt increased, is it increasing, and for what is it increasing? In doing that I can gather all my facts from the Budget. I am not at all accusing the Colonial Treasurer of slurring over anything. He has stated every fact on which I can rely. I make no charge of that kind against the Budget,—though one of the honorable gentleman's tables is wrong. But throughout this House, and throughout the country, we have had it continually proclaimed that we are not borrowing, and Ministers are continually proclaiming that our debt is not increasing. Now, Sir, let me state how our debt increased last year. We borrowed first for debentures, under the Consolidated Stock Act, £284,800; we borrowed for Nativeland purchases, £72,000; for land for settlement, £38,966; for Cheviot, £250,000; for loans to local bodies, £116,500; for naval and military settlers' certificates, £16,300: or a total of £778,263. Then, there was a difference) between our debt that we paid off and our new inscribed stock, because to pay off £902,000 we had to inscribe stock to the amount of £1,038,180, the difference being £136,180—making altogether £914,446 of borrowed money and increase of debt. Well, then, what did we do in paying off any debt? We paid off from released sinking funds the sum of £294,571, and £51,300: altogether, £345,871. That left a balance of debt of £568,575; but, instead of taking all our accrued sinking funds for that purpose, we inscribed part. If honourable members will turn to the Consolidated Fund table, No. 7, they will see to credit £90,371. That is simply borrowed money. We paid into the Public Works Fund £163,702. That, again, was borrowed money—making altogether £260,073, which brought our gross debt up to an increase for the year of £828,648. But our sinking funds increased, and they increased to the sum of £98,227. There is no difference in this amount from what was said in the Budget, only the Colonial Treasurer gave the not increase of £84,398. I take the gross increase and deduct it from £828,648, which gives the increase as £730,421, and leaves the net debt increased this year by the figures £730,421. Now, that is not an increase of debt, as some members on the hustings said, coming merely from conversion operations. There was an increase from conversion operations of practically £136,180. The rest was borrowed money used in aid of revenue, as I shall show. Now I come to the next point of importance—what have been the actual transactions of the year; and in dealing with them I leave out the amount standing to credit at the beginning of the year. I take, first, the comparison without taking in that amount. That amount, as honourable members will see from Table No. 1, is £283,779. Now, our total revenue, leaving out the credit I have mentioned, and leaving out the sinking-fund debentures which appear in Table No. 1, in aid of revenue—our total revenue was £4,368,537 16s. 7d., whilst the total expenditure was £4,386,384, leaving an actual deficit of £17,821 4s. 7d. Then, if we wish to consider the borrowed money for the year taken in aid of revenue, we have to add to this deficit £16,300, which was paying our debts in dealing with the naval and military settlers. Then, we carried £250,000 to our Public Works Fund. I have not given that as an expenditure before, but if you take that as expenditure it would bring the deficit up to no less than £284,121 14s. 7d. And, if you add to this again the borrowed money and money expended in Cheviot, honourable members will see that the total deficit, taking this as expenditure and not as borrowed money, would have been £544,341 14s. 7d. Now, it may be asked, If there was then this deficit, how is this balance of £290,000 arrived at? I will show that. We have first to start with a credit at the beginning of the year of £283,779 his. Then we brought to the aid of the Consolidated Stock Act of 1884 £284,500. We borrowed for Cheviot £250,000, and for military settlers £16,300, making a total of £834,580. I have left out the cross entries of £294,571, because they will not affect my calculation; and, if you take the deficit of £544,841, the surplus, as shown in the Budget, is £290,238. Now, I submit that is the position as I have stated it, and it is absurd for us to say we have a surplus. It is absurd to say that without borrowing—if we had chosen to do without borrowing—our revenue would have been sufficient; and it is no answer to say what other Ministries had previously done. The question we have to consider is, What have we done for the past year, and how docs our revenue stand? Now, the next point I come to is a point which has misled the last speaker, and which I am sure will mislead a great number of other members, and, perhaps, some people outside the House; I allude to Table No. 8, and I am sorry to say, for it is the only table in the Budget I complan of, that, as showing our financial condition, that table is simply a juggle in figures, entirely fallacious, and misleading; and I will show it If honourable members will take up Table No. 8 they will see that the Treasurer table credit for this: that there is an actual decrease of £141,020 on the amount that has to be paid for interest and sinking fund this year compared with last year. Now, that is entirely wrong, entirely misleading, entirely fallacious. I will test it in two ways. I will do so first in this way; Suppose the scheme which the Treasurer has announced at page 5, in dealing with Consolidated Stock, had been adopted lost year, whit position should we have stood in? That, instead of paying, as we paid last year, £1,885,697 "interest and sinking fund, we should only have paid

£1,657,600. So that we have that difference: and I will explain in a minute how that difference arises. In fact, instead of them being a decrease in the interest and sinking fund, this year there is an actual increase of £87,077—no decrease at all. How, then, it may be asked, is this decrease shown? Honorable members must turn to the explanation of the Consolidated Stock Act. Under that Act it has been the habit to issue at the beginning of the year all the debentures necessary to cover the increases in the sinking fund at the end of the year. Last year we issued £284,500 in debentures, but this year we are only going to issue £117,800, and that includes also the first quarter, because the scheme had not been brought into operation until after the first quarter. Well, Sir, we issued £284,500, but the whole of that did not go into revalue There was no less than £169,700 that came back to us last year in redeemed bonds. It appears on the other side of the account. This year we eliminate that side of the account Strictly speaking, we are eliminating one side of that account, and the result is that this £141,020, supposed to be a decrease, includes in it bonds that were released and paid back by the Sinking Fund Commissioners at the end of the year. It is no saving to the colony. There is an increase in interest and sinking fund this year of £87,077; and therefore this table is entirely misleading and fallacious, and unless it is corrected it will go through the length and breadth of the colony that we are saving £141,020 in interest and sinking fund. We are not saving one penny. Suppose we carried out this year the scheme that was carried out last year, what would have been the amount that stood at? The whole thing turns upon conversion; and I ask honourable members to turn to the estimates under the head "Permanent Charges." I assume there has been no conversion of any of the stock under the Consolidated Loan Act If there had been no conversion of that loan, instead of there being a vote this year of £98,593, as honourable members wilt see at page 4 of the estimates, under the head "Permanent Charges," there would have been required a rote of £290,188 if there had been no conversion. However, there has been conversion, and I do not think it is fair to this House that that was not stated. That is the conversion that has taken place since the tables were prepared by Mr. Gavin. Honourable members will see that there have been large conversions this year. There have been large conversion operations since, the 31st March. If members will turn to the Budget they will see the particulars of the 3½ per-cent. inscribed stock. That amounts to £4,521,068. Now, if honourable members will turn to the estimates, they will see that the total amount of interest paid under the Inscribed Stock Act is to be on no less a sum than £5,202,451, showing that the debt under the inscribed stock has increased since the 31st March this year by "no less a sum than £681,383. Now, that inscribed stock is issued to meet debt owing partly under the Consolidated Loan Act of 1867. That appears to be plain from the amount of £738,000 stated in the estimates as now due under the Consolidated Loan Act of 1867. There has also been inscribed the stock of the released sinking funds under other Acts. And, apparently, there has also been inscribed—for we cannot find it in the estimates—the amount for the purchase of the Cheviot Estate; and, while there is a difference between these two amounts I have mentioned, as I have already said, I do not know where the expenses are, and we have no tables to guide us. I mention that to show the position in which we stand. And now I come to the real increase on the estimates. Instead of there being any saving in the estimates for the present year, if the estimates had been framed—that is, if this Table No. 8 had been framed—on the same basis as last year, they should show what we have to pay in the way of interest and sinking fund under "The New Zealand Consolidated Loan Act, 1867," and in conversions. The result would be that we should have to pay £87,000 additional for interest and sinking fund; and on the ordinary expenditure of our annual appropriations there is £54,655 of an increase, although these increases are without the supplementary estimates, and without other things I am going to mention. What has been the increase this year? Not less than £142,000. Now, what are the other things to be added? There is this to be added: I submit that the supplementary estimates, taking the average for a number of years past, may be said to amount to £50,000. Then, in the Crown-lands rating there will be £10,000 to be added; and then there is £250,000 for the Public Works Fund that is not included in these annual appropriations; but altogether it makes up £310,000 to be added to the expenditure. If we take the money at credit at the beginning of the year, and add the proposed expenditure to the other items I have mentioned, and then take the estimated revenue, it will be seen that that will only leave us at the end of the year something like a surplus of £31,000. Now I have dealt with Table No. 8. I now come to show some other figures that may be of importance. The first thing I notice is that there is a gradual increase of Treasury bills, although the increase, no doubt, has been caused not so much by borrowing in anticipation of incoming revenue as to get rid of the guaranteed debentures. The amount outstanding of Treasury bills on the 31st March, 1889, was £279,100; in 1890, £519,900; in 1893, £669,000; in 1894, £811,000. As I have said, of course this includes the bills issued to lift the guaranteed debentures, but I mention it to show the financial' position in which we are being placed; and the best proof of our ticklish financial position is this: that we are called upon to give in ways and means authority to raise the land-tax four months before its time, at a cost to the people of £6,700—that is to say, of those of them who have to pay the tax. There is one other point I wish to bring out, and that is the position of the Public Works Fund. We have only a balance in Part I. of the Fund, if we deduct the liabilities from the money in hand, of £48,916 on the 31st March. We have only in the North Island Main Trunk Railway Fund a balance of £50,000. It is true we expect

to bring in to the aid of the No. 1 Account £250,000, and to bring in, in addition, I presume, sinking funds released which will come into the fund the same as they did last year. But it is not known how much that amount is at present. I see £173,800 down in the table for sinking funds in hand, and I presume that may be the amount brought in this year. There are various other points of finance I should like to touch upon, but I pass on to deal with what may be termed the policy of the Budget; and I see no cause to withdraw a single remark I made to the interviewer of whom the Treasurer has spoken. On the contrary, there are many things I might have said that would have placed the position in a far worse light, as I will mention before I have done. On the face of this Budget there is nothing but borrowing. It is borrowing writ large. I ask honourable members to remember that some of this borrowing is to be annual. It is recurring borrowing. We have, first, £250,000 to buy land. That is plainly, if the Minister of Lands gets his way, to be as eternal as his leases. Then, we have £250,000 for reading; and then, we have £250,000 for Native lands, which will include part of the reading. Then, there is one and a half millions to be lent to farmers. The honourable member said it was most unfair to say this one and a half millions was to be borrowed this year; but the Budget said it was to be borrowed this year, for the Budget put it plainly, thus:—

"I propose, on certain conditions, to ask the House to assent to legislation authorising the raising in London of a sum not exceeding £1,500,000 per annum, to he advanced to settlers in the colony on freehold security, and I propose that 3½ per-cent. inscribed stock be issued from time to time to provide the requisite amount. It may not follow that in the course of a year the whole amount named will be raised for the purpose of advances."

The policy Bill—for of course it demands a Bill—may not pass, but, on the other hand, it may, and the money will have to be borrowed. There is no statement there that only half is to be borrowed; the statement is that the Government propose that the whole of it shall be borrowed. Then, I ask honourable members to remember that the borrowing is not to stop with this two millions and a quarter that I have mentioned. We have several other items for which we have to borrow. There will be several thousands, I suppose, for the naval and military settlers; and we have to borrow for loans to local bodies. Do honourable members know that already this year we have borrowed £40,000—that is to say, during the first quarter of this year—for this purpose? Then, for the purchase of Native lands we have this year already borrowed £50,000; and we have to pay sinking funds, and to borrow again for this purpose, which will amount, I estimate, to about £117,000. If you add that together, you will find that the amount to be borrowed is outside a quarter of a million, while the amount with the money borrowed during this quarter is over £2,700,000. Now, that is pure borrowing for expenditure; and, if you add other items that come in in the table, the amount will not be for short of three millions for this year, leaving out altogether the question of Consols—leaving out the question of borrowing from the Insurance Offices and from other establishments. That is for expenditure during the year. There is one point that might be mentioned if I wished to paint a gloomy picture. As the Treasurer said, we have the Government pledged for the debentures of the Midland Railway to the extent of £018,000; we have also the contingent liability of the Bonk of New Zealand to the extent of two millions. And then, Sir, we have other items to follow that will come in which I have not put in, in reference to various items which always come in. These amounted last year to £700,000, so that at the lowest estimate at which it can be stated the borrowing this year will amount to at least three millions. And I do not know of any one year since the inauguration of the public-works policy in which such a large sum of borrowed money was ever placed in the hands of any Ministry for expenditure during twelve months.

Mr. Seddon.—What about the five millions in 1879 ?

Sir R. Stout.—" What about the five millions in 1679? "asks the honourable gentleman. That is another proof that he knows little of finance. That five millions was not to be spent in 1879. Unquestionably, part of it was to pay for debts already existing. I say that no Government has ever had placed in its hands three millions for expenditure in one year. But there is not only that: they are to go on borrowing every year no less a sum than two millions and three-quarters, and there is no end to it.

An Hon. MEMBER.—No.

Sir R. Stout.—I will show how it amount to this if the honourable member asks me to repeat it. I say the borrowing of this two millions and three-quarters is to go on forever. I ask, where is the country that will stand this strain? Where is the boasted policy of sell, reliance, after this? I say this borrowing policy we are now inaugurating is a borrowing policy that I believe no country in the world was ever asked to face, except in war-time, and I declare it to he an audacious proposal, and one that I entirely object to. I have not the time to go into the other details, but I wish now to point out one thing, and one caution that I give to those who call themselves Liberals. I say it is the Liberal programme all over the world to try not to put the State under the heel of the debenture-holder. As has been said by a celebrated writer—I have not the time to quote it at length, but if honourable members will turn up Laveleye's book on "Democracy" Volume 1, page 306, they will find—

Mr. Ward.—Is it interpreted?

Sir R. Stout.—It is in French, but I will give the passage to you in Englishxs:—

"These enormous debts which States and towns contract in emulation of each other are bad for the democracy. The people become the prey of the debenture-holders. It is for them that they work and that they are deprived of necessaries. This is the new form of slavery. Their condition becomes like to that of the Roman proletariate, under the law of the XII. Tables, who were cut in pieces so that the creditors might be satisfied. And when this happens the modern Shylock must have his pound of flesh.

"The interest of the debt is more grievons than the rent of land. If prices fall the proprietors must diminish their rent, bat the interest must be paid—yea, when the taxpayer must deprive himself of twice as many objects to fulfil his bargain."

So he goes on. I ask, what are we doing now? We are placing this fair young country under the heel of the debenture-holders in London. That is what we are doing. It is all nonsense saying we are only going to the London money-market for one million and a half to lend to the farmers. What did we go There last year to do? Our 3½-por-cent. Consolidated Stock bonds issued since the 31st March of this year amount to no less a sun than £G81,000. This Consolidated Stock belongs to the London debenture-holder. Last year what did we go to the London debenture-holder for? We asked for £250,000 for the purchase of the Cheviot; we went for, practically, something like £730,000 to the London money-lender in order to pay our way. It is all nonsense, therefore, saying we are not going to the London money-lender to obtain this money. I say, if .this scheme which; the Government have put before us is carried out, we shall be going to the London money-lender every year for from two to two and a half millions, and we shall thereby be pledging this fair country—mortgaging it virtually—to the London money-lender. For what purpose? I say we do not require it; it is not necessary. My time presses, and I am very sorry, for I must pass on, although I wished to enlarge a little upon that point. I now come to one other thing about which it is absolutely necessary I should speak, and that is the lessons we have heard so much of about the Liberalism in this House. In what position are we now placed? In no Parliament in the world have Liberal members been treated as they have been treated in this House this year. They are not allowed to have souls of their own. They are not allowed to have an opinion of their own. Every Bill that is proposed by the Government is to be forced upon them at the point of the bayonet. If they do make a suggestion in reference to any Bill they are told they must withdraw it. They are afraid. They are driven like dumb dogs into the lobby. They are terrorised over in the position in which they are placed. Time after time that has been done.

An Hon. MEMBER.—Oh!

Sir R. Stout.—The honourable member has had it done to himself, and in his own inner soul he must be ashamed of himself. I need not refer to the question of the Sergeant at-Arms and other things; but that is the position, and Ministers now think that you can have no Liberalism except you have an autocracy: and you are setting up an autocracy, not only in this House, but also in the country. What is to be the Liberal programmer now? We are told it is "Spoils to the victors"; and I say it is that which damns any democracy where it is started. It ruins it. What does a democracy exist for? It can only exist for one thing—pure administration and progressive legislation. You cannot get pure administration if you have spoils for the victors. It is that which has ruined the United States of America. It is that which has mode that fair country what it is. With its Republican form of government, and its Liberalism, it might have boon a pattern to the world. Now see bow low it has sunk I—all through this policy of "spoils to the victors" that has been inaugurated, I am sorry to say. When I was in office [struggled against such a system. I introduced a Civil Service Reform Act, which took all kinds of patronage out of the hands of Ministers. They were to have no patronage at all. The only way they could exercise any patronage was in the appointment of experts, and when they were appointed their names had to be laid on the table of the House, so that there was every safeguard to insure that appointments when dealt with were made public. The other appointments were taken out of the control of Ministers. That is apt to be stopped; it has been stopped already. I do not wish to refer to anything more than this; but what has been done, for example, in reference to the Railway Department? There was a case of "spoils to the victors." and I am told on good authority, which I believe is perfectly reliable, that prior to the election there were meetings between one or two Ministers of the Crown and the railway union in Christ church, at which were mentioned the names of the men who were to be removed.

The statement that any Ministers saw the list of railway officers to be dismissed has been denied by Ministers, and the denial accepted by Sir R. Stout.

The condition was that the railway union wore to give their support to the Government at the elections. Does any honourable member deny it? Give me a Committee and I can prove it. I can say, further, I have got a list of the names of the men who were to take their places. They were also mentioned. And, in addition to that, what happened? Not only were their names then mentioned, but one of the Railway Commissioners met the railway union men and took up this list to his fellow-Commissionors to carry out this bargain that had been made; and what happened? They said they could not carry it out. One of the Railway Commissioners objected

to carry it out; but they would lower the salaries of the men whose removal was desired, in the hope that they would resign, the salaries were lowered; and the railway union was told afterwards that, after the session, then would come the time when the "spoils to the victors" compact was to be carried out. Is that true or false? I say, let us have a Committee, and let us see whether that proposal was not mode by a Commissioner to his fellow-Commissioners, and see whether the statements I have made can be proved or not. I make the statement from information I have every reason to believe is correct. I have not mentioned the men's names, and will not do so until I get a Committee, because I do not think it is fair until they shall have an opportunity of dealing with it themselves. However, I believe that statement to be absolutely correct. There is one other thing that I strongly object to in this Budget, and that is, the dealing with the savings of the people in the way it is proposed. It is said the savings-banks would not be absorbed; but there is something worse than that, which I have not time to deal with. I will pass on to the next thing, and that is, the way in which insurance, which is simply another form of the thrift of the people, is to be checked, if this Budget is carried out. Even the solvency of the New Zealand Government Insurance Association is threatened; and not only is it threatened, but it will severely endanger its competency to compete with other offices. What is to happen? We have now, I believe, over £2,000,001) in that Association. Only, I think, about one-fourth of that is mortgages on real estate; the rest is mainly lent on debentures. It is, I expect, mainly 4 per-cent debentures. The Government Insurance Association is founded on this class of tables—namely, that they are what are called 4-percent, tables. If you only give 4 per cent, there are always some sums that will remain uninvited, and the result will be that you will not be able to carry out your tables. At all events, you will not be able to give insurance profits to those who have worked hard and saved for their widows and children. Is it honest or fair that they should have their profits interfered with, and that they should not be allowed to get the best interest they can from the Association? What right has the State to step in and say that it will seize part of their earnings and apply it to general State purposes? Sir, it is entirely indefensible. The same thing was to be done to some smaller extent in the case of the other associations. The Treasurer stated I was quite wrong in assuming that more or less of the real estate, including buildings, was not to be taken as securities. This is his own Budget. The words used are "New Zealand securities." He said on cash deposits the rate of interest was to be 4 per cent. only. What is meant when you speak of New Zealand securities? You do not mean mortgage securities. I understood it to refer to New Zealand Government securities, and I assumed it was 4 per cent., as for the cash deposit. I say that is entirely contrary to what should be the aim of the Liberal party in dealing with the savings of the people. The thrift of the people ought to be encouraged in every possible way, and, to encourage that in every possible way, you should not tax their earnings and their savings; but you are doing that in this proposal. What are you doing with your Consols? I see, from a return laid on the table in reference to our Post-Office Savings-Bank, that you had at the end of the your more than three millions of money in the Post-Office Savings-Bank, and you have reduced the interest of the largest depositors. I do not Bay the Treasurer was wrong; I believe, under the circumstances, he was right, because he found, no doubt, that the other banks, through the present state of insecurity, were being depleted of their deposits, which were being put into the Savings-bank, and the savings-banks are not meant for large depositors. I do not, therefore, see that There is so much wrong in lowering the rate of interest for very large sums. I apprehend that, so far as small deposits are concerned, we should not lower the rate of interest; we should increase the interest on them. It simply means helping them to save. It is doing for them the same as we are asked to do with the old pension scheme. It is giving them the same help perhaps for a rainy day; and I do not think it is the duty of the State to say that the interest of the people of small means should he kept down to the very lowest amount. Now, I wish to say what should be our policy with regard to giving aid to farmers. If the State has plenty of money to lend, it should lend money on mortgage and not on debentures. The Now Zealand Government Insurance Association could have had a million more lent if it had not been taken up by Government debentures, Treasury bills, et cetera. We should have given this relief already to the farmers at a fair rate of interest. But this should apply to more than the freeholders; it should apply to the leaseholders also. It would enable them to carry out their work as Crown tenants. And not only that: we should have taken the money from the Post-Office Savings-Bank and also from the Public Trust Office; and we could have gone to the Government Insurance Association, as I have said. The money is there, and, if we took three or four hundred thousand a year, that would be ample to aid our farmers. And why should we not aid our formers in this why? It would be only lending from ourselves to ourselves, and we should not be liable to the foreign money-lender at all. That would be a reasonable and fair scheme. It would give help to our poor and small struggling farmers, especially to those who had not the freehold, and who have to make considerable improvements, and it would enable them to make their improvements. That would have been a stales, manlike proposal. Why should we go to the foreign debenture-holder and pledge our colony to him? It is starting a system of plunging, It means that you will lose money by it. You cannot be more careful than some of these men have been in the past who have had the management, for instance, of our trust and loan companies. But, with the greatest tare, they have found they have made many bad bargains. And so will it be

with the State. It is said you must have capital. If yon it quire to borrow money, as I have no doubt you do, for the purchase of Native lands and other lands, a small amount—I believe, £50,000 a year—would be ample, and to aid the small farmers you need not have gone to the foreign money-lender. For the rest, you might have raised that amongst yourselves, and the amount could have been safeguarded by 1 per cent at least of sinking fund, so that you could reduce the liability; or you could have used yon sinking fund for the purchase of land, and then the State would have been able to [*unclear:* pur.] chase land, and be free from debt. What is this policy? The policy, so far as self-reliance is concerned, is cast to the wind. There is no such thing as self-reliance. You are going to pledgo our colony to the foreign debenture holder, and I do ask members of this House to remember that they are not legislating merely because we are in temporary difficulties. I apprehend that they ought to recognise that they are legislating for the future; and I ask them, what is to be the future of this fair colony if we are to plunge ourselves into a state of having to meet the demands of the foreign debenture-holders? I say it mens injury and ruin to our children. It may mens temporary relief to ourselves; but I ask the House to look to the future. I ask this House to think what the future is to be. I alse say this: that there are many ways in which we can give assistance without these [*unclear:* suds] cious borrowing proposals. If we have to spend money on roods, the amount ought to be limited, we are spending now up to £300,000 or £400,000 a year on roads. That mean £250,000 of this borrowed money, a certain proportion of it from the Public Works Fund. A certain proportion of the fund went for advances on blocks of land. I think £36,000 was so spent last year. I say this colony cannot afford to spend £300,000 or £400,000 a year, and we must go more easily. We cannot afford to spend that on public works.

Mr. Hogg.—That would stop our public works.

Sir R. Stout.—Why not stop our public works, if they exceed our means? Are we dealing as prudent men would deal,—as our means will allow? We are merely plunging our colony into debt. Then, I believe we should have more economy also in dealing with our roads, by having the roads placed under one management. I entirely dissent from the proposal to have the making of roads taken from the Public Works Department. The Public Works Department should have the sole charge of the roads, and it should manage the whole of them. It ought not to be left to the Lands Department at all. The Lands Department has got enough to do in the survey of the land, and to see that the land-laws are complied with, without troubling itself with doing public works. It means, practically, that we have two sets of Engineers, one for the Public Works Department and one for the Lands Department. Now, I have noted down here several other things I should wish to refer to, but I find my time is nearly up, so that I should not go into them at proper length, and therefore I wish to say one or two words more about the Statement,—in reference to several other things mentioned this evening. One thing I have not dealt with was the charge I about this new borrowing system. Sir, there is ft difference between borrowing and spending. It is true, with these half-million Consoles, there has been only half a million this year and half a million next year. But if one takes in the amount of money the Treasurer will have at his disposal, coupled with the contingent liability to the Bank of New Zealand, the colony within the next eighteen months will be more than six millions in debt—when you take the contingent liability.

Mr. Ward.—The Treasurer will not have the £1,500,000 at his disposal at all.

Sir R. Stout.—The Treasurer must have it at his disposal, and no Lending Board can stand between him and this £1,500,000, though he gives it to irresponsible persons, the same as we have given the railways. We shall have the tame difficulties that we have in dealing with the management of the railways. This Lending Board must be under Ministerial supervision; and, if not under Ministerial supervision, then it is all the worse. It means that we are giving over to irresponsible people the control of £1,500,000; and does the honourable gentleman say that is sound finance or sound administration? It may be said—and this is the only thing I shall refer to—as was said by some honourable members in this House when the public-works policy was brought down, that we needed money, and we needed it soon. We need money and we need it soon; but if we are to be prudent men we shall need to rely upon ourselves. I submit that there is no need whatever, if we only are prudent and careful, to go outside this colony to borrow money. We can do without going to the London market, we can leave the London market, and, as to money for all our wants, that will be got through private sources, and I think our people can do very well without our assistance. It is not merely what this £1,500,000 a year will mean. So far as the fall in prices is concerned, I submit that those prices will not be added to by lending the farmers money, even up to two-thirds the value of their laud. There are some people who get money on their stock to carry on their business, and there are farmers in this colony who are mortgaged for three-quarters of the value of their land, and perhaps more; and the men who require most aid will get no aid under this Bill. I should like to know, if the State is to lend money, where is it to stop? Is it to stop at the farmers? Why should not the manufacturers have State aid as well as the farmers? Where are you going to draw the line? If you make the State a money-lending agency, such as the honourable member for Avon said, what will that mean? It will mean that you will have a system such as the London County Council proposes—State pawnbrokers. And why should not a poor man, who has got no money in his pocket,—whose children are sick,

and perhaps starving,—why should he not have State assistance? How are you to draw the line? If the State is to help these people, it has a right to lend money not only to one class, but to everyone. What is the principle laid down in these proposals? That the State is to have full control of money in this colony. It is to be entirely removed from private hands. I believe, if we did that, we should set up a tyranny such as never existed in any part of the world, coupled with spoils to the victors, coupled with autocracy and tyranny in Parliament—a majority of this House not allowed to express their own opinions in case a Minister may resign;—what is more, this House, most improperly, most unconstitutionally, threatened with a dissolution if they dare to refuse to pass a Bill at the dictation of the Minister of Lands. No Minister over uttered such a threat. Are we to have that? We are to have the second Chamber flooded also if it dares to come between the wind and his authority. Are wo to permit that? That is probably what we are to have if the State is to have the solo control of the capital of this colony. Are we to have a Liberal Government? Certainly not. We are to have in this place a pure autocracy; and I ask those who follow Liberal principles to rise above mere personal considerations, and to vote as they think right between themselves and their consciences. It they do so, I feel sure the Ministry will have the good sense to acquiesce in that vote. This is, I believe, one of the gravest crises that have arisen in this colony. It is not the mere million and a half asked for on the London money-market, but it is starting a policy that I submit we cannot see the end of. Do you not see that you are pledging the colony not simply, as you think, to one million? If the farmers get this, do you suppose that political pressure will not be brought to bear by manufacturers and others? How are we to draw the line? I say, if the farmers are to get this money, I, for One, cannot vote against the manufacturers getting money. I cannot vote against the laboring-man getting his money too. I do not see any distinction between the one party or the other. And what is the position? It means, Will two millions satisfy the colony? Will three millions satisfy the colony? We are pledging this colony to the foreign borrowing of money year by year amounting to two millions, because if we borrow the money here we must next year inscribe the stock in London, and the result is, we are asking this colony to become a debtor to foreign people to an extent, I repeat, of over three millions a year. Where is our self-reliance? Where is our non-borrowing? There are not a dozen members of this House who, on the Hastings, were not pledged against foreign borrowing; and they are to throw their pledges to the wind, to think nothing of themselves whatever, and, after they have solemnly pledged themselves, to shot their eyes and swallow it. Where is their conscience? I give the Government every credit for doing what they consider best, and I hope I have said nothing in my speech to throw any slur upon them. They are doing what they think best for the colony, and I give them every credit for good intentions; but we ought in this House to save them from themselves, and to save this country from what I believe to be one of the gravest disasters that over threatened us.

SAMUEL COSTALL, Government Printer, Wellington.

The Irish Question and its Lessons for Colonists. Lecture by Robert Stout, Esq. Dunedin: Printed by Mackay, Bracken & Co., Moray Place MDCCCLXXXI.

The Irish Question and its Lessons for Colonists.

A Lecture Delivered by Robert Stout, Esq.

I need not tell you that I am not an Irishman, bat I may state that I have never even seen the "Emerald Isle." I come to the discussion of the abject I have proposed for myself—The Irish Question and its Lessons for Colonists—unbiased by national or party feelings. And as i am not a member of any of the contending religious sects in Ireland, I hope I am free from that bitterest kind of partisanship—that which is intensified by s man's religious convictions. If it were my object merely to point out how one or other of the parties that have fought in Ireland had treated the others, I would not have been here to-night. I am here, however, to speak right out what I think, and if I offend any Irishman or anyone who may never have seen Ireland, I cannot help it. Let those offended remember that every historical subject has not two, but many sides. History, after all, must in social affairs be our guide. There ought to be a higher aim in viewing past and present events than merely to record them. What do they teach? You may have a historical review painted with all the Rembrandt shades of a Carlyle's French Revolution; or you may read the account of a partisan, written in defence of a particular party or sect; but after you nave considered these, the question still remains, what do the events teach, and what were their causes? Is a mere sketch of events drawn by a master's band history T I do not think so. We must in looking at the present and at the past try and discover the causes of things—why did such things happen? What was the result that flowed from this action, what from that? If we thus approach history we may find a guide to help us to solve the pressing political problems with which even we are surrounded. Do not let us imagine that the questions that we see causing agitation, unrest, deep study, in Europe have no concern with us. Alas! we

have not solved the questions that the old world is grappling with. And though they do not distress ns as they do dwellers in Europe, they have sot to be considered by us. In approaching this Irish Question, what then nave we to do? It seems to me we have to enquire whether a calm perusal of Irish history furnishes us with any explanation of Irish unrest and distress. If it does, then I suppose we will all agree that the causes will have to be removed before peace and plenty again appear in Ireland. Coercion Bills have never vet brought peace, save by extermination, and no one predicts they will bring prosperity. When we have glanced, and is s lecture we can only hope to glance, at Irish history, may we not consider whether its pages do not teach us lessons ?—may not we, who are the founders of what we all hope to be a nation, learn what we should avoid and what we should pursue ?

In what state do we find Ireland at present? I do not know if in any civilised country there is greater unrest or greater distress The Government in many parts is powerless, and in hardly any district is there that feeling that law and authority should be at all hazards maintained, such as happily exists amongst ourselves. I hope none of us believe in chance. If we see an event we naturally enquire what was its cause, or at any rate its antecedent. Can we give a reason for Ireland's state? Let us contrast two countries—Ireland and Scotland. Ireland is poorer than Scotland, Ireland's population has wonderfully decreased, Scotland's is net on the wane. Ireland has a climate superior to Scotland, and I believe has more and better agricultural land. And yet Ireland has not half the industrial enterprise of Scotland. Why is this? In endeavouring to answer this question we must, I think, proceed to ask what are the physical buses on which industries must thrive. For example, in the absence of the coal and iron deposits that exist in Scotland, it was simply impossible for Ireland to equal Scotland in manufacturing enterprise The physical environment counts for a great deal. Race, religion, system of government, education, culture, all count; but without the physical capabilities or possibilities what avail all these? In, therefore, viewing Ireland, do not let us be led away with the idea—as some are, I think, led away—that had Ireland's history been different, or the race different, or the religion of the inhabitants different, that Ireland would have become the home of at many manufacturing industries as exist in Scotland or midland England. It bad not the necessary mineral deposits. But though it had not the necessary physical bases for the development of such industries as we set in England and Scotland, we must next enquire whether anything occurred to damp its industrial enterprise. And history tells us there did. I need not refer to the continued wars of which it was the battle-ground, nor need I point out bow it has all along been treated as a conquered country. There are other things that explain Ireland's present state. If we do not go very far back, out take the period when trade began to grow is England, say the beginning of the 18th century, we may see how Ireland was treated.

For example, in 1700, the population of England and Wales was about five and a-half millions, and its exports about six millions, and imports nearly five million In 1750 the population had risen to six and a-halt millions, but the exports to ten millions, and the imports to seven and a quarter millions. In 1775 the population was nearly eight millions, but the exports about sixteen and a half, and the imports nearly fifteen millions. These figures show the remarkable strides that trade was making—most remarkable compared with the increase of the population. Now, how was Ireland treated during this time of the birth of manufacturing and trade enterprise in England? Was she let alone? Was a helping hand held out to her? Or were her trade and manufactures crushed! Remember that though Ireland has not the physical capabilities for some industries that flourish in the neighbouring kingdoms, she has exceptionally favourable natural surroundings for other industries. Ireland is suited for the raising of sheep and cattle. It is the Emerald Isle. And then it is the natural home of all those industries that naturally follow the rearing of cattle. Well, how stood Ireland at the close of the seventeenth century, at the time, as the statistics I have quoted show, trade was only beginning to be developed in England? History tells us that Ireland had paid great attention to cattle and sheep rearing, and that industries like the woolen industry were flourishing. Indeed, at this time the Irish wool was famous throughout Europe. But what did the English Parliament do? By two statutes passed in 1665 and 1680 the importation into England from Ireland of all cattle, sheep, swine, of beef, pork, bacon, mutton, butter, and cheese, was prohibited. Here was a blow struck at her main industry, and she was deprived of her main market so that English farmers and stock raisers might be protected. Compared with Scotland, how was she treated? From 1707 Scotland bad free trade, could go where she liked with her produce, but Ireland had to seek a market in France. There was, however, the West Indian and colonial trade. But what happened to it? In the Amended Navigation Act of 1663 Irish vessels were deprived of the privileges accorded to English ships, and hence her shipping was ruined. Not content with this, it was enacted that no goods should he imported into the colonies directly from Ireland, and not until 1731 was this disgraceful prohibition even slightly relaxed. Well might it be said that Irish industry, commerce, and trade were ruined. And knowing this, English people sneer at the want of enterprise and industry in Ireland. Can we wonder when Irishmen hear these taunts that, remembering the disgraceful laws that were passed to destroy Irish trade and industry, and to satisfy the demands of the English farmers and traders, their blood boils with indignation? But that was not all. You see how her farming industry,

her foreign and colonial trade, and her shipping were crippled in their infancy. What, then, did the Irish do? Deprived of their means of trade, they began woollen manufactures, or rather they further developed their existing manufactures. English, Scotch, and even foreign manufacturers came to Ireland, and the woollen manufacture grew. What then happened? The English manufacturers got alarmed, and they petitioned Parliament, and both Bouses of Parliament urged the King to protect the English manufacturers. The King and the English influence dominated the Irish Parliament, and got its aid, and the result of the English manufacturers' agitation was that the British Parliament passed an Act (1699) prohibiting the export of manufactured wool from Ireland to any country whatever. And no wonder that Swift wrote :—

"Ireland is the only kingdom I ever heard or read of, either in ancient or modern history, whose people are denied the liberty of exporting their native commodities or manufactures whenever they pleased, except to countries at war with their own prince or state. Yet this privilege, by the superiority of mere power, is refused, as in the most momentous part of commerce, besides an act of navigation, to which we never assented, pressed down upon us and vigorously executed."

And what followed? It was computed that 12,000 Protestant families in Dublin, and 30,000 in other parts of Ireland, obtained employment from the woollen industry. This destroyed, they had to leave, and many of them betook themselves to England and Scotland. And then came famine, for the trade of the country was ruined. The linen industry was small, and gave employment to but few; and what now was left for Irish people to do? We may trace many effects from this checking—nay, destroying—of Ireland's trade.

(1.) Some of the most enterprising Irishmen left their native country; the men that were imbued with the industrial spirit—that spirit that alone makes a nation progress, were driven into exile.

(2.) Then, as land was the only thing left, men rushed to farming, and a bad year's crops meant poverty—nay, famine. A country with only one industry to rely on never becomes great.

(3.) Note that large numbers of Protestants had to leave, and any chance of the contending religious parties being about equalised in numbers was put an end to by the legislation of the British Parliament. Who made Ireland Catholic? I reply, the British Government. But with this I propose to deal in a later portion of my lecture.

But it was not only the destruction of her trade, her commerce, her industries, that Ireland had to suffer. She was abominably governed. The abuses of the Government were frightful. On this subject I prefer quoting from Lecky, to whom I have been indebted for many of my facts, He says:—

"The Irish establishments were out of all proportion to the wealth and to the needs of the people, and they formed a great field of lucrative patronage, paid for from the Irish revenues, at the full disposal of the English Ministers, and almost wholly beyond the cognisance of the British Parliament. How such patronage would be administered in the days of Newcastle and Walpole may be easily imagined. Until Lord Townsend's administration, the Viceroys were always absent from the country from which they derived their official incomes for more than half, usually for about four-fifths, of their term of office. Swift, in one of his 'Drapier's Letters,' writing in 1724, has given a curious catalogue of the great Irish offices, some of them perfect sinecures, which were then distributed among English politicians. Lord Berkely held the great office of Master of the Rolls; Lord Palmerston that of First Remembrancer, at a salary of nearly £2000 a year; Dodington was Clerk of the Bills, with a salary of £2500 a year; Southwell was Secretary of State; Lord Burlington was Hereditary High Treasurer; Mr Arden was Under-Treasurer, with an income of £9000 a year; Addison had a sinecure as Keeper of the Records in Birmingham Tower; and four of the Commissioners of Revenue lived generally in England. The Viceroy, the Chief Secretary, and several other leading political officers, were always English. In the legal profession every Chancellor till Fitzgibbon was an Englishman, and, in the first years of the eighteenth century, every chief of the three law courts. In the church every primate during the eighteenth century was an Englishman, as were also ten out of the eighteen archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, and a large proportion of the other bishops. Swift said with perfect truth that 'those who have the misfortune to be born here have the least title to any considerable employment, to which they are seldom preferred but upon a political consideration'; and he compared Ireland to a hospital where all the household officers grow rich, while the poor, for whose sake it was built, are almost starving. The habit of quartering on Ireland persons who could not be safely or largely provided for in England was inveterate. The Duke of St. Albans, the bastard son of Charles II., enjoyed an Irish pension of £800 a year; Catherine Sedley, the mistress of James II, had another of £5000 a year. William bestowed confiscated lands exceeding an English county in extent, on his Dutch favourites, Portland and Albemarle, and a considerable estate on his former mistress, Elizabeth Villiers. The Duchess of Kendall and the Countess of Darlington, the two mistresses of George L, bad pensions of the united value of £5000. Lady Walsingham, the daughter of the Duchess of Kendall, had an Irish pension of the value of £lo00. Lady Howe, the daughter of Lady Darlington, had a pension of £500. Madame de Walmoden, one of the mistresses of George II, had an Irish pension of £3000. The Queen Dowager of Prussia, sister of George II., Count Bernsdorf, who was a prominent German politician under George I., and a number of other less noted

German names may be found on the Irish pension list."

Ireland's revenues were used to pension the mistresses and illegitimate children of our immoral monarchs, and to pension political partisans and bribe political allies. Such was the English Government of Ireland.

And now I come to another black page in Ireland's annals—the religious persecutions of which she was the scene. Do not let it be believed that the persecution was all on one side. Catholics persecuted Protestants, and Protestants Catholics. The Act of Attainder passed in James' reign was, notwithstanding Lecky's apology for it, a not to be defended piece of legislation by the Catholic party.—" In this way no less than 2461 persons were proclaimed, incase they did not appear and submit to trial before a fixed day, as traitors to Government; and in this list were included seventy peers, nine peeresses, eighty-six baronets and knights, nine archbishops and bishops, 105 other clergymen, and over 2000 private gentlemen. No notice was given to any of them that a measure affecting their property and lives was under the consideration of Parliament. They wen declared guilty without trial, and sentenced by Act of Parliament to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. So hastily was the thing done, that the names of some were inserted in the list of the condemned who were at the time actually serving in King James's army under the walls of Derry and so shamefully was it done that Mount joy, who was in James's service up till the time that he was cast into the French prison, where he was still lying, and who could not possibly comply with the conditions necessary to obtain acquittal, was by the Act proclaimed a traitor. No pardon, even from the king, could benefit any person thus attainted, except it was issued before the first day of November in that year, and enrolled before the last day of that month. When the Bill had passed both Houses, and was presented to the king for signature, he was informed by Nagle (the Speaker of the House of Commons) that many of the persons named therein were found guilty or evidence which satisfied Parliament, and the remainder on "common fame. 'And considering the man called upon to lead the army of James against that of William—St. Ruth—who had earned for himself in France the title of the "Scourge of the Heretics," one can predict how Protestants would have been treated had James been successful his St Ruth had hunted down and murdered peasants guilty of no crime save that of worshipping God in their own way, and daring to think for themselves in religion. The records of the martyrdom suffered by the French Huguenots should not be forgotten. But though Protestants had been persecuted by Catholics, that was no excuse for them treating the Catholics like slaves. They should not have forgotten that during the lone siege of Derry, the Catholics in Ulster had certainly behaved well to the Ulster Protestants, who were neither in Derry nor in Enniskillen; and this Professor With row, in his able work on Derry and Ennisktllen; has pointed out. But the dominant party had no scruples in punishing Catholics, nor in passing a Test Act that drove from the north of Ireland many of Ulster's bravest Presbyterian defenders. No Catholic coull I hold any office in the Government, nor be a master of a corporation, nor a lawyer, nor a tradesman, save under heavy taxes; nor could they hold land nor even keep horses, for a Protestant could, if they were beyond a certain value, force them to be sold to him. And the public exercise of their religion was forbidden. Catholic priests, for frivolous crimes, were transported and Catholic schools were prohibited and none substituted for them, Nay more, Catholics could not possess property like Protestants for if the son of a Catholic became a Protestant, he could claim his father's property. To sum up their treatment would simply be to say they were degraded, pauperised, and enslaved. The only thing left them was life And then, also, the Presbyterians, by the Test Act, were put under disabilities, though not treated half so ill as the Catholics were treated I quote, Professor Witherow The treatment of the Presbyteriana in Ireland, throughout the 18th century, by the High Church prelates and by the Irish Parliament—which seemed to make itself the humble tool of the prelates' bigotry—was very little less disgraceful than that which was dealt out to the Roman Catholic population. First, they were refused a legal toleration for their faith. Dissent was then regarded in the eye of the law as very much worse than Buddhism or atheism would be regarded now. When toleration came, it was fettered with the Test Act, and men were thrust out of the service of the Crown and the country for no other fault than that they were Presbyteriana. They were made churchwardens against their will, and then prosecuted for not acting as officers of a Church to which they did not belong, They were subject to expensive actions at law, for the crime of being married by their own ministers. They would not be allowed to teach a school without license from a bishop, and this license no Dissenter, in ordinary cases, could obtain. All the penal machinery that prelates and clergy could put in operation was employed to ruin the Presbyterian faith, and to induce its adherents to desert it "And the effect of this treatment of the Presbyterians, Mr Froude has sketched. He says :—"Now recommenced the Protestant emigration which robbed Ireland of the bravest defenders of English interests, and peopled the American seaboard with fresh flights of Puritans. Twenty thousand left Ulster on the destruction of the woollen trade. Many more were driven away by the first passing of the Test Act. The stream had slackened, in hope that the law would be altered. When the prospect was finally closed, men of energy and spirit refused to remain in a country where they were held unfit to hold the rights of citizens; and thenceforward, till the spell of tyranny was broken in 1782, annual ship-loads of families poured themselves from Belfast and Londonderry. The resentment which they carried with them continued to burn in their new homes; and in the War of Independence England had no fiercer enemies than the grandsons and

great-grandsons of the Presbyterians who held Ulster against Tyrconnel And can we not trace some results that flowed from some of the things that I have been speaking of. Let me mention one. There grew up a want of respect for the law. This grew up first in Irish trade having to find illegitimate channels—having to trust to smuggling. Then it grew up, also, by men having their religion and the law ever at war. Their religious convictions were the stronger, and hence the respect for the law, instead of developing, decreased. Can, then, it be wondered that a race that has had nigh two centuries of training to look upon the law—upon the governmental authority—as a tyrant, as an oppressor, should have no respect for law. A race once trained as the Irish have been trained, cannot change or be changed all at once. Training counts for a great deal, and heredity is now recognised. With the most beneficent legislation, it may take half-a-century before the race can have the same respect for law that exists amongst people on whose side the law has ever been. And cannot the record of Irish history also explain the bitterness that exists between Irishmen of different religions—those who have been dominant, and those who have been ruled. Alas! that the past, with its evil associations, should be sought to be remembered, and cause enmity and strife.

And now, to come to another part of Irish history—that of how the owners and tillers of the land were treated. I have not time, even were it necessary for me, to speak of the old Brehon laws, nor of the customs that grew up in the olden times in relation to the holding of the land. The feudal system, in a modified form, existed in Ireland; but the old law is Ireland was, as elsewhere, that the tribe held the lands, and for the tribe We see a similar method of holding land amongst the Maoris. The tribe holds the land, but there is a chief of the tribe, and his "mana" extendi over the land, though individually he may not be entitled to any of it. Ha is what we might term a "trustee" for his people. Now, the head of the clan or sept, or in Maori we might say hope, had to took after the defence of the clan and of its land, and he required the clan to contribute towards the defence. As the power of the chieftains lessened and that of the central authority grew, the chiefs had to contribute to the central authority—i.e., to the King. This process went on in almost all European countries, and with the lessening of the chieftains power relatively to the King's, there was, however, a growth of his power over the land and the people of the tribe. And in long process of years we see that the land came to be looked upon as the chief's land; the tenants were, however, not disturbed; and this no doubt was the origin of that oboe universal system of holding land what we call now yearly tenancies But Ireland did not develop its method of laud holding as other countries developed, merely by the chiefs or nobles becoming landlords. There was a disturbing element that came in. Ireland was conquered more than once and her lands partitioned and sold by the conquerors. I need not go further, than to what is termed the Cromwellian settlement of Ireland, to show bow, in this respect, the original holders were treated. (" Prendergast's Cromwellian Settlement in Ireland" can be referred to.) The old chief tains and their people had to make way for the conquerors. They lost their land; their Land was confiscated, and not much care was exercised to see—as we even do when we seize Maori land—that proper reserves were left to enable the inhabitants to maintain themselves. Some of the conquerors settled in Ireland and held the lands. Many let them and farmed them, getting agents and middle men to pay them their rents, and leaving them to deal with the tenants pretty much as they liked. What the result of the land system was, the famines, the disturbances of the eighteenth century and of the beginning of this can show. The relation existing between landlords and tenants prior to 1860 may be explained in a few words. Practically the tenants lived on their land at the will of landlords. They had no leases. By a six months notice to quit they could be evicted without compensation for improvements, or for disturbance. That is, they held on the same terms as people in New Zealand hold who are yearly tenants, s0 far as power to evict is concerned. I am not alluding to Ulster Tenant Right—a right which was really a local custom or customs in certain parts of Ulster. Now, land being limited in quantity, the landlords lould say to their tenants—and they did say to them—unless you pay me an increased rent I will evict you. And, remember, in many intances this threat was uttered by a man who bought the confiscated land, or had it granted to him, to those who were, had they their rights, the lawful owners of the soil. In most cases the tenants agreed—had to agree. For what could they do? Whither were they to flee? No doubt many emigrated, but even those who emigrated did not make the population so sparse as to make land plentiful. And in some cases there were wholesale evictions. This happened in Scotland also. I have seen a small valley, which had been inhabited for hundreds of years by the ancestors of the tenants, left without a human inhabitant by a six months' notice to quit, no compensation given, though all the improvements had been made by the tenants. Then, again, let me mention another thing that often happened in Ireland. The tenant had perhaps reclaimed a bit of bog and added it to his farm—or made some other improvements. As soon as he had done these, his landlord would at once demand from him more rent I have seen the same thing done in Scotland. There were two small farms alongside of one another. One farmer built a comfortable house and a buyer for his cattle; the other put up a very indifferent house, was lazy, and made hardly any improvements. And what do you think the landlord did! He at once gave notice to the industrious farmer that if he did not pay double the rent he had been paying, which was the same at the lazy tenant, he would have to quit. I need not tell you what the result of such conduct as that was—improvements were discouraged.

Having then such a system of land-holding as I have pointed out—a system that permitted a landlord to either drive the inhabitants off the face of the earth or charge them what rent he liked—what could be expected? Tenants agreed to pay rents that simply took all profit from them, and left them to starve, and there arose a bitter feeling against landlords; the desire for improvements was crushed, and as there were not the industries that were in other countries to fall back on—famine often visited Ireland. Then there was another thing that cursed Ireland, that was absenteeism. Even so far back as 1838 the rental that was paid to absentee landlords was about £5,000,000 annually. I have not reliable statistics to enable me to say what it is, or was previous to the present agitation, but I note that one writer says it cannot be under £6,000,000 That is out of a poor country of about 6,000,000 people there is besides the taxes, Ac., taken the enormous sum of £6,000,000. Then there are vast sums paid to landlords who live in Ireland for some time of the year, but who do not expend on the land or in the country, much of their rents. And now I come to two remedial Acts passed by the British Parliament to deal with this land question, and why they have failed I think I shall be able to point out to you. There was passed in 1860 a Landlord and Tenant Act. It was to introduce what some people are clamorous for, Free Trade in land. Shortly put, it provided the following things:—

- The relation of landlord to tenant was founded on contract; that is, what the parties agreed to was to regulate their dealing.
- If a tenant had a written agreement, and after the end of his agreement he continued in possession for one month after the landlord demanded possession, the landlord might treat him as a yearly tenant upon the terms of his previous tenancy under the written agreement.
- Every person who bought the landlord's interest bought his rights against the tenant, and likewise every one who bought the tenant's interest had the same rights against the landlord.
- The person who bought the tenant's lease could not rid himself of his liability by assigning it to any person, unless with the landlord's consent.
- The tenant had the right to remove certain fixtures that could be removed without hurting the land or buildings.
- The tenant could work mines that were opened when the lease began.
- The tenant at rack rent was entitled to hold the land till he got in the corn he had planted, &c.
- If the buildings, &c., let were destroyed, the tenant could surrender his lease.
- The landlord could only distrain for one year's rent.
- If an action of ejectment was begun for non-payment of rent, the action would be stayed on paying rent and costs.

To put it in a word, there was enacted in Ireland the same law of landlord and tenant we have here, save that in two or three cases advantages were given to Irish tenants that are not bestowed on New Zealand tenants.

Distress for rent was limited, and in two or three other things the advantage was on the side of the Irish Tenant. Now, remember that this Act failed. It made the letting of land a mere thing of barter—of buying and selling. The landlord demanded certain terms, and the tenant had to give him these terms or leave the land. That is, the English Parliament chose to say that there was no distinction between land and other property; and as the law allows a baker or a grocer to fix the price of his bread or sugar, and the termson which he will sell it, so the law left the letting and occupation of land to the landlord and the tenant. I hope this will not be forgotten, for I see it loudly asserted in New Zealand that there is no distinction between land and other property, and that the law should recognise no difference. Now, this is just what the Imperial Parliament did in 1860, and their Act was a huge failure. Let me read to you what an able writer—one, certainly, that has written in a most impartial way, and whose political opinion, from his book, I cannot even guess, so free from bias is his work—has said on this Land Act of 1860. I quote Dr Richey's (Professor of English Law in the University of Dublin) book on "The Irish Land Laws, "'published last year:—

"The objection to the application of a land law founded upon contract to the relations of landlords and tenants in Ireland lay, not in the injustice of the law itself, nor in any advantage given by it to the landlord as against the tenant (for the system, as based on pure contract, was strictly just, and the reforms in the law had been made distinctly in favour of the tenant), but in its introduction into a society not adapted for it. As between the landlord and the majority of the tenants, there was not, nor could be, any freedom of contract. The smaller tenants were not possessed of any capital, and lived poorly by their own labour upon their unimproved farms. If deprived of their farms, they had no other means of livelihood; the demand for land so far exceeded the supply that they had no hopes of establishing themselves elsewhere, and therefore the interest of a tenant in a farm fetched a price absurdly large as compared with the returns to be bad from the land. A tenant once turned out of his holding, had no means of existence; to him and his family the loss of his tenancy meant starvation and death. When served with a notice to quit, the farmer was willing to offer any rent for a new letting of his holding, regardless of his ability to pay it in subsequent years. From the very nature of the tenancy from year to year, many tenants naturally regarded their farms as their own property, subject to the payment of the usual

rent. Upon farms held under this tenure, families had lived for generations; the land had been in many cases reclaimed and improved by themselves or their fathers; and when it had not been so they believed that it had. Easy-going and unenterprising, they never realised the possibility of a notice to quit; and when it was served upon them, it seemed an act of unjust oppression, and a sudden destruction.

"The energetic purchaser in the Landed Estates Court generally served notices to quit upon all the yearly tenants with a view to a readjustment of the rents; and having thus increased his income, either congratulated himself upon the large returns upon his investment, or sold to another capitalist his estate, enhanced in value by a fictitious rental."

Seeing, then, that the Act of 1860 bad failed, the Imperial Parliament attempted to help the tillers of the soil by passing another Act—that of 1870. It had three objects—(1) To obtain for the tenants in Ireland security of tenure, (2) to encourage the improving of lands, (3) to create peasant proprietors. Now, here I ask you to note that the English Parliament, by the passing of this very Act, declared that laud was not like other property, and that freedom of contract, as applicable to land, could not be permitted. I need not wade through the five parts of the Act, but I shall shortly state the important points in which an alteration was made in the existing law.

1. The tenant was to be paid compensation if held for a term less than thirty-one years, if disturbed in his holding by his landlord; and any tenant for year to year of a holding rented at not more than £100 per annum, if disturbed by his immediate landlord, is entitled to compensation. The compensation was defined to be—

- If the tenancy be valued on the Government valuation at £10 or under per annum, seven years' rent.
  If valued at or under £30 per annum, five years' rent.
  If valued at or under £40 per annum, four years' rent
  If valued at or under £50 per annum, three years' rent.
  If valued at or under £100 per annum, two years' rent.
  If valued above £100 per annum, one years' rent
- The compensation is in no case to exceed £250.
- No tenant of a holding valued above £10 per annum, and claiming more than four years' rent, and no tenant of a holding valued at less than £10 per annum, and claiming more than five years's rent, shall be entitled to an additional claim for improvements other than permanent buildings and reclamation of waste land."

From this compensation (1) arrears of rent have to be deducted, and (2) damages for deterioration in the holding, or breach of any covenants.

If a tenant sub-lets his holding without written permission, he is not entitled to compensation. If a tenant fails to pay his rent, or fails to perform the terms of his lease, then he only gets compensation for improvements, none for disturbance. A landlord was not bound to accept the assignee of a tenant if he be objectionable, and if he was forced on him, he could evict without paying compensation for improvements. The County Court Judges had to fix the compensation if the parties could not agree. Then the tenant was entitled to certain improvements; but I need not go into all the details and limitations provided in the Act. I may state the tenant was to be entitled to his way-going crop, and had only to pay one-half of the county cess or rate. And I need not dwell on the clauses—the Bright clauses—of the Act for the creation of a peasant proprietorship, for they have not worked well. Nor need I refer to Ulster Tenant Bight. Its five essential rights were—

- The right or custom in general of yearly tenants, or those deriving through them, to continue in undisturbed possession as long as they act properly and pay their rents.
- The correlative right of the landlord perpetually to raise the rent, so as to give him a just, fair, and full participation in the increased value of the lands, but not so as to extinguish the tenants's interest by imposing a rack-rent
- The usage or custom of the yearly tenants to sell their interest, if they do not wish to continue in possession, or if they become unable to pay their rent.
- The correlative right of the landlord to be consulted, and to exercise a potential voice in the approval or disapproval of the proposed assignee.
- The liability of the landlord, on taking land for his own purpose from a tenant, to pay the tenant the fair value of his tenant right."

Now, it is important to remember that this tenant right exists, and has existed in that part of Ireland where there has been the best farming and the least agitation. Indeed, some of those in New Zealand who discuss the Irish question, say look at Ulster, forgetting that there there has been some fixity of tenure, and law, and custom, and public opinion have so far controlled the freedom of contract that a landlord cannot do with his land as if it were his own.

And now I come to the question, seeing that the Irish Land Act of 1870 interfered with the freedom of contract, controlled the letting and provided compensation for eviction, how comes it that ten years after the Act there are famine, distress, and, it is estimated, in one year 10,000 evictions all that is more than all the

farmers in our seaboard driven off their farms, and as in many cases their rents were not paid, and could not be paid—driven off without compensation for disturbances. The point to be asked is was there anything in the Act that prevented the landlords raising the rent? Certainly there was nothing that prevented them keeping the rental atita then amount, and that in hundreds of cases this was too much, I think a reference to Griffiths' valuation will prude—even though Griffiths is not to be taken as correct in every case. Unfortunately there was not. As Professor Richey saya:—

"What the tenants wanted was to be left in quiet occupation of their holdings, to secure which they were willing to pay high, nay, extravagant rents. The measure which they agitated tor was that so long as they paid the rent they should not be disturbed in their possession; the Act passed in 1870 merely made it expensive for the landlord to turn them out. The compensation for disturbance, and compensation for improvements were not what the tenant wanted; this pecuniary compensation was nothing in comparison to the loss of his home and the destruction of his business; a sum of money in hand was no adequate compensation to him, for he knew only two modes of using it, either in stocking a farm or lodging it in a bank upon the security of a deposit receipt. It was doubtless imagined that the landlord would be deterred from serving notices to quit, by the amount of the compensation for disturbance, as statesmen have endeavoured to exclude an article by attaching to its importation a prohibitory duty. If the landlord were wealthy and wanted the laud, he asserted his legal rights, and was ready to pay the legal penalty; the tenant lost his holding and got such damages as he might Supposing the landlord to be not only wealthy, but generous to his tenants, the matter would be worked out in somewhat the following fashion :—The landlord, wishing to get possession, offers to the tenant a sum of money to surrender his interests, which the latter, indignant as a Naboth at the proposal to purchase his vineyard, unhesitatingly refuses; notice to quit follows, and then an ejectment process; the tenant tiles his claim for compensation, putting down for disturbance the actual rate, and claiming compensation for everything done on the lands as an improvement; whether a cowshed was erected, or an old house pulled down; fences built, or ditches levelled; bog reclaimed, or bog cut; everything is an improvement, and not an ounce of bone dust has been put into the lands for the last seven years, nor has a cow crossed the field during that period, which is not entered under the head of unexhausted manure. When the 'land' case comes on, the landlord's witnesses, marshalled by an excited agent, are equal to the occasion; every improvement alleged by the tenant is proved to have been detrimental to the value of the holding; anything erected by the tenant is described as no better than a hovel; any thing which he has palled down as substantial and useful; the ditches levelled were most necessary for drainage; the fences erected render the lands useleas for agriculture; thus the battle of evidence sways to and fro, until the County Court Judge, acting upon his own knowledge of things in general more than the evidence given in the case, makes a decision, liberal in intion, but which often leaves the tenant with less money in his pocket than if he bad accepted the terms which he might originally have obtained. When the market for land is rising, and the tenants begin to compete against each other, the costs of the ejectment, and the compensation payable under the Act are frequently advanced by the incoming tenant, who has undertaken also to pay an increased rent. The consciousness that their present distress is largely due to their own struggles to secure the possesaion of lands, explains the great unpopularity of anyone who is found in possession of a farm which had belonged to another."

And now I come to the remedies for Ireland. Coercion Bills are no remedy : Ireland has now had 49 Coercion Bills since 1830, and have they succeeded? Ireland's population has decreased, her industries have not increased, and her people are dying for lack of food. What then is proposed? First I wish to speak of Home Rule. Mr John Stuart Mill, in 1868, said the Irish were loyal in the colonies—why? "They have the land; they have no sectarian church; they have even a separate legislature. All this they have under the British crown and the British flag. If you gave all this to Ireland the people would be tranquil enough there." And though Home Rule is not, in my opinion, a panacea for Irish ills, I do not see why there should not have been granted to Ireland a Provincial Parliament. Why should not Ireland be allowed to manage her own affairs, only sending up to represent her in what would be a Parliament dealing with Imperial and not local concerns, some of her ablest men? Do we not see how this question is forcing itself on the attention of able men who are not Irishmen. Dr Bain, lately Professor of Logic in Aberdeen, a clear, bard-headed Scotchman, sees that at present the business men of the nation cannot be members of Parliament. To attend to the business properly they would require not only to live constantly in London, but whilst there to do little or nothing else. Now even in such a wealthy country as England, bow many men can afford to do this? Do the English people not lose the services of some of their ablest men by having a Parliament sitting so long, and having to attend to so many parish and local concerns? The evil is seen, and Dr Bain makes some suggestions how this evil may be lessened. Whether or no we have this problem in New Zealand, where our sessions are only about three months, you oan answer, I believe it will yet be found that the idea of that illustrious Frenchman. Augusta Comte, was not far wrong, and that small republics with confederations will work better than large centralised governments. But what harm could happen to England if Ireland was allowed, as a colony is allowed, to govern herself? It has been said that

the Catholic Church will rule Ireland, and that Catholicism will thus get fresh life. Now, I am not a Catholic; I have no desire to see Catholicism increase, and yet that argument would not have the slightest effect on me, and I think it should effect no one. Those who believe that we live in a world where there are

One God, one law, one element,
And one fir-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves;

and that our duty is to do justice, leaving the issue to the future; ought not to consider anything save this—what is the just thing to do. If we believe that, as intelligence increases, and that if the Catholic Church is wrong, her power will decrease, why should we be afraid to do what is right. Let her have power and I believe that what we have seen taking place on the continent of Europe we will see happening in Ireland. What do we witness in Belgium, in Spain, in Italy, in Portugal, in France? There will be developed two parties in Ireland, just as we have two parties here. There will be the Conservative party—or, as they are termed on the continent, the Party of Reaction—and there will also be the Liberal party—the Party of Progress. If it is right to grant Home Rule, let it be given. To do justice, I repeat, is our first duty, and I hope we all believe that no harm can come to humanity from so acting.

But granting Home Rule will not save Ireland. There must be a radical change in landholding and in the ideas of property in land, and this the Irish Land League see, I am not here to defend everything that every member of the Land League may have done or said. Unfortunately for England and the English it seems impossible to get any great Legislative effort completed until the people and Parliament get worked up into a state of excitement bordering on terror, History tells us what happened before liberty was granted and justice done to the Catholics by the Emanci pation Act. We also know what had to precede the Reform Act of 1832, How near to a Revolution were parts of England. Then we witnessed the struggles for the Extension of the Franchise before the Representation of People's Act became law. Hardly one step towards freedom is taken unless a revolution is threatened. If agitation ceases, oh why pan remedial measures? Are the people not content? They are quiet. It is the absurd method of legislating adopted by the English people that leads to the necessity for agitation. And whenever you have agitation—prolonged popular agitation—coupled with dire distress and much injustice, you must expect men to pass the limit of justifiable agitation. But let me state two things. (1.) I believe that the very fact of there being a Land League has prevented crime and revolt. The people have been trained, as the great O'Connell fought hard to train them, to look to peaceful means for the remedy of their grievances. The popular enthusiasm has, therefore, been diverted into a safer channel than Fenian organisations. And but for the League there would have been efforts, I believe, at open revolt. Then (2.) do not believe the half you read about agrarian outrages. With all the poverty and misery and agitation in Ireland, crime is not relatively more than in England. And as for not obtaining convictions for crime, I do not know if Irish juries are any wor:e or better than juries that are to be found amongst ourselves. I have a list of offences called agrarian, and to show you bow absurd is the method of classification, I'll quote one or two for you; they are taken from the list furnished to the House of Commons by the Ministry as an excuse for the Coercion Act:—

"William Harding—Firing at the person.—Mr Harding, senior, made a will leaving his farm to his younger son, William, to the exclusion of Thomas Harding, who had come from America in expectation of getting the land. This caused disagreement among them, hence the assault by Rosanna Harding, wife of the elder son, Thomas. She threw stones at him, then a basin of water, and finally fired a shot at him from a pisto He was not injured."

"William Marley—Incendiary fire.—About 9 o'clock p.m. Marley's a house was found to be on fire, which was extinguished before much injury resulted. About two years ago Timothy Rabbit got married to the widow of Marley's son. She expected to inherit her father-in-law's house and plot of ground, but Marley sent for his daughter to America, and she returned and got married about a week before this outrage."

"Thomas Ross—Injury to property.—On September 25, 1880, a cock of hay, the property of Thomas Roach, was maliciously thrown down and damaged considerably."

"On the night of the 1st October, three cocks of hay, the property of James Irwin, were maliciously thrown down, and almost thrown into the River Shannon."

Now, these are samples of what are termed agrarian outrages, and they are thus classed in the Parliamentary Papers.

I tell you that the Irish have been moat patient under their troubles. I do not approve of war; neither civil war in Ireland nor war at the Transvaal nor in Afghanistan. All wars are wrong in my eyes; and he who first invaded the Transvaal, and those who ordered the Afghans to be shot down, are just as criminal, I believe, in

the eye of strict justice as those who shot the landlord. And yet men who properly condemn murder in Ireland write that they think the Boers should have been conquered—that is, be me thousands of homes should have been made desolate by the death of the father or the brother before justice was dona If, however, we are to have contrasts between Ireland and other countries, let me ask you to consider what the Scotch would have done under similar circumstances to those in which the Irish nation has been placed. Let me suppose Episcopacy bad been forced on Scotland, and no Presbyterian allowed to occupy any office, or to trade, or to hold land, or to worship, and trade had keen prevented and their lands taken from them and divided amongst Southerners, what would the Scotch have done? I venture to any that the King who attempted that would net have lived long, and I venture also to add that the Scotch would have fought, and fought, until victory crowned their arms. Can we blame, then, the Irish people taking the more peaceable means of League agitation. The League has adopted the proper quesations on which to raise discuaaion—(1) Land holding, aad (2) Rent paying. These comprehend all. And here again, I must ask you to bear in mind what land is. From the way some people talk and write you might imagine that there was no radical and never-to-b-got-over distinction between land and other property. Now, I assert that those who are unable to see such a distinction have not mastered the ABC of either political economy or of statesmanship. First, land is a natural agent It is the producer. The things produced may not produce again. You may get gold from the land, but what will gold produce? If you have land you have the mother of all things Then, land is limited in quantity, and though you may increase its productiveness you cannot increase its area. And note, that once you pass a certain line you have the lew of diminishing returns—that is, after a time, before you can get it to produce anything more, it coats more relatively in labour and capital The production of many "moveables "—to use a good Scotch law phrase—is almost unlimited; the immoveable—the land—cannot be produced. Then another great difference between land and other property is that, as population increases, as material progress extends—that is, as machinery, education, and all the other things we call progress develop—land rises in price. Wheat may fall, but land rises. How is this? Land is a monopoly, and the theory of rent brings that out; for it is laid down that in the price of a product—we may say wheat or osta—there are three things—(1) The return for the capital expended, (2) the return for the labour expended, and (3) a residuum called rent. Now, what is this rent? It is a payment that the person who uses the land can afford to give for its monopoly. For his capital he gets something, for his labour something, and for his monopoly something. But I might show you what stating that land is like other property means a I suppose most people are horrified at Communism. Well, I do not believe in a social system having that doctrine as its basis Probably the human race may in some far distant millenial era be able to live under such a rule. It is not ready now, and we have got to deal with the pr sent. But if there is no distinction between land and other property, how is socialism to be stemmed? There being permission to every man to use his property as he pleases, all property being alike, the law will not put any restrictions on the use of land that are not put on the user of other property. Has any State ever sanctioned such an idea? A man is permitted to use his gold, his silver, his personal property as he likes, but no State can afford to say that a man may use the land as he likes. It is the patrimony of the State; without it, how is the State to exist! Indeed, if there was no distinction, we would be reduced to what a Maori legislator predicted—the only thing left for the people would be the roads. Let me illustrate further. Suppose there was admitted the right of a landowner to do as he liked with his land, he might demand to have a whole county or town obliterated, so far as human habitation was concerned. No; all States, civilised and uncivilized, have had to recognise the right of the law to control for the public good the manner of holding land; and if you do not recognise the distinction you lead the way to Socialism of the most radical type. What I ask is the central truth of the individual system as opposed to Socialism. Is it not this—" The indestructible basis of the right of property is labour ?" Remove that foundation, and how are you going to meet Socialistic doctrines! Apply this doctrine to land. You did not make the land. All that you made is yours, but the land yon did not make—it is the State's. The land your absolute property, is it? By what right are you allowed to monopolise the earth's surface? I reply, only by the right granted by the State, and only so far as the State sees it is for its benefit. As the great German jurist (Ihering) has said, "There is no such thing as absolute property—as property, that is, independent of the consideration of the interests of the community; and history has taken care to inculcate this maxim into the minds of all nations." If, then, you hear a New Zealand politician talking of the land as not different from other property, you may at once conclude that he is in favour of a few having a monopoly of the earth's surface, and that he will fight for the landlord class.

Let me again impress on you the distinction between the land and other property, and let me quote to you the words of an able political economist (Professor Cairnes), clearly showing the distinction:—

"A bale of cloth, a machine, a house, owes its value to the labour expended upon it, and belongs to the person who expends, or employs the labour; a piece of land owes its value—so far as its value is affected by the causes I am now considering—not to the labour expended upon it, but to that expended upon something else—to the labour expended in making a railroad, or in building houses in an adjacent town; and the value thus added to the land belongs, not to the persons who have made the railway or built the houses, but to some

one who may not even be aware that these operations are being carried on—nay, who perhaps has exerted all his efforts to prevent their being carried on."

And here I come to the remedy of the League. It is seen that the three parts in which the return of the laud should be divided, (l) the interest for capital expended on improvements, (2) the wages for labour, (3) the payment for the monopoly—that is, the rent, (1 have not time in this lecture to point out the distinctions between economic rent, rack rent, &c.) that the last-named has swallowed up the other two. That is through the power of the landlord to raise the rent and to evict, and through the competition amongst the people for land, caused by the increase in population and the absence of other industries or means of living; the rents are so high that the land can in many instances not return sufficient to pay the rents, far less give wages or a return for capital. To remedy this the tenants demand—and demand rightly—that, the indestructible basis of the right of property being labour, capital and labour must first have a return—the payment for the monopoly must follow, not precede these. Fixity of tenure at fair rents, is one way to settle this. On one estate—the Portcarron—the landlord and tenant difficulty was settled by both parties agreeing to lease on terms such as these—which, you will see, approach more closely to what is termed a fee in Scotland, than to an ordinary lease:—

The term is 10,000 years. The rent is fixed every 10 years according to the rise or fall of the price of ten articles of farm produce, mentioned in the schedule to the lease. There is provision for forfeiture of the lease on (*a*) non-payment of the rent, (6) a subdivision of the farm, *(c)* sub-letting without consent, *(d)* waste or injury to the farm; and there is reserved to the landlord all game, woods, minerals, quarries, and watercourses.

It is stated that so far these terms have been accepted, and both parties are pleased. And possibly the Irish Land Act that Messrs Gladstone and Bright bring in, though not going this length, will yet give some fair terms to the tenant. But without the agitation of the League, and prolonged agitation, too, you will find that—with a House of Land lords, such as the House of Lords in England is—the tenants will be but scurvily treated. To my mind, there can be no settlement of the land question till two things are recognised and acted on—(1) The land is the State's, (2) the increase of the value of the land, caused by population and material progress, belongs to the State, not to the landlord. If these principles were followed, the tenant would be looked upon as the user of the land. Everything he did by way of improvements, that were unexhausted, belonged to him. The results of his labour he should reap. But the land—the natural agent—is the State's; and if land increased in value, not by his exertions, but by the development of the State, the State should reap the advantage of that. How the land so increases, we have hundreds of instances here in this very town. Let me tell you what we all have seen happening. Two men got two sections of land, perhaps, adjoining. They got them for £12 10s each. One went and lived on his section—he improved it; he helped to build up the town. The other owner did nothing to his land. But the town improved, and that meant his land improved; and after a few years, instead of being worth the price he paid for it, it would fetch twenty, nay, sometimes a hundred times what he paid for it. What made its value increase? It was the growth of the town, of material prosperity. Now, who should reap that increase? Surely the State. But what about the Irish landlords? They have had right granted them by law; on the faith that these rights would be respected, they bought. Many of them have sunk their all in the purchase of hind. Are they to be made beggars? I advocate no such measure. What they paid can be ascertained. Some paid nothing—some hold their land as some hold perpetual pensions, as grants for services rendered. That I need not mention. But let all be fairly treated. If the Church funds had been properly treated, I believe they would have gone a long way to create a peasant proprietary. 1 deny their right to get what they may term the value. Great care will no doubt have to be exercised in dealing with them; but this I may say, that a nation that dealt as England dealt with her slave-owners, will no doubt deal justly—aye, more than justly, with them.

And now I must ask you to consider what lessons Ireland's state teaches us I hope and believe that none of us are so inhuman as not to feel for her sufferings. The man who asks you to consider New Zealand finance, and not think of his fellow men suffering from poverty and from distress, has not much soul. Luckily there are few such. We are all feeling now that humanity is one, and when famine and distress visit any place we offer them relief—even be they natives of India or China, But the Irish have a peculiar claim upon us. They have been persecuted and made what they are by the English Parliament, and we cannot expect a reformation all at once. Development is allow, and once a race is deprived of industries, of education, and made poor, it takes some time before the scale can be again ascended by it.

But merely sympathising with her sufferings, even helping her people to recover themselves, does not comprehend all our duty. We are the founders of a nation, and consequently a heavy responsibility rests on us to see that we so shape our lawa that the destiny of New Zealand may be great, glorious, and free. And are there not finger-por-poste, nay, beacons of warning in Ireland's history, allowing us what to avoid. The first lesson, I think, Ireland's history teaches us is the extreme danger of allowing any Church or sect to rule in secular politics—and not, indeed, Ireland's history alone, but all histories. Let a Church rule and you get an enforced conformity; you get hypocrisy, or a breach of the Jaw. I hope it will never be able to be said in New Zealand that a man's religion or want of religion affects his status as a citizen. Do not think this is not a danger that has

to be avoided. Men so train themselves to think that the inculcation of their peculiar opinions is needed for the safety of the State that they fight for their inculcation not as a religions but a political question. Whenever you see a class or party of men stating that unless their views are taught the morality or safety of the people is in jeopardy, you have the beginning of the demand for exclusive privileges for a religious sect, and I suppose even in Dunedin we have heard something of this.

Surely we at this day will determine to live as citizens, allowing each other to worship as he pleases, and refusing to annex a disability to any expression of opinion. Then there is another lesson I think we may lean, and that is, that one big legislature is not always a guarantee a country will be cheaply or well governed. Whether we need or not to profit by Ireland's lesson in this respect I do not require to state. Some people say, look at the union of England and Scotland, why should not Ireland a union have been as successful? I admit that Scotland's union with England has not injured Scotland, but do not forget there is almost a Scottish Parliament maintained, for I believe I am right in saying that no Act dealing with Scottish affairs hase ver been passed by the Imperial Parliament that was not considered by the Scotch members amongst themselves, and approved of by a majority of them. This was never attempted in reference to Irish Act.

Then there is the land question. Have we not something to learn here? I look upon the fight the Irish Land League is making as a fight for the agriculturist all over the world. It is not a religious question. Some of the ablest members of the League, like Charles Stewart Parnell, are Protestants, and Charles Russell says that Catholic landlords are no better than Protestant landlords. Indeed, he gives one instance where a Catholic landlord treated his tenantry as harshly as any have been treated in Ireland. The fight is, whether there is to be poverty and distress amongst the agriculturists, or whether the standard of living is to be raised, and plenty take the place of poverty. The battle has been fought before. When the great social and political upheaval called the French Revolution took place, the condition of the French tenants was perhaps worse than those in Ireland. Carlyle has said—"The widow is gathering nettles for her children's dinner; a perfumed seigneur, delicately lounging in the [*unclear:* Ceil] de Boeuf, hath an alchemy whereby he will extract from her the third nettle and call it rent" But look at the French peasant now. He is the most thrifty in Europe, and France, as a result of that, recovered quicker from the great duel than Germany, and there is less landlordism in France than in England or Ireland. The battle of the Irish peasants to-day will be that of the English and Scotch to-morrow, and when the battle is won, as it must be, we will see the whole land system changed. If we had only been wise in our time what might we not have done? We might, as a Colony, have been receiving sufficient rents from our lands to have done without taxes, and possibly we might have had far less debt. If we had said to the colonists : the land is the State's, just as the gold-mines are the State's; but if you pay us for the right to use the land a fair price, then the produce of the land is yours. You will have a fixed tenure so long as you use the land, and the improvements you make are your own; but we—that is the State—must be paid for the monopoly you obtain. But we lost our opportunity, and though we have got much valuable land left, public opinion in the Colony is not yet ripe for the nationalisation of land. It is true that in 1878 our Parliament passed two Acta of great import on this land question. (1.) An Administration Act, which, being re-passed in 1879, is now law. By it there is no going of land to the eldest son, nor any primogeniture. The land is to go as the statutes provide personal property is to be distributed. And this Act will yet have a good effect, for it will help to prevent the accumulation of property such as we see even taking place here. And the Land Tax Act, an Act which recognised the distinction between land and property was also passed. It in effect said land is the State's, and part of the increase of the value of the land caused by no effort of the landowners must go to the Government. The Government, that is, the people as a whole, has by expenditure of borrowed millione improved the lands, held by certain proprietors, and these proprietors should help to pay the interest and sinking and of the borrowed millions, But it recognised the rights of both capital and labour, and hence all improvements were exempted from the tax. The only thing taxed was the land, as if it bad been unimproved. Unfortunately this beneficent measure was repealed. We have heard it called a measure of confiscation, that is to say, a tax of a halfpenny on the value of land to sell without improvements is confiscation; but a tax of a penny on the value of land to sell with improvements is a fair tax. I believe, however, as this land question gets to be understood the people will tee it to be for their advantage to make part of the rent, part of the payment, for the monopoly go to the State, and not to their advantage to take part of a man's labour and capital for the State as the present Property Assessment Act now does. I earnestly ask you not to think that the land question is at end when the Government sells the land. It is when the land is all sold that the real land question begins. We live in a democratic country, and we must never forget that "Democracies which fail to preserve equality of conditions, and in which two hostile classes, the rich and the poor, find themselves face to face, are doomed to anarchy and subsequent despotism." And there is another thing that we are taught by reland'a sad history—the absolute need of industrial enterprise. No country ever becomes great, or can be permanently prosperous, if it has to depend on only one or two industries. There must be diversified industries not merely for the sake of wealth, but also as an educating factor in our social life. It is the true industrial spirit that creates peace and harmony—that leada to

the march of science and to the culture of the intellect. Are we fully alive to this. We see in some other colonies that the need of varied manufactures and industries is fully recognised. Let us not forget the injury Ireland sustained—an injury that still shows its effects in her social state—from the suppression of her trade and manufactures, and let us determine that whatever we do, we shall encourage and foster the industrial spirit. And, lastly. I think Irish history teaches us the benefits of being united as a nation. The worst friends of Ireland have often been found in her own household. Even now-a-days in New Zealand we see attempts to revive the feuds and animosities of the past. What should be our aim? Should it not be "To show that conscientious and honest difference of opinion on religion is not inconsistent with kindly feeling, with friendly intercourse in daily life, with mutual help in distress or difficulty, with harmony of action on all questions touching the common good; and as Professor Whitrow, he who is the historian of Boyne and Aghrim, of Derry and Enniskillen, speaking of certain anniversary days, asks—' is it a duty which we owe to God and our country to celebrate the victories of our ancestors in any form that is calculated to excite the prejudices and provoke the ill-will of neighbours, with whom, though we differ in religion, yet we come into contact in the everyday business or life, and to whom we are bound by ties of citizenship and of mutual service and obligation? Is it not quite possible to cherish the remembrance of great actions without doing anything that living men may justly regard as a provocation and an insult. . . . A great man,' he adds, 'rights if he must fight, and shakes hands with a gallant, when the fight is over; but no truly brave man ever insults the, vanquished by reminding him and his, years afterwards, of the defeat.'"

As colonial let us not revive the feuds our fathers fought. We have enemies to fight; we have to fight poverty and ignorance, diaease and superstition. Let us fight them; they will tax all our energies. We have to see the standard of living is kept up, and fight for that. For depend upon it if wages fall and men are deprived of good homes, good food, good clothes, and some leisure, we will have the race degraded,—let us never forget that Then we have to give each other help. We are not so long after all on this earth as not to spend our time in doing good if we can. May we not, then, atrive to—

Stand to together brothers all,
Stand together, stand together;
To live or die, to rise or fall,
Stand together, stand together.

And may we not ask Irishmen to take up the refrain, and say—

From Kerry's cliffs to Donegal
Bound in heart and soul together.

Printed by MACKAY, BRACKEN & Co., Moray Place, Dunedin.
Front Cover

Robert Stout

Impressions of a Visit to Europe.
By Sir Robert Stout.
J. W. Kealy, The Book Exchange. Auckland. 1910.

Impressions of a Visit to Europe.

By Sir Robert Stout.

No. I.

Cities.

No one's memory can give all that is seen or heard, and it is a good thing that it is so. A wealth of detail brings about that state of mind that is summed up in an old aphorism of "not seeing the wood for trees." When,

after you have paid a visit to a place, a person asks you what impressed you, it is not expected that you will reply as if you examined what you saw with a microscope. It is the big things that exist in your memory—it is the general outlook to which the inquiry is addressed. It is what remains in your memory after the small details have been forgotten, that I call "impressions" or "recollections," and I purpose to jot down some of the things I saw.

However numerous the men and women may be we have seen, there are no two alike. It is said sometimes that a person has a double, but place the so-called double alongside the original and a difference to an observant person will be at once apparent. There are varieties in tiling as in persons; and if we examined common things like blades of grass or leaves of clovers, do we not see that each blade or each leaf has an individuality of its own? In visiting cities you see that no two are alike, and every one has something that seems to dominate it. I noticed this in every city I visited. The city that impressed me most was the greatest city in the world London; and apart from its great size, its variety, its millions of peoples, two things seemed to dominate it—St Paul's Cathedral and the Houses of Parliament—or the Church and the world. It has, of course, thousands of fine buildings, fine churches, houses that have a history, but these two buildings seemed to stand as its sentinels The new Catholic cathedral is a massive building, and there are the Royal Exchange, the Mansion House, Westminster Abbey, etc., but, after you have considered them all, the impression of London being dominated by St Paul's and the Houses of Parliament remains.

If you enter some of the leading buildings I think you will be most impressed with the British Museum; its vast library, its books, pamphlets, etc., and its treasures from all parts of the world. The building is only striking by its vastness. I cannot say I was so much impressed with the National Gallery. Many of the pictures are priceless, and when I stood before a painting of Holbein's, for which a fabulous sum had recently been given, I confess I thought the money could have been better spent in helping young artists. I would prefer to spend some hours in the Tate Gallery, among modern pictures, than amongst the famed pictures of the famous artists of long ago.

It is the boulevards of Paris that remain in your memory more than the buildings, though you may admire the beautiful Notre Dame, the Madeleine, and the great church on Montmartre. If you go to Glasgow, it is not the busy banks of the Clyde, and the well-built and fine stone houses of Glasgow's well-to-do citizens in the West End, not the endless traffic and business of the city, nor St. Mungo's Cathedral that you dwell upon. It is Glasgow's educational institutions that most impress yon. Perched on one of its hills, on the finest site in Glasgow, stands a noble pile of buildings. What are they? A church? No. It is the university, and when you ascend the hill, and pass through the building to its library, its museum, its pictures, its manuscripts, its professors' houses, etc., you are forced to the conclusion that the Glasgow people have placed education first. This impression will be intensified if you visit what was once the Andersonian University, and is now the Technical College of Glasgow and the West of Scotland. Here, indeed, io a noble building. It is not yet finished, but its cost up to the present has exceeded £400,000. It has 13 miles of corridors, and its floor-space is about eight acres. Within its walls eight thousand students are trained in the practical things of life. Docs a young Glaswegian wish to learn to bake bread? Here he will be scientifically taught, nothing is haphazard. So in dyeing, in printing, in drawing, in electrical engineering, etc. Not far from the University are the Art Gallery and the Botanic Gardens, both educational institutions, and both equal to any in large cities, even if Paris be compared with Glasgow.

There are public libraries also—the Mitchell and the Baillie. The latter is not large, but it is comfortable, well arranged, and a good place to study in. Glasgow is the foremost city in municipal organisation. It has city trams, city water, city baths, city washing-houses, etc., and it is not surprising that its public institutions are a credit to its people. It has more than one hospital—the Western Infirmary is up-to-date, and its maternity hospital is a large and magnificent building. Its municipal buildings can challenge comparison with any anywhere. It local governors, the provost, baillies—magistrates as they are called—and councillors are able, keen, well-informed men. I met many of them in the provost's room, and I saw no men anywhere more keen and more alive to the social problems of the day, and better informed as to all the attempted solutions, than the Glasgow magistrates. Happy is the city that has such men to control its civic affairs!

Manchester is an English Glasgow, a busy manufacturing centre, with keen business men controlling it. Its university looms large, and its art gallery is excellent. The Rylands Library is housed in a building just as fine as some of the old churches about which much enthusiasm is evoked. It looks like a church. It is a church filled with books. Its staircase is a fine specimen of architecture, and shows that the art of building is not a lost art. We can build better than our fathers built. The impression Manchester gives you is that you are amongst workers. The Municipal Technical College is a vast building, well managed, well arranged, and here you will find all the manufacturing processes, weaving, dyeing, printing, baking, etc., taught. It is hardly so large as Glasgow, but Glasgow has a later building—Manchester led the way.

Edinburgh is dominated by its history. Its castle, Holy rood, and Carlton Hill are its Trinity, though it has

the finest hospital I saw. Every detail is attended to, and the hospital kitchen, with no smoke, no grime, no fires, but with hot water, gas, and electricity, is worth a visit to Edinburgh, even if you had nothing else to see. Its university is hid, though it has a fine hall, McEwan Hall, the gift of one of its citizens, open to view. Edinburgh has also one of the finest streets I saw in any city—if not the finest—namely Princes Street. It is unique, and its beauty grows on you so much that after a time you think that there is no other street in Edinburgh. There are many streets, however, that in other towns would be thought fine streets. If you go up to the castle, and walk round its ramparts and visit the noted places, you can fancy you hear what Aytoun's ballad describes, the news of Flodden. Then in Holyrood you tread historically holy ground, and no Scotchman visits either castle or palace without recalling the past of his country.

In Aberdeen it is Marischal College that dominates the city. It is a new and magnificent building, and you can see it from almost any part of Aberdeen. The granite city, as it is called, is a university city, and a thriving business centre as well. It has its ancient university, with its two colleges, and it has an improved harbour, manufactures, ship-building, and is a fishing centre, etc. It has fine parks, and a small winding river, and fine dwellings, with a hard look, through the material used. I had been in Aberdeen in 1863. I was there in the early morning, and I wished to know if there was any difference amongst its workers 46 years later. Then I saw workers going into spirit shops "for the morning," as it was called, before going to their work. I saw none of that in 1909. I was told the public-houses did not open till nine. One thing I saw that rather astonished me was the number of women and children going into baker's shops for fresh bread and rolls, and coming out carrying steaming bread for breakfast. Surely porridge is better than fresh bread! Is it that the trouble of cooking is got rid of, or is it that the taste for oatmeal has passed away? I doubt if the young Aberdonians will be as well served with fresh wheaten bread as with oatmeal porridge.

Aberdeen University has a fine library, and though I visited it in the recess, there were many readers in the library. The glory of the university has been its able teachers and its many distinguished students. Its people have always loyally supported its educational institutions, and its town council gave £30,000 for its new college buildings. As in Glasgow, so in Aberdeen, they made no fuss about Governors' residences and visits of the Sovereign. If the Sovereign comes he is loyally welcomed, but with practical Scotch people university education is ever more important than even Royal visits. Scotch universities flourish because the people have a passion for education, and no university will flourish anywhere if there is not the passion for culture. If we place social pleasures, balls, dances, etc., before university education, we will not become an educated people.

In Switzerland the cities are secondary to their surroundings. Lucerne is dominated by "Pilatus" and "Righi," Geneva by the distant "Mont Blanc," Lugano by its lake, and Pallanza by Lake Maggiore and the Borromean Isles—like green oases in its blue waters. On one of the islets I found New Zealand trees flourishing—the rimu, the cabbage tree, and many New Zealand shrubs; also some Australian eucalypti. In Switzerland, mountains and lakes count more than city buildings. In Geneva, the ancient university founded by Calvin flourishes. The cathedral of St. Peter, a fine Gothic building, is in the hands of the Presbyterians, and at service there you can understand why in Scotland the people used to sit at singing and stand at prayer. In St. Peter's that is the custom to-day, and it seems to me more reverential and more manly than sitting at prayer and standing at singing. The service in the cathedral was very fine, and the preacher was an eloquent broad churchman, so broad that I wonder what John Calvin would have said had he been present. A fine monument is being erected to the reformers by the Genevese, and John Knox has not been forgotten. There is a monument to Rousseau in his favourite dwelling-place, Geneva, and monuments of many kinds in and near the city, but the monument that will surely strike a stranger most is that erected in the suburb of Champel, in the Rue Michel Servet. It is a granite monument, and on one side there is the inscription in French of which the following is the translation: "Respectful and grateful sons of Calvin, our great reformer, condemning a mistake which was common in his age, but firmly adhering to liberty of conscience according to the Reformation and the Gospel, have erected this expiatory monument, the xxvii. October, MCMIII.'" On the other side there appears in French this intimation: "On the 27th October, 1553, died at the stake in Champel, Michel Servet, of Villencuve D'Arragon, born 29th September, 1511." I wonder what other church has erected monuments to its victims of persecution. I came from the monument much impressed with the Geneva Calvinists and their courage and enlightenment.

In Brussels the two things that will impress the visitor is the square in which the Town Hall and other guild halls stand, and their quaint buildings, and the Grand Palace of Justice, THE building in Brussels. It is one of the finest buildings I saw anywhere, but I had in my mind's eye, however, the Congo atrocities, and I could not understand how a people that could erect such palatial buildings for the administration of justice could have sanctioned the brutal horrors and atrocities in the Congo.

No. II.

Churches.

"Homo sum, et humani a me nil alienum puto."—Terence.
"Religious beliefs play a great part in the life of humanity."—

J. G. Fraser.

Terence's aphorism, quoted above, comes to mind when one desires to say something about the religions of mankind. Every race has its religion, and behind all religions there is a vast past. "Our creeds," far more than "our deeds," still "travel with us from afar." St. George Impart in his book on "Contemporary Evolution," and Professor J. G. Fraser in the "Golden Bough" and in "Psyche," etc., both tell us how far back the roots of popular religions extend.

When I visited the Buddhist temples in Ceylon this truth came home to me. The Buddhists of the present day have beliefs and practices that were quite foreign to the ancient Gautama and his immediate followers. They do not follow the rules he laid down, but, incorporated in their religion, there are beliefs and practices he would not have sanctioned, and which he spent his life in condemning. But is that not always what comes after some generations, amongst the followers of a religious reformer? In the Buddhist temples of to-day there are images and pictures of what appears, it is said, in Hell, the tortures inflicted on sinners. Looking at the pictures they seem as if reproduced from a little pamphlet that was published, by Christians, some 20 or 30 years ago; and in these temples Buddha—the Lord Buddha—is worshipped as a god, and sacrifices of flowers, etc., are made to his image. There are monks, too, living near the temples, who have made the vows of obedience, chastity, and poverty. A Buddhist, who was my guide, said they were holy men, who lived an ascetic life on only one meal a day, and who spent their time in prayer, etc. And no doubt they are just as devoted as monks and ascetics in other countries. The ascetic life appeals to some in all civilisations. Have we not all read Tennyson's "St. Simeon Stylites," and was there not an ancient Greek, a Diogenes, and in Palestine the Esscnes?

All Buddhist temples have images of the Buddha. Some of these are very large, and Buddha is in a reclining position. The temples have much tesselatcd work, are clean, and have shrines, and, as I have said, pictures. How different from what Buddha preached? Perhaps the best little book to read in order to get an idea of the early Buddhism is that of Professor T. W. Rhys-Davids, published by Archibald Constable and Company, in the "Religions Ancient and Modern" series. From it we will learn that Buddha did not teach either prayer or sacrifice. "The Eightfold Path" was: "Right Views, Right Aspirations, Right Speech, Right Conduct, Right Mode of Livelihood, Right Effort, Right Mindfulness, and Right Rapture," and, as Professor David says in the early Buddhism, "There is not a word about God or the soul, not a word about Buddha or Buddhism." Now Buddha is a god, and there are tales of future punishment, and prayers and shrines, and sacrifices and monks, etc., etc The things that Gautama denounced are present in Buddhism, and he has been made a god! To understand how this has happened, one has only to become acquainted with the religions that preceded Gautama's preaching, and with what has ever occurred after the promulgation of a new faith. The old cult influences the new, and becomes incorporated with it.

There are many Buddhist temples, and as all visitors give some coins to the keepers it is profitable to have temples near where tourists visit. So much is this the case that I was told a new temple had been erected near Mount Lavinia for the benefit of the tourists. The Cingalese are mainly Buddhists. There are, however, Christian missions with converts attached to them, and there are Hindus with their temples, and some Mohammedans and their mosques. It does not seem to me that the religion of the natives makes much difference in their conduct. In coming back from Mount Lavinia to Colombo in a rickshaw, which I had taken so as to go off the main road and visit the many temples on the way, my rickshaw man felt the heat oppressive. It was intensely hot, and with the bush on each side of the road there was no breeze to cool the air. The driver of a passing carriage was accosted by my rickshaw man, and the result was that he was allowed to fix his rickshaw to the tail of the carriage, and we thus got a pull for about a couple of miles, when we stopped to visit a Hindu temple. I asked the rickshaw man what he would have to pay, and he said: "Oh, nothing, I give him drink when we go to Colombo." "But," I said, "you are, I understand, a Buddhist, and a Buddhist does not drink." "Yes," he answered, "but he Christian."

In the Hindu temples there are images of the gods of the Hindus, and which have been made known to us by small images and pictures, and these temples have their attendants, who expect some small payment for the view of their sacred places.

There are in Colombo various Christian temples, Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, and I saw

one mosque.

At Port Said I visited the Greek Church. It was Easter Sunday, and the church was crowded. In the outer porch a great trade was being carried on in the sale of candles—candles that had been blessed by the priests, and which, in consequence of such blessing, sold for a much greater price than the same candles in a store. The worshippers, with a candle in their hand, approached an icon which was on the right-hand side, and before which many candles were burning, lit the candie and held it before the picture of the saint. On the left-hand side there was also an ikon with candles before it, but it was not so popular as the one on the right-hand side. At one time there must have been 20 or 30 candles burning in fixed sockets before the popular ikon, and many more were held in the hands of the devout surrounding it. Service was going on. Priests in fine-coloured vestments, and bearded, were flitting backwards and forwards before the altar, on which were candles burning and many flowers. The choir—male voices only—were sonorously singing, the people in half the church were seated, and more men than women, and in the other half people were moving about, some with candles, some chatting, and a few at the sides were kneeling. There were pictures of the cross, but no images, and as it was a bright sunny day, the sun was pouring in and made the candle-light pale. Not half the audience seemed to be following the service. In this service, as in the Buddhist temples, perhaps the "old cults" were represented.

Leaving the Greek Church I went to a mosque, and the contrast was great. Here there was a puritanism in all the surroundings. You had on entrance to put on a covering over your shoes. There were no images, no candles, and individuals were in praying attitude, kneeling towards Mecca. One worshipper, and one only, seated on the ground, was reciting or rather chanting some prayer in a low voice. The priest took us to a back room, and showed us some ancient manuscripts in Arabic, and a long sword which had, it was said, belonged either to Mahommed or one of his immediate followers. At the door were some poor men asking alms. The Mahommedans made you welcome to the mosque. This has not always been so, but I suppose being under British rule they have become more tolerant of the "infidels" than their fathers were. A reference to the Hibbert Journal for April last will show what Moslem sermons are preached nowadays.

I was in many Catholic cathedrals and churches in France. The two prominent buildings in Marseilles are Catholic churches. I was in the Madeleine, Notre Dame, and the Sacred Heart at Montmartre, etc., in Paris. I was in these churches at various hours and on various days—week days and Sundays—and at early mass, between seven and eight a.m. On none of the occasions were the majority of the worshippers men. I was at a marriage at the Madeleine, at a first communion at Montmartre, etc. The services in these great cathedrals are similar to what we see in Catholic churches in our Dominion. The church in Montmartre is, I think, the grandest church in Paris, though not so beautiful as Notre Dame. It has cost, it is stated, about one and a-half million pounds, and is not yet finished. On the footpath or side-walk opposite its main entrance is erected a bronze monument in an enclosed space. To enter the church you go in a gate a little to the north of this space, and some yards up a slight declivity you enter the church. This bronze monument was erected—so it states in French—to the memory of Chevalier de la Barre, who was executed at 19 years of age, in 1766, for not bowing to a passing church procession. Contemporary history states that it was a wet day, and he did not lift his hat to the passing sacrament. I noticed when I was viewing the monument, two policemen on the footpath opposite, and I accosted them, asking them if the church had erected the monument, for I was thinking of what the Calvinists had done at Champel for Servetus. My question gave them great amusement. In fact, they rolled their bodies about, laughing immoderately, and saying interrogatively "L'Eglise? L'Eglise?" They said it was the municipality, and that there was an anti-clerical majority in the municipality at the time of its erection.

Some of the Parisian Catholic churches, like many of the Anglican churches, are poorly lighted. How different are the Catholic churches in Switzerland. There they are whitewashed, airy, and full of light. I especially refer to the Jesuit Church, and to the Hoffkirche in Lucerne. In one French church there was hardly any light, and gas jets were necessary. It was an old and grimy church, but I have forgotten its name. It lies east in a cross street not far from the Boulevard des Italiens.

In England I attended many churches, Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian, Congregational, Unitarian, etc Two Anglican churches I attended—St. Andrew's, Worthing, and St. Albans, Holborn—were indistinguishable in their services from a Catholic service, only that the dresses seemed more elaborate in the Anglican churches, and more candles were used at some parts of the service. At St. Andrew's, candles, incense, genuflexions, crosses, and other accessories were similar to what is seen at high mass in a Catholic church. At about 10.30 the church meets, and the morning service is hurriedly read. At 11 begins the communion service, in which there is no communion of the members present. I sat in both churches in the front seat, so that I might hear what was said. At neither could the prayers be heard. All I heard was the reading of the gospel and the recital of the Commandments. It was a mass in Catholic form, and the preacher boldly called it a mass, and said, referring to the gospel, that when Christ said to his disciples that he would return to them, he meant returning in the mass, and he was present now on the "altar." The moving from one side to the other of the altar, as it is now called, the holding of the Bible before the priest, with surpliced boys holding candles alongside of the book, on both

sides—all seemed strange in an Anglican church, let alone the vestments and incense. In St. Albans no incense was used. In St Albans the Reverend Father Stanton preached. He seemed an earnest and sincere monk, with a wonderful facial expression. His sermon was such as one could have listened to in Peter the Hermit's days. It was all about the shortness of life, and the danger of dying without faith. There was no appeal to the intelligence, but only to what Burns called "the fear of Hell." I heard he was a kindly man to the poor, in a poor parish, and very devoted to his work. Whether the poor in London can be permanently benefited when their intelligence is not appealed to, remains to be seen. One thing that struck me in the church was a large "cover" to the baptismal font. It must have been 20 or 30 feet high, like a large candle extinguisher, and covered with gold leaf. A little leaflet circulated amongst the worshippers, stated that it was to be consecrated next Sunday, and the Bishop of Stepney, and Archdeacon Sinclair of St. Paul's, were to be present, so the St. Albans ritualism has apparently their sanction. The cost of this cover was about £700, and it has been defrayed wholly by the vicar, out of a present made to him some time previously. To expend £700 on a cover to a baptismal font in a parish where men and women are starving, seemed to me a very peculiar proceeding.

It is practices like those which you see in St. Albans and St. Andrew's that have led to Protestant associations being formed amongst the Anglicans in England. It looks as if what Lord Halifax told Abbe Portal is true, namely, that all the distinctive doctrines of Roman Catholicism, even the supreme jurisdiction of the Holy See and the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, are taught "in" the Anglican Church, though not "by" the Church. How clergymen can reconcile such conduct with the law of the Church laid down by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court, the Privy Council, and with the 39 Articles and the Prayer Book, an onlooker does not know. Ritualism appears in a modified form in many other churches. Even in St. Paul's there was an ornate worship that shocked an Australian Anglican who accompanied me to see the service.

In Christ Church, Paddington, I visited the church between seven and eight in the morning. The morning service was just concluding. The service was being held in what in Catholic churches would be called a side chapel. The priest was at the communion table, to use the Prayer Book phrase, on the south side of the church. On this table in its center is an image of Jesus Christ, half life-size, covered with gold leaf, and I noticed those coming in, and leaving the church, all bowing to the image, unless, indeed, they were bowing to the altar, for there was nothing else to make obeisance to. The audience was not large, about 30 or 40, and only two men were in the congregation, the rest being middle-aged women.

The Communion service was begun as the clock in the church struck eight, and when I heard the priest recite the Second Commandment: "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image .... Thou shalt not bow down to them," etc., and then the response of the people: "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law," I left. The contrast between the prayer and practice was so extraordinary that I could not understand it. Was I in the presence of rational people?

vignette

No. III.

Prophets.

"For all people will walk, everyone in the name of his God."—Micah iv., 5.

A learned Jewish Rabbi, in a recent book, has said that the above-quoted prediction by Micah of the Millennium is the highest ideal of religious liberty. Such exists in London, as a visit to various churches will show. The difference in creed is great, and even those who call themselves Christians do not see eye to eye in religious beliefs. This will appear clear when you hear the prophets. The preachers of to-day are the prophets. This is the root meaning of the word prophet, for does it not come from Greek roots meaning speaking before all—"pro," to use Roman letters, "before all," and "phemi," "I speak," with "tes" meaning the agent or speaker, "prophets," and in old English the word "prophecying" meant "preaching," and was so used: A man might be a prophet and yet foretell no future event. Did not Queen Elizabeth put down "prophecyings," which were simply expositions of the Scriptures, as Hallam in his "Constitutional History" tells us?

I heard many prophets, and your space would not be larg enough to give all my impressions or recollections of the prophets I heard. I wended my way one Sunday morning to hear the Rev. H. J. Campbell, in the City Temple, in Holborn. It was a showery morning, but the church was full to overflowing. The preacher is a freshlooking man, clean shaved, with grey hair, and has a kindly but keen look. The pulpit is perched aloft, for it has to face an audience, not only on the floor, but in the gallery above. Behind him stands the organ and the choir gallery. The choristers are all robed, but not in white surplices, and the music was fine, though experts will say that it does not equal what one hears in Westminster Abbey and in some other churches. There is, however, in the City Temple, congregational singing, and some of the hymns went with a vim that is missing

when the people listen to the choir as if they were at a concert The sermon was not startling to those who had read the "New Theology." It exalted the ideal life, the "Christ life" he called it. To this prophet, in Jesus Christ were summed up all the highest ideals of mankind. That was the subject, and the Christhood of Jesus Christ, according to Mr. Campbell, did not consist in his moral perfections, nor in his place in the Godhead, nor in what he called "His supposed atonement to divine justice," but in His having given mankind the highest human ideal. "He was the first born amongst many brethren." It seemed to me a thin partition. Did this announcement divide from the Unitarian position ?—that is, if there was any partition at all. Hymns were sung, and prayers said, that if literally translated, or expounded, meant something very different from the prophet's message. In going to and returning from Holborn one could see that people had come from the east and west, from the north and south, to listen to this prophet.

The next Sunday evening I went to Westbourne Chapel, and heard the eminent Baptist, the Rev. Dr. Clifford. There were no accessories of a robed choir, etc, and the first utterance of the preacher was not like the first words of Dr. Campbell. He had opened the service by mentioning that the people need not be alarmed at the windows not being opened, for the City Temple was one of the best ventilated churches, and every minute, by a special system, the air was changed. You did not see any formality in the chapel. It is as if it were a meeting in a home. Dr. Clifford gave out a hymn, and then prayed, and a young man, I suppose one of his deacons, read the Bible, and after more singing, etc., the message was delivered, and what was the subject? It was "George Meredith," the novelist. He gave a short story of his life, told of his works and aspirations, dealt gently with his poetry, and then he spoke of his beliefs. I remember well the beginning of this part of his criticism. "But you will tell me," he said, "that George Meredith was an agnostic. He was. He looked at the universe, and reverentially said: 'I do not know,'" and perhaps, he added, that attitude was as reverential as ours. And again : "I call George Meredith a thoroughly religious man, and one whose memory we should ever revere." And I heard this in a Baptist Chapel, and on a Sunday evening! What prophet 50 years ago, and that is in my memory, could have predicted that a Sunday evening in a Baptist church would have been spent in dealing with the life of an agnostic novelist, and that the preacher would have given this "infidel" credit for sincerity and for deep religious feeling? Truly our race has marched onwards in the path of religious liberty. But Dr. Clifford had many other passages in his message to which, perhaps, universal assent would not be given. Listen to this: "There was a time," said he, "when we were asked to fix our minds only on personal salvation, and on personal culture. We do not nowadays hear so much about these, as we hear it asked, what is to be the future of the race? We have a higher mission in life than even personal culture. We have a higher mission in life than even personal salvation. We have to deny ourselves, and take up the cross of endeavour, for the salvation of the race."

Let me add that towards the end of the sermon he said that the Christian was on a surer and higher platform than the agnostic. When one hears Dr. Clifford in his pulpit, and out of his pulpit, in his messages to mankind for the poor and oppressed, whether it be the poor Africans in the Congo, or the Jews in Russia, or the Christians in the East End, we realise how it is that he is one of the greatest prophets in the world. He is a humanitarian, and of all the preachers he impressed me the most. It was not eloquence, though he lacks not oratory; nor his learning, and he is a scholar; but it is his love of men. That dominates his life, and makes him one of the greatest men of his age.

On a Wednesday, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, I went to Portland Chapel, not far from Oxford Circus. To those who have read the "Endeavours after the Christian Life" and the other books of James Martineau, this chapel was hallowed ground. In this small building, the great Martineau, the prophet whose defence of Theism has never been excelled, used to preach. Alas! It is to cease to be a place for the prophets, and is to become an emporium for the chafferers of goods. The chapel has been sold. The minister was the Rev. J. Page Hopps, formerly of Leicester, many of whose works have been circulated in New Zealand. He was not the preacher this Wednesday. The Rev. Dr. Estlin Carpenter, a clergyman that, I learned in Geneva, the Presbyterians of Calvin's city greatly admired, was to preach. He is head of the new Manchester College in Oxford, and is recognised as the leading Unitarian minister in England. I may add that the only Oxford man who received the degree of D.D. at the Calvin Celebrations was Dr. Carpenter. The Cambridge man who was similarly honoured was the then vice-chancellor, and master of Pembroke, the Anglican divine, the Rev. Dr. Mason. What struck me most in the service was the reverence of the preacher, and his power of impressing his congregation. His address was on the function of religion and the relation of Unitarianism to science. You could almost have fancied that you were listening to a Hebrew prophet. The burden of his sermon was the words that followed in Micah after the quotation I have given at the head of this paper: "We will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever." You could not tell whether he was a Theist after Martineau's idea, or whether he had a touch of Spinoza's pantheism. He did not define. To him God was the ideal, it was the bond of union of men. He preached brotherhood as a live belief, and treated the fatherhood as that which made brotherhood possible. He was the philosopher speaking, the philosopher impressed with the vastness and mystery of the universe, and urging men

to practical issues. He pointed out that truth must ever be welcome, and that every new scientific discovery should be received as a revelation of God. It might be that men, through these discoveries, might have to abandon many of their beliefs, but would that harm the world—O! ye of little faith? Truth can never hurt mankind. The audience was like all the Unitarian congregations I saw, quiet, decent, well-to-do, intelligent people, more keenly interested in what was said than in "the service," as the word is used in England.

In Cambridge the preacher that most impressed me was the Rev. J. Ross, in the Presbyterian Church, near the Presbyterian College, Westminster College. Mr. Ross was preaching his farewell sermon, for he had been called to a large church in America. There were many graduates and undergraduates in the church, wearing their robes. One undergraduate read the lessons. I could well understand Mr. Ross's call. He was an eloquent preacher, and of that broad type which is now so common in all Presbyterian pulpits. Indeed, I heard none that were otherwise, though no doubt there are many of the old type left. His theology was broad, and his love of mankind was apparent from his sympathetic references. I heard the Rev. Dr. Strong in Glasgow—brother, I believe, of the Rev. Dr. Charles Strong, of the Australian Church, Melbourne. The Rev. Dr. Strong ministers to one of the fashionable congregations of Glasgow in the West End, and I noticed no ritualism there, nor in any Presbyterian church save in St. Giles's, in Edinburgh, and even there what is seen would not be called ritualism in England. The Scotch people, however, are keen in scenting sacerdotalism, and they resist "the beginnings." One story I heard from a representative elder of the Established Church will illustrate this point of view. In a church in Elgin there has been some ritualistic trouble. It appears that the clergyman, instead of reading the Bible from the pulpit, wished a reading-desk of the kind in use in Anglican churches. This was resisted, as ritualistic, and an old Scotch woman spoke to the representative elder who told me the story. She was opposed to this innovation, and after enlarging on the enormity of the change, she said: "Mr. Campbell, what wad hae touch that I should iver hae lived tae see th' wird o' God read off the back o' a hen."

One of the leading ministers in Glasgow is the Congregationalist, the Rev. John Hunter. He has a fine church in the West End. I saw his church, but had not the opportunity of hearing him, as the church was undergoing repairs and he was not in Glasgow. So far as his published sermons are concerned, he seems as heretical as the Rev. A. J. Campbell. I heard many other preachers, and in some of the small country churches in Scotland there are able men acting as ministers, indeed, to their people, and looking after them in times of sickness and distress. I was not well when Father Bernard Vaughan was preaching in London, and the Catholic preachers I heard were not noted men. I also missed the Bishop of London, but I read some of his sermons that have been published.

I heard one prophet, however, who was unique. This was Dr. Stanton Coit, in the Ethical Church, in Queen's Road, Bayswater. It is a small Gothic building, not unlike a church outside, but unlike one within. The church within is a square room with a gallery round three sides. On the floor the seats are arranged in rows, each row parallel to one of the three sides. On the fourth side is a narrow platform or pulpit, holding three people. On the left is a statue of Christ, very like (it may have been a duplicate) the one on the altar in Christ Church, Paddington, and covered with gold leaf, and on the right a statue of Buddha painted green. There were busts of Plato, Socrates, etc., in the gallery. Behind the platform was a very large oil painting, representing a section of the globe with male figures passing a lighted torch along, and a scroll at the top of the picture stating that so the heroes pass the torch of Truth along! The picture is well painted. There were other pictures, and some tapestry in the church. The organ and a male choir in crimson were on the right of the platform. There are several Ethical churches in London. The service was like an ordinary non-liturgical service, save that there are no prayers. There are a few minutes of private meditation, when absolute silence reigns, Dr. Stanton Coit standing all the time. The singing and chanting were effective, and the keynote of hymns, service, and sermon was expressed in the chant "Fellowship is Life." It was sung to the tune of chant 16, Westminster Abbey Chant Book, and I quote a few lines:—

"Fellowship in the moral life is salvation."
"Infinite is the help that man can yield to man."
"It is our moral nature longing to be fed and strengthened."
"That urges us into fellowship."
"Fellowship we need that will defy duty and worship goodness as a god," etc.

There is no mention either of deity or immortality in the Ethical hymn-book.

The sermon was on brotherhood, and there was one passage that I remember that will make clear the difference between the Ethical Church and all other churches. Dr. Coit said: "The great curse of humanity has been the belief in a supernatural. It is that that has led to bloodshed, and that has made brotherhood impossible."

I understand that after every evening meeting there is a social meeting in the hall below the church, where light refreshments are provided, and music and talk, so that brotherhood may be promoted. The audience were all well-dressed, well-to-do-looking people, and the sexes were about equal. When the service was over, Dr. Coit came off the platform, and chatted with the people. The people were of what is termed an intellectual cast,

so far as one could judge by appearances. Next Sunday, Dr. Saleeby, whose books on Evolution, etc., are well-known, lectured, but I was unable to attend.

There was no doubt as to Dr. Coit's earnestness. I heard no more earnest speaker. His utterances were at times passionate, but never denunciatory. Kindness ever prevailed.

I can't close this paper without briefly referring to the Reform movement amongst the Jewish people. It has not, it is true, the sanction of Chief Rabbi Adler, but it has the sympathy and help of the most highly educated and intelligent of the Hebrew people. Mr. Claude Montefiore is one of the leaders of this reform party. In America it is more prominent than in London. Services are held on Sunday, and deeds are elevated above both creeds and fastings. It is the broad church movement in the Jewish world, and I must deal with it in perhaps a separate paper. There are, I may add, three parties in the Jewish Church—the orthodox party, led by the Chief Rabbi; the reform party, led by Mr. Claude Montsfiore and others; and a middle party, of which the Rev. Morris Joseph is a type.

vignette

No. IV.

"The Politicians' and the House of Commons."

To act in absolute freedom, and at the same time realise that responsibility is the price of freedom, is salvation.

The Parliament loomed large in the public eye in England in 1909. The Budget war was on, and daily, or twice daily, newspapers were recording speeches about the Budget and criticising the utterances of public men. It was first. What will the House of Lords do? And then, What will people say to the undoing of the Government's financial proposals? I heard no speeches on the Budget, but I read scores of reports of speeches, and the literature issued by both parties in the contest. I was, however, more than once in the House of Commons during debates on other than Budget proposals, and I met many Parliament men in and about the precincts of the House. A luncheon in my honour was given by the Temperance reformers in both Houses, Mr. Leif Jones, M.P., being in the chair, the Earl of Carlisle representing the Lords, etc. I met many of the Irish Nationalists, and I was at afternoon tea on various occasions on the Terrace. One interesting debate I heard was on the naval policy. Mr. Balfour attacked the Ministry. I had not heard him speak before. He was complaining of the want of energy in shipbuilding, and criticising how the two-Power standard was being carried out. He has a pleasant voice and pleasant manner, is clear, concise, and critical. He is what I would call a "deft" debater. He rises to no great height of oratory, but he is an effective speaker. No point that could have been made was omitted. I was seated in the Distinguished Strangers' Gallery, and alongside an Irish gentleman who had been a member of the House. He was a Unionist, and he followed with intense interest Mr. Balfour's speech. When it ended he turned to me and said, "Was not that an able speech? What do you think of it?" I replied that it was able, but I asked were his facts correct? That was the important thing. Mr. McKenna, the First Lord of the Admiralty, got up to reply, and he clearly showed that Mr. Balfour's facts were not correct. In a clear, quiet statement, he proceeded to point out that Mr. Balfour had not dealt fairly with the attitude of the Government to the two-Power standard, and he quoted the opinions of two First Lords of the former Balfour Administration—Earl Selborne and Lord Goschen. His answer, to my mind, was complete, and I turned to my companion and said, "Who do you think got the best of the argument?" and the answer came, "Mr. McKenna." I heard Captain Craig, an Irish member, Mr. Walter Long, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Birrell, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Lee, Mr. John Burns, and many others. In the debate at which I was present, there were no great speeches such as one reads of in Gladstone's and Disraeli's days, far less of the Macaulay type. Mr. Asquith is a clear, logical speaker. It is like listening to the demonstration of a problem of Euclid, more than to a human speech, to hear Mr. Asquith address the Commons. If his premise is granted, the conclusion is inevitable. Addressed to educated and business men, his speeches are very effective. I do not know, however, how he would get on, with his lack of emotion, in a mixed audience. He uses no unnecessary words, he is ever stating a business proposition to business men, with incisive logic, and no doubt his power as a debater is great. I heard Mr. Winston Churchill in a very short speech, but even in his brief utterance his ability was apparent. I read all the addresses to electors by the leaders on both sides, and I put his speech to the people of Dundee as by far the ablest of all the addresses. It had a policy. It was the speech of a statesman, whether one agreed with his policy or was opposed to it, and a Conservative friend of mine told me he had told the members of his club the same thing. If he remains stable he is one of the coming great leaders. I did not hear Mr. Lloyd-George, but judging by his public speeches he and Winston Churchill are the orators of the Liberal party. The statesmen, however, that most impressed me were Viscount Morley (John Morley), Sir Edward Grey, Lord Crewe, and Mr. Alfred

Lyttelton. They all speak, not as partisans, but as philosophers, looking all round the question they are discussing, and seeing not two sides, but all the sides of the problem they are trying to solve. Lord Morley is feeling the effects of age. He has not the vigour of youth, but his intellect was clear as ever, and his speech to the press representatives was both witty and humorous. Sir Edward Grey struck me as a man that knew his own mind, and who had such a strength of will that nothing—neither majorities nor minorities—would force him to do what he did not approve of. His manner is quiet, and his words few, but always weighty Earl Crewe is of the same type. Like many of the Home speakers, he lacked fluency. He was often in his speech waiting to get the exact word he desired. He, too, however, was ever calm and careful in his utterances. The Hon. Alfred Lyttelton was in his manner and his utterance very like Sir Edward Grey and Lord Crewe, and amongst all the Unionists he most impressed me with his judgment and impartiality. I did not hear Mr. Haldane, but judging by his published speeches he is of the same type. I heard no speaker who was carried away by a torrent of words, and who was emotional. That is not the common English type. I suppose amongst the Celtic British such speakers are to be found, but that is not a common type in the House of Commons. Even some of the Irish members were as calm as if they had been Lowland Scots or Saxon Englishmen.

John Dillon, John Redmond, T. P. O'Connor, and other Nationalists are much esteemed. I met Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Connor, and had a long talk with them both. No one can come into contact with them without appreciating their ability, shrewdness, and desire to do the best they can for their country, and by country I do not mean Ireland alone. I believe that the Empire is losing much through not having many of the Nationalists as administrators of the Empire.

It is not, however, the speaking in the House of Commons that impresses a stranger. Much that one hears is mere routine work, and it is only occasionally that there is political warfare, and that the play of the expert swordsman in debate is seen. And some whose names are not blazed abroad speak with authority. There are men like Mr. Haldane, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Hobhouse, Mr. Kettle, and others, whose names do not appear as great speakers, who are always well worth listening to. But as I have said, it is not the speaking that impresses one. The historic associations crowd out all the present. It is the "Past" that is in the halls of both Houses. And when you look at this comparatively small hall of the Commons, and recall those who made it ring with great speeches, and who have gone, and of the power and influence that the men that were speakers in this Hall have exercised, you think not of the present. There is only one thing that is present that you cannot ignore, and that is the conduct of the House. I can conceive of no finer Speaker than the present occupant of the Speaker's chair. He is so fair, so impartial, so judicial, and yet so witty, that I do not wonder at a stranger saying he is "the" Speaker. I was present when one member was criticising an opponent, and the opponent rose to a point of order—"Was," he said, "the honourable gentleman in order in saying," etc., etc.? The Speaker said he did not know if he was, but if members will say so-and-so (quoting the complainer's language), they must expect similar retorts. All parties in the House recognise that they have a Speaker that has never been excelled, and that the honour of the House is safe in his keeping.

I heard Mr. Austen Chamberlain twice—once addressing the Press delegates and once in a short speech in the House. He did not impress me. I believe he is well up in the business of the House, but I doubt if he would have attained his present position but for the fact that he was the son of Joseph Chamberlain. He has no sense of humour, and he seemed to me a second-rate man. One rising light on the Unionist's side is Mr. F. E. Smith, member for a Liverpool division. I did not hear him speak, but judging by one of his speeches, personalities play an important part in his political warfare, and in one instance, when he was proved wrong, he declined to apologise, as his opponents had made similar attacks.

I was not present at any debate in the House of Lords, but I read the report of the Budget debate, and judging by it, there are still many Conservatives of the old type alive in England, and in positions of power. The slowness of social reform appals me. Education has been fought over for 40 years, and there is still an education question. To read and hear of the endless discussions of the religious questions, whenever education is mentioned, one would imagine that religion dominated the life of the English people. What one sees in the streets of the large cities does not agree with such a conclusion. The struggle seems to be how can every party get its religion taught at State expense. That is the dominating question when education is discussed. There must, in a free State, either be concurrent endowment of all religions—Protestant, Catholic, Mahommedanism, Buddhist, etc., or else the State must confine itself to secular matters. But the English people are a long way off such a solution as that. And all kinds of attempts are made to arrive at some compromise, and all compromises proposed are up to the present devoid of any principle, and consequently unsatisfactory to all people who think that principles cannot be ignored in State questions.

I saw in the South of England elections in progress Elections do not differ much with change of climate. There are public meetings, placards, canvassing, etc., etc. Compared with elections in New Zealand, there is in England more election literature than there is here, and large numbers of picture placards. The Liberals circulated broadcast the clever cartoons of the Westminster Gazette prepared by Sir F. C. Gould, and the

Unionists were not behind in pointing out by pictures, comic and otherwise, what they conceived to be the result of their opponents' policy. Colours are worn. Walking down the streets of Bournemouth or along the cliffs there, you meet ladies and gentlemen, young and old, ostentatiously wearing the party colours. Where, as in Bournemouth, there were so many idle people wintering, you found the Unionist colours in the ascendency. Each county had its own colours. Blue may be the Conservative colours in one county, and the Liberal colours in another. The Socialists took red as their emblem; and at a reception given by Mrs. Guest, in Wimborne House, I noticed several Socialists with red ties. Reading the local South of England papers, I confess neither the recorded speeches of the various partisans, nor the comments of the newspapers, much impressed me. Commonplaces generally were what one read. There are able provincial papers, and able political speakers in the provinces, but they are not everywhere. The papers in some of the large cities are as able as those published in the capital—the papers of Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Edinburgh, Glasgow, etc., for example; but some of the papers of towns larger in population than even our own chief cities are not comparable with the papers in even our second-class towns.

Let me add that we do not frequently see in the colonies some of the ablest journals of Britain. In weeklies, for example, the most widely circulated amongst us is the Spectator, no doubt a very able journal. We also occasionally see the Saturday Review, but it is not like the Saturday of 40 or 50 years ago. How rarely, however, we see the Nation; and it is, to my mind, as ably written as the Spectator. The fact is that the Liberal and Radical press is rarely seen in the colonies; and even the cablegrams that reach Australasia represent the Conservative more than the Radical party in its opinions sent to our papers under the heading cable news. If the colonists want to learn what the Liberals are doing, they should read the Saturday Westminster Gazette. It has 16 pages of matter, and all Gould's cartoons of the week, and has always interesting news and criticism of recent books, etc. Its chapters on nature and science are worth the price of the paper.

The interest taken in politics by most of the young University men is very evident, and in this respect a pleasant contrast with the attitude of most of our graduates and undergraduates. Living the citizen's life is part of a University course there. Is it so here?

vignette

No. V.

"The Poor."

"Ye have the poor always with you "—Mat. ch. xxvi., v. 2.

I have heard from many visitors to Europe who hailed from our Southern Colonies, that what impressed them most in their visit was the poverty in the big cities. It is always in evidence. You meet in certain quarters of all large cities some who are badly clothed, and badly fed, and their residences are overcrowded, and the beneficent sun rarely enters their dwellings. Suppose you are in London, and you take a walk to the East End on a Sunday, and stop on your way at Middlesex Street—formerly known as Petticoat Lane—you will see hundreds of people in the street, chaffering, Belling food, clothing, etc., even old books. If you have with you one who has been medically trained, he will point out to you, first this one and then that one, telling you that they have been, and are, starved. Others you will see that have been the victims of many diseases. If you express surprise he may tell you of some of his experiences in the slums; how as a medical student he had to learn practical midwifery by visiting many houses, and what did he seel He will tell you there is abject poverty in the majority of homes. In some cases no food, in many very scanty clothing, and the absence of necessary utensils. Even a wife about to become a mother is often without food, far less the other things deemed necessary in the homes of our poorest. Children are seen who are emaciated, in rags; and as for bedding and beds, they have to be content to sleep on a floor, covered with rags. Go to the Embankment on a winter night, and you will see thousands homeless. Look at many of the children in the slums, and you will be forced to say they have little chance of living decent or happy lives. What you see in the slums oppresses you, and you will probably come away with the idea that the fight against poverty is hopeless, and will say that we will have the poor always. What are they but the "chips" in Nature's workshops, and they are sacificed for the higher kinds of human life.

You will, however, soon get rid of this pessimism if two things are kept in view, the advance made since 1834 and the many agencies that are organised to uplift the poor. These things must impress you. After all, and notwithstanding the growth of big cities, pauperism has declined in the past 30 years. In the years 1871 to 1879, the average per 1,000 was 31.2. From 1896 to 1905, the average fell to 22.2. Surely that is a big advance. Then the agencies of help have enormously increased. Not to mention the good work done by General Booth's wonderfully organised Salvation Army, the agencies outside of these are numerous, enthusiastic,

well-organised, and run on business lines. You meet "settlements," as they are called, in many quarters. These settlements are managed by University men, who have the love of humanity in their hearts. They give aid, and shelter, and instruction to the needy. They try to find work for them, and train them and lead them to habits of work and self-reliance.

I spent one afternoon in the Browning settlement in South London, at Walworth. The head of the settlement is F. Herbert Stead, the brother of the world-renowned W. T. Stead. He is a M.A. of Glasgow, and was a distinguished student in philosophy, and here he is wearing his life out to help those who much need assistance. Their hall is the old Independent Church, where Robert Browning often sat in his father's pew. Then there are settlements connected with English Universities, and the devotion of many trained young Englishmen for the poor has not been paralleled in the history of the race. Perhaps one of the most pathetic, and at the same time the most hopeful thing in the mass of misery, is the helpfulness of the poor to the poor: out of their penury they give assistance to their neighbours. "What a wonderful thing is human brotherhood."

The better English people, I may say the mass of the English people, are quite alive to the problem of poverty, and are searching for a solution. Though the report of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, published in 1909, is sad reading, it has many joyful and hopeful passages. The world is getting better. The reports fill three large volumes, without counting the volumes of evidence, and if anyone wants to study the question of poverty in Britain, he should read the reports, both of the majority of the commission and of the minority. They differ much in some of their recommendations, but in many things they agree. To me, after reading the 1623 pages of these reports, the thing lacking is that little is said of the causes of poverty, and in both reports the recommendations are more how poverty is to be dealt with than with measures striking at its cause. If a farmer has a farm on a portion of which he yearly sows seed, and ho complains that weeds come up, would he not be better to spend some time in cleaning his seed than in eradicating the weeds? The problem is difficult. In 1906, 817,012 persons received poor law aid, not including persons in lunatic asylums, for mere casuals. The percentage per thousand of estimated population at same age was 23.6, or about one in every 43 people of the age relieved got poor law assistance. The average cost per head was £15 12s 6d per year. There is a good deal of space taken up in both reports in treating of "unemployment" as a cause of distress, but what leads to "unemployment?" Does not inefficiency play a big part in unemployment? And what if men and women are inefficient through inheritance of physical, mental, or moral weakness, and have their wills weakened by a drug habit? The expenditure on the poor on education and public health has grown to about £60,000,000 a year, but the expenditure on alcohol alone is more than double that amount, and any use of alcohol is pure waste, and leads to inefficiency. The United Kingdom consumes about three times as much alcohol per head as New Zealand does. Then in England the wholesale cost per year for tobacco, and the duties thereon, are about £17,000,000. If the retail cost were estimated, it would be seen how much more is spent on tobacco than in helping the poor, or in poor law relief. Is it any wonder that the cry of poverty is heard in the land where there is such useless expenditure ?

What does the Royal Commission propose? A vigorous campaign to put down luxury, waste, drug habits, to deal with degenerates in a medical way, and to look after the increase of the unfit? Not at all. The main recommendations of both are merely administrative. It is related of the famous physician, Dr. Abernethy, that he was attending a wealthy lady who had been ailing for a long time. One day his patient said to him: "Dr. Abernethy, you do not seem to me to strike at the cause of my disease. I am very disappointed." "Madam," said the doctor, "do you really wish me to strike at the cause of your trouble?" "Certainly," said the lady. The doctor, who always carried his cane, said, "Very well," and approaching the lady's sideboard, smashed all the decanters which were not empty, saying: "These are the cause of your trouble." There were no Dr. Abernethys on the Royal Commission, though the Commission were able and fearless men and women. Let any one, for example, compare these long reports with the reports of the late Dr. McGregor, in 1888, 1892, 1895, etc., and they will easily decide which are the more masterly, and which have grasped the evils which have to be remedied. Very shortly put, the majority suggested that the present administration should be altered, and large poor law areas created, etc. Practically, the proposals made were those carried out in New Zealand under the 1885 Hospital and Charitable Aid Act and its amendments. They suggest improved technical education, the creation of labour exchanges, or as we term them, bureaus. We have attempted both these. The loafer is to be treated as a quasi-criminal, and the real hard- working man benevolently assisted through industrial institutions and labour colonies. The minority report, which was signed by four of the Commissioners, the Rev. Prebendary Russell Wakefield (since made a dean), Messrs. Chandler and Lansbury, and Mrs. Sidney Webb, who recommended a change in the administration by, as was recommended, enlarging areas and making the local authority the controller of the poor law expenditure; that those asking aid be classified into the able-bodied and the non-able-bodied, and that special committees of the local authorities should be created with specialised work, such as the Education Committee, the Health Committee, the Asylums Committee, the Pensions Committee. Their main suggestion was in dealing with the unemployment. There is to be a Minister for Labour, and under

him a Department with six divisions, namely: The National Labour Exchange, the Trade Insurance Division, the Maintenance and Training Division, the Industrial Regulation Division, the Emigration and Immigration Division, and the Statistical Division. Salvation, one old Church Father said, comes not by argument, and it is, I think, doubtful if poverty will vanish by the creation of a labour officialdom. No doubt most of the suggestions are admirable: Afforestation, land reclamation, etc., are all admirable, but after reading the reports and hearing many of the poor law reformers in Britain, I missed much a Dr. Abernethy.

Let me add that I saw a great improvement in the slums in the East End of London, and in the slums of Edinburgh, and I was told that Glasgow and the other big towns had greatly improved. There seemed less drinking, less poverty, better streets, more open spaces, and in a word a more civilised people. That this is not mere appearance is proved by the great fall in the death rate. In some towns it is only about half of what it was 50 years ago. That the people are more keenly alive to the problem of poverty, and more agencies at work than in the year 1860, is evidence of an improvement, for it tells of a quickened public conscience, and a recognition that we are our brothers' keepers.

No. VI.

Farming—a Comparison.

"Ergo tua rura manobunt."—Virgil, Eclogue I.

I WONDER what Virgil would have thought if he had been told that the descendants of what the Roman world called the "savage inhabitants of Britain." would, centuries after his death, choose a line of his first eclogue as their motto for a colony to be founded at the Antipodes, in an island then unknown to Europe. But it so happened. The Canterbury pioneers selected as their motto the words I have placed above. They looked forward to being dwellers in a pastoral land and an agricultural country, and Meliboeus' prediction to Tityrus seemed to them to presage the future of their enterprise in settling Canterbury: "Fortunate senex, ergo tua rura manebunt." But will Canterbury remain a rural province? Notwithstanding the development of manufactures and the growth of large towns which follows the increase of industrial enterprise, a great country must have settlers living in the open air. This is needed for the persistence or preservation of the race. A visit to a purely manufacturing town, where the men and women have cheeks without colour, and who are, so far as physical appearances are concerned, not good specimens of humanity, will impress this on the most casual observer. "God made the country and man the towns" is an aphorism that emphasises the same conclusion. The skeleton in the German closet is the absence of an increase of country settlers. The population in Germany has greatly increased during the past 40 years, but the population in the purely country districts has remained stationary. People who are factory hands, and live in slummy cities, do not live so long, and have not so many healthy children as people who work in the fields and live amongst the fresh air and the flowers and the glories of the fields. The farmers are the persons who make a country, and without whom the race would degenerate. How important then in visiting foreign lands it is to know how farming is conducted.

Two things strike one on the Continent. First, on travelling from Marseilles through France, the few animals seen from the train. I think the first flock of sheep I saw was near Aries. You pass through fine fields, much garden and orchard culture, but you do not see any cattle or sheep. In Germany it is the same, even in the Rhine Valley. You see patches of crops. The land is like a chess board, here an acre or two of grain, there an acre or more of vegetables of different kinds. We have not in one field 100 or 200 acres, no big fenced-in paddocks. Everything is small. It is intensive culture! Next you will see primitive methods used in ploughing, harrowing and reaping. The human is greater than the machine. The best self-contained farms I saw on the Continent were in Northern Switzerland. There were the paddocks, the big farm-house, and mixed farming. In the parts of France and Germany I was in, fences were almost unknown, and the land was cut up into irregular patches, with different crops, potatoes, turnips, grain, all mixed up. I saw few young men working in the fields. I was told they were in factories or in barracks. In the South of England in the parts where I was, farming is poor. I saw ploughing with a single furrow, and a man leading the single horse. Two men for one plough and one horse. Harrowing was done in the same way. I saw no double-furrow ploughs, and not a single ploughing team such as is common in most parts of New Zealand. The soil also in the South of England did not impress me. It was not till I reached the north of England that the methods of farming improved. Vorkshire is much better than [*unclear:* Sun]. rev. I heard that in Wiltshire and in some other counties I did not visit, the farming was better. I was told, however, by the Duke of Argyle, whom I met in the New Zealand Court of the "White City" Exhibition, that I would see the best farming in the north. You pass after leaving Berwick into a proper farming district. In East Lothian the farming is all one would wish to see—well-kept farms, fences and dykes in order, every part utilised, machinery used, strong men and women working in the fields. The farming in

Forfarshire and Ayrshire is also good, though I think the farms in East Lothian were the best I saw. Passing through the Midland of England the fields were covered with small "stooks," all blackened. The rain had ruined all the crops. I should think not one stook I saw was worth anything, not even as cattle feed. In going through Cumberland and Westmoreland the absence of sheep strikes one compared with similar-looking country in New Zealand. Of course, in passing from Barrow-in-Furness to London you have not a long railway journey without towns meeting you in every short interval. How different from travelling, say, in Australia, or on our Northern line. The remarks of an Australian girl from the backblocks on her first visit to England, will be appreciated by every Australian who has travelled through the Commonwealth, and in a less degree by a New Zealander. She landed at Liverpool, and took train to London. After travelling two or three hours, she asked her father: "When do we get into the country?" "We are in it now," he replied. "Why, it is all a city," she said. But off the railway line there are hills and dales, and open spaces, and fine rural scenery in abundance, notwithstanding the many millions of people. In fact, it will strike you that there is much "waste" land—land not farmed. Many things account for this: (1) The love of city life, which is a predominating feature of our present-day civilisation; (2) the growth of industries; (3) the monopoly of the land. You will see great stretches of land without homes, without cultivation, though no doubt large areas are unsuitable for agriculture, or at all events intensive agriculture. It must be in large holdings to pay. Still, much might be done in intensive, or small, cultivation, and experiments are being made in that direction. City life, as I have said, is not good for the race. Deterioration sets in unless the cities are pure, and clean, and sweet, and the pleasure of city life do not make for physical improvement. At the same time, city life is improving, compared with what it was 50 years ago. Physical exercise, open spaces, gardens, better drained and better ventilated houses, purer water, are all on the side of public health, and the death rate has wonderfully fallen, and the fevers that used frequently to decimate the population are absent.

The home farmer has much to contend with that is unknown in New Zealand. He has a climate different from ours in these sunny isles. There are more grey days than with us, and in Scotland the cattle have to be housed for seven months of the year, and fed indoors. Another expenditure is on manures. This is a heavy item to most farmers. It is true labour is cheaper than with us, but in many parts of England it seemed to me not so effective as with us, and machinery was not so much used as on our farms. I learned from an intelligent Ayrshire farmer that the cost of feeding a cow indoors for the seven months was about £13. With a rent of £2 per acre, and a long winter, I asked him how he made it pay, and he said he got a good price for his milk, and he bought and sold cattle, feeding young cattle in the summer, and that he had no complaint to make.

What I have seen makes me consider what is to be the future of farming. We are greatly aided by our climate and our virgin soil, but a continual use of the land weakens the soil; the phosphates and nitrates will be consumed, and what is to be done to replace them. Our farmers must look forward to a continuing increase of the manure bill. Will the present price of land stand a greatly increased cost in this direction? Another thing for which we will have to pay in the years to come, is the often wanton destruction of our forests. Bush-covered hills in the Wellington district and elsewhere have been deprived of their first crop, and what is to replace them? A few patches of stunted grasses. The humus has in many cases been burned or washed off, and the yellow clay protrudes. We have in effect not applied to the settlement of our country the scientific knowledge attainable from older lands, and waste, more than care, has marked our treatment of our lands by many of our pioneer settlers. "The pay day comes round," and after us our successors will have much to do to repair the blunders of their ancestors. The clamant need is, in my opinion, the scientific training of our farmers, and how little we have done in this direction! In every university college there should have been more students in agriculture than in arts, law, or medicine, and there is not one in most of our colleges. Our young men should have seen a great career in agriculture, our staple industry, but how few look forward to such a future? If England has failed in agriculture it is for this reason. It is only of late that any wide attention has been paid to scientific farming.

vignette

No. VII.

Scenery.

There was a child went forth every day;
And the first object he look'd upon, that object he became,

And that object became part of him for the day, or a certain part of the day, or for many years, or stretching cycles of years
The strata of coloured clouds, the long bar of maroon tint, away solitary by itself, the spread of purity it lies motionless in,
The horizon's edge, the flying sea crow, the fragrance of salt marsh and shore mud;
These became part of that child who went forth every day, and now goes and will always go forth every day.

—"Leaves of Grass" (1867), Walt Whitman.

So sings the poet of democracy of America. Our surroundings influence us. Not in one year, nor in one generation, may this influence be apparent, but it accumulates, and after what in the history of the race may be only like "a watch in the night," but may be a thousand years as we measure time—the result is there. Living under sunny skies will produce one type or variety of mankind, just as living under grey skies will produce another. How otherwise are the human varieties to be explained? It may be as some evolutionists say, that mankind has not come from a single pair, but even if that were granted, the question of how the variety arose only puts the question further back. It is there. Environment counts for much. Even in two or three generations there is a difference between the country born and bred and the town-dweller. If this occurs under the same skies, what must it be where the skies are different? We do not expect Laplanders to be like dwellers in the Sahara Deserts. Why? Nor do we wonder that dwellers in the British Isles differ from Italians, and that is so even if some of the British may have had Roman ancestors in the days of Julius [*unclear:* Caear.] We can test the influence of surroundings on plants. Let us grow tomatoes under a grey sky and where there is wind, and let us grow tomatoes under glass, and we can see difference in the thickness of the skins of the fruit. We do not expect large flowers in tempest-tossed beds, nor in some varieties where the sun is rare. The climate of England differs from that of New Zealand in three particulars : we have more sun, less greyness in our skies, less calm still weather. Compared with England our skies are blue, our colours blue, and we have more wind. There is less quiet or calmness here. If we go to New South Wales, what will strike us is that there is more yellow in nature, yellow skies, yellow atmosphere. Ours is blue and English is grey. Of course, England has sometimes bright skies, though I never saw a real New Zealand sky all the time I was in Britain, and we have grey days, but I am writing of what is general, not particular or occasional.

Then the country is different. There are no mountains in Great Britain. There are hills in England, high hills near Wales, and the highest hills in Scotland, but the country lacks the Ruahines or our Southern Alps, and there are no Ruapehus, nor Aorangis, nor Mount Egmonts. You can see undulating country—not vast plains—and even in Scotland the noted mountains do not strike you. Ben Lomond did not look bigger than what we call hills. Its height, in fact, is 3192 feet. The highest mountain in Britain is Ben Nevis, 4406 feet. That is small compared with our Aorangi, 12,349 feet. We have nine celebrated mountains in the North Island higher than Ben Nevis, and forty in the South Island. Aorangi, Tasman, Malte Brun, Sefton, Elie de Beaumont, and Hardinger are all over 10,000 feet. Mount Aspiring is nearly 10,000 feet, and Mount Earnslaw just over 9000. Then our bush or forest far exceeds any forests in Britain in beauty, in the size of the trees, and in the extent of the forest areas. England has, however, lovely landscapes and a quiet beauty of its own, which grows on you when you get accustomed to the change of scenery. In the Highlands of Scotland you are "lifted up," and you get a touch of sublimity that is absent from the lowlands. The lake region of Cumberland and Westmoreland is a bit of the Scottish highlands in England, but after a tour of the New Zealand Alps or the Cold Lake region of Otago you are not impressed. I think I can answer the question, why do so many English people love Switzerland? They commune with the mountains there, and the glory of the Alps dominates them.

After seeing Switzerland I do not think it excels New Zealand. It is true it has higher mountains, but from where you see them they do not look higher, and their lakes are not to be compared with our lakes. Taupo is larger than Geneva. Even in glaciers we excel Switzerland, for the Tasman is longer than the Gross Aletsch. In fact, in mountain and lake scenery we are ahead of Switzerland. We excel Norway in fiords, and we have a finer hot water region than the Yellowstone in the United States.

But there are scenic beauties in Scotland in the autumn that cannot be excelled anywhere. [*unclear:* i] only saw part of the Highlands. My wife has during this year travelled all over the Highlands, and in a letter she gives her impressions of what she saw, and I quote some of her observations: "We embarked at Dunoon in the Columba, bound for Oban. Unfortunately, it rained from Rothesay to Crinan, pouring during the passage of the canal. The Kyles of Bute were as beautiful as ever. The canal also was beautiful. The sides are wooded and the trees were just turning into brown and gold. The mountain ashes, with their brilliant scarlet berries, made a blaze of colour, and there was a harmony amongst the green, gold, and yellow brown leaves of the woods. After passing through the canal the clouds lifted, and the sun came out in a blue and white cloud-flecked sky. It

rained again before we reached Oban, but cleared as the steamer entered the bay. We got many fine views in Oban. The sunset on our first night there was quite unique. It was a study in greys. The town was grey and the sea, sky, and hills were in all shades and tones of grey. The sun hung as a ball of silver, shedding shimmering rays of white, cold silver light upon the pale grey sea. It reminded me of Shetland, although the shades were paler and the sun more silvery white. In Shetland the grey shades were dark, the hills in deeper and darker shades, and the sea more cold and less luminous. It was very lovely, and seemed to promise well for next morning. Alas! Next morning the rain came down in torrents, and the wind was blowing a gale, so our trip to Staffa and Iona had to be postponed.

"We started two days later for Portree and Gairloch in a little steamer, in a gale and in heavy rain. The steamers are not so good as the boats that took us north of Auckland to the Bay of Islands and Mangonui. We passed the Lismore Lighthouse, and the ruins of Duart Castle, stopped at Cragmore, and then coasted along Mull, passing Rock Island. The mountains of Mull and the islands are bleak, mostly rock and heather, with patches of fertile land along the shore. The trees were few. There were low hills with waterfalls coming over them on the Morven side. Along the Morven shore, trees relievo the monotony of the rocks and heather, and as we pass along we notice some farms with cattle, but behind the farms the hills look barren, covered with heather and ferns. We stopped at Lochaline Pier .... On the Skye side there were many good farms and crops, and the houses looked comfortable, clean, and well cared for. There were trees on the shore, but in the background were heather and rocks. On the mainland the mountains were very fine, the colouring and shadows most magnificent, but, oh, so barren and black, and impossible of cultivation. At Loch Hourn the mountain scenery was grander than at any other part of the west coast whish we have yet passed. ... At the island of Ornsay there is a very fine house, picturesquely set amongst trees. It looks quite modern, and is no doubt a comfortable summer residence, but it must be quite lonely in winter. . . . . Some of the mountains are grand; range upon range, in ever-changing form and varying lights and shadows, hold one in awe-inspiring silence and deep emotion. No wonder the Highlanders feel the absorbing love and enduring reverence for their grand mountains and heather-clad glens; hill upon hill, peak upon peak, with purple, green, brown, and golden shadows thrown from the gorgeous heather. The feathery bracken fern and the pink, purple, and bluey rocks of the mountain sides and glens are marvellous, and never to be forgotten. It is like one glorious cathedral, with peaks and turrets thrown into light and radiance by the lights and shadows of the setting sun. At Glenelg we landed fishing tourists and took on board others. Here we came upon the first stretch of sandy beach, which is about a mile long. There is a good hotel and a few cottages in the foreground, with mountains and glens in the background. At the next point there is another lighthouse, and we pass through a narrow strait into Loch Alsh. This is the most barren and desolate place we have yet seen .... On the right we pass the opening into Loch Druich, and we see another fine range of mountains. At Kyle of Loch Alsh, a station on the Highland railway, we landed, and more fishing tourists came on board. . . . We started for the canal from Inverness on Thursday. We called at Fort Augustine, and took the train from there to Invergarry, a lovely country on the borders of the River Garry, surrounded by the most beautiful woods I have ever seen. The trees are now turning into the most gorgeous autumn tints. The beech trees especially were very fine. There was an old one that must be hundreds of yean old. The leaves were green, with splashes of yellow, gold, and orange red all over. The oak trees, too, were changing colour. They do not turn brown and drop off as they do in New Zealand. There is so much moisture in the atmosphere that they remain on the trees through the varying shades and stages of decay before they fall. The birch trees resemble laburnum trees, the golden sprays of dying leaves hanging amongst the green like festoons of flowers. There were long avenues of trees along the road to Invergarry, and also up in the hills, in the woods of these beautiful trees. On Tuesday we walked about two and a-half miles to a waterfall, through avenues of trees, all beautiful, and all old and tinted with autumn shades. The waterfall is the outflow from the Garry Loch into the Garry River. It is very rapid, strong, but not high .... The Caledonian Canal is very fine, though I was not so much impressed as I expected to be. Loch Ness is not very broad, and the banks vary from farms and rock barren hills to thickly and well-wooded slopes. The mountains are not high, according to our ideas, but they are very fine in shape and variety, and the heather and bracken, now that the golden tints are showing, make a fine scheme of colouring. To-day we had the most glorious sunset when coming in from the North. The hills, or as they were called, mountains, were all tints of purple, blue, red, and pink, from the rays of the setting sun. Mount Cruachan was bathed in pink glow, with fleecy clouds around the summit. The sun was sinking behind Ben More amongst clouds, and in silver sheen. Then as we came in here (Oban) and turned to the west, the sun dropped behind the mountain, and shot up pink, yellow, and golden rays on a pale green, blue, and fleecy coloured sky. Then it again changed to red streaks and deeper blue, and at last sank down in gorgeous crimson flames. Surely, we have been lucky to witness two such different and opposite sunsets. Oh, the Highlands are wonderful!

"We took the trip from Oban to Iona and Staffa. We were much impressed with the ruins in Iona; the Cathedral has been repaired. From Iona we went to Staffa, and climbed round the island to the great cave.

Fingal's Cave is Nature's cathedral. Column after column, which seem to have been cut out of the rock, form the sides and the roof of the great cave. It is most wonderful. The columns are about the size of a great oak, and we stepped from one to another as if one were stepping on the stumps of trees. . . .

"The heather, bracken, and rocks are glorious pictures of purple, gold, and red, and really the whole country is splendid in its wild beauty. Then the old castles in ruins and the spots where tradition and history tell the tale of the brave men of the past, with the associations woven round them in song and story, make the old land wonderful and grand. Are the ghosts of the past looking on at the American and other tourists who are treading their natal country? Do they look from the tops of the mountains and wonder at the strange transformations that have take place since they were here? The same sun shines, but what a difference there is! Ben Nevis was grand in its cloud-encircled summit. There were several patches of snow still visible, the last enduring evidence of the winter's cold, and soon again another white mantle will cover his shoulders."

Reading these descriptions, I do not wonder at the Highlanders' song:

My heart is in the Hielands,
My heart is not here.

Who can tell the influence such scenery has had on the Celtic Scotchman? And what will our scenery do to us? The child who goes forth every day and sees his environment will become what? What in 500 years will the New Zealander be?

vignette

No. VIII

"The People."

'Tis weary watching wave by wave,
And yet the tide heaves onward;
We climb like corals, grave by grave,
That pave a pathway sunward.
We're driven back, for our next fray
A newer strength to borrow;
And where the vanguard camps to-day
The rear shall rest to-morrow.

—GERALD MASSEY.

"Where there are the best people there is the best country." What is the aim of humanity if it is not to have good women and good men—why all the pother about institutions and reforms? What impression then do the people of Europe make on a visitor? It is only by comparison that one can arrive at any conclusion. How stand present-day Europeans with, say, Europeans in New Zealand! I did not see much difference, save in the manufacturing towns and in the slums of the large cities, between the two. In the city slums you see physical degradation apparent on many countenances, but in the country districts the people seemed physically as strong as with us. Perhaps the weak drift to the towns, and perhaps a more rigorous climate kills off many physically unfit. The most robust lot of school children I saw was at a small country school in my native islands, and that may be accounted for by the climate eliminating the unfit. What is to become of the submerged tenth, as they have been called? That is a problem. They die early, and that no doubt helps to maintain the race. Physical strength must ever be the basis of a race, and bad air, scrimp food, unhealthy dwellings, drug habits, shorten life and cause a yearly sacrifice of infant life. But for the daily migration to the cities of people physically strong, the dwellers in cities, as at present constituted, would become a helpless race. You might as well expect a mob of "culls" to produce good sheep, as people subjected to the evils that are common in slums to produce good men and women. There would be some normal, but there would be many abnormal. If, as it is said, insanity has increased, and cancer is more common than a century ago, we need not be surprised. We are not constituted like the "one-horse shay" of which Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote. Something must give way in the strain and struggle for life, and the nervous organisation, or our cell tissue, will become affected. Men and women do not collapse as the "one-horse shay" collapsed. It suddenly fell into a heap of dust, and no one part failed before the

other. When you have a death-rate up to 35 per thousand, as there is in many congested districts in cities, as against the New Zealand death rate of 10 per thousand, you can tell what is happening. Degeneration exists in such congested areas. The report of "The Interdepartmental Committee on Natural Physical Degeneration," appointed in 1903 by the late Duke of Devonshire, and which reported in 1904, tells us of this degeneration, though it is said it was not so bad as it had been represented. In 1900-3, 32 per cent, of the recruits for the army in London were rejected, and in Manchester the percentage was higher. Most of the medical witnesses stated that alcohol was a great factor in this degeneration, and the facts given proved this statement. In France, in 1830, with a consumption of 2.2 litres of spirits, containing 50 per cent, of alcohol, per head, the rejection of recruits was 21 per cent. In 1893 the consumption had gone up to 10 litres, and the percentage of rejection to 32 per cent In Sweden again, where the consumption of spirits was 46 litres per head in 1830, and in 1890 six litres, the percentage of rejections of conscripts fell from 34.45 to 20.4.

But much is being done to grapple with this problem of life, and open spaces, better drainage, more attention to sanitation generally are improving the race. The one thing that is not a passion amongst the people is the abolition of the drug curse. True, the leading doctors in France and Britain point out the evil that alcohol and other drugs are doing, but the mass are supine. There is not the enthusiasm for temperance that exists in the Australasian colonies and in the United States. Quite lately one of the greatest physiologists in the world, the learned Professor Metchinkoff—of the Pasteur Institute—who was received with applause by the savants assembled at the Darwin celebration in Cambridge, published this statement: "During the past 10 years I have abstained from all alcoholic beverages, having verified their bad effect on my physical constitution:" and he is not alone in this opinion, in France. The principal of the Medical School at Rouen, said: "I habitually drink water because I have found that my digestion, my sleep, my work, are much better than were I to use any alcohol." The principal sums up his opinion thus: "(1) All distilled alcoholic liquors are harmful; (2) all fermented liquors are much less hurtful, but they are never useful. It is prejudice arising from habit that makes us think that wine, cider, and beer are nourishing." This is the testimony of the majority of the medical experts.

Recent experiments conducted on dogs in one of the universities of the United States—the Clark University—show that the effect of alcohol is felt in the young of the alcoholised dogs.

But the British people are not without hope. They are attacking the social evils. They are getting rid of some slums. Temperance societies are active, all kinds of educational reform associations are struggling to raise humanity, and some forward movement has been made. Let us read an eighteenth century novel, and compare life in the city and country districts, as depicted in the novel with what it is to-day, and it will be seen that an advance has been made. If we read also the account of some of the criminal trials of the eighteenth century, we would see that London to-day, with its evils, is better than the London of over 150 years ago; and the country districts have also improved. The schoolmaster has been abroad. In one country district, in 1727, a poor woman was burned to death in a barrel of tar because she was said to be what is called "a witch;" and belief in witchcraft, in fairies, and evil spirits continued until the nineteenth century, and perhaps continues yet amongst those far removed from the civilisation of the age. Such has been the credulity of the race. An educated people gets rid of its primitive beliefs, and slowly education is being diffused.

Manufactures are improving, and Britain need not be afraid of either German or American competition. There is in the towns a passion for practical or technical education. Efficiency is being sought after, and the future will show that the British race is not effete.

I have nothing but praise to give to all classes of people for their never-ending courtesy. In my opinion our own people are just as courteous as the people dwelling on the Continent of Europe. I have found them ever helpful to strangers. It is true some boys I met, even in London, did not seem to know things that I fancy a colonial boy would have known. The most intelligent boy I met was one in Glasgow. He was resourceful. I was looking for the office of the Scottish Permissive Bill and Temperance Association, and the directions I had got were not sufficient to enable me to find it, for I had neither the name nor the number of the street. 1 asked a little lad who was carrying a parcel if he could direct me, and he replied that he did not know, but he added, "I'll soon find out." Anyone who has read Elbert Hubbard's noted work, "The Message to Garcia," will appreciate his answer, as I did. After learning from me where I thought it was, he, after some inquiries and some searching, was able to show me the place. I was much struck with his keen intelligence and his kindness. I rarely met a London boy who could give me much information when I asked him about places in his neighbourhood, but then there were always the able and obliging policemen, so perhaps the boys' services were rarely required.

The one thing that struck me most in France was that the people looked physically stronger than I expected. In Paris, as elsewhere, I always had my early morning walk before breakfast, and the physique of the clerks, shopmen, and shopwomen and others I met going to their work greatly impressed me. I also saw some of the French cavalry, and though they were not tall, they seemed well-built, sturdy men, and handled their horses well. Even in Southern France the people looked well. Of course, in the large towns, as in other large cities,

there are degenerates, but on the whole the physical well-being of the people impressed me. In fact, it seemed to me the young French working people were stronger than the same class I met in London.

It may be asked how do other nationalities look? I met in Paris one evening, at the home of the learned editor of Les Documents du Progres, ladies and gentlemen of almost all the nationalities of Europe—Italians, Russians, Greeks, Roumanians, Austrians, Germans, Spaniards, etc.—and really there is not so much difference as I expected to see between them and a gathering of English people. Swedes and Russians were fair-haired and blue-eyed. There were many celebrated people. One French poetess recited beautifully one of her own poems, and there was present a Russian sculptor. They were all members of the Institut International pour la Diffusion des Experiences Sociales, and with them humanity loomed larger than nationality.

I saw members of the Duma that visited England. I met them at Trinity College, Cambridge, as they were under the care of Dr. Butler, the master, viewing the College. Most of them would have passed as Englishmen, but a few were darker, like the people of Southern Europe, but larger framed. They seemed much impressed with this visit to Cambridge, and with the freedom of Cambridge College life. At the Darwin celebrations and at the Geneva University celebrations I also met many of different nationalities, and if we are to see peace reign it will be through education and science, and the knowledge of each other, that such an era will come. There are many silent forces in all countries making for peace. We hear the cries of the military and naval advocates, but the voices of those who are strong for brotherhood are not so loud.

Of course there are social evils in Europe, and they are more intense than amongst ourselves. There are idle rich who think of nothing but their own amusement, and who can talk of nothing but of sport and amusements. That class is, I believe, small, and perhaps recent political movements may help them to realise that man lives not for himself alone. There is much misery, much crime, and much vice, much waste, and much thriftlessness. But when this side of the world is seen there is another side to be examined. There is more altruism than in past centuries, more humane associations, more noble men and women struggling to uplift their fellows. The forces of light are more numerous and stronger than the myrmidons of darkness, and this belief is inspiring millions with hope.

Lastly, I may say I come back to New Zealand an optimist. The millenium is ahead of us, though it may take centuries yet before the race reaches that blessed state. Gerald Massey's verses are true. The race is going forward and an enthusiasm for humanity is dawning, and our kin beyond the sea are playing an important part, for they are not effete, in the bringing to pass the long-looked-for day. Humanity sweeps onward.

And all the feature of the past
But make the future more serene.

But let us beware. Do not let us imagine that we are rid of racial evils. We do not yet know what the effect of our warmer climate may be on the physical, intellectual, or moral stamina of our race. We need care and watchfulness and incessant effort, not only to maintain the progress we have made, but to go forward, for other nations are not lagging behind.

Wilson and Horton, Printers, Auckland—79195

Leasing State Lands A Speech Delivered By Robert Stout *In the House of Representatives, N.Z.* On the 15th September, 1875. Dunedin: Millis, Dick & Co., Printers, Stafford Street.

Leasing State Lands.

Mr Stout, in moving the motion standing in his name, said he was aware that he was about to advocate what might be termed a theory; for the proposition to dispose of the waste lands of the Crown by lease had only arrived at what might be called the theoretical stage; but it must be remembered that every great reform that had ever taken place had gone through its theoretical stage. Even in matters of science, the hypothesis must always precede the experiment and the fact. And this was even more striking in matters of politics than in matters of science; for they would not have had those great reforms in England—they would not have had what was called the change in the commercial system—they would not have had the repeal of the Corn Laws—they would not have had the ballot—they would not have had the extension of the suffrage—had all these questions not been calmly debated and considered by political economists, and at first discussed from the political economist's point of view. Therefore, although this system might be termed a theoretical system, the time would come when it would be regarded as a most pressing practical question. For the present he would set cut, as briefly as he could, some of the reasons why such a system should be adopted in New Zealand, in the hope that, if not in this Parliament, at no distant date there would be a party strong enough to make this system the law of the land. He

was well aware that one of the first objections to the system would be that it was Utopian. Time would not permit him to show that even in countries where all the lands of the Crown had been sold it was not regarded as Utopian, and therefore, instead of reading long extracts upon the subject from the writings of gnat men, he would simply refer those honourable members who might desire to study the subject to the works of those writers. A very interesting discussion has been going on in England for some time with reference to this question, which had been debated by some of the ablest political econo- mists, such as Professor Cairnes, the late Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Professor Fawcett, Mr. Macdonnell, and several others; and although their opinions differed in some Tespects, yet they all admitted that, theoretically, this was the best system of land administration for every country that had not disposed of all its lands. The book of Mac-donnell's showed that the system might be applied with advantage oven in England, Ireland, and Scotland; and several reports had been presented to the House of Commons, amongst them one by Mr. Harris Gastrell, who gave an interesting account of the land system of Prussia, and traced it down from the time of the Stein-Hardenburg legislation to the present time, showing that the system might not only be applied to Prussia, but that it would be of vast practical benefit to the various countries in Europe. He would briefly sketch some of the arguments that might be adduced in favour of its adoption here; and he would just mention that the subject was not new to New Zealand, because it had been debated in the Otago Provincial Council, where & motion, affirming the principle, was only lost by three votes on a division, the numbers being 15 for it and 18 against it. He noticed also, from a late Victorian 'Hansard,' that the question had been discussed in the Parliament of that colony, and that some of the ablest men in that colony had been found voting in favour of it, such as Mr. Grant, Mr. Higin-botham, and others, who had made this question of the land laws a special subject of study. There were two views of the question which might be taken: first, the question of right, as it was termed; and, second, the question of expediency. He had no objection to view it from one or both of these standpoints, for he was prepared to contend that, whether viewed as right or expedient, it was a proper land system, and one suited to New Zealand, He did not intend to go into the question of right. Honourable members who desired to view the question from that standpoint might derive much useful information from Spencer's "Social Statics." There it was laid down that the State should not part with its lands, because it was, as it were, allowing the people at present existing in the world to say what the people of the future were to do. It was giving the present race, so to speak, a greater power over posterity than they had any right to exercise. Spencer went further, and showed that, if this question of right were carried to its extremity, a man in a city would have power to say that no person should live in that city. For example, suppose a man happened to buy up the whole of Wellington, he could, if he pleased, prevent anybody living in the city of Wellington, Of course, that was not likely to happen; but one had only to look at the history of Scotland and Ireland to see what had taken place there in evictions. That was an illustration of the question of right, to which he would again refer hereafter. Then came the question of expediency, and the matter would, after all, be decided by that question: not that the question of right should be lost sight of, because the two questions were intimately connected, and should always be looked at together—he meant the two questions, what can be done and what should be done. In our circumstances, more so than in the circumstances of an old country, this question of expediency was bound up with the question of taxation; and it was bound up with it in a most striking way, because he thought he should be able to show that if they were to conserve the land they at present possessed, and, instead of selling it, were simply to lease it, they would have so much revenue accruing from these lands that they would be able to do away with all kinds of taxation. And this was not only not a new system to New Zealand—it was the policy adopted in regard to all their reserves. Their reserves for municipalities, for schools, and for universities were all founded on this principle, that, instead of trusting to the taxation of the day, a landed estate is given to them so that they may have a permanent revenue; and if it were wrong for the State to keep lands to be disposed of under the leasing system, it was equally wrong to endow municipal, educational, and other institutions in the way they had done hitherto. But there was more than that in the question. There was what political economists termed "an economic rent and it was in order to get hold of this economic rent for the benefit of the community as a whole that those who advocated the leasing system so strongly insisted upon it. What the "economic rent" was had been elucidated by several political economists. It was, so to speak, the advantage the land derived from the fact of population being settled near it, and from the progress of the State as a whole. Land increased in value not be much because of the exact amount of money spent upon it as by reason of the increase in the general progress of the community, and from other circumstances ever which the landlord had no control. That was what had been termed economic rent; and the late John Stuart Mill, in addressing the Land Reform League in London, put that very briefly and very pointedly. He would quote a short passage from his address on that occasion. Speaking of the programme of the Land Reform League, he said—

"The other of the two points of our programme—the claim of the State on the unearned increase of rent—requires rather more explanation, as it is not vet equally familiar, though the time has already come when it is listened to, and it is probably destined to become an article of the creed of advanced reformers. The

lend of the world—the raw material of the globe—in all prosperous countries, certainly increase in value. The landlord need only sit mill and let Nature work for him; or, to speak truly, not Nature, but the labour of other men. What is it that has produced the prodigiously increased demand for building land which has created the colossal fortunes of the Grosvenors, the Portmans, the Stanleys, and others of our great families? It is the growth of manufactures and the increase of towns. And what has produced that? Your labour and outlay, not that of the landlords. The same labour and outlay—namely yours, not theirs—produces a steady increase of demand for agricultural and mining products, causing prices to rise and rents to increase. No other portion of the community has a similar advantage. The labouring classes do not find their wages steadily rising as their numbers increase; and even capital—its interest and profit, instead of increasing, becomes a less end less percentage as wealth and population advance. The landlords alone are in possession of a strict monopoly, becoming more and more lucrative, whether they do anything or nothing to the soil. This is of little consequence in a country like America, where there is plenty of unused land waiting for any one who chooses to go and cultivate it; but in an old country like ours, with limited land and a growing population, it is a great and growing grievance. We want the people of England to say to the landlords, "You are welcome to every increase of rent that you can show to be the effect of anything you have done for the land; but what you get by the mere rise of the price of your commodity compared with others—what you gain by our loss—is not the effect of your exertions, but of ours, and not you but we ought to have it.'"

That was what was termed "economic rent;" and Professor Cairnes, in one of his essays on political economy, made the statement that had often been urged—namely, that land was in a different position from other property that land might rise in value, and the State did not receive any benefit from it. And he further pointed out that there was no analogy between the possession of the soil and other property, because land did not increase in size; it could not be made larger, while other property might increase or decrease in extent. There was also an illustration given by Professor Cairnes in reference to what "economic rent" was. He said that a man might be the "monopolist of a favoured situation, in the advantages arising from which, as they are no part of the fruit of his toil, he can, on the principle on which we proceed, have no right to property." In fact, he was placed in the same position as a man who was a monopolist of the water or of the air. He was placed in the position of a monopolist who gained an advantage and did nothing with it. Speaking of the advantages possessed by the monopolist class, he said—

"Such advantages, so far as they are peculiar to the situation, are not properly the result of his labours, but of the social oircum-stances which have made the situation specially advantageous, and, on the priociple we have recognised would belong, not to him, but to society at large. Now, the ease I have put will be found to fall within this reasoning, The corn, and roots, and grass, which constitute the agricultural returns, no doubt result, nature assisting, from the labours of the cultivator; but the value of these things—the power they confer of commanding the resources of society—is not measured by those labours, but depends on causes extrinsic to the cultivator's operations. The produce bears the price it does, not in virtue of what the farmer has done, but because society needs food—needs food is quantities which can only be obtained by bringing lands under cultivation inferior to the best on his farm. That portion of the value of his produce which is due to this circumstance is, so far as he is concerned, an accident, something to which he has no more right than anyone else. As it does not result from his exertions, so it oners no encouragement to his industry; his claim to it is therefore wanting in that basis which constitutes the justification of property from the economic point of view. My conclusion, then, is that the due reward of the cultivator's industry, even where he supplies the entire labour and capital employed in production, is not necessarily co-extensive with the whole produce of his farm. It is only so on the supposition that he enjoys in raising it no exceptional advantages arising out of his relations with other people. But where he enjoys such exceptional advantages—that is to say, where be farms land better than the worst that yields the current profit of the country,—the principle of property, economically considered, is satisfied by his retaining so much of the produce as shall give him the average remuneration, leaving to society the remainder to be disposed of as it shall think fit."

There were other passages in that work which touched upon the question of economic rent; but he would not take up the time of the House by reading them, and would merely refer honourable members to the essay, where they would see that the question had been fairly and fully discussed. Then there was another book—Macdonnell's "Land System"—in which he had shown that the possession of land was different from the possession of any other property, and he also gave a quotation from the book from which he had just quoted. He said—

"A bale of cloth, a machine, a house, owes its value to the labour expended upon it, and belongs to the person who expends or employs the labour: a piece of land owes its value, so fares its value is affected by the causes I am now considering, not to the labour expended upon it, but to that expended upon something else—to the labour expended in making a railroad, or building houses in an adjoining town: and the value thus added to the land belong, not to the persons who have made the railway or built the houses, but to some one who may

not even have been aware that these operations were being carried on—nay, who perhaps has exerte all his efforts to prevent their being carried on."

So in reference to various other things that might be done, as for example in this colony where railways had been constructed, and where owners had protested against railways passing through or near their properties, but still had the value of their property afterwards increased three or four times by the very fact of the construction of those railways. Such men had done nothing of themselves to improve the value of their property, but it was the State which had done so, and therefore the State ought to reap some reward for its work. That was the principle on which what was called economic rent was based. But it was not only from the construction of works on or near the land that its value was increased, as there were other causes, independent of the exertions of the landowner himself, which tended to improve the value of the land, such as the increase in the population of towns, and the development of industries and manufactures. Take, for example, the city of Wellington. Ten years ago a man might have bought a section in that town for one-fifth or one-sixth the price at which he could sell it now, and yet nothing whatever might have been done by the man himself to enhance the value of his property. What was the cause of this? Simply, that people had settled in or near the town of Wellington. Therefore it was argued, and as he thought very justly, that no one had a right to the increased value of land which was not brought about by his own labour. He mentioned this fact, because some people argued that if this leasing system was introduced it would destroy all industry and desire to acquire wealth, which after all was the great strength of a country. He altogether denied such a deduction. Industry would not be interfered with, because a man would still receive all the profits that would arise from his own exertions, and all that the State would insist upon was that, he should not get something for which he had not worked. Many objections would no doubt be raised to the introduction of this system, but ho would only take up two or three of the arguments that could be used against it. The first, and he believed the most formidable one, bad been put forward by the wellknown political writer, Mr W. R. Greg, whose position was that the land should be so utilized as to support the best men—that was to say, that the land laws should be so arranged that the best of the race, as it were, should occupy the land, or, in other words, that the laws should be so framed that only the best of the race should live. To that argument there were several replies. First, that, so far as our system in the past was concerned, it had not produced the best men. He thought that what Emerson said was perfectly true, namely, that an Englishman born to an income of £200 or £300 a year rarely came to much. Looking at the list of scientific and literary men in England, it would be found that almost all had to make their living, so to speak, by their science or their literature. The plain outcome, therefore, of the system of getting a monopoly of land in England and other countries—of course there were exceptions, but that was the general rule—was a sufficient answer to the argument used by Mr. Greig. The second reply to that writer's argument was that, in the past, land had not been cultivated so well where the State had not interfered with the land laws at all, as in those countries where the State had exercised some supervision over the land. Mr. Greg neglected to consider the principle, with reference to this question of ownership of land or rather of the social improvement of a people, that you could not expect to raise the intellect of a people by merely saying that some should hold property at the expense of others. Those who objected to the leasing system must be prepared to defend the present system; and he had already pointed out, that if they did so, they must defend the principle that a man might destroy a large portion of the colony. He might say, in the words of a writer, that there was a large part of this colony at the present time

Wherein the beast was ever more and more.
And man was less and less.

He who had a piece of land that would support thousands of his race might say that he would have nothing but sheep and cattle upon it, and, if he possessed land on which a town was built, might destroy its general progress by preventing proper houses being erected, or not giving good terms to his tenants. In fact, he would have the power in his own hands of destroying the district or town. Those who advocated such a system could not find fault with those in other countries who had said to the people, "Your ancestors have lived on the land for hundreds of years, but you shall now leave it and they could not contend that the wholesale system of evictions in force in Scotland and Ireland was wrong. The land law at present in force in this colony was defended as right by some, but he thought it could not be defended on good grounds. Ruskin had brought forward another argument in favour of selling the land, when he said, "You must create a love of country; you must give a man heart in the work that he is doing." That writer in one of his works said that he would like to see all men have stone houses for dwellings, in order that they might have a permanent interest in the country. No doubt there would be members of this house who would adopt the same line of argument, and say that the only way to get land properly tilled would be to give a man the freehold of it, because if he knew it was not his

own it would not be his interest to improve it. There were two replies to that argument. First, that in the past those men who had improved the nation, or who had fought for it when fighting was required, or who had improved its agriculture, were tenants, and the best farming in the world had been carried on by tenants. That of itself was a sufficient reply to the argument that "if you destroy the freehold system yon will not have the people tilling the land as they ought to do, or making permanent homes for themselves." As an example, he might instance the Lothians of Scotland, where the finest farming in the world was carried on, considering the unfavorable climate and the other difficulties with which the people had to contend; and vet he did not believe there was one single freehold farm in all that country. The same might be said of the best-cultivated districts in both England and Ireland. So that, so far as this question of tilling or improving the land, or of people forming permanent homes, was concerned, it could not be said that tenants would not carry out these objects as well as landlords, or that they had not done so in the past. Honourable members must also recollect that under a system of State-leasing, instead of selling, it did not necessarily follow that a tenant should not have full compensation for any improvements he might make. He could conceive, and would be ready to explain a system under which the tenant would have the fullest compensation for any improvements he might make. That system was already in force in one place at least in the colony. He could not imagine a more efficient system than that which was now carried out by the Municipality of Dunedin, which possessed landed endowments to the value of from £150,000 to £200,000. The Municipality so leased these lands that every permanent improvement made by a tenant should be valued at the end of his lease, and the incoming tenant must pay for these improvements on the lands being put up to auction, or the old tenant might have his land back with the improvements added. Of course there must be a separation of the two kinds of improvement—namely, the kind of improvement from which the tenant reaped present advantage, and that kind which might be termed permanent improvement, and which gave additional value to the soil as such. This matter had been referred to by various writers, and especially in the reports which he had before mentioned, which were presented to the House of Commons in 1860 and 1870, and which were printed in the Blue Books of the British Parliament. It was there clearly pointed out that the distinction could easily be made, and that there were, so to speak, three values in the land. The writer said,—

"As regards the value of advantages : the advantages of olimate and of soil are evidently simple, but the advantage of position is seemingly complex. It is compounded of the advantages of local position and of the general position of the nation, and ultimately of the world. These advantages constitute the varying variable in this value of advantages. Now, it is clear that the value of advantages is entirely independent of the single or accumulated labour invested or on the land. It is equally clear that the other three values are dependent upon such labour. The individual man, who has the usufruct of the land, and has invested that labour, is obviously entitled to such part of the gross agricultural returns as shall correspond to these three values, and is as obviously not entitled to the remaining part which corresponds to the value of advantages. But if the usufructuary be not entitled, who is entitled? Whenever land is given over to private speculation, the private owner receives that remaining, and it known as theoretical rent But in the principle that the right of property of any individual man to a thing only attaches to the things which he has himself created by labour, or acquired by payment of accumulated labour, he is evidently not entitled to any increase in the value of advantages beyond the value of his payment of accumulated labour."

Consequently the writer of the report argued in favour of a system of State-leasing, as well as other economists who had taken up the subject. He would now point out the benefit which the colony might derive from introducing this system. He had already stated that if it were introduced, taxation might almost cease; and very slight reflection would show that this would be the case. Take, for example, the pastoral lands in the Province of Otago, which at present yielded to the Government about £60,000 a year, but they were rented at so low a rate that they returned to the pastoral tenants immense profits when they brought their produce into the markets; in fact those gentlemen got a large premium for occupying the land. These leases however would very soon expire, some of them in two or three years, and the longest within ten years. He was not defending the system of small holdings; but if these runs were taken and cut up, and so offered in the market that the whole of the people could compete for them at a fair rental, he believed he was fixing a low figure when he said that the purely pastoral lands in Otago would yield nearly a quarter of a million a year. Besides that, there were vast tracts of land in that province which were suitable for agricultural purposes. Of course a distinction must be made between the pastoral and the agricultural land; but if they were divided into half, half agricultural farms and half hill farms, an immense income would be derived from them, and he believed he would not be wrong in stating it at £150,000 a year as the amount which would be derived from the unsold lands in Ota go. There would thus be derived from those lands as much as was now obtained from the disposal of them, namely, at least £400,000 a year, which would do more than pay interest on the loans, and go far to lessen the amount required to be derived from Customs duties. Were the same system carried on in other parts of the colony, there would be such a revenue as would put the Government in a difficulty to know what to do with the money. The

revenue would be so great that, as had been said to him some time ago, the Colonial Treasurer when he came down with his Financial Statement would actually not know what to, do with the large sums of money at his disposal. That was one way in which this system would work : bat there was another way in which to look at it, outside the question of taxation,—and that was, that we were in this colony under the present system unduly creating a capitalist class. He did not intend to speak against capitalists, for he recognised that they were a class of the community as necessary to the prosperity of the country as the labouring class; but he contended that it was not fair for this colony to expend its millions in order to increase the value of its lands, so that the whole profit arising from them should go into the hands of those who had a monoply of the land. That was a system which was thoroughly wrong in theory, and it could not be defended by any one who looked at it from a purely politico-economic view, and it was equally wrong in practice. What was the hope that was in the minds of all those who came to this colony? It was that all the evils from which older nations such as the mother country suffered should not follow them here—that the land should not be held by a few landlords, and that their tenants should not be tenants at will, bound to do as their landlords told them, who is the meantime lived in great affluence and wealth while their tenants found it difficult to-live. One of the greatest incentives to emigration from older countries was to get rid of this powerful landlord class, but the present system in force in New Zealand was simply creating them. Let anybody travel through Canterbury and see its splendid land and judge whether it was properly utilised. He had done so, and had seen miles of land belonging to one landowner—miles of fine level land, owned by one person; the value of which was immensely increased by the construction of railways near it! and yet there was nothing on that land but sheep and cattle. There was an immense quantity of land in that part of the colony which could be settled by very many people, and which could be cultivated with the plough—and yet large tracts of it were in the hands of one man, who could say that sheep and not men should be settled on it. That was the system in force in New Zealand, and it was a most vicious system, not only from an economic point of view, but from this point of view: that under it New Zealand would never grow into a nation. In reference to this point he might say that the system he proposed would give the. State control over these lands in a better way than it had at present: and he would submit that it was only necessary to look at the Irish land laws to see the necessity for some such system, and to see that the question was a very pressing one. Some persons might contend that the difficulty would be at an end as soon as all the waste land was sold. It was absurd to imagine that such would be the case, for even in America it was now being recognised, and several articles had appeared in various magazines, and notably one a short time ago on the subject, in which it was pointed out that the question of the American lands was one that would soon have to be taken up by American politicians, because some of the best land had already been parted with, and "going out West" was not so easy as it was some years ago. Therefore those who imagined that the land question would be at an end when the land was all sold would see that, as soon as the agricultural land in the country was sold, there would be such a land agitation as had never taken place in the past. Then the difficulty would be really recognised, and what he desired by his motion was to avoid such an agitation, and not only that, but to put an end to a great deal of the present bickerings between pastoral tenants and agriculturists, by providing that the state should have the power of leasing the lands in such a way that each year a certain quantity should be thrown open, which could be taken on leases extending over a series of years. That could always be arranged, and thus an end would be put to the continual agitation between the two classes to which he had referred. Knowing that the day was devoted to private members business, he had confined his remarks to as short a space as possible; bat there was one point to which he must refer, and that was the right of the State in the matter. Upon this question there was a short extract from Spencer's "Social Statics" which he would like to read. That writer pointed out that, so far as the right of the State was concerned, it could insist, and did insist, when the necessity arose, to review the tenure of the land—that was to say, that various Parliaments in England had interfered with the freehold of land; and when the construction of railways or other works required it, Parliament had insisted upon the owner giving up his land. The writer said,—

"Moreover, we daily deny landlordism by our legislation. Is a canal, a railway, or a turnpike road to be inside? we do not scruple to seize just as many acres as may be requisite; allowing holders compensation for the capital invested. We do not wait for consent. An Act of Parliament supercedes the authority of title deeds, and serves proprietors with notices to quit, whether they will or not. Either this is equitable, or it is not."

Then he spoke further about national works, and said,—

"Either the public are free to resume as much of the earth's surface as they think fit, or the titles of the landowners must be considered absolute, and all national works must be postponed until lords and squires please to part with the requisite shoes of their estates. If we decide that the claims of individual ownership must give way, then we imply that the right of the nation at large to the soil is supreme; that the right of private possession only exists by general consent; that general consent being withdrawn, it ceases; or, in other words, that it is no right at all."

That would be a very strong argument in favour of the State resuming possession of the land that had been

sold. He did not however intend to deal fully with that question at present, but merely mentioned it in case any argument as to the right of the State to control these lands should be brought against the system which he proposed. He could point out a way in which any difficulty in that respect could be disposed of and in which land could be resumed without any wrong being done to the present possessor, although he would be deprived of the economic rent to which he had referred. The scheme would be met by some honorable members with the argument that it was a socialistic scheme. Nothing could be more childish than to say that the system which at present existed in the colony of leasing waste lands was socialistic; and the system which he proposed was only an extension of that which now prevailed. Socialism had no reference whatever to the question. What he understood by socialism was, that the result of the labours of the community should be put, as it were, into a common purse, in the same way as the House was proposing to do in the abolition of the provinces; but he contended that there was no such thing as socialism in the system which he now proposed. His scheme proposed that for everything a man did by his own labour upon the land he was entitled to a benefit, or, in other words, he had a right of property in anything that he did by his own work. He would give to the tenants the reward of their own industry, of their own skill, and of their own time; and all that he would take from them was something for which they never worked—something, perhaps, which they never ex— pected to earn. There was nothing of socialism in that. The scheme would also put an end to speculation in laud. Why were so many persons anxious to purchase Native land"? Why were so many desirous to pounce upon the land and bay it up here and throughout the colony? It was not with a view to producing something from the land or to tilling it. He was told that a man could travel through the North Island, and in many parts he would go over miles and miles of land, and see nothing but sheep and cattle on it. It was not, therefore, with a view of reaping something from the Boil itself that they purchased the land, but they simply wished to hold it for what might be termed speculative purposes, knowing very well that if they only held it for two or three years its value would be increased three or four times what it was when bought. That was the cause of land speculation. There was another point which should not be lost sight of, and that was that in New Zealand the area of agricultural land was limited. A vast quantity of it was only fit for pastoral purposes, and it was nonsense to suppose that many millions of acres, in Otago for instance, could be used for any other purpose. That should therefore be kept in mind, because, as the agricultural area was parted with, the great land agitation would then become an agitation really. He did not suppose that this motion would be fully discussed, as no doubt some members had not thoroughly thought it out, and he had rather taken the opportunity of making these observations in the House, with the hope that in the forthcoming elections the matter would be thoroughly considered. If they could only get the people to look upon the land as the property of the State, and to insist upon a certain amount being returned by it to the State, then the country would get rid of many of the evils which had troubled it in the past. That was the urgent need. It was not, as he had mentioned the other night when speaking on another question, that the mere passing of Bills had any effect. The people must be educated to an idea, and in that would be the hopes of progress of a race. In the resolution he had only asked the Government, daring the recess, to consider the matter in all its bearings, and he would urge honourable members to do the same. In the few remarks he had made, he had not so much spoken on the question as indicated the books that might be consulted by honourable members who wished to see the arguments put in a much better way than he could pat them. He might refer them to Cairnes, Mill, Spencer, Macdonnell, and on the other side Greg and Fawcett. He would ask honorable members to do so if they really wished to get a really good land system for New Zealand—a system that would prevent the heavy and ruinous taxation that must necessarily ensue if the present system of spending public money was carried on, for it seemed that any person or any Government that would only promise to spend money would be popular. But the means of spending that money was coming to a close, and not a day too soon. If along with the vast scheme of public works which the colony bad undertaken, the author of that scheme had come down with some plan that would have secured to the colony the benefit arising from the public works scheme in the increased price of land, it would have been a statesmanlike proposal. They had neglected that opportunity, but there were millions of acres left, which, if dealt with under a leasing system instead of being sold, would add greatly to the prosperity of the colony, and an example would be set that other colonies would he bound to follow; and the colony might be doing something which he hoped it would yet do,—tako a lead in this part of the world in social questions—such a lead as older nations might be proud to follow. In moving the resolution, he was not asking the affirmation of anything that could not stand the strictest test of the strictest schools of political economy. He admitted there were speeches made—not in this House, but outside—to the mass of the people who might not have been studying political economy, in which such cries as "Down with capital" Down with the owners of the land," were raised; and these things were mischievous; but this principle was not one belonging to anything but the strictest economic theory, and it could stand all argument, he did not care what, that could be brought against it. He trusted that honourable members would, at their leisure moments, refer to the books he had named, where they would see the question argued far more ably than he could argue it, even if he had time to speak at length on the matter; but he had merely gone over the heads of

the subject. The introduction of such a system into New Zealand would be the only way of laying the foundation of a population go trained as to look upon themselves as true colonists—as usufructuaries—as holding soil in trust not only for themselves but for the whole race; and would inaugurate not only a new system of government, but a new system of progress, such as the world had not yet-seen.

vignette

Front Cover

New Zealand. Memorandum Regarding the Powers of the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives in New Zealand.
By the Hon. Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G.
Wellington. By Authority: George Didsbury, Government Printer. 1886

Memorandum Regarding the Powers of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives in New Zealand.

THE recent decision of Her Majesty's Privy Council on the questions submitted to it by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of Queensland, regarding the power of the former to deal with money Bills, cannot fail to be of interest to every British colony. The value of the judgment of this Court of last resort in the Empire is enhanced by the fact that it is the opinion of able politicians and renowned lawyers. The following were the members of the Judicial Committee that pronounced on the points in dispute, namely: Lord Spencer (President), Lord Herschell, (Chancellor), the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, Lord Aberdare, Lord Blackburn, Lord Hobhouse, and Sir Richard Couch. The questions submitted to the Court were two—

First, whether "The Queensland Constitution Act, 1867," confers on the Legislative Council powers co-ordinate with the Legislative Assembly in the amendment of all Bills, including money Bills?

Second, whether the claims of the Legislative Assembly, as set forth in their message of the 12th November, 1885, are well-founded?

The message of the Legislative Assembly appears in the Appendix, where also will be found the other documents referred to the Judicial Committee. (See Appendix No. 1.) To these questions the Lords of the Committee replied that the first should be answered in the negative, and the second in the affirmative. Thus the contention of the Legislative Assembly was accepted in full.

The Constitution Act of Queensland has the following sections bearing on the subject:—

Section 1. There shall be within the said Colony of Queensland a Legislative Council and a Legislative Assembly.

Section 2. Within the said Colony of Queensland Her Majesty shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the said Council and Assembly, to make laws for the peace, welfare, and good government of the colony in all cases whatsoever: Provided that all Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, for imposing any new rate, tax, or impost, subject always to the limitations hereinafter provided, shall originate in the Legislative Assembly of the said colony.

Section 18. It shall not be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to originate or pass any vote, resolution, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the said Consolidated Revenue Fund, or of any other tax or impost, to any purpose which shall not first have been recommended by a message of the Governor to the said Legislative Assembly during the session in which such vote, resolution, or Bill shall be passed.

These clauses in the Queensland statute are similar to certain clauses in the New Zealand Constitution Act. Section 32 of 15 and 16 Vict., cap. 72 (called the Constitution Act), provides,—

There shall be within the Colony of New Zealand a General Assembly, to consist of the Governor, a Legislative Council, and House of Representatives.

And section 54 is similar to section 18 of the Queensland Constitution Act. There is, however, in New Zealand an Act called "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," passed by the General Assembly of New Zealand; and section 4 of that Act is as follows:—

The Legislative Council and House of Representatives of New Zealand respectively, and the Committees and members thereof respectively, shall hold, enjoy, and exercise such and the like privileges, immunities, and powers as on the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five were held, enjoyed, and exorcised by the Commons House of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the Committees and members thereof, so far as the same are not inconsistent with or repugnant to such and so many of the sections and provisions of the said Constitution Act as at the time of the coming into operation of this Act are

unrepealed, whether such privileges, immunities, or powers were so held, possessed, or enjoyed by custom, statute, or otherwise; and such privileges, immunities, and powers shall be deemed to be and shall be part of the general and public law of the colony, and it shall not be necessary to plead the same, and the same shall in all Courts, and by and before all Judges, be judicially taken notice of.

An interpretation, though not judicial, has been passed on this Act by Lord Coleridge and Sir George Jessel (the late eminent Master of the Rolls). I shall refer further on to the conflict which arose between the Houses, and which led to the obtaining of the opinion of Lord Coleridge and Sir George Jessel, who were then the Law Officers of the Crown in England, being respectively Attorney-and Solicitor-General. They stated that they were of opinion that" The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," did not confer on the Legislative Council any larger powers in respect of money Bills than it would otherwise have possessed. They thought that the Act was not intended to affect, and did not affect, the legislative powers of either House of the Legislature in New Zealand. Todd, in his "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," page 479, assumes that the opinion given by these eminent lawyers was a direct and unimpeachable settlement of the point at issue.

It may, however, be interesting to trace what has happened in New Zealand regarding the claim of the Legislative Council to alter or amend money Bills.

The first session of the first Parliament was assembled on the 24th May, 1854, and it concluded on the 17th August, 1854, Parliament being prorogued on that day to the 31st August, 1834. On that date the second session began. No Appropriation Bill was passed during the first session. The struggle for Responsible Government and the dealing with the waste lands of the Crown were the two questions that mostly occupied the attention of both Houses during the first session. In the second session an Appropriation Bill was passed. The Council claimed the right on that occasion to amend this Bill. The Hon. Major (afterwards Colonel) Kenny, indeed, considered that the estimates should be laid before the Council, and the Speaker urged that, even if the Council had no power to amend the Bill, yet that a copy of the estimates should have been furnished for the consideration of the Council.

The Council went into Committee on the Bill, and an amendment was moved by the Hon. Mr. Whitaker (now the Hon. Sir Frederick Whitaker) to the following effect:—

To strike out, after the words "out of the," the following words: "revenue arising from taxes, duties, and imposts levied within the colony, and which are hereby raised by Act of the Assembly, except such portions thereof as shall by an Act of the General Assembly be declared to be otherwise applicable."

The title of the first Appropriation Bill was as follows: "An Act to provide for the Appropriation of the Public Revenue of New Zealand." The preamble was as follows:—

Whereas, by an Act made and enacted in the Parliament holden in the fifteenth and sixteenth years of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, intituled "An Act to grant a Representative Constitution to the Colony of New Zealand," it is amongst other things enacted that, after and subject to the payments to be made under the provisions therein contained, all the revenues arising from taxes, duties, rates, and imposts levied in virtue of any Act of the General Assembly, and from the disposal of waste lands of the Crown, shall be subject to be appropriated to such specific purposes as by any Act of the said General Assembly shall be prescribed in that behalf, and that the surplus of such revenue which shall not be appropriated as aforesaid shall be divided among the several provinces in the like proportions as the gross proceeds of the said revenue shall have arisen therein respectively; but no specific provision has been made by the recited Act for the appropriation of Her Majesty's revenue levied under and by virtue of ordinances made and enacted by the Legislative Council of New Zealand before the passing of the said recited Act: And whereas it is expedient that the revenue arising from the disposal of the watte lands of the Crown, and from such revenues as aforesaid, should be appropriated in manner hereinafter mentioned.

The enacting clause was—

Be it therefore enacted by the General Assembly as follows.

The amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Whitaker was carried by the Council, and the Bill as amended was forwarded to the House of Representatives, and after debate it was agreed that a Conference on the amendment should be asked; and after Conference it was agreed that certain amendments should be made in the Bill. These amendments were the same in substance, though not in words, as had been recommended by the Legislative Council. The amendments were,—

That in the thirteenth line of the prcamble the words "that portion of," and the words "arising from the duties of Customs" in the thirteenth and fourteenth lines, be struck out, and the words "duties of Customs" in the seventeenth lino be expunged, and the word "revenues" inserted instead.

In clause 1 the following words after "out of" in the first line be struck out, "the said duties of Customs," and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "Her Majesty's revenue arising from the Post Office, duties of Customs, and fees and fines of the Supreme Court, now levied within the colony."

In clause 2, the words "Customs and land" in the sixth line be expunged.

These amendments were accepted by both Houses. The Legislative Council passed several resolutions regarding this Appropriation Bill, with the object of guarding their rights (if any) and of declaring that the course adopted in the passing of this the first Appropriation Bill was not to be deemed a precedent. The resolutions were as follows:—

1. That the honourable member bearing the message with the Appropriation Bill inform the House of Representatives that the detailed estimates have not accompanied that Bill, and that whatever course may be hereafter followed in reference to Supply Bills, whether called upon either wholly to accept or wholly to reject, the Legislative Council is desirous it should be understood that the course now taken is not to be considered as a precedent.

2. That, under these circumstances, the Legislative Council have agreed, with extreme reluctance, to an Act winch places large sums of money at the absolute disposal of the Executive Government, the particular mode of appropriating those sums not having been prescribed by the Act.

Resolved—(1.) That, as the Bill for appropriating the public revenues was not introduced into the Legislative Council until the 15th September, and as the Assembly is to be prorogued on the 16th instant, this Council has no alternative but either wholly to reject the Bill or to agree to it in the form in which it has been transmitted to them by the House of Representatives.

(2.) That, in consenting to pass the Appropriation Bill for 1864-55 without alteration of any of the sums voted by the House of Representatives, the Legislative Council have regard solely to the maintenance of the civil establishment of the colony, and desire in no way to prejudice any right to alter or amend the annual Appropriation Bill or any other measure for raising or disposing of the public revenues.

(3.) That, although the Act for granting a Representative Constitution to the colony of New Zealand contains no provisions for limiting or restricting the power of the Legislative Council to alter or amend any legislative measures whatever which may be submitted for their consideration, the question has nevertheless been raised whether the Legislative Council would be justified in making any alteration in a measure of Supply, or whether, by analogy to the British Constitution, the Legislative Council of New Zealand must not either wholly accept or wholly reject every such measure.

(4.) That, in order to avoid the evils which would result from any conflict of opinion between two of the branches of the General Assembly as to the nature and extent of their respective constitutional rights, all doubt upon the subject should be at once and authoritatively set at rest; and that, with a view to that object, His Excellency the Officer Administering the Government be respectfully moved to bring the question under the consideration of Her Majesty's Imperial Government.

(5.) That a copy of the preceding resolutions in reference to the right of the Legislative Council in respect of measures of Supply be forwarded to His Excellency the Officer Administering the Government, and that His Excellency's attention thereto be respectfully requested.

The House of Representatives made no reply to these resolutions, and the Council and the House were prorogued the next day.

In pursuance of the fourth and fifth of the above resolutions, His Excellency the Officer Administering the Government forwarded to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies a despatch, inquiring whether the Legislative Council would be justified in making any alteration in any measure of Supply which had been voted by the House of Representatives, or whether, by analogy to the British Constitution, the Legislative Council must either wholly accept or wholly reject every such measure. The Secretary of State (Sir G. Grey) replied as follows:—

The question raised by your despatch is one of great importance in itself, and touching on the very first principles of English constitutional law. In this country it has been the undisputed practice, as affirmed by the resolution of the House of Commons of the year 1678, that Bills of Supply ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords. It is quite true that the New Zealand Constitution Act contains no provisions to the same effect, but it appears to me that the analogy of the English Constitution ought to prevail, the reason being the same when the Upper House is not elected by the people; and in Canada, where the Constitutional Act is similar in this respect to that of New Zealand, the Lower Assembly has hitherto exercised without dispute the same privilege in regard to money votes as the British House of Commons.

This despatch was dated the 25th March, 1855.

In 1855 the Parliament met on the 8th August, and continued sitting until the 15th September. An Appropriation Bill was passed, and the Council again, to guard its rights, passed a resolution as follows:—

That any proceeding of the Legislative Council in reference to "The Appropriation Act, 1855," shall not form any precedent for a future session.

There seems to have been no question raised between the Council and the House on any question of Supply or money Bills.

In 1856 the Appropriation Bill was passed without any attempted amendments or any protest, although the

Council discussed certain provisions in the Bill regarding the increase of the salaries of the Ministers.

In 1855-56 the form of the Appropriation Bill was the same—namely, a recital and a statement out of what the revenue was to be paid.

In 1856 provision had to be made for extending the Appropriation Bill.

There was no meeting of Parliament in 1857.

In 1858 the House met on the 10th April, and sat until the 21st August. An Appropriation Bill for 1857—58 was passed, and an Appropriation Bill for 1838—59. No amendment was attempted to be made in either of the Bills by the Legislative Council. In 1858 the form of the Act was altered: there was no preamble to the Appropriation Bill, and the Act began at once at the enactment clause. The appropriating clause was also different. It was,—

There shall and may be issued and applied towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year 1858-59, in addition to the sums mentioned in the Civil List Act and other Acts, the sum of seventy-two thousand six hundred and sixteen pounds and ten shillings out of the ordinary revenue, to be appropriated towards or for the purposes hereafter expressed.

The Legislative Council amended the Surplus Revenue Bill, which was strictly a money Bill. The amendment was made in the schedule, and was assented to by the House of Representatives without any objection.

There was no meeting of the Assembly in 1859.

In 1860 the Parliament met on the 30th July, and was prorogued on the 5th November. The Appropriation Bill was passed through all its stages by the Council without any amendment. The New Zealaud Loan Bill, however, was amended by the Council, and the amendment was assented to by the House of Representatives; but the House was careful to provide that the amendment accepted was in furtherance of the provisions in the Bill. The amendment was accepted in the following words:—

Resolved, That the amendment made by the Legislative Council, it being in furtherance of the intentions of the House and to render the clause consistent.

The Debenture Bill of 1860, which was also a money Bill, was amended, and the amendment accepted by the following resolution of the House:—

That the amendments made by the Legislative Council be adopted, they being for the purpose of rectifying a clerical error, and in furtherance of the intentions of the House.

The Appropriation Bill was in the same form as that of 1858.

In 1861 the Appropriation Bill was passed without any amendment, and no question was raised regarding any Supply Bill.

In 1862 a provision was inserted by the Legislative Council in "The Native Lands Act, 1862."

The amendment made was adopted by the House, but the following resolution was passed:—

That the amendment of the 17th clause of the Native Lands Bill made by the Legislative Council is an infringement of the privileges of this House, inasmuch as it assumes to regulate the imposition of a fee and the limits within which it is proposed to be levied, contrary to the provisions of the 128th Standing Order and the practice of the Imperial Parliament in such matters.

The Bill was returned to the Assembly by the Governor, who proposed that the words added to section 17 by the Legislative Council should be omitted, and that a 10-per-cent. *ad valorem* duty on the transfer of Native Lands should be imposed. The proposal of the Governor was accepted by both Houses. The Legislative Council, however, appointed a Committee to consider and report whether the amendment made by the Council was a breach of the privileges of the House of Representatives, and also, at the option of the Committee, to prepare a case to be submitted for the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England as a guide to the Council in its future dealings with like questions.

The Committee reported in favour of a case being submitted for the opinion of the Law Officers; and His Excellency the Governor, Sir George Grey, forwarded the case proposed by the Council to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle to obtain the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown. There was a memorandum by Mr. Domett setting forth the view entertained by the House of Representatives, and also a memorandum by Mr. Dillon Bell (now Sir Dillon Bell), the Native Minister, on the same subject. These documents appear in Appendix No. 2.

The opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England, Sir W. Atherton and Sir Roundell Palmer (now Lord Sclbornc), was given on the 9th April, 1863, and stated that the Legislative Council was within its rights in making the amendment. I have set out the opinion at length. (Sec Appendix No. 2.) It will be noticed that these eminent lawyers did not assert the Legislative Council had any authority the House of Lords did not possess, but that the amendment made did not directly impose any tax.

Mr. Hugh Carleton, who was Chairman of Committees of the House and had been Acting-Speaker, submitted the question to Mr. T. E. May (afterwards Sir T. E. May and Lord Farn-borough). He took a different view from the Law Officers. Mr. Carleton forwarded their opinion to him, but still Mr. May saw no reason to

alter his views. The correspondence was presented to the House in 1864 by Mr. Carleton, and ordered to be engrossed in the Journals of the House. (See Appendix No. 3.)

In 1864 the Parliament was a very short one. It met in Auckland on the 24th November, and was prorogued on the 13th December, 1864. No question was raised regarding any Bills of Supply.

In 1865 the form of the Appropriation Bill was altered, there being a preamble as follows:—

Whereas it appears by messages from His Excellency Sir G. Grey, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, and Commander-in-Chief in and over Her Majesty's Colony of Now Zealand and its dependencies, and Vice-Admiral thereof, and by the estimates accompanying the same, that the sums hereinafter mentioned are required to defray certain expenses of the Government of this colony and of the public service thereof, and for other purposes, for the year ending on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six: be it therefore enacted, &c.

A similar preamble appears in the Appropriation Act of 1866. Neither in 1865 nor in 1866 did any question arise in either House about any Supply Bill.

In 1867 the form of the Appropriation Bill was altered, it taking the form adopted by the other colonics, as a grant of Supply to Her Majesty. It may be noted that in New Zealand the statutes are unlike, in form of their enacting clause, to those of the other colonies. In the other colonies—take, for example, Canada, Victoria, New South Wales—the legislation is by Her Majesty the Queen by and with the consent of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, &c. In New Zealand it is the General Assembly that passes the laws. The General Assembly is the Governor and the two Houses, but not Her Majesty.

In 1867 the Appropriation Act had the following preamble:—

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

And this form has been continued up to the present time. This amendment in the form of the Appropriation Bill gave rise to no discussion—indeed, it does not seem to have been noticed by the House or Council.

In 1867 no question of privilege arose between the two Houses.

In 1868 the subject of the privileges and the constitution of the Council was discussed. The Hon. Mr. Holmes moved that a Committee, consisting of the Hon. the Speaker, the Hon. Major Richmond, C.B., the Hon. Dr. Pollen, the Hon. Colonel Kenny, the Hon. Mr. Johnston, the Hon. Mr. Lee, and the mover, be appointed for the purpose of exactly ascertaining the powers and privileges of the Council, with a view to the modification of its constitution. This Committee made a very lengthy report.

The report was referred back to the Committee, and a further report was brought up on the 21st August, and both reports were adopted on the 26th August. As the question of amending the constitution of the Legislative Council may possibly come early before Parliament, these reports are well worthy of consideration. They deal, not only with the powers of the Council, but with its constitution, and with amendments deemed necessary to promote its greater usefulness. (See Appendix No. 4.)

The adoption of the report gave rise to considerable debate, which appears in *Hansard*, Vol. III., pp. 9—18. No question arose on the Appropriation Bill, nor regarding any other money Bill.

In 1869 a very long and elaborate report was prepared by the Hon. Sir John Richardson and the Hon. Dr. Menzies on the privileges of the Council. (Sec Appendix No. 5.) The investigation dealt with—

- As to the powers conferred on the Council by the Constitution Act and by any subsequent legislation.
- As to the powers hold or exercised by law, rule, or usage by the House of Lords and the House of Commons respectively.
- As to the powers conferred on the chief colonies of Great Britain under constitutional government by any Constitution Act and legislation, and as hold and exercised by the Legislature of the United States of America.

There was no question between the Council and the House on any Bill in this year.

In 1870 no question arose between the Houses as to any money Bills.

The next serious question that arose in connection with the privileges of the House was raised in 1871.

In that year a Bill termed "The Payment to Provinces Bill"was before the Legislature, and the Legislative Council amended the Bill by striking out clause 28 and making other alterations in the 14th, 15th, and 29th sections. The Bill as amended was returned to the House of Representatives, and the House disagreed with the amendments, the reason being given as follows: "That the clauses [*unclear:* 11,] 15, 28, 29, relate to the appropriation and *management* of money, and that the Legislative Council has not power to alter or expunge such clauses."On this message being forwarded to the Legislative Council, the Council referred it to the

Standing Orders Committee, who brought up a report on the subject which was adopted by the Council.

Managers were appointed to draw up reasons for insisting upon their amendments; but the report was not agreed to, and another was adopted. (Sec Appendix No. 6.)

The House of Representatives adopted resolutions on the subject, which are embodied in the case submitted to the Law Officers. (See Appendix No. 6.)

The result was that both Houses agreed to make the Act only temporary—viz., till July, 1872—and to submit the question to the Law Officers of the Crown of England.

The case submitted to the opinion of the Law Officers appears in Appendix No. 6, as well as the opinion. The despatch by Earl Kimberley conveying the opinion was presented to the Council by message from the Governor, and ordered by the Council to be entered in its minutes.

In 1872 a Customs Bill, called the "Drawbacks Bill,"was amended by the Legislative Council. The penalty, instead of being left in the Bill as it passed the House of Representatives, at £200, was amended by placing the words "not exceeding"before it. The Council also altered the procedure of the Customhouse officers in the seizing and detaining of goods supposed to be contraband. The alterations were brought before the House; but the Speaker ruled that the amendments were of a nature that could be made by the Legislative Council, and, after an adjournment of the question, the House agreed to the amendments made.

In 1873 the constitution of the Council was again discussed. This arose in consequence of a statement made in the Governor's Speech at the opening of Parliament that a measure would be laid before Parliament to initiate a reconstruction of the constitution of the Legislative Council.

A motion on the subject was proposed by the Hon. Mr. Waterhouse; it was amended, and ultimately lost. A Bill called "The Legislative Council Temporary Appointment Bill"was introduced into the Council and shelved, the Council agreeing, without a division, that it should be read that day six months.

There was no question raised between the Houses on any Bill in 1873; nor were there any differences between the Council and the House.

No question arose between the Council and the House of Representatives in 1874 or in 1875 on any Supply Bill.

In 1876 the Rating, Counties, and Municipal Bills were all amended by the Council; and, as the limit of rating and borrowing was interfered with by the Council, it is doubtful if the House of Commons would have allowed the House of Lords to amend the Bills in the manner in which the House of Representatives allowed the Council to do without protest.

In 1878 an important question was raised as to the power of the Legislative Council to alter a Bill providing for the construction of railways. This Bill was called "The Railways Construction Act;"it was an Act to provide for the construction and extension of railways; and the question was whether amendments could be made in the Act by the Council. The matter was fought very keenly. There were two Conferences between the Council and the House. The Speaker of the House ruled that the Bill was a money Bill, and could not be altered by the Legislative Council. The 3rd clause of the Bill, the Speaker stated, amounted to an appropriation clause.

The Managers agreed to the following course: that the clause should be amended, the Ministry recommending the Governor to forward a message to the House suggesting a proviso being added to clause 3. The report of the Managers appears in Appendix No. 7.

This course was taken, and a message was sent down to the House by the Governor. The House agreed to the amendment on the ground that it was in furtherance of the wishes of the House.

The Hon. Mr. Hall (now Sir John Hall) pointed out that, as the Council had forwarded a message to the House of Representatives, stating that they had agreed to the Bill only on the reception of the report of the Managers of the Conference, the position contended for and obtained by the Council as to their power to alter the Bill had been established.

In the Public Works Appropriation Bill, which was headed with the usual address to Her Majesty as a Supply Bill, the 17th section authorized the construction of railways, and was to be deemed a special Act for that purpose. This 17th section was called in the Council a "tack,"and there is no doubt that it had been put in for the purpose of enabling the Government to go on with the railways if the Railway Construction Bill did not become law. This was so stated in the Council by the Colonial Secretary, who, however, offered on behalf of the Government to advise His Excellency to send down a message to strike out the 17th section. A question as to the power to do this was raised by the Attorney-General (Sir R. Stout), and the Speaker of the House of Representatives ruled that, as this was a Supply Bill, he could not give it up to the Government until all the grievances of the House were redressed and until all the other Bills had been assented to; and, as a Supply Bill was different from other Bills, it not being in the possession of the Government of the day, they could not advise His Excellency to recommend an amendment of it. The result was that this 17th section remained in the Bill, and was not struck out.

In 1881 a Pensions Bill was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Shrimski in the House of Representatives. The

Legislative Council proposed to strike out clause 6 in the Bill, and a very long debate and controversy arose in consequence between the two Houses. The Premier (the Hon. Sir J. Hall) wished to assert that the Council had power to make the amendment made; but the Speaker (Sir M. O'Rorke) held a different opinion, and made a long and able statement on the subject, which appears in *Hansard*, Vol. XL., pp. 455,456. (See Appendix No. 8.)

The Council insisted on its amendment, and appointed as Managers the Hon. Sir F. Whitaker, the Hon. Mr. Acland, and the Hon. Mr. Waterhouse, to draw up reasons for insisting upon their amendment. (See *Hansard*, p. 515, Vol. XL.)

The House of Representatives replied to these reasons by arguing the matter with the Council. (See p. 527, Vol. XL., *Hansard.)*

The Council offered to accept clause 6 if it was not made retrospective. The Hon. Sir F. Whitaker moved,—

- That the complications which have arisen in the proceedings in the Pensions Bill render it desirable that the whole subject should be referred to the Standing Orders Committee to search for precedents, to consider the matter carefully, and report fully to the Council without delay, and that it be so referred.
- That a message be sent to the House of Representatives informing them that the proceedings in reference to the Pensions Bill appear so unusual and complicated that the Council have referred the whole subject to the Standing Orders Committee to search for precedents, to consider the subject carefully, and report without delay to the Council.

This was done because of some dispute which had arisen as to the position of the Bill. A Select Committee dealt with the matter, and their report appears in *Hansard*, Vol. XL., p. 797.

The question of the Pensions Bill was submitted by the Agent-General to Sir T. E. May (see Appendix No. 9); and the view of the Speaker was upheld.

In 1886 two important questions were raised regarding the power of the Council—

- In dealing with rates, could the Legislative Council alter, for example, the limit of the rate proposed to be authorized to be levied by Municipal Councils?
- Could the Legislative Council interfere with the rates that were to be levied by Harbour Boards on vessels!

In the first case the House passed a resolution stating that the Council had no power, and it was a breach of the privileges of the House, to amend the rate. The Council had reduced the rate of 1s. 3d. to 1s. The Council waived its amendment. The Harbours Bill had been introduced in the Legislative Council, and when it reached the House of Representatives certain amendments were made by the House, one increasing the rating-power of Boards so far as levying dues on ships were concerned. The Council objected to the increase of the rate, and amended the amended Bill. The House of Representatives refused to allow the Council's amendment, alleging that their privileges had been interfered with. There was a Free Conference held, but that Conference could not agree. Another was appointed, and ultimately the Conference agreed to recommend the Ministry to advise His Excellency, if the Bill were passed, to send down a message suggesting an amendment in the rating-power, by limiting it. This was not mentioned in the report from the Conference, the Managers simply reporting that they had agreed to the Bill; but an undertaking was given by a Minister that the Government would recommend His Excellency to send down the amendment. The Bill was passed, and an amendment was sent down by message from the Governor, and agreed to by both Houses.

The power of the Legislative Council to throw out a Bill which provided for the remission of taxation was discussed in the House. A Bill proposing to abolish the export duty on gold had often been before Parliament. On more than one occasion the Legislative Council had laid the Bill aside. The right of the Council to do this was challenged by Mr. Pyke, and a Committee was appointed, consisting of Major Atkinson, Mr. Conolly, Mr. Fergus, Colonel Fraser, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Seddon, Mr. Guinness, Mr. Pykc, and the Minister of Mines, to search for precedents. The Committee reported as follows:—

Your Committee, having diligently searched for precedents and inquired into the usages and practice of the Imperial Parliament, to which the General Assembly of New Zealand is an analogous body, possessing and exercising the same rights and privileges, have the honour to report as follows—

- *That the right of granting aids and supplies to the Crown is in the House of Representatives alone, as an essential part of its constitution; and the limitation of all such grants as, to matter, manner, measure, and time is in it only.*
- *That, although the Legislative Council has exercised the power of rejecting Bills of several descriptions relating to taxation by negativing the whole, yet the exercise of that power by the Council has not been frequent, and is justly regarded by the House with peculiar jealousy, as affecting the right of the House of Representatives to grant the supplies and to provide the ways and means for the service of the year.*
- *That, to guard for the future against an undue exercise of that power by the Legislative Council, and to secure to the House of Representatives its rightful control over taxation and supply, the House has in its*

own hands the power so to impose and remit taxes and to frame Bills of supply that the right of the House as to the matter, manner, measure, and time may be maintained inviolate.

- *That this power may be exercised in accordance with the practice of the House of Commons, initiated in 1861, and since continued, by embodying in one Bill the whole or any part of the financial arrangements of the year.*

No action was taken on this report, but another Bill, providing for a gradual reduction in the gold duty, was introduced, and passed by the House of Representatives. This Bill was also laid aside by the Council. No steps were taken by the House.

It will be seen, from what has taken place between the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives, that the differences that have arisen parallel almost the history of the conflict between the two Houses in England regarding supply Bills. In the early days of the Parliament the Lords were allowed to amend the supply Bills without much objection, and greater latitude was granted in dealing with local taxing Bills than is now allowed by the House of Commons. In 1671 (see Appendix No. 10), and again in 1678, the Commons took a firm stand on their privileges regarding supply, and since then the House of Lords has not ventured to interfere with any Bill of supply.

So far as New Zealand is concerned, no Appropriation Bill has been attempted to be interfered with by the Legislative Council since the first Parliament. The question as to whether a particular Bill was one of supply has often been raised; but, whenever it could be shown that a Bill or clause of a Bill dealt with supply, then the power of the Legislative Council to alter or amend it has always been challenged.

The powers of the Lords to deal with the levying of rates, even though they were of local character, has been denied, the only concession being given that the Lords should have the right of altering private Bills. Since "The Native Lands Act, 1862,"the power of the Council to alter the rating clauses of a Bill has not been specifically raised till last session, when, as I have already stated, the House of Representatives insisted that the Legislative Council had no power to deal with the imposition of rates even by local bodies. It was not until 1860 that the House of Commons passed the clear and explicit resolution, which was moved by Lord Palmerston,—

1. That the right of granting aids and supplies to the Crown is in the Commons alone, as an essential part of their constitution; and the limitation of all such grants, as to the matter, manner, measure, and time, is only in them. 2. That, although the Lords have exercised the power of rejecting Bills of several descriptions relating to taxation by negativing the whole, yet the exercise of that power by them has not been frequent, and is justly regarded by this House with peculiar jealousy, as affecting the right of the Commons to grant the supplies and to provide the ways and means for the service of the year. 3. That, to guard for the future against an undue exercise of that power by the Lords, and to secure to the Commons their rightful control over taxation and supply, this House has in its own hands the power so to impose and remit taxes, and to frame Bills of supply, that the right of the Commons as to matter, manner, measure, and time may be maintained inviolate.

If this English precedent be followed, then the right of the Legislative Council to lay aside a Bill remitting taxation will, in future, be challenged, and possibly the plan hinted at in Lord Palmerston's resolution—a "tack "—may be adopted. Whether this resolution of the Commons was or was not a stretching of the powers of the Commons need not be debated. Writers on constitutional history have assumed it was within the power of the House. (See Todd, Vol. L, p. 459, May.)

ROBERT STOUT.

Wellington,

3rd December, 1886.

Appendix No. 1.

Correspondence respecting the Powers of the Two Houses of the Legislature of Queensland.

Governor Sir A. MUSGRAVE, G.C.M.G., to Colonel the Right HON. F. A. STANLEY, M.P. (Received, 12th January, 1886.)

Government House, Brisbane,
Sir,—

26th November, 1885.

I have the honour to forward to you an Address to Her Majesty the Queen, voted by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly on the 17th instant, concerning questions which have arisen between those two bodies with respect to their relative rights and powers, and which has been presented to me by the President of the Council and Speaker of the Assembly for transmission to you.

2. I also enclose a copy of a letter to me from the Colonial Secretary and leader of the Government upon the subject of this Address, with copies of the documents therein forwarded.

3. I agree entirely in the views expressed by Mr. Griffith, and believe that it would be difficult to over-estimate the value which would attach to a declaration of the opinion of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council upon the questions involved. Even if there does exist some difficulty in bringing these questions before them as a Court, except by proceedings in the nature of an appeal, I cherish the hope that there may be found some mode of eliciting their judgment, as the legal advisers of Her Majesty in Council, on points of great importance in colonial constitutional law.

4. Almost all collisions and complications of any importance, in the administration of this group of colonies at least, have arisen from conflicting views of the rights and privileges of the two Legislative Houses. It will tend greatly to the avoidance of future mischief, not only in this colony but in others, if it should be found possible to provide an umpire in a body whose decision will be respected as entirely free from local or official bias, and to establish a precedent for reference of doubtful or disputed points to such an arbitrator in a friendly manner. Opinions given by the Attorney-and Solicitor-General as Law Officers of the Crown for the time being do not carry the judicial authority necessary for the purpose in view.

5. But, in respect of readiness to abide by the decision of a competent umpire, the two Houses of Legislature of this colony have furnished an example well worthy of imitation.

I have, &c.,
A. MUSGRAVE.
The Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

SCHEDULE of DOCUMENTS forwarded with Original Address from the Council and Assembly.

12 copies of Address.
12 copies of "The Constitution Act, 1867"(Queensland).
12 copies of Standing Orders of the Council.
12 copies of Standing Orders of the Assembly.
12 copies of the Members' Expenses Bill, 1884.
12 copies of the Members' Expenses Bill, 1885.
12 copies of Estimates of Expenditure, 1885-86, Executive and Legislative Departments.
12 copies of Appropriation Bill, 1885-86, No. 2.
12 copies of Extracts from Proceedings, Legislative Council, relating to Appropriation Bill.
12 copies of Extracts from Proceedings, Legislative Assembly, on same subject.
12 copies of Parliamentary Debates (local *Hansard)* on same subject in Legislative Council.
12 copies of Parliamentary Debates (local *Hansard)* on same subject in Legislative Assembly.

Enclosure 1.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,—

We, your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects, the members of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of Queensland in Parliament assembled, humbly approach your Majesty with a renewed assurance of our affection and loyalty towards your Majesty's person and Government.

Questions have arisen between the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly with respect to the relative rights and powers of the two Houses, which questions we are desirous of submitting for the opinion of your Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

We have caused a case to be prepared setting forth the questions which have so arisen, and which we desire to be so submitted, in the words following:—

1. The Constitution Act of Queensland, 31 Vict., No. 38, contains the following provisions:—

Section 1. There shall be within the said Colony of Queensland a Legislative Council and a Legislative As sembly.

Section 2. Within the said Colony of Queensland Her Majesty shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the said Council and Assembly, to make laws for the peace, welfare, and good government of the colony in all cases whatsoever. Provided that all Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, for imposing any new rate, tax, or impost (subject always to the limitations hereinafter provided), shall originate in the Legislative Assembly of the said colony.

Section 18. It shall not be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to originate or pass any vote, resolution, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the said Consolidated Revenue Fund, or of any other tax or impost, to any purpose which shall not first have been recommended by a message of the Governor to the said Legislative Assembly during the session in which such vote, resolution, or Bill shall be passed.

2. Sections 1 and 2 are re-enactments of sections 1 and 2 of the Order in Council of the 6th June, 1859, providing for the constitution of the Colony of Queensland.

Section 18 is a re-enactment of section 54 of the Act of New South Wales, 17 Vict., No. 41, contained in the First Schedule to the Imperial Act, 18 and 19 Vict., c.54.

3. The members of the Legislative Council are nominated by the Governor for life, subject to certain contingencies. The members of the Legislative Assembly are elected by the several constituencies into which the colony is divided.

4. During the sessions of 1884 and 1885 "A Bill to provide for the Payment of the Expenses incurred by Members of the Legislative Assembly in attending Parliament,"was passed by the Legislative Assembly, and on each occasion rejected by the Legislative Council. No limit was proposed to the duration of this Bill.

5. In the estimates of expenditure for the year 1885-86, which were laid before the Legislative Assembly in the session of 1885, after the rejection of this Bill for the second time by the Legislative Council, there was included, under the heading of "The Legislative Assembly's Establishment,"an item of £7,000 for "expenses of members,"to be payable for the year 1885-86, under conditions precisely similar to those defined by the Bill which had been so rejected by the Legislative Council.

6. The estimates are not formally presented to the Legislative Council, but are accessible to members.

7. The Annual Appropriation Bill having been sent by the Legislative Assembly to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, containing an item of £10,585 for "the Legislative Assembly's establishment "—which sura, in fact, included the item of £7,000 for "expenses of members "—the Legislative Council, on the 11th November, 1885, amended the Bill by reducing the sum proposed to be appropriated for "the Legislative Assembly's establishment"from £10,585 to £3,585, and making the necessary consequential amendments in the words and figures denoting the total amount of appropriation, and returned the Bill so amended to the Legislative Assembly. There was nothing on the face of the Bill to indicate the special purpose for which any part of the sum of £10,585 was to be appropriated, except that it was for "the Legislative Assembly's establishment."

8. On the 12th of November the Legislative Assembly returned the Bill to the Legislative Council, with the following message:—

The Legislative Assembly, having had under their consideration the amendments of the Legislative Council in the Appropriation Bill, No. 2,—

Disagree to the said amendments, for the following reasons, to which they invite the most careful consideration of the Legislative Council:—

It has been generally admitted that, in British colonies in which there are two branches of the Legislature, the legislative functions of the Upper House correspond with those of the House of Lords, while the Lower House exercises the rights and powers of the House of Commons. This analogy is recognized in the Standing Orders of both Houses of the Parliament of Queensland, and in the form of preamble adopted in Bills of Supply, and has hitherto been invariably acted upon.

For centuries the House of Lords has not attempted to exercise its power of amending a Bill for appropriating the public revenue, it being accepted as an axiom of constitutional government that the right of taxation and of controlling the expenditure of public money rests entirely with the Representative House, or, as it is sometimes expressed, that there can be no taxation without representation.

The attention of the Legislative Council is invited to the opinion given in 1872 by the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General of England (Sir J. D. Coleridge and Sir G. Jessel), when the question of the right of the Legislative Council of New Zealand to amend a money Bill was formally submitted to them by the Legislature of that colony. The Constitution Act of New Zealand (15 and 16 Vict., c. 72) provides that money Bills must be recommended by the Governor to the House of Representatives, but does not formally deny to the Legislative Council (which is nominated by the Crown) the right to amend such Bills. The Law Officers were nevertheless

of opinion that the Council were not, constitutionally, justified in amending a money Bill, and they stated that this conclusion did not depend upon and was not affected by the circumstance that, by an Act of Parliament, the two Houses of the Legislature had conferred upon themselves the privileges of the House of Commons so far as they were consistent with the Constitution Act of the colony.

The Legislative Assembly believe that no instance can be found in the history of constitutional government in which a nominated Council have attempted to amend an Appropriation Bill. Questions have often arisen whether a particular Bill which it was proposed to amend properly fell within the category of money Bills. But the very fact of such a question having arisen shows that the principle for which the Legislative Assembly are now contending has been taken as admitted.

The Legislative Assembly maintain, and have alway maintained, that (in the words of the resolution of the House of Commons of 3rd July, 1G78) all aids and supplies to Her Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of this House, and that it is their undoubted and solo right to direct, limit, and appoint, in Bills of aid and supply, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the Legislative Council.

For these reasons it is manifestly impossible for the Legislative Assembly to agree to the amendments of the Legislative Council in this Bill. The ordinary course to adopt, under these circumstances, would be to lay the Bill aside. The Legislative Assembly have, however, refrained from taking this extreme course at present, in the belief that the Legislative Council, not having exercised their undoubted power to reject the Bill altogether, do not desire to cause the serious injury to the public service and to the welfare of the colony which would inevitably result from a refusal to sanction the necessary expenditure for carrying on the government of the colony, and in the confident hope that, under the circumstances, the Legislative Council will not insist on their amendments.

9. On the same day the Legislative Council again returned the Bill to the Legislative Assembly, with the following message:—

The Legislative Council, having had under consideration the message of the Legislative Assembly of this day's date, relative to the amendments made by the Legislative Council in the Appropriation Bill of 1885-86, No. 2, beg now to intimate that they insist on their amendments in the said Bill—

Because the Council neither arrogate to themselves the position of being a reflex of the House of Lords, nor recognize the Legislative Assembly as holding the same relative position to the House of Commons:

The Joint Standing Orders only apply to matters of form connected with the internal management of the two Houses, and do not affect constitutional questions:

Because it does not appear that occasion has arisen to require that the House of Lords should exercise its powers of amending a Bill for appropriating the public revenue, and therefore the present case is not analogous: the right is admitted, though it may not have been exercised:

Because the case of the Legislature of New Zealand is dissimilar to that now under consideration, inasmuch as the Constitution Act of New Zealand differs materially from that of Queensland, and the question submitted did not arise under the Constitution Act, but on the interpretation of a Parliamentary Privileges Act. If no instance can be found in the history of constitutional government in which a nominated Council has attempted to amend an Appropriation Bill, it is because no similar case has ever arisen:

Because in the amendment of all Bills the Constitution Act of 1867 confers on the Legislative Council powers coordinate with those of the Legislative Assembly; and the annexing of any clause to a Bill of supply the matter of which is foreign to and different from the matter of said Bill of supply is unparliamentary, and tends to the destruction of constitutional government; and the item which includes the payment of members' expenses is of the nature of a "tack."

For the foregoing reasons, the Council insist on their amendments, leaving the matter in the hands of the Legislative Assembly.

10. On the 13th of November the Legislative Assembly, by message, proposed the appointment of a Joint Select Committee of both Houses "to consider the present condition of public business, in consequence of no supplies having been granted to Her Majesty for the service of the current financial year."Such Committee was appointed on the same day, and on the 17th of November brought up their report, recommending, amongst other things,—

That, for the purpose of obtaining an opinion as to the relative rights and powers of both Houses with respect to money Bills, a case be prepared, and that a joint Address of both Houses be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be graciously pleased to refer such case for the opinion of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

11. The following Acts and documents are to be deemed to form part of this case:—

- *The Imperial Act, 18 and 19 Vict.; c. 54.*
- *The Order in Council of 6th June, 1859.*

- *The Constitution Act of 1867 (Queensland).*
- *The Standing Orders of both Houses.*
- *A copy of the Members' Expenses Bill of 1884.*
- *A copy of the Members Expenses Bill of 1885.*
- *The estimates of expenditure for 1885-86, Executive and Legislative Departments.*
- *The Appropriation Bill of 1885-86, No. 2.*
- *Extracts from the Journals of the Legislative Council relating to the Appropriation Bill.*
- *Extracts from the Votes and Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly relating to the same matter.*

The questions submitted for consideration are—

- *Whether the Constitution Act of 1867 confers on the Legislative Council powers co ordinate with those of the Legislative Assembly in the amendment of all Bills, including money Bills.*
- *Whether the claims of the Legislative Assembly, as set forth in their message of the 12th November, are well founded.*

We humbly pray that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to refer the said case for the opinion and report of your Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.

A. H. PALMER,
President of the Legislative Council.
WILLIAM H. GROOM,
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Legislative Chambers,

17th November, 1885.

The following speech was delivered by the Speaker of the House of Assembly on receipt of a message from the Legislative Council regarding the Bill:—

Mr. SPEAKER said,—I think it my duty, as guardian of the rights and privileges of the House, to call its attention to the message which I have just read. It is the first time in the history of Responsible Government in Queensland that an attempt has been made on the part of the Upper Chamber to amend an Appropriation Bill. In the session of 1884, on the 11th December, I considered it my duty to call attention to amendments which had been made by the Upper Chamber in the Crown Lands Alienation Bill, and which distinctly infringed upon the privileges of tins House. And in the session, on the 22nd September, I called attention to amendments made by the Upper Chamber in the Local Government Act of 1878 Amendment Bill. On that occasion I again felt it to be my duty to call the attention of the House to amendments by which I thought the privileges of this Chamber were decidedly invaded and infringed upon. But the amendment in the Appropriation Bill is of a much graver character, and, in calling the attention of this House to the amendment which has been made, it will be my duty at once to disclaim anything in the nature of a political contention. My desire is simply to call the attention of the House to the grave constitutional question which is involved in the amendment of the Appropriation Bill. If it is admitted that the Upper Chamber possesses co-ordinate powers with the representative branch of the Legislature, then Responsible Government in Queensland is entirely at an end; because the claim to amend a money Bill, if admitted, must undoubtedly extend to the amendment of taxation Bills; and thus the public policy of the country could be entirely thwarted and set aside by a Chamber which is responsible to no one. The voice of the public outside would be entirely set on one side, and the opinions and will of the majority in this House would also be entirely set on one side. This is therefore, as I said before, a matter of very great importance indeed, and one which I think this House should take proper time to consider before it arrives at a decision. I should not like, on the present occasion, to trouble the House with any long extracts from the different constitutional writers who have written upon this question; but there is one extract from "Hatsell's Precedents"which I consider it my duty to read, because it is one upon which the House of Commons has acted from the time it was delivered up to the present moment; and I may say, further, that the House of Lords has, from that time to this, acquiesced in it. It is probably one of the most ancient claims set up by the House of Commons, and will probably, on that account, be the more entitled to our consideration and respect. The occasion when this opinion was given was on the 9th May, 1689, when the Lords amended the Poll Bill by adding a clause for appointing Commissioners to rate themselves. To this the Commons disagreed, and on the loth May the Commons appointed a Committee to draw up reasons and report them to the House; and this was one of the reasons:—

All money, aids, and taxes to be raised or charged upon the subjects in Parliament are the gift and grant of the Commons in Parliament; and are, and always have been, and ought to be, by the Constitution and ancient course and laws of Parliament, and by the ancient and undoubted rights of the Commons of England, the sole and entire gift, grant, and present of the Commons in Parliament; and to be laid, rated, raised, collected, paid, levied, and returned for the public service and use of the Government as the Commons shall direct, limit,

appoint, and modify the same. And the Lords are not to alter such gift, grant, limitation, appointment, or modification of the Commons in any part or circumstance, or otherwise to interpose in such Bills than to pass or reject the same for the whole, without any alteration or amendment though in case of the subjects.

From the time that was delivered in 1689 up to the present time, and including the ninety-one instances collected by Hatswell, where the Lords interfered with supply Bills, and where the Commons insisted upon their rights, and where the Lords have almost invariably acquiesced in them, except in some minor details, the reasons I have read to the House have been invariably acted upon. It is therefore for the House to take into its most serious consideration the important matter which is brought before them by the Legislative Council's message. I discharge my duty in calling the attention of the House to the gravity of the question. It is one of extraordinary importance, because, as I said before, it is the first time in the history of parliamentary government in this colony that the Upper Chamber has attempted to amend the Appropriation Bill; and their claim to possess co-ordinate powers with the representative Chamber is of such a character that I believe, if it is acceded to, the whole of the policy of the Government, as expressed by the people, can be revolutionized and entirely set on one side by the other Chamber. I think I have discharged my duty now by calling the attention of the House to this matter. It is for the House itself to decide upon what course it will take in view of the extreme gravity of the present circumstance.

Mr. GRIFFITH then moved, That the Legislative Council's amendments be considered in Committee to-morrow.

Debate ensued.

Question put, and passed.

Enclosure 2.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY TO SIR A. MUSGRAVE.

Colonial Secretary's Office,
SIR,—
Brisbane,

26th November, 1885.

With reference to the Joint Address to Her Majesty lately agreed to by the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of this colony, submitting a case on which they desire to obtain the opinion of Her Majesty's Privy Council, I have the honour to offer the following observations for your Excellency's consideration.

2. Your Excellency will doubtless have observed that the questions submitted (and in particular the second question) are rather questions as to the constitutional rights and powers of the two Houses of the Legislature than technical questions as to the construction of the statute law. So far, at least, as the Legislative Assembly are concerned, I think I am right in saying that the literal interpretation of the words of the Constitution Act is regarded as a matter of small importance as compared with the larger question, Whether, on a true construction of the written and unwritten Constitution of the colony, the two Houses of the Legislature should be regarded as holding and discharging, relatively to one another, positions and functions analogous to those of the House of Lords and House of Commons.

For the assistance of Her Majesty's Government, and in compliance with a promise mode by myself to the Joint Committee by which the Joint Address was framed, I enclose copies of the official reports of the debates in both Houses on the question which gave rise to the Address, which will indicate the line of argument adopted by both Houses respectively.

4. I am not aware of any instance in which a similar case has been submitted for the opinion of the Privy Council. The only analogous case that I have been able to discover is that of the case submitted in 1872 by both Houses of the Legislature of New Zealand for the opinion of the Imperial Crown Law Officers. Some reluctance, however, existed in this colony to submit the matter, as one purely of law, for the opinion of the Law Officers. I am sure that very great satisfaction will be felt by both Houses of the Legislature if Her Majesty should think fit in this instance to refer the matter to the Privy Council, as prayed by the Joint Address. And I conceive also that such a reference would not involve any departure in principle from ancient theory and practice as to the functions of the Council, although those functions may not in recent times have been exercised under circumstances precisely analogous. But, even if the proposed reference is considered to be not supported by ancient theory or precedent, I venture to suggest that the establishment of such a precedent would not be disadvantageous.

5. In the event of the reference being made, I do not, of course, know whether it would be made to the

Judicial Committee of the Council or in Borne other form, or whether, in either case, it would be thought advisable that the case should be argued by counsel. As to the desirableness or otherwise of its being so argued I have no suggestion to offer; but, if it is proposed, it would be a great convenience if information were given either to your Excellency, by telegraph, or to the Agent-General for Queensland in London, in order that the necessary arrangements may be made without delay for supporting the views of either House, if it should be thought desirable that they or either of them should be represented.

I have, &c,
S. W. GRIFFITH.
His Excellency Sir Anthony Musgrave,
G.C.M.G., &c.

THE COLONIAL OFFICE TO THE COUNCIL OFFICE.

Downing Street,

3rd February, 1886.

MY LORD,—

I have the honour to transmit to you a copy of a despatch from the Governor of Queensland, enclosing a petition from the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of the colony concerning questions which have arisen between those two bodies with regard to their relative rights and powers, together with certain documents which are specified in a schedule to the despatch, and which are in the nature of exhibits to the petition.

I shall feel obliged if you will be so good as to submit these papers to the Queen, with a recommendation that Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to refer this matter to the hearing and consideration of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in pursuance of the power reserved to Her Majesty by the Act 3 and 4 Will. 4, c. 41, s. 4.

I should also be glad to be favoured with your opinion whether it is desirable that the case should be argued by counsel on behalf of the two Houses of the colonial Legislature, and whether each House should be represented separately.

I have, &c.,
FRED. STANLEY.
The Lord President of the Council.

The Council Office to the Colonial Office.

SIR,—
Whitehall,

3rd April, 1886.

I am directed by the Lord President of the Council to acquaint you, for the information of Earl Granville, that the Lords of the Judicial Committee have proceeded, in obedience to Her Majesty's order of reference of the 8th March, to consider the petition addressed to Her Majesty in Council by the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, which was transmitted to this office with a letter from the Bight Hon. Sir Frederick Stanley on the 3rd February last past.

The Lords of the Committee present on this occasion were the Lord President, the Lord High Chancellor, His Grace the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, Lord Aberdare, Lord Blackburn, Lord Hobhouse, and Sir Richard Couch; and their Lordships, having considered the petition and the two questions therein raised, namely,—

- Whether the Constitution Act of 1867 confers on the Legislative Council powers co-ordinate with those of the Legislative Assembly in the amendment of ail Bills, including money Bills;
- Whether the claims of the Legislative Assembly, as set forth in their message of the 12th November, are well founded—agreed humbly to report to Her Majesty that the first of these questions should be answered in the negative, and the second question in the affirmative.

The report of the Judicial Committee has been approved by Her Majesty in Council to-day. Copies of the

Order in Council approving the same will shortly be forwarded to you for transmission to Queensland.

I have, &c.,
HENRY REEVE,
Registrar, P.C.
Sir Robert Herbert, K.C.B.,
&c.

Appendix No. 2.

Copy of Despatch from Governor Sir GEORGE GREY, K.C.B., to His Grace the Duke of NEWCASTLE, K.G.

Government House, Auckland,
MY LORD DUKE,—

31st December, 1862.

A question of privilege having arisen between the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives of New Zealand, the Legislative Council has requested time to transmit a case, embodying the facts of the question at issue, to your Grace, with a request that you would be pleased to obtain, for their future guidance, the opinion on this case of the Law Officers of the Crown in England.

2. In compliance with the address of the Legislative Council, I have now the honour to enclose the documents necessary to enable you to obtain for the Council the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, if you would be pleased to do so.

I have, &c.,
G. GREY.
His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, K.G.

Enclosure.

Case for the Opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown.

A QUESTION of privilege has arisen between the Legislative Council and House of Representatives of New Zealand, upon which the Legislative Coun- cil are anxious to obtain, for their guidance, the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England.

They venture to ask for that opinion partly be cause the question arises upon the construction of an Act of the Imperial Legislature, and partly because the question depends upon analogy to the practice of other constitutional governments, and in particular of the Imperial Parliament.

The circumstances out of which the question arises occurred in the passing of the Native Lands Bill through the Colonial Legislature, and are as follow:—

A large extent of land in New Zealand, comprising many millions of acres, is still held by the aboriginal inhabitants, who have never surrendered their title to the Crown, and whose rights were guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Waitangi.

Hitherto the only mode in which such land has been acquired for purposes of colonization has been through the exercise of the Queen's right of preemption or exclusive purchase. Land so acquired is subject to the disposal of the General Assembly of New Zealand under the 72nd section of the Constitution Act.

It has been determined to effect a change in this system; to abandon the Crown's right of preemption or exclusive purchase; to institute Courts for denning the rights of Natives to their lands according to their own customs; and to permit the Native proprietors to dispose of their land as of common right.

With this view a Bill was introduced into the General Assembly through the House of Representatives in the last session—a copy of which, as finally passed, is herewith.

The Bill as passed by the House of Representatives contained, instead of what is now clause 19, a clause to the following effect:—

Upon the signing and sealing of every certificate by the Governor, or the issue of every Crown grant in exchange for a certificate under the provisions of this Act, there shall be paid to Her Majesty the sum of two shillings and sixpence for every acre of land described in such certificate or grant; and such sum shall be deemed to be part of the land revenue of the province in which such lands are situate, and shall be paid over to the Treasury of such province, subject to the appropriation of the Provincial Council of such province.

The Legislative Council amended the Bill by adding to clause 17 the following proviso:—

But no certificate shall entitle any tribe, community, or person named therein to sell, exchange, or lease for a longer period than seven years, or dispose of any land or interest thereby affected, unless such certificate shall have been indorsed by the Governor and sealed with the Public Seal of the colony as aforesaid, and the amount payable on such indorsement and sealing be duly paid.

The Bill was returned to the House of Representatives so amended. The amendment was accepted by the House of Representatives, and a message to that effect was transmitted to the Legislative Council, without notifying any exception thereto. A resolution, however, was passed, at the same time, in the House of Representatives to the following effect:—

That the amendment of the 17th clause of "The Native Lands Act, 1862,"by the Legislative Council is an infringement of the privileges of this House, inasmuch as it assumes to "regulate"the imposition of a fee and the limits within which it is proposed to be levied, contrary to the provisions of the 128th Standing Order and the practice of the Imperial Parliament in such matters.

The Bill, thus amended, was transmitted to the Governor for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon.

The Governor, under the provisions of the 56th section of the Constitution Act, returned the Bill to the House of Representatives with a message proposing two amendments, a copy of which message is herewith.

The Governor's amendments were adopted by both Houses, and in that shape the Bill finally passed, and now stands.

The question submitted for consideration is, Whether the Legislative Council was warranted in amending the Bill as they did, or whether their amendment was, as the House of Representatives insists, a breach of the privileges of that House?

The general rule practically acted on by the two Chambers as regards money Bills and money clauses is understood to be analogous to that which governs the two Chambers of the Imperial Legislature, *mutatis mutandis*.

The following Standing Orders have been specially agreed to by both Houses:—

That, with respect to any Bill brought to this House from the Legislative Council, or returned by the Legislative Council oil to this House with amendments, whereby any pecuniary penalty, forfeiture, or fee shall be authorized, imposed, appropriated, regulated, varied, or extinguished, this House will not insist on its undoubted privilege in the following cases:—

- *When the subject of such pecuniary penalty or forfeiture is to secure the execution of the Act, or the punishment or prevention of offences.*
- *Where such fees are imposed in respect of benefit taken or service rendered under this Act, and in order to the execution of the Act, and are not made payable into the Treasury or Exchequer, or in aid of the public revenue, and do not form the ground of public accounting by the parties receiving the same, either in respect of deficit or surplus.*
- *When such Bill shall be a private Bill for a local or personal Act.*

Also, that provisions for giving full effect to the object of such Bills, but which might infringe upon the privileges of the House, ought, if printed in italics, to be treated by the House as forming no part of the Bill, and ought not, if adopted in Committee of Supply, to necessitate the return of such Bill to the Legislative Council as though amendments had been made.

The Legislative Council appointed a Select Committee to consider the question of privilege. The report of the Committee is as follows:—

Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report as to the question whether the amendments introduced into the Native Lands Bill by the Legislative Council be a breach of the privileges of the House of Representatives, and, if the Committee shall think lit to do so, then to prepare a ease to be submitted for the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England, as a guide to the Council in its future dealings with like questions.

Your Committee have considered the question referred to them. At this late period of the session they can do little more than state their opinion that the question involved is one of the greatest importance as affecting the legislative functions of this Council, particularly as the House of Representatives has passed a resolution on the subject which, if acted on, will bring the two branches of the Legislature into collision.

In the opinion of your Committee the Council has not exceeded its privileges in this matter.

As a guide to the Council in future upon a question of so great importance, your Committee recommend that a case be prepared to be submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown in England, by and under the direction of the Chairman, the case to embody the following material points:—

A copy of the Native Land Bill, in its original and amended state, the Governor's amendments, and the reports of such of the debates as may elucidate the points at issue should accompany the case.

The question to be stated is this: Whether, the House of Representatives having, in a Bill, imposed on a Crown grant, or an instrument in the nature of a Crown grant, a certain tax or duty, it is competent to the Legislative Council to introduce an enactment to the effect that no transaction shall take place under another class of instruments affecting Native lands until such instruments have been practically transmuted into or changed for Crown grants, so, in effect, rendering the latter class of instruments liable to such tax or duty.

HENEY SEWELL.
Committee Room,

13th September, 1868.

In the course of debate two arguments were urged which appeared to have great weight with the Council, one, that, if the present claim of the House of Representatives be admitted, the Legislative Council will be practically excluded from legislating on one of the most important questions, viz., the price of waste land, or, what is virtually the same thing, the taxation on alienation; the other, that, if the House of Representatives could, by imposing a tax or duty on a particular kind of legal instrument, exclude the Legislative Council from all consideration of questions connected with the subject-matter of such instruments, the field of legislation over which the power of the Legislative Council would extend would be greatly and most injuriously narrowed. It would, in effect, be the same as if, a stamp duty being imposed on deeds in England, the House of Peers were thereby precluded from considering whether certain transactions should or should not be effected by deed.

The question of taxation, as the Council insists, is, in this case, merely incidental to a general question of policy, upon which the Legislative Council is unquestionably entitled to legislate and make amendments in Bills. It cannot, it is conceived, be debarred from doing so by the mere circumstance of a question of taxation being incidentally involved.

The report of the debate in the Legislative Council accompanies the case.

HENRY SEWELL,
Chairman of Committee.

Copy of Despatch from His Grace the Duke of NEWCASTLE, K.G., to Governor Sir GEORGE GREY, K.C.B.

SIR,—
Downing Street,

17th April, 1863.

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your Despatch, No. 134, of the 31st December, forwarding, in conformity with a request to that effect which was made to you by the Legislative Council, a case embodying the facts relating to a question of privilege which had arisen between the two Houses, upon which the Legislative Council were desirous that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown should be obtained for their future guidance.

The House of Representatives are not parties to this application; but, as I have no reason to suppose that they object to it, and as I infer from your despatch that the reference is in conformity with your wishes and of those of your Responsible Advisers, I caused the case, with the documents which accompanied it, to be forwarded to the Law Officers of the Crown; and I now enclose for your information a copy of the report which they furnished upon the subject.

I have, &c.,
NEWCASTLE.
Governor Sir George Grey, K.C.B.

Enclosure.

The Law Officers to the Duke of Newcastle.

MY LORD DUKE,—
Temple,

9th April, 1863.

We are honoured with your Grace's command, signified in Sir Frederic Rogers's letter of the 28th March ultimo, stating that, in compliance with an application forwarded by the Governor of New Zealand from the Legislative Council of that colony, your Grace directed him to request that we would favour you with our opinion on a question of privilege which had recently been raised in Now Zealand, and which is stated in the following terms, in the report of the Committee of the Legislative Council:—

Whether, the House of Representatives having, in a Bill, imposed on a Crown grant, or an instrument in the nature of a Crown grant, a certain tax or duty, it is competent to the Legislative Council to introduce an enactment to the effect that no transaction shall take place under another class of instruments affecting Native lands until such instruments have been practically transmuted into or changed for Crown grants, so, in effect, rendering the latter class of instruments liable to such tax or duty.

Sir Frederic Rogers was also pleased to annex the case which was received from the colony, and the papers which accompanied it.

The Standing Orders quoted in the case were passed under authority of the 52nd clause of the New Zealand Government Act 15 and 16 Vict., cap. 72.

Sir Frederic Rogers was further pleased to state that we would not fail to observe that the case was drawn on the part of the Legislative Council, and that the House of Representatives was not a party to the reference; but we would find among the papers a Ministerial memorandum in an opposite sense, from which it might be inferred that the question was fairly stated.

In obedience to your Grace's commands, we have taken this matter into consideration, and have the honour to report,—

That we are of opinion that, if, in a Bill introduced in the House of Representatives, and passed through that House, a certain tax or duty has been imposed upon a Crown grant, or an instrument in the nature of a Crown grant, it is competent to the Legislative Council, without any breach of the privileges of the House of Representatives, to make the efficacy for any given purpose of another class of instruments intended to affect Native lands under the provisions of the same Bill dependent upon their assuming the form of Crown grants or of those instruments in the nature of Crown grants on which the tax or duty has been so imposed by the House of Representatives.

It is, we think, a fallacy to represent this as a case in which the Legislative Council takes upon itself to impose any tax or duty. It merely provides that a particular kind of instrument shall be necessary to produce a particular effect. It has a right to decide for itself upon the form and character of the instrument which shall be sufficient for that purpose, and it cannot be deprived of that right merely because the form of instrument which it prefers is one on which a duty may have been already imposed by law, or will be imposed if the Bill should pass—the imposition of the duty on that form of instrument being the act, not of the Legislative Council, but of the House of Representatives.

We do not agree with the argument that the 2s. 6d. per acre was not in its nature a tax or duty. But the other argument urged on the part of the Legislative Council, that the House of Representatives cannot, by imposing a tax or duty on a particular kind of legal instrument, exclude the Legislative Council from the power of originating or amending Bills relating to such instruments, seems to us to be well founded; and we see no answer to the suggestion that the privilege contended for by the House of Representatives would, in effect, be the same as if, a stamp duty "being imposed upon deeds in England, the House of Peers were thereby precluded from considering whether certain transactions should or should not be effected by deed."It has never been supposed in England that the privilege of the House of Commons as to originating taxation is attended with such consequences as this.

We have, &c.,
W. ATHERTON.
ROUNDELL PALMER.
His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, K.G.

Enclosure 2.

MEMORANDUM for His Excellency the Governor.

Auckland,

29th December, 1862.

IN transmitting the accompanying resolutions of the Legislative Council to His Excellency the Governor, Ministers desire to append thereto the following remarks by the Colonial Secretary and Native Minister. ALFRED DOMETT.

The difference of opinion as to the breach of privilege complained of by the House of Representatives evidently arises from the ambiguous mode of legislation adopted in the clause of the Native Land Bill inserted by the Legislative Council. A price fixed, virtually, for the sale of land, was imposed in the shape of a fee upon the instrument conveying the land. Considered in the latter light (as a *fee*, to be imposed not in respect of benefit taken, to be paid into the Public Treasury, and to be publicly accounted for) the imposition of the half-crown per acre on the certificate was evidently a breach of privilege by the Legislative Council.

Considered as a fixed uniform price of land, settled in a kind of commercial transaction between the Government or the Crown and the public as voluntary purchasers, the Legislative Council had an undoubted right to impose it.

The principle on which the exclusive right of the House of Representatives to deal with money is founded is, of course, that of the right (by some called *sacred)* of property. No man is to take that which belongs to another. Money taken in the shape of taxes, fees, &c., for Government purposes is to be taken only by the representatives of the people, that is, by themselves from themselves, or, in other words, it is considered not as taken but voluntarily given.

But, where the subject-matter is the fixing a sum to be taken for a full equivalent given, a mere exchange of money for a material object of barter, and where it is quite at the option of the payer to pay or leave it alone and not enter into the transaction at all, this principle of the right of property does not enter. There seems no reason, in this case, why the consent of the payers (through representatives) should be required, or why the Legislative Council should not legislate as well as the House of Representatives.

It is true another argument might be used. It might be urged that these two cases are similar in one respect, viz., that in both an equivalent for money is given, only in one case the return is in government and its advantages, or in the mental labour of the governing body, and in the other case in a material object, *i.e.*, in land: that, where any price is to be fixed by the Legislature, both the buyers and the sellers should concur in that price, and, as the lands to be sold belong to the whole public, and the whole public may be buyers, the House of Representatives alone should fix this price. But I think this would prove too much, and limit to an extent never demanded or advocated (as far as I know) the powers of this or any non-representative branch of a Legislature.

The above is the view taken of the clause by the Chairman of the Committee of the Legislative Council. On the other hand, the Native Minister urges the following (which expresses the opinion of the House of Representatives) as the more correct statement of the character and effect of the clause under consideration.

The Bill, as originally passed, conferred on the Natives the power of selling their lands after obtaining certificates of ownership.

The amendment of the Legislative Council deprived them of this power, because by it the original certificate was made only to confer a right of leasing. Unless the certificate obtained the signature and seal of the Governor it was not, under the amendment, to confer the power of sale; and for this signature and seal a fee of 2s. 6d. was to be paid.

There are three documents conferring power of sale under the Bill as originally passed ana finally amended.

- Certificate issued by the Court (after confirmation of its proceedings by the Governor), not signed or sealed.
- Certificate signed by Governor and sealed with colonial Seal (for not more than twenty persons), having all the effect of a Crown grant.
- Crown grants to be given in exchange for either of the foregoing classes of certificates.

A fee of 2s. 6d. was chargeable on the last two documents.

The amendment of the Council took away the power of sale from the first class of certificates, limiting it to the second class—that is, the Natives, to acquire a general power of sale, would have to pay the 2s. 6d. fee and get the second class of certificate. Looked at in this light, the Council's amendment evidently amounted to the imposition of a fee or tax, as it could not be to the Native the price of his own land. It is not a sufficient answer to say the European purchaser would really pay the 2s. 6d., because he would deduct it from the price to be paid to the Native.

And, as the Bill conferred on the Native the right of absolutely selling his land, only requiring the payment of 2s. 6d. per acre for the additional privilege of getting a Crown grant or equivalent document for it, the true

opinion seems to be that the 2s. 6d. was always a tax or fee, not a price for land. In such case the amendment of the Legislative Council was a breach of privilege.
ALFRED DOMETT.

Further Memorandum on the same Subject by the Native Minister.

I SHOULD like to add a few words to Mr. Domett's minute, that the nature of my objection may not be misunderstood.

The Bill granted an absolute right of sale of their lands to the Natives, free from any tax or fee. If European buyers were content to hold and sell under the Maori certificate and a proper conveyance of it, they could do so; but, if they preferred to come in and exchange their certificate for a Crown grant, or to get the certificate sealed, which gave it the qualities of a Crown grant, for that special advantage they were to pay 2s. 6d. an acre. Now, the Legislative Council's amendment said that no Native should sell at all unless he had paid a tax of 2s. 6d. an acre on his land to the European Treasury.

In one case, the European paid for a privilege which converted his tenure under a Maori certificate into fee-simple according to English real property law—he paid a price for his English title, and the payment of it was optional with himself. In the other, the Natives' property was taxed absolutely, since he could not sell it without paying a tax, for which he literally got nothing in return.

The promoters of the amendment knew perfectly well that such a tax was ruin to the whole working of the Bill, and, not being able to defeat it directly, they resorted to this apparently indirect mode of securing to the provinces a revenue out of land which did not belong to the provinces.
F. D. BELL.

Appendix No. 3.

Privilege.—Mr. SPEAKER intimated to the House that he had received the following letters from Mr. Chairman of Committees respecting; the privileges of this House;

And the said letters having been read,

Ordered, That they be recorded on the Journals of this House:—

SIR,—
Auckland,

1st December, 1864.

I have the honour to request that you will lay upon the table of the House the enclosed copy of a letter from Mr. Erskine May, in addition to the correspondence already placed in your possession concerning an alleged breach of privilege.

I ask leave to observe that the letter in question is an answer to one from me (of which I have not preserved a copy) enclosing a copy of the opinion given on the same case by the Law Officers of the Crown, and requesting Mr. May to state whether his own had been in any way changed by the arguments adduced on the other side.

I have, &c.,
HUGH CARLETON
Chairman of Committees.
The Hon. the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR,—
Bournemouth, Hants,

19th January, 1864.

As the mover of the resolution agreed to by the House of Representatives in the session of 1862, "That the amendment of the 17th clause of The Native Lands Act, 1863,' is an infringement of the privileges of this House,"I feel it my duty, having been informed that the Legislative Council do not admit that any breach of privilege has been committed, to take the opinion of Mr. Erskine May upon the question, and accordingly forward you a copy of the correspondence on the subject, requesting you to inform the House of that gentleman's decision.

I have, &c.,
HUGH CARLETON,
Chairman of Committees.
The Hon. the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR,—
40, Duke Street, St. James',

22nd July, 1863.

I have the honour to request your opinion upon a disputed point of privilege which has arisen between the Legislative Council of the General Assembly of New Zealand and the House of Representatives.

The practice of the Assembly in regard to money clauses is identical with that of the Imperial Parliament.

I am content, on behalf of the House of Representatives, to accept the statement of the case which has been drawn up by a Select Committee of the Legislative Council. I lay this statement before you, and desire to ask whether or not, in your opinion, an extension of the operation of a tax in the manner described, if made to the Lords, would be a breach of the privileges of the Commons.

I have, &c.,
HUGH CARLETON, M.G.A.
Thomas Erskine May, Esq.

SIR,—

23rd July, 1863.

In reply to your letter of the 22nd instant, I desire to state that I have perused the papers which you submitted to me, and particularly the report of the Committee of the Legislative Council of New Zealand upon the Native Lands Bill

It appears to me that the amendment made by the Legislative Council to that Bill, having rendered a certain class of instruments liable to a tax or duty from which they were exempt under the Bill as passed by the House of Representatives, was an infringement of the privileges of the latter. No such amendment would have been accepted in this country by the House of Commons if made under similar circumstances by the Lords.

I have, &c.,
Hugh Carleton, Esq., &c.
T. ERSKINE MAY.

House of Commons,
MY DEAR SIR,—

30th May, 1864.

I have no desire to be engaged in a controversy at the antipodes, but I have no objection to state, without entering into any arguments, that I adhere to the opinion stated last year—that, if such an amendment, having the objects designed by that in the Native Lands (New Zealand) Bill, had been made by the House of Lords to a Bill sent up to them by the Commons, the latter would not have assented to it, in accordance with their own privileges and the usage which is maintained between the two Houses.

I have, &c.,
Hugh Carleton, Esq.
T. ERSKINE MAY.

Appendix No. 4.

Extract from Journals of Legislative Council, 18*th August,* 1868.

Legislative Council Committee.

—The Hon. Mr.Holmes, from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the powers and privileges of this Council, with a view to a modification of its constitution, brought up a report, which was read as followeth:—

In the consideration of the subject remitted to your Committee to report on, they have deemed it expedient to state concisely the authorities on which the powers, privileges, and immunities of the Legislative Council are based; to review the constitution of similar Chambers in other British colonies; to narrate the action which has hitherto been taken by the Council in the direction of a limitation of its numbers; and then to suggest such a course as, in their opinion, would be best adapted to extend its influence and to sustain its independence.

With reference to the first of these stages of consideration, it may be observed that the Constitution Act, which passed the Imperial Legislature in 1852, empowered the Legislative Council and House of Representatives, among other things, to make such standing rules and orders as might be necessary for the orderly conduct of business (52); defined the power of the General Assembly to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of New Zealand (53); and enabled it at any time to alter any of the provisions of the Act itself (68). This Act was amended in 1857 by an Imperial Act, repealing certain clauses, and enabling the General Assembly to alter, suspend, or repeal all or any of the provisions of the said Act, except those which were specified (2); and was further amended by the Imperial Act of 1862, with respect to the power of creating new provinces, repealing a previous Act on the subject, and making further provisions instead thereof.

In 1856, in pursuance of the power vested in it by the Act of 1852, the Legislature of New Zealand passed "The Privileges Act, 1856,"whereby certain of the privileges, immunities, and powers of the General Assembly were defined and declared (1 to 10); such definition, however, was not to be construed, directly or indirectly, by implication or otherwise, to restrict in any manner whatever the privileges or immunities of the Legislature (12).

"The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865,"repealed the fifty-second section of the Constitution Act, which had empowered the Legislative Council and House of Representatives to make standing rules and orders for their guidance (5), and conferred upon the Council and the House respectively, the privileges, immunities, and powers enjoyed and exercised by the House of Commons on the 1st of January, 1865, whether such were held by custom, statute, or otherwise (4).

Your Committee now proceed to state briefly the constitution of the Upper Legislative Chambers of some of the principal colonies of Great Britain.

In New South Wales the constitution was established in 1853. The Legislative Council consists of not fewer than twenty-one members, appointed for life by the Governor and Executive Council, of whom not less than four-fifths consist of persons not holding office under the Crown. The Council now consists of twenty-seven members, the Legislative Assembly consisting of eighty members.

In Victoria the constitution was established by a local Act in 1854, confirmed by the Crown, and was subsequently amended. The Legislative Council consists of thirty members, elected for six provinces, one of the members of each electoral district retiring every two years: the qualification of members being the possession of a freehold property worth £5,000, or of the annual value of £500; and the qualification of the elector being the possession of freehold property worth £1,000, or of the annual value of £100. The Assembly consists of seventy-eight members.

In Tasmania the constitution was established by local Act in 1855. The Legislative Council consists of fifteen members, elected for twelve districts, each holding his seat for six years. The Council is competent for the transaction of business so long as seven members remain. The House of Assembly consists of thirty members.

In South Australia the constitution was remodelled in 1856. The Legislative Council consists of eighteen members elected by the inhabitants, one-third retiring by rotation every four years. The House of Representatives consists of thirty-six members.

In Queensland the constitution was established in 1859, and subsequently amended. The Legislative Council is without limit as to numbers, but consists of twenty members, nominated for life by the Governor; four-fifths of these consist of persons not holding office under the Crown. The numbers of the House of Assembly being thirty-two.

In the Dominion of Canada the constitution was established in 1867. The Senate consists of seventy-two members, apportioned in equal numbers to the three divisions constituting the Dominion. This number may be increased to seventy-eight. The members are summoned to the Senate by the Governor-General in the Queen's name, and hold their places in the Senate for life. Its House of Commons consists of 181 members.

Your Committee now proceed to narrate the changes which have taken place in the Legislative Council of New Zealand, and those further changes which have been desired.

By clause 33 of "The Constitution Act, 1852,"the Governor was authorized to summon to the Legislative Council, before the first meeting of the General Assembly, such persons, being not less than ten, as Her

Majesty should think fit; and thereafter from time to time to summon such other person or persons for supplying any vacancy or vacancies or otherwise.

On the 9th of February, 1855, instructions were conveyed to His Excellency Colonel Thomas Gore Browne, C.B., authorizing him to summon to the Legislative Council such person or persons as he might think fit, in addition to the present members of the said Council, or for supplying any vacancies that may take place therein, by death or otherwise, but so that the whole number of the said Council should not at any time exceed fifteen. (See Votes and Proceedings of Legislative Council, 1854 to 1858.) 1858.)

On the 12th of August, 1861, instructions were given to His Excellency Sir George Grey, K.C.B., to the effect that the number of members of the Legislative Council should not exceed twenty.

On the 28th March, 1862, further instructions were given to His Excellency, revoking the previous instructions, and empowering him to summon such an additional number of persons to the Legislative Council as he might deem expedient. *(Vide* Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1862, A. No. 1, pp. 4 and 7; also A. Nos. 4 and 5, pp. 3 and 4.)

On the 22nd August, 1862, the Council adopted a resolution requesting Her Majesty to place a limit on its numbers, of which the following is an extract:—

Your Majesty's Legislative Council, believing that its usefulness depends upon its freedom from party spirit, and viewing with apprehension the power vested by the above despatch in the Ministry of the day, who could, by suddenly introducing any number of members, seriously impair the independence of the Council, respectfully pray that your Majesty would be pleased to place a limit on its members.

We respectfully solicit that the number of members of the Legislative Council should not exceed three-fourths of that of the House of Representatives, and that no greater number of new members be appointed, in addition to those required to fill up vacancies by death, resignation, or other causes, in any one year than would amount to one-eighth of the entire number composing the Legislative Council.

On the 17th April, 1863, His Grace the Duke of Newcastle informed His Excellency Sir George Grey that Her Majesty did not see any sufficient ground for exercising her Royal prerogative with a view to limit the number of the Legislative Council, which number is not limited by the law of the colony.

In consequence of this decision, a Bill was introduced into the Legislative Council in October, 1865, for the purpose of limiting the number of its members, but which Bill did not pass the second reading.

On the 30th July, 1866, a Bill of a similar purport was again introduced, and passed through all its stages in the Legislative Council, but lapsed in the House of Representatives.

On the 20th August, 1867, a still growing desire being evinced for some restriction of the number of members, a Bill was brought into the Council to effect this object; but, on the Government promising to consider the subject during the recess, and bring in a Bill, or give sufficient notice to enable some private member so to do, it did not proceed further that session.

The next question which engaged the attention of your Committee had reference to the mode whereby the influence of the Council might be extended, and its independence secured. And here it may be remarked that the period at which Bills have been introduced into the Council has very materially interfered with that due deliberation which should be given to them. The greater portion of the early part of each session of Parliament is not infrequently devoted by the House of Representatives to debates on great questions of policy, either originating with the Government or with private members, so that it is only towards the middle or close of the session that Bills are forwarded to the Council, thereby leaving little time for their consideration, and consequently the Bills are either laid by for a time, to the detriment of the public service, or passed hurriedly through all their stages without that careful and minute scrutiny which attends Bills referred to a Select Committee, or reviewed in a Committee of the whole Council; and this evil still occurs, even though repeated protests have been entered against the hasty legislation involved. An examination of the statement (A) attached to this report will show to what a length this injurious procedure has extended. Your Committee can see no reason why many of the Bills submitted to Parliament should not, in the first instance, submitted to the Council. Any difficulties which might arise with reference to Bills affecting charges on the people might easily be removed by the course proposed in the twenty-first chapter of May's "Parliamentary Practice."

Your Committee would also remark that, in their opinion, it is desirable that the number of members holding any office of profit under the Crown during pleasure should be limited. In New South Wales and Queensland the number is restricted to onefifth of the number of members. This proportion, even though including Ministers of the Crown, may be too large; but it would, nevertheless, be undesirable that public officers who may have great departmental knowledge and experience should be absolutely excluded from a seat in the Council.

The attention of your Committee has been drawn more particularly to the expediency of limiting the number of the members of the Council. It appears to be a rule in the principal colonies of the Empire, either by law or by practice, to limit the proportion of the members of the Upper Chamber to about one-half of the

number composing the Lower House, and this more especially appears to have been the case in the latest Constitution granted by the Crown, where the number of members of the Senate of the Dominion of Canada is not allowed to exceed seventy-eight; whereas the number of its House of Commons is 181. There are many and obvious reasons why this limitation should be enacted. Among others might be mentioned the fact that an undue extension has a tendency to impair the value attached to a seat in the Upper Chamber, and might expose the Chamber at any moment of popular or party strife to have its independence sacrifice through the sudden introduction of members, with a view to carry out some object. While the Upper Chambers of all constitutional Legislatures recognize their position as one removing them entirely from party considerations, and as designed to be a guard against hasty and immature legislation, they would doubtless feel it to be their duty to weigh with more than ordinary anxiety and care the explicit declarations of public opinion, when deliberately given by all classes of the community, upon any measure, after the period of excitement which might have given rise to it had passed away. When such a spirit pervades the Upper Chamber there need be no apprehension of a conflict between the two branches composing the Legislature. Moreover, the experience of the past, as exhibited in statement (B) hereto attached, makes it evident that in the course of one or two sessions at most the Ministry of the day could have at command a sufficient number of vacancies to fill up, which, aided by the discretion, judgment, and good sense of the members of the Council, would enable them to pass any measures which had at least more than once received the unquestionable approval of a marked majority of the House of Representatives, and would thus avert the injurious consequences likely to arise from a conflict of opinion. Nevertheless it is necessary, should a limit be fixed, that some precaution should he taken by means of which a new Government might, where the limit has been attained, have an opportunity of appointing one or more Ministers to represent them in the Council.

Your Committee are therefore of opinion—

- That a Bill for limiting the number of members of the Legislative Council should be introduced during the present session.
- That the Council should press on the Govern ment what it has so repeatedly urged—namely, the expediency of causing important Bills to be submitted to the Council at an early period of the session; and, further, should express its strong repugnance to entertain any Bill when, by reason of the late period of its introduction, it would be impossible duly to consider its provisions.
  - Statement showing the Number of Bills intro duced into the Legislative Council, either origi nating therein, or sent from the House of Repre sentatives; with the Total of Each of the Four Weeks preceding the Day of Prorogation, and also of the Month.

    Year.1864.1865.1866,1867.Number of days of the session..209710195" Bills introduced ..108789108——1804.1805.1860.1807.Bills introduced during the last week of the session—House of Representatives Legislative Council Bills introduced during the last week but one of the session—House of Representatives Legislative Council Bills introduced during the last week but two of the session-House of Representatives Legislative Council .. Bills introduced during the last week but three of the session-House of Representatives Legislative Council 10 4 5 21 2 6 6 119 2 14 2 5 1 4 211 1 11 2 13 1 15 9Total of Bills introduced during the last month of each session19864968Percentage upon the total of the whole number of Bills introduced during the session 40-0255-0558-3363
  - Statement showing the Number of Members at the Close of each Session, and also of those added or subtracted before the Close of the following Session, from the Year 1854 to 1868.

    Before Close of following Session.No. of Members at Close of Sesstion Added.Subtracted.SessionI., ending 14th August, 186414NilNil.SessionII.."lGth Sept., 1864 ..14NilNil.SessionIII.,"15th Sept., 1855 ..14NilNil.SessionIV.,"16th August, 18661328Sessionv.,21st August, 18682092SessionVI.,"5th Nov., I8601912SessionVII.,"7th Sept., 18612054SessionVIII.,"15th Sept., 1862 ..2561SessionIX.,"14th Dec, 1863 ..2862Sessionx..13th Dec., 186428NilNil.SessionXI.,"80th October, 186535103SessionXII.,"8th October, 18663577SessionXIII., m10th October, 18673643SessionXIV., commencing 9th July,1868.... .. ..3468 N.B.—Average number of members at the close of the session 1865, 1866, 1887—35. Average number of members added to or subtracted from the Legislative Council dining the last three years respectively—Added, 6 noarly; subtracted, 6.

Ordered, That the said report do lie upon the table.

Extract from Journals of the Legislative Council, 21*st August*, 1868.

Legislative Council Committee further Report.—The Hon. Colonel Kenny, from the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the powers and privileges of the Legislative Council, with a view to a modification of its constitution, brought up a report, which was read as followeth:—

Your Committee, having considered certain "papers relative to the appointment of members of the Legislative Council,"remitted to them on the 20th instant for report, have to state as follows:—

On the 5th December, 1867, the Attorney-General forwarded a memorandum to the Hon, the Colonial Secretary on "the course followed in summoning persons to the Legislative Council,"which course he considered not to be in accordance with the Constitution Act. He is of opinion "that the instrument whereby Her Majesty confers on the Governor authority to summon persons to the Legislative Council must specify the persons to be summoned,"and that "the Imperial Act imposed on Her Majesty the duty of selecting, and the power to authorize the summoning by the Governor, and on the Governor the ministerial act of summoning;"and he observes that there is "no general provision in the Act enabling Her Majesty to delegate "the power thus conferred on her. In practice, however, the Governor has nominated members to the Legislative Council, and they have at once taken their seats; but warrants have subsequently been sent from England "authorizing the summoning of the persons already summoned."The last such warrant appears to have been received in April, 1862. On the 28th of the previous March instructions had been received removing the limit of the number of the members of the Legislative Council, and from that time, without any apparent reason, the practice of informing the Secretary of State of appointments to the Legislative Council appears to have ceased, and consequently warrants have not since been issued. The Attorney-General further remarks that, if special warrants are necessary, "then an Act of the Imperial Legislature will be required to validate all Acts of the Assembly heretofore passed."

This memorandum was forwarded on the 10th of the same month to His Excellency the Governor, and the covering memorandum recommended that, if necessary, an Act of the Imperial Parliament should be passed to validate all Acts of the General Assembly heretofore passed, and to prescribe exactly the mode of summoning persons as members of the Legislative Council.

His Excellency forwarded these two memoranda on the 24th of the same month to the Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

In June, 1868, Mr. Adderley and Mr. Sclater-Booth brought into the House of Commons "A Bill to make Provision for the Appointment of Members of the Legislative Council of New Zealand, and to remove Doubts in respect to Past Appointments."This Bill, which it is believed has by this time become law, validates all past summonses to the Legislative Council, and, moreover, empowers the Governor to summon such persons as he may think fit to the Legislative Council; differing, in this latter respect, from the Constitution Act of 1652, where it is "amongst other things enacted that it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, from time to time, by any instrument under her Royal sign-manual, to authorize the Governor to summon persons to the Legislative Council"—transferring, in fact, the selection of persons, without limit as to number, from the Crown to the Governor.

So far, then, as the validation of the past Acts of the Colonial Legislature is concerned, the Imperial Government appears to have acted with promptitude; but they have apparently overstepped what was requested of them, in that they caused an organic change to be made in the Constitution Act, induced, no doubt, thereto by the practice which has latterly prevailed in New Zealand, and which might reasonably have been assumed to be in conformity with the wish of the New Zealand Parliament.

The further question, then, which your Committee had to consider was. Is this change desirable? It appears that, though the power of summoning persons was vested in the Crown, it was really exercised by the Governor, acting on the advice of the Ministry of the day. A similar course would doubtless prevail should the Imperial Bill become law.

Your Committee are of opinion that it is desirable that an Act should be passed leaving the selection and summoning of members in the hands of the Crown, with a power of delegation to the Governor; and they recommend that a respectful address be presented to Her Majesty in order to effect this object.

Your Committee are still of opinion that a Bill should be introduced limiting the number of members of the Legislative Council; that such Bill should be reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon, with a request, should it be informal, that the proposed limitation of the Council should be embodied in the Imperial Act.

Ordered, That the said report do lie upon the table and be printed.

Appendix No. 5.

Report on Privileges, &c., of the Legislative Council.

MEMORANDA.

[NOTE.—The numbers refer to the pages of the author's work referred to.]

IN inquiring into the subject remitted to us to report upon, we have deemed it expedient to divide the investigation into three branches, viz.,—

- As to the powers conferred on the Council by the Constitution Act and by any subsequent legislation.
- As to the powers held or exercised by law, rule, or usage by the House of Lords and House of Commons respectively.
- As to the powers conferred on the chief colonies of Great Britain under constitutional government by any Constitution Act and legislation, and as held and exercised by the Legislature of the United States of America.

We submit the opinions which have been expressed by eminent writers on the privileges of the Parliament of Great Britain and other Legislative Assemblies, and extracts from the Acts granting Constitutions to Victoria, New South Wales, and Canada.

We would observe, with reference to the first branch, that in the 54th section of the Constitution Act of New Zealand it is laid down "that it shall not be lawful for the House of Representatives or the Legislative Council to pass, or for the Governor to assent to, any Bill appropriating to the public service any sum of money from or out of Her Majesty's revenue within New Zealand, unless the Governor on Her Majesty's behalf shall first have recommended to the House of Representatives to make provision for the specific public service towards which such money is to be appropriated."So early as 1854, on the introduction into the Legislative Council from the House of Representatives of the first Appropriation Bill, the Legislative Council raised the question whether it did not possess the power to amend or alter any such legislative measure submitted for its consideration; but, as it was proposed to prorogue the Assembly on the following day, the Council consented to pass the Appropriation Bill without alteration, referring the question of its rights to alter such Bills to the consideration of Her Majesty's Imperial Government. The reply, dated the 25th March, 1856, was to the effect "that, as the New Zealand Constitution Act was silent on the subject, the analogy of the English Constitution ought to prevail; and it pointed out that the undisputed practice, as affirmed by a resolution of the House of Commons of the year 1678, was that Bills of Supply ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."

The Privileges Act of 1856 indicated certain privileges as pertaining to legislative bodies and officers of the Government of the colony and provinces of New Zealand, conferred certain powers on the said legislative bodies, and gave protection to persons employed in the publication of papers under the authority of the same. At the same time it was expressly stated that the Act was not to be held directly or indirectly, by implication or otherwise, to restrict whatsoever privileges or immunities any such legislative body might possess.

"The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865,"passed on the 26th day of September, repealed the 52nd section of the Constitution Act, which empowered the Legislative Council and House of Representatives to make rules for the orderly conduct of the business of such Council and House; and also repealed so much of "The Privileges Act, 1856,"as applied to the Legislative Council and House of Representatives; and it enacted that "the Legislative Council or House of Representatives of New Zealand, and the Committees and members thereof respectively, shall hold, enjoy, and exercise such and the like privileges, immunities, and powers as, on the 1st day of January, 1865, were held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the Committees and members thereof, so far as the same are not inconsistent with or repugnant to such and so many of the sections and provisions of the said Constitution Act as, at the time of coining into operation of this Act, are unrepealed, whether such privileges, immunities, or powers were so held, possessed, or enjoyed by custom, statute, or otherwise."The Act also provided that "such privileges, immunities, and powers shall be deemed to be and shall be part of the general and public law of the colony;"and further declared that, in cases of inquiry into such privileges, printed copies of the Journals of the House of Commons shall be evidence of such Journals. It also empowered the Legislative Council and House of Representatives and their Committees, or any joint Committee, to administer oaths, and protected publishers of reports acting under the authority of either branch of the Legislature. "The Privileges Act, 1866,"exempted members of the General Assembly from attendance in Courts of law in certain cases. Since then there has been no further legislation on the subject.

With reference to the second branch of the inquiry we would observe that in 1704 the Lords communicated a resolution to the Commons at a Conference—to which resolution the Commons assented—"That neither House of Parliament have power by any vote or declaration to create to themselves new privileges not warranted by the known laws and customs of Parliament."(See May "On the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament,"1868, p. 66.) Without entering minutely into the question of the rise and progress of the power to impose taxation and grant supplies, it may be sufficient to say that "Her Majesty's Speech at the commencement of each session recognizes the peculiar privilege of the Commons to grant all supplies, the preamble of every Act of Supply distinctly confirms it, and the form in which the Royal assent is given is a further confirmation of their right."The grant from the Commons is not, however, "effectual in law without the assent of the Queen and the House of Lords."(P. 534.)

The claim thus recognized of originating grants appears to have existed for 300 years. In 1678 it was extended, and the Lords were precluded from amending Bills of Supply. (P. 537.) "This principle is acquiesced

in by the Lords."(P. 538.) "In Bills not confined to matters of aid or taxation, but in which pecuniary burdens are imposed upon the people, the Lords may make amendments, provided they do not alter the intention of the Commons with regard to the amount of the rate or charge, whether by increase or reduction; its duration; its mode of assessment, levy, collection, appropriation, or management; or the persons who shall pay, re- ceive, manage, or control it; or the limits within which it is proposed to be levied."(P. 538.) Bills containing provisions of the above kind are sometimes introduced into the Lords, but ultimately passed in a form by which no privileges of the Commons are infringed upon. When Bills of Supply have had tacked to them enactments which, in another Bill, would have been rejected by the Lords, such a proceeding, invading the privileges of the Lords, "has been resisted by protest, by Conference, and by the rejection of the Bills."(P. 545.) In 1860 the Commons, on the rejection of the Paper Duties Repeal Bill, which overruled the financial arrangements voted by the Commons, resolved—"3rd. That, to guard for the future against an undue exercise of that power by the Lords "(viz., the power of the Lords to reject Bills of taxation) "and to secure to the Commons their rightful control over taxation and supply, their House has in its own hands the power so to impose and resist taxes, and to frame Bills of Supply, that the rights of the Commons as to the matter, manner, measure, and time may be maintained inviolate."(P. 545.) Acting upon this resolution, the Commons, in the following session, embodied the repeal of this duty in a general financial measure for granting taxes and duties, "which the Lords were constrained to accept."(P. 546.)

Lord Brougham, in his work on the British Constitution (1844), observes, in reference to the tenacious adherence by the Commons to certain privileges with respect to the Lords: "I allude particularly to the exclusion of the latter from the originating of any measure of Supply, and from all alterations upon any financial measure sent up from the Lower House. Although the Lords have never abandoned their claim to originate and to alter money Bills, as well as the Commons, yet, in practice, they never assert the right, and we may therefore take it that, by our Constitution, the Commons alone can begin any measure of Supply, and that the Lords have no power to alter it as sent up to them, but must either accept it wholly or wholly reject it."(P. 115.) The Commons have, however, he states, allowed this exclusive privilege to be broken in upon once and again, as when they withdrew from "the absurd pretence that a prohibition, being enforced by a pecuniary penalty, could not be touched by the Lords because it was a money clause."(P. 116.)

Mr. Hearn, in his work on the Government of England, observes that "although Parliament grants supplies to the Crown, and provides the ways and means for raising these supplies, the functions of the two Houses of Parliament are not in this respect alike. The House of Commons has acquired in this matter peculiar powers. It claims as within its exclusive jurisdiction all questions of finance. With the initiation of all such questions, and with all their details, this House exclusively deals. The House of Lords on these Bills, like the Crown on these and all other Bills, retains the general power of assent or rejection only, but not of amendment. The functions, then, of the several powers of the State in matters of finance may be thus briefly stated: The Crown makes requisitions to the Commons for the supplies which the public service demands. The Commons grant the supplies, and provide the ways and means for raising them. The Lords assent to these grants and these financial arrangements. The Crown accepts the grants and assents to the legislation which they involve."(P. 353.)

The exemption of such Bills (money Bills) from amendment by the Lords may be dated from the Conferences of 1671 and 1678. "These principles may now be regarded as firmly settled. The House of Lords, indeed, has never formally abandoned its right of amendment, but it has for many years abstained from its exercise in cases calculated to excite dispute."(P. 353.) In 1860 the Lords rejected, for financial reasons, a Bill passed by the House of Commons for the repeal of the excise duties on paper. This action of the Lords was met by the Commons by declaratory resolutions, and in the following session by a Bill including various enactments for the repeal of some taxes (the paper duties among the number) and the imposition of others. The House of Lords, after some opposition, passed the Bill rather than reject it in its entirety; but such forbearance, it is said, is not to be expected where "questions of general commercial policy are involved."The precedent of the paper duties does not sanction the combination of a Tax Bill with an Appropriation Bill, or with any other measures not connected with ways and means. (P. 354.)

The constitutional theory of taxation, it is said, has been recognized by express enactment in the various Colonial Constitutions which during the present reign have received the sanction of Parliament. (P. 353.)

Mr. Todd, in his book on parliamentary government, remarks that "there is no rule or usage of the House of Lords to forbid the presentation and discussion of a petition for pecuniary redress or compensation, provided it be couched in general terms;"and the Lords "are not constitutionally debarred from instituting inquiries by their own Committees into financial matters or into questions which involve the expenditure of public money,"because it is desirable "that they should be prepared, by full investigation and tree inquiry, to give or withhold their assent intelligently"to every legislative measure, whether of Supply or otherwise. In 1852 the House of Lords inquired by a Select Committee into the claims of Baron de Bode for pecuniary relief; and in 1860 a Lords Committee upon Floating Breakwaters recommended "that a sum not exceeding £10,000 be

placed at the disposal of the Admiralty"to enable that department to test any plans for the suitable construction of such works. (P. 433.)

Upon matters of Supply and taxation the Commons "have succeeded in maintaining their exclusive right to originate all measures of this description. They have gone further, and have claimed that such measures should be simply affirmed or rejected by the Lords, and should not be amended in the slightest particular. The Lords have practically acquiesced in this restriction, although they have never formally consented to it."(P. 457.) "Every Bill to impose or repeal a tax involves other considerations besides those which are purely questions of revenue: it necessarily includes principles of public policy or of commercial regulation; and on points of this kind the Lords, as a coordinate branch of the Legislature, are constitutionally free to act and advise as they may judge best for the public interests."Their power should, however, be only "resorted to upon extraordinary occasions."(P. 459.) In 1862 the Budget propositions, involving twenty-two millions of money, were introduced into the House of Commons in one Bill. When the Bill was before the Lords, Lord Derby, in debating the expediency of such a mode of introduction, remarked that "the one course interposes to us no greater obstacles than the other, because, as it is perfectly within our province and our right to reject a particular proposition in a single Bill, so it is equally within our competence to reject that same proposition when incorporated with others,"and "leave the Commons to the consequences of their own proceeding."(P. 464.)

Mr. Homersham Cox observes in his work on the institutions of the English Government (1863): "The now established practice of the House of Commons admits of no discussion with or amendments by the House of Lords with respect to money Bills; but that practice was not completely established until after the seventeenth century."(P. 185.) "In 1678 the Commons resolved that all supplies were their sole gifts, and that the 'ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants ought not to be altered by the House of Lords.' From the end of the seventeenth century these claims have been seldom, or but faintly, controverted by the Lords."(P. 186.) Mr. Cox also quotes the proceedings of the House of Commons in 1860 with respect to the rejection of the Paper Duty Repeal Bill, and the consequent action taken by that House in 1861, in passing a Bill "in which measures for the repeal of some taxes and the imposition of others were combined." "The Lords,' he observes, "passed the Bill, but not without a protest from several lords against the course taken by the House of Commons, on the ground that it was contrary to usage, and that measures of Supply and repeal of taxes ought not to be combined in the same Bill."He also quotes Blackstone as saying with reference to the right of the Lords to reject money Bills, "It is sufficient that they have a power of rejecting, if they think the Commons too lavish or improvident in their grants."Also De Lolme: "The Lords are expected simply and solely either to accept or reject them."(P. 188.)

Hallam says ("Constitutional History,"Vol. III., p. 27) "that the importance of the exclusive privilege claimed by the Commons"(in money Bills) "has been rather exaggerated by them." "In early records Lords and Commons made money grants to the King without mutual communication." "22nd Edward III.: Commons alone granted three-fifteenths, levied on themselves." "After this both Lords and Commons are jointly recited, sometimes after deliberating together."

In Richard II.'s reign, Commons are recited to grant money with assent of Lords, apparently indicating that the vote originated with Commons, and that the grant was mainly theirs.

In the reigns of Henry IV. and V. the Commons grant, the Lords consent. Hallam doubts whether, in other than cases where it is specially mentioned, the Lords bore any part of the taxes.

Hallam further says that "in 1 Car. I. Commons began to omit names of the Lords, reciting the grant as if wholly their own."

The Commons further maintained that "the Lords could not amend Bills making a charge upon the people."Hallam, "Constitutional History,"Vol. III., pp. 30, 31, and 32:—

If the Commons, as in early times, had merely granted their own money only, it would he reasonable that they should have, as they claimed, a fundamental right as to the matter, measure, and time. But that the peers, subject to the same burdens as the rest of the community, and possessing no trifling proportion of general wealth, should have no other alternative than to refuse the necessary supplies of the revenue, or to have their exact proportion, with all qualifications and circumstances attending their grant, presented to them unalterably by the other House of Parliament, was an anomaly that could hardly rest on any other ground of defence than such a series of precedents as establish a constitutional usage, while, in fact, it could not be made out that such a pretension was ever advanced by the Commons before the present Parliament. In the short Parliament of April, 1640, the Lords having sent down a message requesting the other House to give precedency in the business they were about to a matter of Supply, it had been highly resented as an infringement of their privilege, and Mr. Pym was appointed to represent their complaint at a Conference. Yet even the boldest advocate of popular prejudices who could have been selected was content to assert that the matter of subsidy and Supply ought to begin in the House of Commons. There seems to be still less pretext for the great extension given by the Commons to their acknowledged privilege of originating Bills of Supply. The principle was well

adapted to that earlier period when security against mis government could only be obtained by the vigilant jealousy and uncompromising firmness of the Commons. They came to the grant of subsidy with real or feigned reluctance as the stipulated price of redress of grievances. They considered the Lords, generally speaking, as too inti- mutely united with the King's ordinary Council, which, indeed, sat with them, and had, perhaps, as late as Edward III.'s time, a deliberative voice. They knew the influences or intimidating ascendency of the Pcers over many of their own members. It may be doubted, in fact, whether the Lower House shook off absolutely and permanently all sense of subordination, or, at least, deference, to the Upper till about the close of the reign of Elizabeth. But I must confess that when the wise and ancient maxim—"That the Commons alone can empower the King to levy the people's money "—was applied to a private Bill for lighting and cleansing a certain town, or cutting dikes in a fen, to local and limited assessments for local benefit (as to which the Crown had no manner of interest, nor has anything to do with the collection), there was more disposition shown to make encroachments than to guard against those of others. They began soon after the Revolution to introduce a still more extraordinary construction of their privilege: not receiving from the House of Lords any Bill which imposes a pecuniary penalty, nor permitting them to alter the application of such as had been imposed below. These restrictions upon the other House of Parliament are now become in their own estimation the standing privileges of the Commons. Several instances have occurred during the last century, though not, I believe, very lately, when Bills chiefly of a private nature have been unanimously rejected and even thrown over the table by the Speaker, because they contained some provision in which the Lords had trespassed on these alleged rights. They are, as may be supposed, very differently regarded in the neighbouring Chamber. The Lords have never acknowledged any further privilege than that of originating Bills of Supply. But the good sense of both parties and of an enlightened nation, who must witness and judge of their disputes, as well as the natural desire of the Government to prevent in the outset any altercation that must impede the course of its measures, have rendered this little jealousy unproductive of those animosities which it seemed so happily contrived to excite.

After the Revolution the Commons objected to the Lords providing for local and limited assessment; then "by-and-by to the Lords meddling with or first passing Bills imposing penalties or altering the application of such as had been imposed by Lower House."

Taylor, in his "Book of Rights,"1833, tells us that "Sir William Beetham says that no deliberative assembly existed until the reign of Edward I."

In 34 Edward I. "No tallage or aid shall be taken by us without the goodwill and assent of the archbishops, bishops, earls, barons, knights, burgesses, and other freemen of the land."

It appears that laws were placed on the Statute Book in the reign of Edward II. without, and sometimes against, the consent of the other branches of the Legislature; which seems to have occasioned a petition of Commons as to an equal participation in drawing up statutes. (5 Richard II., 1381.)

In 9 Henry IV. we find a very important record of one of the first disputes, if not the first, about money Bills between the King and Lords and the Commons. (Pp. 117, 118, 119.)

Taylor further observes (1604), "The Commons say that their privileges and liberties are their right and inheritance no less than their very land and goods."

Guizot, in his work on representative government (1861), says: "Barons (vassals of the King) had a right to levy imposts only as representatives of their own vassals. E.J." "Although they were not elected, and had received neither appointment nor mandate, we may nevertheless say that they were regarded as representing their own vassals, and that it was only in virtue of the power which was attributed to them in this fictitious representation that they exercised the right of levying imposts on all the proprietors in the kingdom." "(Note.—This is expressly indicated by two writs, one in the reign of John, 17th February, 1208; the other issued by Henry in., 12th July, 1237.)"(P. 35.)

The Convocation of County and Burgh Deputies became an actual necessity as the principle, that consent in all matters of impost was right, came to be recognized. (P. 375.)

Guizot also cites, for the division of Parliament into two Houses, the following authorities: "Carte 17, Edward III., 1844. Parliamentary History, 6 Edward III., 1333. Hallam, 1327, or perhaps 8 Edward II, 1315"(organized, perhaps, between 1345-1355). (P. 418.) He tells, at page 514, that in 1407, Henry IV., Commons recognized these principles: Parliamentary initiative in its present form, and exclusive initiative of Commons in matters of subsidies. (P. 514.)

Guizot explains fully the causes of jealousy of the Commons and reasons for their seeking to have control of money Bills. (Pp. 434, 435, 436, 447, and 462.)

Arthur Mills, in a work on Colonial Constitution, 1856, says that "Upper House can originate, amend, or reject all Bills except money Bills;" "the extent of their parliamentary privileges is considerable, but hardly admits of legal definition;"and that "the election of representatives, as Lord Chief Justice Holt expresses it, is an original right vested in and inseparable from the freehold."

Earl Russell, in "English Government and Constitution,"1866, says, "It was a part of the practical wisdom

of our ancestors to alter and vary the form of our institutions, as they went on, to suit the circumstances of the time, and reform them according to the dictates of experience. They never ceased to work upon our frame of Government as a sculptor fashions the model of a favourite statue. It is an art that, till of late years, had fallen into disuse, and the disuse was attended with evils of the most alarming magnitude."(Pp. 10, 11.)

Bagehot, on the English Constitution, 1867, says, "The evil of two co-equal Houses of distinct nature is obvious." "In both the American and Swiss Constitutions the Upper House has as much authority as the second." "If it does not produce a deadlock it is owing, not to the goodness of the legal Constitution, but to the discreetness of the members of the Chamber."(Pp. 127,128.) At page 130 he says, "Since the Reform Act the House of Lords has become a revising and suspending House. It can alter Bills, and it can reject Bills on which the House of Commons is not yet thoroughly in earnest—upon which the nation is not yet determined. This veto is a sort of hypothetical veto: they say, We reject your Bill for this once, or these twice, or even these thrice, but, if you keep on sending it up, at last we will not reject it. The House has ceased to be one of the latent directors, and has become one of the temporary rejectors and palpable alterers."

The Duke of Wellington's letter to Lord Derby quoted here is worthy of perusal: Mr. Bagehot goes on to say, "The House of Lords now is a Chamber with, in most cases, a veto of delay—with, in most cases, a power of revision—but with no other rights and powers." "As the Duke's letter in every line evinces, the wisest members—the guiding members of the House—know that the House must yield to the people if the people are determined." (P. 135.) And at page 169, "But I do not consider that, upon the broad principle of omitting legal technicalities, the House of Commons has any special function with regard to financial different from its functions with respect to other legislation." "It is to rule in both, and to rule in both through the Cabinet." And at page 270 he adds, "The House of Commons may, as was explained, assent in minor matters to the revision of the House of Lords, and submit in matters about which it cares little to the suspension veto of the House of Lords; but, when sure of the popular assent, and when freshly elected, it is absolute—it can rule as it likes and decide as it likes."

We would further observe, in reference to the third branch of the investigation, that the Constitution Act of New South Wales, of 1853, provides "that all Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any new rate, tax, or impost, subject always to the limitations contained in clause 62 of this Act, shall originate in the Legislative Assembly"—that is, the Lower Chamber; and by clause 62 it is provided "that it shall not be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to originate or pass any vote, resolution, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the said Consolidated Revenue Fund, or of any other tax or impost to any purpose which shall not have been first recommended by a message of the Governor to the Legislative Assembly."

The Constitution Act of Victoria states that "it shall be lawful for the Legislature of Victoria by any Act or Acts to define the privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Council and Assembly, and by the members thereof respectively: Provided that no such privileges, immunities, or powers shall exceed those now had, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament, or the members thereof." And also that "all Bills for appropriating any part of the revenue of Victoria, and for imposing any duty, rate, tax, rent, return, or impost shall originate in the Assembly, and may be rejected, but not altered, by the Council." And, further, that "it shall not be lawful for the Legislative Assembly to originate or pass any vote, resolution, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the said Consolidated Revenue Fund, or of any other duty, rate, tax, rent, return, or impost for any purpose which shall not have been first recommended by a message of the Governor to the Legislative Assembly during the session in which such vote, resolution, or Bill shall be passed."

The Act of 20 Vict., 25th February, 1857, is "An Act for defining the Privileges, Powers, &c., of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of Victoria," and differs from the New Zealand Act of 1865 chiefly as to the date from which the privileges, &c., of the House of Commons are to be taken as a guide. The Victorian Act fixes the date at 18 and 19 Vict.; the New Zealand Act at the 1st January, 1865.

The British North American or Canadian Constitution Act was passed in 1867, and it declares in clause 18 that "the privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, or exercised by the Senate and the House of Commons, and by the members thereof respectively, shall be such as are from time to time defined by Act of the Parliament of Canada, but so that the same shall never exceed those at the passing of this Act held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the members thereof;" and it further provides, in clause 53, that "Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the House of Commons," and in clause 54 it is declared that "it shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor-General."

Judge Story, in his Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, says that "the first clause" (sec. 7, art. 1) "declares, all Bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives, but the Senate

may propose or concur with amendments as on other Bills. This provision, so far as it regards the right to originate what are technically called 'money Bills,' is, beyond all question, borrowed from the British House of Commons, of which it is the ancient and indisputable privilege and right that all grants of subsidies and parliamentary aids shall begin in their House, and are first bestowed by them, although their grants are 'not effectual to all intents and purposes until they have the assent of the other two branches of the Legislature.' The general reason given for this privilege of the House of Commons is, that the supplies are raised upon the body of the people; and, therefore, it is proper that they alone should have the right of taxing themselves. And Mr. Justice Blackstone has very correctly remarked that this reason would be unanswerable if the Commons taxed none but themselves. But it is notorious that a very large share of property is in possession of the Lords; that this property is equally taxed as the property of the Commons; and therefore, the Commons not being the sole persons taxed, this cannot be the reason of their having the sole right of raising and modelling the supply. The true reason seems to be this: The Lords, being a permanent hereditary body, created at pleasure by the King, are supposed more liable to be influenced by the Crown, and, when once influenced, more likely to continue so, than the Commons, who are a temporary elective body, freely nominated by the people. It would, therefore, be extremely dangerous to give the Lords any power in framing new taxes for the subject. It is sufficient that they have a power of rejecting, if they think the Commons too lavish or improvident in their grants. (Sec. 874.)

"This seems a very just account of the matter in reference to the spirit of the British Constitution, though a different explanation has been deduced from a historical review of the power. It has been asserted to have arisen from the instructions from time to time given by the constituents of the Commons (whether of county, city, or borough) as to the rates and assessments which they are respectively willing to bear and assent to, and from the aggregate it was easy for the Commons to ascertain the whole amount which the commonalty of the whole kingdom were willing to grant to the King. Be this as it may, so jealous are the Commons of this valuable privilege that herein they will not suffer the other House to exert any power but that of rejecting. They will not permit the least alteration or amendment to be made by the Lords to the mode of taxing the people by a money Bill, and under this appellation are included all Bills by which money is directed to be raised upon the subject for any purpose or in any shape whatsoever, either for the exigencies of Government, and collected from the kingdom in general, as the land-tax, or for private benefit, and collected in any particular district, as turnpikes, parish rates, and the like. It is obvious that this power might be capable of great abuse if other Bills were tacked to such money Bills, and accordingly it was found that money Bills were sometimes tacked to favourite measures of the Commons with a view to insure their passage by the Lords, an extraordinary use or, rather, perversion of the power, which would, if suffered to grow into a common practice, have completely destroyed the equilibrium of the British Constitution, and subjected both the Lords and the King to the power of the Commons. Resistance was made from time to time to this unconstitutional encroachment, and at length the Lords, with a view to give permanent effect to their own rights, have made it a Standing Order to reject upon sight all Bills that are tacked to money Bills. Thus the privilege is maintained on one side and guarded against undue abuse on the other. (Sec. 875.)

"It will be at once perceived that the same reasons do not exist in the same extent for the same exclusive right in our House of Representatives in regard to money Bills as exist for such right in the British House of Commons. It may be lit that it should possess the exclusive right to originate money Bills, since it may be presumed to possess more ample means of local information, and it more directly represents the opinions, feelings, and wishes of the people; and, being directly dependent upon them for support, it will be more watchful and cautious in the imposition of taxes than a body which emanates exclusively from the States in their sovereign political capacity. But, as the Senators are in a just sense equally representatives of the people, and do not hold their offices by a permanent or hereditary title, but periodically return to the common mass of citizens, and, above all, as direct taxes are and must be apportioned among the States according to their federal population, and as all the States have a distinct local interest both as to the amount and nature of all taxes of every sort which are to be levied, there seems to be a peculiar fitness in giving to the Senate a power to alter and amend, as well as to concur with or reject, all money Bills. The due influence of all the States is thus preserved; for otherwise it might happen, from the overwhelming representation of some of the large States, that taxes might be levied which would bear with peculiar severity upon the interests, either agricultural, commercial, or manufacturing, of others being the minor States; and thus the equilibrium intended by the Constitution, as well of power as of interest and influence, might be practically subverted. (Sec. 876.) There would also be no small inconvenience in excluding the Senate from the exercise of this power of amendment and alteration, since if any or the slightest modification were required in such a Bill to make it either palatable or just, the Senate would be compelled to reject it, although an amendment of a single line might make it entirely acceptable to both Houses. Such a practical obstruction to the legislation of a free Government would far outweigh any supposed theoretical advantages from the possession or exercise of an exclusive power by the House of Representatives. Infinite perplexities, and misunderstandings, and delays would clog the most

wholesome legislation. Even the annual Appropriation Bills might be in danger of a miscarriage on these accounts, and the most painful dissensions might be introduced. (Sec. 877.) Indeed, of so little importance has the exclusive possession of such a power been thought in the State Governments that some of the State Constitutions make no difference as to the power of each branch of the Legislature to originate money Bills. Most of them contain a provision similar to that in the constitution of the United States; and in those States where the exclusive power formerly existed, as, for instance, in Virginia and South Carolina, it was a constant source of difficulties and contentions. In the revised Constitution of South Carolina (in 1790) the provision was altered so as to conform to the clause in the Constitution of the United States. (Sec. 878.)

"The clause seems to have met with no serious opposition in any of the State Conventions; and, indeed, could scarcely be expected to meet with any opposition except in Virginia, since the other States were well satisfied with the principle adopted in their own State Constitutions; and in Virginia the clause created but little debate. (Sec. 879.) What Bills are properly 'Bills for raising revenue' in the sense of the Constitution has been a matter of some discussion. A learned commentator supposes that every 'Bill which indirectly or consequentially may raise revenue is within the sense of the Constitution a revenue Bill.' He therefore thinks that the Bills for establishing the Post Office and the Mint and regulating the value of foreign coin belong to this class, and ought not to have originated (as in fact They did) in the Senate. But the practical construction of the Constitution has been against his opinion. And, indeed, the history of the origin of the power already suggested abundantly proves that it has been confined to Bills to levy taxes in the strict sense of the words, and has not been understood to extend to bills for other purposes which may incidentally create revenue. No one supposes that a Bill to sell any of the public lands, or to sell public stock, is a Bill to raise revenue in the sense of the Constitution. Much less would a Bill be so deemed which merely regulated the value of foreign or domestic coins, or authorized a discharge of insolvent debtors upon assignments of their estates to the United States, giving a priority of payment to the United States in cases of insolvency, although all of them might incidentally bring revenue into the Treasury. (Sec 880.)"

J. RICHARDSON.
JAS. MENZIEB.

Appendix No. 6.

Report of the Managers appointed Last Session by the Legislative Council to prepare a Case for the Opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England respecting the Practice of the two Houses of the Legislature as regards Money Bills.

THE Managers have the honour to report that, in accordance with the resolutions of both Houses of the Legislature, a case was prepared and agreed to by the respective Managers for the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England, a copy of which case is appended to this report.

Appended to the case are stated at full length reasons in support of the views urged by the Legislative Council.

From causes to which the Managers do not think it necessary to advert more particularly, a delay, for which the Managers do not consider themselves in any degree responsible, took place in the transmission of the case to England; it was, however, forwarded in a despatch from His Excellency the Governor to the Secretary of State on the 30th March last, but, so far as they are aware, no answer has yet been received to such despatch.

J. RICHARDSON.
H. SEWELL.
WALTER MANTELL.

Legislative Council Chamber, Wellington,
18th March, 1872.

THE Managers of the Legislative Council and of the House of Representatives transmit to the Colonial Secretary herewith a case, stating the facts upon which they are agreed, for reference to the Law Officers of the Crown, in accordance with the resolutions of both Houses, relating to the difference on a question of privilege

which arose between both Houses last session.

Appended to the case are stated at full length the reasons submitted by the Managers of the Legislative Council in support of the view urged by the Legislative Council.

The Managers of the House of Representatives do not deem it necessary to submit any further statement beyond the statement of facts contained in the case.

It is requested that the Colonial Secretary will move His Excellency the Governor to transmit the accompanying papers to the Secretary of State by the outgoing mail.

W. B. D. MANTELL,
HENRY SEWELL,
For the Managers of the L.C.

F. D. BELL,
A. DE B. BRANDON,
For the Managers of the H. of R.

Case for Reference to Law Officers of the Crown.

A QUESTION has arisen between the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives of New Zealand, upon which the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England is sought to be obtained. The Legislative Council amended a Bill by striking out a clause. The House of Representatives insisted that the Bill was of that class in which the Legislative Council is, by constitutional usage, debarred from making amendments.

The facts of the case are as follows: Under various Acts for regulating the public revenues of New Zealand, certain principal branches of revenue—viz., the duties of Customs, Post Office, stamps, &c.—are thrown together, and form the consolidated revenue of the colony, out of which the annual supplies for the public service are appropriated.

By "The Payments to Provinces Act, 1870" (of which a copy is herewith), certain capitation allowances, determined according to the population of each province, were made payable to the respective provinces of New Zealand out of the consolidated revenue for a period of seven years, the amount payable to each province being fixed on a gradually descending scale, varying in amount according to the population in the respective provinces each year. In the current year the rate per head of the population payable under such Act would have been £1 18s.

In the same Act was also contained a provision that, in every year [*unclear:* Caring] the same period of seven years, a sum of [*unclear:* £5] should be paid out of the consolidated revenue to the provinces, in the ratio of their respective population, for distribution amongst the various Road Boards within such provinces, according to a scale fixed by the Act.

In the same session (1870) another Act was passed, intituled "The Immigration and Public Works Act, 1870" (a copy of which is herewith), whereby provision was made for various subjects—viz., the construction of railways, immigration, the construction of water-races on goldfields, the purchase of lands from the Natives, the extension of telegraphs, the formation of roads in the North Island.

And by another Act of the same session (1870), intituled "The Immigration and Public Works Loan Act, 1870" (a copy of which is herewith), authority was given to the Governor to raise by loan £4,000,000, to be applied in the way prescribed by the schedule to the Act—viz.,—

The amount was authorized to be raised by issue of debentures, the charge for interest and sinking fund not to exceed 6 per cent., and the same were to be a charge upon the consolidated revenue.

The 14th section provided that the "moneys raised under the authority thereinbefore contained should and might, subject to the provisions thereinafter contained, and to the provisions contained in 'The Immigration and Public Works Act, 1870,; be issued and applied to the purposes mentioned in the Act, and no other; and, as to purposes mentioned in the said schedule, should be issued and applied in sums not exceeding the amounts in the said schedule respectively provided."

It was further provided by the 19th section that, in the event of the Imperial [*unclear:* parliament] passing an Act to guarantee any loan [*unclear:* tubed] by the Colony of New Zealand for all or any of the purposes for which the loan thereby authorized might be applied, the Governor, or any such Agents as might be appointed under the Act, might raise any portion of the loan, with such guarantee, upon and subject to all or any of the terms, conditions, and stipulations expressed in such Act of the Imperial Parliament; and the Governor or such Agents as aforesaid was further empowered to enter into any such contract or arrangement as he might think fit with the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury in England, with regard to any portion of the loan, and the guarantee thereof; and, in and by any such arrangement or contract, the Governor or such Agent as

aforesaid might fix the order of priority of charge on the Consolidated Fund of New Zealand which the loan so guaranteed, or any part or parts thereof, should take with relation to any other part or parts of the loan; and in and by such arrangement might provide for the transmission to England and investment of the sinking fund (if any) of the loan so guaranteed, provided that such contract or arrangement was not inconsistent with the purposes for which such loan was authorized to be raised.

In the session of the General Assembly just passed (1871) the Government introduced into the House of Representatives a Bill intituled "The Payments to Provinces Bill, 1871 "(a copy of which is herewith), the object of which was to alter the financial arrangements between the colony and the provinces, to reduce the amount of capitation allowance payable out of the consolidated revenue from £1 18s. per head to 15s. per head, and, in lieu of the £50,000 per annum payable under the Act of last year out of the consolidated revenue to the provinces for the service of the Road Boards, to apply £100,000 out of the moneys authorized to be raised by the loan under the Immigration and Public Works Loan Act, and which are referred to in the Bill as "the Public Works Fund," to the provinces for distribution amongst the Road Boards, "to be expended by them in the construction of new roads, bridges, and culverts, and in the maintenance thereof, for one year, and the completion of such works commenced last year as were not yet finished." And there was added in the Bill, as sent up to the Legislative Council from the House of Representatives, a clause which has given rise to the question now raised, upon which the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England is requested The clause was as follows:—

28. Notwithstanding anything herein contained, it shall be lawful for the Minister for Public Works, if he think fit, on the application of the Superintendent of any province, to expend any sum not exceeding one-half of the money to be allotted to such province for the year ending the thirtieth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, under section eleven of this Act, in payment of or in repayment to such province of the cost of permanent public works in such province: Provided, however, that, except in the County of Westland, such works shall have been authorized by any Act of the Superintendent and Provincial Council of the province now in force.

The Legislative Council objected to this clause. Accordingly, they expunged the clause, and the Bill in this amended form, and with some other unimportant amendments, was returned to the House of Representatives.

The House of Representatives returned the Bill, with reasons for disagreeing from the amendments of the Legislative Council in clauses 14, 15, 28, and 29, as follows:—

That the above clauses relate to the appropriation and management of money, and that the Legislative Council has not power to alter or expunge such clauses.

The Legislative Council replied as follows:—

At this late period of the session it would be impossible for the two branches of the Legislature to discuss with the requisite deliberation the important question of privilege raised by the House of Representatives. But the Council desires briefly to state its views of the question thus raised.

The present Bill, so far, at least, as concerns the application of the Immigration and Public Works Loan authorized to he raised last year, is not, in their opinion, a Bill of Aid or Supply. It imposes no new burden on the people, nor alters any existing burden, nor is it a grant of money by way of Supply.

The Colonial Parliament last year authorized a very largo loan to be raised on the credit of the colony, to be expended strictly and exclusively on immigration, railways, and other public works and undertakings specified in the Act.

It is proposed by the present Bill to divert a part of the money so to be raised to other objects of a cognate character, and to that extent the Legislative Council is prepared to concur in the proposed measure. But it is proposed, further, to authorize the Governor to pay over one-half of the amount so to be diverted to the provinces.

Such an application of the Immigration and Public Works Loan authorized to ho raised last year is not, in the opinion of the Council, right or consistent with the engagements upon the faith of which Parliament last year consented to raise the loan.

The Legislative Council claims the right to exercise its own judgment upon that point. The concession of that right would so narrow as practically to destroy its proper functions as a legislative body in dealing with questions of a similar character, which come before them in a great variety of forms. For the foregoing reasons the Legislative Council earnestly trusts that the House of Representatives will accept the Bill as amended by the Legislative Council.

To this the House of Representatives made a rejoinder as follows:—

That it is beyond the power of the Legislative Council to vary or alter the management or distribution of any money as prescribed by the House of Representatives; that it is within the power of the House of Representatives, by Act of one session, to vary the appropriation or management of money prescribed by Act of a previous session.

To which the Legislative Council replied by the following message:—

This Council cannot assent to the reasons adduced by the House of Representatives for disagreeing to its amendments in the Payments to Provinces Bill, and maintains that the amendments to which the House of Representatives objects are strictly within the powers and privileges of the Council to make.

The Council considers the clauses in the Bill, in their original and unamended shape, to be objectionable in principle, and in manifest violation of the spirit and intention of the Public Works Act of 1870. The Council recognizes, however, that the Bill is a portion of the general financial policy of the Government, and that its rejection at this stage might be attended with great public inconvenience.

While, therefore, still maintaining its constitutional right to make the amendments in question, it consents to abstain from the exercise of this right on the House of Representatives agreeing,—

- *To amend the Bill so as to restrict its operation to the present financial year.*
- *To refer the point in dispute between the two Houses to the Law Officers of the Crown in England, upon a case to be prepared by Managers appointed by each House.*

Subject to these conditions, the Council will, on being made acquainted with the names of the Managers appointed by the House of Representatives to draw up the case for reference, cease to insist upon its amendments.

Whereupon the House of Representatives accepted the terms by the Legislative Council, and transmitted the following message to the Legislative Council:—

The House of Representatives have considered the reasons adduced by the Legislative Council for refusing to concur in the reasons of the House of Representatives for objecting to the amendments of the Council in the Bill intituled "The Payment to Provinces Act, 1871."

The House have concurred in the first proposition of the Legislative Council respecting the operation of the Bill, and have agreed to the following clause, to stand last clause of the Bill:—

"This Act shall continue in operation until the first day of July next, and no longer."

On consideration of the second proposal of the Legislative Council, the House of Representatives have agreed to the following resolution;—

"That this House will concur in the proposition of the Legislative Council that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown be obtained on the question whether, in accordance with the practice of the Imperial Parliament, the amendments made by the Council are within its functions, having regard to constitutional usage and to the powers conferred on the Council by 'The Privileges Act, 1865; and that Mr. Speaker, Mr. Brandon, and the Hon. Mr. Fox be appointed Managers to meet Managers on the part of the Legislative Council to prepare a case for the purpose. Such opinion to be taken with a view to assisting the Legislature in future action, but not to be binding on either House."

To this the Legislative Council replied by the following message:—

The Legislative Council have waived their amendments in the Bill intituled "The Payments to Provinces Act, 1871," and have agreed to the following clause to stand as the last clause of the Bill:—

"This Act shall continue in operation until the first day of July next, and no longer."

Also, the Legislative Council have appointed the Hon. the Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Sewell, and the Hon. Mr. Mantell as their Managers to meet the Managers appointed by the House of Representatives, to prepare a case in accordance with the resolutions agreed to by the House of Representatives, in accordance with the suggestions of the Legislative Council, contained in Message No. 84, of the 13th November.

Another distinct question has been raised as to the constitutional powers of the Legislative Council under an Act passed in the year 1865, intituled the Parliamentary Privileges Act (a copy of which is herewith).

By the 4th section of the Act of 1865 it is enacted that—

The Legislative Council or House of Representatives of New Zealand respectively shall hold, enjoy, and exercise such and the like privileges, immunities, and powers as, on the 1st January, 1865, were held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the Committees and members thereof, so far as the same are not inconsistent with or repugnant to such and so many of the sections and provisions of the Constitution Act as at the time of the coming into operation of this Act are unrepealed, whether such privileges, immunities, or powers were so held, possessed, or enjoyed by custom, statute, or otherwise; and such privileges, immunities, and powers shall be deemed to be and shall be part of the general and public law of the colony; and it shall not be necessary to plead the same, and the same shall in all Courts, and by and before all Judges, be judicially taken notice of.

The only unrepealed clause in the Constitution Act which touches this question is the 54th, by which it is enacted that it shall not be lawful for the House of Representatives or the Legislative Council to pass, or for the Governor to assent to, any Bill appropriating to the public service any sum of money from or out of Her Majesty's revenue within New Zealand, unless the Governor, on Her Majesty's behalf, shall first have recommended to the House of Representatives to make provision for the specific public service towards which

such money is to be appropriated."

The opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England is requested upon the following points:—

- Whether, independently of "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," the Legislative Council was constitutionally justified in amending "The Payments to Provinces Bill, 1871," by striking out the disputed clause (clause 28)?
- Whether "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," confers on it any larger powers in this respect than it would otherwise have possessed?
- Whether the claims asserted by the House of Representatives in their messages to the Legislative Council are well grounded, or what are the proper limitations thereof?

HENRY SEWELL.
W. B. D. MANTELL.
F. D. BELL.
A. DE B. BRANDON.

Reasons submitted by the Managers for the Legislative Council in support of the View of the Legislative Council.

A QUESTION has arisen between the Legislative Council and the House of Representatives of New Zealand, upon which the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England is sought to be obtained. The Legislative Council amended a Bill by striking out a clause. The House of Representatives insisted that the Bill was of that class in which the Legislative Council is, by constitutional usage, debarred from making amendments.

The facts of the case are as follows:—

Under various Acts for regulating the public revenues of New Zealand, certain principal branches of revenue—namely, the duties of Customs, Post Office, stamps, &c.—are thrown together, and form the consolidated revenue of the colony, out of which the annual supplies for the public service are appropriated.

By "The Payments to Provinces Act, 1870" (of which a copy is herewith), certain capitation allowances, determined according to the population of each province, were made payable to the respective provinces of New Zealand out of the consolidated revenue for a period of seven years, the amount payable to each province being fixed on a gradually descending scale, varying in amount according to the population in the respective provinces each year. In the current year the rate per head of the population payable under such Act would have been £1 18s.

In the same Act was also contained a provision that, in every year during the same period of seven years, a sum of £50,000 should be paid out of the consolidated revenue to the provinces, in the ratio of their respective population, for distribution amongst the various Road Boards within such provinces, according to a scale fixed by the Act,

In the same session (1870) another Act was passed, intituled "The Immigration and Public Works Act, 1870 "(a copy of which is herewith), whereby provision was made for various objects—namely, the construction of railways, immigration, the construction of water-races on goldfields, the purchase of lands from the Natives, the extension of telegraphs, the formation of roads in the North Island.

And by another Act of the same session (1870), intituled "The Immigration and Public Works Loan Act, 1870 "(a copy of which is herewith), authority was given to the Governor to raise by loan four million pounds (£4,000,000), to be applied in the way prescribed by the schedule to the Act—namely,—

This amount was authorized to be raised by issue of debentures—the interest and sinking fund not to exceed 6 per cent.—and the same were to be a charge upon the consolidated revenue. The 14th section provided that "the moneys raised under the authority thereinbefore contained should and might, subject to the provisions thereinafter contained, and to the provisions contained in 'The Immigration and Public Works Act, 1870,' be issued and applied to the purposes mentioned in the Act, and no other; and, as to purposes men- tioned in the said schedule, should be issued and applied in sums not exceeding the amounts in the said Schedule respectively provided."

It was further provided by the 19th section that, in the event of the Imperial Parliament passing an Act to guarantee any loan raised by the Colony of New Zealand for all or any of the purposes for which the loan thereby authorized might be applied, the Governor, or any such Agents as might be appointed under the Act, might raise any portion of the loan, with such guarantee, upon and subject to all or any of the terns, conditions, and stipulations expressed in such Act of the Imperial Parliament; and the Governor or such Agents as aforesaid was further empowered to enter into any such contract or arrangement as he might think fit with the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury in England, with regard to any portion of the loan, and the guarantee thereof; and in and by any such arrangement or contract the Governor or such Agent as aforesaid might fix the

order of priority of charge on the Consolidated Fund of New Zealand which the loan so guaranteed, or any part or parts thereof, should take with relation to any other part or parts of the loan: and in and by such arrangement might provide for the transmission to England and investment of the sinking fund (if any) of the loan so guaranteed: Provided that such contract or arrangement was not inconsistent with the purposes for which such loan was authorized to be raised.

In the session of the General Assembly just past (1871) the Government introduced in the House of Representatives a Bill intituled "The Payments to Provinces Bill, 1871" (a copy of which is herewith), the object of which was to alter the financial arrangements between the colony and the provinces, to reduce the amount of capitation allowance payable out of the consolidated revenue from £1 18s. per head to 15s. per head, and, in lieu of the £50,000 per annum payable, under the Act of last year, out of the consolidated revenue, to the provinces for the service of the Road Boards, to apply £100,000 out of the moneys authorized to be raised by loan under "The Immigration and Public Works Loan Act," and which are referred to in the Bill as "the Public Works Fund," to the provinces for distribution amongst the Road Boards, "to be expended by them in the construction of new roads, bridges, and culverts, and in the maintenance thereof, for one year, and the completion of such works commenced last year as were not finished." And there was added in the Bill as sent up to the Legislative Council from the House of Representatives a clause which has given rise to the question now raised, upon which the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England is requested. The clause was as follows:—

28. Notwithstanding anything herein contained, it shall be lawful for the Minister of Public Works, if he think fit, on the application of the Superintendent of any province, to expend any sum not exceeding one-half of the money to be allotted to such province for the year ending the thirtieth of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two, under section cloven of this Act, in payment of or in repayment to such province of the cost of permanent works in such province: Provided, however, that, except in the County of Westland, such works shall have been authorized by any Act of the Superintendent and Provincial Council of the province now in force.

The object of this clause, as it appeared to the Legislative Council, was, under colour of a repayment to the provinces of former outlay on public works, really to place in the Provincial Treasuries additional funds for provincial appropriation.

The Legislative Council objected to this clause. Though ready to give effect to the financial arrangements of the Government so far as they properly could, they considered that to divert £50,000 of the money authorized to be raised by loan last year for new public works specifically defined by the Act, to other services of a wholly different kind—namely, to replace in the Provincial Treasuries moneys already expended—was objectionable in principle, and in manifest violation of the spirit and intention of the Act authorizing the loan to be raised. Accordingly, they expunged the clause, and the Bill in this amended form (and with some other unimportant amendments) was returned to the House of Representatives.

The House of Representatives returned the Bill, with reasons for disagreeing from the amendments of the Legislative Council in clauses 14, 15, 28, and 29, as follows:—

That the above clauses relate to the appropriation and management of money, and that the Legislative Council has not power to alter or expunge such clauses.

The Legislative Council replied as follows:—

At this late period of the session it would be impossible for the two branches of the Legislature to discuss with the requisite deliberation the important question of privilege raised by the House of Representatives. But the Council desires briefly to state its views of the question thus raised.

The present Bill, so far, at least, as concerns the application of the Immigration and Public Works Loan, authorized to be raised last year, is not, in their opinion, a Bill of Aid or Supply. It imposes no new burden on the people, nor alters any existing burden, nor is it a grant of money by way of Supply.

The Colonial Parliament last year authorized a very large loan to be raised on the credit of the colony, to be expended strictly and exclusively on immigration, railways, and other public works and undertakings specified in the Act. It is proposed by the present Bill to divert a part of the money so to ho raised to other objects of a cognate character, and to that extent the Legislative Council is prepared to concur in the proposed measure. But it is proposed, further, to authorize the Governor to pay over one-half of the amount so to be diverted to the provinces. Such an application of the Immigration and Public Works Loan authorized to be raised last year is not, in the opinion of the Council, right or consistent with the engagements upon the faith of which Parliament last year consented to raise the loan.

The Legislative Council claims the right to exercise its own judgment upon that point the concession of that right would so narrow as practically to destroy its proper functions as a legislative body in dealing with questions of a similar character, which come before them in a great variety of forms. For the foregoing reasons, the Legislative Council earnestly trusts that the House of Representatives will accept the Bill as amended by the Legislative Council.

To this the House of Representatives made a rejoinder as follows:—

That it is beyond the power of the Legislative Council to vary or alter the management or distribution of any money as prescribed by the House of Representatives; that it is within the power of the House of Representatives by Act of one session to vary the appropriation or management of money prescribed by Act of a previous session.

To which the Legislative Council replied by the following message:—

This Council cannot assent to the reasons adduced by the House of Representatives for disagreeing to its amendments in the Payments to Provinces Bill, and maintains that the amendments to which the House of Representatives objects are strictly within the powers and privileges of the Council to make.

The Council considers the clauses in the Bill, in their original and unamended shape, to be objectionable in principle, and in manifest violation of the spirit and intention of the Public Works Act of 1870. The Council recognizes, however, that the Bill is a portion of the general financial policy of the Government, and that its rejection at this stage might be attended with great public inconvenience.

While, therefore, still maintaining its constitutional right to make the amendments in question, it consents to abstain from the exercise of this right, on the House of Representatives agreeing,—

- *To amend the Bill so as to restrict its operation to the present financial year.*
- *To refer the point in dispute between the two Houses to the Law Officers of the Crown in England, upon a case to be prepared by Managers appointed by each House.*

Subject to these conditions, the Council will, on being made acquainted with the names of the Managers appointed by the House of Representatives to draw up the case for reference, cease to insist upon its amendments.

Whereupon the House of Representatives transmitted the following message:—

The House of Representatives have considered the reasons adduced by the Legislative Council for refusing to concur in the reasons of the House of Representatives for objecting to the amendments of the Council in the Bill intituled "The Payments to Provinces Act, 1871." the House have concurred in the first proposition of the Legislative Council respecting the operation of the Bill, and have agreed to the following clause, to stand the last clause of the Bill:—

"This Act shall continue in operation until the first day of July next, and no longer."

On consideration of the second proposal of the Legislative Council, the House of Representatives have agreed to the following resolution:—

"That this House will concur in the proposition of the Legislative Council that the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown be obtained on the question whother, in accordance with the practice of the Imperial Parliament, the amendments made by the Council are within its functions, having regard to constitutional usage and to the powers conferred on the Council by 'The Privileges Act, 1865;' and that Mr. Speaker, Air. Brandon, and the lion. Mr. Fox be appointed Managers to meet Managers on the part of the Legislative Council to prepare a case for the purpose. Such opinion to be taken with a view to assisting the Legislature in future action, but not to be binding on either House."

To this the Legislative Council replied by the following message:—

The Legislative Council have waived their amendments in the Bill intituled "The Payments to Provinces Act, 1871," and have agreed to the following clause, to stand as the last clause of the Bill:—

"This Act shall continue in operation until the first day of July next, and no longer."

Also, the Legislative Council have appointed the Hon. the Speaker, the Hon. Mr. Sewell, and the Hon. Mr. Man tell as their Managers to meet the Managers appointed by the House of Representatives, to prepare a case in accordance with the resolutions agreed to by the House of Representatives, in accordance with the suggestions of the Legislative Council contained in Message No. 84, of the 13th November, 1871.

Thus the difference between the two Houses was terminated. The Bill was passed in the form agreed to, and the present statement (prepared on behalf of the Legislative Council) is submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown in Eugland, in accordance with the arrangement come to between the two Houses.

A case will, it is understood, be also submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, embodying the views taken by the House of Representatives in support of their reasons. This mode of submitting the question to the Law Officers of the Crown lias been adopted by the Managers on either side as most convenient.

The broad denial by the House of Representatives of the power of the Legislative Council "to vary or alter the management or distribution of any money as prescribed by the House of Representatives," by the assertion of their sole right "by Act of one session to vary the appropriation or management of money prescribed by Act of a previous session," obliges the Legislative Council to examine the principles which ought to govern the two branches of the Legislature in dealing with money questions.

The leading resolution of the House of Commons on this point is that of the 3rd July, 1678. referred to by Mr. May as that "upon which all proceedings between the two Houses in matters of Supply are founded," and is

as follows:—

That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants: which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords.

Further, Mr. May says,—

In Bills not confined to matters of aid or taxation, but in which pecuniary burdens are imposed upon the people, the Lords may make any amendments provided they do not alter the intention of the Commons with regard to the amount of the rate or charge, whether by increase or reduction; its duration; its mode of assessment, levy, collection, appropriation, or management; or the persons who shall pay, receive, manage, or control it; or the limits within which it is proposed to be levied. All Bills of this class must originate with the Commons, as the House of Commons will not agree to any provisions which impose a charge of any description upon the people, if sent down from the Lords, bat will order the Bills containing them to be laid aside. Neither will they permit the Lords to insert any provisions of that nature in Bills sent up from the Commons, but will disagree to the amendments, and [unclear: insist] in their disagreement, or will lay the Bill aside.

As regards the legal right of the House of Lords to reject money Bills, their power "as a co-ordinate branch of the Legislature to withhold their assent from any Bill whatever to which their concurrence is desired," is unquestionable. It is a power, however, rarely exercised. The last memorable instance was that of the Paper Duties Repeal Bill. Under what circumstances such a power may constitutionally be exerted cannot, it would seem, be exactly defined. "The constitutional power of the Commons to grant supplies without interference on the part of the Lords has," as Mr. May points out, "been occasionally abused by tacking to Bills of Supply enactments which, in another Bill, would have been rejected by the Lords, but which, being contained in a Bill which their Lordships had no right to amend, must either have been suffered to pass unnoticed, or have caused the rejection of a measure highly necessary for the public service. Such a proceeding is as great an infringement of the privileges of the Lords as the interference of their Lordships in matters of Supply is of the privileges of the Commons, and has been resisted by protest, by Conference, and by the rejection of Bills."

Such appear to be the leading principles governing the two branches of the Imperial Legislature in respect of money Bills; and they do not appear to justify the propositions maintained by the House of Representatives.

The question in the particular case is, whether the Legislative Council has a right to amend the Bill for altering the capitation allowance to provinces, and applying part of the Public Works Loan to the service of Road Boards, by striking out a clause the effect of which will be to apply part of such loan to the aid of the Provincial Treasuries.

Is such a Bill a Bill of Aid or Supply?

The answer may, it is conceived, be given by referring to the character and functions of "the Committee of Supply." Whatever is within the province of the Committee of Supply must form the subject-matter of a Bill of Supply; whatever is out- side the functions of that Committee cannot, it is presumed, have that character. The functions of the Committee of Supply are stated by Mr. May (at pp. 556 and 557, "Treatise on Law, &c., of Parliament ") as follows:—

The Committee of Supply votes every sum which is granted annually for the public service, the army, the navy, and the several civil and revenue departments. But the fact already explained should be constantly borne in mind—that, in addition to these particular services, which are voted in detail, there are permanent charges upon the public revenue secured by Acts of Parliament, which the Treasury are bound to defray as directed by law. In this class are included the interest of the national funded debt, the Civil List of Her Majesty, the annuities of the Royal Family, and the salaries and pensions of the Judges and some other public officers. These are annual charges upon the Consolidated Fund; but the specific appropriation of the respective sums necessary to defray those charges, having been permanently authorized by statutes, is independent of annual grants, and is beyond the control of the Committee of Supply.

Mr. May then proceeds to consider the functions of the Committee of Ways and Means.

The Committee of Ways and Moans votes general grants from time to time out of the Consolidated Fund "towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty;" and Bills are founded upon these resolutions of the Committee, by which the Treasury receives authority to issue the necessary amounts from the Consolidated Fund for the service of the year.

Bills of this class are, it is presumed, properly Bills of Supply, which it is against parliamentary usage for the upper branch of the Legislature to alter.

But as regards Bills not of this class, but affecting charges more or less permanent, already created by law, on the consolidated revenue, and which are beyond the control of the Committee of Supply, the Legislative Council insists that there is no rule debarring it from exercising its ordinary legislative functions. Were it

otherwise, it might be compelled to submit to, without the power of varying, changes of a fundamental character in the Civil List, or to reductions in the salaries of Judges, with a condition altering their tenure of office, or, as in the present case, to the diversion of money authorized to be raised by loan for specific services, to a wholly different purpose.

The parliamentary precedent which appears to be most in point is that of the West India Bishoprics Bill in 1868, reported in *Hansard* (Lords, July 7, 13; Commons, July 27, 28). In that case a charge had been made on the Consolidated Fund, by way of endowment for bishoprics in the West Indies, to the amount of £20,800 a year. It was proposed to rescind such grant, and a Bill for that purpose was sent up to the House of Lords from the House of Commons. An amendment was proposed in the House of Lords, the effect of which was to extend the saving of vested interests to a case not provided for by the Bill, and so to diminish the saving to the Consolidated Fund. The Bill so amended was returned to the Lower House, where the Lords' amendment was taken into consideration, and an amendment was proposed upon the Lords' amendment, the effect of which, if carried, would have been to diminish still further the saving to the Consolidated Fund. Upon this the question was raised whether such proposed amendment ought not to have been previously sanctioned by resolution of the House. A double question, therefore, seems to have presented itself—namely, as to the power of the Upper House to amend the Bill, and the power of the Lower House to amend the Lords' amendment in the way proposed; the effect of which would, it was argued, be practically to make a new grant out of the Consolidated Fund. The Speaker ruled as follows:—

It appears to me, as far as the privileges of the House are concerned, the question turns upon whether there is any new charge upon the Consolidated Fund; and, while the Bill proposes to relieve the Consolidated Fund of £20,000, this amendment would relieve it of £18,000 only. The question of the merits of the Bill is a matter for the consideration of the House. The honourable member for Edinburgh (Mr. McLaren) has asked me whether, in point of form, this amendment can be put. The question is whether it is relevant; and it appears to me that it is relevant to the amendment of the Lords. I do not mean to say it is not a somewhat complicated question. I adhere to the substance of the opinion I gave last night, that, as there is no new charge upon the Consolidated Fund, therefore I think it is a matter more to be decided by the House on its merits than by any opinion from the chair.

The Lords' amendment was agreed to.

There is a special ground in the present case for maintaining the right of the Legislative Council to amend the Bill as they did. It has been pointed out that by "The Immigration and Public Works Loan Act, 1870," it was provided that, in the event of the Imperial Parliament passing an Act to guarantee any loan raised by the Colony of New Zealand, for all or any of the purposes for which the loan thereby authorized might be applied, the Governor or his agents might raise any portion of the loan so authorized, with such guarantee, upon and subject to all or any of the terms, conditions, and stipulations expressed in such Act of the Imperial Parliament. He was also authorized to fix the order of priority which such guaranteed portion of the loan should have over other parts of the loan. By an Act of the Imperial Parliament (1870, chap. 40) the Imperial Treasury was authorized to guarantee, in such manner and form as they might think fit, payment of the principal of all or any part of any loan, not exceeding £1,000,000, raised by the Government of New Zealand for the purpose of the construction of roads, bridges, and communications in that country, and of the introduction of settlers into that country, and payment of the interest of any such loan at a rate not exceeding 4 per cent.

The Treasury was directed not to give any such guarantee unless and until provision had been made by an Act of the Legislature of New Zealand, or otherwise to the satisfaction of the Treasury—

- For raising the loan and appropriating the same to the purposes mentioned in the Act.
- For charging the consolidated revenue of New Zealand with the principal and interest of the loan, immediately after the charges on that fund existing at the time of the passing of the Act.
- For providing a sinking fund of 2 per cent.
- For charging the consolidated revenue of New Zealand with any sum issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom under the Act, with interest at 5 per cent., immediately after the sinking fund of the said loan.
- For rendering an annual abstract of accounts of expenditure of the money raised by means of the said loan, under such heads as the Treasury from time to time desire.
- For remitting to the Treasury half-yearly the sinking fund, and for its investment and accumulation.

The Treasury were restricted, by the terms of the Act, from guaranteeing more than £200,000 in any one year, and were bound, before guaranteeing any portion other than the first, to satisfy themselves that the portion already guaranteed had been or was being spent for the purposes mentioned in the Act.

It was further provided that every Act passed by the Legislature of New Zealand which in any way unpaired the priority of the charge upon the consolidated revenue of New Zealand created by that Legislature in respect of the loan, and the interest and sinking fund thereof, should, so far as affecting such priority, be void

unless reserved for Her Majesty's pleasure; and that the Treasury should cause to be prepared and laid before both Houses of Parliament a statement of any guarantee given under the Act, a copy of any accounts received by them respecting the expenditure of the said loan, and an account of all sums issued out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom for the purposes of the Act.

On the 19th April, 1871, Messrs. Vogel and Julyan, Agents appointed by the Governor for the purpose, intimated to the Treasury the acceptance by the colony of the guarantee offered by the Imperial Government, upon the terms stipulated in the Imperial Act.

The Treasury assented by letter of the 20th May, 1871; and under the arrangement so made debentures to the value of £200,000 have been issued with the Imperial guarantee, and are now held at the disposal of the Colonial Government.

But the claim now made by the House of Representatives, of the right, of its sole authority, "by Act of one session to vary the appropriation or management of money prescribed by Act of a previous session," and by virtue of such right to divert at pleasure the moneys raised under the Loan Act of 1870 to other purposes than those prescribed by such Act, if admitted, might possibly have the effect of subverting the objects of the loan, and might conflict with the conditions imposed by the Imperial Act.

Another distinct question has been raised as to the constitutional powers of the Legislative Council under an Act passed in the year 1865, entitled "The Parliamentary Privileges Act," a copy of which is herewith. The object of this Act was to define more exactly by statute the powers and privileges of the two Houses of the Legislature, and the respective members thereof, which had been partially defined by a former Act of 1856, a copy of which is herewith.

By the 4th section of the Act of 1865 it is enacted that "the Legislative Council or House o Representatives of New Zealand respectively shall hold, enjoy, and exercise such and the like privileges, immunities, and powers as on the 1st January, 1865, were held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Commons House of Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, and by the Committees and members thereof, so far as the same are not inconsistent with or repugnant to such and so many of the sections and provisions of the Constitution Act as, at the time of the coining into operation of this Act, are unrepealed, whether such privileges, immunities, or powers wore so held, possessed, or enjoyed by custom, statute, or otherwise; and such privileges, immunities, and powers shall be deemed to be and shall be part of the general and public law of the colony; and it shall not be necessary to plead the same, and the same shall in all Courts, and by and before all Judges, be judicially taken notice of."

It has, ever since the passing of this Act, been maintained and insisted on by the Legislative Council that its effect is to invest that body with all the constitutional authority of the House of Commons, and so to place it on an equal footing with the House of Representatives as regards the power of dealing with money Bills.

The only unrepealed clause in the Constitution Act which touches this question is the 54th, by which it is enacted that "it shall not be lawful for the House of Representatives or the Legislative Council to pass, or for the Governor to assent to, any Bill appropriating to the public service any sum of money from or out of Her Majesty's revenue within New Zealand, unless the Governor, on Her Majesty's behalf, shall first have recommended to the House of Representatives to make provision for the specific public service towards which such money is to be appropriated."

All supplies for the public service are, or are presumed to be, recommended by the Governor to the House of Representatives, either by message or by the mouth of a Minister.

Practically, the Legislative Council, though it has from time to time claimed co-ordinate power with the House of Representatives in the matter of money Bills, under "the Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," has governed itself by the usage of the House of Peers in the Imperial Parliament.

Under the foregoing circumstances, the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England is requested upon the following points:—

- Whether, independently of "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," the Legislative Council was constitutionally justified in amending "The Payments to Provinces Bill, 1871," by striking out the disputed clause (clause 28)?
- Whether "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," confers on it any larger powers in this respect than it would otherwise have possessed?
- Whether the claims asserted by the House of Representatives in their messages to the Legislative Council are well grounded, or what are the proper limitations thereof?

HENRY SEWELL.
W. B. D. MANTELL.

Despatch from the Right Hon. the Earl of KIMBERLEY to Governor Sir G. P. BOWEN, G.C.M.G. (No. 45.)

SIR,—
Downing Street,

26th June, 1872.

I have to acknowledge your Despatch No. 35, of 30th March, enclosing a case prepared by the Managers of the two Houses of the Legislature of New Zealand on the subject of a difference which had arisen between them on certain points of law and privilege.

According to the request of your Responsible Advisers, I referred the case to the Law Officers of the Crown, and I transmit to you a copy of their opinion.

I have, &c.,

KIMBERLEY.
Governor Sir G. F. Bowen, G.C.M.G.

(Enclosure.)

The LAW OFFICERS of the CROWN to the Earl of KIMBERLEY.

MY LORD,—
Temple,

18th June, 1872.

We are honoured with your Lordship's commands, signified in Mr. Holland's letter of the 12th instant, stating that he was directed by your Lordship to acquaint us that, a difference having arisen between the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of New Zealand, concerning certain points of law and privilege, it was agreed that the questions in dispute should be referred for the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown in England; that he (Mr. Holland) @@@@was accordingly to request us to favour your Lordship with our opinion upon the accompanying case, which had been prepared by the Managers of both Houses.

In obedience to your Lordship's commands, we have the honour to report,—

- We are of opinion that, independently of "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," the Legislative Council was not constitutionally justified in amending "The Payments to Provinces Bill, 1871," by striking out the disputed clause 28. We think the Bill was a money Bill, and such a Bill as the House of Commons in this country would not have allowed to be amended by the House of Lords; and that the limitation proposed to be placed by the Legislative Council on Bills of Aid or Supply is too narrow, and would not be recognized by the House of Commons in England.
- We are of opinion that "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," does not confer on the Legislative Council any larger powers in this respect than it would otherwise have possessed. We think that this Act was not intended to affect, and did not affect, the legislative powers of either House of the Legislature in New Zealand.
- We think that the claims of the House of Representatives, contained in their message to the Legislative Council, are well founded; subject, of course, to the limitation that the Legislative Council have a perfect right to reject any Bill passed by the House of Representatives having for its object to vary the management or appropriation of money prescribed by an Act of the previous session.

We have, &c,
J. D. COLERIDGE.
G. JESSEL.
The Right Hon. the Earl of Kimberley.

Appendix No. 7.

The Hon. Mr. Hall.—I have the honour to bring up the following report of the Managers of the second Free Conference on the Railways Construction Bill:—

The Managers, being unable to agree upon the question whether clause 3 of the Bill is or is not an

appropriation clause, recommend that the amendments made in the said clause be omitted; and that the Ministry should advise His Excellency the Governor to avail himself of the powers conferred by the 5Gth section of the Constitution Act by transmitting the following amendments for the consideration of the Legislative Council and House of Representatives, instead of those that the Legislative Council proposed:—

"Provided always that no contract shall be entered into for the construction of any railway or any portion thereof unless—

- *In the case of each line to be constructed plans and estimates shall he laid before the Governor in Council, with a certificate from the Chief Engineer that the route chosen for the railway is the best available one.*
- *Such plans and estimates be approved by the Governor in Council.*

"And it is hereby declared that, within thirty days after the commencement of the then next session of Parliament, such plans and estimates shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament, together with a copy of any contract which may have been entered into with respect to the railway to which such plans and estimates refer."

I now move the following resolution: That, upon considering the report of the Managers for the Legislative Council of the second Free Conference on the Railways Construction Bill, this Council entirely approve the course which their said Managers have taken, and agree to the said report; and—relying upon the assurance given by the House of Representatives, through its Managers, that, upon His Excellency the Governor being advised to send down a message recommending the amendment to which the Conference have agreed, the House of Representatives will concur in the same—the Council will not insist further upon their amendments in clause 3 of the said Bill.

The Hon. Colonel WHITMORE.—On behalf of the Government, I agree that that advice shall be given.

Appendix No. 8.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think if the Premier had known the view I entertain on this point he would scarcely have appealed to me on the subject; but, an appeal having been made, I may state at once that I hold a counter-opinion to that entertained by the honourable gentleman. I had occasion to look into a matter of this nature yesterday. Being desirous of supporting views taken by the honourable member for Wanganui (Mr. Ballance) in reference to the Bill that was before the House for the consolidation of the law relating to the privileges of Parliament, I referred to the latest work on the subject. I am quite aware that there are numerous references to the point in May, but I will not allude to them in the first instance, but will read to the House a few extracts from the latest work on Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies, by Mr. Todd, published last year. Alluding to the fact that in the Colonies of Canada and New Zealand certain Acts were passed respecting the powers and privileges of the two branches of their Legislatures, he says, speaking of the general powers of the two Houses of Parliament, the constitutional powers of the Upper House are defined as "established for the sole purpose of fulfilling therein 'the legislative functions of the House of Lords,' whilst the Lower House exercises within the same sphere 'the rights and powers of the House of Commons.'" (P. 475.) Alluding, then, to the circumstance that the Imperial Parliament in the British North America Act pointed to the House of Commons "as being equally the example to the Senate or Legislative Council, as well as to the Representative Assembly, of the proper extent and limitation of the privileges, immunities, and powers to be defined on behalf of each House by a statute to be locally passed for that purpose," he says,—

But neither the New Zealand nor the Canadian laws can be so construed as to warrant a claim by the Upper Chambers of eithor Parliament to "equal rights in matters of aid and supply to those which are enjoyed and exercised by the Commons' Houso of Parliament of the United Kingdom;" for such a claim, if insisted upon, would, to a great extent, derogate from and diminish the constitutional rights of the representative Chamber." (Pp. 476-7.)

And, then, remarking upon the relative powers of the two branches of the Legislature, he says constitutional practice—

.... justifies the claim of the Imperial House of Commons (and, by parity of reasoning, of all representative Chambers framed after the model of that House) to a general control over public revenue and expenditure—a control which has been authoritatively defined in the following words: "All aids and supplies, and aids to his Majesty in Parliament, are the sole gift of the Commons; and it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords." This parliamentary principle, moreover, has been generally, if not universally, admitted in all self-governing British colonies by the adoption in both Legislative Chambers of Standing Orders which refer to the rules, forms, usages, and practices of the Imperial Parliament as the guide to each House in cases unprovided for by local

regulations.

Then, referring to the dispute that occurred in 1871 between this House and the Legislative Council as to the statutory right of the Legislative Council to amend Bills of Supply, he quotes the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, Coleridge and Jessel, given upon a case stated, as follows:—

- We are of opinion that, independently of "The Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," the Legislative Council was not constitutionally justified in amending "The Payments to Provinces Bill, 1871," by striking out the disputed clause 28. We think the Bill was a money Bill, and such a Bill as the House of Commons in this country would not have allowed to be amended by the House of Lords; and that the limitation proposed to be placed by the Legislative Council on Bills of aid or supply is too narrow, and would not be recognized by the House of Commons in England.
- We are of opinion that "the Parliamentary Privileges Act, 1865," does not confer on the Legislative Council any larger powers in this respect than it would otherwise have possessed. We think that this Act was not intended to affect, and did not affect, the legislative powers of either House of the Legislature in New Zealand.
- We think that the claims of the House of Representatives contained in the message to the Legislative Council are well founded, subject, of course, to the limitation that the Legislative Council have a perfect right to reject any Bill passed by the House of Representatives having for its object to vary the management or appropriation of money prescribed by an Act of the previous session. (Pp. 478-9.)

Which opinion is characterized by Todd in these words:—

This opinion is a direct and unimpeachable settlement of the point at issue. . . . The relative rights of both Houses in matters of aid and supply must be determined in every British colony by the ascertained rules of British constitutional practice. The local Acts upon the subject must be construed in conformity with that practice wherever the Imperial policy is the accepted guide. A claim on the part of a colonial Upper Chamber to the possession of equal rights with the Assembly to amend a money Bill would be inconsistent with the ancient and undeniable control which is exorcised by the Imperial House of Commons over nil financial measures. It is therefore impossible to concede to an Upper Chamber the right of amending a money Bill upon the mere authority of a local statute, when such Act admits of being construed in accordance with the well-understood laws and usages of the Imperial Parliament.

The point has been suggested to me whether this Bill comes within what is understood to be a money Bill. To my mind this Bill deals with nothing but money, and therefore I am of opinion that, as a whole, it is a money Bill. In the 2nd clause it says that, after the passing of this Bill, pensions are not to be paid except in accordance with provisions therein contained, one provision being that contained in the clause which has been struck out. I hold that the clause in this Bill relating to the limitation of pensions is wholly in accordance with the other portions of the Bill referring to pensions. There are some references in May to the subject, which I shall quote, as his authority is more familiar to the House than Mr. Todd's:—

On the 3rd of July, 1678, the Commons resolved, "That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament are the solo gift of the Commons; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords."

This is the same resolution that is quoted by Todd; and May's comments on it are as follow:—

It is upon this latter resolution that all proceedings between the two Houses, in matters of supply, are now founded. The principle is acquiesced in by the Lords; and, except in cases where it is difficult to determine whether a matter be strictly one of supply or not, no serious difference can well arise the Lords rarely attempt to make any but verbal alterations, in which the sense or intention is not affected.

Here, it will be observed how the emphatic words "to limit" and "limitations" are used—which is exactly what the clause rejected by the Legislative Council proposed to effect—namely, that the enjoyment of pensions should be subject to the limitation that deduction should be made from the pension if the pension and salary of office combined exceeded the salary received prior to the pension being obtained. Reliance is then placed by the Hon. the Premier on the following dictum in May:—

On the 30th July, 1867, it was very clearly put by Earl Grey and Viscount Eversley that the right of the Lords to omit a clause which they were unable to amend, relating to a separate subject, was equivalent to their right to reject a Bill which they could not amend without an infraction of the privileges of the Commons.

Now, what are the circumstances of this case? In the Parliamentary Reform Bill of 1867—the Bill for the representation of the people—there was a clause—and it was retained in the Act as clause 7—to the effect that the occupiers were to be rated in boroughs, instead of the owners of the properties—a subject, as it appears, rather foreign to the subject-matter of the Bill; and Viscount Eversley, so well known as Sir. Shaw-Lefevre, for eighteen years Speaker of the House of Commons, gave it as his opinion that the omission of this clause could

not be objected to by the Commons, as it related to a subject separate from the main object of the Bill. But in our Bill regulating the mode of granting pensions the rejected clause did not relate to a subject distinct from pensions, but embraced a specific limitation and qualification of the enjoyment of such pensions. Lord Cairns's opinion was, that it was within the competency of the House of Lords to deal with the clause as they thought proper; but he adds,—

No doubt the other House might raise a question of privilege on their part; hut with that their Lordships had nothing to do. If their Lordships rejected this clause they would interfere in the question of the incidence of taxation; but their Lordships were not the judges of the privileges of the other House or what they would do in such a case.

That is, as I understand it, the Lords had the indisputable right to reject the clause as they might reject a money Bill, but subject to encountering the resistance of the Commons on the score of the violation of their privileges. I have now 'given my opinion frankly, and I have only to say that, if the House of Representatives were to waive its privileges in this instance, I cannot see how it can refuse to waive them in all others whenever the Legislative Council chooses to encroach upon the special functions of this House in regard to money Bills.

Appendix No. 9.

Sir FRANCIS DILLON BELL to Sir ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B.

London,

14th March, 1832.

DEAR SIR ERSKINE MAY,—

In pursuance of your kind permission, I beg to bring under your notice a difference which arose lately between the two Houses in New Zealand about the right of amending Bills. The difference was cognate to the one about the Council amendment in the Railways Bill which you let me bring before you some time ago.

The present dispute is whether a Bill on the subject of pensions, which had been passed by the House of Representatives, was one which the Legislative Council could amend by omitting a certain clause.

The Speaker of the House (Sir Maurice O'Rorke) held that the Council could not strike out the clause; the Clerk of Parliaments (Major Campbell) thought they might. I was therefore asked to solicit your opinion.

I enclose a copy of the Bill. It was brought in by a private member, its general object being to "regulate the granting of pensions "to Civil servants. The dispute was about clause 6, which was alleged to affect injuriously the right of a Civil servant under the existing law. The clause is shown by being enclosed within lines on the copy of the Bill.

I also send you an extract from our *Hansard*, giving an account of what passed in both Houses.

The difference seems to have practically turned on the point whether the clause which the Council struck out was one coming within the principle defined by yourself in the case of clauses omitted by the Lords as being "upon a subject separable from the general object of the Bill; "but it was contended that the Bill was a money Bill, and as such incapable of being amended at all.

The points on which Sir Maurice O'Rorke would like your opinion are these:—

1. Was the Bill a money Bill?

2. Could the Council omit this particular clause?

3. If not a money Bill, was it one of such a character that it was capable of being amended generally in any way; for instance, could clause 6 have been amended by altering its retrospective effect, instead of being simply omitted?

To which I should like to add,—

4. Must a money Bill be brought in by a Minister, signifying the consent thereto of the Crown; or may a private member bring it in without such consent being signified?

You will see in the debates the formal reasons that were exchanged between the Houses when the Representatives disagreed to the Council amendment. There was a further interchange of reasons afterwards, but they were only repetition; at last there was a Free Conference, but the Houses were unable to agree. The Bill was therefore lost, and the same battle will probably be fought over again next session. An expression of your opinion, if you could spare a little of the time every moment of which is now so precious, would no doubt be accepted at once by both sides.

I have. &c.,
F. DILLON BELL.

Sir Erskine May, K.C.B., &c.

Sir ERSKINE MAY, K.C.B., to Sir F. D. BELL.

House of Commons,

23rd March, 1882.

Dear Sir Francis Bell,—

I have read, with great attention and interest, all the papers you have sent me regarding the New Zealand Pensions Bill. The case is exceedingly well argued on both sides; and I will very briefly state my own opinion upon the points in dispute.

1. As the Bill related to the granting of pensions payable out of the public revenues, and to such pensions exclusively, I consider it to have been a money Bill.

2. Such being the character of the Bill, I am of opinion that the Commons would not have accepted from the Lords any such amendment as that made by the Council, but would have disagreed to it on the ground of privilege, or would have laid the Bill aside.

3. I do not think clause 6 was separable from the other clauses of the Bill, or that the precedents cited of the omission of clauses by the Lords were applicable to this case.

4. For all purposes of privilege as between the two Houses a Bill relating solely to charges upon the public revenue is a money Bill, whether introduced by a Minister of the Crown or by a private member.

I need scarcely add that, in answering your questions, I have confined myself to the practice of the Imperial Parliament, and offer no opinion upon questions specially concerning the colonial Constitution, or the action of its authorities.

I have, &c.,
T. ERSKINE MAY.
Sir Francis Dillon Bell, K.C.M.G., &c.

Appendix No. 10.

Extracts from Journals, House of Commons.

JOVIS, 13° DIE APRILIS, 1671.

The House then proceeded to the reading of the amendments and clauses sent from the Lords to the Bill for an imposition on foreign commodities, which were once read:

And the first amendment sent from the Lords, being for changing the proportion of the impositions on white sugars from one penny per pound to halfpenny half-farthing, was read the second time, and debated.

Resolved, &c., nemine contradicente. That, in all aids given to the King by the Commons, the rate or tax ought not to be altered by the Lords.

Ordered, That it be referred to Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Coleman, Sir George Downing, Mr. Attorney Montague, Mr. Coventry, Mr. Vaughan, Sir Robert Carr, Sir Thomas Meeres, Sir Thomas Littleton, Sir Edward Deering, Mr. Treasurer, Sir Robert Howard, Sir Robert Atkins, Sir William Coventry, Colonel Birch, Mr. Milward, Sir Thomas Lee, Sir Richard Temple, Sir John Birkenhead, Sir Phillip Warwick, or any five of them, to prepare and draw up reasons, in order to a Conference to be had with the Lords, to show them why the Commons do not agree with their Lordships' amendments and provisos to the Bill of additional impositions on foreign commodities; and report the same to the House. And they are to meet this afternoon, at five of the clock, in the Speaker's Chamber,

VENERIS, 14° DIE APRILIS, 1671 (Post Meridiem).

Sir ROBERT HOWARD reports, from the Committee appointed to consider of reasons to be used at the Conference to be had with the Lords, the said reasons, which he read, and opened to the House, and were approved of by the House.

Resolved, Ac, That a Conference be desired with the Lords upon the subject-matter of the last Conference, and that Mr. Waller do carry up the message to the Lords.

SABBATI, 15° DIE APRILIS, 1671.

The House then attended the Conference with the Lords upon the reasons of disagreeing with their Lordships to their amendments to the Bill of additional imposition on foreign commodities.

And the Managers thereof report, That they had attended the Conference accordingly.

JOVIS, 20° DIE APRILIS, 1671.

A message from the Lords, by Sir John Coell and Sir William Beversham:—

Mr. SPEAKER,—The Lords have commanded us to acquaint you that they desire a present Conference with the House of Commons, in the Painted Chamber, upon the subject-matter of the last Conference concerning the Bill for an additional imposition on several foreign commodities.

The messengers being called in, Mr. Speaker acquaints them, That the House had agreed to a present Conference upon the subject-matter of the last Conference concerning the Bill for an additional imposition on several foreign commodities.

Ordered, That the former Managers do manage this Conference.

Mr. Attorney-General reports, from the Conference had with the Lords, That the single point insisted on at the Conference was the matter of privilege arising upon the Lords' alterations of the rate upon sugar imposed by this House; and the reasons offered, and precedents insisted on, by the Lords in justification of their privilege therein; when he opened and read to the House.

Resolved, Ac, That it be referred to the persons who did manage the Conference, to consider of the matter of the last Conference reported from the Lords, and the reasons and precedents relating thereto; and to report the matter, with their opinions therein, to the House; and to search for precedents; and send for papers and records, or to direct the perusal of them, as they shall find convenient; and Mr. Powle and Mr. Waller are added to the Committee.

(Post Meridiem.)

Ordered, That it be referred to Colonel Birch, Sir John Birkenhead, Sir Charles Harbord, Mr. Coleman, Mr. Powle, or any two of them, to peruse the Journal of the House of Lords for the proviso in the time of Henry VIII., insisted upon by their Lordships at the Conference upon the Bill of impositions on foreign commodities.

Ordered, That the Committee appointed to draw up reasons for the intended Conference to be had with the Lords upon the said Bill of impositions do sit to-morrow morning at nine of the clock to perfect the same.

SABBATI, 22° DIE APRILIS, 1671.

Sir THOMAS LEE reports from the Committee the reasons and precedents agreed by the Committee to be offered in answer to the reasons and precedents delivered by the Lords, in writing, at the Conference desired by the Lords on Thursday morning last; which he read to the House, with some amendments and additions made at the table upon the question agreed to; and he also reports the opinion of the vote of the Committee, viz.:—

That a Conference be desired with the Lords upon the matter proposed and delivered, in writing, at the Conference desired by the Lords on Thursday morning last past.

Resolved, &c, That this House doth agree with the Committee that a Conference be desired with the Lords upon the matter proposed and delivered, in writing, at the Conference desired by the Lords on Thursday morning last past; and Sir Robert Carr is to desire the Conference.

Sir ROBERT CARR reports, That the Lords had agreed to a present Conference.

Mr. Attorney-General reports the Conference had with the Lords.

Resolved, &c, That the Lords' reasons, and the answer of this House, be entered in the Journal of this House; which are as followeth, viz.:—

THURSDAY, 20TH APRIL.

This Conference was desired by their Lordships upon the subject-matter of the last Conference concerning the Bill for impositions on merchandise, &c., wherein the Commons communicated to the Lords, as their resolution, That there is a fundamental right in that House alone, in Bills of rates and impositions on merchandise, as to the matter, the measure, and the time.

And, though their Lordships had neither reason nor precedent offered by the Commons to back that resolution, but were told that this was a right so fundamentally settled in the Commons that they could not give reasons for it, for that would be a weakening of the Commons' right and privilege,—

Yet the Lords in Parliament, upon full consideration thereof, and of that whole Conference, are come to this resolution, *neminc contradicente*:—

"That the power exercised by the House of Peers in making the amendments and abatements in the Bill intituled "An Act for an additional Imposition on several Foreign Commodities, and for encouragement of

several Commodities and Manufactures of this Kingdom," both as to the matter, measure, and time, concerning the rates and impositions on merchandise, is a fundamental, inherent, and undoubted right of the House of Peers, from which they cannot depart."

Reasons, &c.

The great happiness of the Government of this kingdom is, that nothing can be done in order to the Legislature but what is considered by both Houses before the King's sanction be given unto it; and the greatest security to all the subjects of this kingdom is that the Houses, by their Constitution, do not only give assistance, but are mutual checks, to each other.

2. Consult the Writs of Summons to Parliament, and you will find the Lords are excluded from none of the great and arduous affairs of the kingdom, and Church of England, but are called to treat and give their counsel upon them all without exception.

3. We find no footsteps in record or history for this new claim of the House of Commons; we would see that charter or contract produced by which the Lords divested themselves of tins right, and appropriated it to the Commons with an ex- elusion of themselves; till then, we cannot consent to shake or remove foundations in the laying whereof it will not be denied that the Lords and grandees of the kingdom had the greatest hand.

4. If this right should be denied, the Lords have not a negative voice allowed them in Bills of this nature; for, if the Lords, who have the power of treating, advising, giving counsel, and applying remedies, cannot amend, abate, or refuse a Bill in part, by what consequence of reason can they enjoy a liberty to reject the whole? When the Commons shall think fit to question it, they may pretend the same grounds for it.

5. In any case of judicature, which is undoubtedly and indisputably the peculiar right and privilege of the House of Lords, if their lordships send down a Bill to the Commons for giving judgment in a legislative way, they allow and acknowledge the same right in the Commons to amend, change, and alter such Bills as the Lords have exercised in this Bill of Impositions sent up by the Commons.

6. By this new maxim of the House of Commons a hard and ignoble choice is left to the Lords, either to refuse the Crown supplies when they are most necessary, or to consent to ways and proportions of aid which neither their own judgment or interest nor the good of the Government and the people can admit.

7. If positive assertion can introduce a right, what security have the Lords that the House of Commons shall not, in other Bills (pretended to be for the general good of the Commons, whereof they will conceive themselves the fittest judges), claim the same peculiar privilege, in exclusion of any deliberation or alteration of the Lords, when they shall judge it necessary or expedient?

8. And whereas you say, This is the only poor thing which you can value yourselves upon to the King, their lordships have commanded us to tell you that they rather desire to increase than any ways to diminish the value and esteem of the House of Commons, not only with His Majesty, but with the whole kingdom; but they cannot give way that it should be raised by the undervaluing of the House of Peers, and an endeavour to render that House unuseful to the King and kingdom by the denying unto it those just powers which the Con- stitution of this Government and the law of the laud hath lodged in it for service and benefit of both.

9. You did, at the Conference, tell us that we did agree to a Book of Rates without so much as seeing it, and that never Book of Rates was read in the Lords' House, and that the said Book of Rates was signed by Sir Harbotle Grimston, then Speaker of the House of Commons, and not sent up lest the Lords' Speaker might sign it too.

The Book of Rates, instanced in by the House of Commons, was made in a way different from all former Books of Rates, and by an Assembly called without the King's writs; and winch wanted so much the authority of Parliament that the Act they made was no Act till confirmed by this Parliament; and, though the work, which happily succeeded in their hands for restoration of the ancient government of the kingdom, will ever be mentioned to their honour, yet no measure for parliamentary proceedings is to be taken from this one instance, to the prejudice of the right of the Crown in making Books of Rates, and of the Lords in having their due consideration thereof when they shall be enacted in Parliament; which was so far from being according to former usage that the Lords, considering the necessity and condition of that time, and there being no complaint, passed that Bill upon three readings in one day, without so much as a commitment, little imagining the forwardness of their zeal to the King's service in such a time would have created an argument in the future against their power; and, if the Lords never did read Books of Rates in their House, it is as true that the House of Commons do not pretend, nor did show, that ever any was read there but this.

Introduce the Precedents thus:—

Though where a right is so clear and reasons so irrefragable, it is not to be required of those who are possessed of the right to give precedents to confirm it; but those who dispute the right ought to show precedents

or judgments to the contrary, not passed *sub silentio*, but upon the point controverted; yet the Lords have commanded us to offer and leave with you the following precedents:—

By records, both ancient and modern, it doth appear,—

1. That the Lords and Commons have consulted together, and conferred one with another, upon the subject of supply to the King; and of the manner how the same may be levied, as the 14 E. III, N. 5: "Apres Grand Tret and Parleance entre les Grantz et le ditz Chevaliers et autres des Communes esteans en dit Parliament est accordes et assentus par tous les Grants et Communes," &c.,—that they grant to the King the ninth of corn and wool.

Another, 29 E. III., N. 2; and another, more particularly, in 51 E. III., N. 18, where certain lords were named, from time to time, to confer with the Commons for their better help, in consulting for the raising money.

And this was sometimes by the King's command, as the 22nd E. III., N. 3;

Sometimes by motion or appointment of the Lords, as the 5th E. III., N. 8; and in the case of the great contract for tenures and purveyances, 7 Jac, 14 Feb., 1609;

And sometimes by desire of the Commons, 47 E. in., N. 6, 4 R.II, N. 10, 11, 12, 13,14. 15, upon a great sum demanded for the King, the Commons come to the Lords and desire a moderation of the sum, and their consideration how it shall be levied. And it is very observable in this record, No. 13, which saith, "that the Lords sent for the Commons often before them, and showed to them their advice how the same shall be levied; and thereupon was granted, by Lords and Commons, twelvepence of every man," 6 R. II., N. 14. And in the case of the great contract before-mentioned, 7° Jac, 18th June, 1610, the Commons, at a Conference, desire to know what project their lordships will propound for levying that which shall be given other than upon land; and afterwards, by the Commons' answer to the Lords' proposal, agreed that the manner of levying it may be in the most easeful and contentful sort that by both Houses can be devised. See the whole proceedings of this intended contract, which doth, in several remarkable instances, show that the House of Commons themselves did allow the House of Peers their part in treating and debating on the subject of money to be levied for His Majesty.

2. That in aids and subsidies the Lords have anciently been expressly joined with the Commons in the gift, as in the first we can meet with in our statutes—that in the body of Magna Charta, cap. 37: "The archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, earls, barons, knights, freeholders, and other our subjects have given unto us the fifteenth part of all their movables; "which undoubtedly included merchandise and this style the ancient grants of subsidies, and the modern ones, too, do retain (the troublesome time of the war between the Houses of York and Lancaster only excepted); and even then it was, "The Commons, by advice and consent of the Lords, do give and grant; "till the beginning of Charles I. by the words, "We your Majesty's loyal subjects in Parliament assembled," the Lords implicitly; or by the words, "We the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in Parliament assembled; "the Lords expressly, are joined in the grant, as by perusal of the statutes will appear.

3. That in subsidies of this nature—viz., Customs—the Lords have joined with the Commons in the grant of them; and that in the very beginning of those impositions, at when forty shillings on every sack of wool (a native home commodity) was granted to Edward I., in the third year of his reign, to him and his heirs. The grant is, *Magnates, Pralati, ct tota communitas concesserunt:* See Patent Roll, 3 E. I., M. 1., N. 1. As also in other Patent Rolls where subsidies are recited, as the 15 E. III., N. 1., M. 12, the Close Roll and the Patent Roll of 3 E. I., M. 6.

4. And more particularly in impositions of this very species—tounage and poundage—the Lords were, even at the first beginning, joined with the Commons in the grant; as the Parliament Roll in the 47 E. III., N. 10, the first establishment of it by Act, doth declare, where it is, expressly, "The Lords and Commons do grant." And this style did continue, in Acts of this nature, till the end of R. II. After which, in those troublesome times, the style was various, till King H. the Eighth's time; and the style of Acts of Tonnage and Poundage was, "We, the Commons, by advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, do give and grant." This form of gift, in tonnage and poundage, lasted E. the Sixth's, Queen Mary's, Elizabeth's, and King James's time, as the statutes themselves do declare.

5. And, to prove most undeniably that the Lords have their share in the gift of aids and supplies to the King, see the Act 9, II. IV., commonly called the Indemnity of the Lords and Commons; which provides expressly that the Lords should commune apart by themselves, and the Commons by themselves; and at the latter end enacts that the King shall thank both the Lords and Commons for subsidies given to him.

6. That the Lords may make amendments and alterations in Bills which grant tonnage and poundage (the very question now between us) appears in an ancient book, Case 33, H. VI., fol. 17; which was a consultation of all the Judges of England, and the Master of the Rolls, and the Clerk of the Parliament called to inform them of the manner of proceedings in Bills of Parliament: Where it is said that, if the Commons grant tonnage and poundage to endure for four years, and the Lords grant it but for two years, it shall not be carried back to the Commons, because it may stand with their grant, but must be so enrolled: And that the Lords have made

amendments and alterations in Bills granting tonnage and poundage appears by that of the 1 E. VI. and 1 of Q. Eliz., and, even in the very point now in dispute, such amendments as do lessen the sum to the King, as the first of H. VIII.

Read the proviso.

We have seriously consulted our judgments and reasons to find objections, if it were possible, against this power of the Lords, and are so far from finding any that we are fixed in opinion that the want of it would be destructive to the government and peace of the kingdom, and the right of the Crown, in balancing and regulating of trade, and the making and preserving leagues and treaties with foreign princes and States; find the exercise of it cannot but be for the security of all, and for the ease and benefit of the subject.

The modesty of your ancestors in these arduous affairs gave great deference to the wisdom of the Lords.

Their lordships are very far from desiring Jo obstruct this gift—no, not for a moment of time—much less for ever, as was hinted to them at the last Conference: And therefore they desire the House of Commons to lay it to heart, and consider—if it should happen (which they heartily wish it may not) that there should be an obstruction upon occasion of this difference—at whose door it must he, theirs that assume to themselves more than belongs to them, to the prejudice and diminution of the other's right, or theirs that do only exercise that just, lawful, and necessary power which, by the very nature and constant practice of Parliament is, and for many ages hath been, vested in both Houses.

Their lordships had under their consideration and debate the desiring a Free Conference with your House upon the reasons of the amendments in difference between the Houses; but, when they found that you had interwoven your general position with every reason you had offered upon particulars, it seemed to them that your judgments were prepossessed; and they hold it vain, and below the wisdom of Parliament, to reason or argue against fixed resolutions, and upon terms of impossibility to persuade, and have therefore applied themselves only to that point which yet remains an impediment in the way of free and parliamentary debates and Conferences, which must necessarily be first removed, that so we may come to a Free Conference upon the Bill itself, and part with a fair correspondence between the two Houses.

SATURDAY, 22ND APRIL.

The Commons have desired this Conference, to preserve a good correspondence with the House of Peers, and to prevent the ill consequence of these misunderstandings, which may possibly interrupt the happy conclusion of this session, and of all future Parliaments too, if they be not very speedily removed.

Wherein the Commons are not without hopes of giving your Lordships full satisfaction in the point in question, and that without shaking any foundations, unless it be such as no man should lay, much less build upon, the foundations of a perpetual dissension between the two Houses.

Three things did surprise the Commons at the former Conference concerning the Bill for an additional imposition on several foreign commodities:

First, that, where they expected a discourse upon some amendments to that Bill, they met with nothing but a debate of the liberties of their House in the matter, measure, and time of rates upon merchandise, with a kind of a demand that these liberties might be delivered up to your Lordships by our public acknowledgment, before there should be any further discourse upon that Bill.

Secondly, that your Lordships should declare so fixed and settled a resolution in this point before you had so much as heard what could be replied in defence of the Commons.

Thirdly and lastly, that your Lordships should be so easily induced to take this resolution, if there be no other motives for it than those precedents and reasons which your Lordships have been pleased to impart to us.

The Commons confess that the best rule for deciding questions of right between the two Houses is the law and usage of Parliament; and that the best evidences of that-usage and custom of Parliament are the most frequent and authentic precedents.

Therefore the Commons will first examine the precedents your Lordships seem to rely upon; then They will produce those by which their right is asserted; and, in the last place, they will consider the reasons upon which your Lordships ground yourselves.

By the nature of the precedents which your Lordships produce there is an evident departure from the question. As the former Conference left it, there the doubt was narrowed to this single point: whether your Lordships could retrench or abate any part of the rates which the Commons had granted upon merchandize. Here the precedents do go to a joint power of imposing and beginning of taxes, which is a point we have not yet heard your Lordships to pretend to, though this present difference prepares way for it.

Therefore, either these precedents prove too much by proving a power of imposing, or they prove nothing at all, by not proving a power of lessening.

And yet they do not prove a power of imposing neither, for these words, "the Lords and Commons grant," must either be understood *reddendo singula singulis*—that is, the Lords grant for themselves, and the Commons

grant for the counties, cities, and boroughs whom they represent; or else the word "grant" must be understood only of the Lords' assent to what the Commons grant because the form of law requires that both join in one Bill to give it the force of a law.

This answers the statute of Magna Charta, c. 37, and those few instances where it is said "the Lords and Commons grant"—viz., 47 E. III., N. 10; 4 R. II, N. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14; 6 R. II., N. 14. But what answers can be given to those ancient and modern precedents and Acts where the grant moves and is acknowledged to come from the Commons alone, of which a multitude shall be hereinafter mentioned?

The case of 14 E. III., N. 5—" Apres grant tret & parleance enter les grantz & chevaliers & Communs fuit assentus," &c.—is no grant of the 9th sheaf, as your Lordships cited it to be, but an agreement that the nones, granted in a former Parliament, should now be sold, because the money came not in fast enough.

22 E. III., N. 3, winch your Lordships cite to prove that the King did sometimes command the Lords to consult with the Commons about raising money, proves little of that; but it proves expressly that the Commons granted three fifteens. And, as the grant runs wholly in their own name, so the record is full of many reasons why they could grant no more, and upon what conditions they granted so much.

And yet all these records wherein the Lords advised with the Commons about raising money, though they seem to make a show in your Lordships' paper, yet they prove two things of great importance to the Commons: First, that all aids must begin with the Commons, else the Lords need not to have conferred about the aids, but might have sent down a Bill. Secondly, that, when they are begun, the Lords can neither add nor diminish; else it was in vain to adjust the matter by private conference beforehand if the Lords could have reformed it afterwards—which shows how little service the records of 29 E. III., N. 11, 51 E. III., N. 18, can do your Lordships in the present question.

From the time of R. II. your Lordships come to 7° *Jac.* to tell us of the treaty between the Lords and Commons touching the contract for tenures *in. capite*, wherein, the Lords and Commons being to be purchasers, it was less subject to objection to confer both of the method and manner how the price agreed might be paid, for the satisfaction of the King; but this matter hath so little affinity with the present question of lessening rates upon merchandise given by the Commons that nothing but a scarcity of precedents could ever have persuaded your Lordships to make use of this instance.

As for the precedent of 3 E. I., cited by your Lordships, the Commons have most reason to rely upon that case. Your Lordships say, in the beginning of impositions, when 40s. upon a sack of wool was granted to E. I. and his heirs, the Lords joined in the grant; for the words are, *Magnates, Pralati, and tota Communitas concesscrunt*, wherein are these mistakes:—

First, that record was not a grant of 40s. upon a sack, as your Lordships suppose, but a reducing of 40s. upon a sack, which E. I. took before Magna Charta was confirmed, to half a mark, viz., 6s. 8d. per sack: and it was at the prayer of the Commons, as some books say, and cite for it 3 E. I. *Bot. fin. Memb.* 24.

Secondly, the record which your Lordships cite is twice printed, once in the second part of the *Institutes*, page 531; and again in the fourth part of the *Institutes*, page 29. And by both those places it is evident that the *concesserunt* is to be applied only to the *tota Communitas*, and not to the *Magnates*, for this was a grant of the Commons only, and not a grant of the Lords. And, to demonstrate this beyond all possibility of scruple, the printed books do refer us to the Statute of 25 E. I., c. 7, called *Confirmations Chartarum*, wherein it is expressly so declared by Act of Parliament; for, by the last statute, it appears that the *Male tot* of 40s. upon a sack was again demanded by E. I.; and was therefore now abrogated, saving to the King and his heirs, the demi mark upon a sack of wool granted by the commonalty, which is the very same grant of 3 E. I., cited by your Lordships in the present question.

But this is also a convincing evidence that these words, "the Lords and Commons grant," are words of form, and made use of in such cases where the grant did certainly proceed from the Commons alone. And, to clear this point yet more fully by a modern precedent, we pray your Lordships to take notice of the statute of 2 and 3 E. VI., cap. 36, where a relief is given to the King by Parliament, and in the title of the Act, as also in the body of it, it is still called, all along, the grant of the Lords and Commons. Yet in 3 and 4 E. VI., cap. 23, this former Act is recited, and there it is acknowledged to be only a grant of the Commons.

And as for the case of 9 H. IV., called the Indemnity of the Lords and Commons, these things are evidently proved by it:—

First, that it was a grievance to the Commons, and a breach of their liberties, for the Lords to demand a Committee to confer with about aids.

Secondly, that the Lords ought to consider by themselves, and the Commons by themselves, apart.

Thirdly, that no report should be made to the King of what the Commons have granted, and the Lords assented to, till the matter be perfected, so that a plain declaration is made that the Commons grant and the Lords assent.

Fourthly, that the gift ought to be presented by the Speaker of the Commons.

The Book Case, 33 H. VI., 17, is the weakest of all, for the words are, "Si les Communs grant Tonage p' 4 Ans, & S'urs grant mes p' deux Ans ceo ne serra reliver aux Communs mes vi[*unclear:* a] versa si Communs Grant p' 2 Ans, & S'urs p. 4 ceo ne ser' reliver.'

Now, first, this was no opinion of any Judge, but only of Kirkby, Cl de Pari'.

Secondly, this was a case put by-the-by, and not pertinent to the matter in hand.

Thirdly, it is impossible to be law, being against the constant practice and usage of Parliament, for then your Lordships may not only lessen the rates and tune, but you may chose whether you will send us the Bill or no back again with amendment, which was never heard of. And, if that may be, why was it not done so now?

Fourthly, that Clerk says your Lordships may increase impositions too, which part of the case you thought not fit to cite, because you pretend not to it.

Fifthly, *Brook.*, Parlm 3, puts a quaere upon the case, as it deserved.

But if the law books are to be heard in this matter, 30 H. VIII., Dyer 43, is a judicial authority where subsidy is defined to be a tax, "Assess p' Parliament & Grant al Eoy p' les Communs durant vie de chest' on Eoy tantu p Defence des Merchants sur le Mere."

The provisoes in the Bill of 1° II. VIII., which your Lordships seem mainly to rely upon, we conceive to be of no force at all, unless it be against your Lordships; for, by your Lordships' Journals, the case was this: The Bill itself did noc pass till 3 H. VIII.; and upon the forty-third day of the Parliament the Lords assented to it. Afterwards, upon the forty-fifth day, two provisoes came in, one touching the merchants of the Hanse Towns, another touching the merchants of the staple of Calais. Both were signed by the King and the Chancellor; and the Biuhop of Winchester did declare that the signiug of those provisoes by the Kiug's own hand was enough, without the consent of either House. So that the addition of those provisoes prove nothing for which your Lordships cited them, because—

1. They were signed by the King;

2. They were brought in, against all course of Parliament, after the Bill passed;

3. The provisoes were nothing but a fleving of former rights, usually considered in former Acts of that nature;

4. Your Lordships' Journal declares that the King, without those provisoes, might have done the same thing by his prerogative. Only this may be fit to be observed by the way: that, as the Bill was a grant of the Commons alone, so the thanks for that Bill was given to the Commons alone; and so appears upon the endorsement of that very record.

The precedents for the Commons which on the sudden we find (for we have had but few hours to search) are all these following:—

11 E. I., *Walsingh.*, 471. *Populis dedit Iiegi trieesimam partem nonum*.

25 E. I., *WaU.t* 486, & pag' 74. *Pojmlus dedit Bcgi denarium nonum*.

7 H. IV., *Wah.t* 566. *Postquam milites Parliamentarcs din distulissent concedcre Iiegi subsidium in fins tamcn fracti coiicessere*.

6 H. IV., *Wals.*, 564. *Subsidium denegatum fuit Proceribus renitcntibus*.

So, hitherto, when granted, the Commons gave it; when denied, the whole Bill rejected; never abated.

1 E. III., Stat. 2, c. 6. The Commons grieved that when they granted an aid, and paid it, the taxes were reviewed.

18 E. III., cap. 1. Statute at large. The Commons grant two fifteenths. The great men grant nothing, but to go in person with the King.

36 E. III., cap. 11. The King, having regard to the grant made by the Commons, for three years, of wood and leather, grants that no aid be levied but by consent of Parliament.

21 R. II., N. 75. Is the first grant of tonage and poundage for life; and it was given by the Commons alone.

2 H. VI., N. 14. The Commons grant tonage and poundage for two years.

31 H. VI., N. 7, 8, 9, 10. The Commons grant tonage, &c., for life.

8 Ed. IV., N. 30. The Commons grant twotenths and two-fifteenths.

12 E. IV., c. 3. The grant for tonnage and poundage for life is recited to be by the Commons, and most of the rates mentioned in the Bill.

The wars of Yorke and Lancaster are so far from weakening these precedents, it strengthens them rather, for no man can think the Lords were then in less power, or less careful of their rights, than your Lordships are now. Wherefore, if, in those days, those forms were approved by those mighty men, it is a sign the right is clear.

1 H. VIII. Commons, by assent of the Lords, grant tonage.

15 H. VII. In Ireland was the first grant of tonage and poundage: but it said, at the prayer of the Commons it is enacted: which, in a kingdom where they are not tied to forms, shows the clear right.

1 E. VI., cap. 13; 1 Mar., cap. 8; 1 El., cap. 19. We, your poor Commons, by advice, &c., grant: and also

avers the right, time out of mind, to be in the Commons. In like manner this statute of the 1st of El, cap. 19, gives us occasion to put your Lordships in mind of another precedent, which appears in your own Journals, Wednesday, 15 Feb., 1 Eliz.; for, while the Bill was passing, the inhabitants of Cheshire and Wales petition the Lords upon the second reading, that, forasmuch as they were subject to pay the Queen a certain duty called miset, therefore they might be excused of the subsidy and abated their parts of it. The Lords, who then knew they had no power to diminish any part of the aid granted by the Commons, did therefore address themselves to the Queen in their behalfs. The Queen commands an entry to be made in the Journal of the House of Lords, that she was pleased that the Cheshire men and the Welsh men should be respited the mises when they pay subsidies, and respited the subsidies when they pay mises; which is a strong proof that, as the Commons alone grant, so nobody can diminish their grant; else what need had the Lords to apply themselves to the Queen for it?

17 Car. I. Tonage and poundage was granted once for a month; then again for three months: but still the grant was by the Commons. In those days (how tumultuous soever) the Commons did not rise against the Lords; they agreed well enough.

- 12 C. II., cap. 4, tonage.
  - Cap. 24, for £7,000.
  - Cap. 23, excise for life.
- 12 C, cap. 27, for £420,000.
  - Cap. 19, £70,000 more.
- 13 C. II., cap. 3, £1,200,000.
- 14 C. II., cap. 10, chimney money.
- 15 C. II., cap. 9, four subsidies.
- 16 & 17 C. II., cap. 1, Royal aid.
- 17 C. II., cap. 1, Oxon, £1,250,000.
- 18 C. II., cap. 1, Poll Bill.
- 19 Car. II., cap. 8, eleven months' tax.
- 20 Car. II., cap. 1, £310,000 (wine).
- 22 C. II., cap. 3, wine and vinegar.
- 23 Car., subsidies, Id. per pound.
- Additional excise.
- Impost on the law:
- And the preamble of this very Bill now in question.

All grants of the Commons; yet none of those Bills were ever varied by your Lordships or your predecessors, which, if there had been such a right, would, some time or other, have been exercised, though in very small values, purposely to preserve that right.

Thus an uninterrupted possession of this privilege ever since 9 H. IV., confirmed by a multitude of precedents both before and after, not shaken by one precedent for these three hundred years, is now required to be delivered up or an end put to all further discourse; which opinion, if it be adhered to, is, as much as in your Lordships lies, to put an end to all further transactions between the Houses in matter of money, which we pray your Lordships to consider:

Because there appears not to the Commons any colour from the precedents cited by your Lordships why your opinions should be so fixed in this point, we suppose the main defence is in the reasons that have been given for it.

That paper begins with an observation that your Lordships had neither reason nor precedent offered by the Commons to back their resolution, and yet concludes with an answer to a precedent then cited by the House of Commons, *viz.*, the Act of Tonage and Poundage now in force; and if your Lordships heard but one precedent then, you have now a great number besides those 1 of 3 E. I., and H. VIII., and 9 H. IV., and divers others your Lordships furnished us with.

Before the Commons answer to your Lordships reasons in particular, they desire to say first, in general, that it is a very unsafe thing, in any settled Government, to argue the reasons of the fundamental Constitutions, for that can tend to nothing that is profitable to the whole.

And this will more sensibly appear to your Lordships if the grounds and foundations of judicature be examined.

For there are several precedents in Parliament and some in book cases, which prove that the judicature is not to be exercised by all the Lords, but only such as the King is pleased to appoint. So is the Book Case of 22 E. III., 3 A. 6. And so is the Parliament roll, 25 E. III., N. 4; and divers other rolls of Parliament.

Several other precedents there are where the Commons, by the King's good pleasure, have been led into a share of the very judicature. So are the 42 E. III., N. 20, 21; 31 H. VI., N. 10; 8 Ed. IV., Hugh Brice's case, in the rolls of Parliament.

Some precedents there are where it was assigned for error in the House of Peers that the Lords gave judgment without petition or assent of the Commons. So is 2 H. V. N. 13.

Would your Lordships think it safe that a dispute should now be made of the very rights of judicature, because we have such precedents?

If usage for so long a time have silenced all disputes touching your Lordships' judicature, shall that usage be of no force to preserve the privileges of the Commons from all further question?

Also there is a precedent of an Act of Parliament passed by the King and Commons alone, without the Lords—viz., 1 E. VI., c. 5, and that twice approved—viz., 1 Eliz., c. 7, and 5 Eliz., c. 19, which do both allow and commend this Act.

Shall we therefore argue the foundations of the Legislature because we have such precedents?

But, to come to particulars,—

1. Your Lordships' first reason is from the happiness of the Constitution, that the two Houses are mutual checks upon each other.

Answer: So they are still: for your Lordships have a negative to the whole.

But, on the other side, it would be a double check upon His Majesty's affairs if the King may not rely upon the *quantum*, when once his people have given it; and therefore the privilege now contended for by your Lordships is not of use to the Crown, but much to the contrary.

2. Your Lordships' reasons, drawn from the writ of summons, is as little concluding, for though the writ do not exclude you from any affairs, yet it is only *dc quibusdam arduis negotiis*; and must be understood of such as by course of Parliament are proper, else the Commons, upon the like ground, may entitle themselves to judicature, for they are also called *ad faciend dc consentiend dc quibusdam arduis & super negotiis antedictis*.

3. Your Lordships proceed to demand where is that record or contract in Parliament to be found where the Lords appropriate this right to the Commons in exclusion of themselves?

Answer: To this rhetorical question the Commons pray they may answer by another question: Where is that record or contract by which the Commons submitted that judicature should be appropriated to the Lords in exclusion of themselves?

Wherever your Lordships find the last record they will show the first endorsed upon the back of the same roll.

Truth is, precedents there are where both dries do exercise those several rights; but none how either side came by them.

4. If the Lords may deny the whole, why not a part?—else the Commons may at last pretend to bar a negative voice.

Answer: The King must deny the whole of every Bill, or pass it; yet this takes not away his negative voice. The Lords and Commons must accept the whole general pardon, or deny it; yet this takes not away their negative.

The clergy have a right to tax themselves; and it is a part of the privilege of their estate. Doth the Upper Convocation House alter what the Lower grant? Or do the Lords or Commons ever abate any part of their gift? Yet they have the power to reject the whole. But, if abatement should be made, it would insensibly go to a rising, and deprive the clergy of their ancient right to tax themselves.

5. Your Lordships say, Judicature is undoubtedly ours, yet in Bills of judicature we allow the Commons to amend and alter: why should not the Commons allow us the same privilege in Bills of money?

Answer: If contracts were now to be made for privileges, the offer might seem fair: but yet the Commons should profit little by it; for your Lordships do now industriously avoid all Bills of that nature, and chuse to do many things by your own power which ought to be done by the legislative, of which we forbear the instances, because your Lordships, we hope, will reform them; and we desire, not to create new differences, but to compose the old.

6. Your Lordships say you are put to an ignoble choice either to refuse the King's supplies when they are most necessary, or to consent to such ways and proportions which neither your own judgment nor the good of the Government or people can admit.

Answer: We pray your Lordships to observe that this reason—

1. Makes your Lordships' judgment to be the measure of the welfare of the commons of England.

2. It gives you power to raise and increase taxes, as well as to abate; for it may sometimes, in your Lordships judgments be for interests of drade to raise increase a rate, as well as to lessen its and then, still you are brought to the same ignoble choice, unless you may raise the tax.

But it is a very ignoble choice put upon; the King and his people that either His Majesty must demand and the Commons give so small an aid as cap never be diminished, or else run the hazard of your Lordships re-examination of the rates; whose proportions in all taxes, in comparison to what the commonality pay, is very inconsiderable.

7. If positive assertion can introduce right the Lords have no security, but the Commons may extend a right as they judge it necessary or expedient.

Answer: We hope no assertions or denials, though never so positive, shall give or take away a right; but we rely upon usage on our side, and non-usage on your Lordships part, as the best evidence by which your Lordships, or we, can claim any privilege.

8. Your Lordships profess a desire to raise our esteem with His Majesty and the whole kingdom, but not by the under-valuation of the House of Peers.

Answer; We have so great confidence in His Majesty's goodness that, we assure ourselves, nothing can lessen His Majesty's esteem of our dutiful affections to him; and we hope we have deserved so well of our country, by our deportment towards His Majesty, that we shall not need your Lordships' recommendation to any who wish well to His Majesty or the present Government.

But we are so far from wishing to raise an esteem by any diminution of your Lordships' honour or privileges that there never was any House of Commons who had a more just and true respect of that noble Constitution of a House of Peers; of which your Lordships have had frequent instances, by our consenting to several clauses in former Bills for the securing and improving your Lordships' privileges.

9. We are sorry to see your Lordships undervalue the precedent of this last Act of Tonage and Poundage, because, though it were an Act of the last Convention, it was confirmed in this Parliament, and because the right of the Commons there asserted was pursuant to a former precedent in 1642; and possibly had not passed so if the younger members of that Convention had not learned from some of those great and noble Lords who now manage the Conference for your Lordships, and were then Commoners, that this was the undoubted right of the Commons.

To conclude, the Commons have examined themselves and their proceedings, and find no cause why your Lordships should put them in mind of that modesty by which their ancestors showed a great deference to the wisdom of the Lords, for they resolve ever to observe the modesty of their ancestors, and doubt not but your Lordships will also follow the wisdom of yours.

It was unanimously *Resolved*, That the thanks of the House be returned to Mr. Attorney-General for his great pains and care in preparing and drawing up the reasons delivered to the Lords, in answer to their reasons, which was by him performed to the great satisfaction of this House, in vindication of their privilege, and just and undoubted right of the Commons of England.

And Mr. SPEAKER did, accordingly, deliver the thanks of the House to Mr. Attorney-General.

By Authority: G. DIDSBURT, Government Printer, Wellington.

The National Council of Women of New Zealand

By Lady Stout.

The present meeting of delegates from the various Women's Societies in New Zealand, may be considered a favourable and fitting opportunity for organising and forming a Woman's National Council for New Zealand.

Some time ago I received a letter from Mrs Eva McLaren, foreign corresponding secretary of the Inter-National Council, requesting me to allow myself to be nominated as president of a Woman's National Council for New Zealand. At first I declined as I was afraid my health and domestic responsibilities would prevent me from fulfilling the duties of the position in a satisfactory manner; but when I was informed that Mrs Sheppard had consented to become corresponding secretary, and undertake the more arduous part of the work to be done, I wrote to Mrs McLaren accepting the office of president *pro tem*. Of course after the New Zealand Council is organised, the delegates will be called upon to confirm the nominations of the Inter-National Council, or elect a president and corresponding secretary of their own choosing. I shall now give you a short sketch of the initiation of the idea of an International Council of Women composed of delegates from national councils, which are in their turn composed of delegates from the many and various women's societies, engaged in political, social, professional, religious and industrial work. Twelve years ago Mrs Cady Stanton of the United States during a visit to Europe, proposed that a convention of women, with the object of organising those in favour of the enfranchisement of their sex should be held in Washington on the fortieth anniversary of the famous first Women's Rights Convention, which was held in Seneca Falls. New York. Miss Susan Antony expanded the idea so as to include the co-operation of all women working for educational, religious, philanthropic and political progress. In the year 1888 the first convention was held in Washington, U.S., at which Mrs Wright Sewall proposed a plan for the formation of National Councils in every country, which should meet every three years, and be composed of delegates from women's societies. These national councils

should be affiliated to an International Council, which should be composed of delegates from the National Councils, and should meet every five years. The National Councils were intended to concentrate the power of existing organisations without multiplying the number of such organisations. The nineteen societies of American women which were represented at the Convention, and the delegates from various societies in seven European countries, were favourable to the idea, and appointed a committee to prepare formal constitutions for the permanent bodies or councils. Before the delegates separated the constitutions were accepted and recommendations adopted that the officers of the National Council should issue an address to the women of the United States explaining the objects of the new organisation, and those of the International Council should take measures to "secure the co-operation of women in all countries (irrespective of race or creed), in this movement tor the promotion of sisterly understanding, sympathy and love."

The constitution committee in their report expressed the opinion that such an organisation would be of much benefit in increasing the sum total of womanly courage, efficiency and *esprit de corps*; that it would tend to widen the horizon by bringing together women of the most diverse views on all subjects who would thus be able to appreciate the fact, that, though they were opposed radically to one another in religion or politics, they were at one upon the common ground of unselfish devotion to the advancement of humanity and the social and moral improvement of the race.

The meeting together of women of all classes who had been brought up under the most diverse conditions, could not help showing some good results. Many living alone in country districts, and confined perhaps to one small village during the whole of their lives, would, no doubt, be astounded by the wider and more enlightened opinions that they would hear expressed by women who had seen the world, and had dug deep into the fundamental truths that govern the social, political, and religious thought of the day. By such discussions as were held each one gained a broader and truer plane of vision which was thus expressed in the feeling embodied in the preamble of the constitution of the permanent National and International Councils:—" Sincerely believing that the best good of humanity will be advanced by greater unity of thought, sympathy, and purpose, we hereby bind ourselves together in a confederation of workers committed to the overthrow of all forms of ignorance and injustice, and to the application of the golden rule to society, law, and custom."

The first meeting of the International Council was held at Paris in 1889 in connection with the French Exhibition. I have no report of what was done; but understand that the meeting was so successful that the delegates were encouraged to continue further organisation on the same lines.

The first meeting of the Federated National Council of Women of the United States was held in Washington in 1891, three years from the time of its organisation, and at that meeting Mrs Potter Palmer, President of the Board of Managers of the Columbian Exposition, on behalf of that body, extended a cordial invitation to the National Council to hold the proposed World's Council of Women in Chicago, at the time of the Columbian Exposition. This convention, which was to be called the World's Congress of Representative Women, was to meet for the purpose of holding a Memorial Congress in celebration of the progress of women throughout the world since the discovery of America in 1492. The National and International Councils appeared at this Memorial Congress simply as representatives of one feature of women's work and progress, namely, that of their ability to organise women's work and make their power effectual. The success of this congress was mainly due to the organised work of the National and International Councils that preceded its convocation.

At this meeting of representatives from various European countries to the International Council, delegates were appointed to organise National Councils in their respective countries. As a result of the work done by these delegates National Councils were formed and affiliated to the International Council in Canada, France, Germany, Belgium and Finland. Steps are being taken to form a National Council in Denmark by those interested in the Danish Women's Association, a Society which has done much work with the object of securing the rights of property to married women. Miss Margaret Windeyer is working in New South Wales with the object of forming a Council, and Mrs Sheppard and myself have been authorised to initiate the movement in New Zealand. I hope that we shall succeed in federating the numerous and vigorous women's societies in New Zealand into a Council which will be strong and powerful to advance the progress of our country, and help on the women of other lands to the attainment of the fuller freedom that we have gained. The British National Council has appointed Lady Henry Somerset president, Lady Francis Balfour vice-president Mrs Bedford Fenwick secretary, Miss Louisa Stevenson treasurer, and Mrs Eva McLaren corresponding secretary.

The British National Council held a most enthusiastic meeting on June 27th at which Lady Henry Somerset made an eloquent and vigorous speech, in which she pointed out the wonderful power for good that a National Council would have in England, and the advantages that such an organisation would have as an educating force.

Mrs Croby, the founder and President of the "Sorosis" the first women's club in New York, advocated the co-operation of women which pointed in the direction of absolute unity. She explained how the "moral and social regenerative force of a great body of women becomes almost infinite and practicably irresistible."

The British National Council is to be hostess on the occasion of the next meeting of the International

Council which will he held in London in the summer of 1898. Many national councils are expected to he represented, amongst which I hope the delegate from New Zealand will take a prominent position. The officers of the International Council are President, the Countess of Aberdeen; Vice-President, Mrs Wright Sewall; Treasurer, Baroness Alexandra Grippenberg, Finland; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs Eva McLaren; Recording Secretary, Madame Maria Martin, France.

It is unnecessary to enumerate the advantages of belonging to such a wide reaching confederation of women as is represented in the National and International Councils, composed as they are of representative women of all nations holding the most diverse opinions, but bound together by sympathy in the earnest desire to further the advancement of women's work, and to promote the cause of freedom and social progress and the sisterhood of humanity.

I shall now read the form of constitution of the British National Council, and its aims and objects as specified by the secretary, Mrs Bedford Fenwick, at the meeting held in London on the 12th December of last year.

- To unite all organised societies of women for mutual council and co-operation, and in the attainment of justice and freedom for women and for all that makes for the good of humanity.
- To encourage the formation of societies of women engaged in trades, professions, and in social and political work, in connection with which no organised union exists.
- To affiliate with other national councils of women for the purpose of facilitating international conference and co-operation.

Membership shall be open to all women under the folio wing regulations:—

- All organised societies of women in sympathy with the national policy and which shall be invited by the Executive Committee to send representatives.
- Distinguished women who shall be termed councillors. The honour of life membership to be conferred upon such by the council.
- Representative women workers, who may be invited to take a seat on Sectional Committees by the Executive Committee.

Each society affiliated to the National Council shall pay an annual subscription of £1 for each of its delegates, and shall be entitled to one delegate for every 1000 members or fraction of 1000 members. It is proposed that the National Council of women shall be organised in four divisions.

- Industrial.
- Professional.
- Social.
- Political.

Each division would be divided into as many sections as might appear desirable.

Each section would be composed of delegates from the societies engaged in the special department of work represented by the section.

The sections would meet as often as might be necessary to consider matters relating to their special work, and pass such resolutions or take such action thereto as might appear to be advisable.

As each section would in time doubtless represent all the chief workers in its department, any resolution which it passed after due deliberation would certainly have the greater effect and influence both with the public and with everyone engaged in its sphere of action.

Such is a clear statement of the aims and object of the British National Council of Women and the form of its constitution.

It will be seen that each section is a unit which concentrates the efforts of all the societies engaged in special work of its department of woman's work, and this has the effect of intensifying the work of such societies and making the work done more practical and wide-spread. Each society would by their representatives in the section be made acquainted with the work done in similar societies and thus prevent much waste of energy by the constant overlapping of efforts which at present exists.

In the industrial section, for instance, which would consist of women representing all the organisations of women's labour, much might be done by extending the scope of work hitherto undertaken by women, and many new branches of work for which women are suited might be started and carried out to a successful issue by co-operation. For instance, such work as dairy-farming, fruit and vegetable growing and poultry rearing, as well as flower growing and bee-keeping, all of which would be most suitable, desirable and healthy occupations for women, would be encouraged and facilitated by the meeting of women in council and the discussion of ways and means by which such occupations might by co-operation be made productive and established as branches of women's work. Meetings of delegates from Trades Unions, such as tailoresses' or factory unions, would be of much benefit to women in organising and regulating the wages and payment of operatives, and would bring together women who fully understood the difficulties of employers as well as the requirements of the

employees, and would tend to a more equal adjustment of obligation and responsibility. Of course the employers' societies would be represented as well and would be brought into contact with the representatives of the workers thus learning the requirements and grievances of the latter from the wider range of national as opposed to individual interest.

The professional sections would comprise delegates from societies of women engaged in medical, nursing, teaching, artistic or dramatic occupations, or any other professional work in which women might be engaged. The professional sections would undertake the work of securing legal status for women and greater equality and justice in the matter of remuneration and position, than are granted to women in the professions at the present time.

The political sections would undertake the revision of laws particularly relating to women and children and to the advancement of the political equality and influence of women. Amongst these the equalisation of the divorce laws and the improvement of the laws relating to illegitimacy, the rights of property and probate would be considered. In relation to this section I may explain that so far as the laws relating to illegitimacy, rights of property and probate are concerned the laws that have been passed in New Zealand fulfil all the requirements of justice both to women and children. We still require improvements in our divorce laws and some amendments in the laws relating to seduction and the raising of the age of consent, as well as the repeal of a law which is an insult to our women and a menace to the morality of our youth; a law that is not based on the equality of the sexes nor on any sanitary foundation.

The social sections would include the representatives from all societies interested in social reforms and progress, and in religious and philanthropic work. The work undertaken by this section would comprise all civic, domestic, and hygienic reforms and improvements, and would be the one in which women would be able to utilise their hereditary and special training, and effect most beautiful results. In the discussions on domestic reforms women have a wide field in which to advocate such improvements in domestic arrangements as would tend to economy both in material and in labour. The study of domestic science and the laws of health by women would have the effect in a very short time of diminishing our death rate from fevers and infectious diseases, and adding to the efficiency of our bread winners by the improvement in quality and nourishment of our food. By co-operation we could effect most beneficial results in the various branches of household management, such as cookery, sewing, nursing, and the rearing of children, which would revolutionise the present conditions by which numbers of women are degraded into leading lives of domestic drudgery and children are brought up or rather dragged up under such unfavourable circumstances that they cannot possibly develop either mentally or physically into healthy members of society. Numbers of women representing various classes of society would by discussion and interchange of ideas be able to help one another to some better solution of problems, that individually they are powerless to grapple with or take effectual measures to solve. Such work as is undertaken by the philanthropic societies in connection with religious denominations and temperance unions and friendly societies would be classified with the social sections. Amongst the subjects to which I hope the New Zealand National Council, when formed, will first give its attention is that of training our boys and girls in the study of physiology in relation to temperance and morality. It is of no use crowding our statute books with laws for the protection of our girls and for the enforcement of morality, if we do not at the same time train our young people to understand the duties and the responsibilities that they must fulfill towards each other. Fortunately women of all classes are beginning to realise the injustice of punishing wrong-doing and sins committed in consequence of ignorance. I think the feeling or sentiment of responsibility will now rapidly develop, and that in the near future we will consider that fathers and mothers are deserving of punishment if they neglect to have their children of both sexes educated so as to have accurate knowledge of the pit-falls into which they may in the future fall, and the inevitable penalty of their wrongdoing. I hope to see medical lecturers appointed to all our public schools not necessarily in the junior classes, as all the knowledge that is required by young children is at present given in many schools by the teachers. In the senior classes where more special and absolutely necessary instruction is required a medical man or woman should deliver carefully prepared lectures. It is of no use saying that parents should instruct the children, as in nine cases out of ten—or I might say ninety-nine out of a hundred—parents need as much instruction as the children in the know ledge that is required, and if competent to impart the necessary information would not do so. Ignorance and false sentiment, by allowing our children to grow up in ignorance of the human form divine and the laws governing the whole of the future happiness and health of the race, have too long perverted the pure stream of the knowledge of the springs of human affection. Now that women are awakening to a clearer understanding as to their duties to the coming generation and appreciate the need of its moral as well as material welfare, they should demand the abandonment of all false sentiment and adopt the wiser plan of guarding against ship wreck by placing buoys and danger signals upon all the sunken rocks of human weakness and temptation. The sentiment that has been oft repeated, though seldom understood, and so has remained a mere quotation, "To the pure, all things are pure," must help to guide our minds to solve the problem of how to make our children profit by our knowledge

without the necessity and attendant misery of learning wisdom by sad experience, and by fatal mistakes. Knowledge is power, but ignorance is certainly not innocence. Innocence is the light which radiates from a pure mind and gentle soul, which knowledge but strengthens and concentrates in love and sympathy towards the sinner. Ignorance is with idleness the source of every evil thought and base action which degrade our fellow creatures.

The National Council exercises no control over either the sections or societies which are affiliated with it, nor is any resolution that has been passed by the Council necessarily binding upon the sections or societies that they represent. At the same time any resolution that was carried by the Council would voice the opinion of the largest number of societies of women, and would thus carry more weight than any resolution passed by the most powerful society in the country. If our women could be made to realise that by co-operation, organisation, sympathy, and charity we could mould ourselves into such a powerful army that we could overcome the most indomitable foe, we should have no difficulty in storming the ramparts of prejudice and winning our battle for justice, home, and humanity. We must first overcome the foes that are in ourselves, and for which we are not so much to blame as the conditions of selfishness, jealousy and dependence that we have been satisfied to submit to. We have our chance, and must show how we can make the best use of it by being true to our better selves, throwing off our petty failings as we have done our bondage, and advancing as a united band, strong in our determination to conquer our world and to overcome ignorance, prejudice and crime. In the National Council women of all classes and of all shades of opinion on religious, social and political questions, would meet together and discuss all subjects from every point of view. Enthusiasts in the cause of political equality would meet others who were equally enthusiastic in the cause of industrial independence, and who believed that their remedy was the only one that could accomplish the advancement of women, and the abolition of misery and degradation. Those too who held to "prohibition" as the cure for every evil, would meet women who blamed our unsectarian education for all the crime and sin that surrounds us. They might be much surprised when they found there were some women who blamed the apathy of the ministers of religion for much of the immorality and vice that we deplore. It might startle others to find that clergymen who acknowledge that they cannot find suitable or qualified Sunday school teachers, and who lack the ability to make Bible lessons sufficiently attractive to interest children, expect to shift their responsibility upon the shoulders of the already very much overworked and underpaid state school teachers, who would be obliged to undergo a course of religious teaching themselves before they could be qualified to teach their classes so as to satisfy the clergymen and parents of all sects, and prevent the children from taking part in sectarian warfare after school hours. Other women who believe that the true spirit of Christianity has its shrine in the human heart, and will not rule the world until the ministers of religion cast aside their dogmas and disagreements and preach with one voice, truth, justice, purity and brotherly and sisterly love, may be surprised to find how very little difference there is in the fundamental truths that underlie all their most cherished convictions. They will find that the meetings and discussions will have the effect of widening the horizon for all parties, and showing that there are many ways and means by which to promote the advancement of social reforms, and to improve the position of women. They would find that though divided as the poles in their opinions they could act as one when the broader issues by which women could be raised to independence were put before them. "Co-operation amongst women for the advancement of their social domestic and industrial status, and for the promotion of all that makes for the good of humanity," is a noble aim for which to strive. Women can if they would rule the world and make their power felt in every sphere of life but they will not. They must have their own small triumphs and their own pet comforts, and so they fail.

The National Council has been formed with the object of drawing together all classes of women with the common aim of promoting the advancement of women, and the enlargement of the sphere of women's work. There is no class and no individual opinion to be considered. The Councils are composed of societies of individuals and each individual representative acts as a society, thus helping to broaden the scope of work, and make it possible for the societies to cooperate upon the higher and broader plane of national progress and national interest. Every woman who belongs to any society, will without regard to class or creed be represented in the council by the representative of the society to which she may belong. Each society will by correspondence with the societies belonging to the same section be made conversant with the work done and requirements of women all over the world, and will thus be brought into touch with the noblest and best thinkers and workers amongst the women of the day. Advice and assistance will be given to those who may be struggling to redress wrong and help in the advancement of women's work and the establishment of greater freedom and complete equality for women in every country.

Mrs Bedford Fenwick remarked in the speech she made at the meeting in London in December, that the sex question was to be avoided in the formation of a National Council; but that all women must recognise that it was their duty to be loyal to their sex. Mrs Fenwick went on to say that if we had grievances against men we must remember that they were our fathers, brothers and sons, and that we mothers were to blame for not

moulding them into a higher type, and that when women taught their sons the beauty and goodness of justice, truth and honour, the equality of the sexes before the law would soon be obtained. "Women should be loyal to their sex," Mrs Fenwick says. Perhaps by co-operation amongst women and the meeting together in council of women from all classes, the sense of justice and equality will be so far expanded that women will understand better how it is that they must be loyal to their sex, and treat those who are in conditions which make them more apt to fall into temptation as sisters and not as a class set apart from them by their lapse from virtue. It is the want of charity, and the cruel indifference of women that makes one hopeless of obtaining justice for women and raising the standard of honour and purity amongst men. When we consider that it is the conditions and circumstances of life that are the causes of our vice or virtue, we should rouse ourselves to work so as to make it impossible that anyone should suffer unjustly the penalty of their misfortunes or hereditary weakness. Equal justice and equal responsibility with conditions that make happiness and virtue possible to all women must be the aim of the united sisterhood of humanity. It is not to men we have to look for the raising of our sisters, as it is not upon them we have to cast the blame of the degradation of women; but to the conditions of society that have made women helpless and dependent, and to the callousness of those women who are always ready to cast stones at their fallen sisters, and to pride themselves upon their superior virtue, when very often the only merit in that virtue is the lack of temptation. Women must be loyal to their sex if they hope for equality or the advancement of the cause of justice and humanity. It is to the women, to the mothers and sisters we look to raise the standard of social, moral and political purity. Religious denominations with their constant warfare and their disobedience to the Master's command to "love one another," have perhaps failed to help on the cause of human progress as they might have done. We must recognise the need of love and tenderness towards the weak and by organisations which will bring the abuses and wrongs under which women suffer before those who have the power and the will to redress them, we shall help to hasten the good time when men will be brothers all, and women will have the right and the opportunity to develop all their powers and lead the life that is best suited to their needs and to the physical growth and mental development of their children, and the advancement of the race.

I hope the formation of a National Council for New Zealand will be agreed to, and that the delegates from the societies of women represented at this convention will lay before their various societies the advantages that would accrue to their particular branch of work and to women's work in general by affiliation with the National Council. We New Zealand women have now political power; but we must bestir ourselves, and show that we are governed by high aims and unselfish motives, and that we can lay aside all petty disagreements and work together for the sake of justice, home, and humanity. A house divided against itself cannot stand; so we women must be united, and with one hope and one mind resolve to sweep wrong and injustice from our fair land. and by co-operation and mutual sympathy make our country one in which friendship and perfect trust between all classes will be developed and consummated by the attainment of industrial social and political reforms.

vignette

By Lady Stout

The Hon. Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G.

Sir Robert Stout, ex-Premier of New Zealand, is a distinguished Scotsman, who at present occupies the position of Chief Justice of the Colony, and has done more than any other man to place the land of his adoption in the favourable position it now occupies on this question.

We much regret to say that since giving his consent to write for us, Sir Robert has been seriously ill. In the circumstances we are greatly indebted to Lady Stout, who has most willingly taken her husband's place and prepared for the National Council this very able and convincing paper.

I T is with the hope that the following statements of fact of what has taken place in reference to the Drink Problem in New Zealand may be an encouragement to Y.M.C.A. men throughout Scotland, that this pamphlet is issued by the Temperance Committee of the Scottish National Council of Y.M.C.As.

In New Zealand there were many attempts made to minimise the evils of the drink traffic and to regulate the sale of alcohol, before the Local Option Bill became law. None of these measures, however, gave the power to the people to vote for or against the sale of intoxicants. The granting and refusing of licences was left in the hands of a Licensing Committee in 1881, who had the power to refuse licences in cases where the hotels were badly conducted or insufficiently provided with accommodation for lodgers, or on the petition of a majority of the residents in the neighbourhood. The Committee had also the option of refusing licences if they considered the licence was not required.

1893 And After

In 1893 the Local Option Bill became law and thus gave the power of regulating the drink traffic into the hands of the electors. In New Zealand there is adult suffrage, so the women who had been enfranchised during the previous session of Parliament had the right to vote for the "Continuance," "Reduction," or "No-Licence "of the hotels. The result of the poll in 1896 was that 139,580 votes were cast for "Continuance," 94,555 for "Reduction" and 98,812 for "No-Licence," showing a large majority for "Continuance." At the next poll, owing to the strenuous efforts of the Temperance Party, and the interest that had been awakened amongst the women voters, the "No-Licence" vote increased to 118,575. At the poll in 1902 the position of the parties was reversed, the "No-Licence" vote having secured 3075 of a majority. In 1905 the majority had increased to 15,984, and at the last poll, in 1908, the splendid majority of 33,331 was recorded. There is no doubt that

The Women's Influence and Vote

have been the means of securing the great success in Temperance reform that has been attained in New Zealand. The majority of women consider Temperance and social reform from the effect that it will have upon their husbands, sons, and children. When they have the opportunity they will always record their votes for the good of the community, except in cases where self-interest and financial gain make them ignore the promptings of their conscience. The feeling of responsibility which is aroused by the knowledge that they have the power to sway the destiny of their homes or country by their votes has even more effect upon women than upon men. Women have always been accustomed to leave the responsibility to others, so when they realise that the power is in their own hands they develop a new sense of personal responsibility in the exercise of their duties as citizens. When once that sense is aroused they must vote for what appears to them to be the best means of improving the conditions of social and industrial life. They must vote for removing the vices that have retarded human progress and brought misery and degradation upon those who were least able to bear the burden.

The Effect of "No-Licence"

in New Zealand has been that in twelve districts there is now no liquor trade. Since 1893 there has been a reduction of 462 in the number of hotel bars. At the last "No-Licence" poll 150 bars were closed. Some people might think that that meant a decrease in employment, but such is not the case. The expenditure of money in liquor tends to decrease efficiency, and also the expenditure on useful commodities

In the towns and districts where "No-Licence" has been carried in New Zealand the hotels have been turned into shops for the sale of all kinds of merchandise. The rents of the buildings, instead of being reduced, have been increased. The working men, having money to spend on their homes and families, encourage legitimate trades by their patronage. In Invercargill where "No-Licence" has been working for several years, I found in driving round the town that the workmen's cottages and gardens were clean and tidy and well cared for. The whole place has an appearance of order prosperity, and peace. There is a splendid free library and reading-room. A new town hall and good municipal theatre have been built since "No-Licence" was carried. In all the other districts where the bars have been closed the same conditions prevail.

There is still much to be done, as in the districts where the hotel-bars are open there is a good deal of drunkenness. The evidence of the evil effects of the drink traffic is found in the applications for charitable aid that are made by the wives and children of the men who spend their money in "keeping up the revenue." The people who think the revenue is in danger by the abolition of the drink traffic forget that these men are drawing upon the revenue not only by their incapacity to work, but by the help their families require from charitable aid grant. The statistics of

The Diminution of Crime

in the districts in which "No-Licence" has been carried prove that drink is, in New Zealand at least, the main cause of all crime, misery and degradation.

In spite of the efforts of the Temperance Party and the habits of the people, the drink bill for the Dominion was increasing per head until last year. Compared with older countries it is very small, being only £311s. 1½d.

per head. The quantity consumed compared with the United Kingdom was—New Zealand 10 gallons of beer; United Kingdom 26 gallons per head. Wine and spirits were very much less than Britain, as they are not very much used. The decrease in the amount of liquor that is consumed by temperate people, and the large number of total abstainers, makes it appear as if there must be a good deal of drunkenness amongst those who are the main consumers of alcohol. The evidences of the diminution of crime in the "No-Licence" districts shows clearly the beneficial effect of the abolition of the drink traffic.

The following comparative statement will show the decrease in crime in the "No-Licence" districts.

CLUTHA.—The number of all offences, except in law cases, for the last ten years under "Licence," was 292, compared with 122 during the first ten years under "No-Licence"; while in the portion of CLUTHA likely to be more influenced by the drink the figures are respectively 251 and 81.

In CLINTON (part of Clutha) all police offences for the last seven years "Licence" numbered 157, and for the first seven years "No-Licence" 41.

Ashburton.

Nearly all of the convictions for drunkenness came from adjoining license districts.

OAMARU.—Under "Licence" for the last year the total offences numbered 352, whereas under "No-Licence" for the first year there were only 134. The striking extent of the improvement will be realised when it is mentioned that during the last eighteen months of "Licence" the total number of offences was 440, and that during the first eighteen months of "No-Licence" the number was 142.

MATAURA.—Under "Licence" for the years 1902 and 1903 the figures were 124 and 78, and under "No-Licence" for 1904 and 1905, 28 and 39.

The chief magistrates and business men of all these districts affirm that "No-Licence" has been most successful from every point of view. The social conditions of the people prove that the closing of the bars has secured prosperity and happiness in families where formerly there was evidence of misery and degradation.

The "No-Licence" Vote

must be in a majority of three-fifths of the votes polled to carry "No-Licence" in any district. Under this restriction there is no chance of a vote for "No-Licence" ever being reversed, as the same provision is made for reversal to "Licence." The Temperance reform party are divided in their opinion as to the fairness of this provision. Some think that the "No-Licence" issue should be carried on a bare majority vote, and that there is no reason and great injustice in a different system being applied to the liquor question than to all other questions in a democratic country. There is a very strong movement to have the question settled by a bare majority, but whether that measure will be carried is doubtful. There is no doubt that justice demands the same treatment for this question as others, but expediency and the safety of a three-fifths majority makes it doubtful if the gain would be very great. There was a bare majority for "No-Licence" in fifty-three of the sixty-eight licensing districts at the last poll, but a three-fifths majority was only received in twelve districts, which are now under "No-Licence." This does not mean that all the people in these districts are total abstainers, but that no one is allowed to sell alcohol, and that all packages sent into the district for private consumption must be stamped and marked by the consignee. There are evasions of the law, but not to any great extent. Most of the evasions of the liquor laws take place in the districts and towns where the [*unclear:* bare] open. Hotel bars are all closed on Sundays, and most of them have to close at 10 P.M. on week days, though in some districts the closing hour is 11 P.M. On election days the bars are closed from 12 noon until 7 P.M. The "Reduction" vote ensures a reduction in the number of hotel bars in the districts where "No-Licence" has had a bare majority.

The New Zealand Alliance of Men and Women and the Women's Christian Temperance Union are very strong organisations, and have the help of non-abstainers who believe that the open-bar system is demoralising to the people, and especially to the young people. No respectable woman would be seen entering a public-house bar in New Zealand, nor is it allowable to Kell drink to young people under eighteen years of age.

The temperance sentiment is so strong and the practice of temperance so universal that one rarely sees any but non-alcoholic beverages at hotel or steamer tables.

The Y.M.C.A.

is very powerful in New Zealand, especially in Wellington, where they have a splendid new building fitted

up with gymnasium, reading, and recreation rooms. The young men have worked well in the "No-Licence" campaign. The number of members is, I think, about 800 senior and 500 junior. Their debating club has been successful in securing the highest position amongst debating societies. They have also been successful in securing the championship in physical culture gymnastic competitions. Their football, cricket, hockey, and swimming teams all make good records. The young men are developing into splendid specimens of muscular Christianity, and set an example which might well be followed by other organisations of the same class.

The University students in Dunedin gave great assistance in the Temperance campaign, securing by their united efforts the return of a "No-Licence" candidate and a large vote for "No-Licence" in Dunedin. The "No-Licence" Annual Report to hand records a tribute to the work done by the University students, both men and women. The following passage is taken from the Report:—

" Particularly gratifying were the efforts of the University students in Dunedin, whose great gatherings, arranged and carried out by themselves, were the outstanding feature of the Southern campaign. Nor were the young women one whit behind them. From their ranks many of our most successful canvassers were obtained. A cause that can thus command the enthusiasm of so large a proportion of the best of the young men and women of the Dominion may face the future with the greatest confidence."

There appears to be much that the young [*unclear:* mern] Scotland could do to help the cause, and the example which the New Zealand young men have set should be an incentive to the young men in older lands. The Temperance cause can never flourish without the help of the women and the young people, just as the liquor traffic cannot flourish without the ruin of our boys and the degradation of our girls.

It behoves the members of an association such as the Y.M.C.A. to exert themselves to combat the evils that are incident to the liquor trade. This cannot be effectually done until the political right to vote for or against the closing of the bars has been put into the hands of the men and women of the country.

Published by THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL COUNCIL OF Y.M.C.AS. AND FELLOWSHIP UNIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS, and to be had from the GENERAL SECRETARY, National Council Office, 1 North St Andrew Street, Edinburgh. Price 1/6 per 100, or 10/-per 1000. Orders above 100, carriage paid.

The Official University Institute. Woking, England. Ex Oriente Lux. Ex Occidente Lex. New Zealand. By The [*unclear:* Sir] Robert Stout, K.C.M.G. *From the* Emperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review, *July*, 1895. Publishing Department: Oriental University Institute, Woking, England.

The Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review and *Oriental And Colonial Record*. (Founded 1886.) SECOND SERIES. July, 1895. VOL. X. No. 19.

Contents.

Publishing Department:
Oriental University Institute, Woking.
5s.net.
(*Number of pages*, 240.)
[*All Rights reserved*.

New Zealand.

BY THE HON. SIR ROBERT STOUT, K.C.M.G.

"The land of eternal spring."—John Fiske.

NEW ZEALAND was first visited in 1642 by the Dutch navigator, Abel Tasman, who, leaving Batavia to explore the Pacific, discovered Tasmania which he called Van Diemen's Land, after the then governor of the Dutch Indies. Thence, steering eastwards from Storm Bay, he sighted, after some days' sail, the Middle Island of New Zealand and called it Staaten-Land. He had anchored in Massacre Bay, in the north of the Nelson District; and as the sweep of the land there showed no outlet eastwards, he took Cook's Straits for a deep bay. Four of his crew were massacred, and he soon sailed homewards, when, after sighting and naming Cape Maria Van Diemen and staying a few days near The Three Kings, he bore away again to the north. No other navigators visited the Islands for many years; at least no other visitors have left any record, till we come to Captain Cook, who sighted the east shore of the North Island in October, 1769, and coasted all round the group. He again visited New Zealand in 1773, 1774 and 1777. Captain Vancouver, who had been with Cook in the *Resolution* in 1773, visited New Zealand in 1791 in the *Discovery* sloop-of-war, accompanied by the armed tender *Chatham*. The ships anchored in *Dusky Bay*, in the S.W. of the Middle Island, whence they went to Tahiti: in this voyage, Lieut. Broughton, who commanded the *Chatham*, discovered and named the Chatham

Islands.

Many visitors now came to New Zealand, as the group was renamed after the discovery that it was not Schooten's "Staaten-Land." Several French navigators arrived shortly after Cook's first visit; whalers from N. S. Wales and N. America coasted round its shores; a few whites quitted their vessels to reside with the natives; and the first

Reprinted from the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, July, 1895.

missionaries of a stream that has never since failed arrived in 1814.

Not till two centuries after its discovery, and only 55 years ago, was British sovereignty proclaimed over New Zealand, by Governor Hobson, on the 30th January, 1840. It remained a dependency of N. S. Wales till proclaimed a separate colony in May 1841. Its present form of Government was established in 1852 and amended in 1875.

The total area of New Zealand is 104,471 sq. miles, divided thus: N. Island 44,468; S. Island 58,525; Stewart's Island 655, Chatham Islands 375; the Bounty, Antipodes, and Kermadec Islands, 438. This area is nearly as large as Tasmania and Victoria together; and the United Kingdom exceeds it by barely 17,000 sq. miles.

Passing over the physical geography and geological formation of New Zealand, which are described in numerous works and are more or less generally known, it suffices to remark that its mountain ranges, if not very lofty are numerous; it has a mixture of various kinds of lands capable of yielding very varying productions; its lakes are many, both large and small; its coasts are plentifully indented with bays, creeks and fjords; it has an excellent river system furnishing abundant natural irrigation; traces of recent volcanic actions are evidenced by numerous extinct and several active craters, while geysers and hot mineral baths—acid, alkaline and saline, and of varying temperature—are numerous, especially near Lakes Rotorua and Taupo.

In consequence of its extending lengthwise between the 34° and 47° of S. Latitude, New Zealand has a very varying temperature, climate and produce,—from subtropical at the northern extremity to a resemblance with that of S. England (without its severe frosts) in the southern portions and in Stewart's Island. North of Auckland grow the orange, lemon, passion-fruit, olive, and even the banana; while in the southern parts are oats, wheat, barley, turnips, potatoes, stone and small fruits, etc. The north is warm and moist, the rainfall averaging 45 inches and the rain falling about 175 days. The mean summer and winter temperatures

For the two warmest and two coldest months.

are thus given: North parts, 70° and 53°; about centre of N. Island, 64.7° and 49.3°; in Wellington, 64.66° and 47.8°; in Nelson, 63.6° and 45.9°; in Christchurch 55.2° and 44.31°; in Dunedin 58.o° and 43.2°. The absolute maximum temperature was 81° in Auckland and about 90° inland. There is a good deal of moisture with the heat; and the East coasts, especially about Canterbury, have a smaller rainfall than the West. Snow never falls in the extreme north. It is generally rare; so that under 1,000 ft. above the sea it is seldom seen in the North Island, and rarely lies over a day even in the South. The winter frosts are severe; but compared with that of England, the climate is warmer and more equable. In Stewart's Island, owing to its position in the warm current from Queensland and its formation sheltering it from the prevailing south-westerly winds, plants grow in winter in the open which the frosts would kill in Canterbury. Chatham Islands form a large lagoon with a thin rim round it, and were the seat of a settlement of the Moriori, a tribe slightly different from the Maoris in appearance and language, though of the same race.

These climatic and other differences in various parts of New Zealand cause a great variety in produce. North of Auckland we have Kauri gum and timber, subtropical fruits, and some sheep and cattle;—in Auckland are gold mines, a few sheep, and a larger number of cattle, but little cereal production: it has also the great thermal region. In this thermal and pumice district only small patches are suitable for agriculture, but the rest may eventually be used for forest or even grass; and both Forestry and Viticulture have been suggested. The East side of the N. Island from East Cape to Napier was originally bushland. The limestone ranges of Hawkes Bay, from Hawkes Bay southwards, have taken grass easily and become rich sheep-regions, which, for their size, produce more wool than any other part of the Colony. In 1893, these holdings of 3,902.64 acres had on them 3,587,221 sheep and 75,693 cattle. In Wellington, too, pastoral pursuits prevail; and though some cereals are cultivated in the Wairarapa district and on parts of the west coast of Wellington, the N. Island depends mainly on its sheep, cattle, dairy produce, Kauri gum and gold.

Nelson, in the North of the Middle Island is a small farming district, raising wheat, cattle and sheep;—Marlborough has sheep and cattle and produces barley and a little wheat. On the W. coast, there is mainly mining—gold and coal—with a few cattle and sheep, but no agricultural products save small and unimportant patches in Grey valley and near Hokitika. Canterbury however is the granary of New Zealand. But for the fall in the price of wheat it would still export immense quantities. In 1893, the colony raised 8,000,000 bushels of wheat. The crops in 1894,—the smallest of the decade—were:—wheat, 4,819,695 bushels; oats, 12,153,068; barley, 724,653; hay 86,198 tons; and potatoes 126,540 tons,—of which 4,679,982 bushels of

wheat, 11,197,792 of oats, and 667,614 of barley, 47,064 tons of hay and 82,826 tons of potatoes were grown in the N. Island, and the remainder in the S. Island. The largest farming districts are Otago and Canterbury. Otago raised 1,161,672 bushels of wheat and 6,816,769 of oats; Canterbury 3,407,841 and 4,172,690 respectively. Canterbury has large numbers of sheep. Otago has more mixed farming, growing wheat and potatoes in the north, and wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, turnips in the south. It depends more on oats than on wheat; it has large flocks of sheep and herds of cattle; and in its interior are the chief gold mines. The long-woolled sheep are, in parts of the S. Island, fed on turnips or chaff in the winter; but in the N. Island little, if any, winter food is given to sheep or cattle, as grass grows nearly all the year round; while the climate all over New Zealand is so mild that nowhere do sheep or cattle need housing in winter.

New Zealand has a great variety of timber. Unfortunately, magnificent forests are ruthlessly cut down and burnt to clear the ground for grass; and the exports of this class are yet small. Kauripine, however, is now exported to Australia and England, and our Rimu or red pine and our birch—really a beech—are beginning to be used in Europe for paving purposes. These two woods, with the white pine, exist in vast forests on the S. Island,—in its extreme north, and south and its west coast. The Kauri is a splendid tree, often rising to 160 ft., with trunks of which 100 ft. are free of branches. The wood is durable, and the turpentine of this tree on the sites of the old forests furnishes the Kaurigum of commerce. The Rimu or red pine is also a fine wood, clear grained, heavy and solid, extensively used in building, flooring, *etc.*, as also for furniture, from its taking a fine polish. Harder woods—Matai or black pine and Totara—are not so common as the red and white pine.

The total gold raised till now in the Colony was 12,600,944 oz. = £49,566,878, exclusive of gold exported unknown to Government, or used locally for jewellery, *etc.* The total export of silver was 667,762 oz.; but silver mining has received little attention. About 1,500 tons of copper, 500 of antimony, and 17,296 of manganese have been exported. Mines of tin exist but are still undeveloped. The output of coal in 1894 was 691,548 tons (including brown coal and lignite), the previous output, to end of 1893, being 8,496,869 tons. The bituminous coal mines are on the west coast near Westport and Greymouth; of brown coal in Auckland, Canterbury, and Otago; and of lignite in Wellington.

The Colony has 20,230,898 sheep, 831,831 cattle, 308,812 pigs, and 211,040 horses.

Our total agricultural exports in 1893 were valued at £3,781,898, including grain, fruit crops, hay, grass, and garden and orchard produce. The total export of wool in 1894 was 144,295,154 lbs. = £4,827,016; frozen meat, 1,026,240 cwt. = £1,194,545; rabbitskins, 17,536,460 lbs. =£138,952; sheepskins, 2,534,502 =£172,294; tallow. 8,094 tons =£183,588; oats, 1,806,411 bushels =£190,094 The land under grass or crops is a good index of the work done in 50 years in New Zealand: 10,063,051 acres were under various kinds of crops in 1894; and the average yield of wheat for that year—the lowest average during many years, but still higher than in the other Australasian Colonies,—was 20.i5 bushels per acre; in 1888 it was 26.37 bushels. In 1894 the oat crop was 12,153,068 bushels—average 32.27 per acre; barley, 74,653 bushels—average 25.11; potatoes, about 125,000 tons—average about 6 tons. The gradually increasing exports of butter and cheese—in 1893, respectively 58,149 and 46,201 cwt.—promise a vast extension in the near future. The export of Kaurigum in 1893 was 8,317 tons, price £61 8s. 3d. per ton, or over £500,000. The total exports in 1894 were £9,231,047, and imports £6,788,081.

New Zealand is pre-eminently the healthiest of all the Colonies. The death-rate varied in 1888-90 from 9.43 to 9.66 per 1,000; in 1892 it was 10.06; and 10.23 in 1893. The death-rate in England is about 19 per 1,000, in Scotland 18.5, in Ireland 19, whilst in the Colony coming nearest to New Zealand for health—N. S. Wales—it is 13.25. The census of 1891 gave 70,222 persons over 50 years of age; and our population now numbers 684,765,—363,885 males and 320,880 females.

These numbers exclude the Maoris, regarding whom I add a brief statement. Their own traditions state that they came in several canoes from Hawaiki—a land the locality for which cannot now be determined. In race and language they are similar to the inhabitants of Tahiti, Samoa, the Harvey group, *etc.;* and like them they have neither the Papuan element found in the Fijis nor the Malay and Japanese elements existing in the islands north of the Line. The Maoris, who a century ago must have numbered about 200,000, are now only about 42,000, and are gradually decreasing. They are second to no uncivilized race with whom Europeans have come into contact, being brave, physically strong and intellectually apt, though, of course, unable to consider matters in an abstract form like Europeans. Some of them, who have had an English education, can speak and write English very accurately and show remarkable ability in debate. When Europeans first arrived, the Maoris, though they had small cultivations, were barely emerging from the hunters' stage of development; but now some of them have flocks of sheep and herds of cattle, while others attend to agriculture and own reaping and threshing machines of the latest American patterns. The old life, with its ancient relation of chief to people, is departing; and it remains to be seen whether they can, in the struggle for existence, exist as a separate race, or whether the Maori blood will survive in a century or two, unless mixed with that of Europeans. The Colony admitted the Maori ownership of land; and almost all that which belongs to the Crown or to Europeans has been

purchased from them. Some land was confiscated in the wars; but the Maories have had ample reserves made for them, so that none have been left landless. Intertribal war—once common—is now at an end, and the habits and life of Europeans are now partially adopted by almost all: the result on the race, time alone can unfold. Phthisis is not unknown; but if attention is paid to health, and European diseases are kept away from the Maori settlements, the race may linger on; yet I doubt if it will increase. When a superior meets an inferior civilization, despite philanthropy, the latter is doomed. Its only chance is the adoption of our customs, and that requires time. The Native schools, now maintained amongst all the tribes by the Government, are doing much, and the teaching of English helps; but progress is slow, and unfortunately the vices of civilization are often copied more than its virtues: the results are degradation and death. Among the 74 members of the House of Representatives are four Maori members, elected by the Maories: two are half-castes, one speaking English fairly well. Of the two Maories one—Hone Heke, a relative of the great Hone Heke, who fought with us in days gone by—is an excellent English scholar, an effective debater, and has the manner of an educated English gentleman. The Legislative Council has two Maori members, while in the Executive a half-caste, elected by a European constituency, is an excellent English scholar. War troubles have ceased; for though there may be riots, or disturbances, the railways and roads have rendered impossible such wars as the Colony witnessed between the forties and the seventies. If the Maories were thrifty and active, they could all, with the land now in their possession, be more comfortable than they are, and could become wealthy; but, unfortunately, they are not thrifty as a race, nor have they been trained to hard work as agriculturists: hence their future is doubtful. Many of them are ignorant of sanitary rules; and this often produces fever and other illnesses, though as a race their health is good. What makes their outlook gloomy is the fewness of births, and the lack, in many tribes, of adaptability to our customs. Lately a movement has begun, among two or three of the tribes, to stop intemperance, and to pay attention to the laws of health; but reforms work slowly even among Europeans, and we cannot expect great or immediate results among a people only emerging from barbarism.

The safety of a State, it has been said, depends on its finance. Finance has, at one time or another, troubled every Colony; and New Zealand has had, and may again have, years of anxiety about it. On the 31st March 1894, the net debt was £38,874,491, carrying an interest and Sinking Fund charge of £1,873,682. In the Session of 1894 the Parliament authorized an increase of liabilities of no less than £7,250,000, made up as follows:—A guarantee of £2,000,000 to the Bank of New Zealand, the debt to be paid off at the end of ten years;—£3,000,000 to be raised in two years for advances to country land-owners and Crown tenants;—£1,250,000, to be spent in five years at the rate of £250,000 a year, in purchasing land to be leased for settlement purposes;—£500,000 to be borrowed in two years by the issue of Consols in New Zealand at 3½ per cent.;—and £500,000, to be used at the rate of £250,000 a year, for purchasing and making roads in Native lands to be sold or let to settlers. The money to be raised by Consols has not been specifically appropriated, and it may either be used for some of the other purposes mentioned, or may take up some of the Treasury or De-ficiency Bills (similar to Exchequer Bills in England), that are ever afloat. They are practically accommodation bills drawn in advance of revenue, repaid when the revenue comes in. Oftener than once, they have been added to the permanent debt: and they show, just now, a tendency to increase. The amount outstanding on the 31st March, was in 1887, £279,100;—in 1890, £519,900;—in 1893, £699,000;—and in 1894, £811,000. The Receipts of the ordinary Fund of the Government, for the year ending 31st March 1894, were £5,497,688 17s. 7d.;—the Expenditure,. £5,207,450 11s. 2d.;—the surplus, £290,238 6s. 5d. But of the Receipts, £283,779 us. was the surplus from the previous year;—£284,500 were proceeds of Debentures issued under the Consolidated Stock Act, 1884;—£294,571 sinking funds set free;—and £16,300 10s. borrowed to pay claims under the Naval and Military Settlers and Volunteers Land Act, 1892. But for the Debentures under the Stock Acts, and the surplus from last year, the actual deficiency would have been £17,821 4s. 7d., without considering the payment of £250,000 to the Public Works Fund. This year we expect the surplus to be £150,000, or a drop of £150,000 compared with last year. Regarding our debt, we should note that it has not all been expended in wars, or on things yielding no return. We have about 2,000 miles of railway open, besides many miles more nearly ready, which gave for 1893-94 a revenue of £1,172,792 17s. 2d., with an expenditure £735,358 15s. 1d. Then we have water-races owned by the Government; millions of acres of land are leased to tenants; our buildings, telegraph cables and lines, *etc.*, have all come out of borrowed money; our 5,513 miles of telegraph connexion necessitate 13,515 miles of wire; we have fourteen telephone exchanges and ten sub-exchanges with about 4,300 subscribers. The revenue from Customs duties in 1893-94 was £1,655,502 17s. id.; from Stamps, including Postal and Telegraph receipts (being in these two last cases for services rendered), £674,647 8s. 8d. The Land Tax yielded £285,320 10s. 5d.; the Income Tax, £73,237 16s. 2d.; the Excise duty on beer brewed in the Colony, £61,807 18s. 4d. The depression existing all over the world has visited us too, and the accounts for the financial year 1894-95 will doubtless show a fall in our Customs' revenue; for the value of our imports for 1894 was £123,434 less than for 1893. Our financial outlook, if not brilliant, may, with care, be made safe. The everpresent danger is the ease with which we obtain loans from London. The time when our

loan money was expended lavishly on railways, water-races, *etc.*, has passed. We are using little borrowed money for railways. For roads and railways respectively the expenditure has been for the four past years as follows:—1890-91, railways, £179,012; roads, £71,683;—in 1891-92, railways, £154,416; roads, £109,716;—1892-93, railways, £220,894; roads, £135.339;—£1893-94, railways, £176,255; roads, £177,667. Voted for 1894-95:—Railways, £313,028;—roads, £386,505. Scarcely half the sums voted will be spent. The danger of spending borrowed money on roads is that there is no direct return, though no doubt indirectly the Country is benefited, and settlement promoted. The new financial experiment being made in lending money to settlers, will be dealt with further on, when considering what may be termed new lines of policy that have been tried in the Colony.

The Colony has all the various religions of older lands, the percentage to the populations of the leading bodies being, Anglican 40.51, Presbyterians 22:62, Catholics, 13.96, Wesleyan Methodists 10.14—the remaining 12.67 per cent, includes Baptists, Congregationalists, Methodists other than Wesleyan, Lutherans, Unitarians, Friends, Plymouth Brethren, Salvation Army, Hebrews, Buddhists, Confucians, Mormons, Freethinkers, and some who object to state their religion. The Anglican Church has six bishops, and the Catholic four; the Presbyterians are divided into two bodies—the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand having jurisdiction over all New Zealand save Otago and Southland, and the Presbyterian Church of Otago and Southland. Everywhere religious facilities are open to the people; and save that lands were in the early days granted to a few of the Churches, their support is entirely from voluntary contributions. Education is the concern of the State. The New Zealand University, founded by the State with a grant of £3,000 a year, is a purely examining institution, which grants degrees and scholarships. It has given already after examination 453 degrees in Law, Medicine and Arts. There are 1,551 enrolled matriculated students. The University has 15 junior scholarships tenable for three years, and 9 Senior Scholarships tenable for one year, besides a private Senior Scholarship. Affiliated to it, with a full Arts' course, are 3 teaching University Colleges, at Auckland, Christchurch and Dunedin, and provision has been made for a new College at Wellington. Auckland has a Music course, Canterbury an engineering and an Agricultural school, and Otago a Medical and Mines School. The examiners for degrees in Arts and for some portions of the Law and Music degrees are residents in the United Kingdom. The Auckland University College has 6 professors; the Canterbury College 10, besides the staff of the Agricultural College; the University of Otago has 9 professors, and 16 lecturers. These teaching Colleges have all been endowed by the State, as have been almost all the numerous Secondary or Grammar Schools found in all the centres of population. About 500 youths went up in 1894 from these Secondary Schools for the University entrance examinations. The Primary School system is free, compulsory and secular, supervised by an Education Department in Wellington, and managed by Education Boards and local Committees, each School District having a Committee, and being generally the seat of one school. There are 13 Education districts in the Colony, each having a Board elected by the Committees, which are themselves elected by the householders and parents. There are neither fees nor rates; and the whole expense is borne by the General Government, amounting, for 1893-94, to £440,411 9s. 5d., out of the Consolidated Fund, and from reserves and loans for School buildings. Scholarships are granted to the brighter boys to enable them to pursue their education at Secondary Schools. The Art and Technical School of Wellington has distinguished itself in competition at South Kensington, and at the Guild examinations in London; and there are Art Schools in Dunedin, Christchurch, Wanganui and Auckland. The number of children in the Primary Schools is about 125,000; and over 94 per cent, receive instruction in drawing. Directly under the control of the Education Department are between 60 and 70 Native Schools and three Industrial Schools to which the juvenile waifs and strays of our population are sent. Private Schools, maintained by the Catholics or by private persons, educate 15,000 pupils. There are 7 hospitals for the mentally deranged, entirely under State control, at Auckland, Wellington, Porirua, Nelson, Christchurch, Sea-cliff, and Hokitika, with one private Asylum near Dunedin. The Colony is divided into Hospital and Charitable Aid Districts; and Hospitals are managed by Boards elected by contributing bodies. These Boards receive from the State 20/- for every 20/- contributed out of rates, and 24/- for every 20/- given by private persons. There are 32 hospitals, with about 15,000 beds. Then there are Charitable Aid Boards who manage Orphan Asylums and Old Men's Homes, and also grant out door relief, the funds for which are raised by contributions from the local bodies in proportion to the valuation of the property in the Districts and from voluntary gifts. There are numerous Literary, Musical, Athletic, Racing, and other Societies, besides Friendly Societies, Masonic bodies, and other Altruistic organizations. We live the same social life as our race in other parts of the Globe, with perhaps more freedom from social restrictions. We have our Trade Unions, our Knights of Labour and Political organizations of various kinds; for here, as elsewhere, the problems of life are still unsolved. Criminal statistics are, certainly, no accurate test of conduct, as so much depends on the laws, and their administration; but, contrasted with other countries, our record is not unfavourable. Serious offences dealt with by superior Courts show convictions amounting to 3.50 per 10,000 of our population; and Summary convictions of all kinds before Magistrates, 2072 per 1,000: this excludes Maori

offenders. We have a strict registration system for births, deaths and marriages; and the proportion of illegitimate births per 100 births was in 1893 the highest yet recorded in the Colony—370; but this is lower than any of the Australasian Colonies except South Australia. Whatever faults we have, we are certainly a law-abiding people; and not having large cities, we no doubt escape many of the vices always prevalent when people are crowded together. We have four chief cities: Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin, and with the suburbs the population does not differ much, averaging about 40,000 each.

Our political and social experiments, are perhaps the most interesting matters of our Colony. It was settled under a system differing in many respects from that of other Colonies. Organizations—some being connected with Churches—were formed in England to colonize New Zealand. Otago was founded by the Free Church of Scotland Association; Canterbury by the Anglican Church; and Taranaki, mainly colonized by South of England people, had room for Wesleyans, while Nelson had no particular religion. These organizations brought together able men inspired with the idea of founding a new nation, and applying their rule of life to a new country. The lines on which the separate settlements were founded had, in the end, to be modified, but the original impetus in some respects still remains. The arrival of gold miners from Australia, Europe and America made great changes; and as travelling became easier the settlements lost their original distinguishing characteristics, and became more cosmopolitan. In proportion to its population—when it was under 100,000—the Colony had more able men than perhaps any other Colony; and the effect of the ability, character, and aims of the early settlers is still a precious possession. It is impossible to include in one article our political struggles; our war and peace parties; our Centralist and Provincialist parties; our Labour or Liberal party. Suffice it to say that we have felt here the great Socialistic tendencies that have reached the civilized countries of Europe. Books and pamphlets, urging social reforms, were read by us; and having a political system that enabled reforms to be made easily and quickly, we have plunged into the outer whirl of the Socialistic vortex. We have extended the State functions. We have the usual Governor, Executive Council, and two Chambers; but our second chamber is appointed by the Crown, *i.e.*, the Ministry of the day, and at present for a term of seven years; but there is no limit to its numbers, and there is generally a struggle, when an appointment has to be made, between the Governor and the Ministry.

When the people demanded extensions of State functions these were granted; but it would be a mistake to say that these have all taken place in the last few years. The most important, and perhaps eventually the most enduring, are quite 25 years old. The New Zealand Government Assurance Association, founded in 1870, is a Life Assurance and Annuity granting Association; and though there are several healthy and strong Life Assurance Companies in New Zealand it has been wonderfully successful, showing, in round numbers, insurance, £10,000,000, accumulated funds, £2,250,000, and annual income, £375,000. Other societies show about £10,000,000 insurance, so that New Zealand is the best insured State in the world. This has resulted from persistent canvassing, Life Assurance becoming popular, and from the great facilities afforded by the State for insurance. Then the Savings Banks system also has been encouraged and promoted: there are over £4,000,000 in the Government and private Savings Banks, the Government holding about £3,500,000. Another extension of State functions, instituted in 1872, was the setting up of a Public Trust Office, a Department of State that acts as Trustees, Executors and Administrators, Committees for Lunatics, etc. Under its control are estates valued at £1,500,000; and as its transactions are guaranteed by the State many have availed themselves of the security it affords.

So far these experiments may be deemed successful. But we have undertaken others. We enacted, in 1893, the political equality of the sexes for the Parliamentary franchise, the result of discussion and agitation extending over 15 years. The elections of 1893 passed quietly; but the full effect of the change cannot be judged from one election. So far no one can say that the women look less to character than men; and character is of at least as much consequence in a Parliamentarian, as ability. We have a modified local option Licensing Law, under which the Clutha Electoral District has declared for prohibition. Under the women's vote the Licensing laws will soon be reformed, and other Districts will vote no-license.

Another experiment tried, co-operative labour, is not new. Instead of letting all Government work by contract or getting it done by workmen on daily or weekly wages, the Public Works Department has let some parts of road or railway works, painting public buildings, *etc.*, at a certain price, on condition that the men who were balloted for the position formed an Association to carry out the works. Where a fair price has been assured, and under efficient inspection, the system has worked fairly well. In some instances it has not; and many practical difficulties have arisen in applying it to all work; but it has the merit of tending to raise the self-respect of the employé, and making him, in fact, a master, and not a mere servant under a Contractor. The other measures lately passed dealing with the Labour problem are,—The Shop Hours Act,—The Factories Act,—The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act,—The Workmen's Wages Act,—The Contractors and Workmen's Lien Wages Act,—The Shipping and Seamen's Act,—The Truck Act,—The Employers' Liability Act. The Shop Hours Act declares that one half week day must be set apart as a holiday by the local authorities

for all shops employing assistants. If no day is fixed the half-holiday is Saturday afternoon. In existence only 4 months, it has caused considerable friction. Some say it will prevent the employment of assistants; and as the holiday varies,—being in various places, Wednesday, or Thursday, or Saturday,—trade is interfered with. The Factories Act makes new regulations regarding hours, and the employment of women and youths, with various sanitary provisions. Its most important requirements, wherein perhaps it differs from other Factory Acts, are the following:—Every place where two or more persons are employed is declared a Factory, and liable to inspection;—no one under the age of 14 can be employed in a factory, and above that age and under 16, only on proving that he or she has passed the fourth Standard of Education;—every factory must give a half holiday in the week, and no person under 18 years of age, and no woman, except on a half holiday, shall be employed in any factory for more than 4½ hours continuously without an interval of at least half an hour for a meal;—girls under 15 cannot work as type-setters; no boy under 15 can be employed for more than 48 hours in a week, nor at any time between 6 p.m. and 7.45 a.m. No female shall be employed for more than 48 hours in a week. During the meal hour no person is to be found in a factory except in rooms that have to be specially provided for the purpose. Any manufactured work done, not in a factory but in private houses, must have a ticket or label affixed, stating that it was made in a private dwelling or unregistered workshop.

The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act was passed in 1894 to prevent strikes; but no cases have yet come under it. It provides for disputes between trade unions and employers being referred first to Boards of Conciliation. The Colony has been divided into industrial districts, each with its board; but these have not yet been formed. Half of each board is elected by the Industrial Unions of Employers, the other half by the Industrial Unions of Workmen, and there is a complicated provision for the election of a chairman by the two parties. The boards have no power except as to conciliation; if that fails the dispute may be sent to the Colony's Court of Arbitration, one of whose three members is to be appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the employers, one on the recommendation of the employées, and the third from among the Supreme Court Judges. The award of this Court is compulsory, and may be enforced like any other court award; but if it is not complied with the utmost penalty is £500. It is a most inadequate penalty; for if a strike took place on a large scale, it is clear that the losing side would sooner pay the £500 penalty than be forced to obey an award which might be ruinous to their interests. Public opinion will doubtless have a greater effect in the enforcement of the award than the £500 penalty.

The Workmen's Wages Act gives a workman certain remedies against a Contractor and his employer, and prevents the employer paying the contractor until a month after the work has been finished, thus giving the workman a chance of obtaining a judgment against the contractor and enforcing a lien on moneys coming to his employer. The Contractors and Workmen's Lien Act is framed for the same purpose, only it gives those supplying goods to building contractors similar remedies to those granted to workmen for wages. The Shipping and Seamen's Act ensures a certain number of seamen and firemen being carried in sailing and steam vessels, and also has some of the provisions advocated by Mr. Plimsoll, such as load-lines, deck cargoes, *etc.* The Truck Act insists that all wages be paid in cash and not in goods. The Employers' Liability Act is a copy of the English Statute; and the Coal Mining Act forbids the employment of women and youths in coal mines. Such in effect has been what is termed Labour Legislation in New Zealand; and it will be observed that it has not, as yet, been very alarming or very radical.

It is impossible to pronounce what the effect of this labour legislation may be. If the measures tend to raise the standard of living and increase individual thrift and self respect, the result must be beneficial; but if they promote a slavish dependence on the Government, evil will follow. That there is often a tendency amongst employers to neglect the well-being of their workers for the sake of their profits, is too true; and surely the State should look after the physical and general well-being of its citizens.

Notwithstanding what has been done in Labour Legislation, however, the problem of the unemployed still remains unsolved. Our new Labour Bureau has partially coped with the difficulty; and we have two small experimental farms to which those out of work may be sent. This Labour Department acts also as an Inspecting department under the Factories and Shops Act; and it tries, besides, to obtain work for those out of employment. Every winter, however, there are hundreds of men seeking work, and sometimes much genuine distress. No one remedy can meet the evil. Many causes have helped its growth:—the nomadic habits of the digger, the large number of men who came to the Colony when railway and other works were started, the want of thrift, the need for settling on farms those who were engaged in mining and in public works, the slow rise of manufactures in every new country, and the easy mode of transit and the habit of travelling common in all the colonies, have all tended to swell the ranks of the unemployed; and render difficult the solution of the problem. The other experiments sanctioned in 1894 may be termed Land Law Legislation. Under one, the Government can purchase compulsorily estates exceeding 1,000 acres of first class land or 2,000 acres of second class land or over 500 acres if near one of the four large cities. The proprietors may, at will, reserve the areas just mentioned or compel the Government to purchase the estate as a whole. The full value of the Land is to be paid,

and if this cannot be agreed upon otherwise it has to be fixed by a Court consisting of a Supreme Court Judge and two Assessors. The practical result is that owners of more than 1,000 acres of agricultural land hold the surplus quantity at the will of the Government, without security of tenure. Land has fallen in value, and proprietors of large estates, especially if mortgaged, have been anxious to sell. So far only one estate has been compulsorily purchased; but the Act has certainly caused unrest and loss of confidence amongst land-owners. The lands to be taken are to be leased at a rental on a 5 % basis on cost, but whether these rents will be paid remains to be proved. On some of the estates already the cry is for a reduction of rents, and this means, if yielded to, increasing the burdens of the Colony.

In 1890 the system of direct taxation was changed. Till then, every kind of property, subject to a £500 exemption, was taxed at its saleable value. The new scheme was to tax land, *minus* the improvements, at its selling value; to exempt all personal property from taxation; and to have a graduated tax on land, and a graduated income tax. The graduation on land was increased in 1893. The taxes are:—

The ordinary Land tax is id. per pound, on all land over £500 in value, less improvements.

Where the value is £5,000 and less than £10,000 1/8d. extra.

This is certainly a high rate. It may be assumed that at present prices, the interest earned on £210,500 worth of land (without counting the improvements) will not exceed 5 %, giving a net income of £10,525. On this the Land Tax would be £2,625, or 25 %. Add the additional local rates perhaps amounting to another penny, and, if the owner is resident out of the Colony, the Absentee tax of 20% besides the Graduated Tax. This Tax on its imposition was called a "bursting up tax," and perhaps its incidence has enabled the Government to purchase large estates without relying upon the compulsory powers of this statute.

The income Tax is 6d. in the £ on all incomes over £300 and up to £ 1,000, and 1s. on all taxable incomes over £1,000.

The other Agrarian Law is that of advances to Settlers. The Government has authority to borrow £3,000,000 in two annual instalments, to lend to settlers, who must be country settlers and freeholders or Crown tenants. The maximum loan to any one person or Company is £2,500, and it must not exceed 3/5 the value of the land in case of freeholds; and ½ the value of improvements in case of leaseholds. The interest is 6% per annum, but of this amount 1% is a sinking fund, so that after 73 payments the loan is redeemed. The moneys are to be borrowed at 3½%, and it is thought that the 1½% margin will cover probable losses and pay the expense of the Department. Such a financial scheme needs years to test its economic soundness.

As the effect of the graduated tax and the Land and Settlement Act has necessarily been to lower the value of large holdings, so this scheme of lending money lowers interests, which again will lessen the profits of the Life Assurance Department and may mean a recasting of the rates. The effect on farmers remains to be seen. Professor Gide in his Social Economy does not seem to think that encouraging mortgages has been beneficial to the peasantry of France.

Such, however, are some of our social experiments. Their effect may not be seen in our life time; but whatever the result of these and other laws, New Zealand is eminently fitted for the breeding of what is called the Anglo-Saxon people. It lacks the summer heats of Australia and the United States; it has no cold winters; and the climate has been termed by an American, "an eternal spring,"—a phrase that characterizes it very well, yet it lacks the continuity of a Continental climate. Our future who can predict? We are still drawn by cords of Home associations to the Motherland. Her literature is our literature; and though the papers and journals of the United States are extensively read, our feelings are British. Whether the loose Confederation that now exists will bear the strain of war, or whether the future will see an English-Speaking Federation that will weld England, America and Australasia into one in heart and one in aim—the uplifting of humanity—who can tell?

For us in the Colonies, our task is clear. It is to do what our hands find to do, to promote civilization as best we can, hoping and believing that in the future, peace will triumph and a peaceful federation take the place of hostile nations.

Notes on the Progress of New Zealand For Twenty Years, 1864-1884. By the Hon. Robert Stout, Premier of the Colony. Wellington: George Didsbury, Government Printer. 1886.

Notes on the Progress of New Zealand for Twenty Years.

THE natural development of the colonies has often engaged the attention of statisticians. There is some difficulty in so grouping the statistics as to show, not merely the growth of the colony, hut the lines along which it has progressed. I propose to show the increase in population, in wealth, and in well-being of New Zealand, and also to point out how colonization has advanced in these Islands. Twenty years is a fair period to take for

purposes of comparison and contrast. It is especially suitable in the case of New Zealand, as, twenty years ago, the gold fever had begun to cool, and colonists were looking for other sources than gold-mines for the production of wealth.

It would be out of place to sketch the earlier progress of the colony, but it may be here briefly stated that New Zealand has passed through what might be termed distinct economic eras. In the earliest days it was looked upon as the scat of the whale-fishery in the Pacific, and in its harbours were to be found whalers from America, from Tasmania, from New South Wales, and from England, all prosecuting their calling. Shortly after the whale-fishing came pushing traders, who bartered [*unclear:* go] with the Maoris, and usually looked upon Sydney as their head-quarters. Then there were in these periods the planting of missions, and the beginning by the Maoris of a rude form of agriculture. The next economic era saw New Zealand, from the small settlements that had been founded by the New Zealand Company and various associations, rapidly produce agricultural products, aided in this by the Maoris in various districts. These products were sold at high rates to the new goldfields of Victoria; and these goldfields did more for the early development of New Zealand than is usually credited, especially when the distance between Australia and New Zealand is remembered—more than a thousand miles.

Pastoral pursuits also became of importance. At the same time as the goldfields of Victoria were started, enterprising colonists from Australia visited New Zealand, and took up large areas of waste lands of the Crown, mostly in the South Island, for pastoral purposes. This might fairly be termed the pastoral era.

Then came the opening of the goldfields in Otago in 1861. A vast population was soon attracted to that district; and, just as the population increased, so the exports of wheat, oats, and potatoes, that had been large in the years 1853—60, suddenly ceased. There was, in fact, a home consumption for everything that could be raised. Nay, more; New Zealand had to depend upon foreign countries for her food-supplies. From South America, Chili particularly, and from South Australia, she drew her wheat and flour. Butter and cheese and hams she had to obtain from England and Ireland. After 1864 agricultural produce began more rapidly to develop; and for some years past we have entered, and are still entering, on manufacturing enterprises. Not that our pastoral or agricultural pursuits have decreased; on the contrary, they have largely increased; but along with their increase we are slowly building up a considerable number of manufacturing industries.

I propose to view the progress that New Zealand has made, under the following heads:—

- To deal with population, including under that head the location, the education, the birthplaces, the religions, the crime, and the morals of the people. Under the education of the people, it may also be well to notice those things that go to make up the social and intellectual wellbeing of the people—libraries, museums, &c.
- Trade and shipping development.
- The mineral development.
- Pastoral development.
- Agricultural development.
- Manufactures.
- The increase of wealth, advance in credit, and general material advancement.
- Probable future developments.

I. Population, Etc.

To begin first with the population, New Zealand had a population, at the end of 1864, of 184,131 persons, not including those of the Native race; but of that number 9,136 were officers and men on military service. We have now practically no army, such as existed in 1864. The Native difficulty does not now, as it then did, loom largely in the public mind. We have, it is true, a police force for the colony, but it only numbers 238 armed constabulary and 490 police. While for the defence of our ports from foreign aggression we have as a nucleus for the Volunteer movement the following number of artillerymen at each port: Auckland, 26; Wellington, 27; Lyttelton, 27; Dunedin, 26: making a total of 106. We do not need officers and men to fight the Maoris now, and, so far as foreign aggression is concerned, we have of thoroughly drilled Volunteers no less a number than 10,110, made up as follows: Adults, 8,530; cadets, 1,580; whilst there are many of our population who have been drilled, hut who are not enrolled in any permanent Volunteer corps. The total population at the end of 1884, exclusive of Maoris, was estimated to be 564,304 persons, of whom 306,667 are males and 257,637 females. Perhaps there are now in the colony about 45,000 Maoris. It was estimated that in 1881 there were 44,097 Maoris, but it is impossible to state at present their exact number. Amongst our population, however, we have people from all parts of the world. Of coloured races the largest number, outside the Maoris, belongs to the Chinese empire. At the last census, in 1881, we had no less than 5,033 Chinese. But, if we take the

birthplaces of the settlers in the colony, it will be seen that those born in New Zealand now number considerably more relatively than they did in 1864. In 1881 45.60 per cent, of the people were born in New Zealand, and as the population of the colony increases the percentage of native New Zealanders will soon show a higher percentage. The following were the nationalities for the years 1864 and 1881 respectively:—

As to the religions of the people, the census of 1881 gave the following: and, relatively, there will not be much change—namely, 41.50 per cent. Church of England, 24.09 Presbyterian, including under the head of Presbyterian the various Presbyterian organizations. In New Zealand there are two main Presbyterian bodies, what is called the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, and the Presbyterian Church of Otago and Southland. One does not interfere with the territorial jurisdiction of the other, and they are managed by distinct Church Courts. Of Wesleyans there are 9 52 per cent. The following statement will show the religions in the years 1864 and 1881 respectively:—

There can hardly be said to be any place noted for a particular religious belief. The original constitution of Canterbury was Anglican; of Otago and Southland, Presbyterian; and of New Plymouth, Nonconformist: but that has been altered by the subsequent colonization of the country. There is, however, a larger proportion of Presbyterians in Otago and Southland than in any other part of the colony, and in Canterbury perhaps there is a larger proportion of Anglicans.

In 1884 there were 730 clergymen licensed to marry, and here it may be mentioned that every clergyman is licensed to marry on application by the head of his church or by twenty-four of his people to the Registrar-General. The number licensed to marry in 1861 was 247.

The test of the popularity of the churches can hardly be determined by the number of marriages performed by the clergymen. The Anglican Church still insists upon marriages being in the church, and so does the Roman Catholic, while the Presbyterian body allow their clergymen to perform the marriage ceremony in private houses. Marriages are also performed by Registrars, and these have, in late years, greatly increased. It may be noted that in 1864 and 1884 respectively the marriages performed by the various clergymen and Registrars were as follows:—

Still, dealing with the population of the colony, it may be well to notice the birth-, death-, and marriagerates, which, for the two years 1864 and 1884, were as follows:—

The marriagerate is the lowest in all the Australasian Colonies. In the other colonies the rates were as follows for 1884:—

The deaths recorded were 5,740, the rate being 10.39 per 1,000 of the mean population. Only once in the twenty years has the rate been so low—viz., 10.13 per 1,000 in 1871. The rate in 1864 was 17; and it has been during the last twenty years as follows:—

The deathrate in New Zealand is considerably below that of the other Australasian Colonies, and much lower than in England, the rates for the last eight years being as follows:—

The occupations of the population show the different avenues in which people are now seeking employment:—

I now come to the education of the people, and that may he tested in two or three ways. In arriving at the education of the people by an enumeration of those who are returned as able to read, or to read and write, we are apt to be misled by the statistics. First, the ages of the population have to be considered. It is impossible to make a correct comparison, as the census returns of 1864 and 1881 were differently calculated. According to the census returns of 1864 and 1881 the following were the proportions per cent, of the population:—

If the ages were tabulated—if those under and over fifteen were taken in the two years—the proportions would be:—

The reason why there was such a high percentage of those who could read and write in 1864 was the large number of adults in the colony, mainly attracted by the gold discoveries. This also accounts for the then vast preponderance of males over females. Excluding military and their families—which consisted of officers and men 9,136, male children 933, women 1,026, and female children 880—there were,—

This state of things has been greatly changed during twenty years. The family-life has grown, and the numbers of young people relatively to old have increased, as the following table will show:—

The most satisfactory thing in the statistics is the fact recorded that our young people are more advanced than their elders in education. This will be seen when it is stated that, of persons between 15 and 20 years of age, 97.48 per cent. were able to both read and write. After 20 years of age there is a slight decrease. Between 20 and 25 it was 96.75, and so on:—

The test by the number of those who married and were able to sign the register can be seen by the following proportions in every 100 marriages of those who signed by marks:—

It will be noticed that there has been a gradual decrease of those who cannot write their names in the marriage register.

In 1864 the colony was divided into provinces, and each province had the management of its own

educational affairs, without any interference or assistance from the General Government. In 1875 the provinces were abolished, and a general Education Act passed in the year 1877. We have had since then one system applicable to the whole of the colony. We have thirteen Education Boards, which have the general management of education in their districts; and for each school district there is a School Committee, elected annually by householders and parents of children. There is rarely more than one school in each district. The Committees take considerable interest in the educational affairs of their own districts. The Boards are elected by the School Committees. Each Board consists of nine members, and three retire annually.

In 1864, though a good deal had been done for education, matters were not, relatively to the population, so far advanced as they are now. As far as I can ascertain the attendance at the schools in 1864 was as follows:—

The total expenditure on education was as follows:—

These amounts did not include school fees, nor, in Otago, the school rates: the sums are merely the votes and expenditure out of the general provincial revenue.

The provision for secondary education, even so far hack as 1864, had been, considering the age of the colony, considerable. There was a college at Nelson, a college and grammar school in Canterbury, and a high school at Dunedin, and some good private secondary schools in other parts of the colony. There are now in New Zealand the following secondary schools, viz.: Auckland College and Grammar School, Auckland Girls' High School, Thames High School (for boys and girls), New Plymouth High School (for boys and girls), Wanganui Endowed School, Wellington College, Wellington Girls' High School, Napier Boys' High School, Napier Girls' High School, Nelson College, Nelson Girls' College, Christ's College Grammar School, Christchurch; Christchurch Boys' High School, Christchurch Girls' High School, Rangiora High School (for boys and girls), Akaroa High School (for boys and girls), Ashburton High School (for boys and girls), Timaru High School (for boys and girls), Waitaki High School, Otago Boys' High School, Otago Girls' High School, Southland Boys' High School, and Southland Girls' High School. All these are in full operation.

We have now also a New Zealand University, which is purely an examining body; it confers degrees, but it has no teachers in its employment. The teaching part of the University work is done by affiliated institutions. At present they are as follows: The Otago University at Dunedin, the Canterbury College in Christchurch, the Auckland Uni- versity College in Auckland, the Nelson College at Nelson, and St. John's College, Auckland.

The expenditure on University education in 1884 was £26,815. The number of students was 499.

The expenditure on secondary education was £71,517: the attendance being—roll number, 2,577; daily average, 2,351.

The expenditure on primary education was £363,316, inclusive of £49,679 on buildings: the attendance being—roll number, 96,840; daily average, 75,391.

The morals of the people are usually tested in the following ways: (1) By the amount of police protection they require; (2) by the criminals sentenced in the Courts; and (3) by the number of illegitimate births. In 1864 the police force also was under the control of the Provincial Executives; the number in proportion to the population was about one policeman to every 462 persons. In 1884 the number of civil police was only 490, or taken along with the armed constabulary, including the artillerymen, the total number was 834. Compared with the other colonies, where there has been no Native trouble, New Zealand stands well, as will be seen from the following:—

The other test is the number of offenders found guilty in the Courts. Crimes may be classed under two heads: what may be termed petty offences, and grave offences—offences dealt with by Magistrates and by the Supreme Court. A Magistrate can only deal with simple assaults and petty larcenies, breaches of by-laws, and other mere police offences; whilst the Supreme Court deals with graver questions of theft, and all the higher crimes, felonies, and misdemeanours. Taking the statistics of the two years, it will be seen that in 1864 the total number of convictions (exclusive of Maoris) in Magistrates' Courts was 11,357, being at the rate of 65.95 per 1,000 of population, whilst in 1884 it was 17,068 or 31.98 per 1,000 of the mean population, showing that, though our population has increased, our crime has greatly decreased. Of these, the convictions for drunkenness amounted to 6,527; but it is to be observed that, if one person is convicted five, six, or a dozen times, each conviction is counted as if it had been a separate offender, and therefore the proportion of persons convicted to the population cannot be given, but only the proportion of convictions—viz., 11.81 to 1,000 of population for drunkenness. The convictions before the superior Courts in 1866 were 282, and 1884 219, or 0.39 per 1,000.

There has been a gradual decrease in the number of offences against the person. There were only 871 in 1884, the proportion being 1.57 per 1,000 of population. The proportion of offences against property in 1884 was 2.14 per thousand of population.

Including offences dealt with summarily, and also in the higher Courts, compared with the other colonies New Zealand stands the lowest in the criminal record, being, for offences against the person and against property, 3.71 per 1,000, whilst in Victoria there were 3.86; South Australia, 4.05; Tasmania, 6.98; Queensland, 7.80; and in New South Wales, 10.67. In juvenile crime New Zealand is also exceedingly low, and no doubt

that has been caused by the elaboration of the industrial-school system, which has been permanently adopted in New Zealand. The Government has industrial-school institutions directly under its control in Auckland (at Newton and Kohimarama, treated as one school), at Burnham in Canterbury, and at Caversham in Otago. In connection with these three institutions there were the following children at the close of 1884: Resident in the schools, 432; boarded with foster-parents, 384: making a total of 816 maintained at the expense of the State. There were also 347 children at service or with friends, although still under the legal protection of the managers of the schools. There is also an industrial school and orphanage at the Thames, supported by the Government, but under the management of a local Committee, in connection with which there were at the end of the year 1884 seventeen committed children, five of whom were at service or with friends. There are also what may be termed private institutions to which children are sent, for whom the Government pays, as a rule, about 7s. per week, these are: St. Mary's School in Auckland, St. Joseph's in Wellington, and St. Mary's in Nelson. These institutions are Roman Catholic.

The children committed under the industrial-school system are of three classes: Children who themselves have done wrong, children who were in destitute circumstances, or whose parents have either done wrong or neglected them. The total number committed under the Act in 1884 was 313, who may be classified as follows: Destitute, 195; vagrant, 11; residing in disreputable houses, 23; uncontrollable, 27; guilty of punishable offences, 37; committed by agreement with the parents, 20.

It may also be noticed that, though crime has decreased, a great number of those who are in our gaols are what may be termed "habitual criminals" or "habitual drunkards." In 1884 there were 483 males and 81 females who had been once convicted, 282 males and 65 females who had been twice convicted, and 720 males and 579 females who had been convicted three or more times. The birthplaces of the prisoners were as follows:—

The low percentage of the New Zealand born population is, no doubt, partially accounted for by the fact of all the young children having been born in the colony. At the same time it is believed that the people in the colony are, compared with the people born elsewhere, less criminal. This, no doubt, may be accounted for by education, by surroundings, and by greater material comfort. As to illegitimacy—the third test that is applied to the morals of a community—the following are the statistics: The number of illegitimate births registered in 1884 was 587, or 2.96 of every hundred births. In 1873, which is the earliest date of which there is any reliable record, the proportion was 1.416. As compared with the other colonies New Zealand stands well, as will be seen from the following statement of illegitimate births in the Australasian Colonies for the last ten years per 100 births:—

There seems, however, to be an increase of illegitimate births in New Zealand as the colony grows older, and as the population gets more dense in the larger towns.

The religions of the prisoners for the year 1884 were as follows:—

It will be necessary now to note the provision that has been made during the past twenty years for those things that tend to increase the happiness of the people—providing for their social enjoyment and intellectual life. We have libraries in every village. In Auckland there are a museum and a public library, as well as an art gallery. Wellington has a large library, a very fine museum, and a library of scientific works connected with the Scientific Institute. In Christchurch there is a magnificent museum—better, indeed, than either the one in Melbourne or in Sydney. It has also a large public library. In Dunedin there are a very fine museum and an art society, which holds exhibitions of pictures once a year. Art societies are formed also in Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch, There are a University library, an Otago Institute library, principally for scientific works, and a large athenaeum library—all in Dunedin. Invercargill has a handsome athenaeum building. A test of the desire for information amongst colonists may be obtained by a comparison of the newspapers published in New Zealand, and the books and literature imported, as well as the newspapers posted. The value of books imported in 1884 was £115,246. This does not include magazines, newspapers, &c., and books coming by post. Then, the number of newspapers published was 49 daily and 91 weekly, bi-weekly, and tri-weekly, and 32 others, making a total of 172, or one to every 3,281 of the population. In England and Wales the number was 1,962 newspapers, or 1 to every 13,828; in Ireland, 152 newspapers, or I to every 32,585; in Scotland, 184 newspapers, or 1 to every 21,013; and in the United States, 10,771 newspapers, or 1 to every 4,056 of the population. There are theatres in every town, also concert halls, musical societies, and debating societies, and the New Zealand Institute—an institute founded for scientific purposes—has no less than eight branches. A handsome volume is published every year giving the researches of the members, and its pages show that great attention is paid to the natural history of the colony. In 1864, though there were the nuclei of libraries, there had been little development in that direction, nor were there any museums in existence; and the New Zealand Institute was only incorporated by Act in 1867.

II. Trade and Shipping.

The trade of the colony has undergone many changes in twenty years. The character of the shipping has been entirely altered. Up to 1864 our goods were brought to us from England mainly in wooden ships, and these took our produce from the colony to other countries. It is true that there were steamers running between Melbourne and the colony, and occasionally from Sydney, but these were small compared with the steamers now performing the passage. After 1864 iron ships began to be numerons. But now we have direct steam communication with England, two services of most magnificent vessels, comprising the following,: "Ionic," 4,753 tons; "Coptic," 4,367 tons; "Doric," 4,744 tons; "Tainui," 5,200 tons; and "Arawa," 5,200 tons, belonging to the Shaw, Savill, and Albion Company: and the "Rimutaka," 4,474 tons; "Ruapehu," 4,163 tons; "Kaikoura," 4,474 tons; "Tongariro," 4,163 tons; and "Aorangi," 4,163 tons, belonging to the New Zealand Shipping Company. There is a fine mail service to America by the San Francisco route; the steamers leave the colony once every month and arrive once a month, calling on their way at Honolulu.

The number of ships and tonnage do not seem to have so largely increased, considering our exports and other trade; but, of course, that may be partially accounted for by the fact that the steamers are larger, and make more rapid voyages. The shipping in 1864 was the following:—

In 1884 the number of ships entered inwards was 852 vessels, of 529,188 tons, made up as follows:—

The shipping outwards consisted of 872 vessels, of 534.2-42 tons. viz.:—

One thing these tables show is that our English ships had, after landing their goods, to go to Australia, "to Guam," to South America, or elsewhere, seeking freight; now our exports are so near our imports that we can send our vessels away loaded and not in ballast.

In 1864 the imports amounted to £7,000,655; in 1884 to £7,663,888.

In 1864 the exports amounted to £3,401,667; and in 1884, £7,091,667.

It may be well to give a table showing the exports and imports during the last twenty years, and earlier (see table in Appendix No. 1).

It will be observed that the imports have not increased so largely as might have been expected; but this can easily be explained: First, local manufactures have wonderfully increased; and, second, the price of commodities imported has fallen. For £1 we obtain now in clothing what must have cost us £1 10s. in 1864; and other goods have similiarly fallen in value.

The increase of our imports and exports will be seen by a diagram (see Appendix No. 3), which has been prepared by Mr. W. N. Blair, Assistant-Engineer-in-Chief of the colony. One observation may be made on the diagram. The imports show a great variation, jumping up to high figures after the discovery of gold and after the beginning of our railway-making in 1870. Our exports have gradually, almost uniformly, increased since 1854, showing few jumps if the value of gold is excluded.

I intend further on to speak of the development of the manufacturing industries. Bearing on this question, it is interesting to note how the population has increased, especially about the larger centres, since 1864. This, of itself, is sufficient to show the development of manufacturing enterprise. Of the maps (see Appendix No. 4, A and B). A shows the present location of the population, whilst that in 1864 is shown on map B. The maps also show the density of the population, exclusive of Maoris, in 1881.

The countries with which New Zealand is doing trade appear from the following figures, which show the total value of the imports in 1864 and 1884 respectively:—

This table points out that for a considerable time after the gold rush we depended in no small degree on Australian merchants. Now we import directly, and only get from Australia her own products, and small quantities of British merchandise.

III. Mineral Development.

In 1864 but little attention had been paid to the development of any mineral save gold and brown coal. Coppermining had been tried, but with little practical result. The goldfields are not producing now so much as they did in previous years. There are many reasons to account for this. There is no doubt that the richer alluvial fields—the shallow alluvial workings—have been worked out, or at all events cannot sustain so large a population as in former years; secondly, the development of public works and of agriculture has drawn a great many persons who obtained a precarious livelihood in mining for gold to other pursuits giving a more certain wage; and, further, it requires considerable capital now to develop many of the gold-mines, and that can only be done when the population is considerably larger. The returns from all the gold-mines since the opening are as follows: 10,724,850oz., at a value of £42,368,192, and the amount exported during the year, 1884, was £988,953, showing a slight upward tendency from 1883, when the amount was £892,445; and at the present moment it seems as if there was considerable chance of further developments in mining enterprises. Many of the mines thought to have been exhausted are now being worked and returning handsome profits. In the North

Island, especially in the Maori country, we may expect that there will be discoveries of gold.

Attention has also been paid to a kind of mining different to that which existed in 1864. Up to that time mining had been entirely alluvial, and generally in shallow workings; now there are large sluicing claims and considerable quartz-mining. There is also an improved method of separating gold from pyrites, and obtaining better results from quartz by various processes—such as smelting, &c. The number of quartz-mines in 1884 was, approximately, 200.

The production of copper, had it not been for its great fall in price, would no doubt have been considerable; but, even with the fall that has taken place, attention is being paid in one or two districts to copper-mining. The utilization of the large quantities of iron-sand in the colony has been often tried, and is still in process of experimentation. The main development during the past twenty years has been in the production of coal. New Zealand is peculiarly situated in reference to coal; there is hardly a district in the colony which has not brown coalmines. Indeed, beginning at the ranges west of Christchurch and going to the Bluff, you can scarcely travel twenty miles without finding a brown coal-mine: the brown coal is distributed over such a large area of the South Island. In the Provincial District of Auckland, too, from the Bay of Islands down to the Waikato, there are large deposits of brown coal, some of a very superior quality; and these have been and are being worked. In the Mokau River there is a large coal deposit, and coal has been reported from the Wanganui River. The produce of the coal-mines in 1864 was, approximately, 10,000 tons, but it has gradually mounted up to 480,831 tons in 1884, as will be seen from the following statement showing the amount produced each year for the last seven years:—

On the west coast of the Middle Island there are enormous deposits, thousands of acres of carboniferous land, with seams of more than twenty feet in depth, of the finest steam coal in the world. There is also magnificent gas coal at Greymouth. The area of the coalfields of Westport and Grey may be said to amount to 129,000 acres; and, as the great drawback hitherto has been the want of proper harbour accommodation for vessels to take away the coal, provision has been made for the construction of two harbours—one at Westport and one at Grey—to provide accommodation for steam colliers. These harbours are being constructed in accordance with the plans of Sir John Coode, and, so far as their construction has proceeded, there seems every chance of a considerable depth of water being obtained. One harbour is at the mouth of a large river—the Buller—and the other at the mouth of the Grey River. The production of true coal has largely increased; it amounted to 418,101 tons in 1884. At the same time, New Zealand, owing to the intercolonial steamers having to take return freight from Sydney, and doing it at a cheap rate, largely imports coal from Newcastle, New South Wales. Newcastle coal, however, cannot compare with the Westport or Grey Valley coal, and does not fetch such high prices, the retail prices being—Newcastle coal, on an average, about 32s. to 35s. a ton; Westport coal, 34s. to 36s. a ton; and Grey Valley coal, 33s. to 36s. 6d. a ton.

There is also great probability that attention will be paid to other mineral developments in New Zealand—viz., silver, shale, copper, tin, and other minerals. The region of Collingwood, in the north-west of Nelson, and the whole region of Westland, and the west part of Otago, west of Wakatipu, may be termed mineral regions, which, through their inaccessibility, and being mainly timberlands, can hardly be said to have been prospected, and the Thames and Te Aroha Districts in Auckland are mineral, with gold, silver, and lead in abundance.

II. Pastoral Development.

I now come to the pastoral development. It has been mentioned that this cannot now be termed the pastoral era of New Zealand, and yet New Zealand largely depends upon its pastoral productions. In 1864 the total amount of wool exported was 16,691,666lbs., while in 1884 there were 81,139,028lbs. exported. The number of sheep has increased from 4,937,273 to 14,056,266; the number of cattle from 249,760 to 700,000; the number of horses from 49,409 to 170,000; and the number of pigs from 61,276 to over 200,000. There has been a great change also in reference to the mode of dealing with pastoral pursuits. Before 1864 pastoral tenants were mainly leaseholders, paying a varying rent, according to their tenure and situation in the colony, for the permission to graze their sheep on Crown lands. There are still millions of acres held on pastoral tenure, there being 11,384,603 acres. But sheep and cattle are now fed on freehold land, and this especially in the Districts of Canterbury, Hawke's Bay, and Wellington. In Otago there are more sheep fed on Crown lands than on freehold lands. But there has grown up, in connection with pastoral as well as with agricultural pursuits, the export of frozen meat, and that has encouraged the rearing of sheep on freehold lands that were formerly occupied for grain-raising. The agricultural development is closely connected with the pastoral.

V. Agricultural Development.

The agricultural development may be tested in two ways: (1) by the area of land alienated from the Crown; and (2) by the area brought under cultivation. The area of land alienated in 1864 was 7,759,954 acres; in 1884 the area alienated, from the foundation of the colony, was 17,692,511 acres. The area of land under cultivation in 1864 was only 382,655 acres, which included under crop 110,532 acres, and in sown grasses 272,123 acres; whilst in 1884 there were no less than 6,391,075 acres under crop and sown grasses—viz., 1,132,211 acres under crop and 5,258,834 acres in grass.

Then it may be tested by its products. In 1864 we exported almost no agricultural products, and we imported, as has been stated before, much of our food-supplies; but in 1884 we exported 2,706,775 bushels of wheat, valued at £436,728; 128,450 bushels of barley, at a value of £25,138; 51,311 bushels of malt, valued at £14,665; and 2,474,613 bushels of oats, at a value of £267,286. We also exported £33,324 worth of flour, £53,536 worth of potatoes, and 254,069cwt. of frozen meat, at a value of £345,090. The value of hides exported in 1864 was £11,972; in 1884, £38,199. In 1864 £1,865 worth of tallow was exported, as against £234,829 in 1884. During the last year, through the fall in the price of wheat and the export of frozen meat, the export of grain has somewhat decreased, as will be seen from the following:—

Agriculture is now seeking other outlets: orchards are being planted, tobacco is now produced, and linseed is grown.

Treating the forests as a branch of agriculture, it may be noted that the export of timber has largely increased, as the following table, giving the value of the timber exported, will show:—

A Forest Department has just been started, and attention is to be directed to the conserving and properly utilizing of the existing forests, and to the creating of new forests. The area of forest lands is about 20,000,000 acres; and of this area about 9,000,000 acres contain useful timber trees.

A large amount of planting has been done, and 5,804 acres planted have been subsidized or aided by Government; and, in addition to this, in the Lake and Maniototo Counties large quantities of trees are raised for distribution in the treeless districts of Otago. There have been almost no manufactures of forest products, save timber-ware; a little charcoal has been produced, but it is so small as not worth recording. The same danger that has threatened other countries in the treatment of the forests has been felt in New Zealand. Valuable forests necessary for the maintenance of an equable climate have been destroyed to make way for the farmer or stock-raiser. It is hoped that the evils that have resulted in other countries from such a course of procedure will be sufficient to ensure attention being paid to tree-planting, and to make forest preservation more-popular in the colony than it has yet been.

VI. Manufactures.

The manufactures that are first started in a colony are those that are immediately necessary to the colonist in his new surroundings. The bush saw-pit and the blacksmith's forge are the pioneer industries: these are necessary for his house and for the settlement. After them come industries dependent on natural products, which are not so easily obtainable from foreign countries. Soap-boiling from tallow comes early; and after a few years the brewery, even when the malt has to be imported; then tanning leather from hides; but not till a long time after the tannery does the boot factory appear, and the stearine-candle works are quite recent. As New Zealand has magnificent timber, one would expect to find woodware factories early. In reality, however, the cheap timber of America, and even lumber from Norway and the Baltic, were importod up to a late period. At the present time local timbers are being so much utilized that there is little timber imported, and that which we receive is mainly the harder woods of Australia. Fur- niture, however, of the finer kinds has been and is still being imported. The common or coarser kinds were made early, but even for these we depended upon America. In late years furniture factories have attained a high state of excellence, and there are now manufactured in the colony drawing-room suites that would not disgrace London or Paris. Shipbuilding was an early industry; small schooners were built in almost the pre-colonial days, and still a few wooden vessels are built; but we have had a new kind of shipbuilding—iron and steel shipbuilding are now amongst our industries, and there have been built in the colony several steamers—namely, a total of thirty-one vessels, with a gross tonnage of 3,153, and horse-power 909. This includes one or two steamers framed at Home and put together in the colony. The making of engines too has become established. We have patents even for water-engines invented in the colony; and we have now in all the chief towns foundries, and boilermakers and mechanical engineers engaged in these works. Some months ago a contract was let for the making of locomotives for our railways.

In 1864, notwithstanding that agriculture had made material progress, hardly any agricultural implements were manufactured; even carts were imported; now, New Zealand is an exporter of agricultural implements; her ploughs and harrows are sent to Australia, and the following, amongst other articles, are manufactured in the colony—viz., ploughs, chaff-cutters, grass-mowers, winnowing machines, disc-harrows, drills, reaper and binders, horsepowers, corn-crushers, horse-hoes, scrub-cutters, grass-seed threshers, cream-separators, churns, &c. Various woollen factories have been established in the colony; there are now no less than six in actual operation; these have all been founded within recent years. The amount of wool manufactured in 1884 was about l,600,000lbs., and agencies are now being established to push the sale of the manufactured tweeds in Australia, and small orders have even been sent to Europe. Other woollen factories are about to start, two being near completion. As the habits of the colonists become more luxurious the manufacture of carriages becomes extensive. Carriages of all kinds are now made in the colony, and some of them are made almost entirely from colonial timber, of which various kinds are very suitable.

I have mentioned that a tannery is an early industry in a colony; we still, however, have to import the finer kinds of leather, and a considerable quantity of ladies' and children's shoes. The imports of leather, boots, shoes, and saddlery in 1864 amounted to £244,727; in 1884, to £251,267. But we can show now an export of leather, which amounted to £37,227 in 1884; there was no leather exported in 1864. Boot factories are now large and extensive, and an industry which has sprung up along with them is the manufacture of the machinery necessary for conducting a boot factory. Saddlery is now made all through the colony, though still a considerable quantity is imported.

Gas is required for lighting our towns, and, following the manufacture of gas, we have had manufactories established for the making of gas-, lead-, and composition-pipes, gas chandeliers, and all kinds of gas fittings. We have several firms also who make all kinds of brass-work, work needed for breweries, distilleries, and other purposes; and these turn out brass-work equal to any that can be imported.

Of recent years some attention has been paid to the export of meat and fish in a preserved state; several companies have been started for this purpose, and it is expected that this year the export of canned fish will be considerable, although still large quantities are imported from America. The export of tinned meat has increased; and, no doubt, with the development of orchards the export of preserved fruit will be soon noted in our Customs returns. Some attention has been paid to the planting of olives and oranges, and in the north of Auckland there will be a considerable amount of tropical and subtropical fruits produced. A little has been done for the rearing of silk- worms; and the planting of the grape has led to the production of wine—both these in very small quantities. A small factory has been started for carpet-weaving. The clothing factories are very extensive, and there are factories for hat-and shirt-making. All those things that are needed in our houses are now being manufactured. We have kitchen ranges and stoves equal to any that can be imported, and we have now chemical factories, which produce not only various kinds of acids, such as sulphuric acid, but chemical manures, glycerine, &c.

In our agricultural industries, too, we have seen considerable development during recent years in the production of cheese and butter for export. In 1864, as has been stated, we were importers of cheese, butter, and hams; we now export these. Last year the export of these productions amounted to £104,100. The utilization of the New Zealand flax has always been difficult; it has been almost impossible to separate the gum from the fibre. Still we have cordage factories, and, as Manilla is imported, we produce all kinds of twine. There are cordage factories in Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin. Small attempts have been made in glassware, and there are considerable numbers of tinware factories. The actual statistics of the factories it is difficult to obtain. Hitherto there has been no complete record taken at the enumeration of the census, but in 1886 it is proposed to find out accurately the number of manufactories, the amount of goods produced, and the number of workmen employed. I estimate the amount of fallow made up into soap and candles for 1885 to be as follows:—

There are other small industries which it may not be necessary to state—brush factories, &c. One sugar refinery has been established in Auckland. Sugar is brought from the Pacific Islands for the purpose of refining, and the refinery is a large and a very complete one. It may be noted that in Auckland there has been a larger development of small industries than in any other part of the colony. Many of these have arisen out of the timber industries, and some from the fact that the people in Auckland had to depend upon small industries, as their country was unsuited for any large production of either wool or grain. Some of the small industries in the colony may be mentioned. They are manufacture of tobacco and cigars, blacking, confectionery, pottery and brickware, paper, aerated waters, jam, essences, perfumery, writing ink, pianos, organs, taxidermy. There is also a considerable amount of gold and silver smiths' work done in the colony. There are two paper-mills producing brown and wrapping papers, and some printing paper. Printing, book-binding, and stationery manufacture (from imported paper) are common to all the larger towns. Almost all these industries are the result of twenty years' growth.

The advantage that New Zealand will have in her manufacturing industries are—(1) her climate—she has

neither an excess of heat nor cold; (2) her large coal deposits; and (3) never-failing water supplies in almost any part of the colony.

VII.—Increase of Wealth, Advance in Credit, and General Material Advancement.

The material well-being of the colonists may be tested in various ways. One test is the increase in wealth. The mere amount of money deposited in banks is no criterion of the increase of wealth, because the wealth of the colony may not be in circulation. It can be shown by the increase in the number of houses, and the different kind of houses now in existence compared with what were in existence in 1864. In 1864 the total number of houses was 37,996; of these, 25,463 were constructed of wood, 1,082 of stone or brick, and 11,451 of other materials, principally raupo houses and tents. According to the census of 1881 there were 103,335 houses in the colony, of which number 87,646 were constructed of wood, 4,062 of brick or stone, 2,917 were tents, and the remainder were sod or clay huts and raupo huts. In the towns brick and stone have taken the place of wood, and in the country, in many districts, wood has taken the place of clay and daub. All the houses are being added to and increased in size. Then, money has been expended in roads, fencing, and improvements, as can be seen by the number of acres brought into cultivation since 1864, statistics of which I have given in a previous part of this paper. The furniture in the houses and the clothing of the people have vastly improved during the past twenty years. But even in the accumulation of money there has been an enormous advance. The amount in the savings banks in 1864 was £94,248 6s. 8d.; in 1884 it was £1,926,005. The amount of the deposits in ordinary banks in 1864 was £2,461,166; in 1884 it was £9,372,004—namely, £6,043,956 bearing interest, and £3,328,048 not bearing interest. And then since 1864 a new mode of investment has been started in New Zealand; I refer to life assurance societies. In 1864 there was little life assurance business done in the colony, and that which was done was in a few European offices. The Government started life assurance in 1869-70; and there is now in funds to the credit of the Government Life Association £972,775 14s. 8d. The Australian Mutual Provident Society of Sydney has done large business in New Zealand, and it has at least £850,000 invested in this colony. There are other Australian companies—the Colonial Mutual, the National Mutual, the Mutual Life—all doing a considerable business. I believe it is not an exaggeration to say that one person in every seven holds a policy in a life assurance office, and I doubt if there is any country in the world that can show, in proportion to the population, such a percentage of insured lives as New Zealand can. This is one means of investing savings.

The value of the personal property in New Zealand that is liable to taxation amounts to £40,000,000; but if the £500 exemption were included the amount would be £53,000,000. The total value of real property held by colonists is £75,000,000; and it is calculated that the Native lands within five miles of a road suitable for horse traffic are worth £5,750,000; and the education, church, municipal, and other reserves £11,750,000.

Building societies are very popular, and friendly societies are widely diffused. There are fifteen friendly societies, with 18,848 members, in the colony, with funds amounting to £255,371 16s. 11d.; and there are forty-seven building societies. There are various societies also for lending money, and which receive money on loan and deposit, performing the function, in fact, of a deposit bank. I have not been able to obtain complete statistics of this class, but I estimate the capital invested in these to be £500,000.

As showing also the things that have been done for the material well-being of the people, one may take the length of railways. In 1864 the system was only being begun, and that in a very small way. Since 1870 the colony has undertaken the construction of railways, and there are now 1,527 miles of railway open.

Then, another test of the conveniences of civilized life is the length of telegraph-lines and the number of telephones used. The total number of miles on which telegraphs are laid is 4,264, and the number of miles of wires is 10,474. There are telephone-exchanges in the following cities: Auckland, Wellington, Nelson, Christchurch, Oamaru, Dunedin, and Invercargill, and there are telephone-stations in other places. The total number of telephones used is 1,961. The postal and telegraph revenue amounts to £284,245. The number of letters carried in the year 1884 was 16,611,959. The number of telegrams sent was 1,654,305.

In 1864 the means of communication between the principal ports of the colony by sea were very limited, principally by small sailing vessels, a few steamers, and an occasional steamer for Victoria, which, calling first at the Bluff, would after wards proceed *viâ* Port Chalmers and Lyttelton as far as Wellington, from thence returning to Melbourne. In 1884 the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand had a fleet of twenty-eight fine steamers of an aggregate tonnage of 39,000 gross register; and the ordinary services of the company include weekly boats from Melbourne and Sydney to New Zealand, and *vice versâ*, and almost daily communication with the principal New Zealand ports. In addition, there is a monthly service between Auckland

and Fiji; and in the latter colony one of the company's boats plies regularly between the different islands of the group. During the summer months supplementary services are run over all the company's lines, and special excursions are made to the West Coast Sounds. In 1884 a new feature was the introduction of midwinter excursions to the South Sea Islands. The company has also now the contract for the mail service between Auckland and San Francisco.

There is also now direct fortnightly communication between Great Britain and the colony by the splendid steamers belonging to the New Zealand Shipping Company and the Shaw-Savill and Albion Company.

It may be noticed also that, with the increase in the wealth of the population, the possibilities of living in comfort have been greatly increased in another way. The prices of provisions have fallen since 1864. The tables in the Appendix No. 2 will show the contrast in the main articles of food. The prices of clothing have also fallen since 1864 proportionately, if not to a greater extent than those of provisions.

Then, the number of miles of streets and main roads made is very considerable; in fact, it may be said that throughout the length and breadth of the colony there are roads constructed. Of course, as settlement increases, new roads have to be made; and in the bush districts they are very expensive.

The number of incorporated towns where gas is used is twenty-seven. The number of towns incorporated is sixty-nine, and the number of town districts, which are smaller incorporations, corresponding, in fact, with villages, is forty-nine. The number of miles of postal routes is 527, and the annual number of miles travelled with mails is 3,295,901.

Another test is the amount of money-order work done. The number of money orders has increased from 16,592 in 1861 to 186,052 in 1884, and the amounts from £678,557 to £572,666.

The revenue of the colony has been considerably augmented:

The expenditure has been increased by the fact that large sums have been borrowed for the prosecution of public works. New Zealand has also been placed in a position different from most other colonies, by having had a large war expenditure. The total public debt is £30,649,099, but, of this amount, large sums have been expended in public works, which are now returning considerable interest. The average interest on all the railways opened for traffic was in 1884 3 per cent. on £11,810,194.

No doubt, as the colony increases in wealth, this rate will be considerably increased.

I might, before concluding, point out what different ideas of well-being people in the colony have had. In the early days, when the settlers first landed, few of them were able to obtain even a weatherboard house—a house of sawn timber, with a brick chimney, was not only a great rarity but almost unknown. They had to live in what were called "whares," or huts made of flax or daub. That era has now passed. Even in the farthest outlying settlements a settler is almost able at once to live in a well-built cottage, and it is not long till he demands all the accessories of civilization—roads, postal services, &c.; and as soon as a small township is started it has its own local organ or newspaper.

VIII.—Probable Future Development.

As to the future, it is difficult to predict in what particular line development may proceed. I have no doubt that considerable attention will be paid to dairy-farming. The country seems suited for it before almost any country. Grass grows all the year round in many districts; there is no snow or cold weather, requiring the cattle or sheep to be housed. The winter, in fact, is evergreen. Then, the colony does not suffer from droughts; water can be got anywhere, and the number of cattle and sheep that can be maintained compared with the acreage far exceeds that of any country in the world: and just as railways increase so settlement will increase. Population will increase, and at a more rapid rate than in old countries. Agriculture will become more intense; smaller farms and industries of a more varied kind will soon be common. It was not until after the railways had been inaugurated—in fact, it was not until late in 1872—that the balance of trade in our favour in cereals was reached. Up to 1872 the balance of imports of wheat and grain and flour was against the colony, but after the railway-system began to be developed this was changed, and since 1872 we have been large exporters of agricultural produce. This, no doubt, in future years will take other channels; we may not send more grain, but we shall send more meat, more butter, more cheese, more leather, and we shall send also the manufactured articles that are easily produced from our pastoral and agricultural products. Our gold-mining also seems increasing, and attention has been paid in various parts of the colony to the development of other mineral wealth, and manufactures are rising into importance. With the oportunities given to our youth by our educational system, and the bias that they will have in after years towards industry owing to technical training, we may expect a vast increase of material wealth: and our intellectual advancement and our amusements, that should make up so large a share of our social life, will keep pace with our other progress. The outlook of New Zealand may be said to be extremely favourable, and he who has to compare 1904 with 1884 will be able to

show as great a contrast as I have pourtrayed between 1864 and 1884.

I have attempted in this paper to point out, briefly, what the colony has done in twenty years, believing that, by making such a contrast, people outside the colony especially will be better able to gauge our prospects for the future, and also appreciate what our colonizing efforts have been. Many things that it would have been interesting to notice I have had to omit. I have not touched upon our form of Government nor our mode of Government, nor have I referred to the many things of convenience that we possess, as well as many departures that we have taken both in our legislation and in our govermental administration. To have mentioned all these would have made the paper unnecessarily long.

NOTE.—The Statistical Department has prepared a series of diagrams showing—

- The Population of New Zealand.
- The Ages of the People.
- The Birthplaces of the People.
- The Religions of the People.
- The Education of the People.
- Births, Deaths, and Marriages.
- Imports and Exports.
- Sheep, Cattle, and Horses.
- Land in Cultivation.
- Yield of Wheat, Oats, and Barley.
- Holdings of Land under Cultivation.
- Deposits in Savings-banks.
- Revenue and Expenditure.
- Miles of Railways open.
- Miles of Telegraph open.
- Shipping, Inwards and Outwards.
- Deposits in Banks.
- Capital invested in Industries.

I append these to my notes, believing they will probably more clearly show than the figures I have given the progress of the colony. To some of the diagrams I have not thought it necessary to make any special reference.

Appendix No. 3.

TABLE showing TOTAL VALUES of IMPORTS and EXPORTS, from the Year 1841 to 1884 inclusive.

Appendix No. 2.

TABLE showing the AVERAGE PRICES of PROVISIONS and LIVE STOCK in NEW ZEALAND in 1864 and 1884.

Appendix No. 3.

NEW ZEALAND DIAGRAM of TRADE Scales. Vertical 1,500,000£ to One Inch. Horizontal 3Years to One Inch, AEFEAENCE. Total Imports full Muck line Total Exports full red line

THE DENSITY OF THE TOWNS PER SQUARE MILE IS GIVEN BELOW AUCKLAND 61/6 6 PARNELL 4768-9 ON EH U NGA 23/ 6 THAMES 5//9-0 HAMILTON 4/62 GISBORNE 7423— NEW PLYMOUTH 24/6 NAPIER 33660 WANGANUI 2323-5 PALMERSTON N. 177 MASTERTON 3/92 G R EYTOWN /52S WELLINGTON 46357 NELSON BLENHEIM 8/67 WESTPORT 9233 GREYMOUTH 7482 KUMAR A 9087 HOKITIKA 7692 ROSS /9. RANGIORA 503/ KAIAPOI 0175 CHRISTCHURCH 92762 1 SYDEN HAM 4779 LYTTELTON ASHBURTON 7707 TIMARU 5/53-9 WAI MATE 4/6-0 OAMARU 3235-2 DUNEDIN 93738 ROSLYN 9650 CAVERSHAM 2279-4 MORN INGTON 27486 MAORI HILL DUNEDIN 5990 N. E. VALLEY 4/98 W. HARBOUR 352-6 [si KILDA /2078 1 Pi CHALMERS 53/95 LAWRENCE II2/I MILTON 30643 RIVERTON f069-0 INVERCARGILL 29086

MAP SHEWING THE DENSITY OF THE POPULATION OF NEW ZEALAND IN 1864. (MAORIS EXCLUDED) Scale of Miles. SCALE OF COLOURS. Under 3 per square mile, 10 and ever 3

Vertical Scale 50,000 to Aninch

Diagram IA Showing the Population of New Zealand (exclusive of Maoris) at the end of each Year, from 1854 to 1884, and on 30th September. 1885.

Diagram II. Showing the Ages of the People of New Zealand (exclusive of Maoris) in Quinquennial Periods, as at the time of the Census, April, 1881.

The male population increased between the date of the Census and the 30th September, 1885, to 313,126, or at the rate of 16.14 per cent.

The female population increased to 263,108, or at the rate of 19.41 per cent. red signifies males, blue females.

One Coloured Inch—50.000

Diagram III. Showing the Birthplaces of the People of New Zealand (exclusive of Maoris) as at the time of the Census, April, 1881.

The male population increased between the date of the Census and 30th September, 1885, to 313,126, or at the rate of 16.14 per cent.

The female population increased to 263,108, or at the rate of 19.41 per cent.

The red represents males, blue females.

Diagram IV. Showing the Religions of the People of New Zealand (exclusive of Maoris) as at the time of the Census, April, 1881.

The population increased between the date of the Census and the 30th September, 1885, 10576,234, or at the rate of 17 61 per cent.

One Coloured Inch =50.000

Diagram V. Showing the Education of the People of New Zealand (exclusive of Maoris and Chinese) as at the time of the Census, April, 1881. The population increased between the date of the Census and the 30th September, 1885, to 576,234, or at the rate of 17.61 percent.

One Coloured Inch—50.000

Diagram VI. Showing the Births, Deaths, and Marriages in New Zealand (excluding of Maoris) during the Year 1855 to 1884 inclusive.

The red line signifies births; yellow, deaths; and blue, marriages.

One Vertical Inch 5000 persons.

Diagram VII. Showing the Birth, Deaths, and Marriages in New Zealand per 1,000 of Population (excluding Maoris) for the

Year 1855 to 1884 inclusive.

The red line signifies births; yellow, deaths; and blue, marriages.
Vertical scale 10 per 1,000 to An Inch.

Diagram VIII. Showing the Imports, Exports, and Total Trade of New Zealand for the Years 1853 to 1884.

The red indicates the proportion of imports and the blue the exports.
One Vertical Inch = £4,000,000

[*unclear:* Diagram] IX. Showing the Total Value of the Exports from New Zealand for the Years 1853 to 1884 inclusive, and the proportions to the whole of Wool, Gold, Grain, Flour, Oatmeal, Bran, and Sharps, and the remaining Exports.

[*unclear:* total] value of the exports is represented by the coloured space of the diagram. The red indicates the proportion of vool; the yellow, gold; the blue, grain, flour, oatmeal, bran, and sharps; and the buff, the remainder of the exports.
One Vertical Inch = £2.500.000

Diagram X. Showing the Sheep, Cattle, and Horses in New Zealand in the different Census Years from 1851 to 1881, and the number of Sheep in 1884.

The red bars represent sheep; yellow, cattle; and blue, horses.
One Coloured Inch = 4,000,000

Diagram XI. Showing the extent of Land in Cultivation in New Zealand for the Years 1869 to 1885, distinguishing Land under Sown Grasses, under Grain Crops, Green and other Crops, and Broken up but not under Crop.

One Coloured Inch = 2,000,000

Diagram XII. Showing the estimated Yield of Wheat, Oats, and Barley in New Zealand for the Years 1869 to 1885 inclusive.

The red colour represents the produce of wheat; yellow, oats; and blue, barley; for the year.
One Vertical Inch = 2,000,000 Bushels.

Diagram XIII. Showing the Number of Holdings of Land over One Acre in extent under Cultivation in New Zealand for the Years 1869 to 1885 inclusive, distinguishing those occupied by Freeholders from those occupied on Lease only.

The total number of occupied holdings is represented by the whole of the coloured space of the diagram.
One Vertical Inch = 4.000 Holdings.

Diagram XIV. Showing the Total Deposit in the Savings Hanks of New Zealand at the close of the Years 1867 to 1884

inclusive.

One Coloured Inch = £400.000

Diagram XV. Showing the Accumulated Deposits in the Savings Banks of New Zealand per head of Depositors and per head of the Population at the close of the Years 1867 to 1884 inclusive.

One Coloured Inch = £8,0,0

Diagram XVI. Showing the Total Revenue and Expenditure of the General Government of New Zealand from the Year 1876 (the date of the abolition of the provinces) to the Year 1884 inclusive.

(Expenditure out of loans is not included in the figures dealt with in the diagram.)
One Coloured Inch =£1000000

Diagram XVII. Showing the Total Number of Miles of Railway (constructed by Government)open for Traffic in New Zealand for the Years 1873 to 1884 inclusive.

One Coloured Inch = 400

Diagram XVIII. Showing the Total Number of Miles of Electric Telegraph Line open in New Zealand for the Years 1866 to 1884 inclusive.

One Coloured Inch = 800 Miles

Diagram XIX. Showing the Tonnage of Shipping entered Inwards at the Ports of New Zealand, and the Tonnage of Shipping cleared Outwards, during the Years 1853 to 1884.

The total amount of tonnage of shipping entered inwards and cleared outwards is represented by the whole of the coloured space of the diagram.
One Coloured Inch = 100,000 Tons.

Diagram XX. Showing the Amount of Deposits, at the close of each Year from 1867 to 1884, in the Banks of Issue transacting business in New Zealand.

One Coloured Inch = £2,000,000.

Diagram XXI. Showing the Capital invested (value of Land and Buildings, Machinery and Plant) in each of the principal Industries of the Colony of New Zealand in April, 1881.

It is well known that a very rapid expansion of the industries has taken place in New Zealand since the year

1882, but until the results of the Census of 1886 are ascertained it is impossible to give figures.

The returns of the Joint-Stock Companies registered show a large amount of additional capital sunk recently in industrial companies for Woollen Manufacture, Meat-freezing, Sugar-refining, Butter, Cheese, and Bacon making, Iron and Steel Works, Horse-breeding, &c. The diagram and figures given must only be taken as indicative of the nature and comparatively of the extent of many of the industries now developing in New Zealand.

One Coloured Inch = £300,000

Our first Premier James Edward Fitzgerald Sketch of his Career. A Lecture Delivered at Victoria College on July 31st, 1906, by Sir Robert Stout, C.J., Chancellor of the University. Wellington: New Zealand Times Co., Ltd., Printer, Lambton Quay. 1906.

I believe the first thing that must strike the student of the history of New Zealand is the very large number of able men that were to be found amongst the early settlers To under-stand why it should have been so, one has to look at the history of England during the early part of the nineteenth century. England had ended a successful, and yet what might be termed a disastrous war. She had had hundreds of millions added to her debt. She had seen her industries paralysed, and thousands of her people killed. She had not only fought a duel with France, but she had been engaged on one side or the other in many European wars. Her taxation was heavy, and her people were poor and ignorant, and their sufferings cannot be adequately realised by us to-day. But amidst all her troubles a new spirit was growing up, and her able men were devising means to uplift the nation and the race. One of the means suggested was emigration or colonisation and along with this another means suggested was the education of the people and giving to them of political power. Much was being accomplished in education. Two great educational societies had been founded, one on the Bell and the other on the Lancastrian method. One was founded in 1808, called the British and Foreign School Society, and the other in 1811 called the National Society. But it was not till 1846 that education was recognised as a State duty and function, and then only in a partial and insignificant manner. Political agitation had ended in a step forward by the passing of the Reform Act in 1832, and it was thought that a new era was at hand for England if her people could only be politically educated. There were others who had not much faith in the extension of the franchise, and they looked forward to a settlement of the people in new countries where there would be freedom to develop without the clash of vested interests or class institutions. One of the early settlers of New Zealand had written a notable book on colonisation—"A View of the Art of Colonisation." This was Edward Gibbon Wakefield, and his book was but the expression of what many felt. We see in looking at past history how an idea can get hold of a people, and how all their policy and all their efforts may be torced into one channel, so that this idea may have a realisation. I may illustrate this remark by referring to two historical incidents. For example, what Scotchman has not heard of the ten years' conflict, when all the earnestness and ability and zeal of Scotland were employed from 1833 to 1843 in dealing with a church question. It has been well said that the intellect of Scotland at that period seemed concerned with nothing else, but the gov- ernment of its State church, and that struggle produced a wealth of intellect in the church that has not been seen since. And in our own memory we have seen a wave of feeling for union pass over Europe. We have seen Germany united, Italy made one, and the struggle for the creation of great federations, which has found expression in the Dominion of Canada and the Commonwealth, of Australia, and what is Imperialism but a struggle for the same idea? Nay, we have also seen outside of the political arena the same aim in the creation of large companies and trusts. Association and union are in the air. We have international societies, trade unions, conferences, etc.. etc. Even churches have been invaded by the feeling for union and co-operation. At one time the struggle was for individuality; now it would seem as if humanity imagined that its only hope lay in co-operation, and the existence of this feeling may count for much of what is termed Socialism. Beginning in 1830, there was a struggle to give expression to the idea of colonisation, and the ablest men of England. Scotland, and Ireland entered with zeal into the question, and formed societies for the purpose of giving effect to many of their plans. The colonisation of New Zealand was one of the fruits of this movement, and because the movement had many able men at its head, there were many young men at the universities who became enthused with the colonising spirit, and eventually became pioneers in New Zealand. They started for New Zealand, not with the idea of amassing wealth, and then returning to England to end their days in comfort and luxury, but they left their homes with the hope and ambition of being the founders of new nations. Their vision of the future of colonisation may be expressed in the words of a poem by J. A. Symonds:—

These things shall be; a loftier race
Than e'er the world hath known shall rise
With flame of freedom in their souls.

And light of knowledge in their eyes.

I believe that this is the explanation of why so many men of rare ability were to be found amongst the early settlers of New Zealand.

The First Parliament.

And that there was a large percentage of able men amongst them can be at once seen if we scan a list of the members of our first Parliament in 1854, and consider how short the history of New Zealand had been at this time, and the small number of white inhabitants in the colony. The first colonisers of New Zealand landed in 1840. I do not forget that there were stray settlers in New Zealand before that date, whalers, and some that had drifted from New South Wales, but the first real attempt at colonisation began in 1840, when settlers landed in Wellington and Auckland. Later there were settlements made in Taranaki and Nelson, and in 1848 in Otago, and in Canterbury in 1850. The total white population in 1854 of the whole colony was only 31,243, and yet if we examine a list of the members of our first Parliament we will find among them men like Bartley, Cargill. Carleton, Clifford, Cutten, Featherston, Fitzgerald, Forsaith, Hart, King, Ludlam. Macandrew, Merriman, Monro, Moorhouse, Revans. Rhodes. Sewell. Stuart-Wortley, Taylor. Travers, two Wakefields—Edward Gibbon and Edward Jerningham—and Weld in the House of Representatives, and in the Legislative Council such men as Dillon Bell. Bellairs. Petre, Richmond, Swainson, and Whittaker. I venture to say that we could not now produce out of any 31,000 of our people so many able and distinguished men. And in succeeding Parliaments we had other men of rare ability, such men as Domett. Fox, Fitzherbert, Stafford, and Gillies, the two Richmonds, Tancred, Wood. Mantell, Crosbie Ward, Pollen, Russell, Menzies, Johnston, Jollie, Logan Campbell, Williamson, Atkinson, and many others, and outside of Parliament we were fortunate in our early settlers. In the churches we had Marsden, Selwyn, Hadfield, Harper, Burns, Bruce, Barclay, Buller, Watkins, Reid: and as Judges we had Martin, Chapman. Johnston. etc. We had also merchants, settlers bankes and farmers who were able and experienced men. And they were men, as the earliest debates in the House of Representatives and the Legislative Council show, who were imbued with what may be termed philosophical radicalism, Liberalism placed on the true foundation of science and philosophy, and not on a system of obeying the passing whim of the populace. One cannot but be impressed in reading the debates by the far-reaching prescience of most of the members, and their devotion to the true idea of colonisation—the foundation of a nation that would be the home of a great and free people.

Fitzgerald's Early History.

To-night I wish to speak of one who at the opening of the first Parliament of New Zealand was recognised as the ablest man in the Parliament—James Edward Fitzgerald. He was the youngest son, by his second marriage, of Gerald Fitzgerald, of Kilminchy in Queen's County, and of Catherine, daughter of Sir L. O'Brien. Baronet, of Drumoland, County Clare. At a speech which he made at the O'Connell Centenary in Wellington, he said:—"I am an Irishman, who was born in the town of Bath. England," and he went on to explain that the mere place of birth could not affect his nationality. He was horn on March 4th, 1818, was educated from 1839 to 1842 at the Cambridge University, being a student at Christ's College. Here he met many men who afterwards had distinguished careers in England. His intention was to adopt the military profession, and he prepared to qualify himself for service in the Royal Engineers. Unfortunately, perhaps through over-study, his eyesight failed him, and he had to give up his work. He undertook one or two walking tours through Scotland and Ireland, and during these tours he became acquainted with what is often termed the ″ common people." During these tours he had an opportunity of doing what he always delighted in—indulging his artistic sense. He made many sketches, for he was an artist, but what was of more value to him than a knowledge of the scenery and the beauties of his ancestral country, he became acquainted with the people. His appreciation of humour and wit was much gratified, as he has often told me, by his journeyings in what may be termed his native land—Ireland. The quant remarks of his countrymen often enlivened his travels, and it was always interesting to listen to the excellent stories he could tell of these journeys.

He left the University in 1842, and in 1844 he joined the British Museum as a clerk. He was placed in the Antiquities Department. Two or three years later he was promoted to the position of Under-Secretary, and was recognised as one of the ablest men of the British Museum staff. Whilst at the museum he had taken part in a

debating society in London, which was attended by many distinguished men He had also become, shall I say, to use the words of the late Mr Rolleston, "infected with the colonial microbe," and ho looked to colonisation as one of the ways of saving England. He was one of those who formed a society in London entitled the Society for the Reform of Colonial Government. Of this society He was secretary. Its object was to force upon the British Parliament and people the need of colonisation, and the need of the Government passing such measures as would enable the schemes of the society to be carried out. It was an uphill battle. The British people were not improved with the need of colonisation, and it is marvellous when their apathy and indifference is considered that so many colonies were preserved to the British Empire. If it had not been for the efforts of a few farseeing and able men in Britain and Ireland I doubt if either Australia or New Zealand would have been settled by British people. The British people lost the Argentine through their indifference to its value, and they would have also lost these southern colonies had it not been for the efforts of such men as Fitzgerald. We have now what is termed the imperialistic feeling that was so sadly wanting from 1830 to 1850, but it was private associations that practically forced the Hand of the British Government so that colonisation took place. We are all aware that the New Zealand Company had gnat difficulties in carrying out its scheme and that it got into financial strats which at one time threatened the very existence of New Zealand as a sphere for British colonisation. Fitzgerad, with all the enthusiasm of his race, threw in his lot with those who formed the Colonial Reform party. He wrote and spoke strongly in favour of Government assistance, and thus he became acquainted with such men as God ley, Selfe, Lord Lyttelton, and other leaders of the movement. Godley lad urged a plan of colonisation by the Irish peasants, and he proposed that a large area in Canada should be set aside for them; and who knows but that, if God ley's scheme had been [*unclear:* arried] out, it would not have been letter both for Ireland and the Empire?

In 1847 Fitzgerald issued a circular in favour of founding a colony in British Columbia at Vancouver Island. This was opposed to the ideas of the Ministers of the Crown, for they had proposed to hand the island over to the Hudson Bay Company. In making this suggestion, therefore, Fitzgerald was fighting a wealthy corporation. In 1849 he published a book examining critically the charters of the Hudson Bay Company, and showing that they had no right to make any claim to Vancouver Island. This was the last of his struggles for the formation of British Columbia as a colony. He had written many pamphlets, and delivered many speeches on the question, and the effect of his writings had been that the Hudson Bay Company did not obtain the control they sought: in fact, it was recognised that his examination of their charters had shown that they had obtained more power and more territory than they could legally or morally claim. The effect of his book was such that it was said in London that "he had killed the Hudson Bay Company." The foundation of a colony at Vancouver could not, however, be undertaken, and other territory was looked for. One suggestion was that India might be made the home of British colonists. Robert Fitzgerald, his brother, a captain in the Fifth Punjaub Cavalry, strongly dissuaded him from taking up the plan. New Zealand was then thought of, and the Canterbury Association was formed. Fitzgerald became a member of the managing committee, and when Godley set out for New Zealand in December, 1849. Fitzgerald was chosen to succeed him as Emigration Agent in London for the new settlement, and he continued to hold that office until the first four ships sailed for Canterbury, he himself sailing on the 7th of September. 1850, in the Charlotte Jane. In this year he had married Miss Fanny Erskine Draper, daughter of George Draper, merchant, London, and his wife accompanied him to New Zealand. All who had the pleasure of knowing Mrs Fitzgerald knew that she was an able, highly educated woman, and a great helpmate to him in his colonial life.

On the voyage out Fitzgerald was, I have been told, the soul of the ship; he entered into the amusements on shipboard, instigated fun and frolic, and encouraged the new settlers, firing them with hope and ambition for the life which they were going to undertake. He wrote a poem on board the Charlotte Jane, which I shall quote, as it shows the hopes that animated the early Canterbury settlers:—

The Night-watch Song of the "Charlotte Jane."
'Tis the first watch of the night, brothers.
And the strong wind rides the deep;
And the cold stars shining bright, brothers.
Their mystic courses keep.
Whilst our ship her path is cleaving
The flashing waters through,
Here's a health to the land we're leaving,
And the land we're going to.

First sadly bow the head, brothers,
In silence o'er the wine,
To the memory of the dead, brothers,
The fathers of our line—
Though their tombs may not receive us,
Far o'er the ocean blue,
Their spirits ne'er shall leave us.
In the land we're going to.

Whilst yet sad memories move us.
A second cup we'll drain
To the manly hearts that love us
In our old homes o'er the main—
Fond arms that, used to caress us,
Sweet smiles from eyes of blue,
Lips which no more may bless us,
In the land we're going to.

But away with sorrow now, brothers,
Fill the wine cup to the brim!
Here's to all who'll swear the vow, brothers,
Of this our midnight hymn:—
That each man shall be a brother.
Who has joined our gallant crew;
That we'll stand by one another
In the land we're going to!

Fill again, before we part, brothers,
Fill the deepest draught of all.
To the loved ones of our hearts, brothers,
Who reward and share our toil—
From husbands and from brothers.
All honour be their due,—
The noble maids and mothers
Of the land we're going to!

The wine is at an end, brothers.
But ere we close our eyes.
Let a silent prayer ascend, brothers.
For our gallant enterprise.
Should our toil be all unblest, brothers,
Should ill winds of fortune blow,
May we find God's haven of rest, brothers,
In the land we're going to.

Arrival in New Zealand.

Fitzgerald landed at Lyttelton on the 16th of December, 1850. On board the ships there were materials for printing a newspaper, and on the 11th January, 1851, the "Lyttelton Times" was first issued. The paper was owned by Mr Shrimpton, and it was edited for the first two years of its existence by Fitz-gerald. He occupied at the same time the positions of Immigration Agent and of Inspector of Police. He had to look after the well-being of the early settlers, and also to see that there were law and order in the new settlement, and I believe his rule was much appreciated. There is one story told by him of this period which I cannot forbear from re-telling. His half-brother. Mr Gerald Fitzgerald, who was afterwards a Magistrate in the colony, a member of Parliament, and editor of the "Timaru Herald." a man of ability and much public spirit, was out walking with him one day, when they overtook an escaped prisoner. As they approached him, the prisoner waved above his head a hand-saw, threatening them if they came near him. With a smile, and that gleam of wit which often started from his eye, He called upon his brother in the Queen's name to arrest the absconder. His brother, as a civilian, expressed himself as entirely willing to do what was desired, but he added as a condition that the inspector of police would first remove the hand-saw. I need not add that the prisoner made good his escape; I have no doubt to the intense amusement of Fitzgerald, for about this anecdote he often had a hearty laugh.

From 1850 to 1853 were times of strain and stress in New Zealand, for the early settlers were struggling for self-government. They had come to the colony for freedom, and they found that in their own government they had neither share nor voice. This led to petitions, remonstrances, etc., etc., and several men were notable in those days for leading the settlers in the agitation for local self-government. Godley and Fitzherbert were two of the most noted, and Fitzgerald also used his pen to some purpose. I have not time to-night to refer to some of the most ably-worded remonstrances that were ever penned, and which the early settlers sent to London. After Godley's death, his life and some of his writings were published in a book by Fitzgerald, and I must refer you to this book for further information. Through the agitation that had taken place in the colony, and through the influence of Adderley, Lyttelton. Gladstone, and others, a constitution was at last granted to New Zealand. There were six provinces There were to be six local Parliaments and a General Assembly over all. The Constitution Act was passed in 1852, and in 1853 it was brought into operation. Fitzgerald was elected the first Superintendent of Canterbury, and on the 27th of September. 1853, the Canterbury Provincial Council was opened by him. His speech was long and able, and laid down a policy in no uncertain way on all things that the Council had to consider.

I must quote to you a few passages, so that you may see the grasp he had of public affairs. He began thus:—

"There is a certain solemnity about every event which can occur, but once in the life of an individual or the history of a people: of such a character is the act which it falls to my lot to perform, in addressing from this chair the first Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canterbury. You will feel with me that the language of ordinary congratulation falls short of the dignity of the occasion. . . . We have had restored to us in this Legislature a semblance of the revered and tried in-stitutions of our native land: affording to us a guarantee of the preservation of that most precious gift to a people, the inestimable blessing of civil and religious liberty: uniting us by fresh ties to the great Empire of which we form a part, and kindling afresh within every heart sentiments of loyalty and devotion to the Crown and person of her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen." In one passage he asks the members of the Council to look to the future, and he lays down the ideals that should be ever before them. "I feel that I do not need," He says, "to remind you that your responsibility is measured, not by the smallness of the interests, but by the magnitude of the principles with which you have to deal: that the laws which you enact ought not only to meet the immediate requirements of the present community, but should form the expression of principles which shall be applicable to the future, when every existing interest shall have augmented to a hundred fold its present importance."

Perhaps it would be well for us if we conned over these words and appreciated their import. As to the struggle betwixt the churches, his words on that subject, uttered in 1853, might, if listened to be of service not only to us, but to our kin beyond the sea. He said:—"The State should stand in an attitude of absolute indifference to all religious communities, that we should regard the State as an organisation of society for the purpose of regulating the intercourse between individuals in matters relating to this world, religious communities as coexistent, but wholly independent of organisations of the same society for the purpose of ordering the conduct and promoting the well-being of their several members in matters relating to another world." I do not know if the relation of the State to religion could be better stated.

In the Legislature.

In 1854 the first Parliament of New Zealand met. It was opened on the 24th of May—the Queens

birthday—1854. The Chief Justice, William Martin, administered the oaths to the members. Fitzgerald had been elected member for Lyttelton, and it is apparent from the record of the proceedings of the first Parliament that the members looked to him as their leader. Here I may state that the first division in the New Zealand Parliament which took place was on the question whether the proceedings were to be opened with prayer. Mr Macandrew moved that before the House proceeded with any further business a prayer should be made for a blessing on their labours. This was opposed by many, because they were afraid that it would lead to the recognition of one church above another, and they desired equality. In the Legislative Council the same question was proposed by Colonel Kenny, and there was a difference of opinion there also as to the use of prayers in Parliament. The matter was arranged by the suggestion of Mr Bell, after-wards Sir Dillon Bell, that the Speaker himself should say the prayers, and this was carried, m the House of Re-presentatives the motion was carried, but Fitzgerald voted with the minority.

Fitzgerald was chosen to propose a reply to the Governor's Speech. The address was short, and couched in beautiful language. In his speech in proposing the address, after pointing out the need of being careful in the expressions used in addressing the Governor, so that their time might not be wasted in recriminations with the chief executive officer, he said:—

"It is not, I hope, presumptuous in me to remind the House that there never was an assembly whose proceedings were watched with more anxious attention or more ardent hope than those in which we are about to engage. You well know for how long a period this colony has been suffering under the effects of a struggle between political parties, or rather, I might almost say, between the people and the Government. You well know how disappointed hope has vented itself in indignant complaints, remonstrances, petitions, and addresses; you know, too, how all have tended to one end, all have looked to one remedy—the establishment of the political institutions of England. Sir, the wishes and hopes of ten long and anxious years in the history of New Zealand are consummated in the scene which I see around me. . . .

"Sir, I have endeavoured to express the feelings by which, I conceive, the framers of this address have been actuated. In calling attention to its language I would first ask the House whether it would not be wise that, suppressing for the time all differences of opinion, even in the most important matters, our first act should be one of unanimity and congratulation; that, however we may differ in future times—as differ we shall—however hereafter this House may be divided by the struggles of party and the animosity of faction—as divided it certainly will be; for as it has been justly remarked, party is the price we pay for freedom—our first act should be one expressive of our common loyalty to the country of our birth and to the Crown of Her Majesty, and of an earnest and patriotic desire to support Her Majesty's representative in all his efforts for the good government of the country, so far as we shall believe them to be calculated to that end. . . .

"There is one other omission in the speech to which I cannot but allude: I mean all allusion to the question of responsible government. I will not precipitate a discussion which is about so soon to be raised on this question. I have only mentioned it for the purpose of remarking that His Excellency appears to me to have exercised a very wise discretion in omitting to mention that subject in the speech. The introduction of the principle of ministerial responsibility is an act which does not, as I conceive it, require the sanction of any new law; it requires a simple act on the part of the supreme executive power, but that act is not to be hurriedly and arbitrarily performed, it should be a spontaneous development of representative institutions. Had His Excellency originated such an act, and had the Chambers not been ripe for its completion, or not been thoroughly satisfied not only of its abstract propriety, but that the time had arrived when it was necessary that the principle should be fully recognised, it is obvious that the Governor would have been placed in a posi-position of great embarrassment. I cannot, therefore, for a moment gather from the silence of the speech on this head that any objection to the principle is indicated by the Government, or any desire to shrink from the responsibility, should the necessity of the step become apparent, of carrying it into immediate operation."

His speech is able, statesmanlike, and eloquent, as, indeed, all his speeches were. In fact, reading some of the old "Hansards," and comparing them with the new, I do not think the student of New Zealand history will come to any other conclusion than that in our first Parliament wo had men of wisdom, culture, and oratory with which it is doubtful if our recent Parliaments can at all compare.

On June 14th, 1854, Fitzgerald was asked to form a Ministry. He had some correspondence with Dr Monro, afterwards Sir David Monro, about his joining, but they did not agree as to the attitude the General Government should take up towards the provinces. Dr Monro wan an out-and-out Centralist, and Fitzgerald desired that the provincial institutions should be utilised, though not to the extent of some of the extreme Provincialists. The new Cabinet was composed of Fitzgerald (Premier), Sewell, and Weld, and Hartley afterwards joined the Ministry. Mr Dillon Bell was also sworn in as a Minister on June 30th. but there was some disagreement on a question of policy, and he resigned some days afterwards. The Ministry only remained in office until August 2nd, when it resigned. The cause of its resignation was that the Governor desired to retain in office Messrs Sinclair, Shepherd, and Swainson, who had been members of the Executive Council before the Constitution Act

had been passed, and also because the Governor would not grant full representative government to the colony. On this, Fitzgerald and his colleagues resigned. The next Government was not appointed until the end of the month—August 31st, when Forsaith, Macandrew, Travers, and Edward Jerningham Wakefield formed a Ministry. This Ministry only lasted two days, when the feeling of the House was so strong against it that it resigned. The fight during the first session was mainly on the question of the relationship that should exist between the Executive and the House. On August 17th the Governor prorogued the House. The House then had some backbone, of which this illustration can be given:—On August 17th the Governor sent two or three messages to the House. The first was a message enclosing returns of electoral rolls, and the second was a vindication of the position he had taken up in reference to the Executive Council. Immediately after the second message a third message was announced, and the members knew that it was a message proroguing the House. Before the third message could be read Mr Sewell rose to speak, and he moved that his Excellency's Message No. 32 (the message of vindication) be at once taken into consideration. This would have deferred the prorogation until the House had had time to protest. Mr Travers and Mr Wakefield, however, pointed out that by the standing orders, whenever a message was received from the Governor it must be at once read. To meet this Mr Fitzgerald moved that the standing orders be suspended, and a division was taken on his motion, but as twenty-four members—that is, two-thirds of the members—were not in the House when the division was taken, the standing or-ders could not be suspended. Shortly afterwards, Dr Featherston and Mr Moorhouse and another came in, and, with the Speaker, made up the quorum of twenty-four. There were twenty-five present. Another motion to suspend the standing orders was then moved and carried, and the House went into committee, considered the [*unclear:* rnor's] message, and passed ten very strong resolutions against the Governor's conduct in failing to establish proper Ministerial responsibility. It was only after these resolutions had been carried that the message proroguing Parliament was read.

The Assembly was called together on August 31st, and a long speech was delivered by the Governor, the second Ministry, as I have before stated, being then in power. After the resignation of this Ministry. Parliament was carried on without any Government being appointed from the House of Representatives until 1856, when the Bell-Sewell Ministry was formed.

In 1857 Fitzgerald was stricken with illness which forced his retirement from politics. He resigned the Superintendency, and Mr Moorhouse was appointed in his stead. In 1858 he left for England, via Australia, in a small schooner called the Speedy, which took six weeks to reach Australia. He took his wife and his four children with him. From 1858 to 1860 he remained in London, holding the office of Emigration Agent for the province of Canterbury, and during that time he was not idle. He was on all favourable occasions bringing the Canterbury settlement under the notice of the British people. In 1859 he was informally offered the governorship of the new colony of Queensland, and at another time he was offered the governorship of British Columbia, but on account of his health he had to decline both offers. In 1860 he returned to New Zealand, and for a time devoted his attention to the pastoral industry, having a run in partnership with the late Mr Hunter Brown. Mr Percy Cox, and Mr Draper, his brother-in-law. In 1863 he became proprietor of the Christchurch "Press" newspaper, which He owned until he left Canterbury in 1867. He had entered politics again in 1862, being elected member for Ellesmere in that year, succeeding Mr Rowley who had resigned. He was again recognised in Parliament as one of the ablest men in the House of Representatives, and in that year, 1862, he delivered perhaps the ablest and most eloquent speech that was ever delivered in the New Zealand Parliament, or perhaps in any Parliament. I was told by a member who was present that no speech ever moved the House as this speech did. He said:—

" The present state of things cannot last. The condition of the colony is not one of peace; it is a state of armed and suspicious neutrality. If you do not quickly absorb this king movement into your own Government, you will come into collision with it, and, once light up again the torch of war in these islands, and these feeble and artificial institutions you are now building up will be swept away like houses of paper in the flames. Tribe after tribe will be drawn into the struggle, and you will make it a war of races. Of course, you will conquer, but it will be the conquest of the tomb. Two or three years of war will eradicate every particle of civilisation from the native mind, and will elicit all the fiercest instincts of his old savage nature. The tribee, broken up, without social or military organisation, will be scattered through the country in bands of merciless banditti. The conflagration of Taranaki will be lighted up again in every border of the colony: and in self-preservation you will be compelled—as other nations have been compelled be-fore—to hunt the miserable native from haunt to haunt till he is destroyed like the beasts of the forest. I am here to-night to appeal against so miserable, so inhuman, a consummation. We are here this evening standing on the threshold of the future holding the issues of Deace and war, of life and death, in our hands. I see some honourable friends around me whose counsels I must ever respect, and whose tried courage we all admire, who will tell me that you cannot govern this race until you have conquered them. I reply, in the words which the poet has placed in the mouth of the great Cardinal. 'In the hands of men entirely great, the pen is mightier than the sword. Take away the sword! States

may be saved without it.' I know well that evil days may come when the sacred inheritance of light and truth, which God has given to a nation to hold and to transmit, may only be saved by an appeal to the last ordeal of nations—the trial by war; but I know, too, how great the crime which rests on the souls of those who, for any less vital cause or for any less dire necessity, precipitate that fatal issue. I grudge not the glory of those who have achieved the deliverance of a people or the triumph of a cause by any sacrifice of human life or human happiness; but I claim a higher glory for those who in reliance on a law more powerful than that of force, and wielding spells more mighty than the sword, have led the nations by paths of peaceful prosperity to the fruition of an enduring civilisation. I claim a higher glory for those who, standing on the pinnacle of human power, have striven to imitate the government of Him who 'taketh up the simple out of the dust, and lifteth the poor out of the mire.' And I claim the highest glory of all for that man who has most thoroughly penetrated that deepest and loftiest mystery in the art of human government, 'the gentleness that maketh great.' I have stood beside a lonely mound in which lies buried the last remnant of a tribe which fell—men, women, and children—before the tomahawks of their ancient foes; and I sometimes shudder to think that my son, too, may stand beside a similar monument—the work of our hands—and blush with the ignominy of feeling that, after all, the memorial of the Christian lawgiver is but copied from that of the cannibal and the savage. I appeal to the House to-night to inaugu- rate a policy of courageous and munificent justice. I have a right to appeal to you as citizens of that nation which, deaf to the predictions of the sordid and the timid, dared to give liberty to her slaves. I appeal to you to-night in your sphere to perforin an act of kindred greatness. I appeal to you not only on behalf of the ancient race whose destinies are hanging in the balance, hut on behalf of your own sons and your sons' sons, for I venture to predict that., in virtue of that mysterious law of our being by which great deeds once done become incorporated into the life and soul of a people, enriching the source from whence flows through all the ages the inspiration to noble thoughts and the incitement to generous actions, I venture to predict that, among the traditions of that great nation, which will one day rule these islands, and the foundations of which we are now laying, the most cherished and the most honoured will be that wise, bold, and generous policy which gave the Magna Charta of their liberties to the Maori people."

The Peace Party.

The question of questions before the Parliament of those days was the attitude that the Government and people ought to take towards the native race, and you have seen from the passages which I have read on which side Fitzgerald was ranged. He desired that the natives should be treated not only with justice, but with extreme kindness. He was the leader of the Peace Party, and how rare his advocacy was can be learned from the speech which I have just quoted from. He was Native Minister in 1865, having been appointed to that office by Mr Weld, but he held office for only about two months. But during the time he was in office he introduced and carried what was really the Magna Charta of Maori liberties, the Native Rights Act, 1865, which provided that every person of the Maori race within the colony shall be deemed a natural born subject of her Majesty. The bill was seconded by one I could call my friend—the Hon. Major Sir J. L. C. Richardson—a man who was always to be found on the side of the weak and the oppressed. A glance through the statute books of 1865 will show that the law-givers were affirming principles of much import in dealing with the natives, and also with the duties and privileges of Parliament. In that Ministry there were some very able men. You will recognise that when I give their names. There were Weld, Fitzgerald. Fitzherbert, Sewell, Sir John L. C. Richardson, Major Atkinson, Mantell and J. C. Richmond. On one important policy question, though the Government had a majority, they had not, as Weld and his colleagues thought, a sufficient majority to carry on, and Weld therefore tendered his resignation. I can well remember the news of the resignation coining to Dunedin, and though perhaps the majority of the Dunedin electors were not supporters of the Weld Government, there was a genuine feeling that New Zealand had lost an able Executive.

Another question that Fitzgerald devoted his attention to was that of public finance. He desired that there should be not only audit of the colony's expenditure, but control of it. The audit system in force had been what is called the postaudit system, that is, the Government paid accounts out of the Treasury, and the auditor afterwards audited these accounts, just as auditors do for public companies. Fitz gerald desired that there should be a control, and that before accounts were paid the Comptroller should certify that Parliament had authorised the payment, and that there were funds set aside for the purpose. In January, 1867, he was appointed to the position of Comptroller-General. The name of his office was altered by a later statute to that of Comptroller and Auditor-General, and he held that office till his death, in 1896.

And now I must say a few words about him as a man and a statesman. I have told you what his attitude was on several political questions in the colony, and I have given you a few extracts from his speeches so that you may realise that we had in New Zealand a statesman and a great orator. But he was a many-sided man. He took

an intense interest, not only in political questions, but in social questions also. His early essays and speeches show that he had high ideals, and that he was using bin talents and strength for reform. I have referred to his attempts to found a colony in Vancouver. He was also in-terested in the Irish question. He wrote a letter to the noblemen of England upon the condition of Ireland in the sad years of 1848 and 1849, and advocated Irish emigration in those years. He had, even in these early years, dealt-with the Exchequer system in England, and had written largely on the question. He was a poet, too, for he had then written poetry and songs. In 1853, whilst in the colony, he wrote on psychological subjects and on finance. He was a Home Ruler, and believed that the redemption of Ireland would come if she had a local Parliament. From 1860, when He returned to New Zealand, till 1867 He was the author of many essays, stories, plays, etc. As showing his many-sidedness, may I add that, He was a good lawyer and a law draftsman. He drew the Counties and the Municipal Acts of 1876, and in many financial measures his advice was sought and his draftsmanship adopted. In the "Monthly Review" was published an essay by him on "Dreams," and two papers on the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy. I remember, in 1804 or 1805, being much struck by an article that appeared in the Christchurch "Press" on city architecture. It seemed to me to He influenced by Ruskin, and was yet unlike Ruskin. It was not until twenty years after that I found that Mr Fitzgerald was the author of it. In his lecture on the value of art in the Colonial Museum in 1808 he dealt with the samo subject. I should like to quote many passages from it, but time will not permit me. I may, however, quote its message:—"I would," said he. "suggest to your earnest consideration whether, having not only been placed by our Creator under the authority of a moral law, but placed also by the same power in the midst of a world teeming, from the infinity of greatness to the infinity of littleness, with forms of unspeakable mystery and beauty, it may not be a mistake greater than most of us suppose, to neglect, individually and nationally, the study of this principle of beauty, for the recognition and enjoyment of which we are especially adapted by our nature."

Views on Government.

His lecture on government I think should be read to-day for its wisdom and its lesson. I have not time to give you more than one or two short extracts. He ever kept in view the need of freedom, and he saw, as who has not seen P that a government democratice [*unclear:* n] form may be tyrannical in action. Hear what he said (in 1870):—

"Now it seems a prevalent idea in these days that liberty depends solely upon the share which the people obtain of political power. Hence the enlargement of franchises, and the more complete subordination of the Executive to the Legislature, are spoken of as if they were the only guarantees for the preservation of liberty. But all that these things can do is to render government more completely subservient to the will of the popular majority. That, no doubt, in for certain purposes desirable. But how does it protect personal liberty? A majority may be as intolerant and tyrannical as an individual; and more so, because the tyrant has a head to be chopped off if the worst comes to the worst, which the majority has not. The tyranny of an individual is the evil of past times in civilised nations; at the present day, of still sem-barbarous people. But, in free countries, there is increasing danger of the tyranny of the majority of the hour. An act is not less unjust when done by a multitude than when done by one Liberty is equally destroyed if stabbed by a monarch or trampled under the feet of a mob. Hence [unclear: n] the struggles for liberty in past times it was not sought merely to render government popular, to substitute representative authority for hereditary right, to subordinate the will of the one to that of the many; it was found necessary to surround power, no matter in whose hands it might be, with a network of contrivances for its just use, amongst which we have had this handed down to us as the surest guarantee for personal liberty, the entire exclusion of those whose duty it is to administer the law from all political power, and their in dependence of those in whose hands the executive government is placed. And they are but shallow politicians who fancy that, because the representatives of the political majority of the day have become the depositaries of political power, the guarantees against its unlawful use which have been handed down to us from the past may be safely removed, I venture to speak thus, because there is a school of politicians who, in the eager desire for further improvement, and perhaps in a somewhat overstrained admiration for their own age, regard too lightly what we have received from the past. Let us not mistake forms for principles; and, rudely as we sweep away the technicalities and contrivances of a past age whenever they stand in the way of substantial improvements in the political machine, at least let us endeavour to understand the great principles of the structure we propose to improve, I think no one can have watched the working of the democratic governments established in most of the British colonies, without perceiving a tendency to rely too largely upon the powers of the executive government under the impression that, because it represents the majority of the hour, the ancient restraints upon the authority of the executive may be safely set aside. And, if I regard with some apprehension the results of this doctrine, it is from no pedantic regard for antique forms, but because it

seems to me to tend towards a resumption by the supreme authority of those various powers of government, the disposition of which in separate and independent depositaries was, and ever will be, the surest if not the only real guarantee for personal liberty."

And he ended his lecture with these wise words:—"Far distant, apparently, is the promised era, when men shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into reaping hooks. The worship of physical force will, perhaps, long be the reigning superstition of mankind. But, if there be any difference between one government and another, if there be any standard by which we can measure the value of government, surely our judgment should pronounce a government better or worse in proportion as it leads or obstructs the people under its rule in the march towards a higher national life."

In 1886 he wrote an essay on Imperial Federation which was submitted to the London Chamber of Commerce for their prize. Froude. Seeley, and Rawson, the judges placed it second on the list of essays on the subject. It was not only an essay, but it put in practical shape what the constitution of England should be if it became a federation, and I would refer you to it. The essays were published under the title of "England and her Colonies, by Swan, Souneschein, Lowrey and Co.

There are, I suppose, some present to-night who heard his inaugural address to the Wellington Citizens' Institute in 1893: if so, you will remember his concluding sentences:—"For my own part, I cannot but hold that, of all the words which have ever been spoken by human voice, or written by human hand, the most valuable—the most precious of all the records of the past—those which have exercised the largest influence on the destinies of the human race, and may yet exercise an influence more extensive than the boldest visionary can imagine, are those two charters of human rights and human duties—the first, which claims to have descended from the mountain mists of Sinai, and laid the foundation of law; the second, which were spoken on a mount in Galilee, and taught, 'Love is the fulfilling of the law.' "

I might mention some other subjects which were discussed by Fitzgerald:—"Possible Future Development of Governments in Free States," "Darwinian Theology," "Fourth Dimension," "Socialism," "Public Debts," "Gymnastic Training," " Self-reliant Policy in New Zealand," etc.

I have said he was an artist. He painted many pictures, and many of them were of "great merit. I remember being greatly struck by one which was a picture of a great wave. He said that while watching the waves during his last voyage to England in 1889 he had become so impressed with their majesty and beauty that he desired to put on canvas what had never been put there by a painter before, a huge wave, without any accessories or foreground. He found a great difficulty in getting a colour sufficiently blue and deep. He communicated with Mr Dicksee, the eminent painter, and obtained seme hints from him as to colour. Anything artistic came easily to him. He could carve in wood, and you will see in the museum a picture-frame carve l in walnut from a tree cut down by Mr Gladstone and containing Mr Gladstone's portrait. He was a man of great wit and humour. His fondness for a joke, his ready wit in appreciating one and his delightful fund of anecdotes could only have been fully appreciated if you had had the good fortune to have been a listener. You must have known the man to have appreciated this trait of his character. I can only say that no more delightful evenings were ever spent by me than those in his company. When he visited Dunedin on business I always called on him. I remember once calling on him when he was staying at the Criterion Hotel. There was a street musician playing not far from the window of the room in which we were seated. The hotelkeeper came in to know whether he should not send this musician away. Fitzgerald's reply was:—"For goodness sake, no. It is the best accessory to your hotel. Give the man 5s—here it is—and tell him to go on."

He took an intense interest in all social development, and it could never have been said that he was on what is termed the conservative side. But, above all, he was a man of the highest rectitude, and unbiassed in the performance of his public duties. He did what he believed to be his duty undeterred by fear or favour. He was one of the public servants of the colony of whom New Zealanders should ever be proud. Among the many able men who gave their lives to lay the foundations of this young nation, he was perhaps unique in his public spirit, in his high character, in the variety of his intellectual abilities and attainments, for he was orator, poet, artist, financier, statesman, essayist, and philosopher. And so long as the name and remembrance of New Zealand and her pioneers endure, James Edward Fitzgerald will be revered and his memory honoured.

vignette

Printed at the New Zealand Times Office, Lambton Quay. Wellington.

Public Education in New Zealand: A Speech Delivered by The Hon. Robert Stout, Minister of Education, In the House of Representatives, JULY 21, 1885. crest Wellington. By Authority: George Didsbury, Government Printer. 1885.

Public Education in New Zealand.

IT has not been the custom hitherto for the Minister of Education to make any formal statement about the working of his department. Seeing, however, the natural and gradual increase of the vote for education in proportion to the increase of population, and the need there is in every country of taking care that the lines on which the State aid to education is granted are such as commend themselves to the community, I have thought it proper to make a short statement about the educational position of this colony. I do not think there is any need of apology for my doing so. It is considered the duty of other Ministers with respect to their several departments to report to the House, outside of the official departmental reports, what has been accomplished during the recess, and also, if necessary, to indicate what reforms may be made in the departments under their control. There is no department so important as that of Education. A railway here or there may be of importance to some particular districts, but if it be not made, or even if it should be made in the wrong place, these things can be repaired; but the days of granting education to youth are limited, and, once passed, they cannot be recovered. If, then, our children arc not obtaining a proper education, we, as a State, are guilty of great neglect. We are preventing them from making the best possible of their life in the future. I have thought it best, in order that members may have a full view of all that the colony is doing for education, to divide what I have to say under several heads. I propose, first, to show what our educa- tional machinery is, and what the State does for higher, secondary, and primary education. I then propose to point out what reforms are being made, and in what direction I think there is need of further reform. I also intend to refer to what the State is doing in the way of museum and scientific instruction, and I shall also speak of the Native schools, the school for the deafmutes, and the State industrial schools. Having shown what the State is doing, I shall then point out some reasons why I think that State interference with education should not at present cease, and why Parliament should pass heartily the sums that are asked for the continuance of our system.

And first as to our educational machinery, I would point out that, unlike that of other colonies, and of the Mother-country, our central Education Department is of a very limited character. Even in England, where it has been said that there is no such thing as State education but only State aid to schools, there is a larger central staff proportionately to the population than we have. It New Zealand there are only the Secretary to the Education Department, the Inspector-General of Schools, three clerk, and three cadets. The Native schools, being directly under the control of the Education Department, have as organizing Inspector, but the staff I have mentioned is all that the central Government has for the distribution of the large sums of money placed under its control, and to aid the Minister in dealing with university, secondary, and primary education, and Native and industrial schools. It will be seen, therefore, that the administration of education is left almost entirely to local management.

Coming to the university—the New Zealand University was first established by Act in 1870. That Act might well be termed tentative in its nature: little was done under it, and it was not until 1874 that the present New Zealand University was reconstituted, and really came into life. In its management the State has very little voice. There are two bodies, the Senate and the Convocation. The Senate consists of twenty-four Fellows; one-half are elected by the graduates, and the other half by the Senate itself. The Convocation consists of the graduates above the degree of Bachelor, and all Bachelors of two years' standing. These two Courts have the control of the University. The Governor in Council has a vetoing power, because every election to the Senate is subject to his approval, and statutes and regulations have to be approved and sanctioned by him before they become operative, and the Governor is also the Visitor of the University, having the powers that Visitors of such institutions possess. But, further than this, the Government cannot interfere. I am not proposing to meddle with the university, but I think it is to be regretted that there should not have been some provision for more direct Governmental control in the management of the highest education of the State. A fund placed by the State at the disposal of the university consists of the sum of three thousand pounds a year, paid out of the Consolidated Fund. The reserves that have been set apart throughout the colony for university purposes have been localized, except what are called the Colonial University reserves at Auckland, which it is proposed to deal with this session; and Colonial University reserves of 10,000 acres in Taranaki, 4,000 acres in the Waitotara district, 1,500 acres at Ashburton, and 30 acres in Westland. With this exception the reserves belong to the separate institutions which perform the teaching functions of a university in the various districts. The New Zealand University is strictly an examining institution: it confers degrees, but it has no teachers in its employment. The teaching part of the university work is done by affiliated institutions. At present they are as follows: The Otago University at Dunedin, the Canterbury College in Christchurch, the Auckland University College in Auckland, the Nelson College at Nelson, and St. John's College, Auckland.

Over some of these institutions the Government has considerable control; for example, the Otago University Council, that has the management of the Otago University, is wholly appointed by the Governor; in Auckland, three members (for the present six) of the Council of the Auckland University College are appointed by the Governor, who also appoints the members of the governing body of Nelson College. With regard to the Canterbury College, however, when vacancies arise in the managing body of the college, members are

appointed by the graduates of the New Zealand University on the books of the college, so that, so far as it is concerned, the State has no voice in its management. St. John's College, Auckland, is a Church of England institution. These various affiliated institutions perform, as I have already said, the teaching work of the University, and in some of them there is ample provision made for giving a high-class university education. In Auckland there are four Professors, filling the following chairs: 1. Classics and English; 2. Mathematics; 3. Chemistry and Experimental Physics; 4. Natural Science.

In Canterbury College there are six Professors (for classics, English language and literature, mathematics and natural philosophy, chemistry and physics, geology and palaeontology, and biology), and lecturers on modem languages and jurisprudence.

In Otago University there are eight Professors (for classics, English constitutional history and political economy, mathematics and natural philosophy, chemistry, mental and moral philosophy, biology, anatomy and physiology, and mining and mineralogy), and nine lecturers on law, French, German, surgery, *materia medica*, practice of medicine, pathology, midwifery and medical jurisprudence and public health.

The other institutions are not so well provided with teachers. These affiliated institutions are maintained as follows: Auckland has a grant of £4,000 a year from the General Government. Nelson, Canterbury, and Otago are maintained by revenues from reserves, fees, endowments, &c.

It is not necessary for me to dwell at present on the need of university education for New Zealand. I shall refer to this before I finish my sketch of our educational work. I may say, however, that I have had statistics prepared to show the results of our university education, and I think they may be said to be extremely gratifying. I will not repeat what members perhaps are aware of—the results in previous years—but I may take for example simply what happened at the last degree-capping at the Edinburgh University. I find that the New Zealand youths stood exceedingly high. Mr. Jeffcoat, of Dunedin, a B.A. of the New Zealand University, took senior first-class honours and medals in *materia medica* and general pathology. His position in *materia medica* was first out of eight who succeeded, and his position in general pathology was the highest. Mr. Lindsay, another New Zealand B.A. trained in the Otago University, took first-class honours in *materia medica*, and the fourth position amongst the eight who succeeded. He took first-class honours, junior division, at general pathology, fifth out of eighteen that succeeded. He took a second-class certificate in clinical surgery, the twelfth out of forty-eight who were successful. I find others who have had the benefits of university education in New Zealand also standing high. Mr. Fleming took second-class honours in practical physiology, being the first out of six who were successful. He took the same class honours in general pathology, the twenty-eighth out of sixty-seven who were successful, and the same in clinical surgery, fortieth out of forty-eight. Mr. McKenzie took senior first-class honours in the practice of physic, being the sixth out of thirteen who succeeded. Mr. Allan took junior second-class honours in general pathology; he also took the same in the Institutes of Medicine, and the same in clinical surgery. Other New Zealand youths have also distinguished themselves. Mr. Robertson took first-class honours, senior division, in surgery, the highest out of eight who were successful; and Mr. Borthwick took first-class honours and the medal in the junior division in the Institutes of Medicine, being third out of seventeen who were successful, and second-class honours in practical physiology. Mr. Westenra took senior division second-class honours in surgery. Mr. King took junior division honours in the practice of physic. Mr. Williams took junior division second-class honours in the practice of physic. Mr. Hawkes took second-class honours in general pathology. Three competitions have been held in New Zealand for the Gilchrist Scholarship of £100 a year, the test examination being the same as that undergone by candidates for matriculation at the University of London. At the competition in 1880 the scholarship was gained with much credit by Mr. Herbert, B.A., of Canterbury College, who was a master in Napier High School. Three candidates offered themselves for examination in 1882, when the successful competitor was Mr. S almond, M.A., of Otago University, who was placed by the London examiners "equal with the first candidate in the original honours list" of all that were examined for matriculation by the London University in June, 1882. Mr. Salmond has just terminated his second years' attendance at the London University College. At the close of his first year's course he took the first prize in the classes he attended. He passed the intermediate examination in Laws at London University in first-class honours (being the first of two who gained this distinction among eighty competitors), and obtained the exhibition of £40 a year for two years. At the third examination in July last year there were five competitors: three from Canterbury College, one from Auckland University College, and one, a lady, from Otago University. The successful candidate was Mr. Inglis, B.A., of Canterbury College, who took a high place in the "honours division"; while three competitors, including the lady candidate, took good positions in the "first division," and one failed. Were I to look at the records of other Home universities, where others of our youths are who have been trained in New Zealand, it would be seen that they occupy good positions. I only mention this incidentally, for the purpose of showing that our university institutions and schools are doing good work, and that colonial youths, if opportunities are given to them, can acquit themselves as well as those who hail from the Parent-country.

So far as secondary education is concerned, there are in New Zealand the following secondary schools, viz.: Auckland College and Grammar School, Auckland Girls' High School, Thames High School (for boys and girls), New Plymouth High School (for boys and girls), Wanganui Endowed School, Wellington College, Wellington Girls' High School, Napier Boys' High School, Napier Girls' High School, Nelson College, Nelson Girls' College, Christ's College Grammar School, Christchurch, Christchurch Boys' High School, Christchurch Girls' High School, Rangiora High School (for boys and girls), Akaroa High School (for boys and girls), Ashburton High School (for boys and girls), Timaru High School (for boys and girls), Waitaki High School, Otago Boys' High School, Otago Girls' High School, Southland Boys' High School, and Southland Girls' High School. All these are in full operation. The following have been constituted by Acts of the Legislature, but have not yet begun work: Wanganui High School, Greymouth High School, Hokitika High School, and Waimate High School. The Whangarei High School is closed for the present, but it is proposed in the Forest Bill now before the House to reconstitute it as a forestry and agricultural school. The Board of the Hokitika High School is taking steps to begin work, and with every hope of success.

Of these, the following received assistance directly out of the Consolidated Fund last year: Auckland Girls' High School, £1,000; New Plymouth High School, £200; Wellington College, £150; Wellington Girls' High School, £350; Nelson Girls' College, £500; Christchurch Girls' High School, £200; Timaru High School, £400; and Waitaki High School, £500: the total amount voted being £3,300.

The others, which did not receive assistance, have been endowed with land and money from the Crown, from associations, and from private individuals. The Inspector-General of Schools has authority to inspect most of these schools, and he has done so, and his report will be submitted to you. "When the Education Act was being passed in this House, I doubted the wisdom of divorcing the secondary from the primary schools. I then thought that they might have been controlled by the same Boards of Management, and that the functions of the Boards might have been so defined by statute that there would have been no danger of funds belonging to secondary schools being taken for primary schools, or of funds belonging to primary schools being taken for secondary. However, Parliament thought otherwise; and hence arose the need of having separate Boards to deal with the secondary schools in the several districts. On many of the Boards the Government have representatives, that is, several members are appointed by the Government for varying terms of years. The Government appoints two members of the Board of each of the following institutions: Whangarei, Ashburton, Greymouth, Waitaki, Otago, and Invercargill High Schools; one member of the Board of each of the High Schools at Napier, Timaru, and Hokitika; three members of the Thames High School Board; and four members of the Wellington College Board. The Governor of the colony, in his capacity of Visitor, appoints all the nine members of the Nelson College Board. Independently, then, of the general inspection by the Inspector-General of Schools, the Government has some voice in the management of the secondary schools; for it has the power of appointing members of the managing bodies. The Government has however, no direct control over them; it cannot prescribe their courses of study, nor can it interfere with their internal management, nor can it even provide that their course of tuition shall stand in a proper relation to that of the primary schools or of the university. This, I think, is to be regretted. However, it may not be expedient at present to interfere with their course of instruction. I intend, however, to state presently what the Education Department has done in making suggestions to them regarding a part of education that has been much neglected in the past.

I now come to the primary schools, still dealing only with what may be termed the machinery of the Act. I have already described the constitution of the central department. We have thirteen Education Boards, which have the general management of education in their districts; and for each school district there is a School Committee, elected annually by householders and parents of children. There is rarely more than one school in each district. The cumulative-voting principle is applicable to the election of these Committees, and, speaking from experience extending over seven years, I think it can be said that the Act in this respect has worked well. No doubt, in small districts and at small meetings, it may have happened that men altogether unfit to have the administration of educational affairs have occasionally been put on Committees, but I do not think that any permanent, or even any slight, injury has been inflicted on education by the election of one or two men of this kind. The Committees take considerable interest in the educational affairs of their own districts. The Boards are elected by the School Committees. Each Board consists of nine members, and three retire annually; and, on the whole, I think the colony is to be congratulated on the men who have undertaken the arduous, and often thankless, task of doing Education Board duty. Throughout the colony I believe the Boards have striven to carry out the provisions of the Act; and, though there have been misunderstandings between the Boards and some of the Committees in almost all the districts, yet the Boards have done good work, and raised the standard of education. The Boards have the appointment of the head masters and assistant teachers, and, most Boards have, I think wisely, consulted the Committees before appointments were made, and, except in very rare instances, have deferred to the opinion of the Committees in the appointment of teachers. The power of the dismissal of teachers virtually rests with the Boards, and no doubt the advantage of that has been that the teacher's position

has been more secure than it was before the new Education Act came into force. The chance of a good teacher obtaining promotion is now better than under the old systems; for formerly Committees were allowed the power of appointment and dismissal.

The aid annually granted by the State to the primary schools is at the rate of £4 for every child in average daily attendance; this is made up of the statutory vote of £3 15s., and a special grant of 5s., that has been voted for the last three years. There is also a grant of Is. 6d. a head for the maintenance of scholarships to the secondary schools. In addition to the capitation grants the following sums are voted: £4,000 for distribution among the several Education Boards, to assist them in making sufficient provision for the inspection of the schools; and £8,000 for the maintenance of the training colleges for teachers at Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin. Special grants are also made for school buildings, and for the purchase and improvement of sites and playgrounds. Of course, as the number of children increases, these grants must yearly increase. I think, however, that as population increases the Boards should be able to economize in their management. It is well known that it is cheaper to teach a large school than a small school—I mean relatively to the number of the children. I hope the time may come when the extra 5s. which has been granted for the last three years may be dispensed with. The reason why I mention this is, not that I personally think we are now, even with this extra sum, paying too much for education, but I know that our education system has many enemies, and that the question of expense will be fastened on as one objection to it. The Boards and Committees who really desire to see the State-education system maintained efficiently should do what they can to aid the department in reducing expenditure, so far as is consistent with efficiency. There are under the thirteen Boards 976 primary schools, and eleven district high schools, that is, schools combining some secondary school-work with primary teaching. These have 1,657 teachers, 790 pupil-teachers, and 161 sewing mistresses; and the current cost is £313,316, being at the rate of £4 3s. 2¼d. each for 75,391 pupils in average attendance, or £3 4s. 9½d. each for 96,840 pupils on the rolls. The expenditure on school buildings for last year was £49,679, or at the rate of 13s. 2¼d. for each scholar in average attendance, and 10s. 3d. per pupil on the rolls.

The department also gives aid to normal schools—schools providing for the training of teachers. Every district has a pupil-teacher system, and, valuable as is this system for the training of teachers, it has been rightly felt that there should be some training college to which pupil-teachers might go for the perfecting of their studies in teaching. There are training colleges or normal schools at Auckland, at Wellington, at Christchurch, and at Dunedin, and no doubt as other districts increase they may be able to establish similar institutions. At present, four arc, I think, sufficient for the wants of the colony. The students in the normal schools at Auckland, Christchurch, and Dunedin have the opportunity of attending the university college lectures. Those in Wellington have not had the same advantages in this respect, but the Wellington Board has done what it could to make up for the want of university teaching. Classes in science have been formed, and steps have been taken to render the teaching of the students as effective as possible.

This, then, briefly stated, is the machinery of our State-education system. I may be asked, What has been the result? It is impossible to accurately guage the result of an education system in seven years, or even in fourteen or twenty-one years. There are signs, however, that our education system is doing excellent work. It is perhaps not necessary for me to refer to the number of our university students as compared with our population. I believe, however, that we show as many real university students for our population as any country in the world; and, though our primary-school system is not equal to that of some other countries, it is gradually improving, and, with some alterations that I propose to make, it will still further improve. There is one thing that may be taken as some test of what education is doing for the colony, and that is, the number of teachers who have been trained in New Zealand, and are now teaching in our schools, excluding pupil-teachers. I have the statistics of all the schools in the colony save about ninety, and I find that in these schools there are altogether 1,550 teachers, and of these 1,034 were trained in New Zealand, of whom there were 338 who were born in New Zealand, 307 who though born elsewhere have been educated from boyhood or girlhood in New Zealand, and 389 who were mainly educated out of the colony, but first became teachers after their arrival in New Zealand. One hundred and eleven teachers of primary schools were trained in Australia, 392 in Great Britain and Ireland, and thirteen elsewhere. In our secondary schools we have, out of 139 teachers, twenty-nine who were born in New Zealand; twenty who have been trained from early youth in New Zealand, though born elsewhere; twenty-two who were trained as teachers in New Zealand, though mainly educated out of the colony; nine Australian teachers; fifty-seven from Great Britain and Ireland; and two educated elsewhere. I have also some statistics of those who have been educated in the colony who have obtained positions in our various professions and in our mercantile houses and in our Government offices, and it is surprising to see the number of native-trained youths who have distinguished themselves in every department as professional men, as merchants, as manufacturers, and in the Government service.

And now as to the weaknesses of our system. It seems to me that it has been weak in three respects. First,

there has not been a proper gradation between the primary and secondary schools; secondly, there has been more attention paid to the literary part of education than to the scientific; and, thirdly, technical instruction has been almost entirely ignored. Reforms in education, however, like reforms in everything else, must come slowly; and it is impossible for any Minister for Education to do at once all that he thinks ought to be done to make an education system complete. So far as the gradation between the primary and secondary schools is concerned, existing defects can only be remedied as population grows denser. I hope, however, that in the chief towns of the colony, without waiting for a great increase of population, some effort will at once be made to prevent the attendance of too young children in our high or grammar schools. I think that there ought to be no admission into a high or grammar school until, at all events, the Fourth Standard of the primary schools has been passed. There are difficulties in laying down such a rule. One difficulty is, that there is no provision for giving the first rudiments of a high literary or classical education in our primary schools, and that children who have passed the Fourth Standard, beginning the study of Latin, or French, or German somewhat late, may be placed at a disadvantage compared with those who, having less knowledge of English, may have begun the study of these foreign languages earlier. I see reason to hope, however, that the Fourth Standard may be passed by children at an earlier age on the average than at present; and that, by grounding the children well in the earlier standards, and teaching them scientifically, this may be accomplished without any cry of over-pressure. I only suggest a stricter examination; but I am firmly convinced that much of the hostility manifested towards the secondary schools has arisen from the fact that the secondary schools have been for many children mere elementary schools, so that there seemed to be some reason to complain that the high schools were not real high schools in the true sense of the term. Of course, there is always another side to a question, and the other side of this question, from the high-school point of view, is this: that the younger children pay large fees for the elementary teaching they receive, and that the high school is thus enabled to give education in the higher branches at a cheap rate, so that the authorities may say: "If you have such a strict examination as you suggest, we shall be unable to teach the higher branches with our present revenues, and the State must supplement them." This, no doubt, is a difficulty, especially when every pound paid for higher education is grudged by many in this community. I therefore think that, before much can be accomplished in the direction of doing away with elementary teaching in secondary schools, population must become more dense, and that the standards for primary schools must be slightly altered, so that their pupils can more easily change from a primary to a secondary school.

The second point is scientific education. We have brought with us to our colony the idea that our fathers had about high-class education, and their idea was that a high-class education must be a literary education, an acquaintance with languages, an acquaintance with the literature of ancient peoples, an acquaintance with philosophy. In these days scientific education has taken great strides, and everywhere throughout the world efforts are being made to teach science in such a way that, independently of the information it contains, it may afford a mental gymnastic equal in value with that which is supplied by the study of any classical language. The University of New Zealand has wisely recognised this, and so have the affiliated colleges, though the recognition can only take practical shape to the extent allowed by their revenues. Considerable stress has for some time been placed upon scientific attainments, and now persons may obtain degrees in science without having passed in more than two languages, and one of the languages may be English and the other French or German or Italian. The pass for a Bachelor of Science is as follows: Mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and any two out of the five following subjects: Latin, Greek, English, modern languages, mental scicnce. A candidate can both matriculate and afterwards proceed to the B.Sc. degree without any knowledge of the classics.

I am also glad to state that in the secondary schools considerable advance has been made in providing for scientific education. Several of them have science masters, and all of them are doing something to teach science.

When I give an account of the alterations I have made in the standards, I shall point out what position science is to occupy in the primary schools.

I shall now deal with technical education. Something has been done in this direction. Let me, however, state that the phrase "technical education" is often misunderstood. No school can so equip any youth for the trade he intends to follow as to render an appprenticeship unnecessary. Our schools cannot be utilized—neither our primary nor secondary schools—for direct training for special trades. The workshop, after all, must be the school for the mechanic. All that we can hope to do in primary or secondary schools is to so teach a boy the theory applicable to any trade that the practice may become easy to him, and also to so train him that he may have a bias towards industry. The training may, perhaps, include, where circumstances will permit, some practical exercises in the handling of tools. Believing in the great advantages of technical education to this colony as likely to promote the development of our manufacturing, our mining, and our agricultural pursuits, I addressed, through the department, a letter to the various secondary schools in this colony, a copy of which will

be found annexed to the report of the Education Department laid on the table of the House. I am glad to state that this letter has met with hearty response from almost all the schools, and efforts have been made to establish technical and science classes. I have not time to refer specially to what has been done in the various districts, but it is certain that much will be accomplished in future years. It is not necessary that I should now defend technical education. This I may lay down as an axiom, that the more numerous the manufactures of a country are, the higher will be the intelligence of its inhabitants; and manufactures cannot be properly developed till more attention is paid to technical education.

I now come to deal with the standards of the primary schools; for, after all, it is to the primary schools we must mainly look for the education of the people of the colony. There are only a few that can afford to finish their education at the secondary schools, and fewer still that can afford the time to obtain a university education. I shall not weary you by going over the standards, especially as members will have an opportunity of seeing the old standards and the present standards, and of comparing them. I shall point out what my aim has been in altering them. I found that the objections to the standards were various. One main objection, and one which it is always difficult to overcome, is that, in order to conduct even the small schools in the country districts, there must be a large number of classes. Suppose there are six standards, there will require to be more than six classes, because there are usually some children not yet able to undertake even the work of the First Standard, and some of these classes have to be instructed in geography, history, and grammar; and, if it was impossible for a single teacher do all this work, what then was to be done? I have so arranged the standards that a teacher will be able in country schools to reduce the number of his classes. I have divided the subjects to be taught in the schools under three heads: they are the compulsory subjects, the class-subjects, and the additional. Compulsory subjects, of course, are those in which no child who does not pass individually can obtain a certificate for the standard. The class-subjects are to be examined in class, and the Inspector is to report as to how the children acquit themselves. In the additional subjects there must be some elasticity allowed: some schools may not be able to undertake them. By making history a class-subject and not a pass-subject, and by making the geography for the pass of an elementary kind, and treating geography as a class-subject, except in Standards III. and V., I have, I hope, made it possible for teachers of small schools to get rid of many disadvantages under which they now labour, and rendered it very unlikely that any reasonable critic will say that the children are made to suffer from over-pressure. In order, however, to provide for the teaching of technical science something must be done in the primary schools. What, then, can be done? Following the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners on technical instruction, who reported last year to the British Government, I have included drawing as one of the compulsory subjects. Drawing is of very great importance to most of our trades; the carpenter, the builder, the engineer, the cabinetmaker, the pattern-maker, the manufacturer, the dressmaker—almost all—require to know drawing. It is, in fact, the first step in technical education, and I propose that it shall be compulsory in ail the standards. I shall not expect that the pass will be high, and I shall not seek to enforce this compulsory subject in the higher standards at once. I know that there are many good teachers throughout the colony who do not know how to teach drawing, because they have never been trained, and that is one of the difficulties under which the education system must labour for many years to come. I intend, however, by the adoption of drawing copy-books, and by only requiring at first what may be termed an elementary pass, to lay the lines for the development of drawing, it being, as I have said, the basis of all technical-science education. Then I propose that attention shall be paid to elementary science, and I believe that elementary science can be taught, not from text-books, but orally by the teachers, and that it should be taught to our children from their earliest years, and without any technical names: geology could be called earth-knowledge; botany, plant-knowledge, and so on. And the principles of mechanics could be taught without text-books, by means of object-lessons. In schools in the country I think the teachers should be able to give a special bias towards agriculture, and in schools in the various town districts a special bias may be given towards those manufactures that have been, or are likely to be, established in those towns. This is the system that is practised in many parts of the Conti- nent of Europe with very happy results. With the aid of drawing we may hope to see our manufactures become more artistic. Defect in this respect, as has been pointed out by the Commissioners on Technical Education, has been the great drawback to the manufactures of the English workman: for sound workmanship he is not to be excelled by any foreign workman, but he has lacked the artistic finish and touch of many continental manufacturers.

With this altered syllabus I believe our schools will be made more efficient; I believe they will be made practical; and I believe that the mental training of the children will be as well looked after as it is now.

I may say, before I pass to another point, that I entertain the hope that, perhaps from private munificence, if not from Government aid, we may see established, at all events in each large centre, some working school where the handling of tools may be taught to the children, if only for an hour or two a week. I regret that with the means allowed us for education we cannot at present give any aid in this work.

I must say something about our Native schools. I think, without casting any reflection on the past

administration of Native schools, I may state that it is only in recent years that the Native schools have been doing really effective work, and I believe that the colony is greatly indebted to the efforts of Mr. Pope, the Organizing Inspector. He has entered into his work with great enthusiasm, and I am glad to say that almost everywhere throughout the colony his efforts have been successful, and that many Maori schools are now a credit to us, and equal to some of our primary schools where white children are taught. We have sixty-five Native village schools, in charge of 115 teachers and work mistresses, and the cost including buildings was about £15,500 last year. I hope that no one will grudge this expense. The Maoris, in providing for their own education, have been most generous; they invariably give their sites free—in this respect they are sometimes more generous than Europeans; and they gave in the past large tracts of land to be held in trust for the education of their children. I regret to say that, in some cases, their reserves have not been utilized for the purposes for which they were set apart. The Native Committees, who have a share in the management of the schools, have paid a very large amount of attention to them, looking after them most carefully. Of course, there are places where the attendance has fallen away and the schools declined; but, on the whole, Native schools are in a flourishing position and are doing excellent work. Looking over the reports of the Inspector, and comparing the work with that done in European schools, one sees that with proper educational opportunities the Maori race will not be far behind us. I have seen letters of their own composition written by Maori children, I have seen work done by them, of all kinds, equal in many respects to that done by Europeans; and, seeing that we have a great responsibility in dealing with the Maoris, in providing for their future, I only regret that many years ago similar efforts were not made for the training of Maori children. There are 2,226 attending the schools, of whom 1,834 are Maoris, half-castes, or between Maori and half-castes, and these numbers show a great increase, notwithstanding the decrease of the race. We have also about eighty Maori children in boarding institutions, where they are trained in European habits and ideas, and a large proportion of them are receiving instruction in the higher subjects. We are using the Native schools as a means of teaching the Maoris the elements of sanitary science and social economy. A text-book, "Health for the Maori," has been published in English and Maori, and Mr. Pope is preparing one on Social Economy. We also send the schools useful seeds and plants, with pamphlets showing how to cultivate them. I shall, with leave of the House, lay one on the table dealing with this subject, to show the kind of work we are attempting.

The other schools that are under the Education Department are termed industrial schools. We have institutions directly under our control in Auckland (at Newton and Kohimarama), at Burnham in Canterbury, and at Caversham in Otago. In connection with these three institutions there were the following children at the close of last year: Resident in the schools, 432; boarded with foster-parents, 384: making a total of 816 maintained at the expense of the State. There were also 347 children at service or with friends, although still under the legal protection of the managers of the schools. There is also an industrial school and orphanage at the Thames, supported by the Government, but under the management of a local committee, in connection with which there were at the end of the year seventeen committed children, five of whom were at service or with friends. Members are aware that there are also what may be termed private institutions to which children are sent, for whom we pay, as a rule, about seven shillings per week. These are, St. Mary's School in Auckland, St. Joseph's in Wellington, and St. Mary's in Nelson. These institutions are Roman Catholic.

At the end of last year there were 1,446 children of all classes connected with our industrial schools. I have personally visited the schools in Auckland (the St. Mary's, the Kohimarama, and the Howe Street Home), the schools at Nelson, and those at Burnham and Caversham, and I was pleased generally with what I saw. We have in connection with our industrial schools the boarding-out system established, which, shortly, is this: the children are boarded out, we pay seven shillings a week for their board, and, if they are of suitable age, they attend the nearest school. At present 392 children, out of the 1,446, are under this system. These children are under the guardianship of the managers of the industrial schools in their respective districts. In addition to this, we have a lady Official Correspondent at Auckland, at Christchurch, and at Dunedin, and ladies who statedly visit the children. I am glad to state that these ladies out of love for the children visit them in their homes, and pay attention to their wants; and here I would specially thank them for what they have done during the past years. Any one who chooses to read over the reports that they furnish monthly to the department will see the care and trouble they take.

The children committed under the industrial-school system are of three kinds: children who themselves have done wrong, and children who were in destitute circumstances, or whose parents have either done wrong or neglected them. The total number committed under the Act last year was 313, who may be classified as follows: Destitute, 195; vagrant, 11; residing in disreputable houses, 23; uncontrollable, 27; guilty of punishable offences, 37; committed by agreement with the parents, 20.

It is not for me perhaps to state what the result of this industrial-school system has been; I will only say this, that it has exceeded what might have been expected of it. Of course every child does not turn out well, nor docs every child trained in the primary or secondary schools, but I believe that the proportion in industrial

schools who succeed is just as great as in other schools. I have known instances of children whose parents were criminal, low, and degraded, who have, through being taken in time and placed in our industrial schools, turned out good members of society. Cases of this kind have come before me almost every week since I have been Minister of Education.

When these children are able to work they are placed out to service, and some are apprenticed to trades. Their earnings, after deduction of cost of clothing and other necessaries, are placed to their credit in the Savings Bank, and the several amounts are refunded to them on their reaching manhood or womanhood in the event of their conduct proving satisfactory. It is not an unusual thing for the girls to receive their money as a marriage portion, and the boys on their satisfying the Minister of Education that the money will be applied to some good use, such as the purchase of a house or land, or beginning business. A great number of children have thus got a start in life, and I have been delighted to see from the reports I have received from officers of the department that many children who, if not taken any charge of by the State and placed in industrial schools, would, in all probability, have grown up to be criminals and a plague to society, have been made good citizens and are getting on well in the world. The number of such instances is surprising, and what the State has to face is really this: whether it is not better to take the children when young and impressionable and give them a good moral education, than to allow them to grow up criminals, and thus cost society far more than their education costs. But here I might say one word in reference to the cause of so many children being in the industrial schools. The statistics show that it is mainly the fault of the parents—drunken parents, criminal parents, parents who were leading immoral lives, parents who did not recognise parental duty—it is their children who crowd our industrial schools; and I believe there is need of some more stringent law to make parents who are criminal and neglectful do their duty, and I have asked the House this session to amend the Industrial Schools Act in this direction. There are great difficulties, no doubt, in dealing with industrial-school children: they require peculiar treatment. I am glad to see that, as a rule, masters in charge of the schools have done good work. It would be invidious to single out officers, but I may state that Mr. Titchener, the present manager of the Caversham Industrial School, has reformed many that were given up as unreformable. I need not mention the names—it is unfair to do so to youths who have now settled down and acted rightly—but several instances have come before me of lads, who have been given up as incorrigible, being reformed, and this not by harsh treatment but by kindness, adroitness, and firmness. I may here state that the amount of money in the Savings Bank to the credit of the children at the close of 1884 was £2,756, and that the amount withdrawn and paid to the young men and young women whose good conduct entitled them to their former earnings was last year £190.

In addition to the children committed to the industrial schools there were, at the close of last year, 159 destitute children, maintained out of the charitable-aid vote, in several orphanages which are under the inspection of the Education Department. There are orphanages at Lyttelton, Motueka, and Parnell. A year previously the number of such children was 202, so that there has been a diminution to the extent of 43 during the twelve months.

I must not omit to mention the very interesting work carried on at the Sumner Deaf-mute Institution, under the supervision of the Education Department. This institution is now attended by thirty-six pupils; seven of them are from Auckland, one from Taranaki, four from Wellington, one from Hawke's Bay, ten from Canterbury, and twelve from Otago. Among the pupils is a deaf mute girl, who has been sent from South Australia to enjoy the advantages offered by the school. The method of instruction is that known as the articulation method, by which deaf mutes are trained to the use of the organs of speech, and learn both to speak, in the ordinary sense of the word, and to understand from the motion of the lips the speech of others. No use is made of finger-signs or other means employed elsewhere as substitutes for speech. The course of instruction includes reading and writing in the first instance, followed by the other subjects of a good school education. The girls are, of course, also instructed in sewing, knitting, and other domestic accomplishments. The ability and zeal of the director, Mr. Van Asch, are worthy of high commendation, and he is well seconded by Mrs. Van Asch in promoting the welfare and comfort of the pupils. I have had the pleasure of visiting the school, and seeing the nature of the instruction given, and I must say that the results of Mr. Van Asch's labours are surprising and gratifying.

We have other educational institutions that are helped by the State. We have athenæums, and mechanics' institutes, and public libraries. Generally speaking, the lending of books and the keeping open of reading-rooms are the main work performed by these institutions, though they bear different names: in few of them is provision made for lectures and classes. There are in some centres classes organized for teaching apprentices and others in the evening. Voluntary associations are doing this work in some centres of population—excellent work of this class has been done in Dunedin by the Caledonian Society—and Education Boards have provided drawing-classes and schools of art for many pupils. Our mechanics' institutes are, however, mainly libraries. Aid is given to public libraries, the one condition insisted upon being that the reading-room shall be open to the public without charge. Because of this restriction many libraries, including some of our largest, do not receive

any part of the grant. Last year £4,000 was distributed amongst 385 libraries, and the local receipts of these libraries from donations and members' subscriptions were nearly £9,000. When I state that there is hardly a village without its library, it will be seen how advanced we are in this mode of providing instruction for our population. Indeed, I am tempted to give a few statistics to show the fondness for reading amongst our people. The value of books imported was last year £115,246. This does not include magazines, newspapers, &c., and books coming by post. Then, the number of newspapers published was 49 daily and 91 weekly, biweekly, and tri-weekly, and 32 others, making a total of 172, or one to every 3,281 of the population. In England and Wales the number was 1,962 newspapers, or 1 to every 13,828; in Ireland, 152 newspapers, or 1 to every 32,585; in Scotland, 184 newspapers, or 1 to every 21,013; and in the United States, 10,771 newspapers, or 1 to every 4,656 of the population.

Then, there is another means of educating the people—museums and art-galleries. So far as museums are concerned, we are in advance of the Australian Colonies. The Canterbury Museum excels those of Sydney and Melbourne, and in arrangement of exhibits for scientific purposes the Otago Museum is second to none I have seen. Our Wellington Museum is full of most interesting exhibits; its geological, palaeontological, and mineralogical departments are especially fine: and it is to be deeply regretted that there is not a better and larger building in which the able officers in charge could show the exhibits to greater advantage. In Auckland there is also a museum, which, though smaller than those I have named, has very interesting exhibits. In art-galleries New Zealand is weak. Auckland will soon have a fine one; but little lias been done in any other place. There are, however, art societies in Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin, and, from the pictures exhibited, and the enthusiasm that is each year increasing amongst our young painters, I have no doubt we shall soon have art-galleries in the three cities I have named: a colony that can boast of a Gully, and a Richmond, and a Barraud that have painted its natural beauties should before long be well supplied with artists and art-galleries. This brief statement of what is being done with respect to museums and art-galleries necessarily leads me up to a question which has been brought prominently before the Education Department, and it is this: Should New Zealand have a Science and Art Department, such as is seen in London? And first I have to state that the separate scientific institutes, aided by the Colonial Institute, under Dr. Hector's able management, are to some extent doing this work. Honourable members are acquainted with the valuable and interesting volume published each year of this institute's transactions, and they see from time to time manuals and reports on scientific subjects issued from the Colonial Museum Department. But this is not all that has to be done by the present Colonial Museum Department. The Meteorological Department is under Dr. Hector, and his aid in looking after local industries is always valuable. In fact, to a considerable extent, the Colonial Museum acts as a science department. No doubt more could be done, but I am afraid if more were attempted the cost would be begrudged. No one can read the reports and scientific papers issued by this department without seeing that, as a science department, it is doing a great deal of useful work. Where, perhaps, it has been weak in the past has been in the comparatively small degree of attention paid to technical science. Geology, natural history, and meteorology have too exclusively occupied its attention. All that I think we can ask the Government to do is to maintain the present expenditure, and perhaps utilize the Museum Department, together with the proposed Forest Department, for better promoting the manufactures, and increasing the number, quality, and variety of our local productions. In this manner we may help forward our mining, our agriculture, our fruit-culture, our fisheries, and our manufactures; and I hope without additional cost. As to art, I doubt if the colony can at present afford to do much. We must leave this to private munificence. With drawing made compulsory in our schools, with the natural beauty and grandeur to be met with everywhere in New Zealand, we surely may expect to have many artists amongst our children and children's children. If we give sites for art-galleries, should not our wealthy colonists help? In Auckland, Mr. McKelvie, with rare munificence, has given many beautiful pictures, and it is stated that a large sum has been given by him for an art-gallery. When our colony gets older, we shall have others following his good example. We have not, as a colony, the wealth that can afford to start art-galleries in our chief towns—the needs of our practical, everyday life are too many and too incessant; but the time will soon come when no town of any size will be without its museum and its art-gallery, any more than its common school and theatre.

Before treating of the duty of the State towards education, I may mention incidentally, it being a matter that was referred to by question in the House last session, what has been done with reference to education in the Chatham Islands. In accordance with, the promise that was given last year, one of our most experienced teachers has been sent to the Chatham Islands, and his letter of instructions will be found in the Education Report. I recognised that it was impossible to organize a school at once in a place like the Chatham Islands, but I requested him to see if he could not get half-or even quartertime schools, so that, if possible, the whole of the children of the islands may be educated. I have received his first report, and it is very encouraging. He has started work, and is receiving assistance from both Natives and Europeans. We shall make arrangements for the establishing of a school at Te One, and for his visiting other parts of the island. I may here also state that

arrangements have been made with the Education Board of Auckland for the establishing of a school at Kawhia.

I have to speak of the duty of the State with reference to education generally. I do so not because I believe that there is any desire on the part of the majority of the colonists for any alteration in what I may term the essentials of our Education Act, nor because I think there is any desire to do away with our university, or to destroy our secondary schools. I know, however, and members are aware, that our Education Act has been attacked from various sides. There are some who attack it because, they say, no religion is taught in the schools; there are others who think that the State should not interfere with education at all, but that education should be left to private enterprise or religious organizations; and there is another class who object to State education because of its expense to the State, and who say that the cost of education should be borne by the parents, just as the cost of food and clothing is borne by them; and there are some who object on all these grounds.

I think it is wise, in view of the opposition raised in some quarters to the Education Act, that I should state shortly what my view of the position of the State is in dealing with education; because, if members understand the position that I take up concerning it, they will understand the lines of administration that I propose for myself in conducting the department. I should wish it to be distinctly understood that in much that I am about to state I am simply expressing my own individual opinions. On the subject of education it is well known there are diverse views held by some of my colleagues. First, I at once admit that, in a possible ideal state of society, there would be no State schools. I believe that in some possible future time there will be no need of State schools, for parents and others will have so recognised their duty to teach children that the State will not require to interfere; and I hope that, as civilization advances, the State functions will not increase, but become more limited. The future should be such that the individual is more and not less; but, as practical politicians, we have to do with the present, and we are met with the pressing question of education. Are our children to be brought up in ignorance, or are they to be educated? And when I say that no country in the world that can be termed civilized has been able to do without State aid to education in some form or other, the question really is, what form that aid shall take. There are some who are willing that aid should be given by the State to education, but they think that that aid should be given to private persons or to corporations or religious organizations, who will undertake to do all the teaching. Wherever that system is adopted the State has little control over the modes of education: all that it can do is to test the knowledge of the children at certain examinations.

I believe that the mode of teaching is of as much importance as what is taught, and that if children are trained to acquire knowledge in a proper way, even if the knowledge they acquire may appear small, they have been really educated. I do not think that the State is called upon to expend large sums of money in education if it is to surrender to any persons or corporations or organizations the control of the education of its youth. It is perhaps not necessary that I should state the reason why the State interferes with education at all. It may not he amiss, however, to repeat what have been termed the canons of a State education. One writer has said that the arguments for a State education may be stated somewhat as follows: First, that the first great right of the State is to exist and to perpetuate its own existence. Without this there could he no stability in Government and no such thing as social order. If this be granted, then, secondly, the State has a right to do whatever things will tend to preserve its own existence: one of these is to establish universal suffrage, as a recognition of individual rights, and as a necessary condition of its own existence. Thirdly, it must provide for universal intelligence and social morality, else universal suffrage will become a curse to the State. Fourthly, it must establish universal education as a neccssary condition of universal intelligence and social morality. And, fifthly, in order to obtain universal education, it must have a system of public schools. And a recent writer has said that "the true function of the State is to make the most of the citizen. This is its only inexhaustible function;" and if anything is to be made of the citizen he must be educated. These are the grounds of interference by the State with education, and, as the State must recognise the rights of children as well as the rights of parents, looking upon the individual as the social unit, it must see that children are protected from the cruelty, the selfishness, and the ignorance of parents.

If the State does not do this the result will be, as has been found throughout the world, an increase of cost to the State in other directions. If you can get a people universally intelligent you will have less crime, you will have less vice, you will have greater thrift, you will have, in fact, a higher state of society. Then, another view is this: that the State, in having a system of education, should have such a system as tends to train the children to the duties of citizenship, and to make them feel that the duty of citizenship is a paramount one. To establish such a system as some denominationalists ask, of having as many schools as there are sects, all endowed by the Government, would tend, I believe, to social disorder, tend to weaken the ideas of the duties of citizenship, and not tend to the strengthening of the State's position. I need not stop to point out that, with the numerous sects that exist among us, it would be impossible to have such a system, except, perhaps, in the larger towns; and that, unless the State interfered, in sparsely-populated districts the result would be that there would be no education at all.

To the objection to our system, that religion is not taught, I would first say, from a secular point of view,

that here one of the blots on our system is disclosed; for religion is taught. Our system is supposed to be free, secular, and compulsory. It is free, it is compulsory in many districts, but I do not know that it is secular in any one. Our school-books are full of what may be termed religious lessons. If one takes up Nelson's Royal Readers, which is the series of school-books in greatest use throughout the colony, he will find, on page after page, religious lessons. I shall mention a few:—Book VI.: "Family Worship," from the Cottar's Saturday Night; "John Bright on War" (appeal to professing Christians); Coleridge's "Hymn before Sunrise, in the Yale of Chamouni; "Paul at Athens," by W. J. Fox; "The Problem of Creation," by O. M. Mitchell. Book III.: "Little Jim," Farmer; "We are Seven," Wordsworth; "The Better Land," Mrs. Hemans; "The Child's First Grief," Mrs. Hemans; "Lucy Gray," Wordsworth; "The Rain Lesson," Mrs. Sigourney; "The Ark and the Dove," Mrs. Sigourney. Book II. (Third Series): "Thou shalt not steal;" "Secrets of Nature;" "The Little Girl's Good Morning." Sequel to II.: "Our Daily Bread;" "The Little Chimney-sweeper;" "Lesson from the Flowers;" "The Pet Bird;" "How Fresh on the Mountains;" "The Little Orphan," Mrs. Sewell; "A Sparrow's Nest," Jane Taylor; "The King and the Gipsies;" "British Birds'-nests;" "What is that, Mother?", Doane; "Speak Gently."

Those who would have the right to object to the State system so long as such reading-books are in use, are, first, those who believe that religion should not be taught to children; and, second, those who believe that, whether it should be taught or not, it is no part of the duty of the State to teach it. These classes, however, have said nothing against our system. They are willing, for the sake of maintaining a system that is of incalculable benefit to the colony, to sink their opinions and their feelings, and they have been found to be the warmest supporters of our present system.

And now I come to another phase of the question. If it be said that our State system is doing any moral injury to the children, I say that this question may be tested by statistics. Our State system has now been seven years in operation. This period has been sufficient to afford some test of the system and its results, and the questions we have to ask ourselves are, Has juvenile crime increased, and how do children at our schools turn out in after years? So far as juvenile crime is concerned, New Zealand is far more free from it than other countries. If you take, for example, the number of prisoners from ten to twenty years of age received into our principal gaols, I find that, of the population per thousand at that age, there are only 2.49 between ten and twenty, being 4.90 per cent, of the total prisoners. If I go to England and Wales I find that between the ages of twelve and twenty-one the corresponding proportions are 7.75 and 19.78; in 1878 it was 8.16 and 19.30. If I go to New South Wales, where there has been religious teaching in schools, the clergymen having the right to enter there, I find that from ten to twenty the proportions are 6.38 and 7.60 respectively. In Victoria, where the system is more secular than in the neighbouring colony, the proportions are only 3.94 and 7.58; in Queensland, where there is the secular system, 4.92 and 12.35. The numbers I have formerly given are those of prisoners who have been received in the principal prisons. I have omitted those received in what are termed police-gaols; if these be added, the totals for New Zealand will he 2.96 per thousand. I know it may be said that there are other causes that have led to the differing results in the other colonies. This does not affect my contention, for I adduce the statistics only to show that our own system has not been productive of any ill consequences in the direction of crime, and that we are remarkably free as a colony from any criminal tendency. If I go to Scotland I find that in 1881 the prisoners admitted to all gaols at the age-period from twelve to sixteen was 0.59 per thousand of the population; from sixteen to twenty-one, the proportion was 19.98. The proportion per cent, under twenty-one of the total of prisoners was 15.81. In New Zealand, admitted to all gaols, there were, as I have said, only 2.96 per thousand from ten to twenty; and it is to be observed there were only, out of the 287 under twenty received into the principal gaols, 130 born in New Zealand. Then, there is another thing I would notice, and that is this: that the total amount of crime in New Zealand is not on the increase; on the contrary, there has been practically a decrease since 1876. This will be found from the following statistics:—

The total crime, as estimated from convictions after commitment for trial to superior Courts in New Zealand, per ten thousand of the population, has fallen from 6.43 in 1876 to 4.76 in 1881, and to 3.9 in 1881. In New South Wales the proportions in 1882 and 1883 were 13.3 and 12; in Victoria, 4.8 in 1882 and 3.8 in 1883. It will therefore be seen that, so far as convictions are concerned, there has been a gradual decrease in New Zealand. This is the case with reference to the more heinous offences, but the same decrease is apparent in apprehensions and in summons cases, as well as in summary convictions. In 1876 the apprehensions and summons cases were 57.14 per thousand of population; in 1884, 41.81. In 1876 the summary convictions were 41.55; in 1884 there were only 31.98; and the commitments for trial in 1876 were, per ten thousand of population, 10.68, and in 1884, 8.1: so that, so far as crime is concerned, New Zealand has shown that since the introduction of the Education Act there has been a decline of all kinds of crime. I do not mean to say that the Education Act has caused this; I only say this: that those who say that the Education Act tends to larrikinism or to crime or to vice should look at the statistics, and they will sec that, with a more efficient police force than we ever had, we have had less crime, fewer apprehensions and summons cases, fewer commitments for trial, and fewer convictions. I hope, after the figures I have given, that we shall hear no more remarks about our State

system tending to crime. On the contrary, the statistics show that crime is yearly lessening, and I have no doubt that, as the education of the people progresses, crime will still decrease. Of course, to get rid of crime is, in our social state, and will be for centuries, just as impossible as getting rid of poverty. The training in large towns and many other causes create anti-social feelings, and anti-social feelings lead to many kinds of crime. I believe, however, that if we strengthen the social feeling with reference to the State the result will be a greater respect for property and a greater respect for life; and I really think that amongst classes not at all of the criminal type there is much need of our recognising what the State is. We do not fully realize—I think none of us do—our duties to the State as the emblem of our social life. Is it not a fact that people see no harm in dealing with Government property and dealing with Government money as they would not deal with the moneys of individuals? That the sacredness of the trust imposed upon citizens has not yet been fully realized by any of us is, I believe, abundantly true. It is time enough to speak of the danger of the State to individualism when the duty to the State is considered more paramount than it is at present.

I must deal with another objection—the cost of the present system. Last year when my honourable friend the member for Akaroa (Mr. Montgomery) was Minister of Education a very valuable return was prepared by his direction. It showed that the system was relatively as cheap as that of other countries. I need not repeat that no fees are charged, and that the full cost comes from the Consolidated Fund. Remembering this, the aid given by other countries may be noted.

Having said this much about the duty of the State in reference to primary education, I shall make one or two remarks about its duty to secondary and university education. It may be said that, granted the duty of the State to give children a primary education, there the duty ends. Of course this means that no children of poor parents can have any right to an education beyond the primary. The children of wealthy parents can always obtain a higher education; wealth can purchase education as well as anything else. Is this Parliament prepared to say that those children whose parents have not means to give them a secondary education are to be condemned to a mere primary education? I feel sure that neither this Parliament nor any that this colony will ever have will be found to sanction such an idea. The question, then, comes to this: How is the State to give aid to secondary instruction? Some people reply, you may give scholarships. Scholarships to what? are there to be any schools in the colony in which the scholarships can he held? If so, under whose control are they to he? Is the State to say that all its brighter boys and all its brighter girls are not to be controlled in their education by the State, but that the State is to hand over the education of its brightest and most intellectual youths into private hands, or into the hands of corporations or religious organizations, and to have no control over their training though it pays for it? I do not think the people of this colony are prepared to submit to such a proposal. I say it is more necessary for the State to look after secondary education than primary, just as it is more necessary for the State to look after those works which are not immediately necessary, than it is to provide for works that are deemed a necessity. The State does not need to look after any mercantile pursuit; it does not need to provide for the obtaining of food for the inhabitants: men have been trained to look after these for themselves. The State has to look after the opening-up of means of communication. The State has to look after, by corporations or otherwise, providing for the health and recreation of the people. Why is this? Because these things are not so requisite as the obtaining of food. So it is with primary and secondary schools. All recognize the need of primary schools, and all will do what they can to provide them; but secondary schools are in a different position. They require more attention. The State is required to give more aid to them than to the primary schools; and I can only say, from what I know of the working of the schools, that there are, not dozens, or scores, but hundreds of youths obtaining education in secondary schools that have been endowed by the State that would have been deprived of this advantage had it not been for those endowments.

And now one word as to our university. It is the natural copestone of our educational building; and here again, unless the State had endowed the university, there could have been no such institution in New Zealand. It was thought by some that the proper way was to provide scholarships, as is done in the neighbouring Colony of Tas- mania, for the brighter youths to proceed to England to obtain a university education. It is, I think, a matter for congratulation that this scheme was not adopted. And now New Zealand is in this position: that, considering her population, she has, as I have already said, as many students receiving university education as any country in the world; and I believe she has also, relatively to her population, more university-trained men than any country in the world. What must the necessary effect of that be? It means the raising of the standard of education all along the line; and it also means this: that we shall have soon, I hope, a development of our manufactures, a development of our trade, commensurate with the high-class education that has been bestowed on our youth. I have already pointed but that I believe there has been a danger in the past in making our university education too literary. This, however, is gradually being remedied; and I believe that universities should yet provide, not only for the best scientific teaching, but for the highest form of technical education. Our universities must also be the abodes of research. This is a function that has not yet been recognised in our university system. We have had our New Zealand University a mere examining and degree-conferring body,

and we have had the affiliated colleges teaching bodies. We have not yet had the means to make our university the place of the highest scientific research; that, however, will have to come as the colony progresses. If we consider what our nation must be, we must look forward to a time when our political autonomy will lead us to the possession of a distinct type of national life, and you cannot have a distinct type of national life of any value if you have not in your colony the best teaching that can be obtained in the world, and places which are the abodes of the highest culture and of the deepest knowledge.

I think it is of importance to New Zealand that she has not had merely one university college teaching her students. I am glad that she has several, and I hope that as she progresses she will have more. There will he need shortly of a proper university college in Wellington, though the Wellington College is no doubt doing good work. Instead of there being an objection to the splitting up of our university teaching with several colleges, I believe it is the highest recommendation of our system. It will prevent sameness, whilst every college will have an individuality of its own that must create a healthy emulation in the pursuit of knowledge.

And what is the task of the university? It has to provide for us our professional men, our scientific men: it has to provide for us our men of culture. After all, as has been well said, the high-water mark of a nation is not in its primary, nor in its secondary schools; the value of a nation to the human race depends not even on wealth nor numbers, but it is gauged by the high-water mark of its educated mind. A nation may be small, it may appear insignificant, but, if it can produce men of genius and culture, it stands high amongst the nations of the world. I feel sure that no Parliament will decree, by the abolition of aid to the university and to secondary schools, that New Zealand is to take an inferior position amongst the colonies of the Empire or the nations of the world.

Before I conclude I must refer to a matter for which an Education Minister can do little without hearty co-operation and aid from colonists. I refer to the encouraging of habits of thrift. I hope to see yet inaugurated what was attempted in 1878—79, namely, the establishment of savings banks in connection with the schools. I am aware that many Education Boards opposed the scheme; I believe, however, that it is necessary, for the proper development of our country, that our children should be trained in habits of thrift, and I believe they can best acquire habits of thrift and be taught the value of money by the establishment of savings banks. In this view I am sustained by many who have been in the colony, and who have taken an interest in education. If I had time I should like to read a minute written by Sir John Hall, when he was Premier, urging in the strongest way the advisability of establishing penny savings banks. I hope, however, that the members of the House will aid the Education Department in pressing on the Boards and School Committees in their districts the need of co-operation to supply this want in our schools. I do not think the Education Department in Wellington can be blamed for its non-success. Everything that was possible to be done in the matter by the various Ministers of Education who have held office has been done. The scheme was first inaugurated by my colleague the present Native Minister when he was Minister of Education, and succeeding Ministers of Education attempted to advance what he had begun, but, I regret to say, with very little success. I hope, however, that this subject will yet he warmly taken up, and be approved of by our Education Boards and School Committees.

And now let me just add that I recognise, as I have stated, that our system is not perfect. I hope, however, that the alterations in the syllabus of our primary schools will make our education better and more practical. Scientific education and technical education will not be treated as inferior to literary education; and, as our university and secondary schools follow on the same lines, we can look forward to a great improvement in all our schools and colleges in method and results. And perhaps a succeeding Minister of Education, when called upon, as our system develops, to attempt further reforms, may be able to acknowledge that what has been recently done by the department has helped to make his path easier and to lighten his labours.

Mr Robert Stout, on the 13th April, gave a lecture on the above subject, in the Lyceum Hall, which was crowded in every part. The Mayor of Dunedin occupied the chair, and on the platform were Messrs H. S. Fish (M.H. R.), M. W. Green (M.H.R.), T. Bracken (M.H.R.), W. D. Stewart, J. W, Jago, A. H. Ross, J. Robin, W. M. Bolt, and J. Braithwaite.

His Worship the MAYOR, in introducing Mr Stout, said: Ladies and gentlemen, I have to Introduce to you to-night a gentleman who has been so long and favourably known to a Dunedin audience that I do not need to say one word to you about him. He has always taken a lively interest, both by his action on the platform and by his pen, in everything affecting, not only Dunedin, but the Colony at large. He has been known as a politician, as a Minister of the Crown, and probably as legal adviser to most of you here present,—(laughter.) The only difference between his meeting you in the latter capacity and his meeting you here to-night is a difference against himself, inasmuch as he cannot charge you for the advice he is about to give.—(Laughter.) I don't need, however, to ask from you a patient hearing for him; and therefore, without further remark, I will introduce Mr Stout to you.

MR STOUT spoke as follows: Mr Mayor, ladies and gentlemen, if it has been recently admitted that there can be no good government, no progress nor reform, without political life, and if it has also been admitted that

this political life can best be stimulated by public discussion, and by the public meeting of citizens, I need not apologise for addressing you. I congratulate Major Atkinson on the admission which he has made that political life is necessary, and that it must be diffused throughout the Colony, and not confined to its capital, I also congratulate the party of which he is one of the leaders on their leader making such an admission, When I think how Sir George Grey was abused, and how he was denounced for meeting the citizens of this Colony in public meeting, and for discussing with them vital political questions, I recognise that we have made a great advance in our political education.—(Applause.) I think that this admission having been made, it nerves us all to publicly discuss public questions, for I believe that on their proper decision depends the future well-being of our Colony. In what attitude and in what position, it may be asked, did Major Atkinson address us? I recognise to the fullest extent that he did not make a party speech. I recognise also to the fullest extent that his speech was free from the personal criticisms that often form the staple of political utterances in this Colony.—(Applause.) I recognise, further, that his speeches are free from party bias. But he is a party man, he is Colonial Treasurer, and he is the leader of the Ministry in the House of Representatives. Therefore he is not an ordinary lecturer giving utterance to his political views, He is a political leader, and we must assume and believe that he thinks that these political doctrines which he has enunciated are necessary for our welfare. And then, what is our duty? I apprehend that our duty is to carefully criticise every portion of his speech, and see whether it is politically sound or not, If we fail to do so, we are not doing our duty as citizens. We have no right to take the views of any man, or to accept any political doctrines, without careful criticism—without turning them over, and looking at them from all points of view,—(Applause) I therefore propose to-night to deal with the several political questions on which he has touched, and to see whether the positions he takes up are politically sound. He dealt in the main with six questions,—viz., with our Constitution, with our Legislative Council, with the functions of Government, with taxation, with land tenure, and with pauperism; and to-night I wish to say a few words under each of these heads. He says of our Constitution that it is almost perfect, and the only alteration which he might make is the introduction of what is termed

HARE'S SCHEME OF REPRESENTATION.

It would take a lecture in itself were I to endeavour to explain Hare's scheme to you; but I may say that the scheme which we now have is the very antipodes of Hare's scheme. Hare's scheme consists in this: that instead of confining the constituency to one small district, the electors are to have a wide choice, and minorities are to be allowed to join together; so that the minority, say, in Dunedin, Christchurch, or Auckland may be able to send one man to represent them. Our present idea is this: that there shall be single electo- rates, and that each electoral district shall only return one man, This is the very opposite of Hare's scheme: it almost deprives any minority of the power of sending a representative to Parliament, I ask, and I think you have a right to ask, that if it is proper to have the representation of minorities, how comes it that the system that had existed in New Zealand for many years should have been altered by Major Atkinson's Ministry? We had, for example, the towns united as one electoral district. We had several electoral districts in the Colony—like Franklin, Wanganui, and other places—returning two members. Why was it that the single-electorate system was introduced into this Colony? And I ask if, as we learn from him, there was a great danger of the centres of population ruling, how does it happen that under his system the centres of population have further representation given to them? Dunedin, under the old system, had only three members, and now we have four. I say that the sola reason for the introduction of this single-electorate system was an attempt by the Conservatives of the House of Representatives to stem the growth of democracy.—(Applause.) Their hopes were just the same as the hopea of the Conservatives in France, as those of the Conservatives in Italy—because this question is not being fought out in our Colony for the first time. We have only to read what has been done in France during the last few years, or in Italy, and what do we find? We find the Conservatives in France determined to get what might be termed the single-electorate system. We find that the Conservatives in Italy fought for the same thing. They do not want to see large masses of men sending in one or more members. They trusted to local questions engaging the people's mind, so that the large democratic questions which they are called upon as a nation to solve would be kept away from them. They relied upon their attention being bestowed upon little peddling things—a road here, a bridge there, and a railway in another place. Therefore, if Hare's system is one which gives a representation to minorities, and is a good system, we had no business to introduce this single-electorate system, which has a tendency to keep the minds of the people in a narrow groove, and to stop them from discussing political questions from a wide standpoint. But I must say—and I here agree with Major Atkinson—that I do not think Hare's system would work. If we would introduce proportional representation, there are many systems better than Hare's, We may take Baily's, or a well worked out system recently referred to by Professor Nanson, of Melbourne, in a paper read before the Victorian Royal Society a few months ago.

The latter allows a man to do this sort of thing; Suppose there are three candidates to be elected, a man may say, "We will vote for two or three, and if these are not successful we prefer two farther down the list"; so that he is given a chance, if one candidate does not go in, of putting in another. The maintenance of the large electoral district system was the only hope of New Zealand getting rid of the petty local questions that monopolise our House of Representatives, and I charge Major Atkinson's Government—I do not charge him, but it was well known that some of the members introduced this single-electorate system—saying: "[*unclear:* I] this is introduced the towns will be split up, so that a democracy will not be able to voice itself." I now pass to what he said in reference to the

Legislative Council.

I understand from him that he is in favour of the constitution of the Legislative Council being altered, and I here ask, Why alter it! Does he want the Legislative Council stronger than it is? If he wants that it will mean, I presume, that the Council shall oppose more vigorously than in the past the legislation that is proposed by the House of Representatives—in fact, that though our machinery has worked smoothly in the past, the Legislative Council shall be made so strong that we shall have an era of deadlocks. Does anyone want the Legislative Council any stronger? If not stronger, does he want it made weaker? If he wishes that, what does he mean? That there is to be less control over the legislation of New Zealand by this second Chamber than there has been in the past? If you will read what took place during last session of Parliament, you will find that the Legislative Council, while considering bills, never took the trouble to dispose of one clause at a time, but in Committee they actually voted for 100 clauses of bills at a time without a reading. It cannot be very well made weaker than it now is.—(Applause.) Why then, is the Legislative Council to be altered! I ask Major Atkinson, or anyone who desires an alteration in the constitution of that body, to say what he means, and whether the people of New Zealand are to allow a second Chamber to grow stronger, so that we shall have those ruinous deadlocks we saw occur in the neighbouring Colony of Victoria. Here I ask, Is a second Chamber necessary at all?—(A Voice: "No.") I assert it is not necessary.—(Applause.) I apprehend the only necessity of a second Chamber is to supervise and provide against hasty legislation. Now we can only judge of the good that our second Chamber has done by tracing its history, and I tell you that every vital bill—every bill that really touched our Constitution on a vital point, which was really a political bill—has never been checked, however crude. One has only to look at the Abolition of Provinces Bill—one on which the people had not been consulted, and one which, I believe, worked a great deal of harm to this Colony. What did the Legislative Council do with that bill? Only two or three members out of the whole of the Council saw fit to criticise it, far less to oppose it, If you look at the record of bills passed in New Zealand you will find that the only bill in reference to which the Legislative council seemed to take up a determined position was the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—a bill nobody cared anything about—(laughter)—and at last they passed it. What good, I ask, has our second Chamber done? It has never taken up the position of saying in regard to a bill, "The people have not been consulted, and you must defer it until they can be consulted." There has been no bill altering a policy which has not at once been accepted. How are we to test its usefulness? I appeal to you to look at its past history, and you will find that in only two or three cases was any good done by its refusal to pass bills. And one has only to remember the history of second Chambers. How did they arise? Why, we well know from history that it was the House of Commons that was the second Chamber and that it was given to the people by the lords, in order that there might be some representation of the common people in England, and consequently the second Chamber grew in England out of political exigencies that we have not had in New Zealand. But we have had in New Zealand a legislative body that had no second Chamber. We had our provincial Councils, that had power to tax us—that had power to pass laws creating offences—power to deal with our whole social economy. They passed laws without any supervision from a second Chamber, and I say that if you weigh the laws they have passed they will stand just as careful criticism as any that have been passed by the two Chambers.—(Applause.) We therefore have tried the experiment, and I say that if there is any alteration whatever of the Legislative Council it will be an alteration that will cast greater power into the hands of the propertyholders—it will be an alteration that will give property greater weight and power than it now has, and if we are to alter it at all, the alteration I should suggest is that it be done without.—(Applause.) Now I come to the other point—" the functions of Government," and I regret that here we are now getting on to the twentieth century, and according to Major Atkinson's speech, after all our political training, after all the books on political science that have been published, after all the experiments in government we have had, extending back for thousands of years, we are reduced to this chaotic position. He says that what the duty or function of the Government, is, nobody knows.—(Laughter.) Certainly, if that is so, we are in a very lamentable plight. He says that the only thing that is to guide us is this: that we are to determine from time to time what it is for the advantage of the people that

the Government should do. That is, a chance majority in the House is to determine what the functions of the Government are. I deny that that is so. I say that the function of Government, if we are to have true liberty in any State, must be limited, and that it must not depend upon a chance majority. Why, ladies and gentlemen, if the functions of the Government are to be determined by a chance majority, what will you say has been right or wrong in the past? A majority of people in England, and perhaps a majority of the people is Scotland, say that a State Church is right, and if you put the question to the people of Ireland, I have no doubt that a majority of the people would say that it is the duty of the State to support the Roman Catholic Church, I ask, If this is to be our test of the functions of Government, where is the true liberty for the individual—for the minority? I say that the whole function of Government is this: not merely to recognise the rights of the minority, but to recognise individual liberty; to so pass laws, to so manage its affairs, and to so administer the State, that there shall be given to every individual man the fullest liberty, subject to the like liberty to everyone else in the community.—(Applause.) I say that wherever the functions of Government tread on that liberty that Government is a usurper—that Government is becoming a despotism. I admit, however, to the full that in new countries—through want of historical associations, through want of the habit of organisation amongst residents in new colonies—the State may have to step in and do things that it is not necessary in old countries that Governments should undertake; but I say it is our duty to watch closely the inroads of the State on the individuality of the people. If we ever choose to say that the only limit of the State's functions are the views of a chance majority, we are laying the foundation for a despotism, the end of which we cannot now see; and I say that this theory of Major Atkinson's, that there is no limit of the State functions but what a chance majority may decide is the fallacy underlying the whole of his proposed political changes, with which I shall deal presently. And now I may say one or two words on taxation. He told us that Adam Smith's four canons of taxation were yet recognised as correct, and I may say this: it is almost marvellous, when one comes to read recent writers on political economy, to find how little they have yet done on this great question of taxation, and how little advance they have made beyond Adam Smith's four canons—"equality, certainty, convenience, and economy." The last three no one ever questioned; it is only when one comes to deal with the question of equality that any differences of opinion arise. I do not intend to go into Major Atkinson's figures—I have not time to do so—but I wish to say something about the question of the relative fairness of a

Land and Property Tax.

Those in this meeting who were in the Colony in 1878 know that I then advocated the land tax, and I may say that I have not seen any reason to change my mind—(Applause.) The question is, whether a land tax or a property tax is the fairer tax. Let us test it. Major Atkinson told us that if a man had £1200 worth of land, and the State demanded £2 10s per year from him, that he would term "confiscation." It is an ugly word, "confiscation," and it is said that to take £2 10s a year from a landowner who holds a monopoly over that which he never made and never created is "confiscation." Let us see: If I come to this Colony with £1200 worth of goods—we shall say jewellery,—what does the State officer demand from me before I land them? The demand on the goods is 15 per cent, of their value—a very different thing from the £2 10s on the £1200 worth of land. I ask what would you call that tax which says to a man with £1200 worth of goods, You must pay me 15 per cent. on their value? Would "confiscation" be too ugly a word to use? But that is not all. He has paid the 15 per cent, on the jewellery, and he may be told by the Major, "You have paid the duty, and it is now in the Colony, and you can put that 15 per cent, on and charge it to the person who is buying it from you." Well, let us see how that works. We will now take the property tax. The property tax is a tax on what the thing is worth. Then he has to pay this halfpenny in the, pound on the £1200 worth of jewellery, and he has to pay the halfpenny in the pound on the 15 per cent, he has paid the Government; so that he is taxed on the tax he has paid. What would you call that? Would confiscation be an ugly word for it? And then I ask you, in dealing with this question of property tax and land tax, to look at the great distinction between the two. If you have land you have the producer. It is land that is the producer of everything we possess. If you have £1200 worth of land it will produce something: it will produce grass; it will produce grain; it may produce coal or various other things, and without any effort from you it may produce a great many things. But keep the £1200 worth of jewellery, and the longer you keep it the less valuable it becomes. It is giving you no return. It is not producing anything. Yet a charge of a halfpenny on the land, which is the producer—which is a monopoly—is confiscation; but a charge of a halfpenny on jewellery which has already been taxed 15 per cent, is a fair and equal tax,—(Laughter.) I ask further, in dealing with this question of a land and property tax, that we should look at what is the tendency of either tax. If it is said that the tendency of the land tax is to diminish the value of land, I apprehend that the same tax put on personal property cannot increase its value. Surely that is self-evident. But I ask you, how does the property tax act? We shall say, for example, that here is machinery. Here is a man who wishes to start a now

industry. He puts all his money into the machinery. He knows that perhaps for several years he cannot possibly get interest on his money. In starting that new industry he has to work under great difficulties—he has to work under great disadvantages. He has not only to train workmen who will be able to manufacture for him, but he has actually to cultivate a market, so that the colonists may accept his goods rather than prefer the articles they have been accustomed to. During this time he will necessarily lose money; yet upon all his machinery he has to pay a tax to the Government, Is that a way of encouraging production? I apprehend that the object of the State should be to keep two things in view in dealing with taxation. The State ought to see, first that it encourages production, because that is the only means of making the citizens wealthy. Second, it ought to see that its taxation tends to encourage thrift. That is what we have heard spoken of a good deal lately, I ask you how does the property tax act, say, on two men, both getting the same income, both having the same sized families? One man saves a hundred pounds; the other man saves nothing. The one man at once, after the limit of £500 is reached, begins to pay a tax on his savings to the Government; while the person who spends all his money escapes all taxation. Is that encouragement of thrift! But we may be told: "Oh, but the property tax, you know, will stop people from having unused capital that is not productive." I ask, are there a dozen people in this Colony who keep their money in a stocking? And I say if you put your money in a bank it is not unproductive. Every person who knows anything about commerce knows that just as deposits in the banks increase, the facilities for commerce increase. The banks, as they get larger deposits, will lend money out cheaper; and if so, there will be more industries started, more workmen employed, and the capital will be circulating throughout the Colony. There is therefore no such thing as capital unused in this Colony. There are perhaps two ways in which capital may not be reproductive. We have heard something about pictures, and also about furniture, Well, I do not think all the pictures and furniture in New Zealand are of such immense value as to require the Treasurer to insist on taxing them specially. But I say further, it should not ever be the duty of the State to discourage the possession of pictures. If they have been imported they have already paid 15 per cent., and Picture-frames have to pay 15 per cent.; and I say if there is one thing the Colony requires to encourage it is the fine arts.—(Cheers.) In order to create true humanity in this Colony, we must have culture; and I say there will be no proper culture—I do not mean culture for the few, but for the many—until we have in all centres of population large picture galleries, so that the minds of the people can be continually elevated.—(Cheers.) Therefore, if it is only for the sake of getting at pictures, surely the Government, instead of trying to discourage the fine arts, should do its best to encourage them. Where you have a love of the beautiful you will necessarily have a dislike of vice.—(Cheers.) Another thing said about the land tax is, Why tax land, and not other property? Let me give some reasons. First, I tell you that the tax we put on land, and that is proposed to be put on land, was of the smallest possible amount. What do you think was the total amount estimated to come from the land tax first put on, for the whole Colony of New Zealand? It was only £100,000 for the whole Colony. Was that a large tax to put on the landowners when one considers the millions of money that have been borrowed to make land more valuable. I will tell you

Why the Land Tax was First Put on.

What did we see? We saw this Colony had expended not one million, not two millions, not ten millions, but nearly double that in improving the lands of this Colony. We saw that the lands of this Colony had increased in value; and this increase in value had not been caused by the landowners, but by the State. It had been caused by the increase of population and by their industry. We said: Is it fair that all these railways should be made, that all these bridges should be built, that all these roads should be constructed, and that all the interest for these vast sums of money should come from the Consolidated Revenue—from those who are perhaps landless—and that the landowner should escape free of taxation?—(Cheers.) We said, This is not fair, and it is our duty to put on a land tax. And how did we put it on? Wo said it was our duty, if we could do so by a tax, to encourage thrift; and hence we provided that for every acre a man tilled, for every improvement, for every house, for every fence he put up, no tax should bo charged. We encouraged him to improve his land by exempting all improvements from taxation. We taxed the bare land on its value, exempting all improvements, so that he might be encouraged to improve his land and make it most productive for the benefit of the State.—(Cheers.) I ask whether that was not fairer than putting on a property tax? I ask you to note, in regard to the property tax, this distinction. We find that as the Colony advanced land went up and up in price, while money or personal property gradually cheapened. I remember that when I came to the Colony first in the gold-digging days, interest on mortgages was often 15 per cent., and in very few cases was it 12½ per cent.; but as the millions began to flow in freely, and the Public Works scheme progressed, and after people began to save, money went down in price. People could only get 10, 8, 7, perhaps only 6 per cent, for their money. So you will see that while the land all the while was mounting in value, personal property was practically decreasing in value. I ask, therefore; was there

anything wrong in determining that the land, when it was gradually increasing in value, should pay a small proportion—a very small proportion—of the burdens imposed on the people, in order to make it more valuable? That is the theory of a land tax as opposed to the theory of a property tax. I will say one word more about taxation. I say that a land tax is defensible on another ground; I say that it is defensible, even if the State did not make a single railway, road, or bridge. I will tell you why.

Land, A Monopoly.

Land is a monopoly, and it will always remain a monopoly. I, however, believe that the land should belong to the State, and not to individuals,—(Applause) The only reason why land is given to an individual is that it may be made most productive; and it is contended by Mill and various other writers that taxes may be specially put on it. We may get at its value now, and if it is found at the end of 10 or 20 years that a man's land has increased in value, this tax is put on in order to get (Mill says) some portion—not all—of that unearned increase in the value of the land which is continually going on all over the world. I say, therefore, that a land tax is a fair and equitable tax compared with a property tax, I ask you to remember what has been done by the present Ministry in reference to the property tax. Unless the property tax produces something, the whole burdens of the country are cast on the customs revenue, while the property tax produces a miserable pittance. While the Treasurer says that the Colony is worth many millions, the sum paid annually into the Treasury under the property tax amounts to £156,000. That is the great good which has been done under the present Government in taxing the propertied classes, who, owning hundreds of millions' worth of property within the Colony, are only asked to pay £156,000 a year into the State Treasury. But the radical distinction between a land and a property tax hangs upon

Land Tenure.

Here I may say that I am quite at a loss to understand what views are held by Major Atkinson on this question of land tenure. He says that he is favour of free-trade in land. When did free trade: in land ever answer, and what does it mean? It means that a person who owns land can do with it what he likes. It means that if one person owned Dunedin he could say to the people of Dunedin, "Clear out. The land is mine." It reminded him of what a Maori member once said in the House. The Maori was objecting to the form of fee simple, as their lands were going away under it. He believed in communal rights. He said that if this mode of depriving the Maoris of their land was not stopped, the only thing left far them would be the main roads on which to stand and view their former possessions. If you once admit that there is to be free trade in land, then the State has no right to control contracts relating to land. In Ireland it has been found necessary to pass a law which says that the landlord shall not fix what rent he likes. There the State has said: "We will not recognise free trade in land. We appoint Government officers, who will step in between you and the tenant and fix what a fair rent shall be." In order to meet the difficulty in another way, what did they do in France? There the State has said: "You have no right to dispose of your land on your death as you please; but the State will step in and dispose of it for you." Major Atkinson says that after next session there will be free trade in land in this Colony, but this will simply be the beginning of our difficulties. Until this question of land tenure is faced—until Major Atkinson understands the difference between free trade in land and the nationalisation of the land,—we cannot hope for any wise land laws. Now I come to deal with the Major's scheme of

National Insurance.

Here, I may say, I recognise that we ought to thank him sincerely for the effort he has made to solve this problem—(hear); but I wish to find out first what solution he proposes. His solution is that there should be a poll tax on all people between the ages of 16 and 23 or 18 and 23 years; and those between 23 and 48, in order that they may reap the advantages of the system, have also to pay for five or seven years. I want you to know what this money amounts to—what this poll tax which the Major proposes will produce. I find that there are in this Colony about 61,000 people between the ages of 16 and 23. There are really over 62,000 persons; but I have left out, in order that the Major may have the benefit, those in hospitals, criminals, and others from whom the tax cannot be collected. If you take the average payment to be nearly £6—£5 17s is the sum—the poll tax will produce during the first year £366,000, which is more than double what the property tax yields. Then these payments go on increasing for seven years, because there are about 12,000 people between 16 and 18 years

coming in. There are probably more than that; but here we can knock off 2000 or 3000, because the excess of births over deaths is about 13,000 or 14,000 in this Colony. We have also immigrants coming in, some between these ages; so that, even at the lowest calculation, I believe about 12,000 or 13,000 are coming up each year. But in order to do absolute fairness to Major Atkinson's scheme, I have, as before stated, struck off 3000; so that it cannot be said I am over the mark when I say that, excluding those in the hospitals, lunatic asylums, and gaols, who will not require to pay, there will be at the seven years at least another 10,000 persons between the ages of 16 and 23 years coming in annually. Thus, at the seventh year there will be actually £726,000 coming from this poll tax. But there is to be provision made for the widows and orphans, and consequently persons above 23 years have got to pay two shillings a week each for five years longer in order to provide for these widows and orphans. And those now above 23 and under 48 have to pay from £6 to £8 for five or seven years. Let us again be generous. There are in the Colony 106,000 male persons between the ages of 20 and 45. I am quoting from the census of 1881. Assuming that there are 100,000 males between the ages of 23 and 48; and again, taking the lowest contribution—£6 each—you will have £600,000 contributed by this poll tax during the first year, so that under this scheme the people would be called on to pay into the State Treasury for pauperism £966,000, and the propertied class are paying £156,000, This proposed poll tax will thus produce nearly a million of money during the first year, and if it goes on increasing it will amount in the seventh year to nearly £1,250,000. Why, our customs revenue amounts only to £1,500,000; and this poll tax that the Government are going to give us will put into the State Treasury more than all the other taxes put together—I don't consider railway revenue in the nature of a tax—with the exception of our customs revenue, and it will nearly equal that. Now I assume in this calculation that the immigration will at least equal the deaths. I submit to you that this is a very big scheme, and ask you to notice what this big scheme means. We are to have a fund for the relief of pauperism, which will provide for the giving of 15s a week to sick people, without the attendance of a doctor; and for an annuity of 10s for those over 65, and also for an allowance to widows and orphans. Now, first, I call this taxation on two grounds—because it in a payment in return for services rendered by the State, and it is compulsory. If you join a friendly society or an insurance company, you have not got to pay for sick people. No persons are admitted to a friendly society or an insurance company without undergoing medical examination, and it is only those in good health and who are thrifty that are admitted. But under this system the thrifty are to pay for the unthrifty, and the healthy for the sick. Now I ask you where is the money to come from? It must come either from our savings or our present expenditure—that is, the money must come out of the savings of the people, or else they must lessen their expenditure; and I ask you, is it likely that any unthrifty person will lessen the expenditure of his money merely because the State levies a tax? I would like to know of any instance of a man voluntarily doing anything of the sort. It has been said by Major Atkinson we must not discuss the scheme. He practically says that, because at the meeting at which he spoke after Mr Green he said, "We do not want declamation: show us a better scheme"; and I have heard several people say, "We do not want criticism of this scheme. What is your scheme?" Well, ladies and gentlemen, that puts me in mind of an anecdote. I have known men who have what are termed "fads." If you go to a patent-office, why you find half the ideas registered are useless, and yet men have spent an enormous amount of time and labour on them. Well, I knew a man who fancied he could make a flying-machine, and he constructed one on a very elaborate plan, and undertook to demonstrate that he could fly with it. At the trial he turned round and said, "It is all very well for you to criticise, but show me a better machine."—(Laughter.) I say we have a right, in discussing this scheme, to say to Major Atkinson: "Pauperism is a very bad thing; it is a terrible evil, and perhaps by discussing the means proposed to meet it, we shall learn, how the happiness of every individual can be secured." This question of poverty has been discussed long before flying-machines, and we are no nearer a solution than before. This scheme of Major Atkinson's is one to stop poverty, but I say it does not strike at the root of poverty at all, Does any man say that giving 15s a week to a sick person will stop poverty, and 10s to a person over 65? We know people have been poor who were never sick, and who never lived till 65 to receive this 10s annuity. I will illustrate what I say. We see in some; countries men stricken down yearly with malaria, and quinine becomes of enormous importance to them. They say if they could only get quinine they would get rid of the fever. Major Atkinson's scheme is a quinine scheme. I say the proper scheme is to get rid of the fever, not to give quinine. I would say to the people of a city: "Drain your marshes; look after your health, and you ought to have no fever." All that Major Atkinson desires is that the people should give him little bottles of quinine that he may distribute it when they take the chills. Now what is to be done with this vast sum of money? We are told by the Major and his supporters it must be invested in 4 per cents. What does it mean? It has been said in Parliament that if we get, say, a million a year to be expended on public works, that that would be sufficient for our requirements; the Major does not like to go into the Home market, and says to the citizens throughout the Colony, I will utilise the money from this poll tax, giving a promise to pay for it into a fund, and go without loans. Now I come to what may be termed the root of this question, and I ask, is it the duty of the State to support the poor? Now I admit at once this is a much debated question. There are some able political economists who say it is not, and

some who say it is. As I understand him, Major Atkinson says it is the duty of the State to support the poor. Let us assume that. Let us assume that everyone here grants it is the duty of the thrifty to support the unthrifty, the wise to support the imprudent, the sober to support the drunk; and look what follows, I presume the matter will have to be met by taxation. The four canons of taxation, as prescribed by Adam Smith, must be applied to the poor tax as well as to other things. What is the first? There must be an equality of sacrifice. If, then, there is a duty to support the poor by taxation, the taxation must not be per head, but in accordance with the property a man possesses.—(Applause.) If you admit it is the duty of the State to support the poor, you must necessarily admit that the taxation that is to go for the support of the poor must be a tax not per head, but according to the means of individual citizens. Why, our property tax payers are only supposed to pay £156,000 a year, while you are to be called upon by this taxation per head to pay nearly a million. Is that fair? I say if you once admit that it is the duty of the State to support the poor, and if you once admit that Smith's canons of taxation are right—viz., equality of taxation—then the Major's scheme is gone.—(Applause). But if it is said, on the other hand, that it is not the duty of the State to support the poor—supposing you take up that position, then the scheme is equally gone. What is the use of politicians bothering about the question at all? So that I do not care which view you take: if you say it is the duty of the State to support the poor, then it must be the duty of the State to tax equally, according to their means, the citizens for that purpose; but if you say it is not the duty of the State to support the poor, then, of course, there is no need of considering the schema at all. But now I say further, look at what would be some of the effects of the scheme. And first, I say the main effect of the scheme would be to do that which in his first address Major Atkinson so much deprecated—namely, to direct the attention of the people to the Government for their every want. I say that this is the abiding political sin of Colonial people. Why, we cannot get a bit of a bridge at the North-East Valley built without a formal deputation—(applause and laughter)—a little bit of a bridge that could be built in a week by the citizens working a day or two. But they got up a deputation: we must have a formal deputation, headed by M.H.R.'s: we can do nothing in this Colony without invoking the aid of the Government. I say that that is the besetting sin of Colonial people, and that if they do not guard against it they will soon lose their independence. What, I ask, should be our duty, living as we do in a freer state than at Home? It should be to do without State interference, except in regard to those things which individuals cannot manage. If we look at what the result has been in the past, we will see that whenever a State tends to interfere with a people in any degree it tends to weaken their individuality—it tends to make them slaves, Major Atkinson says the main aim of a democracy—the sole object of a democracy, as I understood he put it—was to work for the common good. I deny that that is the aim of a democracy. I say the aim of a democracy is to turn out perfect men and perfect women, and I say that any Government that does not aim at turning out perfect men and perfect women is doing an injury to the race, and I say that there can be no such improvement of the race if Government here, there, and everywhere interferes with our social affairs. Why, we must leok forward to the time when instead of the Government's functions increasing they must decrease. We have always found in the past that as individual liberty has increased and Government interference decreased, nations have risen in the scale of existence. I ask you, what is the tendency of democracy? At one time it was said that all the world would come to naught if Governments did not have State churches. Is our world coming to naught because the Government does not vote sums for the church in Parliament? I say I look forward to the time when, instead of democracy doing more for the people, a true democracy will do less. I say that I look forward to the time when even in the matter of education the State will not interfere, but will leave it to the citizens. I think we should look to the State doing as little as possible of what the individual can do. This is most important. I could give illustrations by the hundred of its effects. Take this for example: About a month ago I met with the "Naval Magazine"—a magazine published in London, dealing mainly with nautical affairs. I opened it, and thought," Well, one cannot get much, surely, out of this: it deals with warships, seamen, how to have a proper navy—things out of my line"; but in reading it I came across a remarkable thing, and it shows how out of things that seem often out of one's road some facts may be got that are useful. I found that in an essay in it there was this marvellous thing—a thing the writer could not understand. If young people of good parentage were put on a proper trainingship, well fed, well clothed, and well housed, what sort of sailors, it was asked, would they make compared with the fisher lads, who were worse fed, worse housed, and had less training? And what did he say? Why, that a fisher lad, for ability to do seaman's work and for resource in danger, was worth two of the other lads. Providing you give full play to the individual, you will find great advance made. I ask you to inquire of those accustomed to the sea, and they will tell you that if you take a sailor who has been thoroughly trained in a merchant vessel, and another who has been thoroughly trained as a man-of-war's man, the man who will have most resource in time of danger will be the man who has been trained with less control—the man to whose individual character more scope has been given will turn out a better sailor than one who has always had some quartermaster over him. Then if you wish to take a national test, you will find the same result. Go to the Continent of Europe—to some of the nations where they cannot stir, cannot be married, cannot do anything without the Government interfering with them at every stage of

existence, where from the cradle to the grave there is a Government officer looking after them—take one of these men, and take an Englishman—or, better still, because of the greater freedom of the individual—an American, and see which on a desert island would make the better living first? So it is; you must give scope to the individual, and I believe the true aim of democracy is to make a man feel like a man, and not to bow before those in authority over him. If that is the true aim of a democracy, then I say the loss interference of the State with the citizen the better.—(Applause.) Now I say, how will this affect the equal liberty of others? The Mayor gave us an illustration from the keeping of pigs. He said the State now interferes—you are not allowed to keep pigs in a town. That comes within the principle that you are to have liberty in everything, so long as you do not interfere with the liberty of your neighbour. If a man keeps pigs in the city, and causes stench, discomfort, and disease, he is interfering with my liberty. The highest ideal of a State is to prevent interference with liberty; and therefore it is invoking no extraneous aid from the State—it is simply asking the State to protect my liberty in the preservation of health. I will say one word more with reference to the question of equal liberty. I say—for the land problem is closely related to the poverty problem—we must lay down the same rule of equal liberty with reference to land, and if we lay down the same rule we must at once come to this conclusion—that the land is the State's, and that the State should only part with it for the State's benefit. Now I wish to say one or two words in reference to

How is Poverty to be Met?

First, I wish to say a few words in reference to some of Mr Green's remedies, because I wish to apply the same principle in dealing with Major Atkinson's or any other scheme. I do not believe in State interference in reference to becoming a publican any more than the State interfering in reference to dealing out sick-pay, I believe that if the State became the publican—the vendor of liquor—you would not stop drunkenness to any appreciable extent; and you would have other attendant evils, just the same as you have other attendant evils wherever the State interferes with what should be left to individual effort. In reference to a State paper issue, I will tell you what a paper issue means, or how far it could do any good, The only effect of a paper issue, supposing the Colony had a bank of issue, would be this: If instead of the banks issuing bank-note, the Government did so, seeing that the banks issue only about a million a year, it would save £40,000 or £50,000 in interest. That is all that could be saved, because we have got to pay for things outside the Colony, and people outside the Colony will not take our bank-notes except they can get them exchanged or recognised beyond our Colony. Therefore to issue more paper money in this Colony would have no effect further than bank-notes now have in the Colony—simply for the purpose of exchange. You would only save the interest on the money, which I believe would only amount to £40,000 or £50,000 a year. But you would have other attendant evils, because the tendency of every Colonial Treasurer in difficulties would be to use the printing press, quite careless of the effect that would be produced a few months afterwards. I wish to point out, before I leave this question, two dangers in reference to Major Atkinson's scheme, one of which has been entirely overlooked in any criticism I have seen of it. One great evil would be that all our young people at 16 or 18—I mean those of tia labouring classes who have not large means, and who could not pay those various sums to the Colonial Treasurer—would at once have to turn to some profitable employment. What does that mean? It means in one respect that no poor person's children would have a chance of higher education, because if they had at once to turn to work for their living they would be deprived of the chance of attending the higher schools. I say that is a danger existing even now in this Colony, As soon as youths come to the age of 16 they are removed from school and set to work. Some of the brightest boys who, if they were sent to the grammar schools and university, might become ornaments to the Colony, are sent to drudge for a living, and on account of the poverty of their parents they have no chance of attaining to high distinction.—(Cheers.) If we have this evil at present among us, I say it would be intensified tenfold if the Major's scheme were carried out. Then, I say, the standard of living must be necessarily lowered. If you have the people living up to a certain standard, and if they get less money to live on, they must lower their standard of living. What does that mean? It means either worse lodging, or worse food, or worse clothing, or less amusement. You cannot, the Major says, get nothing out of nothing. Therefore, where is this money to come from? It must either come out of the savings of the people, or out of their expenditure. If it comes from the saving people, they would save their money in any case, and make a better use of it than by handing it over to the Colonial Treasurer, who will disburse it perhaps among those who are not provident. Now Major Atkinson gave us four causes of poverty—bad laws, want of thrift, over-population, and crime. I think the causes are different. I say the first cause is State interference with human rights.—(Cheers,) The second cause is physical weakness; third, mental weakness; fourth, moral weakness; and fifth, poverty—because I say that poverty produces poverty. Physical weakness is a cause of poverty when men cannot do the work that is obtainable; mental weakness may, perhaps, produce a want of ability to

save, the person having no self-control; and that is included in moral weakness, such as giving way to drink an other vices. If you agree that these are the causes of poverty, I ask, how are they to be remedied? Will they be remedied by paving 15s a week to people when they are sick, and paying them 10s a week when they are over 65 years of age? The thing is perfectly ridiculous. First got at the causes. First remove bad laws. First hive your land system changed; have your taxation system changed. And you must have par voting system changed to do that. Do not imagine that our Constitution is perfect. Do you call that a perfect Constitution which permits a man who has perhaps £25 worth of land in each ward in a city to vote for four members of Parliament, while a man with £5000 worth of property in one ward has only one vote? Do you think that a perfect system which gives encouragement to faggot votes? I don't. Again, are you consider it a perfect system of government—and here, I say, is an instance of bad laws interfering with human rights—where there is no attention paid to the laws of health, and where we have preventible diseases in all the large cities. I took up a Christchurch paper the other day and read a report of the medical officer of the Christchurch Board of Health. I do not know what our Mayor does with the Dunedin reports; they are very rarely published. I find that there were a vast number of preventible diseases in Christchurch—something like from 150 to 200 cases of actually preventible diseases; and the medical officer shows how they could be prevented. Through disregard of the first laws of health there had been typhoid fever, diphtheria, scarlet fever, and other fevers; and I say that in all our Colonial cities our attention as citizens has not been half devoted to this question. If we wish to get rid of the sickness we now suffer in this healthy clime, we must pay seme attention to the laws of health; and that is one way of getting rid of poverty.—(Applause.) Further, we must pay attention in the education of the young to training them up to habits of thrift. I do not believe you can teach people thrift between the ages of 16 and 20 or 23 and 20. I say you must begin with thd children. Some of those now present know that the late Mr Dalrymple, Miss Dalrymple, myself, and others fought to get savings banks established in the schools, so that children from the earliest ages might learn habits of thrift and self-reliance.—(Applause.) Yet what have we done in this repect? I believe that throughout the whole province there is hardly one savings bank yet established in connection with our schools. Then we must also have the children taught lessons of physiology, so that they may attend to their health; and if we wish also to see them well educated, and to get rid of one of the greatest vices of the Colony—drinking—we must teach them temperance. I fought, and others fought, to introduce into the schools temperance lesson-books, so as to teach the children in their earliest years—not to leave it until they are 16 or 23 years of age—the duty of abstaining from anything that will injure them physically, mentally, or morally.—(Cheers.) I believe that that is the only way in which social reform can be obtained. I ask you to cast your eyes on history, and see how social reform has been obtained in the past. As a race, what enormous advances we have made! If we go back, for example, to the time of the Plantagenets, and look at what even the king had to put up with: no glass in his windows, no paper on his walls. He had no fine Turkish carpets; he had no railroads, no telephones, no telegraphs. Why, he did not live half as well as a large merchant in our town. And if you go further back, just consider the Cave man—or what is termed by geologists the River Drift Man—and see what enormous advances humanity has made. I ask you, how have these advances been made? They have not been made by a short cut of 15s per week. They have been made by raising the standard of living, by training the individual, and they have not been obtained right away. I say to those who think that one or two generations, or three generations, will get rid of this question of poverty, which has existed for ages, or this question of intemperance, which has existed for ages, that they are trusting to a rope of sand.

Conclusion.

This is one of the social evils which it will take ages and ages to get rid of, and it will only be got rid of finally, not by trusting to legislative means, but by raising the standard of living of the people, by educating the people, and by promoting culture amongst the people. Let us look to our Statute-book. It is enough to make us cease to believe that anything can come by merely passing laws. If you look at our Statute-book you will always find an amending Act the preamble of which says that all previous Acts have been failures. No great social reform can ever come from State interference. This I cannot better illustrate than by quoting a passage from one of the greatest of living men, who says: "You see that this wrought-iron plate is not quite flat; it sticks up a little here towards the left—' cockles,' as we say. How shall we flatten it? Obviously, you reply, by hitting down on the part that is prominent. Well, here is a hammer, and I give the plate a blow as you advise. 'Harder,' you say. Still no effect. 'Another stroke.' Well, there is one, and another, and another. The prominence remains, you see. The evil is as great as ever—greater, indeed. But this Is not all. Look at the warp which the plate has got near the opposite edge. Where it was flat before it is now curved, A pretty bungle we have made of it. Instead of curing the original defect, we have produced a second. Had we asked an artisan practised in 'planishing,' as it is called, he would have told us that no good was to be done, but only mischief, by hitting

down on the projecting point. He would have taught us how to give variously-directed and specially- adjusted blows with a hammer elsewhere—so attacking the evil not by direct, but by indirect actions. The required process is less simple than you thought. Even a sheet of metal is not to be successfully dealt with after those common-sense methods in which you have so much confidence. What, then, shall we say about a society? 'Do you think I am easier to be played on than a pipe?' asks Hamlet. Is humanity more readily straightened than an iron plate?" I say to those who imagine that pauperism and all other social evils are to be got rid of by putting an enormous amount of taxation on the people, that they are trusting to something which must end in utter failure. How, then, it may be said, are we to help forward this great movement? I believe we will help forward thrift, and get rid of poverty by means such as these: by educating the people up to this question, which demands solution from us; by expending our enthusiasm on this subject, and not on every subject; by recognising our responsibility as individuals, so that each one of us in the democracy recognises that he does not act for himself, but that it is his duty to act for others. If each one of us acted in the capacity of a moral guide, and adopted the maxim of Kant, and so acted that his actions might form a law unto humanity, what a different nation we would be! If we as a nation are ever to get rid of poverty, crime, and vice, we must not only incline to individualism, but we must each of us try to live his life so as to act as a guide to those among us who may be physically, mentally, and morally weak. Doing these things would do more to promote a true democracy and to raise humanity than to assist some in getting getting rid of the duties of property, and casting on the working men this enormous burden of taxation.—(Loud and continued applause.)

Mr J. W. JAGO had had the honour and privilege of moving a few nights ago a vote of thanks to Major Atkinson for his discussion of this great and important question, in which the present and future welfare of this Colony is involved. He had been asked again by gentlemen upon the platform to do a like duty on this occasion, and he did it as freely and heartily as before. He would not say whether or not he agreed with Mr Stout, as in the case of Major Atkinson, but he thought both had done a great service to the community. The whole question was one of very great difficulty, and required much thought and serious discussion; and any gentleman who aided the ultimate solution of the matter, as he thought Mr Stout had done, deserved the thanks of the community. He would propose a vote of thanks to Mr Stout for his address.

Mr W. D. STEWART, in seconding the vote of thanks, said that everyone who contributed to the information of the people on the problem of poverty was entitled to thanks. He need scarcely say that he had given this matter some little consideration, and keenly appreciated its difficulties. The scheme propounded by Major Atkinson, to his (the speaker's) mind, would tend to foster poverty, and not to prevent it.—(Applause.) He thought that a great many of the suggestions and arguments advanced by Mr Stout were not only plausible, but well founded.—(Applause.)

The vote of thanks was carried unanimously, MR STOUT said: I thank you very heartily for the vote which you have unanimously passed. I have to regret that in consequence of the number of the subjects I had to [*unclear:* conden] a great deal that I had to say, I will ask you now to join with me in a hearty vote of thanks to the Mayor for presiding over this meeting.

The vote was carried by acclamation, and the meeting dispersed.

Printed at the "Otago Daily Times" Office, Corner of High and Dowling streets, Dunedin.

"Peace or War?" "What ought we to do?" Address Delivered by Sir Robert Stout, Chief Justice of New Zealand, In the Unitarian Church on Sunday, January *7th*, 1917.

Address by Sir Robert Stout.

The following address on "Peace or War?" was delivered at the Unitarian Church last Sunday evening by Sir Robert Stout, Chief Justice of New Zealand:—

This is the third year of the greatest war that has ever been waged in the world. With the universal development of wealth and of scientific inventions of every kind, war means something to-day that it never meant before. The history of the world has no record of such a war between nations. The number of men fighting was never so great. Millions of men are engaged in actual conflict, and millions are making munitions for the warriors. Machines for the destruction of human life were never so numerous, and never so perfected. One of the combatants boasts of frightfulness, and this is new in human warfare; and on a nation claiming to be cultured, and posing as containing the most civilised people in the world, there has been cast a stain of broken treaties, of murder, of rapine, of disregard of international agreements for the conduct of war that will be ineffaceable. Do I need to give illustra-tions or examples? We have only to remember the report of the able and impartial Commission on Belgian Atrocities, the murders of Nurse Cavell and Captain Fryatt, the treatment of the prisoners of war in Germany, the murders of non-combatants on merchant vessels like the Lusitania the victims of Zeppelin raids on defenceless towns, to realise the atrocious character of Germany s war methods,

No nation calling itself civilised has ever sunk so low in ethical conduct.

It even glories in its crimes. The school children of Germany had a holiday granted when the news of the murder of the Lusitania's victims reached Germany! That incident alone was enough to stamp the nation as an unmoral nation.

The only gleam of goodness one may see in this horrid war is the heroism of the Allies in fighting for liberty and justice. In no war in the world's history has greater heroism been displayed, and we must fee! pride that our sons and daughters as combatants and nurses have shown themselves to be unexcelled.

In this great world upheaval, and in the discussion of peace or war, it is surely necessary that we have a clear idea of what the terms mean so that we may realise our duty and responsibility, What, then, do we mean by "war"? What does the word "peace" signify? If we refer to our dictionaries we will find that war is defined as a contest between nations by force of arms. That is not the full meaning of "war." There can be a war that is not a contest between nations. We have heard, and perhaps have seen "civil war." That is a contest by force between citizens of the same State. If force is used and arms are utilised, we call such a contest civil war. There was civil war in the United States for over four years in 1860 to 1865. Whenever some of the people of a State disobey the laws of the State, and attempt by force of arms to coerce the other citizens war has been proclaimed.

"Far Worse Than Prussian Militarists."

It is not consonant with my subject to discuss whether revolutions are ever justifiable. It will be held by reasonable men that where the State is under democratic rule, that is, where all citizens have equal rights, where provision is made for the settlement of all disputes by judicial tribunals, whether the dispute may be between citizens, or between citizens and the Government, further, where there is a right to vote granted to all adults, where redress of every kind can be granted by a freely elected Parliament, there is no justification for a revolution. To say that in such a country a revolution was justified would be to proclaim that democracy had failed, and some other form of government was necessary. In a land where human life is sacred, where property is secure, and freedom reigns, to say that some citizens have a right by force of arms to insist on their views being carried out would be to declare that mankind was unfit for social life, and that strength or power must rule, and not freedom and reason. Those who would so contend are not democrats, and they have no right to the name of Socialists used by John Stuart Mill, John Buskin, and other great reformers. On the contrary, they, are militarists of a type worse by far than Prussian militarists. These Prussian military autocrats have the sanction of the laws of their country for their tyrannous military acts. But those who would, in a free democracy, where there is a free Government and universal suffrage, apply force to get their behests carried out, are properly termed military anarchists. The basis of social life is, first, that a majority must rule, and second, that the liberty of the individual is not to be invaded unless it is necessary to do so to protect the liberty of all and and the existence of the State. If the Executive of a State attempts ta encroach oil this human liberty, those oppressed are not without redress. First, in a country where there is a free Parliament they can appeal to it for redress. If the Parliament gives them no relief, they can wait till the triennial election, and appeal to the people, and a democracy is based on the assumption that the people can be trusted. If the people, cannot be trusted, then we must admit a democracy is not a proper form of government; but Socialists of all kinds have said that the people can be trusted, and that they favour democratic government. In the United States and in the Commonwealth of Australia, and, to a small extent, New Zealand, there are written constitutions which limit the powers of both the Executive Governments and the Parliaments, In such countries the highest judicial tribunals may set aside decrees of the Executive Government and Acts of Parliament. Even in England a few months ago, the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire set aside an Order-in-Council of the King as being contrary to natural justice and to international law. The Order-in-Council interfered with the law as administered in the Prize Courts, and the judgment of the Privy Council was given in favour of Swedish shipowners.

Not Democrats, Not Socialists.

It will be seen from another point of view that war in a democracy by democrate is unthinkable. The aim of democrats is the establishment of brotherhood. It is, to realise the hope of Robert Burns:—

When man to man the world o'er
Shall brithers be for a' that.

How is that aim carried out? First, there must be liberty. Where bondage exists there is no true brotherhood. It does not matter much who is the tyrant if citizens are deprived of liberty. It may be one man—for example, an Emperor, or it may be a President; it may be what was sometimes found in ancient cities, an oligarchy—the rule of a few. It may be the rule of some associations or unions. The name of the rulers does not signify if liberty is infringed or denied. How then, is liberty to be maintained and peace and brotherhood assured? I do not think there is or can be any dispute as to the method. The Government and constitution of the State must be democratic. There must be a free Parliament elected by all adults. There must be impartial judicial tribunals to settle differences between citizens, and between the Government and citizens. The day for-settling disputes by duels or by fighting has passed from the social life of a free democratic people. If then we live in a democratic State, having liberty and these social institutions, we will begin to realise practical broth-erhood. Some States have even tribunals for settling wages and salaries between employers and employees. These have been created so that we might have industrial peace. If we are democrats, or call ourselves Socialists, we must in such States obey the laws of the State. If we think the laws wrong, the people can change them, and no citizen and no number of citizens can without violating the law and the basis of social life attempt by force to have their views carried out. If any make such an attempt they are not democrats, they are not Socialists, they are military anarchists, and, as I have said, worse military tyrants than the Prussian military party.

How to Establish Peace.

In many States peace has been secured and brotherhood established. The human race is far from perfection, but it is going ahead to a better and brighter social state than we have yet had in the world. Its march to this better goal will be hindered by social war, by an appeal to force and not to reason. Those who appeal to force show that they lack the feeling for brotherhood and do not trust the people. Peace in a State can exist only if there is a reverence for the laws we ourselves have made, and if the feeling for brotherhood prevails. How can we obtain peace between nations? Peace is the absence of war. How can nations avoid war? I believe there is only one way of avoiding war, and that is to create for nations what some nations have created for their own citizens. The dream of Auguste Comte was a United States of Europe. He proposed that Europe should be divided into small republics, and these republics confederated as the United States of America are confederated. To settle differences between the States there must be judicial tribunals, and behind these tribunals a Federal Standing Army just as behind the tribunals of a State there stand the policemen or the military to enforce the decrees of the courts. We have seen the uselessness of the Hague Tribunal. It has no power to enforce its decisions, and nations are not bound to appeal to it to settle their differences. It has no jurisdiction unless both disputants agreed to leave the matter to it to settle. And if they did, and a decision was given, the Hague Tribunal could not enforce its decision. It is only by the creation of international tribunals such as courts are in a nation, that peace can be established. There would then have to be an inter- national police or army, as a "sanction," as it is termed, behind the tribunal.

"Can we Help?"

It will take some time before the peoples of the world will agree to such a method of settling disputes. But that is no reason why those who desire peace should not begin to agitate for such a reform. At first, and perhaps for some time, those who are dissatisfied with the decisions of the court may refuse to obey the court's decree. There will be non-pacifists amongst nations, just as we have amongst ourselves non-pacifists who will not submit, unless there is force, to the decrees even of our industrial courts. Have we not even in New Zealand, where there is a free triennial-elected Parliament and adult suffrage, seen misguided militarists causing riots because they could not get industries under their control? Have we not seen such non-pacifists, some unsocial "Socialists," acting contrary to law? Once the blessings of peace are, however, realised, we will not have amongst nations such military ideas. Brotherhood will win adherents, and force be resorted to only by the criminal or non-normal classes.

Can we help to establish such a peace? I think we can. It was asked by an American how could he train his children to be obedient, respectful and kindly? And the answer given to him by another American was: "Be

yourself obedient, respectful and kindly." If, then, our people really desire peace, let them be peaceable. Let them obey our laws, All disputes—even industrial dispute—are by our law to be settled by judicial tribunals. Let the decrees of such tribunals bo obeyed. They may be wrong decrees; no judges are infallible. If an attempt is made by force to disobey these decrees and stop people working unless they obey, not the decrees of the court, but the decrees of some self-appointed associations or unions, then war is proclaimed and the basis of true democracy is attacked. Such action will make neither for peace nor for brotherhood. If we wish brotherhood and peace, let us act as brothers and be peaceable. A man or woman who calls himself or herself a pacifist and says that he or she is for the brotherhood of humanity, but attempts in our State to set our laws at naught, and to force any portion of our people to act contrary to the law, either misunderstands what peace means or is not honest.

Who Wanted War?

Having made these general observations on peace or war, it may be asked what ought we to do in the present war? Let us consider our position very briefly. First, who is to blame for the war? Did Britain, or France, or Russia, or Serbia, or Belgium want war? No honest man can say that any of those nations did desire the present war. They had not prepared for war. Russia offered to submit her case to The Hague Tribunal; Germany refused. England asked for a conference; so did France, and so did Italy. Germany refused. Poor little Serbia offered anything if she was allowed to remain an independent nation. Belgium's territory was wantonly invaded contrary to Germany's word, plighted by treaty. It was Germany that, having prepared for war, forced war on Europe. I believe Austria would, but for Germany, have agreed to a peaceable settlement of differences with Russia. We have only to read the literature of Germany to see that Germany wished, and still wishes, world dominance. She desired to rule from Berlin to Baghdad, to attack Egypt, and to destroy England. In such circumstances what could our Empire have done save defend herself? Could she allow the destruction of Serbia, of Belgium, and of France? She knew that the aim of Germany was to destroy Britain, and could her people stand by and see such a crime committed? I believe we did wrong in 1864 in allowing Prussia and Austria to filch the Schleswig and Holstein territories from Denmark. By the Treaty of 1852, signed by Prussia, Denmark was assured in the succession of these duchies, but they were taken from her. We know what wars Prussia has been engaged in since 1864; the war with Austria in 1866; the war with France in 1870—those were wars of conquest, and the war of 1914 had the same end in view. Could British people be so craven as to allow Germany to dominate the world? Was Britain not worth saving?

A Brazilian Tribute to Britain.

Listen to what a Brazilian has said of our Homeland:—

And Great Britain, gentlemen. What man is there, who is really a man, who would not glory in belonging to a race capable of producing this people, that vies with all others in sincerity, virility, and creative power? Spiritually it is from this race that emanates in modern times the world of free humanity. Great Britain's conception of justice has imbued with liberty all those nations which have had the good fortune to be born of her stock, or to have come in touch with her. During a century in her enviable home there has reigned that peace so intimately coupled with the austere and industrious bent of her subjects. But when her gates were forced open by a transformation of which history knows no equal, the most non-militant of all races under the sun was changed into a real hive of invincible warriors; from her castles came forth the very flower of her nobility to teach her people by a glorious death the grand simplicity of dying in the sacred cause of justice; the most wonderful military organisation enveloped the land in an impenetrable armour: the country, awestruck, beheld arise there, improvised in but two years, an immense army, and from that little island, whose destruction her enemies already looked upon as accomplished, there suddenly arose an unexpected grandeur, unlooked for, serene, clear, and inviolable, before which the myths of ancient Titans pale into obscurity and the mountains of the world sink in insignificance.

Because by the might of her fleets, Britannia rules the waves, her armies are battling in every quarter of the globe where blood is being shed, and with the boundless resources of her wealth, of her credit, and of her invincible determination to prevail, she sways the Titanic struggle like a sleepless genie of victory in the clouds enveloping the world with the fog of war.

These, gentlemen are first and foremost the nations to whom we owe our moral code, ouremancipation, our liberty, our civilisation, from whom we have absorbed the lessons of liberty and justice, who have given us our laws, our government, and our best statesmen, who have instructed us in belles lettres, in statesmanship, in our

industries, who with their wealth have given birth to our prosperity and with their sympathy, wisdom, and liberality have enabled us to maintain our credit, and, with it all, they have never coveted our land, have respected our independence have honoured our weakness, and never wavered in their confidence.

We could wish for no more proven loyal and firm friendships.

Yes, we may use the words of a poet of the United States of America, and say of Britain:—

She hath erected reason's sovereignty, Because wherever human speech is known
The touch of English breath does make thought free;
Therefore, for ever is her glory blown About the hills and flashed beneath the sea.

Germany's "Pay Day" Must Come.

It may be said if Germany now wants peace, why should she not get it. Certainly, give her peace if she admits she is conquered, and is willing to pay indemnities for her many crimes, and to give guarantees for her future conduct. But that is not her attitude. She does not admit that she is conquered and she denies she committed any crime or did any wrong. The "pay day" for her conduct and action must come.

There are some people who think that criminals can be reformed without punishment. They do not realise that the dread of a denial of liberty—and that is all the punishment we inflict on our prisoners—may be the most useful factor in the strengthening of the will of a criminal so that he shall not offend again. So with nations, they must realise that crimes committed and wrong done must meet with their proper reward. No one wishes to see the German people deprived of their country; no one desires to see them in bondage as a vassal nation to any other nations. So far as I know, no one proposes to partition Germany, or to take any portion of the country that properly belongs to the German people. Germany has talked of freedom to Poland. Is it proposed to retake from the Government of Germany Prussian Poland and set it up as a separate nation? That has not, so far as I have seen, been suggested, and the Polish nation has suffered cruelly from Prussian dominance. The punishment asked by the Allies is only that Germany shall pay for the damage she has done, and that she must cease to terrorise humanity. As to her colonies, to many she had not even the colour of right. Let us take Samoa as an example. It was contrary to the expressed wish of the Samoan people that she seized Upolu and Savaii. This was accomplished by the weakness of our Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr Joseph Chamberlain. In 1885 the Samoans asked to be annexed to New Zealand, and sent two chiefs as delegates making this request to us. The Home authorities refused, however, to grant their request. During the Boer war the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to appease Germany, weakly agreed to allow Germany to take Upolu and Savaii as her territory. It is time that the wrong then done was redressed. It was Britain that had civilised and instructed the Samoans, and they longed to be under British protection. I know this of my own knowledge from conversations I had with the leading chiefs in 1892 whilst in Samoa.

Our Duty is Plain.

Our duty to my mind is plain. We must stand shoulder to shoulder with our kin beyond the seas, as people desiring justice and freedom, and striving for brotherhood. This is our duty. There may be a few craven souls in our midst who are pro-German, and who care little for the glory, or even the existence, of the British Empire. They are so few as not to be worth considering. The great mass of our citizens have done much to help our Empire; they have gone to fight for her, and they have out of their abundance given her monetary aid. Our young men have done nobly. They have been true heroes. To show you the heroic spirit displayed by some of our New Zealand boys, may I be permitted to give you a short extract from a letter from one who lost his life in France. The letter was written just before he left for his last attack on the German trenches:—

To-morrow night we go forward to the brink, and the next morning at dawn we hop over the parapet on one of the most difficult tasks ever given to a division. There can be only one result—every man will do his clean British bit, and there will be very very many who will never come back. We all know what we are up against; we have heard again and a train of the pitiful handful of men who have returned broken out of whole battalions who have gone forward to push back the Hun. We have seen the ground over which such battalions have fought, and the heaps of dead they have been unable to bury: but, thank God there is not one single man of us New Zealanders who does not welcome this long-awaited chance to do our bit. A wee bit frightened some of us may be; I am a bit afraid myself, and will be more so on the day; but it is our chance, our chance to give one big blow to Germany for all you dear ones back in New Zealand, for you who have given up your sons, who have given up your money, who have suffered deep anxiety and pain for our sakes—our chance to show that once the old Mother Lion is threatened the young cubs are ready to jump to her help and show the strength of their

newly-won manhood—our first chance, and we are going to take it. If we win through it's going to be a big day in the history of New Zealand; if we fail it shall not be through any lack of dash, of go of willingness, of heart in the individual men.

But we are one and all determined to win through, cost what it may—the thought of failure has no place in our minds.

Now Dad, I may be one of the unfortunates. Hence this letter. But I'd like you to know that I'm not frightened of whatever may come my way. In one way I am frightened—for I defy any man, to say that fear does not grip his heart when something big is doing. But I'm not frightened of a wound, and I am not frightened to die. Death must come sooner or later, and death on a battlefield is without a shadow of doubt the most glorious of all ends. [*unclear:* For] myself, it means nothing more [*unclear:* than] a snuff of the candle. But for you and for mother, and for the kiddies it means more. More than ever do I wish that I had not a single soul to worry about me, not a soul to mourn my death. A peculiar wish, perhaps: but you will understand how I feel. For myself the worries of what might happen to me are insignificant; but for you, at home, going into hot action means one of the most heartfelt worries I've ever had to face.

But, whatever happens. I'm going to do my duty. I have my boys to think of—men who have seen me tested in other hot corners, and who have come to place upon my leadership a confidence that I cannot betray. I have my country to think of, and I am determined to prove that I have the blood of a Briton in me.

Much More Yet to do.

We shall have, however, to do much more than we have done. We do not yet fully realise that we are at war. Our pleasures have not been lessened. Useless and wasteful expenditure still goes on. We ought to be saving our means to help the oppressed and to help our Motherland. As far as I can ascertain, we have given up few, if any, of our pleasures. Our newspapers are full of the details of race meetings, of theatres, of sports, and useless expenditure on various things has not been lessened. Can it then be suggested that we have yet risen to the conception of what this world-war is, and that we have done what it is our duty to do for the brotherhood of humanity? We ought to sink all our political and other differences, and fight for this one aim, the salvation of our Empire and of our people, and for the oppressed amongst the nations. If we do so we shall be doing something for peace, something for justice, something for freedom, and hasten the coming of the day—

" . . . . When brotherhood shews stronger
Than the narrow bounds which now distract the world.
When the cannons roar and trumpets blare no longer.
And the ironclad rusts, and battle flags are furled.
When the bars of creed and speech and race, which sever
Shall be fused in one humanity for ever."

"New Zealand Times" Print.

Religion and the State. A New Year's Address Delivered in the Unitarian Free Church on Sunday Evening, the 4th January, 1914. By Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G.

Religion and the State.

(By Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G.)

It was long ago pointed out by an eminent political philosopher that there were at least three ways of considering every question or Social Science. It may be viewed from—

- The historical side,
- The theoretic side, or
- The practical side.

May I use all these three ways of approaching the important subject of Religion and the State?

I feel that at least one hour is all too short for considering any one of these three aspects. To-night I can, therefore, only indicate—and that in a brief way—how the subject may be viewed, leaving to my hearers the duty and, I hope, the pleasure of more fully discussing the subject at their leisure.

(1). What then is the history of the relationship of Religion and the State?

I do not know if we sufficiently realise that every race of human beings, nay, every tribe, has a religion.

The most primitive races with which we have become acquainted have had some form of religion—that is, some theory of their existence and some method or ritual of appeasing the power or powers by which they considered they were surrounded. We call their religion unpleasant names. Sometimes we say it is idolatry, or paganism, or magic, or sometimes we use all these three epithets in describing it. Whatever name is used, we must recognise the experiences of these primitive peoples as "religious experiences," to use the phraseology of the late Professor William James of Boston.

May I refer, in illustration of what I mean by religion amongst primitive peoples, to what is found in Australia? The aboriginals of Australia are not high in the scale of civilisation. They are very low in the scale. They have views of their origin, and they have religious assemblies—we call them "corrobborrees." Their ritual is varied, differing in the different tribes. The Arunta tribe, for example, has one, and the Warramunga trioe another. Full details of their ceremonies are given in Spencer and Gilleas' works on Australian exploration. Each tribe has only one religion. Heresy is unknown. There is only one church, one religious experience, one tribal religious conscience and consciousness. There is in the Arunta tribe no specialisation of social functions. The chief men are leaders in their government and their religion. The division of the tribe into "warriors and priests" has not yet arrived to them. Religion and the State are one. There are no heresy hunts, no religious persecutions and so far as is known, no one has been burned for holding heretical opinions; and obviously there have been no discussions about the realm of spiritual or temporal power. The head or heads of the tribe are not differentiated from the religious rulers. This practice of non-differentiation or non-specialisation has continued amongst European nations to our own day, so do not let us cast stones at the Australian blacks. In Russia the Czar is head of the Russian church, and the King of England is the chief ruler of both the English and Scotch National churches, if you were at the meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland you would see the High Commissioner representing His Majesty—the adumbration of royalty—there. To those acquainted with Scottish history I need not recall the "Ten Years Conflict,' that ended in the "disruption' of 1843 and the creation of the Free Church of Scotland. The headship of the Church was the most prominent cause of the struggle. Before Italian Unity there was one part of the Peninsula in which the Head of the Catholic Church was also head of the State.

In ancient times there was no room for any variety of religious experiences. The National religious consciousness demanded one church and one only. This old view is still prevalent, so persistent are ancient beliefs. In many modern creeds we can see their foundations extending back for many thousands of years, as a perusal of the volumes of the third edition of the "Golden Bough" by Professor Frazer, already published, will tell us.

It is not surprising that this should be the history of our creeds or social beliefs. It is but a page of the history of living things. Biologists tell us that the most primitive living things were not, and are not, specialised in structure. Some of them have only one sac that has to serve them for their life's equipment. They have no socialised heart, or lungs, or liver, and yet they can perform all the functions necessary for life. As the ladder of life is ascended, specialisation is seen both in structure and function. We see animals with a heart, lungs, liver, etc., etc. There is a vast difference between a pro-tozoa and a mammal.

We witness the same specialisation in out industrial life, as we have in our physical life. At one time our worker could be farmer, tailor, bootmaker, carpenter, etc. Now we have specialisation so great, that it takes several workmen to make a pair of shoes. And as civilisation has advanced, so we have had the number of our political and social agencies increased. Our local bodies are numerous and their functions are specialised. One body, or society, or department looks after one thing, another after another, and their spheres of action are kept separate and apart. The test, one might say, of progress, or of civilisation, is the specialisation that is seen in the framework of society. And specialisation is seen not only in the physical structure of living things, in the division of labour in the manufacturing of goods, in the functions of Government departments and local governing bodies, but in the variety of religious beliefs. As intellectual development has appeared so have there been seen many varieties of beliefs. Heretics are not found where the level of intelligence is very low. Voltaire was amazed at England having many creeds, and only one sauce. He found in England thought and freedom, and he should not therefore have been surprised that creeds were numerous, Heretics appear where there are thought and freedom. What a list of them might be read out—Socrates, Galileo, Bruno, Servetus, Ferrer, etc., etc.

It the mass think alike, the religious experiences are alike, and a State Church may have a reason for its existence, and be successful, If you allow freedom to think, do not be surprised at a variety of religious experiences.

I am stating no new doctrine. Has it not all been stated by Herbert Spencer and many others? The law or progress shows a change from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous.

If we consider the struggles between the Christian Religion and the Religion not Christian, or the many struggles between the varieties of Christian faith, we will find that the struggle is ever to go back to the old

theory, to try and have only one religion. Illustrations might be given that would take hours to tell. We know that Roman Catholics were put to death in Elizabeth's reign because of their religious beliefs. We have read of the Wigton martyrs, of two women drowned in the Solway because they would not conform to Episcopalianism, of Thomas Aikenhead hanged because he did not believe in the inspiration of the Bible or in the Deity of Christ, of Chevalier de la Barre because, as stated on his monument erected in Montmarte, Paris, he did not make obeisance to a passing Church procession. We Know how Non-conformists were penalised in the 18th century in England, denied the right of education, and not allowed even to have schools of their own. Have we not heard of rivers of France running led with the blood of dissenting Hugueaots? Were all these people that joined in such persecutions wicked people? Not at all: most of item were sincere. They thought they were saving souls, and the race having been trained for centuries to believe there should be only one religion, they struggled for that end. And amongst us we have sincere people who are dominated by the same idea. In their view, there should be only one religion, and the State should and that religion. They believe there can be no morality and no happiness unless their variety of religious experience is made universal, and they are 30 blinded that they do not see anything wrong in utilising the re-sources of the State to help them to propagate their creed.

II. Let us now consider what is a State. What is the function or what is the duty of a State? where can this be found recorded? There are many books on the subject, Bluntschll's, Humboldt's Bosanquet and many others. Before a wise man builds a house he has a plan of what the structure is to be. A State is a growth, it is an organism of a Society which has taken long to evolve, and in most states there has not yet been committed to writing or put in print the exact limitations of its authority over individuals. There is a limitation, but it varies in different States. All admit that the State exists not for itself out for the people. It is supposed to be, to quote Abraham Lincoln, "A Government of the people, for the people, by the people.'" It is not for a majority only—it is for all. There is such a thing as human liberty.

We say an Englishman's house is his castle. Within his dwelling there is a holy place which even a State officer cannot invade. There must be individual freedom. Freedom in what? In religion! It was not always so. In Great Britain at one time Catholics could not even in their own houses hold their religious services without incurring the penalties of Statutes. At another time Protestants could not worship when or where they pleased. Protestant non-conformists were punished even when the State Church was Protestant. Do we know that at one time not even a school could be opened by non-conformists without the license of an Anglican Bishop? The power of a State has waned since the 17th and 18th centuries. We have more freedom, Indeed, nowadays one might define the duties and functions of a State by enumerating what it can not do. We must have freedom, and if freedom is denied, like Tennyson we feel inclined to leave the State and seek a country where men and women are free. Can we say of our land:—

"It is the land that freeman till,
That sober-suited Freedom chose,
The land where girt with friends or foes,
A man may speak the things he will."

And may we not also say with Tennyson—

"Should banded unions persecute
Opinion, and induce a time
When single thought is civil crime
And individual freedom mute.
Tho' power should make from land to land
The name of Britain trebly great,
The every channel of the State
Should fill and choke with golden sand,
Yet waft me from the harbour mouth wild wind."

It then it is the right of men and women to have freedom of belier and freedom of worship, it cannot be the function of the State to teach a creed which is the creed of the majority only, and at the expense of all. It may be contended that the State has a right to teach all creeds and that concurrent endowment is propar. That would mean the State paying churches to teach the children religion (and why not adults), and leaving the control of that teaching in the hands of the churches. That is an understandable position, and is certainly more logical, and

more in accord with freedom than endowing one or more churches and leaving others [*unclear:* meidowcd]. We have many citizens in New Zealand who are not Christians. We have Confuscians, Mahometans. Agnostics, Theists. Spiritualists. Theosophists—I suppose some people will not call unitarians Christians. Are all these citizens to have aid in the inculcating of their tenets to the young? Very few in a community would say that such was the duty of the State.

The present State Education system would have to be abolished and all religions endowed if we were to have concurrent endowment. To say that the State has a right to select one religion and teach its creed because it is the religion of the majority, is to declare it to be the duty of the State to propagate the religious experiences of only one section of the people. That would not be "the Government of the people for the people," but a Government for part of the people. If such a function is proper, many of our ancestors who fought for religious freedom, and for the abolition of State churches have suffeled martyrdom for nought, and may have been injuring humanity. The State under such an ideal of a State's function is no longer an organisation Cambracing all its citizens. Hitherto those who have been what are called liberals or progressiveists have recognised that there are varieties of religious experiences, and that whatever the beliefs of citizens may be, all must have equal rights and equal privileges "before the law," Make one class outcasts because of their race or religion and you banish freedom and [*unclear:* Jihcfy] from the state Whenever a state curch exists in a community of people of divers creeds, injustice is there present, and true liberty is absent. This has been recognised in some countries of Europe, in the United States in Canada, and in Australasia. As intelligence and civilisation have advanced there has been less and *less* interference by the State with religion. In some districts of the United States there was once a State Church—there in none now. The re sult of the alliance of the State and religion in the united States can be gathered from Longfellow's "New England Tragedies."

It may be said by some advocates or the State teaching religion that they do not want State Churchism revived. But surely: if it is the duty or function of the State to teach religion, the question of age is of no importance. If it is the function of the State to teach religion to children up to 14 or 15 years of age, it cannot be wrong to teach youths up to 21, and to inculcate religious doctriness to youths even after they have reached their majority. The question is—"Is religion in the care or keeping of the State or is it not"? If it is, the State's functions cannot, be confined to teaching children up to 15 Years of ago, nor to the providing of religious teaching in week-day schools.

A proposal being made in our Do-minion is that a certain kind of reigion shall be taught in our State schools. Some time ago it was urged that the Bible should be treated as literature, as Hebrew literature. Thus it was said these ancient, books, or extracts from them, should be used is our schools as moral text-books. *It* was overlooked that, there were ancient stories such as are found in the history of primitive peoples that would not be suitable for the edification of twentieth century folk, but now these two suggestions are merged in the proposal that these books are to be used as religious text-books.

In addition there is a proposal that the clerics or ministers of the various churches should have free access a teachers of religion to the state schools. Diverse religions are to be taught. If such proposal were a-dopted we might see a lesson given in one room on sacraments, and another minister [*unclear:* explaning;] that sacraments have no longer any existence in true Christianity, an our citizens, the Friends, say. Are we to have in the schools what me called sacred or religious emblems? I wonder if the end will be civic peace and civic brotherhood if our schools are turned into diverse Church seminaries? If a State is to he fair and just to all and human liberty preserved, the State must be neutral to all phases of religious experience. So far as teaching is recognised as a State function, the State must teach those things, and those only, in which all citizens may participate. There are not two parties about the teaching of languages, or mathematics, or geography, or music, or science, or technology, etc. And the State is not, by having secular schools preventing the teaching of religious beliefs. It recognises its function as a teacher is limited to certain subjects, and it leaves to parents and churches or voluntary effort the inculcation of religious beliefs. In theory the interference, of the State in the religious domain cannot be defended.

III. May we now approach the queston from a practical point of view There are various tests we may apply as to the effect of the State interfering with religion. Pope said:

"For forms of government let fools contest,
Whatever is best administered is best."

That is the English attitude. How did education fare when it was left to the Churches? It was left to the Churches until the nineteenth century. In some countries in Europe even to-day half of the adult population cannot read, and the management of the schools is deplorable. Illiteracy is highest in Russia where there is no room for dissenters or heretics. In England down to 1870 education was supposed to be mainly a concern of the

Church, though aid was given to schools by the Slate, and with what disastrous results it is not necessary to state? In Scotland the Church had little control of its parish schools, for they were managed mainly by laymen, by "feuars and heritors" us they were called, and they Cared better. Progress in education in our Home country has been delayed by the interminable struggle of the Churches for control of the schools. Wherever and whenever the control has passed to laymen, and the schools have become secular, progress has been seen. Let us take France: What have been the results there? Has crime [*unclear:* aer caud]? I will give you a few statistics: Of persons sentenced in the superior Courts, the assize Courts, for crime:

Then let us take the effect on juvenile crime. In Reformatory Schools there were:

The percentage of illiteracy was—

If we take New Zealand we well find a progressive decrease in crime under our system of secular education. Our Secular Education Act was passed in 1877 and came into force in 1878. Let us begin nine years afterwards, and behold the figures:

These figures have dealt with Juvenile crime.

Let us take prisoners of all ages received into gaol.

We may take serious crime during the five years ending 1912. Sentenced in the Supreme Court there were:

Or take another test, those in gaol on 31st December, in the six years:

But for Intermediate and Habitual Criminal Sentences the numbers would no doubt have shown a far greater decrease.

In Illegitimacy our rate has fallen:

For every 100 births there were:

It will be found that compared with New South Wales where there is religious instructions in State schools, our figures are lower.

In New South Wales the figures are for every 100 births:

In crime also our record is less.

In the Commonwealth of Austalia the rate of illegitimate births was, from 1900 to 1902, 13.3 per thousand of unmarried females and widows: in New Zealand in the same period it was 8.9.

These statistics raise some practical questions. Under our secular system of instruction crime and immorality have decreased. It is not necessary to go the length of the pragmatists in philosophy, who seem to make a good working theory the test of the truth of a philosophical system. We may, at' all events, contend that the absence of a State re ligious system of education has not led to evil results. If the figures had been the other way we would have bean told from pulpit and platform that the absence of Biblical instruction was the cause of our present social position. This we may say, that there is nothing calling for the interference of the State in religious teaching so far as our ethical position is concerned. It may be said Church attendance has fallen off, and the doctrines belived by us 50 years ago and deemed vital are now not generally accepted. These statements may or may not be true, but what have they to do with the State? We know that ministers of churches were put out of their Churches for holding doctrines deemed heretical, and that ministers of the same Churches hold these views to-day and are not expelled. In 50 years views as to the virgin Birth, Miracles, the infallibility of the Bible, etc, etc. may have undergone a great change. If a change has taken place a very practical question arises. It is—What are the teachers to teach the children? Let us take three subjects only.

- Are the children to be taught that the first chapter of Genesis is a true account of the coming into being of the Universe?
- Are they to be taught to believe that miracles happened in Palestine?
- Are they to be taught to believe in the existence of an Evil Spirit, in a personal Devil?

I wonder if a majority of our members ot Parliament, or of our Cabinet or of our heads of Departments, or of our doctors, or our lawyers or our Professors believe these three things? If not, why should our children be taugnt them? Are we honest and wise in inculcating beliefs to children that when they get to years of discretion they will abandon? It is well known in all the branches of, at all events, the Protestant Churches there are ministers who do not assent to any of the three beliefs referred to? Only the other day memorials from teachers of Divinity in Oxford and Cambridge asked for a modification of the question to intending Deacons of the Anglican Church about their belief in the inspiration of the Bible. Is it not hypocritical to insist on teaching our children the doctrine of special creation which no teacher of Biology in any of our colleges teaches? Evolution rules in our Biological laboratories. Is it moral to tell our children special creation is true when we accept the doctrine of evolution?

As to miracles, this is what a Pro fessor of Lampeter Ecclesiastical Col lege (Church of England) says—"And in this paper it is attempted to show that even if it be held that of all the wonders reported to have been worked by Christ, only the cures of diseased persons are sufficiently credi ble, and that these were not strictly miraculous" etc., etc Again "The miracles themselves are not unattend ed by some difficulties . . . They are bound to be a rather frail story for religious faith. (See Hibbert Journal, vol XII, pp. 162 et seq. And what

teacher of repute now refers to Satan as was common 50 years ago? Who accepts the doctrines as to the Devil and Hell that were current fifty years ago? Is the State to see that these doctrines are taught to our children?

There can be no morality unless it is built on the foundation of truth. Tell the truth to your neighbour is the unalterable maxim of the teacher of morals.

If we teach that which is not true we will be sowing the teeth of Cadmus, and the crop we shall reap will not be profitable.

It is not necessary to point out another practical difficulty. No one should be a teacher of religion who does not believe in the religious creed he teaches. It will not be possible, it there is to be religious teaching in schools, for any teacher not of good standing with some leading church to get an appointment as a teacher, and certainly it would be injurious to anyone desiring to be a teacher to study Biology. No Biologist of standing accepts the poem or myth of Genesis as true. It is difficult now to get male teachers of our primary schools who are men of light and learning, but who will we get when the State teacher is to be a teacher of religious beliefs, that even many ministers of religion have abandoned? Our schools will be closed to them! And can we after such closure talk of equal rights, or equal privileges or of freedom of thought in our State?

Our children would be taught by reactionaries, by men of little thought and less learning, and such an end some foolish people may think will be conducive to true religion, Carlyle said his countrymen were mostly fools. I wonder what he would have said if he had seen a state with a secular system of education, neutral to all religions, where social life had been improved, where statistics showed its crime and immorality had decreased, where the standard of life was high, making over the education or its youths to either hypocrites or ill-informed persons! I fancy the epithet would have been even more emphatic than he applied to his country-men.

May I not then say that there is no need of altering the present relationship between religion and the State. History tells us when there has been a State religion there has ever been tyranny and persecution, which have waned in accordance with the stage civilisation has reached. In theory it is indefensible for a free State to give privileges or concessions to one section of its citizens even if that section is numerically the greater, and in practice there will be grave difficulties if any change is made and per secution of one kind inevitably follows, It would be a grave charge to make against enlightened Christianity that it cannot exist unless it persecutes, or utilises the power of the State to work injustice.

Printed at the ALBXANDRA HERALD Office, Tarbert Street, Alexandra S.

crest New Zealand—education Department. The School Journal. Part III—for Classes V and VI. At least one copy of each Part should be filed in the school as a School Rocord. VOL. XI.—NO. 10.] Wellington. [November, 1917.

Chaucer's Good Counsel,

Shun thou the crowd, and make the truth thy bride,
Contented with thy lot, mean though it be,
Who climbs may fall; hate is the fruit of pride;
Crowds shelter foes; blind is prosperity.
Essay no more than what behoveth thee;
Do thy work well, as thou'dst have others do;
Truth hath freed others—it shall free thee too.

Think not in haste to make things crooked straight,
Trusting that Fortune never shall thee fail;
Unhappy ever the reformer's fate;
The foot is pierced that kicks against a nail;
Broken the jar when dashed against a rail;
Reform thyself, and let the others be;
Follow the truth—the truth shall make thee free.

What Heaven sends, with cheerfulness receive;
Who strives with Fate but wrestles for a fall;
Hera is no home, why should'st thou vainly grieve?
Forth, pilgrim, forth—forth from they sheltered stall;
Seek thy true home; look up, thank God for all;
Keep the high road, thy spirit leading thee;
Doubt not—the truth, pursued, shall make thee free.

—*Adapted, W. W. A.*

Great Rivers of the World.

7. THE YANGTSZE-KIANG.

The history and development of a country depend largely on its rivers. Settlements grow into great cities in their fertile basins, and the waters furnish the means of communication between them. Nowadays, in Western lands, railways have robbed them of some of their importance as highroads of commerce. This is not the case in China, however, where railways are few. It is part of the religion of the Chinese not to disturb the graves of their ancestors, and as graves are numerous throughout the country, and the people were long averse to the introduction of Western ideas, they have always opposed the making of great railways; hence the rivers are still the great traffic-carriers.

China is well supplied with them. The Yang-tsze-kiang ranks as one of the great rivers of the world, and the Chinese often call it the Ta-kiang, or "Great River." "Yang" means blue, and "kiang" means river; therefore Yangtsze-kiang means blue river, though it is known by this name only for the last 800 miles of its course.

Three streams rising on the south-eastern edges of the plateau of Tibet unite to form this great natural waterway of China, which at the confluence is three-quarters of a mile wide. At this point the river is 13,000 feet above the sea, and is separated from the Hwang-ho (yellow river), another great river of China, by the chain of mountains whose melting snows feed both streams. For the first 300 miles of its course the Yangtsze-kiang plunges in tempestuous flood through mountain rifts and savage gorges, and is not navigable very far. Many tributaries join it, four from the province of Szechuen (four rivers), the principal being the Min, which is a broad and navigable stream opening up the heart of the province. Although there are many mountain routes and roads, they are all difficult for traffic, and the Min and other rivers are therefore of first importance.

Keystone View Company.

PRIMITIVE METHOD OF IRRIGATING RICE-FIELDS.

By treading on podals women turn the beam on which they are seen standing. Up the frame and Over he beam passes an endless chain with pieces of board attached, and at the beam revolves each board carries a small quantity of wake up the frame and into the irrigating channels.

Sze-chuen has a rich red soil, brought to its highest productivity by splendid irrigation-works. For 2,000 years this province has enjoyed boundless prosperity and immunity from droughts and floods through the efforts of the engineering genius who planned the canals. He also spanned the rivers with iron suspension bridges, which are still repaired or renewed as time wears them away. The grateful Chinese built a splendid temple in his honour. It stands upon a height that towers above the Couching Dragon Gorge. Cut in the stone and golden-lettered the engineer's motto appears on every conspicuous place: "Dig the bed deep; keep the banks low."

Densely populated towns and large villages are thick in this district, and fine farmhouses rise among

GORGE ON THE YANGTSZE.

the, cedar, bamboo, peach, and plum groves, Great magnolia-trees heavy with flowers perfume the summer air; huge peonies, scarlet dragon flowers, waxen begonias, and flowers of richest hues paint the fields in flaunting gaiety; and gorgeous butterflies add the last exquisite touch to the blaze of colour.

The whole province is rich in minerals, and produces petroleum, silk, tobacco, grasscloth, grain, and tea. The provincial capital is Cheng-tu-fu, but 200 miles below the junction of the Min and the Yangtaze is Chung-king, the second trade emporium of inland China. From this city the river proceeds in a course still violent, boiling over rocks and eddying in whirlpools, and rushing in noisy rapids between frowning banks bristling with precipices. For 500 miles it rushes on to I-chang, the last of the Yangtsze gorges. Yet this part is navigable by light boats, and thousands of junks carry cargo up and down the stream. For ages these junks have been driven against the current in the smooth reaches by their huge, square sails, or, the wind failing, have been towed up close to the banks by gangs of ill-paid "trackers," who haul on the bamboo towing-line, dragging the laden junks at a snail's pace over the difficult passages. British enterprise has placed some light-draught paddle-wheel steamers on this part of the river, and speeded up the traffic; but the Chinese opposed the innovation for some years.

At I-chang, 1,000 miles from its mouth, the Yangtaze is a magnificent river. No other stream in the world carries such numbers of craft as does this river of China. Tributaries pour into it; one of them alone—the Han—is navigable for 1,200 miles for cargo-boats, and furnishes access to the richest and most populous districts of China. Hankow is at the junction of the Han with the Yangtaze, being one of a cluster of three large towns. Since 1862 Hankow has been open to foreign trade. A railway 700 miles in length now runs north from Hankow to Peking (north town), the capital of China.

For the last 200 miles of its course the Yangtsze flows through fertile plains—a cultivated dead level, intersected by canals and creeks, forming the most complete network of water communication in the world. The Grand Canal, constructed in the thirteenth century, is a partly natural and partly artificial watercourse 700 miles long, connecting the river with the Hwang-ho, and increasing the facilities for intercommunication. The delta at the mouth of the Yangtsze is a network of canals and lakes, providing 36,000 miles of navigation, and is entirely under water in summer after the crops have been gathered.

Nanking (south town), the former capital of China, is on the Yangtsze, 130 miles from its mouth. Nanking is the prettiest port on the Yangtsze; hills, softly blue, stand up behind the town, and in the

Grand Canal

early summer the slopes are all abloom with azaleas of every hue. About sixty-four years ago many of the Chinese rose up against the Manchu dynasty of Emperors. This was called the Taiping rebellion, and Nanking was seized by the rebels, who destroyed all the magnificent public buildings for which the city was once famous. There are still the remains of the beautiful porcelain tower and the tombs of ancient kings, which were approached by an avenue of remarkable atone figures of animals. The Taiping rebellion lasted ten years, British aid being finally required to quell it; "Chinese Gordon," who died at Khartum, dealt the final blow to it.

Shanghai, the most important seaport for central China, stands on an affluent of the Yangtsze, twelve miles from its month. The European part of the city has broad streets, electric light, tram-cars, and handsome public and private buildings. The Chinese part has narrow, dirty streets and densely crowded houses. Shanghai has an enormous export trade in tea and silks.

AVENUE OF STONE ANIMALS LEADING TO THE TOMES OF THE ANCIENT KINGS.

The Yangtaze-kiang reaches the sea by a wide estuary that begins fifty miles below Nanking and terminates at Shanghai This gigantic river brings down in its 3,000 miles of course enormous quantities of earth, and the Yellow Sea between China and Korea is gradually being silted up. The discoloration of the water can be noticed 200 miles out to sea.

A Message to the Children of New Zealand.

By Sir ROBERT STOUT, Chief Justice.

I met one day two Scout boys. They were in Scout costume, and each had a little satchel and a walking-stick. I asked them this question: "Do you know where you are going?" and immediately they answered, "Of course we do; we are going to Makara. We are out for a walk,"

All boys, and girls too, should, especially when their school-days are coming to a close, have this question put to them; or, better still, each one of them should ask himself or herself, "Do I know where I am going?" That it is a mark of wisdom to "look before us," many of our oldest writers tell us. Shakespeare looks upon this power and capacity of looking before us as a Divine endowment; and Terence, a Latin poet, said, "It is true wisdom to look ahead at those things that are to be."

Boys and girls have been equipped for a journey—the journey of life. That is what is meant by education, by going to school. Their life is before them. Where are they going? Have they thought of their future? They are to be the citizens of no mean country, and they have to work. What are they going to do? All kinds of work have to be done. We need good farmers, brave sailors, expert railway men, industrious mechanics of many kinds, patient methodical clerks; we require doctors, lawyers, clergymen, etc. In the future life of our nation there is much to be done, and all kinds of things to be done; and if the question I have mentioned, "Do I know where I am going?" is put, what is the answer to be? Every boy or girl should consider this, and before answering it should consult parents, teachers, and any wise man or woman friend, for on its proper answer depends not only his or her own future, his or her success in life, but also his or her usefulness to the nation or state.

There are, it is said, not two men and not two women exactly alike. There is always some difference. Men who have studied the subject tell us that in the whole world—that is, in millions of people—there have not yet been found two persons who can make the same finger-marks. What one person can do and do well, another person with as much general ability cannot do well if at all. Sydney Smith, that great wit of the last century, said of one of our English statesmen that "His worst failure was that he was utterly ignorant of all moral fear—there is nothing he would not undertake." This statesman was not wise, Very talented youths may be able to do many things well. We have known men and women who were able to undertake various callings, but most persons have not such ability, and if they are wise they will try to discover that kind of work for which they are beet fitted. How often has it to be said of one who promised well in his youth, "His life has been a failure!" And how often has the cause of this failure been that the youth has, to quote an old metaphor, "Attempted to squeeze a square peg into a round hole! "Boys and girls, ask yourselves, each one of you, "Do I know where I am going?" Consider well what your future work is to be, and once, after due thought, you have fixed on your career, prepare for it. Equip yourself for your journey; see that you are trained for your service. Dare to be wise, and begin to be wise as soon as you can. Wisdom is not easily obtained, Tennyson says,—

"Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers."

You may have gained much knowledge, but you need wisdom. You have to use your mind—to think, to reason, to look before and after. Get this habit, and you are on the way to lead a useful life, and to help to make your country a great nation.

A Noon Song.

There are songs for the morning and songs for the night,
For sunrise and sunset, the stars and the moon;
But who will give praise to the fullness of light,
And sing us a song of the glory of noon?
Oh, the high noon, and the clear noon,
The noon with golden crest,
When the sky burns, and the sun turns
With his face to the way of the west!

How swiftly he rose in the dawn of his strength;
How slowly he crept as the morning wore by;
Ah, steep was the climbing that led him at length
To the height of his throne in the blue summer Sky
Oh, the long toil, and the slow toil,
The toil that may not rest
Till the sun looks down from his journey's crown
To the wonderful way of the west!

Then a quietness falls over meadow and hill,
The wings of the wind in the forest are furled;
The river runs softly, the birds are all still,
And the workers are resting all over the world.
Oh, the deep noon, and the full noon,
Of all the day the best!
When the sky burns, and the sun turns
To his home by the way of the west!

—Dr. HENRY VAN DYKE.

Note.—The "School Journal" will not be issued in December and January next.

Britain's Sea Story.

12. THE NAVY IN THE GREAT WAR.

The sea is ours—those shielding lines of billows,
Those rippling sheaves of armour stern and grey,
That's why we sleep secure upon our pillows,
Let come what may.

The sea is ours; we paid the price to win it—
That price the page of history can unfold;
That's why our hearts of oak keep guard each minute,
For what we have, we hold.

Gold-braided admiral and bold sea-rover—
Old days and new cement Britannia's power;
So still our breed, as future years pass over,
Shall claim, "The sea is ours!"

The British Empire is based on that seasupremacy which, a fighting Navy, backed up by an efficient merchant Navy, has gained and still retains. The strategic keys of the world are the Straits of Dover, Gibraltar, Bab-el-Mandeb, and Malacen, and the Suez and Panama Canals. Britain holds all these except the last, which belongs to America and is therefore open to her Allies. At these points, as well as at all the other important strategical positions along the communications of the world, the British Navy keeps watch and ward.

But the term "British Navy" has taken on a new meaning since the Great War began. The Navy has added over 2,500 vessels to its pre-war strength—vessels taken over from the mercantile marine and now doing duty as troop and horse transports, observation and ammunition ships, hospital ships, oil-tankers, colliers, balloon-ships, meat-carriers, and in countless other capacities. A further addition to the Navy is the patrol fleet of motor-boats, tugs, yachts, drifters, and trawlers, engaged in net-watching, ram- ming submarines, sweeping the fairways for mines, deviating the traffic when they find a nest of German "eggs," hatching them by gun-fire, laying British mines, and charting areas so guarded. Not the least of their services is the rescue of U-boat victims, ruthlessly abandoned on rafts or in small boats to the pitiless waves.

To-day this mighty Navy is everywhere—a far-flung line of ships reaching from Ostend up through the North Sea, along the coast-line of Australasia, across the stormy North Atlantic, down the coasts of Scotland and Ireland to Gibraltar, through the Mediterranean Sea and the Suez Canal to India, with an encircling branch line of ships round Africa. It reaches out from India to join its ally, the Japanese Navy, then stretches to Australasia, and to the waters round South America, thus completing its patrol of the seven seas.

Why is all this necessary when the high-sea fleet of Germany rides at anchor in the Kiel Canal, whither it fled pell-mell after the Battle of Jutland?. It is because some raider more adventurous than the rest may slip through the covering mine-fields under favour of fog and murk, and work havoc among our commerce, as the "Karlsruhe" did. Besides, many German" ships, out on the seas when war was declared in 1914, fled at that time to their nearest neutral port for sanctuary. Some of these escape from time to time, and go forth as privateers, having been supplied with ammunition and stores from one of the many neutral ships that Germany has bribed to enter her service. Therefore our ships must go and come continuously along the waterways, ready to hunt down these sea-hawks, and hold up all shipping in their search for contraband.

Thus, while every trade route in the world is open to Great Britain, Germany's fleet and mercantile marine have been chased, off the surface of the oceans, and she has taken refuge in submarines beneath the waters. These hidden foes are a grave menace to us and only the ceaseless vigilance and unconquerable spirit of our seamen have averted disaster. Many fine ships have received their death-blows, but still the Navy carries on, while Great Britain speeds

A Submerged Submarine as Seen from an Aeroplane.

up her shipyards and develops her defensive agencies for meeting submarines.

So far the destroyers have been most effective, and both British and American destroyers are accounting for a large number of U-boats. In the

Destroyee Sinking a Submarine.

Battle of Jutland our destroyers were at close grips with the enemy, parrying blows aimed at bigger ships and striking blows themselves, and, after preventing the German torpedoes from getting home in the flanks of our dreadnoughts, they drove down the enemy's line. With splendid dash the "Shark" raced down between two lines of German destroyers, discharging her torpedoes right and left at close range. She sank two and damaged others before, struck in her own vitals, she sank beneath the waves. If, we had enough destroyers, the submarines, which sink our merchantmen mostly by gun-fire, would be forced to stay under water and limit their attacks to the small number of torpedoes they could carry. The fishing-net for catching" tin-fish "is very useful, and is being improved. The seaplane is good as a scout for finding sub-marines, and as a machine from which bombs can be dropped. If the submarine bases could be attacked the destruction of these ships would soon be accomplished; but a navy cannot invite annihilation by going into mined harbours. However, as the inventive genius of England and America is concentrated on our submarine trouble a sure cure for it is certain to be devised in the near future.

Seaplanes on a Battleship. (One is being hoisted on board.)

In the meantime the brawny arms of our shipbuilders are helping our seamen; for it is ships, ships, and

more ships that they want. To a ceaseless anvil chorus, to the ring and din of riveting-hammers, mighty ships are growing apace. Some stand almost ready for launching; other huge structures tower aloft, a wild complexity of steel joists and girders, dimly showing the outlines of leviathans yet to be. Snorting engines puff up and down; cranes swing giant arms to the sky; ponderous lathes turn; and monstrous machines cut through steel plates as if they are made of cheese. Truly has Britain learned her lesson—that if she would retain the Empire she has won, she must keep her Navy so numerically and materially strong that it is in all respects equal to its great responsibilities, "On the Navy, under the good Providence of God, our wealth, prosperity, and peace depend." But when we say "on the Navy" so much depends, we do not mean on steel ribs and oaken timbers alone, but, above all, on that distinctive courage, tempered by a traditional and stoic discipline, which, from our boy seamen, to our great Sea Lords, burns in them all—an illuminating fire. This was the quality that sustained Jack Cornwell at his post till the last British gun had boomed out its note of victory. This was the same superb endurance that gave strength to young Musgrave, who, when his ship, the "Aboukir," was torpedoed, swam from it to the "Hogue," and, when the "Hogue" went down under his feet, swam again to the "Cressy," which, in her turn, cast him forth upon the waters. And the boy—such a young lad—swam again to wreckage, and kept afloat till picked up by a friendly Dutch boat. There was also the boy midshipman who was left in sole command of the last survivors of his ship, and who, having shepherded them to the boats, started singing to keep up their spirits. And yet again, there was the boy of the Battle of Jutland

THE BUILDING OF A BATTLESHIP.

1. The timber round the battleship 2. The keel-plate. 3. The magazine bulkhead, the first portion to be erected upright. 4. The ship ready for launching. 5. Placing 11 tons of armour-plate in position. 6. Twelve-inch gun ready for hoisting aboard.

who successfully navigated his ship home, although her steering-gear had broken down.

Boy after boy of British blood and breeding has proved himself a hero in circumstances terrible enough to make strong hearts quail; and it is this heroic fibre in our seamen that is an even more valuable asset to Britain than her mighty fleet.

Vain, mightiest fleets of iron framed,
Vain, those all-shattering guns,
Unless proud England keep, untamed,
The strong heart of her sons!

DATES FOR THE MONTH (NOVEMBER).—1st—Old-age pensions became law, 1898; Naval action off Coronel, South America, 1914: 5th—Great Britain declared war on Turkey, 1914: 7th—Fall of Tsingtau: 14th—Field-Marshal Earl Roberts died, 1914: 15th—Domesday Book compiled, 1086: 16th—Suez. Canal opened, 1869: 20th—Failure of the German efforts to reach Calais, 1914: 23rd—British bombardment of Zeebrugge, 1914; Serbian Army retreated, 1915: 24th—Tasmania discovered, 1642: 28th—First occasion on which New Zealand women exercised the franchise, 1893: 29th—Education Act providing for the free and compulsory education of children passed, 1877; Chatham Islands discovered by Lieutenant Broughton in H.M.S. "Chatham," 1791; King George visited the front, 1914: 30th—St. Andrew's Day.

[On the 7th December, 1914, the South African rebellion collapsed, thus enabling General Botha to undertake the conquest of German South-west Africa. On the 8th the British Squadron under Admiral Sturdee defeated Admiral von Spee's squadron off the Falkland Islands; four of the enemy's ships, the "Scharrhorst," the "Gneisenau," the "Leipzig," and the "Nurnberg," being sunk. On the 17th the Turkish suzerainty over Egypt ended; and on the 18th a new Khedive—Prince Hussein Kamel Pasha—loyal to Britain, was appointed. On the 3rd December, 1915, General Townshend reached Kut-el-Amara. On the 19th December, 1915, the Allies' troops were withdrawn from Anzac and Suvla Bay.]

On appropriate days the school flag might be hoisted

Quotations Worth Remembering.

CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR.

The bells that usher in that morn
Have ever drawn my mind away
To Bethlehem, where Christ was born,
And the low stable where He lay.

—*Thomas Miller*.

Let each fireside, howe'er lowly,
Love the day when Christ was born.

—*Mrs. Barnard.*

Ring out the old, ring in the new;
Ring happy bells across the snow:
The year is going, let him go;
Ring out the false, ring in the true.

—*Tennyson.*

Then pealed the hills more loud and deep,
" God is not dead, nor doth He sleep;
The wrong shall fail,
The right prevail,
With peace on earth, good will to men!"

—*Longfellow*.

The feet of the humblest may walk in the field
Where the feet of the holiest have trod;
This, this is the marvel to mortals revealed
When the silvery trumpets of Christmas have pealed:
That mankind are the children of God.

—*Phillips Brooks.*

I hear the bells on Christmas day
Their old, familiar carols play,
And wild and sweet
The words repeat
Of peace on earth, good will to men!

—*Longfellow*.

At Christmas-tide the open hand
Scatters its bounty o'er sea and land.

—*Sangster*.

Heap on more wood! the wind is chill;
But let it whistle as it will
We'll keep our Christmas merry still.
Each age has deemed the new-born year The fittest time for festal cheer.

—*Scott.*

At Christmas be merry, and thankful withal,
And feast thy poor neighbours the great with the small.

—*Tusxcr*.

Have you any old grudge you'd like to pay?
Any wrong laid up from a bygone day?
Gather them all, and put them away
When Christmas comes.

Blood of our blood, in every clime!
Race of our race, by every sea!
To you we sing the Christmas rime.
For you we light the Christmas tree.

A merry christmas to you all.

Looking Forward.

The heights by great men reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight;
But they, while their companions slept.
Were toiling upward in the night.

At the end of the year many of you who are now reading this *School Journal* will be leaving the primary schools. Some of you will enrol yourselves at schools where education higher than that given in the primary schools can be obtained. Unfortunately, however, many of you may be leaving school altogether. Some of these may know the walk of life upon which they are about to enter, having chosen it because of their liking for it or because they think it best suits their abilities. Others, again, may wait for something to "turn up." The boys will scan the newspapers for a "billet" that offers what are considered good wages, and the girls who are not required to help at home with household duties will be on the watch for a "situation." But you boys and girls should not allow yourselves to take up the burden of the world's work in this haphazard way. The work that first offers may or may not suit you—most likely it will suit somebody else, but not you. At it you may prove a failure, or you may find that your talents may be more useful if used in another direction. You will most likely prove to be "a square peg in a round hole." and in the world there are quite enough of such "square pegs" without your becoming one.

But before any of you finally leave school and join the great army of workers—whether on the land, in the workshop, in the office, in the sale-room, or wherever brain-power and skill load to success—should you not ask yourselves, "Am I fit to go out into the world of work? What will my position be in a few years' time if I

take up some employment now—even if the wages do seem to me to be good? Why are some of my class-mates seeking further education? What are those schools and colleges that many of the boys and girls who formerly sat in these desks are now attending, and what are they for? Can they be of no use to me? "If you seriously ask yourself these questions and make inquiries from teachers and others who will be only too glad to give you information and advice, you will soon find answers.

What you will be told is this: "Not many years ago education was regarded as the privilege of the favoured few who were preparing themselves for high positions; now it is understood that if a country is to advance, to be prosperous, and to take a place among the nations, all its citizens must be efficient workers, and this can be attained only by opening the doors of education to all ranks and providing for each worker the kind of instruction he most needs. This is being recognized more and more by the progressive nations of the world. Ability, it is true, will bring any one to the front to a certain extent; but what our country calls for is trained ability. This is necessary also in the individual who wishes to be more than a mere drudge among his fellows. The lower ranks of all workers are crowded, but, in all trades and professions, for the man or woman of trained ability combined with strong character there is plenty of room at the top. Those institutions to which the boys and girls who formerly sat in these desks have gone, and to which some of your class-mates are going, are provided by the State to give to all the opportunity to fit themselves to be more than mere drudges in the ranks of workers, and to be better citizens to the State. When you go out into the world beyond the school-gates you will find yourself among other workers, and if they are better trained, know more about their work, and are more earnest and persevering than you they will outstrip you, and you will be left behind. Education, just as much as good character, sobriety, perseverance, and good health, is essential to success." Are you answered?

Let us now see what opportunities each of you has for better fitting yourself for the duties upon which you may enter. Well, as a true democracy, New Zealand offers opportunities to all, and gives to all, as far as it can, an equal start. After you leave the primary school other educational institutions are ready to receive you and help you on, and it matters not whether your parents are rich or poor. Some of these institutions most of you must have seen, for not far from your home there will be a District High School, a High School, a Technical High School, or, at least, classes at which students can attend in the evening. How are you to gain admission to these? Well, the doors are open to all who can pay the necessary fees; but to one or other you should have little difficulty in obtaining admission *free*. Let us now look briefly at these institutions and find the keys that will open their doors and give you this free admission.

I. *District High Schools*.

Number in New Zealand = 60.

Number of free pupils in 1916 = 1,983.

Open free to Scholarship-holders and to holders of Certificates of Proficiency.

These District High Schools are widely established, and at one of them a pupil may receive free education until the age of seventeen years is reached. Here you will receive a good general education, and will learn also agriculture, dairy science, commercial work, and, in the case of a girl, needlecraft and cookery. The courses of instruction have an immediate practical value, for they bear more or less on the occupations of the people of the district. Can you not attend one of these District High Schools?

II. *High Schools and Colleges*.

Number in New Zealand = 33.

Number of free pupils in 1916 = 5,826.

Open free to Scholarship-holders and, generally, to holders of Certificates of Proficiency.

In towns where the number of secondary pupils is large, High Schools—sometimes called Colleges—are established. In these the subjects taught have not to the same extent a bearing on the occupations of the people of the Dominion as in the District High Schools, though commercial work, agriculture, and domestic science are taught also. The education is more general than in the District High Schools, and leads to the professions. You see how large is the number of pupils in attendance. Can you not become one of them?

III. *Technical High Schools*.

Number in New Zealand = 8.

Number of free pupils in 1916= 1,915.

Open free to Scholarship-holders, to holders of Certificates of Proficiency, and to holders of Certificates of Competency in S6 with the special endorsement of merit in handwork and elementary science.

Pupils in these receive, in addition to a general education, instruction such as will enable them to hold their own and attain success in the realms of industry, commerce, agriculture, dairy-work, etc., and, in the case of girls, domestic work. The instruction is very practical, and has a strong bearing upon the work of everyday life.

In the larger centres of population there are both Technical High Schools and High Schools, so that if you live in such a place you are particularly fortunate in being able to select the class of instruction that best suits your needs. And the choice should not be made lightly, nor made with any object other than that of fitting you for the work you will do after you leave school. Pupils who seek further education and who live near a District High School only are, in general, required to attend it, those who live near a High School only are required to attend that, but those who live near a High School and a Technical High School (or Day Technical Classes) should make up their minds early what occupation they are likely to follow and select the class of instruction accordingly. If you are going to be a doctor, a lawyer, a teacher, etc., the High School will best suit you. If, on the other hand, you intend to take up a trade, enter upon business pursuits, or join the ranks of industry, the Technical High School provides the more suitable instruction. And for the sake of the boys, particularly, it may be pointed out that, in New Zealand. 34 per cent, of the men are engaged in agriculture, 31 per cent, in industry, 15 per cent, in commerce, 10 per cent, in transport (railways, steamers, etc.), and only 5 per cent, in professions. In making your choice keep these figures before you, and consult your parents or your teacher before taking any step that may afterwards prove unwise.

But to those who think of leaving off school-work altogether we must again say, "Are you as wise as your fellows who intend to proceed further? Can you not find a place for yourself in an institution in which technical subjects are taught?"

IV. *Evening Classes*.

Number of centres in New Zealand = 151.

Number of free pupils in 1916 = 4,060.

Open free to holders of Certificates of Proficiency, holders of Certificates of Competency in S6 with the special endorsement of merit in handwork and elementary science, and to those who hold no certificate at all if they wish to attend industrial classes, are over fourteen years of age, and have left a public school for not more than six months.

At the three classes of schools that have been briefly described pupils must attend during the day, and they are not helpful to those who are really compelled to engage in work in the daytime. For such boys and girls the doors of knowledge are not closed, however. Indeed, they are open very wide, and even if you have to work during the day you still have the opportunity to improve your prospects in life by study.

As you see, these evening classes are widely distributed, and are attended by a large number of students. Can you not become one of them? Ask your teacher about it and follow his advice.

And here let us say that you should not feel discouraged because you have not won a Scholarship, gained a Certificate of Proficiency or Competency, or taken a high place in your class. No certificate is needed to gain you free admission to these evening classes. All that is required is a desire to get on, and pluck and perseverance to carry it through. Nor does it follow that you have not ability because you did not take a high place among your class-mates at school. The bodies of some children grow quickly and those of others slowly. So it is with the mind. Indeed, many children who have been looked upon as dull at school have afterwards become prominent and even famous in the world.

You have now glanced briefly at the different-institutions that the State has provided for the education of its boys and girls after they leave the primary schools. You have seen that thousands of pupils are now attending them. Are you going to neglect your opportunities by not attending at all, by attending for only a short time, by being lazy and indolent while you do attend, or by making the wrong choice where a selection is possible? If you do you will be sorry for it only once—all your life.

Whether your talents be great or small you should use them honestly and well. It has been truly said that "If you have great talents industry will improve them; if you have only moderate talents industry will supply the deficiency." One often hears the remark, "What a lucky man Mr. So-and-so is!" But the so-called "lucky" man may have striven hard and made the most of his talents and opportunities, while the "unlucky" man may have neglected his and allowed pleasure, sport, or a thousand-and-one things—not bad in their proper places—to have first claim upon his time. See that you are not going to be one of those who put down their lack of success to "bad luck," instead of to the proper cause—lack of pluck, industry, and perseverance.

In New Zealand it is not lawful for a boy or a girl to leave school until the age of fourteen years is reached, unless he is thirteen years of age and has gained the Certificate of Proficiency. This is the law, and what is enforced by the law. But this should not satisfy a boy or a girl with any self-respect. The law enforces only the least that is required of one, while the State, which makes the law, provides opportunities for more. Make your school life, therefore, as long as you can. Some shrewd boy or girl may ask, "Does it *pay* to continue my education? "Well, figures showing the extent to which it pays have not been compiled for New Zealand, but let us give you some figures that have been compiled elsewhere. Two groups of citizens were taken, *(a)* those who left school at fourteen, and *(b)* those who left school at eighteen. We cannot give you all the figures here, but it was found that those who left school at fourteen and began to earn money at once received, by the time they reached twenty-five years of age, only two-thirds of what was received by others who remained at school till they were eighteen and for four years earned nothing. Moreover, at twenty-five years of age those who stayed at school for the longer period were, on the average, earning nearly two and a half times as much in yearly salary as those who left school early. Is that an answer to your shrewd question?

Yet the time comes when all boys and girls have to leave school, and the following words of advice may prove useful whether that time is now or later:—

- Consider what you are best, fitted for; ask your parents and your teacher what they think.
- Think of the future. Do not engage in "blind alley" occupations. Many kinds of work, such as is done by messengers, van-boys, errand-boys, and so on, end when a boy reaches seventeen or eighteen, and it is then difficult for him to begin again. Many grown men who earned high wages when they were young have been thrown out of employment because their work led to nothing.
- Learn your work thoroughly. With clever hands and a trained brain you have a double chance in life.
- If you find your work does not suit you, stick to it till you get something better, but do not keep wandering from one kind of work to another learning no kind well and thoroughly. Do not change without good reason.
- If you prefer a trade choose one in which you are likely to find employment anywhere and at any time.
- If you live in one of the larger towns and do not know where employment is to be obtained, seek information and advice from the Officer in Charge of the Juvenile Branch of the Labour Bureau, who will soon find you something to do.
- Be brave and cheerful in whatever work you choose. The struggle to fit yourself will at first be hard, but it will become easier if you persevere. "Practice makes perfect."

What has been just said applies to girls equally with boys, but to the former it may be specially pointed out that they should fit themselves for the future home life that is their proper sphere. A girl or woman who has so trained herself can, if the necessity arises, command good wages in any part of the country.

The most important thing for all to remember is that you should so train yourselves that in time to come you will be just the man or woman you ought to be, and it must never be forgotten that "The hour of your choice is the crisis in your history."

"Cuddle Doon."

The bairnies cuddle doon at nicht
Wi' muckle faucht an' din.
"Oh! try and sleep, ye waukrife
Waukrife—Wakeful.
rogues,
Your fathers coinin' in."
They never heed a word . I speak,
I try to gie a froon;
But ave I hap
Hap—Cover
them up, an' cry,
"Oh, bairnies, cuddle doon!"

Wee Jamie wi' the curly heid—
He aye sleeps next the was—
Bangs up and cries, "I want a piece"—
The rascal starts them a'.
I rin and fetch them pieces, drinks—
They stop a wee the soun'—
Then draw the blankets up, and cry,
"Noo, weanies, cuddle doon!"

But ere five minutes gang, wee Rab
Cries oot, frae 'neath the claea,
"Mither, mak' Tam gie ower at ance:
He's kittlin'
Kittlin'—Foot.
wi' his taes."
The mischief's in that Tam for tricks:
He'd bother half the toon.
But aye I hap them up, and cry,
" Oh, bairnies, cuddle doon! "

At length they hear their father's fit
Fit—Foot
;
An', as he steeks
Steeks—Closes,
the door,
They turn their faces to the wa',
While Tam pretends to snore.
"Ha'e a' the weans been gude?" he asks,
As he pits aff his shoon.
" The bairnies, John, are in their beds,
An' lang since cuddled doon."

An' just before we bed oorsels.
We look at oor wee lambs.
Tam has his airm roun' wee Rab's neck,
And Rab his airm roun' Tam's.
I lift wee Jamie up the bed,
An', as I straik
Straik—Stroke
each croon,
I whisper till my heart fills up,
" Oh, bairnies, cuddle doon!"

The bairnies cuddle doon at nicht
Wi' mirth that's dear to me;
But sune the big warl's cark

Cark—Trouble.
an' care
Will quaten
Quaten—Quieten,
doon their glee.
Yet, come what will to ilka ane,
May He who sits aboon
Aye whisper, though their pows
Pows—Heads.
be bald,
"Oh, bairnies, cuddle doon!"

—ALEXANDER ANDERSON.

Contents of Part III, Volume XI, 1917.

By Authority: MARCUS F. MARKS, Government Printer, Wellington.

State Education.

A Paper Read Before the Otago Schoolmasters' Association.

By Mr. Robert Stout.

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

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

In determining whether it is the duty of the State to educate, the question arises—What is the duty of the State? What limits ought to be set to Governmental interference? Humboldt, in his 'Sphere and Duties of Government,' has answered "security and protection;" while Spencer, echoing his ideas in his work 'Social Statics,' has carried this statement to its legitimate issue. I thoroughly believe in this definition of a State's function, and indeed, in theory, it is one that is generally granted to be right. In practice, however, the philosophers of expediency set right and justice aside, following Burke in his statement, that "politics ought to be adjusted, not to human reasoning, but to human nature; of which the reason is but a part, and by no means the greatest part," and as the same great orator said in his speech on American Taxation "I am not here going into the distinction of rights, nor attempting to mark their boundaries. I do not enter into these metaphysical distinctions." But what is a State? Is it not a voluntary political association, for mutual protection? Of course

individualism must to a certain extent be sacrificed, but sacrificed only to this extent, that the rights of all shall be respected. And the State, by assuming functions, which really are not necessary for the protection of the life and property of the citizens, ceases to be a protector, and becomes a tyrant; and the form of government, under which this wrong is committed, by whatever name it is called, is, so far, despotic and unjust. The surrender of the rights of the individual is often greatly exaggerated, and as has been remarked by an able writer, the more liberty an individual acquires in a State, so much the more is there liberty in that State. We must admit, and keep in remembrance during this discussion, that there is a moral law binding on the State to the individual, as much as one binding on the latter to the former. I speak then not of mere legal rights, or of the social rules which at present guide us, but I base my assertion of State duties on what ought to be—on what is morally and theoretically just. I appeal to the higher law of justice and right.

But to come to the question to be discussed, and not forgetting the definition of a State's duty I have adopted, I ask what is education? For the onus of proving that state education is proper—is right—lies not on the opponents of State education, but on its supporters. Suppose, as an opponent of State education I ask—What is it? Where is the line to be drawn—in age, in learning? How old should a person be before being relieved from the watchful eye of the State educator? How large should bo his acquirements? Where between a dame school, and the most comprehensive University curriculum, is the line to be drawn? At the three it's, answer you? Spencer, using the Socratic method, at once says—" What peculiar quality is there in reading, writing, and arithmetic which gives the embryo citizen a right to have them imparted to him, but which quality is not shared in geography, and history, and drawing, and the natural sciences? Must calculation be taught because it is useful? Why, so is geometry, as the carpenter and mason will tell you; so is chemistry, as we may gather from dyers and bleachers; so is physiology, as is abundantly proved by the ill-health written on so many faces. . . . Where is the unit of measure, by which wo may determine the respective values of different kinds of knowledge?" The three R's are not education; nay, the sciences I have enumerated do not constitute a sound education. If the State were simply to teach even what is termed a *sound English education* (whatever that signifies) is its work accomplished? Mazzini states—" You know how to read. What avails this knowledge, if you are unfit to judge between the books containing error, and those containing truth? You have learned to communicate your thoughts to your fellow men in writing. What avails this knowledge if your thoughts are the mere reflex of your own egotism? "So far, then, it seems the, is a difficulty, I had almost said an impossibility, in determining what is this education .the State ought to provide. And the question of age will just be as difficult. At what age fought the State schoolmaster to give up his charge? Suppose a man ignorant of political economy, and called upon, not only to exercise the franchise, but to fulfil the honorable duties of a legislator for this State, ought he not, at the expense of the State, to bo made acquainted with his duties? nay, to be compelled to study what are the elements of his profession—what are the three R's of & political education? Where are you, I ask, to draw the line? Then again, we witness often in a community agitations arising, demanding laws founded on theories long ago exploded, is it not the duty of the State to step in here, and with judicious instruction, train its citizens in the way they should walk?

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

But here I may be met by the assertion, education will right all these things. Knowledge is power, say some. It will fit all of us, for our duties to the State, and this is the proper sphere of State Education. Its aim is to make us fit for our social duties, and thus greater security will be given to liberty, and hence the State, by educating, is fulfilling its duty as protector of life and property. Well, what pray is a "good citizen," what is

your ideal person fit for social duties and liberties? And who, pray, is to decide what a "good citizen" is? The State, say you. What? The Government to decide on a good citizen, and train all the embryos after this "golden calf"—using its own discretion first as to what a good citizen is, and also as to its method of training. This moulding must, I suppose, admit of no tampering. Ruthlessly must the State wield its power. Liberty of thought, or of action must be silenced. Private schools, except duly licensed, and inspected, will bo unknown, as in Holland. Every teacher will be watched, and *quis custodiet custodian*? Books, except up to the regulation standard, will be banished, and who the Commission are to be, who are to frame the "index expurgatorius" I know not. Nay, we will have, as in China, the most minute regulations. The rules of propriety will bo rigidly enforced. The "good citizen" will be guided by rules of sitting, talking, walking, bowing, reading, eating, dressing, etc., as in the Celestial Empire. And what amusements will be permitted, will also have to be decided. I may, however, be charged with exaggeration. Some may still say, dare you deny that education does not fit us for our social duties? I reply not necessarily. Lieber, whom none can accuse of being an anti-State educationalist, says, in his work on Civil Liberty, "Education is not liberty itself, nor does it necessarily lead to it. Prussia is one of the best educated countries (written in 1853), but liberty has not yet found a dwelling place there. The Chinese Government is avowedly based upon general education, and democratic equality in the hierarchy of officers, but China has never made a step in the path of liberty. Education is almost like the alphabet it teaches—it depends upon what we use it for. Many despotic Governments have found it their interest to promote popular education, and the schoolmaster cannot establish or maintain liberty." Must it not be granted that there is an education of the faculties, which neither books nor schools can impart to a people, but which is necessary for the fulfilment of social duties? And then Mill, who is in favor of free and compulsory education, has to admit that this theory of a model citizen is utterly untenable. He says: "The objections which are urged with reason against State education do not apply to the enforcement of education by the State, *but to the State's taking upon itself to direct that education*—mark that—which is a totally different thing. That the whole, or any large part, of the education of the people should be in the State's hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity of opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people *to be exactly like one another*; and, as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the Government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation; *in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by a natural tendency to one over the body."* So much for the good model citizen, trained to his social duties, such moulding being necessary for liberty.

It may, however, be said by some, as it has been said by Mill, "In the matter of education, the intervention of government is justifiable, because the case in one in which the interest and judgment of the consumer, are not sufficient security for the goodness of the commodity." Now, why should education be alone singled out as a subject in which "the interest and judgment of the consumer, independent of the State's interference, shall not be the proper test." If *this assertion*be sufficient to insure the State's interference, clearly the State will be bound in other matters to see that "the interest and judgment of the consumer "are sufficient guides to the citizen. What we eat, do our interest and judgment always lead us to a sound decision? Do we always drink what is good for our health? Are there none in a community ruined by intemperance, and by want of using proper means of sustaining health? On such an assumption, Henry VIII's Statute declaring it penal to sell any pins but such as are "double-headed, and have their head soldered fast to the shank, and well smoothed; the shank well shaven, the point well and round filed, and sharpened;" and the regulation of James I. fixing the quantity of ale to bo sold for a penny, were perhaps justified by the lack of "interest and judgment" in the consumer. This argument, as is well known, is the stock one in favour of State Religion—the masses are not fit to distinguish true from false religion. Indeed, this theory carried out strictly in practice, would justify all the oppression, and all the governmental interference that has disgraced our historic annals. For instance, a Mr Rugg, (M.R.C.S.,) has published "a pamphlet to point out the injury inflicted upon poor ignorant householders by the adulteration of milk," and proposing as a remedy that there shall be government officers to test the milk, and confiscate it when not sound, inspect cow-sheds, &c., &c. And I read in a Melbourne paper, of the 16th of April, an article urging the Parliament of Victoria, to pass a statute to compel all householders to ventilate their buildings according to Mr Arnott's plan, viz., inserting near the ceiling, a valve to open in the chimney flue, when the fires are not lighted: also, see 'Lancet,' October 1868, p. 531, as to State medicine. As to its being said education is peculiar, it is something not so tangible as milk, medicine, &c., it may be answered that every meddling, by a government, has the same excuse to back it. And were I even to admit that the consumer is not a proper judge, government interference would not bo justifiable for two reasons, 1st. That the race is progressive, and that every gratuitous aid stops progress, *e.g.*, There is a great amount of bad farming in this Province, would the government be justified in superintending all the farms and dictating to the tillers of the soil, what crops to sow, and when? Can we not see we are gradually learning experience, and no forcing process will do us good. No

pupil will ever learn to write if the teacher always holds his pen. No, the best teacher will allow the pupil to make mistakes, and blots innumerable, he well knowing that though at first the writing is not good, yet that his pupil will grow in knowledge. And so ought wo to allow the masses, if they bo incompetent to judge what is good education and what is not, to grow out of their imperfections and incompetency. But, 2nd. It is assumed that the government is a sufficient judge of the "goodness of the commodity." It is asserted that the interest and judgment of the government are sufficient security. Is this so? To whose judgment must we bow? To an intellectual pristhood, the dream of the Positivists? Not so in a democracy, for there the mass govern. And who is the mass? Is it not for its guidance that this interference is deemed necessary? Some one may say, but when a Government is what it should be, then.—True; but this is just the reason why interference is demanded, it is because people are not what they should be. No, as I said before, the world cannot be reformed in a day. Wo must allow for its growth—for the gradual evolution that often, despite our efforts to delay progress, is gradually raising humanity. Spencer has illustrated this idea very happily. "Did the reader ever watch a boy in the first heat of a gardening fit? The sight is an amusing, and not uninstructive one. Probably a slice of border—some couple of square yards or so—has been made over to him for his exclusive use. No small accession of dignity, and not a little pride of proprietorship, does he exhibit. So long as the enthusiasm lasts, he never tires of contemplating his territory; and every companion, and every visitor with whom the liberty can be taken, is pretty sure to be met with the request, 'Come and see my garden.' Note chiefly, however, with what anxiety the growth of a few scrubby plants is regarded. Three or four times a day will the little urchin rush out to look at them. How provokingly slow their progress seems to him. Each morning, on getting up, he hopes to find some marked change; and lo, every thing appears just as it did before. When *will* the blossoms come out? For nearly a week has some forward bud been flourishing with the triumph of a first flower, and still it remains closed. Surely there must be something wrong! Perhaps the leaves have stuck fast. Ah! that is the reason, no doubt. And so ten to one you shall some day catch our young florist very busily engaged in pulling open the calyx, and, it may be, trying to unfold a few of the petals." Somewhat like this childish impatience is the feeling exhibited by not a few State educationists.

The convenient assumption, that the Government, in education, as was once believed to be the case in religion, is an infallible judge, is the basis of their interference. But one quotation, and I am done on this head; it is to show that the interference does not lead to the results anticipated,—and from Buckle: He says, speaking of the influence of religion, literature, and government:—

"The German intellect, stimulated by the French into a sudden growth, has been irregularly developed, and thus hurried into an activity greater than the average civilisation of the country requires. The consequence is, that there is no nation in Europe in which we find so wide an interval between the highest and the lowest minds. The German philosophers possess a learning, and a reach of thought, which places them at the head of the civilised world. The German people are more superstitious, more prejudiced, and, notwithstanding the care which the Government takes of their education, more really ignorant, and more unfit to guide themselves, than are the inhabitants of either France or England." And, in a note, he adds—two points I will refer to:—" 1st. The notorious fact, that the German people, notwithstanding their so-called education, are unfit to take any share in political matters, and have no aptitude for the practical and administrative parts of Government. 2nd. The fact, equally notorious to those who have studied the subject, that there are more popular superstitions in Prussia, the most educated port of Germany, than there are in England; and that the tenacity with which men cling to them is greater in Prussia than in England. For illustration of the practical working in individual cases of compulsory education, and of the hardship it causes, see a scandalous occurrence related in Laing's Notes of a Taveller; and as to the physical evils produced by German education, see Phillips on Scrofula." So much for State efforts and the results.

One of the greatest—indeed, it has been termed the greatest—argument for State education is, that it prevents crime. Now, I hold this has not been proved. Remember I am keeping to the basis of what is termed "a sound English education." If we were to confine our attention solely to the statistics of the number of ignorant criminals to be found in the gaols, in comparison with the number of educated, and to this *alone*, it could not be proved; but even granting, which need not be granted, that the number of ignorant prisoners exceeds that of educated ones, does that prove that education prevents, and ignorance causes crime? It is, surely, quite possible for ignorance and crime to coexist, and yet the one not be the cause of the other. There is no need that ignorance be the cause and crime the effect. Burke asks, in one of his speeches, "May not a man have enjoyed better health during the time that he walked with an oaken stick, than afterwards, when ho changed it for a cane, without supposing, like the Druids, that there are occult virtues in oak, and that the stick and health were cause and effect." I fear there has been a too great tendency to overlook the difference between co-existence and cause and effect. Spencer, on this point, states, "Before any inference can be drawn, it must be shown that these instructed and uninstructed convicts come from the *equal* sections of society—alike in *all other respects* but that of knowledge; similar in rank, occupation, having similar advantages, laboring under similar temptations. *

* * The many ignorant criminals belong to a class most unfavorably circumstanced; whilst the few educated ones are from a class comparitively favored." To attribute crime to ignorance is about as wise, and as near the truth, as to blame, as some doctors have done, bad ventilation and want of cleanliness as the cause of theft. I do not intend to quote statistics. I may refer to Mr Somerville's Physical Geography, in which it is stated that education prevents crime, and statistics are given to prove such an assertion; but they utterly fail to do so. I may mention, however, the testimony of the author of London Labor and London Poor, and that of Mr Fletcher, an Inspector of Schools. The latter sums up his experience thus:—" Down to this period, therefore, the comparison of the criminal and educational returns of this, any more than of any other country of Europe, has afforded no sound statistical evidence in favor, and as little against, the moral effects associated with instruction as actually disseminated among the people." To which may be added the evidence of Messrs Guirea and Dupin, who have shown that the most highly educated districts in France are the most criminal.

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

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

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

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

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

'Yes.'

'Why I never authorised you to do so.'

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

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

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

'And what if I refuse?'

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

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

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

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

'Certainly.'

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

"It has been so decided.'

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

'That is evidently a corollary.'

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

'It is.'

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

'Clearly.'

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

'Yes.'

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

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

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

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

old age, when they are unable to work, and, through their improvidence, they have no resources, give them a place of refuge—a workhouse for an asylum—Can we wonder at the carelessness and improvidence we see in the world? Is it not a fact that the more the State undertakes for the family, the greater becomes the temptation to marry? And hence the greater becomes the number of those moral crimes Mr Mill so much deplores.

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

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

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

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

Sir Robert Stout's Speech at the City Hall, Auckland, July 22, 1896.

Sir R. Stout.

Address in the City Hall.

Enthusiastic Gathering.

On the 22nd of July one of the largest audiences ever gathered in the City Hall, assembled at that place to hear an address from Sir Robert Stout, on political matters. The Mayor (Mr. J. J. Holland) presided, and amongest those on the platform were—Hon. E. Mitchelson, Messrs, J. H. Upton, W. R. Bloomfield, Craves

Aickin, J. T. Steele, J. McLoughlin, G. M. Bead, John Kirkwood, George Dunnet, Alex. Watorn, Gabriel Lewis, D. H. McKenzic, William Culpan, Andrew Bell, Kent, T. W. Leys, Hoyburn, T. Hutton Johnston, Dr. Cox, Wm. Berry, Hildreth, A. H. Bankarb, Cheal, Hampton, H. N. Abbot, Edward Morton, J S. Jones, John Reid, Samuel Vaile Bond, etc. The body of the hall and dress circle were crowded to their utmost capacity, and the proceedings throughout were most enthueistic, though it was evident many Government supportors were present.

The Mayor's Opening.

The MAYOR, in opening the proceedings, expressed the hope that Sir Robert would speak as to the great banking inquiry. (Hear, hear.) Personally, he thought these banking inquiries were more detrimental to the colony than anything else. ('No' and 'yes') It would prove itself detrimental to the colony in the end, and he hoped Sir Robert Stout would be able to show some way out of the trouble or give his views upon it.

Sir R. Stouts Address.

Sir ROBERT STOUT, who was warmly received, did not think it would be proper for him, during an investigation by a commit-tee of the House dealing with banking matters, to refer to that subject that evening (Hear, hear.) He would rather wish to speak on what might be termed some of the principles that lie at the root of political questions. He understood from the past, and he supposed be might still accept it for the present, that a majority of the people of Auckland called themselves Liberals, and that they were determined to stand by the banner of Liberalism. (Applause.) He claimed to be a Liberal. ('No') He claimed to have been a Liberal when the gentlemen who said 'no' did not know the meaning of the term. (Applause.) It might be well for those who called them-selves Liberals to think for a few minutes what the meaning of the term Liberalism find. They might them find out where they stood, and where Liberalism stood in the colony.

Liberalism.

Now, Liberalism in the olden days meant getting a change in political machinery. When the great Chartist movement in England was in progrees, the whole aim of those who took part in it was to get a change in the political machinery of the country. They paid no attention to social questions. They thought if they got the five points of their charter, they would have accomplished what they wanted. They wished bullot, annual parliaments, payment of members, equal electoral districts, and they demanded manhood suffrage. The Charliests thought if they got these things, they would obtain freedom; that they would have a free House of Commons; that in addition to that, they would get equal rights; that all men would be allowed to express their opinions without fear or favour, or threat of punishment. They imagined also they would have pure Government, no sinecures and no corruption. Now almost all the five points had been obtained and some-thing more even than the Chartlats demanded, They now had manhood suffrage and, in New Zealand, womanhood suffrage. Those who gave that were forced to do it against their will. ('No') The gentleman who said no had had his political education neglected, or had forgotten to read his Hansard, for those who voted in 1893 for woman suffrage had opposed it on every occasion before. (Applause).

A Pointed Question

The people had, as he said, these things, and it was their duty to ask what was the result of this political reform? Was the Parliament in the present day better than the Parliament of 20 years ago? ('Yes' and 'no') Was the Government purer than Governments had been in the past? ('Yes' and 'no') It would be his duty to show that the Parliament was not as free and able as it was 20 years ago, and to point out that there were things done now by the present Government that sapped the very foundations of Liberalism, and that would have been repudiated by every Chartist. Could he and his audience agree first of all what a Parliament should be, and what a Government should be? If they were Liberals, he presumed they would agree that Parliament should be the place into which the electors tried to put the ablest men. Surely in the Parliament of the colony they should try to getable, self respecting, and upright men. (Hear, hear.) Of course, the men elected would be expected to carry out the views they had expressed on the platform which would be the views of the majority of the electors. But it was also expected that they should have some ideas and opinions of their own. When members were sent to the House it could not be expected that upon all questions on which they would have to give their votes, or to express their opinions, the electors had decided. Therefore the members were not called delegates but representatives, because it was expected, on many occasion?, they would have to bring to the exercise of their duties great ability and he (the speaker) hoped conseientions conviction.

Voting Machines.

But what was the system that had been inaugurated in New Zealand? Was it not a fact that men had gone into the House having given written pledges to the Premier, and practically prepared to vote as they were told? Was that a free Partidment? ('No') What was the use of having representatives at all if they were going to be mere voting machines at the dictation of whoever might be the Premier of the day? (Applause.) They might just as well, instead of paying representatives £20 a month, send in proxies to the Premier to use at) his discretion. (A voice: 'You have done the same yourself.') 'If I ever did,' said Sir Robert, 'I did wrong, But I deny I ever did.' (Applause) Passing on, he said, whenever a charge was made against the present Government, instead of manfully and honestly meeting it, and either showing it was incorrect or giving some excusee, they continually harked back and said 'somebody else, some years ago, did the very same thing,' (Applause.) Was it Liberalism that the only defence of actions was to bring up alleged improper or illegal actions of those who had gone before? That was a very fine and new defence of Liberalism indeed! It was not Liberalism and no person had a right to call himself a Liberal, if when he went into the House he had to give up his individual opinion, and surrender his vote at the bidding of any other person. Such was not even a delegate of the people, but simply a voting machine. Just as one would touch an electric button, so had the Premier to touch a button with such men, and they went in to the lobby that he pleased. Such men had no right to the term Liberal. (Applause)

Personnel of the House.

So far as the *personnal* of the House was concerned, though be regretted it, it was at all events too higher than it had been 20 years ago. Then they had most able men. It might be many of their vtews were more conservative then the views of those in the present House. But it ability and high character were looked at, it could not be said that, at the present moment, the House of Representatives in New Zealand could compare with that House twenty years ago. (A Voice: 'You are insinuating.') 'That gentleman,' said Sir Robert, 'hardly knows the meaning of the term; I am not insinuating; I am making a direct charge,' Proceeding, he said from the political reform which had been secured it would be expected that political machinery would be perfected. Had his audience thought what an ideal House of Parliament should be? He apprehended, first it should not be a House of men who voted or spoke simply as they were did. It should be a free House, where the rights of the minority were respected, and where a person would have ample opportunity to discuss every question in the freest possible way. But how was the House of Representative now? Why, it had not the liberty that, for example, obtained in every friendly society. Such societies had their standing orders, and by those they were bound. In the House of Representatives at the present moment, the Standing Orders were so framed, that free discussion was often impossible. A mere majority could suspend the Standing Orders, whenever they chose, and might deprive the minority of their rights. The speaker then went on to give instances. In the House of Commons it was considered the greatest privilege that before Supply was given to-the Government every member had the right to ventilate his grievances and move any amendment. What did the New Zealand Government do last session? They brought in supply always on a Tuesday, so as to back debate, for it was provided that there should be no debate on that day when in Committee of Supply. They, too, had kept back the Public Works Statement, which meant that the country was not to have any details of railway expenditure, railway management, road expenditure, lands improvement expenditure, purchase of native lands etc. This they had kept back till Parliament had been more than a hundred days in session. It had then been brought down on a Monday night: at 7.30, when the House was sitting continously bill early on Tuesday, and on Tuesday night they said 'we will now go into the Public Works Estimates.' Permission had been asked to discuss the public works management during tho past year, but that was denied. The House had been asked to vote £750.000 without having had a single opportunity of discussing the management of the Government in the past year or the policy disclosed in their Statement. (Shame.) Could that be called Liberalism? (No) Could the autocracy that existed at the present moment in the Parliament of New Zealand be called Liberalism? (No.) He (the speaker) had moved that the Statement be taken on the Wednesday, and the excuse given was that he had wanted to get away to a concert. Suppose he had, was the whole Parliament of New Zealand to be debarred from discussing the policy of the country simply because he held a certain position? Surely the Parliaiment had not sunk so low as that . But it was not correct. The result of the Government's action was that the Opposition very properly left the House, and allowed the Government party to do with the large sum he had named just as they pleased. He could give other instances of the autocracy that ruled the House. The Government would come down and decline to answer questions; there was no chance of getting on private motions; they could not get a return even unless the Government chose. In the House of Representatives of New Zealand there was less liberty, and less freedom than existed In any Parliament in the world, and less than over existed in a New

Zealand Parliament before. (Loud applause and no.)

A Just Executive.

Passing on, Sir Robert said one thing which he supposed lay at the basic of Liberalism, was that they should have an executive that would administer the laws justly. Ono of the things the Chartists so strongly objected to was that privileges were given to people of a certain class. But the Chartiets could get all the information they wanted, and knew the officers, sinecures and pensions. They could that get any such information in New Zealand. If a Minister chose to give information he might. But if he said 'No' then no information was forth coming, and thus they had never been able to get the list of the officers created and political jobs made by the present Government. Liberalism demandad that there should be equal liberty to all, and that there should be no privileges given to a class. If any executive gave privileges to a class—he did not care whether the class was in a majority or minority—it was not true Liberalism. All should be one level and all have equal rights. (Applause.) When he had been done in this respect. He did not apprehend anyone is that audience would think of propose any man for his religious creed, let that creed be in ever a small a minority. And if that was to apply to religion, was it to be placed on different ground when applied to politics? ('No.') There was no more right to punish a man for holding political views than for religious opinions. And no Government that attempted such a thing had any right to the glorious name of liberal.

Spoils to the Victors.

But what had happened under the present Government? Men were appointed to office because of their political opinions. He would assume there were two men of equal ability and character, and they applied for an office; one was a supporter of the Government and one an opponent. Which would get the office? The supporter (A voice, 'Quiteright.') Those who said that were old Tories. (Laughter.) Let them frankly discuss the matter. Why should any man be debarred from holding office because of holding certain views? There was just as much right to insist on a religious test as a political one. He, however, would tell them what was done in 1886. Mr. Ballance had been a party to the Bill. The Civil Service Reform Bill had been brought in, and its object was to take political patronage out of the hands of the Government. . This Bill had been carried in that form. The wish had been to open the doors of the public service to the young people of the colony, both male and female, and he (the speaker) and those with him said these young people would have to go into the service as cadets, and would have to pass an examination once a year, and those who stood highest in the examination list were to get the office. (Hear, hear.) They were not to be asked what their views or opinions might be. If they stood highest, and were physically fit, they had the office. That was a Liberal measure. But what had been done? That law had been violated and got aside. Cadets had been appointed because of their father's opinions He would give one instance. A young cadet stood 73rd on the list; there were 50 cadets before him on the list who were entitled to the office before him. But he had been appointed. Why? Because of his ability? No, but because his father was a political supporter. If his hearers would go to the Free Library and look up the Blue Books, they would see 24 cadete appointed who had no right to be appointed, and who had been so in violation of tho law. Some of these did not pass any examination at all. Some did not even compete. Why should a cadet who had spent time and trouble trying to pass, and who succeeded, be set aside simply because be might have, perhaps, no father behind him with Strong 'Liberal opinions?' This was not only not Liberalism, it was a violation of the law, and chose who talked of carrying the banner of spoils to the victors were degrading the name of Liberalism. (Appiause.) The Government, too had attempted to bribo the press of the colony. Let people look at the returns made, and they would find the larger share of the advertisements given to papers of the right colour. Sir Robert then went on to give instances. Passing on, he said in a Liberal Government they should have an executive that was law-abiding How much democracy depended on this, Democracy could not exist except it existed by law; whenever an attempt was made to violate the law, it bacame an autocracy. Respect for the law must be at the basis of true Democracy. [f there was no respect for the law and no obedience, then it was admitted that democracy had failed. Hardly a month elapsed but what the Government brashed aside the law when it came between them and any scheme they wished to carry out?. They had done this in scores and hundreds of instances. They set aside the Public Revenues Act, and declined to give information about the accounts. At the Christ-church election they wilfully held back the writ in order to see if they could not got that eminent statesman, R. M. Taylor, to stand. They paid no attention be the law. And he (the speaker) warned the people of New Zealand that if they allowed the young to be trained in a want of respect to the law which the people themselves had made then they could not call themselves a Democracy.

Debating Hypocrites.

Sir Robert then went on to speak of the civil service on a point which he had overlooked for the moment There were great number of people in the colony who called themselves Socialists: they wished State functions increased. He admitted he was not a Socialist. (Applauae.) But he did believe that as the world went on, and as Democracy progressed, the State would be undertaking many things it did not now undertake, and that there would be a gradual extension of State functions, Now, how were they to get this gradual extension of State functions, and make it really beneficial to the community as a whole, if they did not draw into the public service the ablest, to carry out the great State work. If they were going to limit the administration of the Government to one party, or to select people because of one political colour, how could these ablest be got? By such a system as he had condemned, they were not only casting disability upon these men, but were creating hypocritee. (A person who had several times interjected observations, was here approached by a constable, but Sir Robert asked that he be not interfered with, as he was just the person he wanted to educate). (Laughter).

Not Mr. Balllance's Policy.

Continuing, Sir Robert said some people said they supported the present Government because they were carrying on Mr. Ballance's policy. (Applause.) He (the speaker) was in favour of the policy Mr. Ballance laid down when he took office, and he would prove, in several instances, that the present Ministry had departed from that policy. Indeed, they had reversed it. They had done things with regard to that policy that were simply disgraceful, considering the relations they stood in in regard to Mr. Ballance. What had been the key note of his first and second Budget? It had been a policy of self-reliance; that New Zealand was not to be dependent upon the foreign capitalist; that there was not to be a borrewing Government; that the New Zealand Government was not to be a mere agent, as it had now become, of what some Socialist friends called the 'fat man.' Mr. Ballance's policy had been self-reliance and non borrowing. (Hear, hear,) What had happened? Since the 31st March, 1891, the colony's borrowing—without including the guarantees given to the Bank of New Zealand, which means nearly £5,000,000 more—New Zualand's borrowings had amounted to £4,928,581, and the interest to be paid was gradually going up.' The colony's interest this year would be £81,000 more than last year. Up! Up! Up it was going. The colony now owed foreign capitalists something like £42,000,000. What was the use of denouncing foreign capitalists, the 'fat man,' the absentee money lender, when year by year the colony was getting more and moro in his grip? The whole principle of Mr. Ballance's policy had been destroyed. He would give an illustration of what had been done. There was the seizure of the sinking funds. He mentioned this because it was a technical subject, and because it had been so misrepresented by Ministerial advocates. In 1886 an Act had been passed to aid local bodies by loans which would be paid off and the debta extinguished In 26 years, a percentage being put by as a sinking fund. Mr, Ballance in his Financial Statement in 1891 said he considered it his first duty to create a sinking fund. It was wrong finance, it was not honest to future poeterity, that when the 20 years came to an end that the burden of the loans should be cast on the colony. Mr. Ballance held that when an interest-paying asset ceased to pay interest, at the end of 26 years the loans should be paid off. To carry this out, Mr. Ballance brought in a Bill in 1892. Now there were £800,000 that had been borrowed under this Act, and £64,000 sinking fund had accrued. What did the present Government do? They seized the sinking fund; they issued debentures against it, and then refused to give information about it at all. They also seized the current sinking fund amounting to £20,000 and wiped out the whole sinking fund, carrying £85,000 to revenue account. This year they have proposed to seize £20,000 in the same way, so that the result would be heaped up at the end of 26 years. When that time came the entire burden of these loans would be cast upon the colony.

The Excuses.

Sir Robert then went on to speak of the excuses made for this procedure. The Government said first it was in accordance with the law. They did not say the law compelled them to do it. They seemed to forget that he (the speaker) had moved an amendment to the Appropriation Act of last year to prevent them seizing the fund. He had wished to see Mr. Ballance's Act of 1892 preserved in its integrity. But the Government voted against that, and got their blind followers to vote against it, and so the amendment was defeated. It was a peculiar thing that the law which allowed them to do as they had done was passed in 1891, and it was a slur on Mr. Ballance's memory to say that when his law was passed In 1892 he ever thought the Sinking Funds would be seized. The Government now, however, wished to raise a quibble on words in an Act of 1891 to excuse their wrongdoing. In this year's Financial Statement the Government had abandoned their old ground, and now said boldly that 'posterity cannot do us any good: on the other hand, we may do it good; therefore posterity must pay for these loans.' (A voice: 'Right.') 'There are some persons,' retorted Sir Robert, 'who would approve of anything the present Government does short of sending them to prison.' (Loud laughter.) Proceeding, he said he thought

posterity would have quite enough to do to look after its own wants. The present procedure was dishonest. Let the present generation pay its own debts, and not to do so was a reversal of Mr. Ballance's policy. (Applause.)

Advances to Settlers.

Take the Advances to Settlers Act. Some people would say that that was a good measure. ('Very good.') Why was it a good thing? He supposed the gentleman who said that would answer that it gave the farmers cheap money. Did it? Did anyone mean to tell him that borrowing one and a-half millions by the Government was going to lower the rate of interest to the farmers. ('Yes,' and 'No.') What had happened in the past? When he (the speaker) came to New Zealand farmers were paying 17½ per cent.; then it was 15, then 12½, then 10. The rate of interest had been falling and falling for the past 34 years. Interest bad so far fallen in England that Consols, only giving 2¾ per cent., and in a few years only 2½ per cent., were now selling at 113; that was 13 per cent, premium on £100. Three months' bills had been discounted at 1/3 to ½ per cent. That showed the cheapness of money. In New South Wales they had no Advances to Settlers Act, but farmers could get money from 4 to 4½ per cent. And the Government there did not interfere at all. Money was now being lent. In New Zealand at less than the Government could lend it for—At 4 and 4½ per cent. The colony did not either get the advantage which was claimed. The Government went to London and borrowed 1½ millions from the 'fat man' at 3 per cent. But the colony had to pay about 3¼ per cent., because they did not get the £1,500,000, but only £1,394,000 That 3¼ per cent, interest on the entire £1,500,000 the colony would have to pay for fifty years, and that with falling rates of interest. The 'fat man' paid no taxes to the New Zealand Government, but he drew his 3¼ per cent., and made the Government collect it, and pay it in London. The capitalists who lent the money paid nothing, but made 1 to 1½ per cent, more than he could in England, where he would have to pay the English Government income tax (applause). And that was spoken of as a wonderful thing. He (the speaker) would tell them what Mr. Ballance's idea was. He objected to the colony going to London and becoming an interest collector. He said 'as the thrift of the people increases, the Government Insurance fund, the Public Trust fund, and the Post Office Savings Bank fund will increase; I will form a Lending Board and lend to the farmers money coming from these three offices; then the people of New Zealand will be their own borrowers and their own lenders; and we will have a policy of self-reliance, and not be indebted to outside capitalists.' That was the policy of a statesman.

Lands for Settlement.

Then people said the Government had done a grand thing in the Lands for Settlement Act. He recognised the right of the State, in the interests of the people, if land was required for settlement, to resume private lands. He laid down that position 20 years ago and he was not in the habit of going back on the past like some people. (' Oh.') The difference between the present Government and those who had opposed them was twofold—the latter said if a graduated tax was put on the people who had large blocks they would soon be willing to sell and cub them up into smaller sections. This had been proved conclusively by the fact that the Government had been offered about eight times the quantity of land they wished to buy from private owners. Secondly, those who had opposed the Government said if they required the land it should be taken by a judicial tribunal, and politics and colour should have no part in the matter at all. (Applause.) The blocks that had been taken had been dismal failures. The Pomahaka block did not pay more than one per cent. on the money paid for it, and more than half was lying unoccupied. The Studholm Junction village settlement was called Strugglers' Flat, because the people could not make a living out of it. Another large estate in Marlborough had been a huge failure And did the people know what they had to pay for lands for settlement? Bonds, say, at 3½ per cent. were issued; these bonds were lifted by some Government department; the money was obtained from this department, and the vendor put the sovereigns in his pocket. Then these bonds were token to the 'fat man' in London, and he became practically the owner of the land. He held the bonds and the Government collected the rent for him, and he paid neither income tax or Customs duty. Talk about absentee landlords in Ireland; and yet there were people who threw their hats in the air and thought these were glorious measures for the good of the colony.

Land Administration.

The colony, it had been said, had got better land laws than in the past. The present land law was not so advanced as the land law of 1885. The only change that had been practically made was that, in order to obtain the unearned increment, they issued leases for 999 years at a fixed rent. There was no chance of getting unearned increment until that period had expired. If they had to wait till then they might as well abolish it. In comparison to this sir robert went on to cite the perpetual lease system, by which a lease for 30 years was issued, and at the end of that time the land was valued again. If there was any increase in the value of the land

not brought about by improvements the state got the benefit of it; if there had been decrease in value the farmer got the benefit. Therefore it was fair for both. (Applause). There was no liberal in the room who would venture to say that [*unclear:* calling] a 999 years' lease could benefit the state. ('Of course,' and 'Give the farmers a freehold.') It would be far better to give freeholds straight out than to have a humbugging lease of 999 years. (Applause.) He held it was the duty of the state to keep a grip on its land. (Applause.) One of the greatest curses of the farmer when he got a freehold was that he had to go to the money lender; the ideal of farming life was where there was no mortgage at all, and it was far better for the state to have a lease of the land. He did not believe that the mortgage system that had been encouraged by the state was at all beneficial to the farmers. (Hear, hear.)

Public Works.

Passing on, Sir Robert said the Public Works Department had in many cases been simply frittering away its money. Votes had been made for roads that ought to have been dealt with by local bodies. As to some of the votes, they might just as well vote [*unclear:* ney] for metalling Queen-street for the [*unclear:* pose] of opening land for [*unclear:* ment.] [*unclear:* aughter.)] Take [*unclear:* the] Northern rails It would have been of enor[*unclear:* mas] service to Auckland to have a [*unclear:* necting] line with Wellington. The [*unclear:* le] of Auckland had been their worst [*unclear:* mies] in this respect; they had frittered [*unclear:* y] their energies about the line to [*unclear:* naki] instead of pushing on the central [*unclear:* .] Once the Central line had been [*unclear:* eted] it would have been quite enough to have had feeders. But what bad [*unclear:* ned] in reference to that line. He had that the Government had actually [*unclear:* wed] about £5,000,000 without count-[*unclear:* b ill] Bank of New Zealand's guarantee, they came into office in 1891, there [*unclear:* er] £700,000 in the Public Works that practically they had spent About £6,000,000. And the railway for which money was set apart had not been completed, and there was not a penny to spend on it now. It had gone in roads, and and in taking snags out of the Wanganui River, the purchase of native lands, and all sorts of things (a voice, 'give us a railway to Waihi') I believe said Sir Robert, it is necessary, but you will not get it.' In the present Budget, he went on, there was about £1,200,000 to be voted; out of that, only £250,000 was for the whole of the railways of the colony. (A voice: 'Take it out of revenue.') 'Take it out of revenue,' was the reply, 'There is actually a deficit on the year's transactions of £109,000.' There was actually a loss on the Advances to Settlers Act, in the first year of £31,000, and it would take six years, by official computation, to recover that. What would be thought of a loan company with one million and a half to lend, who lost £31,000 in the first year?

The Tariff.

As to the tariff, the Government last years raised the Customs duties. Additional taxation had to be placed on the people for £81,000 more interest had to be paid this year than last Departmental expenditure had also gone up. It was absurd for the Government to say their finances were in a flourishing state. He (the speaker) had said last year that the new tariff meant from £50,000 to £80,000 Increase in Customs duties; it came very near; it was about £78,000. Passing on, Sir Robert said he had intended to deal with the question of an Elective Executive, which he thought a very proper thing. (Applause.) He believed party organisation would not be got rid of. That was impossible. But they would [*unclear:* be] rid of the present autocracy that existed in the House and the country. With an Elective Executive, the House would not be ruled by the will of one man. The ballots would be cast for the best administrators, and he believed many of the evils of a party system would be got rid of. Then he believed the referendum would be for the benefit of the people. (Loud applause.)

The Remedy.

He would now deal with one thing that was a bugbear to many (people. He might be told, 'You have been speaking against the Government; you say they are demoralising the House; that they are autocrats and not Liberals; you are charging them with having been guilty of political corruption, and of having defied and been disobedient to the law; you say their policy measures are not the policy measures of Mr. Ballance, and not statesman like; but what is going to happen if we turn them out, and if this move of progressive legislation is stayed? Don't let them believe anything of the sort. He believed that at the next election, if the people were fully alive to their interest, and were thoroughly educated in political subjects, an independent Liberal party would arise which would carry out Liberal measures. An old farmer was once pulling thistles from his garden—though he was a Scotchman—and a cautious neighbour said, 'Yes, you are pulling up the weeds, but what are you going to put in afterwards?' The answer was, 'Well, I have not yet made up my mind, but these are weeds anyhow, and they have to come up.' When people asked what was going to be in the future, he replied, 'They were weeds at present, anyhow, and had better be pulled up.' (Applause.) There was no danger of

reaction. In the smallest thing the Government evaded the law.

Sweating.

The law provided there should only be six paid Ministers. They had had eight Ministers some time ago; they had seven now. The Government said that only five were paid. He thought in a great slur upon his friend Mr. Thompson that he was not fit to be paid a salary. (Laughter.) The Ministry had brought in a Masters and Apprentices Bill by which there was to be no sweating; every apprentice who went into a shop was to get a wage. There should be no sweating in the Cabinet. (Laughter.) If it was wrong for an apprentice to be taken into a workshop to learn his business without payment, why should the State take these two new Ministers without salary? (Renewed laughter) Passing on, Sir Robert said he had just received a request to speak on questions—one was the licensing question. He was never afraid to express his views, but he had spoken on it the other night and time would not allow him to deal with it then. It would take a whole night. He, however, believed that, that like every other question, should be settled by the majority. (Applause) In conclusion, he said he desired to impress upon all their duty in the present crisis in the colony's affairs. It was said that the Democracies of the world were watching New Zealand. He did not know that it was so. He did not know that the working classes had been benefited by the legislation passed. In the great political crisis in 1875, Auckland came nobly to the front, and he now appealed for a purer Government; that there should be a free Parliament, and that the ablest men should be selected, pledged not to be a delegate to any one man. If the present Government was to be maintained in power, there need be no talk about Liberal legislation. He appealed to the citizens of the colony at election times not to be swayed by beer, bluff, or bunkum, but let them ascertain the true bearings of political questions, uphold no autocracy, and show themselves determined to have pure, honest administration, and progressive legislation. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

A few questions having been answered,

A hearty and unanimous vote of thanks to Sir Robert Stout was passed, on the motion of Mr. Upton, seconded by Captain D. H. McKenzie, 'for his interesting, able, and Admirable address.'

This vote having been briefly replied to,

A vote of thanks to the chairman closed the proceedings.

vignette

The Social Future of Labourers. A Paper Read Before the Tokomairiro Mutual Improvement Association, by Mr. Robert Stout. Friday, 30th June, 1871. Dunedin: Printed by John Mackay, Princes Street North 1872.

NOTE.—The writer confesses his indebtedness to the works of the blowing writers:—Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. J. S. Mill, Mr. Thornton, Mr. W. R. Greg, and Professor Beesly.

The Social Future of Labourers.

IN attempting to sketch the social future of labourers, I desire to state that I do not pretend to expound prophecy—which in these days often means prophesying afresh. All I can hope to do is to point out the present position of labourers, the various utopias presented for their amelioration, and what the tendencies of the ago are in regard to them. My desire is to take you as it were to an eminence from which we may both the more clearly scan the placo from which we have made our ascent; and, if glimpse can bo caught, perhaps discern the dim outlines of that Promised Land which our philosophers, our statesmen, and our poets have in all ages longed for and pictured. In scaning even cursorily the present social state, we have two things to do. We shall have to see the many anomalies, the many perplexing enigmas of the age, and also to try if we can get at the laws which guide us as human beings, one to another. That there is an inter-dependence amongst men, who can deny? And if an inter-dependence, what are the ligaments that bind us together. Let us then ascend Pisgah. Before we glance at the future, we must, as I have stated, first examine all those things that shed a light as it were on our future path. We must needs have some notion, however imperfect, of what the present condition of labourers is. Of course, you understand what I mean by the term "labourers I confine it at present to the toilers of the race—to those who have, by manual labour, to support themselves. What then is their present condition? Let us glance at the hives of manufacturing industry, and examine their condition in the United Kingdom. Canon Kingsley in one of his novels has given us a touching scene of the human wretchedness one meets with in England. Speaking of a family in London, he says

" There was no bed in the room; no table. It was bare of furniture, comfortless, and freezing cold; but, with the exception of the plaster dropping from the roof, and the broken windows patched with rags and paper, there was a scrupulous neatness about the whole which contrasted strangely with the filth and slovenliness outside.

On a broken chair by the chimney sat a miserable old woman, fancying that she was warming her hands over embers that had long been cold, and muttering to herself, with palsied lips, about the Guardians and the Workhouse. While upon a few rags on the floor lay a girl, ugly, marked with the small-pox, hollow-eyed, emaciated; her only bedclothes the skirt of a large handsome now riding habit, at which the other girls, wan and tawdry, were stitching busily as they sat right and left of her on the floor. The old woman took no notice of us as we entered; but one of the girls looked up, and, with a pleasing gesture of recognition, pul her fingers on her lips, and whispered, 'Ellen's asleep.' "

Another master hand has given the following description of an artisan's dwelling in London:—

"I shall be as particular," he says, "as a valuer, and describe what I have seen. The family sleeping-room measured 13 feet 6 inches by 14_feet. Opening out of this, and again on the landing of the third floor, was their kitchen and sitting-room; it was not quite so large as the other. Not to be described are the dinginess of the walls, the smokiness of the ceilings the grimy windows, the heavy, ever murky atmosphere of these rooms. The other side of the street was 14 feet distant. Behind, the backs of similar tenements came up black and cowering over the little yard of number Five. As rare in the well thus formed was the circulation of air, as that of cash in the pockets of the inhabitants. I have seen the yard: lei me warn you if you are fastidious not to enter it. They poor people knew nothing of sanitary reform, sanitary precautions, endemics, epidemics, deodorisers or disinfectants; they regarded disease with the fatalism of despair."

Nor can these descriptions be considered as exaggerated, when the following facts are remembered. In Edinburgh, for example, it is said one common stair alone has 260 souls dwelling there; sometimes actually two families in one room. The pauperism in England is reckoned to be about one in every twenty. More than a million paupers in England! And these are relieved by the state; but what of those who are always on the confines of poverty? who are labourers earning small wages, oft out of work, often hungry, having emphatically no place in this earth of ours that they can call by hallowed name of home. Who, when in work, have hours of drudgery, enlivened by no hope but the preservation until an old age of their life, and who look to the Workhouse as their final asylum. Who, after their dull hours of weary toil are over, go to homes where there are nothing but squalor and wretchedness; afflicted with diseases; their natural affections blunted; their children dying around them, by all kinds of diseases. For them, how joyless is life? Not a gleam of sunshine; no sweetness, no light to cheer them in their earthly career. Even the words of Scripture might be applied to them—" They wait for death, but it cometh not; they rejoice exceedingly and are glad when they find the grave." How hard is their lot. Tell us not of "honest poverty chant not its praises. It seems to me one of the greatest of curses. This is not, however, the condition of all "labourers." The ranks of the poor are filled up from other sources; but, as a class, compared with the wealth and luxury which some enjoy, the dukes, and lords, and millionaires, with thousands a day, it is a terrible anomaly. Just think of one class having all that the most luxurious can desire; and of the other, children of the same father, toiling and moiling, and in their efforts to save their lives losing them. But some say this poverty and wretchedness are only known in old countries, surely we in the colonies have got rid of this want. Is there then no pauperism here? And is it not fact that what is, is on the increase? I fear we often overlook the fact that even in the colonies there is much real poverty and misery. It is a great mistake to suppose that we here have not this question of "pauperism" to face. We have not, alas, solved this problem of the age; nay, we have not come one whit nearer a solution. Glance at our Benevolent Asylum, peep into our Hospitals, see our Industrial and other schools; think of the numbers of unemployed often in our midst; see the agitations that are continually arising for the government to step in and do this thing and the other. And what does this cry of government work for the unemployed signify? Does it not mean that the government should perform the function of parish unions in England—find work for those out of work. The patent and distressing fact that every now and then, and especially in the winter season, government has to expend public money in keeping willing workers from want, is a glaring anomaly which no sophistry of ours can explain away. It may be, nay it is true, that the causes of the want of work are different from those in older communities; and it is often also true that the colonial towns are crowded with some lazy and discontented men who get up "unemployed agitations." But, granting these things, the fact is patent that we have the poor in our midst, that we have labourers often in want and often out of work.

There is then here as in European countries a question to solve; and can we wonder when wo think of the wretchedness, and even of the crimes which are often caused by poverty, that philantro-phists should get impatient and be ready with utopias to set before us to cure our social defects. It is not surprising that benevolent men should, after surveying our social state, get dissatisfied with our present social laws, and demand their abrogation. They and all wise men who have looked at our present state, and also thought on our probable future, have asked—Can it be, that this world of ours is ever to remain a Pandemonium? Is there no future time fast hastening in which we can imagine that the labourers' families, fortified by their own wisdom against all the chances of fortune, would not have any more need, under any circumstances, of imploring the compassion of either the state or of their fellow-citizens? Can it be, that the sad scene pictured by Carlyle in

burning words, of "a white European man, standing on his two legs, with his five-fingered hands at his shackle-bones, and miraculous head on his shoulders," should be worth nothing, should never be false. "If," says Mr. Mill, "the bulk of the human race are always to remain as at present, slaves to toil in which they have no interest, and therefore feel no interest, drudging from early morning till late at night for bare necessaries, and with all the intellectual and moral deficiencies which this implies. Without interests or sentiments as members of society, and with a sense of injustice rankling in their minds—equally for what they have not and for what others have, I know not what there is which should make a person with any capacity of reason concern himself about the destinies of the human race. There would be no wisdom for any one, but in extracting from life, with Epicurean indifference, as much personal satisfaction for himself and those with whom he sympathises as it can yield without injury to any one, and let the unmeaning bustle of so-called civilised existence roll by unheeded.'

There is then a problem, and that a vital one, to solve; all are agreed about that. It is only in the mode of solution that differences of opinion arise. Let us glance at the contending utopias. Of course we shall only have time to take the main ones. They are—1st, Socialism; 2nd, Co-operation; 3rd, Positivism; 4th, Liberty. Regarding the solution offered to us in the colonies, namely "Protection," or as it is grandil of uently termed "Protection of Native Industry," allusion will be made under the head of Liberty.

I shall take Socialism first, because Socialism in one shape or another has been *the* remedy of most of the philantrophists of all ages. Traces of it are discerned amongst the ancient Hebrews, amongst the early Christians, amongst the Chinese, &c. But there is no agreement amongst the Socialists. "Some systems have been based on purely material principles, like Owen's; some have been profoundly religious, like the Moravians; some maintain the family arrangements, some altogether merge them; some recommend celibacy, some enforce it, like the Shaker;"s some relax the marriage tie, some control it; some hold it sacred, and some even advocate doctrines regarding it which would destroy that pivot of English life—the family. Some would divide the property equally. But all have this maxim, that labour should be for the common good. Competition is to be unknown; the right to work and just wages is always asserted. The main agreement in the various socialistic utopias consists in maintaining the equality of men, at least so far as right to support from each other is concerned. Another of the doctrines of most of the socialists is that external circumstances alone constitute the difference between man and man—circumstances are the basis of their morality. Their position may be asserted as this:—Society, they say, is out of joint; its anomalies, its inequalities, the sufferings of the mass, are monstrous and indefensible. Palliatives won't do, nor slow methods of evolution; we must remedy the evil at once. The society system that can permit such a state of things must be overthrown. Private property must be unknown, and grinding competition banished. The nexus that is to join man to his fellow is not competition, nor money, but "love"—hence we must labaur for the common good. Such is very briefly the statement of the socialists. It would be a grave mistake to suppose that these opinions are held by only the revolutionary or the turbulent. Many able men, many philantrophical men, in all countries, are socialists. It would also be erroneous to suppose that they desire their system inaugurated by force. What we have recently witnessed in France of the Communist rebellion has little to do with socialists; of course many of the communists were and are socialists. But the name" communist "is not from communion, or community of goods, but from the divisions of the city—the "commune" and their fight is for republicanism, and right of cities to certain functions without the control of the Government. So much for socialistic theories; let us glance at their defects. To me they seem to start on an entirely wrong basis. They assert, if their statements mean anything, an equality of men. So far as the right to labour, which means the right to enjoy the fruits of labour are concerned, they place all men on a level. But aro all men equal? Can we say, as Carlyle has phrased it, that Quashee the nigger is equal to Socrates? and, if not equal, why should Quashee be told that he is equal? But a far greater difficulty meets us than this one of equality, for it is right in a sense, it is half a truth. Private property is to become unknown, competition to cease, and man to eat though he should not work. Once assert that private property is at an end, and what have we? We cannot have, in our present state, mon united together content to surrender their property or their earnings for the benefit of all. Nor, were all the property once surrendered, could we hope that there would be an end of strife or of contention, nor that every one would fulfil his appointed share of work for the common weal. Unfortunately all men are not moral; some wish to live and enjoy the good things of this world without work. Here is the cardinal defect of socialism. Ir overlooks "human nature;" it is blind to the very patent fact that not only are all men not equal in any sense, but that they are not all unselfish, not all devoted to the common good. Nor does socialism present a remedy for this defect in our nature. Giving the idle, the ill-disposed, the selfish, all that they require—food, clothing, and lodging—and these for ever secured to them, can not rid them of their unselfishness, nor of their evil dispositions. And here I might dismiss socialism, did not there lie at its basis two doctrines erroneous, and found often coming form quarters not at all tinged with socialism. I mean the right of private property and competition. We are often told of usurers; we have it held up to us that money is the root of all evil; and it is pictured, by others than socialists in name, what a benefit it would be if all things were in common, and following this statement comes another, how wrong it is to claim

interest. If we would only go to the root of the subject, and picture to ourselves the growth of private property, the beginning of usury, we would not call them by hard names. Go back to man in the savage or semi-savage state, long after that time pictured by one of our scientific men, when our progenitors were of the monkey tribe. He is a hunter. He finds that by making certain implements he can the better catch his prey Perhaps it is by the aid of a bow and an arrow, or by a polished stone whirled and thrown in a certain manner. He, to enable him to maintain himself, suddenly becomes possessed of his private property; he is a capitalist, for he has that wherewith he can obtain food easily. Through this means he has obtained more food than he needs for some time, and he can therefore rest for a season and apply himself to other pursuits. Getting rid of this continuous hunting, he begins to make other improvements. Once a capitalist, his capital increases. The other huntsmen come to him and examine his capital, and ask him for the loan of it. Now, he says, why should I give my capital for nothing; clearly if I give it to all I will have none for myself If I give it to any, I enrich its possessor for the time being. But the borrower offers him interest, and promises him a share of the booty he may obtain. Getting usury, he is able to apply himself to other avocations, and in this way commences civilisation, for the arts arise; and competition, the socialists' bugbear, grows with it "The vast disorganised mob scrambling each for what he can get," as the socialists phrase our social state, begins to be known. But this vast disorganised mob, however unlovely in appearance, has given us all our arts, all our inventions, all our discoveries. Without competition, if that is thinkable, we would have been wonderfully equal, but the level would have been very low; we would have been all at one state of civilisation, and that a not very advanced one. All machinery would have been unknown. Wide through the woods we would have been roaming, noble, perhaps, but unrobed, and I fear not very intellectual in our pursuits. As to the right to labour, or the right to obtain work and be paid for it, which more than socialists assert, what is this but another way of destroying both private property and competition. For if some in a society have a right to demand labour, or work with pay as this phrase always signifies, from whom? Clearly from the capitalist. Of course from Government simply means from the capitalist, for who pay the taxes? But what is capital but past labour; and if past labour, if one cannot enjoy it, what is this but asserting in another shape that the capitalist, when he by abstinence or care or ability accumulated his labour—his capital—he did so to give it to those who perhaps had like opportunities, but neglected to do as he did.

Closely connected with socialism, in fact springing out of it, came Co-operation as a system. Many of its founders were tinged with socialism. Holding, however, theoretical views, they determined to become practical. Many of the socialists' utopias had miserably failed, and they had not the means, if they had the inclination, to enter into any socialistic arrangements. The Rochdale Society, which is the pioneer society of co-operations, sprang from very small beginnings. The founders thought they were paying too dear for their groceries, and, besides, they said they did not get them of very excellent quality. They therefore met, and without any extraneous aid resolved to form a store for the supply of their necessaries. It was a very small beginning; 28 operatives of Rochdale started what is now a great movement. Most of them were flannel weavers, and provident men, who though having small wages had managed to keep out of debt. By payments of twopence or threepence per week they managed to obtain £28, and this was all their capital. With this sum they bought some sacks of flour, some oatmeal, sugar, and butter. They rented a shop at £10 per year. The opening of the shop was anxiously looked forward to by the Rochdale community, and when the weavers took the shutters clown and exposed their small store, there was great laughter. But laughter would not dismay men like the Rochdale co-operators. They sold their goods, they gave no credit, and so much has the society increased—from this small beginning—that the business actually done now exceeds £300,000 a year. A great increase on the £28. This Rochdale Society is the parent society, and, emulating its noble example in many respects, thousands of co-operative stores have been opened all over the United Kingdom—I may say throughout Europe and America. Not content, however, with co-operative stores, the co-operators have gone further; they have attempted to solve the labour problem, by trying to get rid of an employer class. According to this section of them, all workmen are to form a partnership, or as they term it—to co-operate. They aim, after paying their foreman, at dividing the profits equally amongst the workmen. This attempt has been applied to many trades. One of the first attempts Was in tailoring; but the most successful has been in farming. Time will not allow me to give you full details of the various schemes. While giving them every credit for their endeavours, for who would not give great praise to such efforts as those of the Rochdale and other co-operators? do not let us imagine, as some of them have vainly thought, that co-operation is that solution of the labour problem for which all were so anxiously awaiting the coming. There seems to be defects even in this however successful system; for what, after all, can co-operative stores do? Clearly the only way profit can be made is by the sale of groceries, and salesmen have to be employed. How the salesmen are paid is of little moment. If co-operators pay a little more to the co-operative store than to the grocer next door perhaps, there will of necessity, if the business is properly managed, be some profits to divide at the end of the year. If they obtain profits in any other way, it can only be in this way.—They may obtain a manager or shopmen at lower wage than the grocer, or shopkeeper charges for his care and toil and risk. Whatever they gain thus will also add to their profits; but in

no other way can they make profits. Nor after all will it bo found that their investment of their capital in co-operative stores will return them more interest or profit than if the investment had been made in another way. For competition is not banished, and there are capitalists with whom they have to come into contact. So far then we see co-operative stores give us nothing but this—a manner of investing capital in the business of grocers, and a probable obtaining at a cheaper rate shopmen to serve them, that the compeviting shopkeepers charge for their labour. This can hardly be called any solution at all of the labour problem. But co-operators have not been content, as I have stated, with the selling of groceries. They have aimed at something higher, and that is co-operative production as well as co-operative distribution of flour, butter, and sugar. Unfortunately the societies have generally resembled the socialistic utopias—been miserable failures. And why? The fincstion always to solve, who is to be head? who is to be foreman? who is to decide what work B shall do, and what A has been left unanswered. All men are not equal, and all tailors share the same frailty. And what has happened? Nothing but perpetual wranglings. You see this was au attempt to get rid of the employer, or managing class, and such was the perversity of human nature, that, all being masters, all wanted to rule; and if a majority did fix on a suitable foreman, there were always some enemies in the camp, who considered they were shabbily treated. Had not one of the masters a right to say for what work ho was the most suited? If not, was he not despotically ruled over? And on this rock have co-operative producing societies been wrecked. They alas, like the socialistic dreamers, did not recognise the fact that men are not all masters, but that to be fitted for their systems a long process of evolution is necessary.

Positivism aims to get rid of the evils of both those systems. It asserts with loud tongue that all men are not equal, that all are diverse; and that, as there are different functions to be fulfilled in the social organism, so there are a amongst mankind individuals fitted to undertake them. But above this assertion there is a wider one, and one far more beautiful and as captivating as that of you're-as-good-as-another theory of the socialists, and it is that the highest worship is to worship humanity—the good of the mass is the highest duty of man,—and its divinity is man in the aggregate. With its religious views we have nothing to do, nor with its founders' classification of the sciences, etc. That these, and its principles of social reform, are believed in by some of the brightest intellects in England, should make us weigh carefully the solution offered by it. Its sanction is a religious one. It points to socialism, and says to the socialist:—"You have condemned the competition system because it was a disorganised mob, each of which was clambering and jostling his neighbor to obtain a living; but what are you? You are enthusiasts, who have presupposed what has never yet existed, and by a fatal sort of sleep walking have proceeded to put into operation your system of unselfishness and love, while all the while men were selfish and at enmity. You have imagined men had reached a high standard of morality, when, alas! they had never approached to a low standard; and what are you but an organised mob waiting the auction of that which could alone unite you—an organised religion? The basis of positivism is therefore religious,"—but a religion of an ideal though earthly kind. It would organise society asan army; over all there would be a supreme pontiff, tinged with infallibility Under him there would be high priests and guilds—(I speak of it as modified and shadowed forth by some of its English disciples)—and under them labourers would be appointed and ruled. These rulers would be the wisest and best, and there would and could be no appeal from their decisions, should the less wise appeal against the decision of those more just than they. There must bo no complaining, for those heirarchs are the wisest and best; and what right have the foolish and the bad to complain of the conduct of their superiors? Nor would the guilds and priests look after the labour problem alone. Believing as they do, and as many socialists do, that our marriage laws and customs have everything to do with our well-being, they would regulate marriage. Ruskin, who has in him something of the socialist and much of the positivist, although I believe he disclaims it, grapples with the marriage question in a way that would I have no doubt be pleasing to many in every community. He would have every one—and especially the bachelors—who had not married before twenty-five, looked upon by the community as persons who had committed a great wrong, in fact as social outcasts. Nor could everyone marry. Marriage is to be regulated and looked upon as a reward of merit. The young couple need not, however, be at all put out in money matters. Their honeymoon is to last for seven years—happy couples!—and during this time they are to be paid some two or three hundred a year; and all couples are to be placed upon the same footing. There is not to be one thing for the rich and another for the poor. If the rich have property, it is to be managed during their honeymoon by the Ruskinian bishops, the overseers as he terms them, and returned with accumulations when their sweet seven years of enjoyment aie ended. Who would not support this social utopias? Nothing but happiness here! But, though kind to the newly married couples, the interference of the "overseers" and the priests would become perhaps irksome, for these "overseers" would come to the scientific men and say, you must spend your time only in those subjects which are beneficial to the community as a whole; and if he replied, but this will be beneficial, the overseers would reply, we think otherwise, and the heirarchy are supreme Of the scientific aspects, however, of positivism, Professor Huxley in articles to the Fortnightly Review, republished in his Lay Sermons, has said perhaps all that can be said against its treatment of science and her votaries. With its social system I hardly think we will

agree. It is at best a theocracy whose theus is humanity, and whose priests are all-powerful. To me it has two defects. First, it looks upon men, or the vast majority of men, in somewhat a similar way as Carlyle characterised his countrymen—thirty-six millions, mostly fools. All men except the pontiff and his staff' are in a state of pupilage, and they are ever to remain in this condition, for positivism is not a stepping-stone to something higher; there are always to be the rulers and the ruled, and the method of rule despotic. Its second defect is that it makes no provision, or does not show how the wisest are to be selected as the pontiff and rulers. All admit, and positivists continually affirm, that the men of gold will be always the few, and the men of iron the many If it is to be a popular election, how can the men of iron select the men of gold; can iron detect gold? Here it fails, and will fail, or will become the purest despotism. Might there not be some of "iron" who imagined they were golden? There is nothing more difficult than to persuade some people that they are not Jacks-of-all-trades. To take an illustration. Tell a good comedian that he is good, praise him well. Ten to one he has a hankering after tragedy, and you cannot insult him more readily than by hinting that comedy is his sphere. Nor is this feeling confined to actors, we meet it cropping out amongst every class. Now positivists, leaving to a few the right to settle for the many their avocation, their wage, etc., what is this but a despotism pure and simple; and, asserting what perhaps is true, that the few mean it for the best, are they infallible? Infallibility is at all events, if it exists at all, a very rare thing. Before, however, dismissing positivism, let me state that to its great founder, M. Comte, we owe much. It is to him we are indebted for the founding of "sociology." It is perhaps not a science, yet but for the efforts of him and his disciples we would have been still far behind in discussing man's social relations in anything but a hap-hazard empirical manner. He has aimed at reducing social phenomena to a science, and if he has not succeeded, he has at all events pointed out the way for future philosophers to walk in. That the time may come when any political or social act will admit of no more discussion as to its effects than any act of the chemist or natural philosopher does at present, we may surely believe; and if so, to the positivists are we indebted for the attempt to found social science.

I now come to the last utopia, to that of Liberty. I have fixed on the name liberty for its brevity and comprehension. I might have termed it political economy, properly understood and, what is rarer, acted up to; or I might have termed it the system of justice. I have taken the term liberty as comprehending these Unfortunately it has few disciples, for though there are men who pretend that they as citizens are guided by the dictates of political economy, their action belies their words. Few indeed will allow the liberty system to guide them in everything. Every now and then you find them taking their eye from it and casting about for expedients to rid them of some dilemma. Its followers, ignoring expediency, look to what is right, not to what is expedient. It is never expedient, say they, to do wrong. As a consequence of their action they are looked upon as vain theorists, not at all as practical mon. But what is a practical man, and what a theorist? Is not the true difference between what is popularly termed a theorist and a practical man this? The theorist is not guided by his own experience, nor by the doings of the citizens of his own nation; he looks at the past, and scans carefully the present, and he, relying on his survey, gives utterance to his opinions. The practical man, again, takes a narrow range for his vision. He confines himself to his own experience, which is necessarily limited; to his own people and customs, necessarily contracted; and, glancing like the wayfarers of old at one side of the shield and presumes he has seen both, suddenly comes to a conclusion. Practical men are eminently unpractical. But the political economists have another and graver charge made against them than that of being theorists. When they proclaim as the cardinal doctrine of their system "equal liberty to all," and assert that it is not the duty of the Goveniment—of society—to do aught but maintain "equal freedom," they have flung in their teeth. What right have you to speak? Have you not ruled us always. It is sickening to 'hear, so say some of the opponents of the equal freedom doctrine, this perpetual reference to equal freedom and political economy, as if these were not the causes of all our ills? Is this so—has political economy always guided us? An eminent writer thus retorts:—The assertion that "political economy has hitherto had it allots own way," and is therefore chargeable with the present state of things, we meet with the most indignant and peremptory denial. It is not only not true, but is precisely the reverse of true. Economists affirm, and with perfect justice, that the existing wretchedness of England is directly traceable to ignorance, neglect, and systematic violation of the principles of political economy. It is difficult to name a single precept of that science which has not been either lost sight of, or habitually contravened. Political economy says:—Industry ought to be as unshackled as the wind; restriction cripples it; protection misdirects it; the two together diminish its productiveness, and the number of mouths it am support. When has English industry been free and unimpeded? Political economy, re-echoing Christianity and common-sense, long since proclaimed "that if any man would not work neither should he eat;" our laws enact that a man shall eat whether he will work or not. Political economy, repeating the simple teachings of morality, pronounced that if a man married without means or prospects, and brought children into the world whom he was unable to support, he acted unjustly and selfishly, as well as imprudently, and that the correction of his fault should be left to its natural results;—the law stepped in between the cause and its consequence, between the folly and its cure, and declared that if he could not support his own children, the prudent,

industrious, and the self-denying should do it for him. Political economy, reiterating the dictates of nature, proclaimed that the larger the family a man had to support by his labour, the scantier must be the allowance of each member of it. The common custom till 1834, in England, was to increase the peasant's wages or allowance with every additional child that was born to him. [And to the present day the clergy in some Churches are paid in proportion to the number of their family.] Political economy said to the labourer—If population increases faster than the field of employment enlarges or the demand for labour augments, your position will inevitably deteriorate;—even divines and county magistrates scouted such philosophy, and inculcated upon their hearers "increase and multiply—the strength of a country lies in its numbers—" dwell in the land and verily thou shall be fed." Lastly, political economy said—Industry, frugality, forethought, and perseverance shall not fail of their reward; nor indolence, unthrift, and crime escape a bitter retribution. But no such thing. The English poor-laws, by enacting that all have a right to relief, allow the person who has wasted his time, his talents, and his earnings, to live in the workhouse; while the person who was prudent, careful, and abstemious, and perhaps earned less wages, is taxed to keep him there. Political economy has been neglected and wantonly thrown aside, and in these latter days its throwing aside is openly justified for the benefit of the labourer. There is no maxim that admits of more abundant proof than that "a country's wealth cannot be increased by taxing its inhabitsints." Yes, this is what the protectionists say, if their statement means anything. The disciples of liberty say that as a society, social organism, or Government, all that should be done by the state is to maintain "equal freedom." What equal freedom is that which would assert the right to tax another to benefit his neighbour; yet what are poor laws, protection systems, etc., doing but this?—A species of robbery by the arm of the law. The liberty system would fail if it stopped at the assertion of the widest and fullest liberty, the doctrine of equal freedom. It goes much further. Like that system which, whether divine or not, has so enriched our world with its moral teachings and its religious enthusiasm, it comes to every soul of man and makes it a personal matter with him, this labour problem. It tells him, in tones of which there can be no mistaking their imimport, how he must labour, for whom, for what. It says to him that he must live justly, that he must not trample on the rights of, any one, and that justice not expediency must be his rule in life; and it also points out clearly and unmistakeably a truth of which we are but slow to recognise the importance—that every infraction of law, of social law as well of other laws, is followed by punishment. If a labourer will be wasteful, will marry when he cannot afford to do so, will have a larger family than he can provide for, will spend his money in luxuries or in intoxicating beverages, that he will suffer for it. There is no getting rid of that. In terrible reality will he recognise this truth, that his sin will find him out. Nay, it also tells him that he has no right to demand from society when out of work, employment, nor when in want of food, temporary relief. To many it hence seems cruel and harsh. It is not so. It looks at society as an organism, and says that the members can only become strong by exercise. Of course its doctrine of individual sympathy is not left out, nor that of benevolence. But as a state it insists on this, that the individual who has erred in such way as to find himself reaping the reward of his conduct, should not be placed in peculiar circumstances, and freed from the punishment which should follow. Such are its aims. Though it also may lack something, it seems to me most rational, and at the same time most effective. It is not by forced processes that our social anomalies can be remedied; they can only be gradually and slowly got rid of.

But what then will our future be, I fancy you say. May we not state that all the states, though so diverse, may be blended? that the time may come when the "love" of socialism, the "self-help and union" of co-operation, a broad religious sanction like that of positivism, with the justice and liberty of the liberty system, may bo united. Signs are not wanting of the tendency to equality in all political rights, and will not social rights soon follow? Before in our literary world how few were the stars; now how covered is the firmament with their radiance. A wealthy man was before a rare man, and even he had how few of the things we possess. A Plantaganet king had no glass in the windows of his house, no paper for its walls, no railways, no newspapers, nor could he were he ever so anxious have borrowed immense sums of money to expend as he or his advisers thought fit. The past and present are not the same. We have made a great and a glorious advance, though, alas, the Promised Land is still far distant; and why should we despair, why should we say that a labour utopia is impossible. Impossible, says Carlyle in writing of this question. Impossible, brothers. I answer, if *for you it be impossible,* what IS TO BECOME OF YOU? An ingenious calculator has shown that if ever one in a community did two hours' work every day, that would be sufficient to maintain the race in comfort and happiness, and the rest of our time might be spent in recreation and study. A labour utopia is not then impossible, and I think I may assert that the future will show us this, for it is daily becoming more patent that the condition of labourers will be materially improved. Of course the classes above them will also share in that improvement; indeed it reaches them first, but we should not complain of this. From history we learn that material improvement has always begun, and it always will begin, not with those who need it most, but with those who need it least. And hence we see the higher classes of workmen making experiments, by trade unions, co-operative societies, mechanics' institutes, and clubs, which the lower will by and by repeat. Such is the law of progress. In the future, besides material improvement there will also be vast intellectual advance. It will then be no unusual sight to see the

labourer, as he homeward wends his way when his alloted task is over, scanning the sky and the earth with appreciative looks. The beauty of the forest, or the play of light and shade in the wesrtern sky, will not bring to the artist alone a notion of the sublime and beautiful, nor will the herbs or minerals and their uses be only known to the scientific. The hours of labour will be lessened, and men become more like men,

"Through all the season of the golden year."

Do not imagine that this advance can be at once. Poverty will exist, nay, I may say must exist for a long time to come. As long as we find people selfish and ignorant, imprudent and waste- ful, poverty will exist as punishment for their selfishness, ignorance, ignorance, wastefulness and imprudence. If we wish, however, to hasten the arrival of an utopia in which poverty will be reduced to a minimum, how should we act? It is worse than useless, it is mischievous, declaiming against out social state, and pourtraing in dark colours our terrible anomalies, and stopping there. We have duties to fulfil. It seems to me to be the highest duty in these days to assert and proclaim as loudly as possible, that we have no right to cripple those who come after us. That, on the contrary, it should be our highest aim and our constant desire so to act that those who have to succeed us may be benefited, not injured by our conduct. We must also show to the improvident, and let the self-indulgent know it, that we will not rid them of the penalty of their action. As they sow so must they reap. But, above all, we must regard ourselves not as accidents. We must believe that if there be a moral Governor of the Universe, He has in His wisdom designed us as agents for some purpose. "Not as adventitious, therefore, not as something which may be slighted and made subordinate to questions of policy, or the obtaining of a kind of popularity among our fellows, will we regard the faith that is in us." We may be wrong, as we are fallible, but we will never falter in uttering what we conceive to be the highest truth; nor will we stop until we can get, not by force, but by that which is greater than mere force, the enthusiasm of faith and hope and charity, our idealisms embodied in fact. Acting thus, we will discard all short and easy methods of social improvement, and recognise that it is only bit by bit that real advance is made. Nor will labourers be found competing merely for destructive purposes. They in that future to which we are now advancing will recognise that it is best to throw aside jealousies, rivalries, and everything ignoble. And amongst them the greatest will be those who are the noblest. As in one stage of our progress, the greatest man has been he who was the best warrior; as in another stage, the greatest was he who had most wealth; as in yet another, the greatest was he who had the highest intellect. So in the future, the greatest will be he who will manifest the greatest self-sacrifice, and who if need be "would be content to lay his body in the trench, that others might use it as a bridge to pass over to that emancipation from degradation, and to that victory which yet awaits our labourers."

My vision was of shadows thrown before
Coming events, things that shall surely be;
Nor now delayed, but until man, no more
Wholly on blinding lust intent, shall see—
That ms own interest and his kind's are one,
Blended in individual destiny.

Address Delivered in the Theatre Royal, Auckland, On April 14th, By the HON. Robert Stout, Premier of New Zealand.

Subject; "technical Education."

[NEW ZEALAND HERALD, TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 1885].

THE announcement that the Hon. the Premier (Mr. R. Stout) would address a meeting of the citizens of Auckland at the Theatre Royal last night, at the request of the Liberal Association, was sufficient to bring together almost as large an audience as ever assembled within its walls. The body of the hall was a dense mass of humanity, and the dress circle, which was reserved for ladies, and gentlemen who accompanied them, and for admission to which a charge was made, was well filled. The stage was also filled with a large number of leading citizens, members of the City Council, Harbour Board, and other public bodies. Amongst them were the Hon. Sir Fredk. Whitaker, the Hon. W. Swanson, Messrs. Thompson, Peacock, Hamlin, and Dargaville, M.H.R.'s.

When the Hon. the Premier entered, accompanied by His Worship the Mayor, he was greeted with prolonged applause, which was continued as he advanced to the front and took his seat.

His Worship the Mayor (Mr. W. R. Waddel) opened the proceedings by reading the advertisement and briefly introducing the speaker.

Mr. STOUT, who, on rising to speak, was received with renewed cheers, said: Mr. Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen,—Before I begin to address you on the subject that I have chosen to-night, I wish to say a few words as to my position here. Some time ago the Auckland Liberal Association sent a request to me that if I came to Auckland I should address a meeting under its auspices, and I at once assented, because I call myself a Liberal—(cheers),—and I am exceedingly glad to see that in Auckland there is still political life and still anxiety for liberal principles. (Hear). I have not forgotten that in years gone by—in 1875—I was fighting on the same side as the majority of the Auckland people, fighting in favour of Provincialism, and I felt sure that the people who then had fought so nobly for local self-government were actuated by some high political principles, and had not forgotten them. I felt, however, in a difficulty in choosing a subject on which to speak. My colleague. Sir J. Vogel, had spoken to you on general politics. Your own representatives have no doubt, and others will no doubt, give you an account of what took place in the House of Representatives, and I do not desire in a meeting of this kind to enter upon any question of party politics.

Political Ideals.

I thought I would be doing myself the better justice and paying you a higher compliment by seeing if I could point out some political ideals that I believe every true colonist should have ever before him, and perhaps help you to see bow we might attain them. (Cheers.) To-night, therefore, I have chosen this subject for my address. Before I begin to speak upon it I want to show you why I think it is an exceedingly practical subject.

Technical Education.

We have heard, and I am glad to think that in Auckland the subject is popular, the need of technical education. (Cheers.) Now what does that imply? It does not mean teaching a boy to be a carpenter or an engineer or a mason. We have various kinds of education. We have a literary education, an education that will acquaint the boy with, perhaps, many languages and the literature of many tongues. Wo have also scientific education, an education that will give a boy or a lad a bias towards scientific pursuits. These two different kinds of education have their advantages. A literary education is a noble end in itself. It teaches culture, and it is perhaps one of the best mental gymnastics to which any boy or lad can be put. And so with scientific education. I has a useful end in itself. A boy by it becomes acquainted with nature, with its many marvels, and he becomes also mentally or intellectually trained. What, then, it may be asked, is a technical education? What docs a technical education imply? It implies that there is in the most practical work that a man can do, that there is even in carpentering, engineering, and I could mention a hundred other works that mechanics are employed on, that there is lying underneath them all a principle or law, and that though you may have in a technical school a carpenter's bench or a turning lathe, that is really not technical education alone. A boy must learn the law of mechanics. He must see that in the most practical things of life there is an ideal behind by which, if he is to be a practical man, he must shape his work. That is what is meant by technical education; and by proper technical education also we hope to see our youth having a bias towards industry, and not being ashamed of work, and of hard work too. (Cheers.) If then there is in this most practical thing of life,—labour, hard labour, mechanical labour, some law to be learned, some idea to be set before the man who is to become a skilled mechanic—is there such a thing in politics?

Practical Politics and Technical Education.

We hear people say, "Oh, politics is a practical thing; we must have what aro called practical politicians." I admit there must bo practical politicians, but I say the true politicians must recognise that there are laws in the political world with which he must become acquainted, just as there arc laws in mechanics and laws to be discovered by the scientific man; and, as if we wish to get a skilled mechanic, we must have him not merely taught the use of the plane or saw, but taught in the laws of mechanics, and given what is called technical training if he is to become a great mechanic, so in politics. The politician must have an ideal before him; and if we are practical politicians we must see there is a law, and that after all politics is not what is termed mere muddledom, having nothing to guide the politician through his political career. Let me give you another example. Suppose you want to become an expert miner,—how do you think a man can become a true miner, a scientific miner, by merely delving in the earth? Of course there are geniuses everywhere, even amongst the miners, where you have a man almost of no education who becomes a most skilled workman, just as you have geniuses in portrait painting, or music—some one who is known, we will say, as a born musician. He does not require, it may be, any technical training whatever. No doubt there are some such men amongst miners, but if we want to see a thoroughly skilled miner, who will not make blunders in carrying on his work, he requires to have technical training. In order to develop the great mineral wealth on the Continent schools of mines have

been established, where the miner has to learn the science of mineralogy and engineering, &c., before he can get a proper certificate, that is, in fact, before he can be regarded as a qualified miner. Now what does that recognise? It recognises what I have said about technical education, that there aro laws to bo learnt, or in other words there are ideals to be set forth. If then, in these matters, in practical things like carpentry and mining, there are laws to be learnt, ideals to be set up by the mechanic and miner, so there are laws which guide us in all our practical actions, and it is the duty of the man who wishes to perform his duties of citizenship, to try and discover those laws, and to conform his political views and conduct with the ideal he sets before him.

Ideals to be Sought After.

I therefore propose to show that there are some ideals to be discovered which would ennoble us as colonists in our political action. I go further, and say unless your practical politician has gol clear ideals before him, the laws of political and social life to be remembered and kept, you will find his political action like a mariner without a compass. He will he driven hither and thither with every wind, and you electors will be accusing him perhaps of insincerity, perhaps of ratting" (laughter), accusing him of all sorts of political crimes, while after all the blame is not so much in him. He may be sincere enough, but has not perhaps set before him a true ideal, to which he is ever striving; and you perhaps for the same reason may have been as wayward as he, and changed hither and thither by the political winds which we know exist, even in colonies. (Laughter.) Let me say before I go further one or two words about the nature of this kind of political education. We hoar a great deal of science nowadays. Scientific education, as it is termed, is more popular than classical education. Well, what is political science; what is social science? T say political science or social science, using the latter to express something more than is ordinarily meant by it, is the grandest of all sciences. (Cheers.)

The Aim of Politics.

What is the aim of all politics? Do you think the aim of politics is solely to get a road here, a bridge there, and a railway in another place? If any constituency or colony has only that political ideal before it, it is not fulfilling it duties as a constituency of true citizens. You have in this town a Free Library, free schools, and other institutions. What is the aim of all these? It is to strive to have a more perfect man than we have yet had, in order that we may have a more perfect State than we have yet had. And if such be our ideals and aim in life, to have a more perfect man and more perfect State, you will find that the constituency which has this ideal before it, and has this aim before it, wilt not only be conferring a favour upon itself, but a favour upon those who are to come after us, which will in after years he inestimable to them. Let me draw your attention to some ideals we must keep before us if we wish to have a perfect State—ideals which, though they may be termed theoretical and idealistic, are just as practical as technical education for our mechanics, just as practical as anything in politics can be. (Cheers). We may start with two things. We have got what is termed the [*unclear:* individul], and we have got the State. It has its organisation, its functions, its limitations, its rights, and its duties. Let me approach one ideal we must keep in mind as a State. A State must exist. It has to look after its own existence, and also to look after, as part, of its duties, the maintenance of individual liberty, for I don't believe in Socialism. I believe if the race is to be saved and elevated, it will have to be by individual salvation. Here comes in perhaps the most difficult question in the whole range of social science—tho rights and duties of the State as compared with the rights and duties of the individual. I have not time to-night to even sketch to you the views of some of our great philosophers on this question. Some of you have no doubt seen recent articles of Herbert Spencer and others dealing with this question. But I come to one question, a practical question to us, and one, in fact, I intend mainly to deal with—

The Land Question

That is the question of the land. (Cheers). Let us see if we can discover the individual rights and the State's rights and duties in reference to this question of land, and let us see if we can agree amongst ourselves to have some ideal set before us in reference to the State dealing with this subject. We have still in our possession as a colony millions of acres of land. There is no question more practical to us than to lay down some rule for ourselves as to how the lands we have shall be dealt with. As to the lands which have passed from us and been sold, that is at present out of the range of our practical politics. (" No, no"). I will tell you why. No State can afford to enter upon a career of repudiation, or shake public credit. (Cheers). A State that is unjust will have its members unjust, and injustice in the end never succeeds. (Cheers). It is misleading to those who call themselves Liberals, by setting before them an ideal out of the range of their practical grasp, when there is a question within their own hands which needs all their energy and attention to carry out. (Cheers).

The Land a Monopoly.

I look upon the land as a monopoly—(cheers)—and a monopoly the State has a right to control. (Cheers). I recognise in the land no individual rights unless subject to the rights of the whole community. I look upon land as in one respect like the air—it must be free—it is needed for our use in a State, and no generation has a right to partition the land, or to say to the generation following, "We have decided for you how the earth's surface is to be." In fact, if some people's views were carried out to their logical conclusion, there would happen what a Maori representative in the Assembly pictured was going to happen in reference to native lands. He said the land was taken from them here and there until in time all that would be left to the Maoris would be in the main roads. (Laughter). And so with some people's ideas of the land. I say the State has a right to look after its own existence. What is meant by allowing the full right of private property in land? Suppose some person were to buy up the whole of Newton, if private property in land is to be everything, he might say to the people of Newton, "Be kind enough to clear off here; I want Newton for myself." Don't think that it is an absurd proposition to put. You hear of evictions. I have seen one. I have seen a valley where men were living in the homes where their ancestors had lived in for nearly 500 years, and I have seen it cleared of every living inhabitant, on a six months' notice to quit, and the houses torn down. ("Shnme "). We have, therefore, a right to take care that in our legislation regarding land we have left the ills of the past, and that the wrongs done the people in other countries shall not be enacted here. (Cheers).

Before Henry George.

I am not stating anything new by raying that. I believe I was the first in New Zealand to bring forward in our Provincial Council a resolution that no more lands should be sold. I was the first to bring forward that proposition in the House of Representatives in 1875, and if you take the trouble to refer to the speech which I made on that occasion you will find succinctly stated the reasons for such a step. Long before Henry George had written any of his books I advocated those views, and I say still to all Liberal politicians the State should still control the land, and have large ownership over it. That ought to be the ideal of every Liberal politician.

The State and the Land.

How can we set about that? Well, I think that with your assistance, and the assistance of the colonists, we may yet accomplish that with a large portion of the territory of your colony. If you are only active in this question, and support it with deep enthusiasm, you and others would not only react on your members and the House, but you would create such a feeling as would say that a State should benefit by its land.

The Unearned Increment.

I have pointed out to you what might happen if yon allow private property in land to go to its full length. You may have men to control the lives of the citizens, or perhaps destroy the State, for after all what makes a State but the people. (Hear, hear.) Another thing in reference to land, which I suppose you are not altogether unacquainted with. We find land is not only a monopoly—in that respect different from other kinds of property, but that it increases in value without, perhaps, the landlord doing anything to make it increase. That is not unknown even in Auckland. (Hear, hear.) A man may have a block of land. He may do nothing with it, but his neighbours may improve their land all around him, and their improvements may double and treble the value of his land, and that goes on as the place increases in population and as your industries increase. Why, I may say every industrious man is doing what he can to add to the value of the land of his neighbour. It is not so in other things. It is not so with money. I remember when 17½ per cent, was the ordinary rate of interest. It then went down to 15, then to 12½, then to 10, and is now, I suppose, from 8 to 6½. The man, therefore, who had his thousand pounds in money would derive less revenue now, although the colony has increased in wealth and enterprise. But what has happened to the man who has land near a seulement? Instead of his land being worth less, it may have increased in value a hundredfold.

State Leasing of Land.Now, what would have happened if we had had a large portion of our lands leased I What will prevent your city from being overburdened with rates? You have city endowments leased. Had this colony begun a policy of State leasing we would have had just as prosperous colonists, less taxation, and far better chances of bearing additional burdens cast upon us if the progress of this colony is not to be stayed. What fin advantage it would have been if we had been able to go to the money lender or capitalist in London and say, "You need not depend upon our Customs revenue or taxation, here we hare millions of acres bringing in a certain rental per year. That is the best security in the world, and I hope as we have this leasing system in force

to a very limited extent—only so far as goldfields and education reserves are concerned—we will have it extended. (Cheers).

The Industrious Man and the Lazy Man.

There is another matter in connection with this land agitation. Emerson beautifully expresses it in the words "Corn won't grow without protection." He did not mean fences, but that unless a man shall be sure of reaping the reward of his industry he will not be industrious. And that what I say is the worst point in our socialistic schemes. I don't believe in the lazy man having as many good things as the active man. If a man was lazy and drunken then he ought to suffer for it. (Cheers). I warn you, in dealing with this question, to have this before you: that anything that tends to discourage thrift or to weaken the industrial tendencies of the race will inevitably endanger you. The ideal before you ought to be able to stand the most severe criticism of the most severe political economists. The people who till the land require to have certain tenure. You are not going to have a man improve land if he is not going to reap the reward of his industry. We must keep that in mind, and not mix land and capital together.

Land and Property.

I much regret that the people of this colony do not see a distinction between land and other property. You in Auckland were all in favour of a property tax as compared with a land tax. ("No, no"). if you count by the members from the Auckland provincial district you will find I am not far wrong—(laughter)—and it would be paying you a poor compliment and them to think they for one moment that they misrepresent you. (Laughter.) The State ought to do its utmost to protect the savings of the industrious man and to encourage him, while as regards the lazy and thriftless man the whole community, to use a common phrase, should have a "down" upon him. And in dealing with this question of course it touches on the question of taxation.

Land Tax.

You remember that as member of Sir George Grey's Ministry I supported the land tax, and I believe it was right. (Cheers.) I felt sorry, however, for this, that the farmers throughout the country, I don't know by what process of logic or reason they arrived at it, thought that if their houses and improvements, their furniture and stock, and their corn, were exempted from taxation, and only their lands taxed, they were worse off than if their land and stock and furniture were all taxed together. (Cheers.) I don't know by what logic they arrived at it, but that was the decision of a majority of the farmers. If you wish to obtain this position—that land is not like other property—you will have to modify your property tax, and I will say incidence of taxation, and you will have to meet your members and explain to them that you think land is not like other property, and they will perhaps remember that in the next session of Parliament. (Cheers). Now, I have dealt with land as a peculiar kind of property, as one ideal you can have before you, and that as we have mi lions of acres in this colony undisposed of, we as colonists shall so dispose of them that while we provide the means for colonists to improve themselves, and to reap the reward of their own industry, the State shall have sole control of the land. (Cheers.)

Forest Conservation.

You have—I have seen some of them in the distance—immenee tracts of the most magnificent timber in the world, and I am sorry to hear from the Auckland people I meet that this one wants a railway, and that One wants a railway, so that this kauri in these blocks—extending, I am told, from 200,000 to 300,000 acres—may be cut and taken off the face of the earth. If Auckland is to retain its prosperity, the State must look after the conservation of your forest lands. If you are to look to a future with all your kauri gone, you will look to a future with less prosperity than you now possess. (Hear, hear.) See then how this land question affects you practically. I should say I was pained to see what I saw often in the short travels I made through part of your district—magnificent young kauris utterly destroyed by fire which, if they Dad remained for 50 or 100 years, would have furnished magnificent timber. The State cannot afford to see its great wealth destroyed in this way.

The State.

Turning to another question. The State has the right to look after its own existence. Of course I admit that the State is not to interfere with individual liberty. (Cheers.) We must remember how the State has grown, and remember that it is not yet firmly planted, and that we cannot afford to do anything that would weaken its hands. Don't think that because in an English colony we have great liberty that all is plain sailing. There are

dangers which threaten a democracy,—just as many as threaten despotism. (Cheers.) Just let me say that I am laying down for you some principles which the State, must keep in view if it intends to retain its own existence. They have been summarised by a very able American—Mr. Abbot. He say this: A State has a right to exist and perpetuate its own existence, and that the individual is the social unit. What does this admission mean that the individual is a social unit? It admits that the child has rights as well as the parent, and that the child has a right to have its rights preserved by the State as much as the parent. (Cheers.) And again, he says that the State has a right, in order to perpetuate its own existence, to establish universal suffrage. (Cheers.) And that it has a right to establish universal intelligence and social morality as a necessary condition of universal suffrage. I ask you to follow me carefully in the enunciation of these principles, because one hangs on the other. Next, he says, it has a right to establish universal education, as a necessary condition of universal intelligence, of social morality, and of universal suffrage. (Hear.) And it has a right to establish a system of public schools, in order that there may be established a system of universal intelligence, and that it has a right to see that use is made of its schools, or that children are otherwise educated. It is on these principles that the rights of State education exist, because I admit at once that if you carry out individualism to what I might term an extreme, you would sweep away State education, and you would sweep away something more, that practically hangs perhaps on the same principles, you would sweep away hospitals. You would have the State giving no aid to hospitals, and I will show you that there are, from one point of view, stronger reasons against the State giving aid to hospitals than to schools. Now, you may think that strange. Let us see about hospitals. If you go to a doctor who looks—I am not speaking of a typical doctor—who looks simply at the perfection of physical man, who has no other conception of a man than as a living man, as a physical man, a strong physical man—he will tell you that hospitals injure the race, he will tell you that all the medical scientific education has bad this effect, that it is tending to preserve weak lives, and tending to produce weak lives; and if we look simply at the physical man, if the physical man was to be the only perfect type of humanity, we would have no hospitals. But we look at something different from that. We have to look at the emotional side of man's nature, at the moral side of man's nature, and we see it would be injuring his emotional nature, and his moral nature, if the State or the community were to allow the sick to die without aid and assistance. Hence it is the State says this, although the physical man is injured, greater injury would result to the race to at once cease all aid, and to allow the sick and helpless to die. (Cheers.) A greater moral injury would be inflicted on the race than any permanent physical advantage to be gained. Let me apply this to the schools. I say that if this colony is to make any advance on the past we must have universal education. (Hear, hear.) We must recognise that it is a huge disgrace to have one of our fellow-colonista unacquainted with our literature, and even of some of our scientific facts.

Higher Education.

And I now come to a subject on which, I know, there is some difference of opinion. I come now to the question of aiding higher education. I find throughout the colony—and I suppose it will be the same here—that people will say, "Oh, by ail means maintain the primary schools, but as for grammar schools and high schools, those who want that kind of education should pay for it." (Hear, hear.) I am glad to hear that "hear, hear "—(laughter),—because it shows me that there are some people in this room to be convinced, and I am going to try to do so. (Cheers and laughter). First, I ask you, what would be involved if there were no high schools and no universities in this colony. I do not need to prove to you that no university could exist without Government assistance in different ways. No university in the world perhaps has ever been created without either through the beneficence of some exceedingly wealthy men or State aid. We have not an exceeding number of wealthy men, who either can afford or perhaps are willing to found universities in our midst, and if, therefore, the State is to stop aid to our higher education. New Zealand would be without high schools, and without a university. Now, what would happen? So far as your wealthy people are concerned, they do not even make use of your universities when you have them here. They can afford to send their children to England or Scotland or Germany for their education. You take up the list of students in Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh, and you will see the names of colonial lads whose fathers have been able to send them there to obtain a higher education. So far as the wealthy people in this colony are concerned, they don't need your assistance, and some of them do not take advantage of it. Rut I ask you what is to happen to your youth, who, perhaps endowed with genius, endowed with great intelligence, is yet poor and unable to obtain a higher education? What is to happen to him? Is he to be condemned to this lower plane and to this lower level? What is to happen to him? Are you to have no high school, no high education, and no chance for him? Do not think I am picturing something that is not likely to happen. I have been a fellow-student with lads whose fathers were poor, aye, poorer than the poorest labouring man in Auckland, who through our Scotch system of having higher education were attended to. (How little many of my fellow-colonists realise what the State is doing for them in this respect). I have known poor places where the labouring man was content perhaps with 1s. a day, and never exceeding is. 2d.,

where he had to pay fees out of his earnings, and where there were school rates also, to keep up some higher education, not to keep up merely primary schools. The school I was brought up at was a school for the poor, not a school for the rich. If it had been a school for the rich I should not have had a chance of being educated. (Cheers). We were taught Latin, Greek, French, mathematics, and through these means what happened? I can point even to one fellow-student of myself simply the son of a bootmaker whose earnings were not equal to the earnings of any bootmaker in Auckland, and whose son finished his education at Tubingen University through getting proper education at the parish school and getting a bursary, and getting into the University. You do not know, some of you, what some Scotch boys have to do in order to get higher education. In England until lately there was very little chance given to poorer English boys. I have seen the students of Edinburgh bringing their barrels of meal, dried fish, and perhaps cheese, and having to live on that, and having to go and work to herd cows during the summer in order to maintain themselves. I say we have not been driven to that here, but if you sweep away all aid from higher education, you are condemning the sons of the poor amongst you to have no chance of rising in life, and to become distinguished. I say hold fast to the high schools, if I had my way I should make the high schools as free as primary schools here. (Cheers.) I would say there should be no limit to the bright boy, the boy of genius, getting the best education the world can give him. (Cheers.) What are some of those who condemn higher education. I would like to ask them if they should (I do not think they would) place themselves in the position of a poor boy anxious to obtain a higher education, and to be turned round on and told if you want a higher education pay for it. What mockery that would be. Why, some of the most brilliant students I have known have been the sons of poor men, who have had nothing but hard work and a determined spirit to bring them on. (Loud cheers.) Why even take our able Professor of Chemistry in the Otago University. What had he to do earn his living—he who obtained the high distinction of Doctor of Science of the Edinburgh University? He had during the summer months, in order to obtain a little money to attend the University, he had to herd cows. If we are—if this nation is is be raised higher in the social and intellectual scale, we will have to give opportunity to every poor boy to obtain the highest possible education that can be given. (Cheers.) I ask you to remember also, looking at that from another point of view, what is it that makes a nation great? Do you think it is wealth alone? (A voice: No.) What is it makes a nation great? After all, a nation's greatness depends on its great men. If you read history, what do you find? The nation reckoned great is the nation which produces great men. When we look at the pages of Grecian history, what is it that recalls to us the greatness of Athens, or those noble Grecians in the past? It was its great men. And so it is always. It is the man of genius that elevates the nation more than the nation elevates the man of genius. And as one writer has said—I will quote it to you, because I thoroughly agree with it—perhaps he puts it in better language than I could put it in. He says: "But as the value of a nation to the human race does not depend on its wealth or numbers, so it does not depend even upon the distribution of elemantary knowledge, but upon the high water mark of its educated mind. Before the permanent tribunal copyists, and popularisers count for nothing, and even the statistics of common schools are of secondary value." I say now, if you in Auckland are to say, Down with the higher education, down with the high schools, it simply means this, that you are con- demning perhaps hundreds of your brighest youth to secondary places in life. (Hear hear.) How else can they obtain higher education? Why, some will say, by scholarships. Scholarships to what? Where is the schools to be established to which the scholarships apply? You must establish the schools, or else what is the good of your scholarships. Therefore I hope, as we are members of a democracy, we may never forget this: If a democracy is to be grand it must have high-class educated men and have its avenues open to these men without distinction of race, distinction of creed, and without distinction of wealth. (Cheers.) Let me say one or two words further on the question. I have pointed out to you some ideal in reference to land, some ideal in reference to education, some ideals that we must have ever before us. Let me now see if there are other ideals that we must keep in mind. Bearing on this question, I would point out that, as a State, we must insist upon a secular State—(cheers)—and that I will not put it to you, because I have other things to speak of, and have not time; but I would ask you, if you have time, you will likely find in your Public Library, to go and read a picture that one of the ablest Athenians drew—namely, Pericles. You will find it in Thucydides—Jowett's translation, perhaps, is the best: you will see what he pointed out the Athenians had before them; how they gave the highest positions not to men of wealth—although they did not despise wealth—but to men of merit, and they cared nothing about their poverty and cared nothing about whence they had sprung. (Cheers). In a secular State religion must be left to the individual—(cheers)—and any religion that requires the State's care is not worth much—(loud cheers)—and therefore in your secular schools, in your State schools, you must lay down this principle, that we can recognise no nationality, no creed, and no race. (Cheers). Let me tell you what is involved in that. Here we have come to this colony, men from different countries, and I hope none of us will forget the country from whence they came—(cheers)—but we have come here as colonists to make a new nation and to create a new national life, and I say the very existence of the State depends on this, that we have a national life, and we can have no national life if we allow the old national prejudices or any creed barriers to interfere with us in our actions

(cheers), and I believe that if we are to have a true national life founded on universal suffrage in this democracy, we must maintain our public schools, and must be careful as members of Education Boards and members of School Committees to see that we have no bias in the administration of our duties. (Cheers.) I believe that which will injure our State system of schools more than anything else is if you send in—I do not know the members of your Education Board of Auckland, so there is no personal application—I am only laying down general principles, but I have seen in other districts this, that there have been men returned to Education Boards who wish to make their position a vehicle for getting their own sectarian views carried out. I hope you will not permit that thing with you. (Cheers). I hope you will see that your members feel the high position that they occupy—there is no higher position perhaps in a community than directing the education of the youthful mind. You have got to give them a literary education, a moral education, and a technical training perhaps, and and have got to fit them for the various duties in life, and you can only fit them to be true citizens by teaching them that they are citizens of a nation, and must live in peace and concord with their fellow-citizens, giving them equal rights with themselves, and the right to express their opinions when and how they please. (Cheers.) That is the only way to carry out true national life. I find, as I often find, that I will not be able to get over all my notes. I have spoken, however, of two ideals that you may set before you. Let me now say one or two words as to how these ideals may be carried out.

Political Associations.

I believe in political associations. (Cheers.) I do not know they are always the best people in the community that take an interest in politics. There are some people who think everything is going to the bad. There are some people who think we are worse then they were when they were young. Whenever I hear people talking like that, who are horrified at this and at that, and always drawing a blue picture of what is going to happen, I often think of a worthy and able man—a bishop too. What do you think he said? He said when he was old the fruit had not the same bloom and taste as when he was young. Why, the change was with the bishop, not the fruit. Some people say if you teach every person so well as this who is going to do our manual work. I say to those who raise this cry set your own sons to it. (Cheers.) They just have as much right to do it as the sons of the poor man.

(Cheers.) I do not believe there would be any less manual labour done. I believe people who are afraid of democracy have something wrong with their digestion. (Cheers.) I believe they suffer from some complaint, and the man who has a healthy physical life is a man full of hope, enthusiasm, and fully permeated with the idea that the world is getting better and not worse. (Cheers.) Now, I say in reference to political associations there is need of these. I do not know even the members of your political association in Auckland, but they have set a good example to you. (Hear, hear.) They have done something. They are looking after their own political education, and if you have different views from them it is your duty to band together and give expression to them—the world gets on by this continued clashing of opinion. I do not believe in a community in which all believe the one way, but in men of different views ready to argue and give them utterance, ready to speak about them, and ready to carry them out. Of course I admit that a man has other duties besides those of citizenship. I do not believe in a man who can get up and talk about political and social reform who docs not pay attention to his own family. (Cheers.) Isay that it is his first duty to strive to make his wife and children happy. (Cheers.) A man that cannot do that had better leave reforming the world alone. (Cheers. But I say there is need of political associations, because after all we are a democracy, and as a democracy we must have political life, and unless we have political life we will have political corruption. If you find in any community political life, the pulse beating strongly, there you will have more purity in Government than if people are careless how their representatives act. If you have even the ideals I have mentioned, not to mention others, you ought to be determined to carry them out, and you ought to spend some of your time in the duties of citizenship. What do you think the great Athenian I have mentioned, Pericles, said of those who were careless as citizens. The Greeks looked upon a person who did not trouble himself with political acts as a usleess man, he was no citizen at all. He did not perform his citizen duties; and so with you, and so with us all, wo ought to pay some attention to politics. What have we como here for? Do you think the earth is perfect? Take and read a chapter of the social life of London. Think of the degradation, and vice of our large cities. We came to this colony many of us, and those who are born here I hope are, inflamed with the same desire, to make this colony grander, better, and to have it free from the blots of social life of older lands. (Cheers). We can only accomplish that by having some idea of citizenship duties, by spending some of our time and trying to bring about proper social reform and proper political reform, and I often think if we were all inspired with this idea of looking forward to perfect man and trying to get rid of the evils of the world, trying to get rid of the social evils of the world, trying to get rid of the sins and vices of the world, each of us in our own way, however humble, so to act, what a different world we would have. I would like to see men going to the polling booth to take part in the highest duties and

functions of citizenship, inspired with some of the citizenship feeling, to have some of that pulse-beating national life. I would like to see all go to the polling booth not inflamed with nobblers of whisky or beer, hut as if they were going to perform one of the most sacred duties of our lives, to vote for the man who would carry out our ideal, who is honest. If each of us wen; so to act we would have a different political life to any we have had in the past. (Cheers). We would have a purer Government to any we have had in the past. Why don't you, they say, carry out these ideals you have set before you? Why don't you get this and that done? When I was in one of your schools—a very splendid school, it is one of the best in the colony—I forget its name, but Mr. Worthington is the master—1 found little children had been doing what is culled Kindergarten work. They had little things made of clay, and so learned the first step perhaps in modelling, and perhaps will get a taste for that in after years. I noticed some of their little cups and fruit baskets were broken. What was the reason of that? It was not the fault of the moulder; it was the fault of the clay. And so, if you say to our politicians who are representing you, why don't you do this and that, you must remember the kind of clay. (Cheers). The kind of clay depends upon you. Don't you blame the representative. I believe that every representative is just as good as his constituency. (Cheers and laughter). I say if any representative is bad, his constituency is bad. (Cheers). You have not had enough of political life; you have not had enough of association to carry out any political ideas; and perhaps have not had sufficient—I say it to you plainly—political education to see that there must be an ideal in political life as well as in other life, and that you must work singlebanded for that ideal as in everything else. (Cheers).

I remember coming to this one passage in the life of Abraham Lincoln on this very question—(cheers)—one, I believe, of the grandest men of our race. He was twitted by some Northern men who were really in favour of Southern slavery. "Oh," they said, why did not Abraham Lincoln, if he was really sincere in abolition, at once publish a proclamation when he assumed office freeing the slaves? Why wait until many years after, when so much blood had been spilt, and when it was practically forced upon him?" Well, his biographer gives a reason for that, and he says this, and I say it has a practical application in New Zealand at the present. "Doubtless he had an ideal, but it was the ideal of a practical statesmen—to aim at the best, and to take the next best if he is lucky enough to get even that. (Laughter). It is loyalty to great ends, even though forced to combine the small and opposing motives of selfish men to accomplish them. It is the anchored cling to solid principles of duty and action which knows how to swing with the tide, but is never carried away by it—that we demand in public men, and not sameness of policy, a conscientious persistence in what is unpracticable. For the impracticable, however theoretically enticing, is always politically unwise, sound statesmanship being the application of that prudence to the public business which is the safest guide in that of private life. Well, then, that is a guide for you and for me. It is a maxim we have to keep in mind—that if we cannot get the ideally best we may get the next best, and if we cannot get the next best, we must strive to get as near it as possible. So I say you must remember this, that these statesmen, the politicians of our colony, are what you as constituents make them, and if they are not carrying out these high ideals, if they are not able to accomplish this end, who is to blame? If each elector would hold his high ideal before him, and so art by his vote, you would find your politicians and members of the Government so acting that you would have no fault to find with their action. If you send men to the House and do dot aid them and cheer them in their arduous work, and if you seem to pay no attention to them, and to think they have nothing of troubles and trials, if you do not give them your enthusiastic support, if you are not fired with enthusiasm to help them to carry out their work, do not grumble if they fail. Their failure is caused by you. If, however, as colonists, all of us were fired by this enthusiasm to carry out these political ideas, so that our nation would be grander than any nation in the past, so that our own children rising up amongst us should have cause to say that their parents acted nobly, and had a noble national life, and loved the State, then you would have no fault to find. I often think we are not half educated to love the State. I find all over the colony that people have an idea that the Government is a great dispenser of favours. I say that tends to destroy the State. You ought to look to the State as the representative of you. I would like to see you so fired with enthusiasm about your schools that in a district where there is no school you would say: We will give half a day to help to build it, and give some of our means to assist, because we know this school would benefit our race and our young people. And if anything should threaten the State—though I need hardly mention this to an Auckland audience, remembering how nobly you acted in the past—if war comes amongst us, instead of arguing with the Government for capitation allowances, I hope to see you act as your fathers did before you, and show a true national feeling and love of the State. I say if you are inspired with this national life and anthusiasm about politics, then you will be doing some of your duty in the world; and do not think because you may not even he electors, because you are not representatives, or because you are not members of the Government, that therefore you have not high duties and responsibilities. Why, it has been said—some scientific man has said—that each atom has an effect on all atoms around it; that if you throw a stone in a pool the eddies will be felt on the outer edges, however large the pool is. What do you think would be the effect of a sincere arid honest man in the midst of a dozen working with him. What is the effect of one single honest

enthusiastic man in any cause? I say the effect is electrical, and is such as one cannot even define; and if you, as electors of this colony, having these ideals before you, were to act them out in your daily life, thinking it your duty to make the race and the State better than they have been, you would be doing, each in his own sphere, an incalculable benefit; at all events, it would be said about you when the time came when you will be no more that you had done your duty as a citizen. I do not know any grander epitaph that could be ascribed to any man's memory than this: He loved his family, be loved his children, and he was always helpful to those around him v/ith kindness, though he may not have had any money, and that as a citizen, carrying out a citizen's duty, he had a single eye to the future, a single ideal to see a more perfect type of humanity and of a State. I say I do not know any grander epitaph than that. If we were only all of us, I do not leave out myself, fired with this enthusiasm having before us this ideal, we would be doing our duty in the world, and when we leave it, we should leave it better than we found it. (Cheers.) Now, let me end by giving you one or two verses, which you perhaps may remember—I am sorry I cannot quote the whole poem—from a poet whom I do not think is half appreciated amongst us—a poet who has written many noble and many good things. I mean Robert Buchanan. Let we give you two or three verses from his poem what he pictured to be a perfect State:—

Where is the perfect State
Early most blest and late,
Perfect and bright?
'Tis where no palace stands
Trembling on shitting sands
Morning and night.
'Tis where the soil is free
Where, far as eye may see
Scattered o'er hill and lea
Homesteads abound.
Where clean and broad and sweet
Market-square, land and street
Belted by leagues of wheat
Cities are found.

Where is the perfect State,
Early, most blest and late,
Gentle and good?
Tis where no lives are seen
Huddling in lanes unseen,
Crying for food.
'Tis where the home is pure.
'Tis where the bread is sure,
'Tis where the wants are fewer
And each want fed.
Where plenty and peace abide,
Where health dwells heavenly-eyed,
Where in nooks beautified
Slumber the dead.

Where is the perfect State,
Unvexed by wrath and hate
Quiet and just?
Where to no form of creed
Fettered are thought and deed,
Reason and trust.
Tis where the great free mart

Broadens, while from its heart
Forth the great ships depart,
Blown by the wind.
'Tis where the wise men's eyes,
Fixed on the earth and skies,
Seeking for signs, devise
Good for mankind.

MR. STOUT resumed his seat amidst loud and prolonged cheers.

MR. SHERA proposed that a hearty vote of thanks be given to the Hon. the Premier for the admirable address which he had just delivered. He was sure that the Hon. Mr. Stout was not received by them that evening only as Premier of the colony but as a well-known member of the Liberal party, a front rank man. (Cheers.)

CAPTAIN D. H. MCKENZIE seconded the resolution, which was then put by the Mayor, and carried unanimously with acclamation.

The HON. MR. STOUT, on rising, was received with renewed cheering. He thanked the audience not only for the vote of thanks, but for the patient, and considerate, and kindly hearing afforded him. His only regret was that he was unable to speak to them on many other subjects, but he assured them that he left Auckland with many pleasant recollections of the scenery and climate—he would like it a little colder though, and there, he thought, the South had the advantage of the a—(loud laughter and cheers)—and the exceedingly kind way in which he had been treated since he came amongst them. He hoped they would accept this expression of thanks, and if he did not write to all to thank them, it was owing to his inability to do so, his friends had been so numerous. He begged to propose a vote of thanks to His Worship the Mayor, Mr. Waddel, for the able manner in which he had presided over the meeting.

The vote was carried by acclamation, and His Worship having briefly returned thanks, the meeting dispersed.

W. Atkin, General Printer, High Street, Auckland.

A Trip from Dunedin to Samoa

Via Tonga, Returning Via Fiji and Tonga.

BY A FOURTH FORM HIGH SCHOOL BOY.

[John Logan Stout.]

I left Dunedin on Thursday, the 2nd of August, at 3.15 p.m., by the s.s. Wairarapa, in charge of Mr and Mrs F, of Dunedin. I went to bed after tea and suffered a little from seasickness, but I soon went to sleep. I found my cabin companion to be an old gentleman, who was taking his daughter as far as Auckland to see her start for Honolulu. He was very kind to me. The next morning about 8.30 we were alongside the wharf at Lyttelton. It was a miserable day; raining all day long. I took a turn round the town and then back to the steamer. At ten minutes past ten we left for Wellington and arrived there next morning at 10.30, having made a good passage. As there was no one down to meet me I took a stroll up town, and met one of my cousins. Then I went out to Newtown to see their place, and stayed there all the afternoon. I found that my father had left for Wanganui that morning, so that I did not see him. He left me a Tetter saying he was very sorry at not being able to see me. The steamer left at 6 p.m. for Napier. We had a very bad passage and a head wind. I was again seasick. The next morning when I got up we were running along the coast near Napier. We arrived about 11 o'clock, and as we were anchored out in the bay I did not go on shore. The weather was very bad, raining nearly all the time. At dinner a gentleman in mistake took mint sauce on his plum-pudding instead of brandy sauce. We left Napier at nine in the evening, and started under easy steam for Gisborne. We arrived at Gisborne at 8 a.m. After breakfast we had some fun watching some passengers come on board from the launch Snark. It was hard work because of the heavy swell. We left Gisborne for Auckland at about 10.30 a.m., and as the sea was high I lay down on my bed. I got up for dinner and went to bed afterwards. We arrived in Auckland early next morning. I sent my

luggage to the

Taviuni, the steamer I was to leave the next day in for the Islands. I met my friends as I was leaving the steamer, and had dinner and tea with them, and staved with them all night. They were very kind, and took me for a drive round by Mount Eden and out past Costley's Home and the racecourse, returning by Mount Eden Gaol. I enjoyed the drive very much. I left Auckland on Wednesday, the 8th of August, for Tonga. We took five days instead of four, on account of the bad weather. Nearly all the passengers were seasick, and the captain said it was one of the roughest passages he had made.

On Tuesday, the 14th, we came into Tonga among the beautiful little coral islands and coral reefs. Almost all the people in the village were down to meet us, and the Natives crowded the wharf. I went up to the village with another boy passenger who had a camera, and he took some views. We saw the tomb of the late King George of Tonga, and also the palace. We were not inside the palace. We were inside the House of Parliament, which was to sit in the afternoon. The dress of the Native men is a *lava-lava,* which is a piece of cloth wrapped round the waist reaching to the knees, and sometimes a singlet, shirt, or a coat added. The Natives seem very fond of singlets. The policemen dress in the *lava-lava* and a blue coat with silver buttons. The dress is the same in all the islands. They do not need any hats because of their thick hair. The women have sometimes dresses like little girls, without any waistband, the dress reaching to their ankles. In the morning we also went for a walk to the lagoon about a mile and a-half inland, where we saw a Tongan canoe with a sail made from the cocoanut palm leaves. At the end of the road a cocoanut palm stands by itself in the middle of the road. We were ready for a good dinner when we got back. The walk made us very tired on account of the great heat of the sun. After dinner we wandered about the beach, not feeling fit for a long walk. The Tongan Natives are a very good-looking race, but have rather broad noses. The Native men work the slings to load and unload the steamer, but they are lazy. The women and children flock about the deck of the steamer trying to sell shells for enormous prices—sixpence for a little shell and two shillings for a large one. They are very greedy about money. A lady passenger bought a little basket with a little piece of coral with it for sixpence; the Native women watched where she put it and stole it. We stayed on board the steamer at night, and slept soundly till the dressing gong was sounded the next morning. After breakfast I went up to the post office and bought some stamps, and then returned to the steamer. The scenery is very beautiful—the low-lying islands covered with trees of all kinds such as the cocoanut palm, the banana, the grenadilloes, the orange, and lime fruit trees mingled together. The trees are all colors of greens from the lightest to the darkest, and look very lovely mingled together. The steamer sailed in the afternoon for Haapai, another of the Tongan groups. At night some Samoans, who were on board amongst the Natives, sang their songs to us, which we all enjoyed. I went to bed at eleven o'clock, when the lights went out.

The next morning we arrived at Haapai, and went on shore in the ship's boats. The Natives here are the same as at Tonga, this being the place where they first came from, and the home of the kings of Tonga. The Tongans here are very lazy, like those in Tongatabu. We went to the chief's house, where we had a drink of cocoanut milk and a drink of the Native drink called "kava." After leaving the chief's house we went through the Native churches, which were built by the Natives. The churches are built with material from the cocoanut palm and other island trees. And then we went to the hotel kept by a lady for whom I had a note of introduction. I had dinner with her, and she gave me shells and other things to lake home. I went on board in a luggage punt towed by the ship's boat. The scenery here was the same as at Tongatabu, the island low lying, with the beautiful cocoanut palms, orange and other trees. In about ten minutes after I was on board, the steamer left for Vavau, another of the Tongan group. At Vavau we went about in the ship's boat, and went for a bath in the harbor with the captain and chief engineer. At Vavau we had a change in the scenery, instead of low-lying coral islands like the Tongatabu and Haapai groups. The Vavau group is volcanic; therefore the islands are high and steep. The trees are the same, and the harbor is deep and the scenery lovely. We left at 5 p.m. for Apia (Samoa). We were at sea all the next day, and the morning after that we arrived early at Apia.

I went on shore in the morning with Mr and Mrs F and visited Mr and Mrs C, who asked me to stay with them, but I said I would rather stay on the steamer. My mother stayed at Mrs C—'s when she was at Apia. I went on board for dinner and stayed on board all the afternoon. The next day (Sunday) there was a service on board the man-of-war, but I did not go. I had a good book to read, and did not go on shore till late in the afternoon. I had tea with Mrs C, and went to church in the evening. I stayed all night on shore, and in the morning went for a bath in the river with a Samoan boy. The Samoans are like the Tongans, they try to sell things for enormous prices, and are very lazy. One woman tried to make a gentleman passenger pay twice for a club, but the gentleman threatened to tell the magistrate, and he was bothered no more. In the afternoon I went for a ride with the doctor of H.M.S. Curaçoa, about a mile or so inland, to the Native Girls' High School at Papauta, where we heard them singing. The singing was very good, and after the school was dismissed we had a cup of tea with beat-up egg instead of milk. The ride was up a pretty good road, with cocoanut plantations on each side. The ride was very nice, because the trees shaded you from the heat of the sun. As the steamer was to

leave at 4 p.m. we had to hurry back. When we got back we heard that the steamer did not leave till 5 p.m., so I stayed on shore. I met Mrs Stevenson, the mother of R. L. Stevenson the novelist, at Mrs C—'s on re turning from my ride. I went out to the steamer with Mr and Mrs C—in their boat. I met on the steamer some of my father's friends, and on shore the Chief of Apia (Seumanu) and other Samoans who knew him. The scenery at Apia is like that of Vavau. The town is built at the bottom of the hills on a level space. The town is very small, but very pretty, on account of the trees and Native houses. While at Samoa I heard that the fighting among the Natives would last till the British flag was run up on the beach. At Apia you can see the wreck of the German man-of-war that was thrown up on the top of the reef in the hurricane in which all the men-of-war were wrecked. The vessel is lying on her side, and is broken in two, only the framework being left.

We left Apia for Paga Paga (Tutuila Samoa) at 5.30 p.m., and reached there early next morning. We went alongside H.M.S. Curaçoa to coal her, and lay there all day. I was shown all over the Curaçoa by a sailor, and enjoyed it very much. In the afternoon I Ment out in the ship's cutter with the captain, third officer, another passenger, and two Natives to pull the boat. We went out to put a buoy on a rock in the entrance of the harbor. After rowing about for half an hour we found the rock and placed the buoy on it. We then went back to the steamer. I met R. L. Stevenson, the novelist, on board the steamer. He was taking a trip in the man-of-war. The Natives here seem to have more curiosities in the shape of clubs, kava bowls, and drinking cups than at Apia. We left Paga Paga for Suva (Fiji), and alter spending two nights and a day at sea we arrived there at 10 a.m. The sky looked like rain, and the heat was very oppressive. I went up to the post office and bought some stamps, and then took a stroll along the town. Suva is not such a pretty place as Apia, but still it is pretty. It is built on the slopes of low hills, covered with trees of all sorts. At night a sugar punt loaded with sugar and mosquitoes came alongside, and the sailors started to load sugar. In the middle of the loading the rain came down in a regular tropical shower, and the men had to stop loading the sugar till it stopped raining. The mosquitoes came on board by the hundreds, and most of the passengers had to leave their berths and come on deck. I was up in the forecabin, which was fitted up for the saloon, and there were no mosquitoes there. In the middle of the night a fireman fell into the water and was nearly drowned, but he caught a rope thrown to him by the captain just as he was going down for the last time. We left Suva for Levuka the next morning, and arrived there about dinner time.

Levuka is a beautiful place; the town is built on the side of the hills near the water. The climate is beautiful. Some of the passengers stayed at levuka while the steamer went on to Ba to load sugar. There are not many Natives at Levuka, but there are a lot of white people. The trip to Ba was the best we had; the sea was as smooth as glass the whole way. The passengers who were left were taken by the captain upon the bridge. The scenery all along the coast was very beautiful. The Native villages and the Natives fishing on the coral reefs were very picturesque. I had the loan of the telescope to took at the villages. One village was on the top of the hills amongst the trees and shrubs. We anchored off Ba, and a little steamer came out with the sugar punts. We had to stay on board all day watching the sugar getting loaded. The sugar plantations at Ba are worked by Indians (coolies) and some Japanese, but the Japanese are dying out. We took some prisoners from Ba to Levuka. One was to be tried for the murder of his wife, one for breaking gaol, and the other for a minor offence. We landed them at Levuka, from whence they were to be taken to Suva to be tried. The Indian who had committed the murder seemed quite content with what he had done. We were there all night, and at daylight next day we left for Levuka at 12.30, and were to sail at 6 p.m. for Vavau.

To say something about the Fijians. They are not like the Samoans and Tongans, although there are a lot of Tongans in Fiji. The Fijians are a darker race, not so good looking, and wear their hair very long. It sticks up all round like a mop, and has a reddish look because of the mixture they put on it. The cause of so many Tongans being in Fiji is that 2,000 Tongan warriors sailed in their canoes to Fiji and conquered the half of it, and would have conquered the whole of it had the Fijian chiefs not asked the English to annex Fiji. The English did this without the consent of the Tongans, who had a right to the half of it.

While at levuka walking on the beach I picked up a pretty shell, which I gave to one of the passengers who liked it very much. Some of the passengers bought some pieces of coral, which were very pretty, but very easily broken. We sailed at 6.30 p.m. We reached Vavau after two nights and a day at sea. When we arrived at Vavau the health officer was not going to allow us to land because there was a case of whooping cough at Levuka, in Fiji, but we had none on board. After rowing about and consulting his books he at last let us land. We had to load fruit. I went in for a bathe off the steamer with the stewards, engineers, and one or two passengers and sailors. We had great fun in the water, especially with one of the passengers. Some of the passengers went out for a walk up the village to look at the churches and houses. As we were to go down to the point to load some more oranges we left the wharf, sending a boat for the other passengers, who were out for a walk. I went for a bathe with the captain and two passengers and another boy. We had a nice bathe and a good row round the steamer. Then we came on board and had tea. While at tea the steamer saled for Tongatabu. At night some Natves from the Wesleyan College, Tongatabu, who had been to Vavau to give an entertainment, repeated it on

board. One Naive recited 'The Charge of the Light Brigade' in English, and was encored. They sang songs in both Tongan and Englsh. They had a play in the Tongan language from Milton's 'Paradise List.' They acted very well, especially the man who represented Satan. We reached Tongatabu next morning. I was up when we were gang in between the islands. We did not need a pilot. While I was on the bridge with sane other passengers we were called to have our photos taken by a passenger. We were taken in a group on the deck underneath he awning, and I think we must have made a very picturesque group with our island clothing. We arrived at the wharf a little after breakfast. On the wharf we saw buncies of bananas piled up in heaps for us to lad, and truck after truck of them coming down from the sheds. I took a stroll up the wharf and watched them loadng bananas. We left early in the afternoon or Auckland, leaving our pleasant holiday and the lovely islands behind us. On the wharf when we were leaving there stood some of our passengers and groups of Natives. The Native custom is that when friends are leaving to throw handkerchiefs into the water. The passengers we had left behind and some of the passengers on board threw theirs, also some of the Natives. We were then homeward bound, with many remembrances of those sunny isles of the Pacific.

Our passage to Auckland was very bad. I was seasick once or twice. We had games of quoits and another game of which I do not know the name. At last, after five bad days and nights at sea, we arrived in Auckland four or five days late. I stayed on board all night as it was raining, and the next day (Friday, the 7th of September) I was in New Zealand again, after an absence of about a month. My friends were down to meet me, and took me to their place to stay till Monday, 10th, when I was to leave by the Takapuna for Wellington. On Friday night I went to a party, but did not enjoy myself very much. On Saturday afternoon I went into town and secured my berth for Monday's steamer. I walked back to Ponsonby, where my friends' house is. The next day (Sunday) I did not go anywhere, as it was a bad day. I went for a little walk only, just before tea, to stretch myself. The next day (Monday) I went into town after dinner to the Star Hotel to meet Mr and Mrs F, in whose charge I had been throughout the trip. We took the train to Onehunga, where the Takapuna was lying. She left just after we got on board. I went to bed early. The next morning, at daylight, we were at New Plymouth, and left again before breakfast. As the sea was choppy I lay down, and did not get up till after tea. We had calm weather in the Strait, and arrived in Wellington as 11 o'clock p.m. was striking. My father was down to meet me, and we drove up to his lodgings, where I got into bed and was soon asleep. The next morning, after breakfast, I went for a walk along town. I visited the Houses of Parliament twice. I left Wellington by the Flora, and after a rough passage across the Strait, taking eighteen hours from Wellington, we arrived at Lyttelton. At Lyttelton I saw the Port Melbourne; she was loading horses for Calcutta. There was also one of the Shaw, Savill and Albion Company's cargo steamers, and also some of the Union Steam Ship Company's steamers in port. The Flora left Lyttelton at 3 p.m. for Dunedin, arriving in Dunedin early on Sunday morning. There was no one down at the wharf, so I waited for half an hour and then took a cab home. When I arrived home the boys were just getting up. I had my breakfast at home for the first time after being away nearly seven weeks. Thus ended the most pleasant and interesting holiday, I have ever had, and I shall always look back on it with pleasure.

vignette

Printed at the Evening Star Job Printing Works, Bond Street, Dunedin.

True Democracy.

A Lecture

Delivered in the Protestant Hall, Napier, on Wednesday, December 5th, 1883,

BY ROBERT STOUT, ESQ.

Mr J. Sheehan, occupied the chair, and said they were all aware of the object of the meeting, to hear Mr Stout on True Democracy. On such occasions the chairman's function was to say as little as possible, but he must say this for Mr Stout, no man was more competent to speak on such a subject, as for many years the lecturer has made the subject a special study. He springs from the working classes, and he has now worked himself up to the top of the profession, to which he (Mr Sheehan) also belonged. During the last two or three years they had had triennial Parliaments and manhood suffrage, and it was for them to listen to Mr Stout and

seo how far they could work these concessions for their own benefit. He might say that they owed to Sir George Grey these two concessions, but for him they would not have had them. He had observed that every man that comes forward for Parliament professes to be a Liberal—until it comes to voting, but then the Conservativism comes in. Mr Stout was an old colleague of his and a personal friend, and he was now going to address them on the question that concerned them most of all—how to secure honest government and small taxation. He thought he would do that satisfactorily, even if he might not convince them, and at the close anyone that differed could give expression to his views. He begged leave to introduce Mr Stout.

Mr Stout, who on rising was loudly cheered, said—Ladies and gentlemen, wo live in this century in times of change, and we live also in times of progress. Perhaps there has been no century in this world in which the progress of the race has been so great as in this nineteenth century. They saw this in the scientific knowledge they had gained. They could refer to no science in which there has not been a giant stride made. Let them take one science—for example, take the science of astronomy, and how many new planets have been discovered during the last hundred years. They know now not only about the courses of the planets, not only about the principle of stars, but within the last twenty-five years by spectral analysis they were able to tell the composition of the heavenly bodies. And take up any science they found its history to contain a record of progress; and, if they only considered the inventions that have been made in everything that surrounds them, what enormous strides the race has made. Take the inventions that have risen out of a better knowledge of electricity, why The steamers on our coast can be lighted with electricity. Who would have believed that one hundred years ago. Not only had they acquired enormous knowledge of things, not only had they been able to apply their resources to their use, but they had been able to understand the history of their planet. Geology had grown within the last hundred years with rapid and enormous strides. They could now read the history of their planet; they could tell of its prior life, and they could tell of the great development that had been achieved not only in mere animal life but vegetable life also. This great advance that true education had made led them up to the history of their race. They could trace in the language of a people, they could trace in its past records, the advance that man had made; and would it not be strange, with all this growth of education, if they were to make no advance in government, they were not to be better able to decide what was good for the race and for humanity than their fathers were able to determine. Surely, amid those changes that have come over the race, they should be able to see some progress in society, some progress in the forms of government under which they lived, and some progress of what might bo termed the new science—the science of sociology. Just as might be expected they saw a great change if they thought what a king meant in older days. Contrast one of the Greek plays of Sophocles with these days. A king could sentence a woman to living death without any questioning of his power, without any Grecian citizen daring to say he was violating any law, without judge, without ministers, without the sanction or aid of anyone. He had the power of life and death. And if they traced the history of their own country, they would see how they had made advances in government. Consider what power a king had at the time of the Tudors, and, remember, there was no such thing as ministerial responsibility, and practically the people had no voice in the government. Take the history of the Georges, they would see the same thing—it has not been till the reign of the present Queen that Parliament has asserted the power it now possesses. There was practically no ministerial responsibility, and gradually year by year they saw, just as education had advanced, Governments had become more liberal, the people had acquired more power. And they saw this not only in England, but they saw something the world has never yet seen—a vast Republic in America, having fifty millions of people, having the people able to assert their power and authority, and being able without any hereditary rulers to found a government that might bo said to bo the glory of their race. They saw the same thing in the Continent of Europe. They go to France, and they saw there the growth of a power among the people such as the past has not yet witnessed. What were they to say to all this? They saw' in every country where-ever they were, throughout the world, what was termed democracy among them; whether it be good or bad it was hero, and it was their duty carefully to look at its aims, to try and discover the moans it uses to obtain these ends, and to ask themselves what is their duty? They were placed on a vantage ground. Many of them had come from older countries, and with them had brought not only the laws of older countries, but they had also brought their customs and their habits and their modes of thought with them, and it was impossible that they who had been born in older lands could come to this country and forget their past. They brought the ideas and principles of older lands, and in that respect they might be said to be burdened—carrying the burdens of the past, for they could not get rid of their past history, and with it they were burdened, when they attempted to solve any new problem in government or sociology, and they must never forget that they had been trained in a social state to which they were unaccustomed here Happily they came from a country that was in many respects not a democratic country. They saw in England the history of the past. They saw there the power of hereditary rulers. They saw among those who were educated a reverence for hereditary rulers. They saw a flunkeyism of the past, and it could not bo expected that all their flunkeyism had yet vanished. It took a good deal to forget the country from whence they came. He remembered a story—he

would not state where the *locale* was—two or three Germans newly arrived wished to see their Consul, as it was necessary to procure his signature so as to be able to draw some money from a bank. When they were ushered into his presence they bowed themselves in from the door to his august present, much to the disgust of the Consul, who was an old colonist. They had not forgotten their old world training. Two or three years later they had again business with their Consul, but their bearing on that occasion was very different; there was not bowing and scraping, they smiply shook his hand and enquired after his health—they had become colonized. They who had come from older lands could not get rid of the past, and not getting rid of their past history there was the more need for their seeing that if there were any wrongs in New Zealand the Government of the people must see to them, and if the Government do not see to them it would be the people's own blame. They should look democracy in the face and ask what were its aims, and how were they to carry them, and glance at some of the dangers to which it was liable. He wished to way one word about what might be termed the two political parties—or the standpoint from which all political questions must be discussed. They did not have that tolerant feeling to their fellow colonists which they should have. Though a thing might be plain and demonstrable to them, it might have two sides, and to-night he purposed to say a word about that. They had the Conservative party and they had a Liberal party. He admitted that there was great good in a Conservative party. The Conservative party looked to the past, and asks that the institutions that has brought the race to its present state of development shall not bo altered. The whole of its point of view is continually to the past. It thinks the institutions under which we have lived are suitable for and and our development, and that all change is bad. That is the Conservative attitude. It desires not to change for mere change, and it desires as far as possible to preserve every forward step, and will not ask for change That is the attitude of the Conservative party, and it is a great promise for the future in this respect—when the race learns anything—it may be a mere habit—it is difficult to change that character. There is hope for all reformers, for if a bad thing is bad to change so a good thing is difficult to change, and you have some hope that it will continue in that habit, even if it be good. That is the attitude of the party, and he did not deny that the Conservative party was necessary for the race. But what was the attitude of the Liberal party in viewing this question of democracy. Its attitude is this—it points to the past, and says there has been immense progress, and the government that suited our fathers will not suit us. Were they never to advance in the science of government—they had advanced in all the sciences and in all the arts. The Liberal says no, as everything has grown, as all sciences, all arts have grown, with the sciences and arts government must grow, to keep pace with the sciences and arts. If that be the attitude of the Liberal, let us see something of the true aims of democracy. They might be all summed up in one, though he should look at them in three aspects. The whole science of government, the whole of education, the whole of arts, what is it all for? Why do we have scientific men spending their nights and days to worm some secret from Nature. He replied it was to raise the race, and that should be the only true aim of all true governments, and when they heard people sneering at politicians talking about the human race ho said, whatever that man's head might bo his heart was not right. He submitted that the true man was able at times to sacrifice himself and fight for the good of humanity, and when they got a politician studying himself or his district or his constituency, and not going higher than that, he was not fighting the fight for a good democracy. The three points were, raising the race, raising the individual, and perfecting the State. Here came in what has been practically the difficulty of all Governments, the right of the State and the right of the individual. The whole object of a State was to produce the perfect man, and that Government, that state of society that could produce the most perfect type of manhood, was the State that was fulfilling its proper function, hence it was that there was always the see-sawing between the rights of the race and the individual on the other hand. What was all Nature doing? All Nature was struggling to produce something good. If they went to a hospital, if they went to an asylum, if they went to a gaol—he did not allude to what was the result of accident, but ho alluded more especially to what was the result of chronic weakness—what did they see there. What was meant by prisoners in a gaol, or patients in a lunatic asylum? They might be likened to the chips falling from a turning-lathe—all working to produce the perfect man. Whenever a law of nature was broken, when they did not pay attention to their health, they were physically injured, and if they were physically injured the injury was not only to the individual but to the State; and these were the chips, not perhaps that they suffered for their own misdeeds, but they learned now that they must suffer for the deeds of their fathers and grandfathers. Nature says she will not allow her laws to be disobeyed, hence it is that they saw in our gaols, hospitals, and asylums such an amount of social wreckage, and here came in the question that struck at the root of the matter, and said that the individual who neglected the laws of health should not inflict an injury on the race. They must see that their moral feelings were not outraged. Man was not only a being with an intellect, but a being with a moral nature, and if they neglected the cry of the sick, if they neglected the cry of those who were mentally deranged, they were not doing such an injury to the mentally deranged but to the community, for they were shocking their moral sense. Whenever they found the cry of the sick and the deranged were not crying in vain, they could always guage the moral superiority of that community. He would point out that they had in all countries that vast problem of social

wreckage. Did they think, with all the progress of science and education, that there were no problems to solve by their reformers of government. Though there was a vast amount of wealth in England, something like eight billions of wealth—nearly nine billions in 1882—the wealth of England could be reckoned at £250 per head, while two hundred years ago it was only £109 or less than half. Yet, let them consider the state of England with all its wealth. Out of every 100 persons there were only 31 above actual want, below the 31 there were some who were struggling for a living. What did that mean? They would find nearly a million of paupers were receiving actual workhouse relief, and on the verge of starvation there were many. So that in England at all events the great problem of how to raise the race had not yet been solved, and if they thought what above want meant in England, what they would call above want in the colonies was different to what they meant in England. If they told people in this colony that a certain thing was sufficient food for them, they would be loud in their complaints. This question of the aim of democracy—the raising of the race—this problem is very far from solution, and at the same time the raising the individual, for if the individual was not raised the race could not be raised, had still to be solved. Democracy has certain limits—it has, for example, been said by an eminent American that wheat will not grow without some form of government. In every society, in every state, there must be some safety for a man's earnings, for if a man does not know ho will reap a field, what would be the use of sowing it. There must be some form of police, and there must be something else also, there must be the basis of all government and all true democracy, there must bo equality of conditions. That is a question that raises several others. What is meant by equality of conditions. You will see that there can be no government of the people if some favored persons are allowed different conditions to others. What is meant by equality of conditions? It means this—it does not moan that all men arc equal. If you go into any field Nature is diverse. If you go into any crowd of people, no two men are alike; they have not like natural or moral instincts, and no government can make them equal. Equality in that sense is an impossibility. One shall count as one, and no one count two in the State. This means that so far as government is concerned the Government must look upon one man as one man. And this brings in the consideration of what may bo termed—what is it the Government has to look after, to look after the mere preservation of peace, the mere preservation of order in the State. The Government has to look after other things. There are other things they would not allow any set of men to control, the air they breathed for example. That was necessary for the health of the State, and no State could exist if it allowed any one set of men to control anything that was the life of the State—he meant its land, and he would show them why. For example, if you say that the land is to be left to individual competition, and the State is to exorcise no control over it, you would give control of the State to individuals. Within this fifty miles or that hundred miles he who has the control of the land has the control of the State, and hence it is you will find, if you read past history, that they always put the possession of landed property in a different position to other property. And what ought the State to do in dealing with land? If the State by any law it passes tends in the slightest degree to weaken individuals, if it tends to destroy in the slightest degree the desire of saving which should be implanted in every one of us, if it tends to destroy in the slightest degree the desire of improving land, that would bo an injury to the State. and interfering in the possession of land, without interfering with this property of the individual. For example, in this colony, if the State had kept a great deal of its land in its own hands and leased it, would it not be far richer than it has been in the past. He knew that this was of slow growth, though twelve years ago he held the same opinion. He stated then that at all events our pastoral lands should not be sold but leased, at the same time giving every encouragement to the lessee to improve the land, He got few to support him, but they found a Government that did not purport to be a Liberal Government, that five years ago, perhaps less, would have refused to receive this, would have condemned it as socialism, gladly accepting such a compromise, and allowing State lands to be leased. The people were beginning to be aware of this fact, that land was unlike all other property; no man created the land, it was the mother of all property, for with the control of the land you have the control of the State and the control of the people of the State, and that was one thing that democracy had set its face against. If they go to England, if they go to Ireland, if they go to Scotland, when the whole of the State lands had been parted with, it was then that the true land question begins, it was then that the consequences were seen of allowing individuals to have control of the land, which was giving them all power, which was utterly destructive of true democratic influence, which was destructive of the equalities of life. He might say that Laveleye, in his book on Primitive Property, puts forth a warning voice to those colonies urging them s0 to frame their laws, and especially form their system of government that the evils of the land system of Europe may not become our evils hero. He thought the land question ought to be different from other property, because of the danger of what might be called socialism. What was the root of socialism? He apprehended that socialism was fighting against the individual. Socialism said this, that man ought to be equal in conditions, not merely relatively to the State, but to each other—the ultra school says everything is to be put into one purse. He said that whatever it might be in the future the race was not ripe for such a condition, and ho went further and submitted to them that, if by any means they could accomplish socialism for one day, they would injure the race in a way they could not

conceive of. Individual liberty and freedom make a race great, and socialism is the opposite of individual liberty and freedom, and such was found in those countries where the State had done the most for the people, and where the State was continually interfering in every walk of life. Where do you find the highest humanity? It is the place, the country where the people are urged to self-reliance, where they depend on their own exertions, and where they are not taught to rely on the arm of the State. If time would permit he could point out to them countries all over the world where such existed. Contrast for a moment a modern Yankee with an Austrian, see the difference between the men. Leave the former on a desert island—he would do something. If you

take a person who has been taught to rely on the State for everything through life, you will find that that individual loses his self-reliance, and that is one of the dangers of democracy. The training of the people to rely on the Government for everything was wrong. They must not increase the functions of the Government, but limit them. Tell the people the Government can do very little for them. Their only hope of progress, their only hope of true freedom, was to rely on themselves, and everything the State did to weaken that self-reliance was an evil to the race and the individuals of the State. Let him say another danger of true democracy was the having a "down" on wealth. Ho submitted to them, if all the colony were to be thrifty, what a different colony it would be. Suppose that there was no waste, if they had not their drinking customs, that there was no waste in their way of living, they would not require any National Insurance schemes, for they would have no poor in their midst, and he went even further, they could only have the highest degree of civilisation where they had wealth. What did they mean by capital? Every person had capital, and such was wealth. And without capital, without wealth, they could accomplish little in this world. They could have no art, no painting, no high culture, without wealth, and the Democrat must see that all these things must be attended to. The race would be a poor race if there was no music, no painting, no high art in the world. Every true democracy would do nothing that would discourage saving; it ought to do everything possible to encourage savings. What did poverty come from? Accident? Not only from accident, but from hereditary causes. If they saw a weaklings born into the world, they knew it would not be able to strive with the stronger. So in our gaols you will find among the prisoners some are there from hereditary cause, perhaps their father was a criminal, and so with the lunatics in our asylums, physically and morally they are deranged. In our hospitals you will find the same thing. They could not get rid of poverty, but the only hope lies in this, that you raise the individual and you teach each individual that it is not on the State he must rely, but on his own exertion, and if they did that they would have thrift in the colony, and some hope of lessening the large amount of poverty they had here. He must allude to another point. There was no short road to progress—there was no short road to any thing in this world. If they wished to get a good breed of .sheep or a new flower developed, it must come from patient working. They must not imagine they could get rid of the evils of democracy by a mere change of the franchise or alterations of districts. No reform ever came by such means. They found, for example that their habits and modes of thought were the result of many preceding conditions, and they could not get rid of the past all at once. Take one of the customs against which he was waning. They were aware that he was a temperance man, but he would say this—he recognised to the full, that there could bo no change to teetotalism at once. And any person who thinks that they can get the people to be temperate at once should remember that the customs we have are the customs of centuries; he would find that those drinking customs have come down to them from thousands of years, and how can anyone change a habit that had taken thousands of years to grow. The very fact that once a habit was formed gave them hope for the future; it gave them this hope, that if they could only got the race trained to a good habit, it would keep to it. He would point out another thing that was a danger to democracy—and that was, in imagining the State could do everything, and that was specially applicable to our colony. If they could only go into the money market at Homo and borrow a million they thought they had performed some great feat; they forgot that every additional million borrowed meant increased taxation for the colony to bear—so much money taken out of the savings of the people for the Government. True democracy was that form of government which would take the least possible from the people. If the people were thrifty and self-reliant they could make better use of the money than any Colonial Treasurer they wort over likely to have could. Ho would very briefiy point out to them some other things. He had pointed out to them very briefly some of the aims of democracy, some of the dangers to which every democracy was exposed, and what means they must employ to have a true democracy in their midst. There were to bo no privileges; they were to lay down this rule—every man must count as one, and he submitted there must be no privileges to any class. They must take great care that their legislation was so shaped as to preserve this for the future. There was a cloud; it might be no bigger than a man's hand—they had introduced into the colony of Now South Wales and into Victoria hereditary titles. It might be a small thing to give to wealth hereditary baronetcies, but it was a blow struck at true democracy, it was training colonists to think that one man was not to count as one. He would recognize a colonist's services to his fellows, but every public man should think how his fellow colonists tried him and how his fellow colonists revered him; but if they introduced this system of hereditary privileges they were striking a blow at true

democracy, and he hoped that they would see such was stopped. There were things the people must keep before them—they must have true loyalty. When ho mentioned the word loyalty he did not mean loyalty to a person, ho meant loyalty to the state and the laws. Many of them would remember the loyalty of individuals to the Stuarts, who looked on the Hanoverians as interlopers. That was a kind of loyalty that was now passing away. If they only had enthusiastic loyalty to the State they would have a very different form of Government—every individual would look upon the affairs of Government as dearer to him than if they were his own. How often did they hear—Oh, it was Government money. What an advance it would be if every individual did his duty, thought of what he was doing, struggled to perform one of the highest functions of the State, so that there should be truth and justice in society. Every individual giving his vote, unbiassed by personal feeling, or by district feeling, but thought his highest aim was to perform that sacred trust, that he was to cast that vote as if the whole success of the colony depended upon him. If they had voters going into the polling booth with such a feeling they would have in the colony a better government than the had ever yet seen and in following out the idea of true loyalty to the State, determine, as ho had again and again repeated, that one man must count as one, and how could that be done? He believed they had in their midst an engine that was accomplishing that in a way that none of them could see—he alluded to the Education system. He called them common schools—because they were open to all creeds, they were open to all races, they were opon to all classes in the community. The children of different nationalities, the children of parents of different creeds could all meet at that common platform and be trained as true citizens of the State. And if they so use their educational system they would never impose restrictions on any man because of his race. He was afraid that they had done that in the past. He was afraid, if they looked at the Statute Book, they would find there what their children and children's children would ever turn to with regret and say, our fathers erred in so treating the native race. They had not treated all creeds or all men alike. They might depend upon it, whenever they disturbed the equalities of condition, whether it be of race or social position, they were sowing the seeds of evil; they would bear fruit, and such fruit would tend to destroy their democracy. As colonists they had brought with them many of their older laws. They had entrusted to the people the fullest freedom in all political matters. Every man ought to take some interest, and had a right to take some share in the Government of the country. What was the standpoint of our fathers compared with ours. If they referred to past European history, if they read of the glories of Greece and Rome, of Germany and England, even in the free-est of the Greek republics there was a slave class. Two classes did not count as one. Here they were on a vantage ground. There was a time in our past when the mighty man was the fighting man; there was a time when the mighty man was the intellectual man. He believed the time would come when the highest man will not be the fighting man, will not be the intellectual man, but the highest man will be the man who has the highest amount of moral heroism. And what did moral heroism mean? It meant this, that each will be prepared to do some self-sacrifice for his race, or the society, or the community in which he dwells, and ho told them there was no hope for the trne democracy unless they had the electors fired with some of that enthusiasm. It was to the electors they must look, and not to the party leaders It was to each individual voter they must look. Each time that ho is called upon to perform his function, not only in voting for the Assembly, not only in the municipal election, but in every path of life, he must set before himself that he has more to accomplish than mere self-aggrandisement; he will accomplish but little, but if the electors be fired with moral enthusiasism, anxious to do what is right, they would have a true democracy that would accomplish more than had ever been accomplished by any State or Government in the past. They who termed themselves Liberals did not look to the past; they admitted its glories, and its services, but they had hope in the future; they looked for a finer race of men, a higher form of government, a better elector than the world has yet seen, and if some of them talked about the human race they were recognising that each one had his part to play in this world, and except he did something to elevate humanity, unless ho did something to elevate the race, ho was not playing his part right. Do not sneer at the man who is striving to raise the human race; he is doing far more than the man who is trying to increase his bank balance. If there was any constituency in the colony that sneered at such a man it was doing something to stop progress, that constituency was doing something that was telling against truth and freedom in the world. One word more, and it was this—look at political questions, without bias, never be swayed by personal considerations. There were questions of eminent consideration to every district, and he would think little of him who neglected his own district, for after all family life was the true basis of their civilization. Just as a man looks after his own family it was his duty to look after the things of his own community, and if he did not he was not looking after the race. But the lesser must give way to the greater, and they should not forget that true democracy urged them to look to the future. He hoped those who came to this colony would not be content with the evils of the civilization of Europe, but would determine as far as in them lay to mould the constitution of this colony that the colony should be far ahead of the land they had left behind, and that they could only do by keeping before each one of them the duty of following truth and justice. The man in your community who ignores politics as beneath him, that man is no true citizen; that man is not performing his function; that man has some selfish object in view. But if you get a man who is doing his

best to help his brother man, he will be worshipped in a true democratic community, and be revered more than the fighting man of the past. He would conclude by quoting a few words from an old poet, that put the matter more pithily than he could do:—

Take thou no thought for aught save right and truth,
Life holds for finer souls no equal prize;
Honours and wealth arc baubles to the wise,
And pleasure flies on swifter wing than youth.

* * * * * * *

Take thou no care for aught save truth and right,
Content, if such thy fate, to die obscure;
Wealth palls, and honours, Fame may not endure.
And loftier souls soon weary of delight.
Keep innocence; be all a true man ought;
Let neither pleasures tempt, nor pains appal;
Who hath this, hath all things, having naught,
Who hath it not, hath nothing, having all.

—Mr Stout sat down amid loud, and continued applause.

Mr T. Tanner then rose and said he had much pleasure in moving a hearty vote of thanks to Mr Stout for his able, instructive, and eloquent lecture. He (Mr Tanner) had felt it a great privilege to listen to such an intellectual treat, and he had no doubt the audience felt the same. There was one point he wished to refer to, and that was that democracy must not arrogate to itself the sole right or power of raising the minds of the people. Great as was democracy, and as much as it might aim to elevate the people, it must not be understood that these were the attributes of democracy alone. He (Mr Tanner) held that Conservatism also sought to elevate the people. The aim of Conservatism was also the progress and well-being of all classes of the community. He did not himself pose as a Conservative, but as a Liberal. Still he thought Conservatism deserved a good word. He hoped they would give a good British "Hurrah" in answer to the proposition. Mr Tanner here led off the applause, which was enthusiastically taken up by the entire audience, the cheering continuing for some time.

Mr John Begg rose to second the motion amid applause, and in so doing hoped that something would be made of Toryism yet. He hoped Mr Stout would re-enter the House, and extirpate Vogelism root and branch.

The Chairman then put the motion. He said that some of the Conservatives were very good fellows, and ho would oppose their being annihilated all at once. The difference between a Liberal and a Conservative was that the one moved of his own volition, and the other was moved by the strong pressure of public opinion.

The motion was then earned unanimonsly.

Mr Stout moved a vote of thanks to the chairman, which was carried by acclamation, and the proceedings terminated.

vignette

Printed at the "Daily Telegraph" Office, Tennyson Street, Napier,

University Education.

Supplement to "N.Z. Journal of Education," April, 1917.

Address by Sir Robert Stout, Chief Justice, Chancellor of the University of New Zealand,

delivered before the Congress of the New Zealand Educational Institute at Wellington, 5th January, 1917.

MY time is limited, and I must therefore, without any introduction, plunge *in medias res.* I am to speak of our University Education. The first question that must be considered is: What is the position of our University? It is (*a*) a Federal Institution, and *(b)* it is a Secular Institution. I think we must clearly apprehend these two things before we can speak about its functions.

There are four teaching University institutions in our Dominion—one at Auckland, one at Wellington, one at Christchurch, and one at Otago. The functions of the University are limited. It has nothing to do with the administration of the teaching institutions. It grants degrees, awards scholarships, and gives certificates. The Colleges may teach how and what they please; their individuality cannot be interfered with by the University, and if there is a failure in our teaching in University subjects, the blame cannot be cast upon the New Zealand University. For many years to come, in my opinion, we must have the present system of a Federal University, and four or more teaching Colleges. New Zealand has not the population nor the means to have four or more complete University institutions. I recognise that amongst English people it is always difficult to maintain federalism in any form. There is for ever a struggle for what has been called central or unity government. We saw this in New Zealand when our Provincial system was abolished. It was a federal system. It had its imperfections, no doubt, but it was swept away, and no local institutions substituted for the Provinces. This is not surprising when one remembers that federalism seems foreign to English people. In Australia, federalism is being tried, and though it has only been established since the beginning of this century, there is already a struggle in progress to weaken the federal institutions—the States. Bit by bit it would appear as if the Central Government was obtaining more power. It may be that one of the causes of the continual unrest in Ireland, and the continued struggle for Home Rule, were caused by the want of the federal idea amongst English people. Federalism succeeds in Switzerland; it has also succeeded in America, and there are cravings now amongst many people for some kind of federalism to be applied to the British Empire.

Next, we have to consider that our University is a secular institution. It has nothing to do with the differing and different religious opinions of the people. It must, therefore, steer clear of recognising distinction in theological matters. It cannot give theological degrees. Were it to give such degrees, the Colleges would have to become teachers of dogmatic theology, or .else denominational Colleges would have to be affiliated to the New Zealand University. This would mean the destruction of a national system of education, and the inauguration of a denominational system. We know what denominational systems have done in the past for education, and how in the countries that have exalted theology and theological training, that secular training has not been effective. I need not give illustrations.

Our University can no doubt influence the training which is given in Colleges by giving degrees and certificates on certain requirements. The framing of a syllabus for our degrees will influence to a considerable extent the teaching in the Colleges, but unless degrees are required, there is no interference whatever with any teaching that the Colleges may think necessary for their students. They are free to do as they please. There was a time in some countries when degrees were considered of little value. What was considered the main thing was the education received, and Colleges may now give certificates of their own for success in any studies. This has been done in the past in Otago in the Mining School, and in Auckland in the Music School, and perhaps in agriculture in the Agricultural College at Lincoln.

The question of education is now being debated throughout our Empire in a manner in which it has never been considered before. In England, in Scotland, in Ireland, and in the Colonies there is widespread discussion regarding our future education. Is our education the best suited for the people? That is one question asked, and how is it to be developed or improved is another question asked. The University teaching institutions have to provide for two things: they have to give the highest education possible to our sons and daughters, and, second, they have to attempt to fit them for their social, political and industrial life. Necessarily, they have to deal with fewer students than those who enter our primary and secondary schools. We have to recognise that there are many of our young people unsuited for higher studies. To keep them attempting to study in our Colleges would be a waste of their energy. They are fit for social and industrial life, but may be entirely unfit for the study of the highest education. The unfit are found amongst all classes in the community; some are the children of poor men, some are the children of rich men. It is not a question either of physical health or endowment, or of material endowment, by having wealthy parents. It is a question of individual ability. How can you separate

those who are fit to benefit by the highest education and those who would be wasting their time in attempting to attain it? In my opinion you can only do so by examination. If a boy or girl is fit to obtain and to utilise the higher education, the halls of learning should be open to him or her, and if he or she is not fit, it is a mistake to attempt to teach those not fitted for higher studies. This was recognised hundreds of years ago. John Knox, when he was dealing with national education, pointed this out. He desired that those who were fit for University education should be trained in what we term the highest study, and those who were not fit should seek public service in other directions. And what has been said about University students may also be said about boys and girls enter-ing secondary schools. There is no use in sending a boy to study secondary school subjects if he is not fit to do so. It is a waste of his time and a waste of energy on the part of the secondary school teacher. If, however, children are fit for secondary schools, or fit for University institutions, in my opinion the education for those who are fit should be just as free as it is for the primary school.

The next question is; What are the subjects that will have to be taught in our Universities? There is a great contest going on at present between those who desire a literary education to be made pre-eminent and those who desire a scientific education exalted. There are also some who desire what may be called a vocational education, that is, that all the teaching should have for its aim and object not so much the training of a man or a woman as the training of a person for some special vocation in life. Controversy regarding these three aspects of education—the literary, the scientific and the vocational—is taking up much space in educational journals.

Dealing with these three, it will have to be recognised that the highest object of education is the teaching of a person to be an efficient member of society. We should expect each member of society to be engaged in the service of man. He or she must never forget that he or she is a member of a society or community, and that the community looks to all its members to be efficient, and to have as their ideal of life the service of man. We cannot, in my opinion, when a student enters the University, determine what the vocation of the student must be. He or she may change his or her vocation from time to time. We have, however, to make provision for some vocational training. Some students will aim at being professional men, and some must be prepared for industrial work. We need skilled captains of industry. We will require, so long as we have war in the world, efficient warriors. We have to make preparations for such vocations; but at the same time we should never forget that if a man or woman has a good literary education or a good scientific education, vocational education is far more easily obtained than if there had not been this prior literary and scientific training.

The educational outlook has changed within the past century. We now recognise that people may be highly trained and become great scholars who may not be linguists. At one time literature dominated us, and the requirement of languages—of dead languages mainly—was looked upon as perhaps the sole test of scholarship and of intellectual eminence. That day has passed. The number of subjects in higher education is large, and we cannot do what was done in the past—confine the attention of our students to four or five subjects, and give degrees to those who excel in those subjects only. Our programme of studies must be wide; we must provide for rewards of excellence to those who excel in different branches of learning. Step by step this is being recognised, and the recent proposals that have been made in New Zealand are in the direction of a greater freedom in selecting courses of studies by students. We will not compel a pass in Latin or Greek or Mathematics; all that will be asked in the future will, I believe, be that there is some proof of literary excellence, or some proof of scientific knowledge; in fact some proof by examination of the student having been intellectually trained. If we recognise this, the question will arise: Can a man be said to be intellectually trained who knows nothing of the methods of modern science? I do not think so, and, in my opinion, we will have to insist that at some time in the career of every student who desires recognition by a University he must show that he knows something of scientific method and of the scientific outlook of the universe. I would not consider any person entitled to a degree in a University who knows nothing about the doctrine of evolution, and who knows nothing of the world in which we dwell. This scientific training can be got, no doubt, from the study of different sciences, from biology, or from chemistry, or from astronomy, or from geology, or from mental science, etc. Some scientific training will have, I believe, to be compulsory. So also there ought to be some proof before a person gets a University degree that he is able to use his own language as an instrument of thought, and of utterance, and perhaps some other language so that the grammar of a language may be thoroughly appreciated.

There must be an opening for vocational courses such as a student may desire. A student may specialise in botany, and in chemistry if an agriculturist is to be the student's vocation. One who desires to be an engineer will be able to specialise in mathematics and in engineering. A law student will be able to study law; a doctor, medicine; an accountant, accountancy, and so on, etc., etc. But, above everything, the University student must strive to become an efficient member of society. Efficiency will be tested not by knowledge only, but by what the student has done or can do. Efficiency is the necessity of our day and generation. A student should also show that he or she has what we term "common-sense." I believe that one thing that has made our University institutions unpopular is that people have got the idea that a University student may obtain degrees and

certificates of competency, and yet be devoid of common-sense. You see this popular belief illustrated in many directions. I was reading the other day an American novel which is said to have had no less than between seven and eight million copies in circulation. In this novel is the following passage:—" If schooling or culture, or whatever you choose to term it, is permitted to rob one of the fundamental and essential elements of life, it is most certainly an evil. I tell you I have seen cow-punchers that was mighty good men, an' I have seen graduates from them there Universities that was plumb good for nothin', with no more real men about 'em than there is about one of those wax dummies that they sling clothes on in the store windows. What any self-respectin' woman can see in one of them that would make her want to marry 'im is more than I 'ave ever been able to figure out."

I give this quotation as showing the popular opinion about Universities. I might quote many other authors to the same effect. We know as a fact that many people obtain high distinctions in Universities who have no common-ssnse. It is difficult for a University to gauge this qualification, but it is a necessary equipment for everyone in our social life. A University cannot do everything. It must specialise, and a man and a woman will have to gain "common-sense" in the University of the world, or, as an American put it, in the "University of hard knocks."

Is the task of the University and its associated Colleges accomplished when a student may obtain the highest literary, scientific, or vocational education in the halls of learning provided for University purposes in our Dominion? An eminent Professor in Cambridge has drawn attention to the motto of the New Zealand University,—" *Aude*"—" Dare to be Wise," and he has said that that should be the goal of every student. The University has, therefore, not only to keep the torch of learning alight, but it has to ever proclaim the sovereignty of reason, to aid in the search for truth, and to encourage the getting of wisdom, These are the things that count in the life of a nation. The human race has journeyed a long road since the days of the Cave men, and it has a longer journey yet to travel. It carries with it the burdens and ignorances of the past, and both inside and outside of our University "Reason" is not yet installed as a ruler. We remember what Hamlet says:

"What is a man,
If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed?—a beast, no more.
Sure he that made us with such large discourse,
Looking before and after, gave us not
That capability and god-like reason
To fust in us unused."

Are we guided by reason in our beliefs or in our actions? Who can say so? Do we reverence truth and exalt it above all other things? Since the development of science during the past hundred years we have seen a great advance not only in the knowledge of the universe, but in the standard of human living. Science has taught us that truth must prevail. There is no room for falsehood in our scientific laboratories. The moral effect of science has been great, and it will' transcend even the effect of the study of the humanities. Truth is the basis of morality, and it rests with the University to so, exalt those ideals of life that they may become the guides of our people.

vignette

S. N. Brown & Co., Printers, 263 Princes Street, Dunedin.

At the Capping Ceremony in connection with Victoria College at Wellington, on June 30, the Chancellor of the New Zealand University (Sir Robert Stout) delivered the following address:

I have much pleasure at again presiding at the graduation ceremony of the University in connection with the students of Victoria College.

Appreciatory Notes.

Before I deal with one or two subjects on which I propose to speak, I wish to refer to the death of the late Professer Cook, of Canterbury College. He was one of the first professors of Canterbury College, and he was for many years a member of the Senate of the University. He was appointed in 1884 to a seat on the Senate, and he was a senator until 1908, when he resigned. I can say of Kim that during all the time he was in the Senate he was ever careful, and anxious to do what could be done for the promotion of our University. It is not for me to speak of his teaching abilities, but I am sure his old students will never forget the able and arduous way in which he performed his duties. Many of his students obtained the highest honors obtainable in our University in

mathematics, and throughout his whole career he ever showed great devotion to his profession, and a sincere regard for the welfare of all those who came under his tuition. I am sure that there ip no one connected with the University but who was grieved to hear of his break down in health, and his ultimate death, and that his family, whom he has left, has the deepest sympathy of all connected with education in New Zealand. I think I ought also to mention that we are about to lose the services of Mr Joynt as registrar. He will, however, remain connected with the University, as he has undertaken to perform the duty of Home agent in London. Speaking on behalf of myself—and I am sure I am only echoing the sentiments of other members of the Senate—Mr Joynt's absence from our future meetings as Registrar will be much regretted. We hope, however, that he may serve tie University for many years in his position in London. I am glad that I am able o congratulate Victoria College on having done good work during the past year. Many students have distinguished then pelves, some have obtained scholarships, and I have no doubt many have obtained the education that will fit them for their work in life. Of late there has been sone discussion about

University Reform.

This is a perennial subject in all universities, and therefore it is not surprising that it should be mentioned in New Zealand. We are all aware of what Her Teufelsdrockh thought of the university where he was educated. He said:

The university where I was educated still stands vivid enough in my remen-brance, and I know its name well; which name, however, I, from tenderness to existing interests and persons, shall in nowise divulge. It is my painful duty to say that, out of England and Spain, ours was the worst of all hithero discovered universities. This is, indeed, a time when right education is, us nearly as may be, impossible. Howeve, in degree of wrongness there is no limit; nay, I can conceive a worse system than that of the Nameless itself: as poisoned victual may be be worse than absolue hunger.

It is written; When the blind lead the blind, both shall fall info the [*unclear:* ditci.] Wherefore, in such circumstances, may it not sometimes be safer if both leader and led simply—sit still? Had you anywhere in Crim Tartary, walled in a square enclosure, furnished it with a small, ill-chosen library, and then turned loose into it eleven hundred Christian striplings, to tumble about as they listed, from three to seven years: certain persons, under the title of professors, being stationed at the gates to declare aloud that it was a university, and exact considerable admission fees—you had, not indeed in mechanical structure, yet in spirit and result, some imperfect resemblance of our high seminary. I say imperfect; for if our mechanical structure were quite other, so neither was our result quite the same. Unhappily, we were not in Crim Tartary, but in a corrupt European city, full of smoke and sin; moreover, in the middle of a public which, without far costlier apparatus than that of the square enclosure, and the declaration aloud, you could not be sure of gulling.

Gullible, however, by fit apparatus, all publics are; and gulled with the most surprising profit. . . .

The hungry young (he says further on) look up to their spiritual nurses, and for food were bidden to eat the east wind. What vain jargon of controversial metapaysic etymology, and mechanical manipulation, falsely called science, was current there, I indeed learned, better perhaps than most.

Though the quotation is not very flattering to what was. I suppose, meant to be a criticism of the methods of the University of Edinburgh, we have to remember that at the period at which Carlyle wrote that University turned out many able men who were heard of in the world, and not the least among the number was Thomas Carlyle himself. Perhaps if he had not been educated in the University of Edinburgh he would not have reached the position he occupied in the literary world. Some months ago there was published in England a rather interesting book by Lord Curzon, in the form of a memorandum to the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, on the need of reform in that old University; and Professor Percy Gardiner published' some years before—in 1903 a little work called 'Oxford at the Crossroads,' in which he criticised the course of litteræ humaniores in the University of Oxford. Of late the University of Cambridge has been engaged on the question of reform in that University. I presume that the professors of Victoria College have kept in touch with what has been done and is being done in

University Reform in Europe.

I found in. England that there was no complete satisfaction with their existing institu-tions, and discussions as to reform were active. Some people, I know, amongst us think that the Welsh have been able to found, in the University of Wales, an institution that we should copy, and that it is the final word that has been said in university institutions. I found, on reading the newspapers in England, that many of the Welsh people were not

content with their present institutions, and at one of the meetings in Wales the discussion was heated, and what appeared to me to be much exaggeration was manifested in the debate, but I suppose that even at reform meetings exaggeration—a frailty of humanity—Is not always absent. No one, I think, can therefore say that

The Ideal University.

has yet been founded amongst English people. Before we can discuss any reform we must have in our mind some plan or ideal. It would be as hopeless to decide what reform was to be, until we had this plan formulated, as it would be to start building a house without knowing what the building should be. I apprehend that a university should aim at training men and women, and in impairing knowledge to them of many things, and perhaps a full knowledge of one thing. There ought, I think, to be some guarantee that one who has been at a university should have some general culture. A graduate ought not to be one-eyed. A graduate should be able to see more than one thing. To send a student out of a university who can manipulate things—gases, liquids, etc.—as an expert chemist can, may be sending out of a university a very ignorant person. He or she may have gone through a course which Carlyle calls "mechanical manipulation, falsely called science," and yet he or she may be what Carlyle calls "'gullible." If nothing is known of history, nothing of philosophy, and nothing of what is termed humanity, the graduate may be unable to fulfil his or her duty as a citizen in the struggle for life. So, if a student knows only some classical languages and some history, and is ignorant of science, he also would be one-eyed, and have missed a great part of education. The University must therefore provide not merely for training two or three specialists in one or two subjects, but in giving a general culture to students. The great difficulty in university training, considering the vast number of subjects that now claim our attention, is to decide when to specialise and when to allow students to select one or two subjects and ignore all others. Until we can get an agreement on

What the Aim of a University Should Be,

it is hopeless for us to talk about reform, and I regret to say that in the discussions we have had lately, what a university should be seems not to have been kept in view. I recognise that nowadays the most important subjects for consideration are classed under the head of science. In New Zealand we ought ever to keep in view the limitations of our colony, and the need of our young people being trained in science, so that the industries of this colony may be fostered. I believe that a training in science can give as good mental training as the classics, and that if science is something more than a mere "manipulation of matter," it would fit men for the struggle in life better than any other subject they could study. But science so taught must be more than mere laboratory work. You must try and get an idea of the universe, and you must get a conception of the unity of knowledge. I further believe that a training in science is most important to make people truthful, and to make them cease to be "gullible," and that science perhaps of all knowledge will instil into the minds of her students 'an intense and self-sacrificing enthusiasm for truth." But along with science there must go some reference to history, and some reference to humanity, fur we must ever remember that we are not mere individuals, but that wo are members of a society having duties to that society, and we cannot perform our citizen duties properly if the whole of cur attention is directed to any one branch of knowledge. We have to govern ourselves, and we have to help to govern our country; but I do not think we can fitly do so without consideration of 30th history and literature.

A Scheme of Study must be Formulated.

It seems to me, therefore, that the first step that University Reformers should take would be to lay down what should be the scheme of the University studies. It may be that if we allow a person to specialise too soon in any one science we may make him useless as a member of the community. One eminent man, who was a scienlist as well as a philosopher, has said that to obtain a senior wranglership at Cambridge may have to mean an irremediable waste of human strength, useless to the man, and useless to the community, and so may intense specialisation in any one of the sciences, as Bain has pointed out in his book on 'Education as a Science.'

A Comparison of Syllabuses.

Having defined what the aim and goal of University Reform is, the reformer should see wherein the

syllabus fails. I have compared our syllabus with those of all the English, Scottish, and Irish universities, and I confess that I do not think our syllabus is second to any of them. I havealso spoken to university authorities in most of the English and Scottish universities, and from all that I could gather our syllabus is one of which we have every reason to be proud. I believe, however, that it could be made more logical. I think that the science degree should be more strictly a science degree than it is now; but that we cannot get, unless we can obtain Art degrees, that make neither mathematics nor Latin compulsory. I do not know if the professors are prepared to go to that length. I have urged such reform for many years. I also believe that this system of "major" studies, which is in force in many American universities, and which is now in force in a modified form in Edinburgh, might now be adopted by us.

Limitation of Compulsory Subjects Necessary.

But that will fail unless we have our compulsory subjects more limited than they now are. I do not intend, nor have I the time at present, to deal fully with this subject. I would rather now deal very briefly with some of the statements that have been made by those who desire University Reform. So far as I can gather, the main reform demanded, is that the university professors should examine their own students, and if they certify that the students are fit for a degree, a degree should be granted by the New Zealand University If this scheme be adopted, I do not see the need of having a New Zealand University at all Each college would have to grant degrees. New, this is not the tendency of University Reform in England at present. It is not how one of the most recent universities deals with the granting of degrees.

Teachers as Co-examiners.

Let me refer to the University of Wales. It has three University Colleges—one at Aberystwith, one at Bangor, and one at Cardiff—and the law in Wales is that each of the colleges can appoint an examiner in each subject. The University appoints an examiner who is not a teacher at any of the colleges, who is termed an "external" examiner, and no degree can be granted unless the external examiner certifies that a degree should be granted. An article in the charter states that no examiner's report shall be received by the Court unless the external examiners have concurred in the said report I also find that it is quite inaccurate to say that in either Oxford or Cambridge the teachers are the examiners. I have gone carefully through the calendars of Oxford and Cambridge, and I find that there are scores of teachers who are not examiners in both of these universities, and that in all the colleges very few of the teachers are examiners. I take two colleges as an illustration of what exists. They are in what might be called the middle place in Cambridge, and are Emmanuel College and Jesus College, and I find that the tripose, mathematical, classical, moral natural patural! science, theological, law, historical, Hebrew, Oriental languages, modern languages, etc.—that is, out of eleven subjects examined on in Cambridge—Jesus College had only teachers in two of these subjects who were examiners, and Emmanuel College the same—only two subjects in winch they had examiners. I find the same thing at Oxford. Take, for example, the examination in physics there. I find that of the public examiners in physics and mechanics two colleges only were represent ed in the preliminary, and only one college in the final honor examination. It is true that in the Scotch universities the professors and teachers are examiners, but there are external examiners associated with the teachers. The practice is the same in Manchester, Manchester, for example, has fifty-nine external examiners. To say therefore, that in the universities of the world the teachers are always the examiners is absurd.

Some Pertinent Inquiries.

I would like to know exactly what is wanted to be done in New Zealand. Are the four professors, say in Latin, to be examiners in Latin for New Zealand? Is the examination to be approved of by the majority, or must they all concur? It is incorrect to say that our professors do not act as examinees. They are the main examiners in our matriculation examination, and no one can get a degree in the New Zealand University unless he has been passed by the professors, for every student must sit for an examination before his professr—must pass terms, as it called. Further, oral examinations are provided for under our present system. No one can pass in modern languages French and German—unless he has previously passed an oral examination by his professor, and no one can pass in science, in physics, or in chemistry unless he holds I certificate for practical work from his professor. There are, therefore, oral examinations in some subjects in our University, and there is an

examination in every subject by a professor before the student can sit for his degree. I do not think that in we left the whole of the examinations to the professors it would at present be satisfactory, or that our degrees would be more esteemed than they are now. Now, what is the other subject in which it is said that we need reform? I confess I have not yet been able to discover any subject in all the discussion that has taken place; in fact, all the discussion of Reform seems to have centred round

The Question of External Examination.

I look forward to the time when we shall not need to go outside of New Zealand for our examiners. When we get a sufficient number of educated men, accustomed to examine and able to examine, we shall be able to rely on ourselves, and considering the progress we are making as a University the number of students that are distinguishing themselves both here and elsewhere, we may, I hope, soon be able to have local examiners; but that does not mean having only the professors as examiners. It has been said by some that we have

Too Many Examinations.

Perhaps we do. I would like to know if the professors are content to have no entrance examination at all, as was the case long ago in the Scotch universities, and no term or college examinations. Are these to be given up? I confess I do not see why our entrance examination, on being somewhat extended, should not serve as a junior Civil Service examination, and the two examinations in one year, and almost at the same time, which many students in secondary schools have to undergo, might not be made one examination. Examinations for decrees are, in my opinion, necessary. Might I give you a short extract which a young New Zealander in England sent me about two years ago, dealing with the subject of examinations and of professors acting as examiners.

It has been said that cramming should bo discouraged, and so should examinations, and that the students should receive their degrees according to the work they have done. How are you to tell what a man has done if you are not to examine him thoroughly? If there were no examinations, you would lower the standard of your degree to vanishing point. What is meant by work done? Is practical work iiioant?—for that is the only work that a professor knows anything about. And how can the professor tell what the student has really done in practical work even till he tests him in his work? It is common knowledge that the method of practical work varies enormously with different students, and whereas one man can do his work well, and do it so that it sinks in, another will do it in a slovenly manner. It may be slovenly done only so far as his brain is concerned, and so escape the professor's notice, and the very next day he may know nothing about it. Again, practi- cal work is, as a rule, a small matter in comparision with that which must be done by means of lecturefi and bookfi—eispeciaily the latter. With regard to lectures, if a check can be kept over students, yet some may be alert, and work hard to understand the lecturer, whilst others be mentally asleep. Again, what about reading? How is a professor to test what his student has understood in his reading? To abolish examinations would be a splendid method of letting through all the duffers and slow-witted specimens of the University. . . .

And he idds:

Is not ihe result aimed at the aiuouiit of knowledge the student has really absorbed, ai.d the only way you can satisfy yourself that the kudentJ has obtained knowledge is to examine him, nitten exiuninations to be supplemented by practical examinations, to see if he can do his practical work jji'operly. Oral examinations are the least ftatisfactory, as nervous jjien have more often failed in them than in written examinations.

The Value of our University Education Tested.

As to what the effect of University education has been in the past, I think I jnay say this: that the ordinary pass student in our University as a B.A. is just as well educated as the ordinary B.A. in the older Univereities of Britain. In fact, I heard from two of the examiners we had in Britain that in some subjects out New Zealand students were better prepared than students in Home Universities. I wiui informeil that one of the examiners had said that our LL.B.s gave better papers in Koman Law than those who sat for Roman Law in the University of London. Then, again, one examiner in English who was a professor of one of the Universities in Britain said that as a whole the University students examined from Xew Zealand were better prepared than those of the University witli which he was connectecl. We can test the value of our education by the success of our students who leave the University and go to various institutions in Britain, and I venture to say that our graduates are as well equipped as the ordinary pats student of any University anywhere. Our Rhodes scholars, considering their

number, have done better than the German students, and the German students have come from their secondary schools, which, some of the professors say, excel ours.

What New Zealand Lacks.

Of course we have not the advantages of largo institutions like those in America and Europe. We have not the means, we have not the population, and our wealtliy men have not yet risen up to the conception of what their duty should be in helping this young community in giving the highest possible edcation to its citizens. Kvery year in America there are millions of pounds given for University purposes. Tne amount we have got for I'niversity purposes from our weiilthy men is very small. The only gentleman who left us anything large for Victoria College was the late Mr Jacob Joseph, and I hope his name will ever bo revered. He set an example which I had hoped many would ere this have followed. The only other large donation was, I think, that made by the late Mr Arthur Beverly to the Otago University. There are many wealthy men in our midst, and many wealthy citizens have passed away, but you will search our University records in vain to find many benefactions for higher edcation.

The Splendid Example of the United States.

If we consider the private benefactions given yearly to higher education in the United Statee we will see how little wo have done to help University education. Taking the throe past years, I find that the benefactions were in 1907 £4,764,412, in 1908 £5,087,694, in 1909 £3,709,817. But in 1909 there wore large gift, bestowed of which the returns had not been received by the Commissioner of Education when the amount was made up, and which are therefore not included in the amount put down for that year. The average, you will see, for the last three years is nearly four millions—namely, £5,853,974. If we had given at the same rate, according to our population, our average would have been over £40,000. We have not only not got £40,000 each year, but we have not got £40,000 altogether in the thirty-nine years since our first University was opened. I have not included in these benefactions the sums granted to Normal Schools, Dental Colleges, and other educational institutions, nor grants to libraries, museums, etc. There is much need for the development of the enthusiasm for higher education in our midst, and it is to the students of the University that we must look to call that enthusiasm into being.

Printed at the Evening Star Office, Dunedin.

Wanganui Astronomical Society. Annual Meeting, 1907.

Wanganui Astronomical Society.

Annual Meeting.

The fourth annual meeting of the above Society was held at the Observatory on Thursday evening. Present—The President (Mr 11. Sarjeant), Mrs Sarjeant, Messrs J. T. Stewart, T. Allison, C. Babbage, Janies Watt, L. Jones, J. T. Ward, D. E. Hutton, and J. G. Woon (hon. secretary).

The report of the treasurer was read and adopted.

A letter from Sir Robert Stout, acknowledging letter informing him of election to the Society as an hon. life member, was read and received.

The election of officers resulted as follows:—President. Mr John Duncan; vice-presidents. Mr Jas. Watt and Mr J. T. Stewart; hon. secretory, Mr J. G. Woon; hon. treasurer, Mr Lloyd jones; committee, Mrs J. T. Stewart, Mrs Sarjeant. Messrs Elliott, Allison, Atkins, Babbage; hon. director of the Observatory, Mr J. T. Ward; hon. assistant director, Mr T. Allison; hon. auditor. Mr John Fairburn.

Mr G. H. Blackburn was elected a member of the Society.

The President's Address.

"Ladies and Gentlemen,—

We have again to thank our hon. secretary, Mr James G. Woon, and our hon. treasurer, Mr Lloyd Jones, for the very practical interest they have taken during the year in the affairs of the Society. Our financial state is very satisfactory, we having-considerably reduced our debt. We, however, require more money, chiefly for the purchase of other and latest up-to-date aids for our fine telescope, and general up-keep, besides which we

would like to obtain an orrery such as I spoke of last year, which is a machine for easily explaining the first principles of astronomy, and which might be taken round to the chief schools. Our honorary director, Mr J. T. Ward, with his efficient assistant honorary director, Mr Thomas Allison, have during the last year, with unremitting industry, continued the observations of the double stars discovered by them in the south polar heavens. They have also kept a sharp look-out for the sun spots and for all other phenomena among the starry re- gions within their ken. Throe of the members of our Society subscribed sufficient money for the purchase of a spectroscope, and therewith Mr J. T. Ward procured in London a first-class all-round instrument. Unfortunately, however, through some mishap on the part of the ship-ping company, the instrument has not yet arrived in Wanganui, although considerably overdue. This is to be regretted, because there is much work to do with it. The while light seen in the corona of the sun during an eclipse is now found to contain some half dozen unknown chemical elements, so here alone we have a fine field for useful research.

During the last hour of the term of my two years' presidency I desire to say decisively that I firmly believe there are millions of worlds containing more or less all the phenomena of life such as they exist on this earth. My belief is founded on true science, which is based on the example set before us on the world we inhabit. Scientists have been much concerned of late in searching for the origin of life upon this earth. Tyndall said it came from the sun, and should he be correct it must have passed for untold time through white heat. Darwin, with his keen insight and caution, asked the question, "Is there latent vitality in matter?" and should he be right in his conjecture the spectroscope now tells us the elements arc ready in every star of the universe for the evolution of life. Eminent men now say the atom is found to be divisible into 2,500,000 corpuscles called electrons, therefore should the origin of life take place amid these, now called ultimate electrons, it is fairly certain to lie always hidden from the reach of man.

Mr J. T. Ward during our last year's annual meeting, made mention of the bombardment of the earth by streams and shocks of electricity from the sun, and I recollect that some 20 years ago Professor Siemens suggested that this electricity returned to the sun through the poles of the earth, and that the gorgeous colouring and movements of the Aurorae Borealis and Australis were simply the manifestations of these returning electric streams.

Our Astronomical Society is intended to be educational as well as social, therefore we would like to see more visitors at the Observatory, Tuesday and Friday evenings, to witness the telescopic wonders there displayed, and to dis- course there on with our courteous experts, who are always in attendance.

We are especially indebted to Sir Robert Stout for the great interest he has taken in our Observatory, and his delivery of lectures for the benefit of our Society. His last lecture was on Astronomy, and among a host of wonders he described in glowing language the endless stardepths, the amazing size of the stars and their velocity. It is quite true that to our finite minds there is no beginning' and no end of time and space. The exceptionally choice collection of photographic slides which cast so beautifully on the canvas the marvellous pictures of the star-groups and nebulæ were owned and operated by Mr J. T. Ward, our hon. director, and Mr D. Hutton kindly assisted.

During the two years which I have presided over this, our Astronomical Society, I have greatly enjoyed the genial and scientific companionship of those directors and members I have mostly met, and now on retiring I heartily wish the Society in the future every success.

The Hon. Director's Report.

The Honorary Director, Mr J. T. Ward, presented the following report:—

Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen,—With the expiration of our fourth annual session comes the necessity and the pleasure of informing you of the work at the Observatory during the past twelve months. People, at a loss for something to say, generally talk about the weather. To the one seeking to probe the depths of space beyond this planet the condition of that aqueous envelope that surrounds us is a matter of the first importance. During the session just passed we have experienced a great deal of wet and cloudy weather, with the result that very few first-class nights were obtained, and not much work has been accomplished in consequence. Perfectly clear skies and air steady was experienced on only nine nights. Thirty-nine gave us a clear sky, but air somewhat un-steady, classed as second-class nights, when medium results only can be obtained, and one hundred and seven when the clouds were not sufficiently dense to stop observations and air medium. This gives us 155 nights in the year dur ing which work of some kind was accomplished, mostly that devoted to showing the various celestial bodies to your members and visitors. The attendance of members and visitors during' the session totalled 429. This does not reach the total of last year, which was made up by a special week devoted to the public, when over 250 visited the observatory.

The Sun was particularly active during the early part of the session, last October, also on several other occasions, notably during March and July, when many observations of sun spots and faculae were made. The

fine spectroscope generously subscribed for by Messrs Sarjeant, Duncan, and Tawse has not yet come to hand. When in possession of this instrument we hope to be able to make observations of value on the solar prominences and the spectra of other celestial bodies generally.

On December 19th of last year a cable from Mr Barrachi, of Melbourne Observatory, was passed on by courtesy of Mr John Grigg, of the Thames Observatory This referred to Comet B1905, which was "picked up" on the same evening by sweeping over the region indicated, and followed for sixteen evenings, its positions by circle readings recorded, but owing to considerable faintnes and the obtrusive light from gas lamps in the vicinity, no micrometrical measures were obtained.

Mercury has been observed on several occasions, but so far none of those marking's reported by certain European astronomers have been seen.

Venus for some time has been an object of considerable attraction its extreme brilliance exciting curiosity in many to know what it may be like in the telescope. Their first acquaintance with its phases has lead to considerable interest being taken, which we hope will prove permanent and lead to new additions to the congregation. Venus is just now passing that fine red star Antares, the Alpha of the Scorpion, and the contrast in the brilliant white of the planet with the deep red of the star is worth noting. A most interesting phenomenon in connection with Venus and this constellation is due in December next, on the 10th of the month. At that time Venus will occult the star Beta. An occultation of a bright star by a planet is by no means a

For continuation see page 17.

common phenomenon, and all who have access to telescopes should look for it, it is rather unfortunate that it happens with us after sunrise, but as Venus is such a brilliant object at that time the observer will have no difficulty in getting on to the location. We are indebted to Dr Downing, our esteemed fellow member of the British Astronomical Association, for having drawn our attention to this interesting phenomenon.

I have nothing to report of Mars for the past session, but the present one promises to give us a treat in the coming opposition of this planet. Its southern declination at the most favourable position will be 20deg, south. This will give us an altitude on the meridian of about 70deg. above the horizon; to the observer in Great Britain at the same time it will be less than 20 deg. The great advantage to southern observers is obvious, for, as most of you know, every degree of elevation signifies so much less of that medium, fatal to all first-class telescopic work, the atmosphere. We must endeavour, therefore, to show results in keeping with our advantages. At this favourable opposition we expect the photographic methods applied at the Flagstaff Observatory, Arizona, U. S. A., two years ago, will be prosecuted with renewed energy, as a check on all visual observations.

Owing to his northern declination Jupiter has not been seen to the best advantage since the erection of our Observatory. We shall have to wait another year or two before his orbital journey brings him into greater elevation at this station. It was remarked last opposition that his northern equatorial belt had almost entirely vanished. This has reformed again, and is very intense, so that members may expect to have in-teresting views of this planet in the next few months.

Saturn remains one of the most fascinating of objects to members and visitors to the Observatory. Mis ring system, now rapidly closing, still presents a most attractive spectacle, while his fainter satellites arc now seen to greater advantage.

The Moon, as usual, fills the public eye, and in the estimation of the majority of our visitors easily takes first place. Some few exceptionally good nights have been spent with our satellite, when much delicate detail has been noted. This was particularly so on December 2nd, when the region of Frascatorius, near the terminator, was seen to be pitted with innumerable minute craterlets, and the rill east and west across the floor was seen to show considerable detail. At the same time Messier A was observed to have a secondary rampart east of the main enclosure, and a small mound on the floor to the cast of the centre, not seen at any previous observation.

The total eclipse of the 4th and 5th of August was well seen at this station, and several points of interest noted. The shadow came on of a bluish black hue until it reached Copernicus, when it began to assume the usual bright coppery tinge. This increased until total immersion, when it was most marked, the eclipse being an exceedingly bright one. It was noticed that the shadow darkened slightly as the moon reached the centre of the shadow cone, but undoubtedly it was the brightest moon when fairly within he shadow that I have yet seen. The surface was as bright as that portion showing strong earth-shine at first quarter, and all the smaller objects could be easily picked up in the telescope, yet in the earlier stage, when the shadow had advanced as far as Tycho, it was impossible to distinguish Aristarchus. A short report of this eclipse was sent to the British Astronomical Association, it not being visible in Great Britain. A report was received from the Rev. Oscar Blundell, of Central Otago, where fine weather conditions favoured several observers.

Double star observations have been carried on when weather permitted, and several close pairs have been added to our list. Many of those previously found have been re-observed and their positions checked by the micrometer, but, owing to the illumination of same being without means of reduction, no measures of distance

for faint pairs have been made.

By arrangement with Mr H. M. Payne, headmaster of Queen's Park School, the children will be allowed to visit the Observatory at favourable times during the early hours of the evening. They come in charge of the master at about 7.30 and leave about 9 p.m. The telescope is directed upon a number of objectas in turn and an effort is made, as they take their turns at the eyepiece, to convey clear elementary ideas of the different bodies viewed, their constitution, movements, phases, etc., etc. In this way it is hoped to encourage an interest in and a love of astronomy that will grow with their years.

A lecture was delivered by Sir Robert Stout the Chief Justice, on September 14th in St. Paul's Hall. His Honor took for his theme an evening spent at our Observatory. It is needless to say that the lecture proved a most interesting and instructive one, and I am filad that your committee have authorised me to have it printed, with the particulars of our annual meeting. I am sure that many of you who were unable to be present at the lecture will enjoy a perusal of this paper, which is worthy of a very careful reading.

It having been found that visitors to the town, and some of our residents having friends staying with them for a day or so often apply for entry to the Observatory at the beginning of the week, it has been decided to make the open evenings on Tuesdays and Fridays, instead of on Thursdays and Fridays as heretofore. We trust in this way to meet the convenience of members and visitors generally.

Presents have been received from the following Observatories and societies. I am sure you will accord the donors of these valuable gifts a hearty vote of thanks. Received from P. Baracchi, Esq., F.R.A.S., Melbourne Observatory, first catalogue of 1227 stars, and catalogue of 1211 stars. Sir David Gill, F.R.S., Royal Observatory, Cape of Good Hope, catalogue of 1713 stars and catalogue of 3007 stars. The Director. Lick Observatory, California, U.S.A., Lick Observatory Bulletin Nos. 83—99. (When the news of the great Frisco earthquake came to hand our thoughts instantly centred on the Lick Observatory, and fears for its safety were unavoidable. In answer to enquiries the Director, W. W. Campbell, Esq., F.R.A.S., assured me that they had come out of the ordeal uninjured. This is the more remarkable as we learn that the damage at San Jose, only 13 miles directly west of the Observatory, was most severe, as was also the region to the east of the Observatory site. It would almost appear as if the altitude of the Observatory, over 4000 feet, had something to do with it, but this must remain problematical for the present. The force of this notable earth movement may be gathered from the fact that at a point where a road crossed the line of fissure at right angles it was found to have an offset of seventeen feet after the earthquake, while a large tree, standing ex- actly on the east edge of the fissure, is now iwenty-four feet south of its former position, as indicated by the small roots it left behind it, as the side of the fissure on which it stood was carried twenty-four feet to the south by the shearinii motion of the strata along' the great fault line.) Sydney Observatory, latitude of the Sydney Observatory, C. J. Merfield, Esq., F.R.A.S. Provisional Determination of Astronomical Refraction from Observations made with the meridian circle instrument of the Sydney Observatory, by the same author. (Correspondence with this Observatory has been found most helpful; this applies most distinctly, also, to Mr John (Grigg, F.R.A.S., of Thames)'. Leeds Astronomical Society, Nos. 12 and 13, Journal and Transactions for years 1904-5. These are exceedingly interesting numbers, and are certainly a credit to the society, which devotes practically all its income to its production, several members paying-double subscription to make it possible. It may not be out of place to mention here that this society numbers rather fewer subscribers than our own, but it has within its ranks several exceedingly able men, whose contributions to theoretical practical, and especially observational astronomy are well known. I have also received from the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, I'.S.A., as this work is being-printed. Nos. 1438 and 1459, being parts of Smithsonian contributions to Knowledge, Vol. XXXIV. The secretaries of the Royal Astronomical Society have also kindly sent me the "monthly notices," for all of which I beg to tender my best thanks.

As in former years the local Press has kindly published notices of various astronomical phenomena, reports of our meetings, etc., for which we owe them our sincere thanks. I have to thank your worthy president and the gentlemen of the committee, and particularly Mr Thomas Allison, for assisting-in the work of the Society at the Observatory, and conclude with the hope that in the coming-year our members will make good use of their fine instrument, at least on all those occasions when that unstable clement which stands between us and the stars is favourable to our efforts, to sec, beyond the things of this world, those that shine afar off in space.

Wanganui Herald (N.Z.), Printers.

Astronomy of To-Day.

The lecture was illustrated by slides, and they were explained, and further information not in these notes given.

Extract from Progress," January 2, 2907.

Notes of a Lecture delivered by SIR ROBERT STOUT, K.C.M.G., under the auspices of the Wanganui Astronomical Society, in September, 1906.

Do we realise when we look up to the sky how few stars we can see with our unaided vision? It is said that we can only see between and 8000, even if we examine the sky in both hemispheres. And yet the stars are innumerable. The more powerful we make our telescopes, the more stars we discover, and the most powerful telescope has found no place in the heavens devoid of stars.

We may consider the heavens in two or three aspects. Let us for a little see if we can realise (1) the immense distances of the universe. (2) the sizes of many of the stars. (3) the beauties of the heavens, and, lastly. (4) some theories of the beginning and end of the universe.

(1.) If we are in the Wanganui Observatory, we would perhaps ask to see the Southern Cross. Who has not seen that brilliant constellation? It is situated in that portion of the sky which is the richest in stars, and as we watch it from month to month in its varying altitude to us, we are always struck with its beauty. We will notice the pointers of the cross; they belong to a constellation called Centaur.

You are aware perhaps that the stars in each constellation are named by the Greek alphabet, or by numbers, and named according to their apparent brightness. For example, the brightest star in a constellation will be called Alpha, the next brightest Beta, the next Gamma, and so on. The brightest pointer is called Alpha-Centauri. When you come to examine it through a telescope you will find that it is not a single star, but it is a "double star"—there are two stars. It is a beautiful object. The reason, however, why I wish to direct your attention to it is, that so far as we know, it is the nearest star to this earth. It is from considering its distance that we can get some idea of the vastness of the distances in the heavens. The distance of the sun from the earth is, according to the latest calculation. 92,874,000 miles. This is the calculation of Sir David Gill, who I see has just been appointed President of the British Association; he is an eminent astronomer, and during his residence at the Cape of Good Hope has done good service for astronomical science.

One way of testing distances is to consider how long it takes for light to travel from the sun to the earth. Light travels at the rate of 186,300 miles a second, i.e. seven times round the earth in a second; this would show that light will travel from the sun in about nine minutes. Now, light takes nearly 4½ years to travel from Alpha-Centauri to our earth, so when we are looking at Alpha-Centauri we are looking at the star as it existed about years ago—it may have perished in the meantime. This shows that the distance of Alpha-Centauri from our earth is about—I am giving you round numbers only—25 billions of miles. Let me show you the distance in another way. You have no doubt seen an orrery constructed, that is you have round globes or balls showing the size of the sun and the different planets and their relative distances. Well, let us suppose that at this table there is the sun, and we place the earth, we shall say, a yard off from the sun; where will Alpha-Centauri be? Alpha-Centaur would have to be placed in our orrery 150 miles off. That will give you some idea of the distance of Alpha-Centauri, the nearest star to us.

I may illustrate the relative distance and size by quoting to you what Sir John Herschel said about our solar system. He said:—

Let us suppose we have a globe 2 ft. in diameter; this would stand for the sun. If Mercury is placed 82 ft. away it will be relatively to the sun the size of a mustard seed; Venus will be 142 ft. away, and the size of a pea; the earth 215 ft. away, or 3 chains and 17 ft., and the size of a pea a little larger; Mars will be 327 ft. away, and the size of a large shot; the Asteroids—small planets—will be 600 ft. away, and of the size of grains of sand; Jupiter will be ¼ mile off, and as large as an ordinary orange; Saturn will be four-tenths of a mile off, and of the size of a small orange; Uranus will be ¾ mile away, and like a large cherry; and, lastly, Neptune like a large plum 1¼ mile away. But the nearest star Alpha-Centauri would be a globe about 3 or 4 ft. across, and 10,000 miles distant.

Sometimes during the year we may cast our eyes to what is the brightest star in the southern sky—it is the star Sirius. Well. Sirius is double the distance of Alpha-Centauri from us. Let me try and give another illustration of the distance: We will suppose that we take a train—and it will be an express train going far faster than any express train runs in New Zealand—let us suppose that it travels at the rate of 60 miles an hour; travelling at that rate it would take us 130 years to reach the sun, but to reach the nearest star, namely, to reach Alpha-Centauri, it would take us about 35 millions of years.

There is another star which was at one time thought to be the nearest star—it is in the constellation of the Swan, and is named 61 Cygni. To reach it would take about 40 millions of years travelling at the same rate, and, remember, these arc the nearest stars to us. If we take some of the more distant stars, say for example Sirius, we could not reach it, going a mile a minute, under 72 millions of years.

Let me give you yet another illustration, so that we may try if we can dimly realise the vast distances in the heavens. There burst out in 1901 a brilliant star in the constellation of Perseus. A star had been known in about the same position, but it was not of Great magnitude or brilliancy. On the night of February 21st/22nd. Dr. Anderson of Edinburgh noticed a bright star which increased so rapidly in brightness as to become about the

third brightest star in the sky. Afterwards it began to fade away slowly. Now, this star was so distant from us that what Dr. Anderson was seeing took place in the reign of Henry VIII. The star was trillions of miles from us.

Many more illustrations might be given, but perhaps those used may impress us with the vast distances of the stars in the sky.

It is computed that the diameter of the known Sidereal universe is so great that light would take 90 millions of years to travel across it. This would make the diameter 374 trillions of miles, 374,340 326,400,000,000,000 or 374 with eighteen ligures following it. Can we comprehend it?

(2.) I have spoken about distances: let us consider the size of the stars we see in the sky. I assume that we are still looking through the telescope at Alpha-Centauri, but Alpha-Centauri consists of two stars about equal in size: they are really two vast suns, and each, compared with our sun, is more than seven times its size. They take 81 years to travel round their orbit. The one revolves round the other, There is another star that we sometimes see. It is called Arcturus or a Bootes, and was at one time thought to be the quickest-moving star in the sky. We see it in April in the northeast, in June in the north at S p.m. I refer to it now because it may give us an illustration of the vast size of some of these suns called stars. To try and realise the size of Arcturus, let us look at the size of the sun. The size of our earth is about 8000 miles in diameter, that is, if we bored a hole from pole to pole that would be about the diameter of the earth—I am giving you round numbers. The diameter of the sun is 865,000 miles, but the diameter of Arcturus is 86 millions of miles—about one hundred times the diameter of the sun. Let us not forget that the distance of the sun from us is nearly 93 millions of miles. If the star Arcturus came between us and the sun it would almost fill the space. It is in volume a million times the size of the sun, and there are no doubt many thousands of stars, perhaps hundreds of thousands of stars, as large as Arcturus. The fact is that our earth, relatively to the size of some of the heavenly bodies, is as a grain of sand is to the size of our earth. Sirius, also, is a large star, about 3½ times larger than our sun, and about 48 times as bright. There are no doubt stars smaller than our sun, but we may say that there are hundreds of thousands of stars larger than it.

We speak of the stars as "fixed" stars. Compared with the planets they appear immovable. The fact is, however, that some of them are exceedingly rapid in their movements. If we consider their velocity we will be further impressed with the vastness of the universe. There is a difference of opinion amongst astronomers as to what star, the movements of which can be approximately ascertained, is the most rapid. In 1893 it was said that Arcturus was the most rapid and Prof. Newcomb in his work on "The Stars" assumes that this is correct. The immense distances of the stars make accurate observation very difficult. It has been computed that Arcturus travels at the rate of 376 miles per second or 32,486,400 miles per day. A star called 1830 Groombridge—because that is the number of the star in Groombridge's catalogue of stars—situated in the northern contellation of the Great Bear, travels, it is said, at the rate of 231 miles per second, or 19,958,400 miles per day. And yet these stars, because of their immense distance from us, seem immovable or fixed.

The distance of Arcturus is so vast that light travelling at the rale of 186.300 miles per second would take 181 years to reach our earth from Arcturus. It is about 41 times more distant from us than Alpha-Centauri. From 1830 Groombridge light would take 30 years to reach us.

And now let me say something about the number of the stars. Through the aid of photogrophy, which has been of as great service to astronomy as the telescope, some of the most recent astronomers have come to the conclusion that there are perhaps known now a hundred millions of suns, and if you consider that each of these suns may have, like our sun, planets revolving round it, which, however, are never seen by us, and that these planets have other planets around them, such as our moon around our earth you may get some idea of the number of heavenly bodies that exist in the universe.

(3.) Let us pass to another stage—the beauties of the heavens. The first thing of beauty that you would likely have your attention directed to is in the Southern Cross. There are what arc termed in the sky clusters—magnificent clusters of stars. To the naked eye, if you have a keen vision, the cluster may appear a single clouded star, but when you look through the telescope you behold a most beautiful spectacle. You see thousands of stars sparkling, such as no diamonds or other precious stones ever sparkled in the finest piece of jewellery. Sometimes the stars in a cluster are of varied colours, white, yellow, red, violet. You will often stand in wonder at the beauty of many clusters.

The numbers in the clusters will surprise you. What appears as a single star may, with the aid of the telescope and the photographic lens, become thousands. You know the Pleiades, often called the Seven Stars. You see them on a clear summer night in the north-east heavens. You could see them about 11 p.m. on the 1st October. One with ordinary vision can count six stars. If one has extraordinary vision, twelve may be seen. When you look through a powerful telescope you may count about 2000. and in one photographic plate that had been exposed for some time, have been counted.

Around one of the stars in the cross—the star Kappa—there is a brilliant cluster. The stars are not so

numerous as in some clusters, but they are brilliant and of different colours.

Another very fine cluster is round a star in the constellation of Toucan. This constellation is at present high up in the sky, lying between the constellations Hydrus and Grus (the Crane). to the west of the bright star Achernar. The cluster is round the star 47 Toucani. It is a large circular cluster, with the stars apparently closely compacted together, as seen through the telescope in Wanganui.

The cluster that is said to be the finest in the sky is Omega-Centauri, the constellation in which the Southern Cross pointers are. It is just within the border of the Milky Way. To the unaided eye, and on a clear night, it appears a hazy star of the fourth magnitude. Prof. Newcomb says over 0.000 stars have been counted in one photograph of this cluster, and the whole number is greater—some say perhaps 15,000 stars. It is a most beautiful cluster, and, if the sky is clear, is always visible to us in New Zealand.

There is a fine cluster between Alpha and Beta Scorpionis. It is near Antares, that beautiful red star otherwise called Alpha-Scorpionis. Sir John Herschel considered it the richest and most condensed mass of stars in the firmament. A strange thing happened in this cluster in 1860: one bright star appeared, almost blotting out the cluster by its brightness.

The beauties of these and other clusters will grow on you, and I doubt not but that, whenever you visit an observatory, you will again and again ask to see them. There are plenty to show you. 226 clusters have been observed in the milky way, and 38 outside.

One class of beautiful objects is the double stars. Many thousands of double stars have been catalogued. Most of the catalogued are binary, some are, however, multiple. Are they all physically connected? Some astronomers say so. Few seen as double or triple are not connected.

To the great credit and honour of Wanganui from 80 to 130 double stars, not hitherto catalogued as such, have been observed by Messrs. Ward and Allison, two of the Wanganui astronomers.

The orbits and length of time that binary stars take to revolve round each other have in the case of a few of these double stars been calculated. Some, it is said, take 11½ years to complete their revolution, others even 1000 years.

Some of the solar systems have two suns, some three suns, revolving the one round the other, and there are some stars that have companions that are not shining as they shine. One of the most notable of this class is Sirius: Sirius has what is called a faint companion. Another one is Procyon. It was noticed in reference to Sirius that the star did not move with a uniform and proper motion, and the astronomers determined that this irregular motion must be caused by some satellite near, but they were not able to see any. The discovery of his dark companion came by accident. A very fine telescope was made in Massachusetts, and the son of the maker was looking through the new telescope when he observed a faint companion near Sirius. It was in the position that astronomers had from their calculations predicted. In Procyon the astronomers had also stated that the variation of its motion must be due to some satellite near it, and it was not until 1895 that Schaeberle found the missing satellite through observations made with the Lick telescope in California.

Perhaps the most striking object in the sky (at present) is the planet Saturn. It is unique. There may be other planets that have a ring round them, hut none save Saturn is visible to us. The planets round the suns other than our own sun we cannot see, save the satellites of the planets of our solar system. Saturn is surrounded by a series of rings, beautifully radiant. It looks as if the planet hung in the rings, and you will not grow tired in looking at it for its beauty and uniqueness. These rings consist, of innumerable small moons, each kept in its place by the law of gravitation. Saturn is well supplied with moons, for in addition to its rings, which, it is said, are about 40 miles in depth and 40,000 miles in breadth, it has ten moons—one of them pretty large, namely. Titan.

After von have examined the clusters and Saturn, and perhaps looked at Venus. Mars, and Uranus, you may have your attention directed to some of the Nebulæ. They were once thought to be clouds of stars, but they are clouds of gas in process of being formed into stars.

One of the finest is the nebula in Orion. Every one knows the constellation of Orion—it is perhaps the finest in the sky. In summer and early winter we see it every clear night; you can see it in October in all its beauty about midnight. Orion was known to the ancient Babylonians and Semites, and is referred to in that ancient drama, the Book of Job. In it are most beautiful stars. Betelgeuse is a bright red star, and the star Theta is a multiple star. You can easily see four distinct stars, and it is said that some observers have seen seven.

The nebulæ in Orion, in Andromeda and in Argo are the only nebuæ that can be even dimly discerned by the naked eye. Each looks like a faint blur or small cloud round a star in each of the constellations named. When you examine them by the telescope you get some conception of their vastness and beauty.

Prof. Ball has thus spoken of the nebula in Orion: "The earth sweeps round the sun in a mighty path, whose diameter is not less than 185,400,000 miles. Let us imagine a sphere so mighty that this circle would just form a girdle round its equator, and let this gigantic globe be the measure wherewith to compare the bulk of the vast nebula of Orion. It can be demonstrated that a million of these mighty globes rolled into one would not equal

the great nebula in bulk; though how much greater than this the nebula may really be we have no means of ascertaining."

Andromeda is a constellation not very well seen in our southern sky. You will see it in the evenings in September. October. November and December. It is right north of us now, and linked to Pegasus; you see a large square, and one of the stars in the square belongs to Andromeda. The nebula in Andromeda is, also, a most remarkable one. It is thought that in this nebula we see a stage in advance of the nebula in Orion, and that stars are nearer formation. It is so distant from us that light from it will take 160 years to reach us. The diameter of the nebula is 333,000 times the sun's distance from the earth. Light would take five years to pass from one side to the other of the nebula, that is, the distance is 30 billions of miles, that is more than the distance of Alpha-Centauri from us.

There is a fine nebula in Sagittarius. The forms of nebulæ vary. Many are spiral in form. The spiral form is the first step towards the formation of a sun or star. There are about 500,000 nebulæ within reach of our telescopes, and To per cent. of them are spirals. Then there are ring nebulæ—nebulæ in the form of rings. One beautiful one is near Vega in the constellation of Lyra, or the Lyre. It is half-way between Beta and Gamma of this constellation. There is another in the constellation of the Swan—Cygnus.

Then there is the great nebula in Argo, round the famous variable star Eta—you can see it now-lowm the horizon in the south-east, about 10 p.m. The bright star Canopus is in this constellation. In the brightest part of the nebula there is an opening known as the Keyhole. Regarding this nebula Sir John Herschel, in his "Outlines of Astronomy," says: "If placed at the distance I have assumed for the nebula in Andromeda, it must fill a vast extent of space, a space compared with which our solar system sinks into insignificance.

This nebula, as seen by Sir John Herschel at the Cape, greatly impressed him. He says: it is not easy for language to convey a full impression of the beauty and sublimity of the spectacle which this nebula offers, as it enters the held of view of a telescope fixed in right ascension, by the diurnal motion, ushered in as it is by so glorious and innumerable a procession of stars, to which it forms a sort of climax, and in a part of the heavens otherwise full of interest."

One peculiar feature of this nebula is that it has changed in appearance since it was observed by Sir John Herschel in 1834-38. Mr. Russell, the astronomer of Sydney, noticed in 1871 that part of the cloud had disappeared.

There are two objects that you see in a cloudless night, like two clouds. They are the Magellanic clouds, or Nebecula Major and Nebecula Minor. In the larger cloud is a famous nebula called 30 Doradus.

It has been descibed by Sir John Herschel "as one of the most singular and extraordinary objects which the heavens present." It has a keyhole perforation like the nebula in Argo, and because of its convolutions has been termed the "looped nebula."

The larger cloud shows evidence of a spiral structure, and the smaller cloud has, it is said, the same structure. In both of the clouds numerous small stars are mixed up with nebulous light.

(4.) What is a nebula? Tennyson in his "Princess" has said:

This world was once a fluid haze of light,
Till toward the centre set the starry tides,
And eddied into suns, that wheeling cast
The planets.

And this, in some respects, represents the theory of the nebula to-day. It is that a nebula is a fluid haze of vast extent of burning gas, but as this gas cools suns are formed, and that the suns cast off pieces which form into planets. This was explained by Prof. Darwin in his presidential address at Capetown and Johannesburg, when he dealt with the theories of astronomical evolution. For example, he stated that the moon separated from the earth gradually, and that at first it would be only a few thousand miles away. This took place, according to him, perhaps about 500 to 1000 millions of years ago.

Closely connected with these double stars is the question of variable stars. Some stars vary in magnitude. What is the cause? It is said that some dark body comes between us and the star, so seen to vary in brightness. Some five hundred stars have been observed as variable stars, and their number is being yearly increased. I mentioned the new star in Perseus; that is not a variable star. A star that suddenly blazes out is called a new star, and, so far as our record extends, no star has blazed out twice. Hut some stars have regular periods of brightness and dulness. Is this variability caused by an eclipse? That is the theory. Some dark body, perhaps a dark companion, intervenes between us and the star, and therefore we lose its light. There are many types of variable stars, and I must refer you to Newcombs' work on the stars for a full discussion of the subject.

Are there then dead suns in the universe? Most astronomers say there are. I notice in a number of

Knowledge—in the July number of last year—that Mr. Gore. the author of several well-known astronomical works, states that the existence of such dark bodies has not been proved. He does not say there are none, and it appears to me the existence of such bodies is the most reasonable explanation of variable stars. Hall goes the length in his book on the heavens to state that there may be dark masses of matter not spherical in shape, and this may explain why we see dark patches or rifts in some of the nebulæ.

We know of one dead world, the moon, which appears a luminous body to us because of its borrowed light from the sun. If we admit, and we must admit, that the stars pass through various phases, why should we not accept the theory that there are dead worlds, dead suns?

There may be thousands or hundreds of thousands of such.

The existence of such bodies has an interesting connection with what has been observed, namely, the sudden appearance of new stars. There is a record of sixteen new stars having been seen, that is, stars suddenly appearing where no stars, or stars of a small magnitude, had been seen before. The earliest one recorded was discovered by the great Danish astronomer, Tycho Brahe, in 1572 in the constellation Cassiopeia. Its history is the history of them all. It was first seen by Tycho Brahe on the 11th November 1572, and was then a star of the first magnitude, as bright as Canopus. It con- tinned to increase in brilliancy till it was as bright as Venus—that object of beauty we now sec in our western sky. It was visible in day-light. It began to fade in December, and finally passed out of sight in May.

In 1901 a new star was discovered, as I have stated, by Dr. Anderson from observations made by him in Edinburgh, and it was the brightest new Star discovered since Kepler's star in 1604. When first seen it was a star of the second magnitude in the constellation of Perseus. In two days it increased in brilliancy till it was the third brightest star on the northern sky. Then it began to fade away. In March it was of the third magnitude, in April of the fifth, and it faded till it was of the eleventh magnitude. There was a star of the eleventh magnitude where it blazed out, so it rose from the eleventh to the first magnitude in three days.

How is the advent of these new stars to be explained? The suggestion is that through a collision of the star with perhaps one of the dark ones that have been referred to there is a sudden outburst of flame. Another suggestion is made by Newcomb. He says that it is "probable that stars, like our sun, have somewhat the character of masses of gas confined under enormous pressure, as if they were hollow globes of highly heated and compressed gas. "and" if, by the fall of a foreign body, an opening is suddenly made in the shell, the interior gases will burst forth." He does not venture to give this as a solution of the appearance of these new stars. It is only a suggestion.

One suggestion made as to the creation of stars is that two dead suns may collide and form one new hot, gaseous body, or star, and thus, though there would be one sun the less, we would have a live one instead of two dead ones. If this is happening, we may see endless succession of life for so long a time that it may be called Eternity, for our mind cannot fix a time when there will cease the new stars, new suns, and all that follows from such a creation; an evolution of star-life from the intense heat of the highest-known heated stars through myriads of ages, till we have fluids and then solids, millions of years giving their organic life, vegetable and animal. Then myriads of ages when life will be no more, and again a dead sun, and then after myriads of ages the process of another evolution from death to life. And so the universe is without beginning and without end.

Some may say that it is a sad outlook that just as man, through myriads of ages of development and civilisation, becomes only a little lower than the angels, that decay should set in or a cataclysm happen, and that all the fruits of the long evolution should pass into nothingness. Is it Nature's wav? Who knows? Our duty lies before us. It is to work whilst it is to-day, and to do our work as best we can and be kind. The destiny of the universe is not in our hand. We are a very humble part of the immensities that surround us.

The vastness of the universe, the distances of the stars, their sizes are overwhelming to us. Is it any wonder that a German was led to exclaim: "I will go no further, for the spirit of man acheth with this infinity. Insufferable is the glory of God; let me lie down in the grave and hide me from the persecution of the Infinite, for end I see there is none."

We can see systems being formed and systems dead, and with the aid of the spectroscope we may trace different stages of star development. A picture in Naysmith's Astronomy may give us some idea of the time it takes to make a planet suitable for life. If organic life has existed for 500 millions of years on our earth, the evolution of the earth from a superheated gaseous body till it was lit for organic life may have taken trillions of years—a time so great that it is beyond our comprehension, Truly it may be said that in the universe a day is as a million of years, and a million of years as a watch in the night, million years is to us infinity. We think the civilisation of Egypt old, and beyond our comprehension is the age of some of our fossils, but what are the ages of Egyptian civilisation and of the oldest specimens of organic life compared with the age of the world? There can be little comparison. What theory can we have of the end of the world any more than of the beginning? We may spin theories, but a solid basis of fact for any conclusion we have not. The recent scientific discoveries in

physics and chemistry have altered our conceptions of matter and of life. And in view of these we should hesitate to say anything about either the beginning or end of the universe. Had it a beginning? Will it have an end? I doubt if we can conceive of a time when the universe was not, and I also doubt if we can conceive of a time when it will not exist.

Day by day. I may say, our knowledge of the universe, of its potentialities, of its hidden powers is extending. I see that in a recent number of the *Atlantic Monthly* there is a suggestion by Prof. See regarding the heat of the suns that was not the view of physicists even five years ago. He believes that the sun has not yet reached its maximum of heat and that the years of its decadence are far off. Perhaps 30,000,000 of years after this it may have got cold.

And we all know of the discovery of Radium and of Helium, and how the discovery of these metals has altered our whole view of the age and future life of the suns and of the stars. And who knows what other hidden things in nature may not yet be laid bare. Let me give you one illustration that was given by Prof. Darwin in his address about radium; it will make us appreciate the potentialities and powers of the universe of which a few years ago we knew nothing. It is said that the energy expended in towing a ship of 12,000 tons a distance of 6000 sea miles at 15 knots an hour is contained in 22 oz., of radium It would take about 5000 tons of coal to perform the same operation. And radium and its power were unknown twenty years ago.

Our attitude must be that of the patient observer, ever remembering that our knowledge is limited and ever will remain limited, and that it is a very poor conception of the universe that even the brightest of the intellects of men can ever attain. If there is one study more than another which should make us humble and point out to us the littleness of man and the insignificance of the earth, it is the study of astronomy.

We sometimes hear or read of people making confident and dogmatic statements as if our earth and its life were all; and that the rest of the universe was of no account. Do we realise that, as compared with the seen universe—and who dares venture to say what is unseen?—our little earth is not as large as the smallest particle of matter that can be seen in the most powerful microscope?

It would be a good thing. I often think, if the study of astronomy were popularised. It might rid us of much dogmatism and make us humble when we become observers of nature and her ways.

Some people say that astronomy leaves no place for Deity, or for abodes for the Blessed. Others claim that it stimulates the religious emotions. A clergyman has thus replied to the former assertion:

Go not, my soul, in search of him.
Thou wilt not find him there,
Or in the depth of shadow dim.
Or heights of upper air.

For not in far-off realms of space
The spirit has its throne;
In every heart it findeth place.
And waiteth to be known.

Thought answereth alone to thought
And soul with soul hath kin;
The outward God he findeth not,
Who finds not God within.

And if the vision come to thee
Revealed by inward sign.
Earth will be full of Deity
And with his glory shine.

Thou shalt not want for company.
Nor pitch thy tent alone;
The indwelling God will go with thee.
And show thee of his own.

Oh gift of gifts! Oh, grace of grace.
That God should condescend
To make thy heart his dwelling-place
And be thy daily friend!

Then go not thou in search of him.
But to thyself repair;
Wait thou within the silence dim.
And thou shalt find him there.

F. L. Hosmer.

An old philosopher said the eye sees what the eye is prepared to sec, and I doubt if a man's religion is changed by the study of astronomy. We will read into the stars our creed.

I know no study so glorious, so uplifting, or so impressive as astronomy. A man who communes with the stars will get ideals that must be of immense service to him in his pilgrimage through life. Emerson, that great New-England prophet, said that "Every one should hitch his wagon to a star." High ideals in life were needed by men. May there not be a practical, as well as an idealistic, application of this aphorism? Let us keep our eyes on the stars. May they not guide us all and be a help to us amid the troubles and temptations of our existence?

But whether the stars will be an ethical help to us or not, they will ever brighten our imagination and develop our æsthetic and artistic sense. Has not Shelly told us what we see?

Palace-roof of cloudless nights!
Paradise of golden lights.
Deep, immeasurable, vast.
Which art now and which wert then!
Of the present and the past.
Of th' eternal where and when—
Presence-chamber, temple, home.
Ever canopying dome
Of the ages yet to come!

Glorious shapes have life in thee.
Earth and all Earth's company.
Living globes which ever throng
Thy deep chasms and wilderness.
And green worlds that glide along.
And swift stars with flashing tress.
Icy moons most cold and bright.
Mighty suns beyond the night,
Atoms of intensest light.

three stars
Progress Print, Cuba Street, Wellington.
Front Cover

Anzacs Honoured Anzacs Honoured and vignette
By Wellington Patriotic Society.
The report of the Anzac Celebration in Wellington with the very able and interesting address of the Chief Justice, Sir Robert Stout and others, has been reprinted at the express wish and expense of G. P. Donnelly, Otatara, H.B., for the benefit of our heroes and their relatives. He feels sure that it will be much appreciated by them.

Anzacs Honoured.

By Wellington Patriotic Society.

Dinner at the Town Hall.

Stirring Speech by Sir Robert Stout.

The second Anzac Day commemoration dinner, held at the Town Hall on Saturday night under the auspices of the Wellington branch of the New Zealand Patriotic Society, proved in every way a great success. The great hall had been very tastefully decorated for the occasion with large Hags of the Allies and gay festoons of bunting; the long tables were laden with good things; the orchestra was occupied by the Patriotic Society's Band, which, under the able conductorship of Bandmaster Jupp, briefly rendered a stirring selection of patriotic airs; and by kind permission of Mr Walter Fuller a number of artists from His Majesty's Theatre contributed greatly to the harmony and the hilarity of the evening.

Mr T. M. Wilford, M.P. (chairman of the Patriotic Society) presided over a gathering of sonic 400 returned soldiers, men of the Royal Navy, and civilians, among those present being the Mayor (Mr J. P. Luke), the Hon. Arthur M. Myers (Acting-Finance Minister and Minister for Munitions and Supplies), the Hon. G. W, Rissell (Minister for Public Health, Infernal Affairs, and Marine), His Honour the Chief Justice (Sir Robert Stout), His Honour Sir John Denniston, lis Honour Mr Justice Cooper, Colonel Hughes, D.S.O. (of the Canterbury Battalion), Colonel Porter, C.B. (officer commanding National Resservis), Mr J. B. Harcourt (president of he Navy League), Mr L. O. H. Trpp (president of the War Relief Commitee), and Mr A. H. Hindmarsh, M.?.

Apologies for unavoidable abserce were received from the Hon. A. L. Herdman (Attorney-General), the Hon. W. D. S. MacDonald (Minister for Agriculture and Commerce), Surgeon-General Henderson (Director-General of Medical Services), and others.

Britain Over All.

The toast of "The King" having been drunk with musical honours, he Hon. G. W. Russell proposed the test of "The Empire." In doing so, he strongly contrasted the culture of Iritain with that of Germany. The Gr- mans, he said, had placed before them as their national ideal the extension of "Kaltur," their particular brand of culture, throughout the world. But he made bold to say that the truer and higher culture of the British Empire must prevail. (Applause.) British culture had lasted for many generations, for many centuries, and they all hoped and believed that it would last for many centuries to come. The United States, by coming into the war, had recognised the righteousness of the Entente cause, and had brought about a union of the English-speaking races of the world, which he hoped and believed would continue for all time. He believed that ultimately the whole world, all races, would be English-speaking; that the English language would be the universal language, and that British culture and British fair play, with their love of freedom for themselves and for all those with whom they came in contact, would prevail the world over. (Loud applause.) Referring proudly to the great part that Britain and the British Empire had taken and are taking in the war, financially, on the battlefield, and on the seas. Mr Russell said that Now Zealand, as a young country, had borne no ignoble part in the struggle. (Applause.) At Gallipoli, on the Western front, in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, and elsewhere, their sons had fought as only those could fight who belonged to the bulldog breed—(loud applause); and they were met that night to do them honour. (Applause,) The war, he declared, could have only one end. He was not going to prophesy when that end was to be, but that end could only come when Germany was defeated and Great Britain and her

Allies were able to dictate the terms of a conclusive and lasting peace. (Loud applause.)

Our Brave Allies.

Sr Robert Stout, in proposing the toast of "The Allies." said that in no war that had ever taken place had there been so many Allies arrayed on one side. There were now no fewer than a dozen nationalities—from the little Republic of San Marino to England, France, Russia. Italy. United States, and the most peacable nationin the world, China—against Germany, Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria. Why should there be such a mighty war? How came it, he asked, that so many Allies, differing in nationality, in language, and ideals, were found on one side, fighting against Germans, Austrians, Bulgarians, and Turks? There were some people who imagined that the world was getting worse. This war should be the answer to those pessimists. The Allies were fighting, not to conquer territory, but for the defence of their own countries and of the civilisation of the world. This war was on a higher plane than any past war. In most of the wars of the past there had been Questions of territory involved and where that was not the case misunderstandings had led to the war. But there was no misunderstanding about this war. The question at issue was, whether the world was to be dominated by a cruel, untruthful, immoral, autocracy, or whether there was be be peace and freedom in the world. Hence it was that the United States had joined the other Allies. Since she became a nation the whole policy of the United States had been that she was to be free from entangling alliances and from interfering in European affairs. She had been forced into her present position, however, in order that the civilisation and the freedom of the world might be maintained. She was, therefore, fighting side by side with the other Allies for a noble ideal—for truth and for righteousness. In their commemoration of Anzac, what could be better or more suitable than to remember their Allies who were engaged with them in that noble struggle. (Applause.) Had the Anzac fight any relation to this fight for civilisation? Let him point out to them what the meaning of the Anzac fight was? He need not go into the details of the struggle on Gallipoli. They knew them well. The men of Anzac—some of whose relatives were present at that gathering—were told even when they commenced the fight that it was almost impossible. There they were on the open beach to attack what were termed impregnable fortresses, and with not such a large body of troops behind that they could hope to overwhelm the defences. But they went on and on, fighting as they were told, fighting for their country, fighting for freedom, and fighting for civilisation.

Anzac and Thermopylae.

"Will not, then, this Anzac fight he tor ever renowned?" asked Sir Robert Scout amid loud applause. "Let me direct your minds to a battle that was fought nearly 2400 years ago not very far from Gallipoli. The Persian horde attacked Greece, and in those days, as there are now, there were traitors in Greece. The Persians, through treachery, passed through Thermopylae. They were opposed by Leonidas. He had only 300 Spartans, about 700 Thespians, and a considerable number of Thebians. But the Thebians, in the language of to-day, were shirkers and pacifists; instead of fighting alongside the warlike Spartans, they laid down their arms and took no part in the battle, and the thousand left to fight the enormous Persian army were every one of them slain. And the fight at Thermopylae passed into history and became an inspiration not only unto the Greek nations, hut to the whole world. But the name "Thebians' became a by-word and a reproach. They were 'shirkers' they were 'pacifists; they gave no help in the fight for liberty and for right. Even to-day every schoolboy who reads the history of Greece is inflamed by the story of Leonidas's brave fight. The battle of the Pass of Thermopylae was but the fight of 1000 men. But they made the supreme sacrifice; and as a Greek poet wrote:—

In dark Thermopylae they lie,
Oh, death of glory, there to die!
Their tomb our altar is, their name
A mighty heritage of fame.

"There have been great battles in the world in which our race and ancestors were engaged. We have in our history such names as Waterloo, Balaclava, Bannockburn, Cressy, Lucknow, and many more.

A Great Battle Nobly Fought.

"But this battle—this fight at Gallipoli—is of peculiar interest to us in these southern lands, for our brave boys took part in its glory. Let us realise what a great battle becomes. A great battle, nobly fought, becomes an inheritance and an everlasting inspiration to the people of the nation whose heroes fought therein. (Applause.) The story of the battle is not the mere record of an historical fact. It is not alone that the Australians, the New

Zealanders, and the 29th Division found undying glory.

The Soul of a Nation.

"A heroic act is incorporated into the soul of a nation. It becomes to that nation a heritage more precious than gold. It gives the nation an ideal of courage, of self-sacrifice, of nobility. And poor, indeed, is that nation which has no soul, which has no past history that can vivify and inspire its citizens. The Anzacs have given us this inspiration, have laid up for Us this crown of glory, just as Leonidas das and his small army have inspired all the world. And as long as the English language endures this story will go ringing down the ages and inspiring the future generations of our race. This is what the Anzac have done for us. Browning says in his great poem, 'The Ring and the Book,' The moral sense grows best by exercise.' We have seen is exercised.

"For what, then, are Britain and her Allies fighting? May I quote a few lines of the poem of an American who was anxious to enlist, but was barred on account of his age? He addresses England, and tells us her mission, and her mission is also that of her Allies:

Mother of Freedom pledged to Right,
From honour's path, she would not stray,
But sternly faithful used her night
To lead mankind the nobler way.
My England, patient, valiant, true,
Not foes without, nor frauds within
Will shake her purpose to sublue
The cohorts of embattled sin

This eloquent peroration was greeted with loud and long-continued applause.

His Honour, Sir John Demiston, briefly, but heartily, supporter the toast, as also did the Hon. Arthur M. Myers.

Greatest Estate of Freedom.

Mr Myers, who appeared in his uniform as colonel of the New Zealand Motor Reserve, said that the foremost civilised nations of the world were Britain's Allies, and they were fighting for the greatest estate of freedom that the world had ever known. They were the trustees of that State, and they were determined to hand it down to their children and their children's children untarnished and undiminished, (Applause,) They were living in important times, and every man and woman in New Zealand would join with them in honouring the returned soldiers that night. (Applause.) The marvellous unanimity that existed between the Allies was a notable thing. The Allies had practically pledged their word, and their word was sucred—not as amongst their enemies—that they would not conclude a peace until they were all agreed upon the terms of that peace. (Applause.) There would be no inconclusive peace. (Applause.) Germany had wanted to fight, and she was going to get all the fight she wanted, and more. (Applause.) The Allies were going to see the war through to the bitter end, to a conclusive peace, until the nations of the world were able to live in perfect freedom. (Applause.) It was great matter for congratulation that America had decided to throw in her lot with the Allies; and he ventured to say that her doing so had laid the foundation for the future federation of all the English-speaking peoples. (Applause.) And, just as the result of their fighting side by side was that they were going to have closer political federation of the Empire, so also they were going to lay down an Empire economic policy, which would be to trade first with their own kith and kin—(applause)—not finding the money for Germany to fight t them with, but finding it first for their own country and for the Empire to pay the gigantic debt which had accrued, and afterwards to trade with their Allies. (Applause.) It was a matter for regret that the great Empire-builder, Joseph Chamberlain, had not lived to read what they had road only in that day's paper, that the House of Commons had practically endorsed the result of the Paris Conference, which meant that the [*unclear:* feish] of Free Trade was now to be a thing of the past, and that they recognised the necessity for carrying out not only a joint foreign policy, but also a joint economic policy. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that, thanks to their gallant soldiers, in good time, probably in a very short time, peace would be concluded on the Allies' terms. (Applause.)

The toast was honoured with great enthusiasm.

Giving the toast of the evening—"Our Guests, the Anzaes"—Mr Wilford declared that there was no way in which he or any man could show sufficiently the appreciation in which they held the Anzaes. "They are men

who have done brave deeds," he said. "At times their minds must wander back to the fateful landing at Gallipoli, when against almost overwhelming odds they fought such a fight as made the world wonder." In eloquent and stirring words, Mr Wilford pictured that fight, adding that whenever they spoke of the great work and the marvellous deeds of the Anzacs, they must never forget the noble work, the splendid work, of the magnificent 29th Division. It was one of their great regrets that they had no complete record of that struggle, or of the war as a whole. Even on the Western front there were at the beginning no war correspondents, and it had been left to Lord Ernest Hamilton, in his wonderful book, "The First Seven Divisions, to chronicle the great retreats, the retreats which our soldiers now sing of, and use as a marching lilt—

We beat them on the Marne,
We beat them on the Aisne,
We gave them hell at Neuve Chapelle,
And here we are again!

It had been said by Granville Forsescue, remarked Mr Wilford, and he supposed that, next to Masefield's book, his was the finest on Gallipoli, that if the Navy, when it first attacked the Turks at Gallipoli, had been supported by troops, they could have readily captured the place, as the enemy was unprepared. But when the Anzacs landed the Turks were very fully prepared. A landing in face of their superior forces, superior munitions, and superior guns was considered by German instructors and masters absolutely impossible; but the Anzacs had forced a landing, thereby demonstrating that they, were brave sons of the parent stock, that the old fighting spirit was not dead, and that the inherent qualities which made the greatness of the British Empire were only sleeping, and required only the occasion to blossom forth to show a greatness which was for all time. (Loud applause.) He could not put into words what he felt about those brave boys. The Patriotic Society wished to do honour to them by the gathering. The interest in them was world-wide. They had a reputation that they must never lose. There would be no prouder bar to wear, no prouder medal to display than that of Gallipoli; and as time rolled on and history was written, the great-great-grandsons of those who did such noble deeds would love to read of them. The history of the great enterprise would not be dimmed by time, but would grow brighter and would shine refulgent for centuries and centuries yet to come. (Loud applause.)

The toast was drunk with musical honours. Colonel Hughes, Private Douglas Seymour (secretary to the Returned Soldiers' Association), and Sapper J. T. Fox (manager of the Returned Soldiers' Club suitably responded.

Mr J. B. Harcourt gave the toast, of "The Navy," which was responded to by Lieutenant-Commander C J Keily, R.N.R.

"Our Boys at the Front."

The Mayor, proposing the health of "Our Boys at the Front," said that the whole of the people of New Zealand had absolute confidence in the boys at the front. Whatever sacrifices might be necessary would be made by those now at the front and by those who would yet go to the front to help them in their great fight. (Applause.) They owed everything to the boys who had made all the sacrifices, and to their parents. They honoured the boys, and not only the boys but their parents, too. (Loud applause.)

The toast was enthusiastically hon oured. Then on the call of the Hon. G. W. Russell, the health of the chairman was drunk to the strain, "For He's a Jolly Good Fellow," and with a verse of the National Anthem the proceedings were brought to a close.

Men of Maoriland.

How They Lived and How They Died.

Colonel Hughes, D.S.O., of the Canterbury Battalion, who served four months in Egypt and five at Gallipoli, and was six months in hospital as the result of it, paid a high tribute, at the Auzac dinner on Saturday, to the prowess and good conduct of the men of the Now Zealand Expeditionary Forces. "I would like to tell you," he said, "what our men were like—how they lived and how they died. We knew that they could fight, but we aid not expect them to live all the time they were away in such a way that they were a credit to you all over

the world." (Applause.) Commander Keily, of the Royal Naval Reserve, had just been telling him of how well he found the New Zealanders spoken of wherever he had been. At Colombo on their return he (Colonel Hughes) was in charge of 280 to 290 men. They were entertained by the leading citizens of that city, and their wives and daughters waited on them—he was "d proud of it." (Applause and laugher.) The Major of Albany also spoke most highly of their behaviour. On the Rhododendron Ridge, now called in their honour "the Canterbury Ridge," some [*unclear:* 100] of his men were hit in twenty minutes in a space not much bigger than the floor of the Town Hall, and he never heard a sound from one of then. A boy, just a few feet from him now, without a leg, was badly hit, but when asked how he was he said. "I'n all right sir." And that was the same with all the New Zealanders. They never heard a sound from them. They should be proud to think of their brave boys. (Applause.)

A voice; "We are proud of you, Jack." (Loud applause.)

At Quinn's Post the boys used to sing to pass the time. And they could sing, too. They would have made a good programme for the "halls," those boys. (Applause.) One, Corporal Wilson, used to sing that glorious song, "The Trumpeter." (Applause.) As it happened, a bugler of the First Canterburys was missing. They did not know where he was. But above them at Quinn's Post was "dead ground"; nobody could cross a ridge as high above them as, say, the roof of the Town Hall: and one day Sergeant McLaggen, afterwards badly wounded, one of their best non-coms., went up the ridge, and there he found the bugler. They had been there a week, living and singing within a few feet of him, and had not known it.

vignette

"New Zealand Times," Company, Limited, Printers.

Needs of Peace The Ideal State vignette

Address

Delivered by

Sir Robert Stout

(Chief Justice of New Zealand)

At the Unitarian Church *on* Sunday Night, Dec. 15, 1918

Address by Sir Robert Stout.

At the Unitarian Church on Sunday night. December 15th. 1918. Sir Robert Stout (Chief [*unclear:* Justice]) delivered an address on "The Needs of Peace." He said:

We have witnessed during the past four years the greatest war that the world has ever seen. History does not record any war in which there have been such vast armies in conflict, such diverse war machines, and such numerous arms of defence. Many wars have lasted longer, but in no war have the casualties been so large, and the destruction of property so enormous. The record of brutal atrocities which have been committed in hardly credible when we consider the effort for civilisation which have been made during the past five hundred years. Civilised usages and humanitarian rules have been thrown aside, and treaties and agreements have been broken. It is well accredited that more than one million Armenians, men, women and children, have been murdered; that many thousands of Serbian non-combatants, men, women and children, have been massacred; and that unnameable brutalities have been committed on the Belgians, on the French, on the Poles, on the Serbians, and on the Lithuanians. Can we ever forget how many Allied prisoners in Germany and Austria have been put to death through ill-treatment; how hospital ships and hospitals on land have been attacked; how non-combatant ships like the Lusitania have been tor- pedoed, and innocent women and children muredered? We need not dwell on individual instances of brutality such as the murders of Nurse Cavell and Captain Frvatt. The story of this war surpasses the stories of all pastpast wars, in its record of the premeditated murder of non-combatants. No wonder that the conduct of the Germans, Austrians, Hungarians, Turks, and Bulgarians has been characterised as barbarous, and their people as barbarians. There is no doubt about the lamentable facts. Impartial Commissions, after careful and prolonged investigations, have verified the frightful atrocities with which our enemies have been charged.

Science and Religion.

The question has been raised, what has been the cause of this terrible outburst of barbarity? It is not my intention to-night to trace the cause; but as it has been attributed to the spread of scientific thought, or what by a dyslogistic or name-calling phrase is termed "materialism," we must not overlook certain facts. In the first place, we must be on our guard in assuming, when dealing with the cause of an event, that the mere succession of events implies a casual connection between those events. The old fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc is not

uncommon. There has been a wonderful development of scientific-knowledge in the past sixty years. In the same period there has also been amongst educated people an abandonment of many religious dogmas. We must not, however, assume that because some old beliefs have been given up, and because science has shown that they are without evidence, and unverifiable, that therefore we have descended to a state of barbarism. To test such an a legagation, we would have to find out what are the beliefs of the present day barbarians. There is no evidenee that the Kaiser and his generals are not Christians and believers in all the dogmas of Christianity. Some are Protestants, some are Roman Catholics, and some are Greek Catholics. We know that in all the nations of Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria, religions education of the young is insisted upon. In Germany, which is the most barbaric of all these nations, the teaching of the orthodox Christian beliefs is compulsory. Nor is this barbarity that we have witnessed a new phase of German life. We know what happened a few years ago in China. The nations of Germany, France, United States of America, Russia, England and Japan made war on china, and what is the record of their conduct? The most barbarous of all China's enemies was the German army. Nor was this surprising when it is remembered that the commands given by the Kaiser to the soliders before starting from were that were to imitate the doings of the Huns, as recorded in history. They were to take no pr[*unclear:* i]soners and exhibit no mercy. Impartial Englishmen have told us of the conduct of these armies in China, and it is admitted that the most humane of all the armies was the Japanese. Japan is not a Christian nation.

I shall state two further facts in this connection. We have heard and read of ecclesiastics depicting the dangers of civilisation dependent on secular education, or, as they call it, "Godless schools." How do those nations stand who have had secular education? In this war how have the French soldiers behaved, and how have our New Zealand lads acquitted themselves? This is how one of the most eminent Scotfish clergymen spoke of the New Zealanders—I quote from a letter of the Very Rev. Dr. John Kelman, of Edinburgh.; He said: "I have been along with our fighting troops, have seen them before going into battle, and spoke with some of the gallant men who survived some of the most awful tasks of the war, and I can assure you that no part of my whole experience of the army has impressed me more than the charaeter, loyalty and power of the New Zealand troops."

It is unnecessary to refer further to the absurd charge that materialism is the cause of German barbarity. Have we not read the pronouncement of German Protestant divinity professors, the sermons of German Evangelical clergyman who dauded the German offensive, and had no adverse criticism of German atrocities; and have we not perused the request of the great and noble Cardinal Mercier to his fellow Catholic Bishops in Germany to pronounce against the barbarity with which the Belgian people were treated? They did not respond to Cardinal Mercier's request, and so far as I know, no Bavarian. Prussian or Austrian, Prince, general or military leader has been expelled from the Catholic Church for the barbarities they permitted the German troops to commit. We know that French, English and American Catholics have fought with their Protestant brethren against German barbarity, but both Protestant and Catholic Germans and Austrians have committed untold crimes against humanity. It cannot be said that the Kaiser and his generals were not professed believers in the Christian dogms, and punctilious in their observance of Christian ordinances. Their belief, had not been much influenced by the new thought that is abroad in the world.

Pressing Needs.

Leaving, however, the causes of the barbarities in this is great war, let us consider some of the needs of peace. The first of those needs is that justice should be taught that wrong-doing not pay, There must be restitution, and there must, be retribution. What from these are to take, we must leave to the wise and humane statesmen who will sit round the table at the Peace Conference. There are pressing needs that we have as a people to consider. Our people have suffered greviously. Our nation needs restoration and re-building, though our task in this respect is easy compared with the task in front of France, of Belgium, of Serbia, of Roumania, and even of the United Kingdom. Alas! alas! we cannot restore our brave dead to life: they have died for us.

These are our martyrs, and their blood the seed
Of nobler futures. "Twas for us they died,
Keep we their memory green.

This be their epitaph, "Traveller, South or West,

Go, say at home we heard the trumpet call.
And answered. Now bebside the sea we rest,
Our end was happy if our country thrives,
Much was demanded, Lo! our store was small,
That which we had, we gave—it was our lives."

Let us resolve that the great and willing sacrifices they made were not in vain, but that they will lead to the establishment of a more noble nation, to a much higher and more humane social life.

We may class the Needs of Peace under three heads. Our Dominion has lost heavily in human life and financially, but perhaps we are better off than any other part of our Empire. So far as our loss of brave women and men are concerned, they cannot be replaced, and their loss must be borne with resignation.

Dealing with our finances, we find that our funded debt has enormously increased, and, unlike some other portions of our debt, it has been increased for works that will give us no direct return. Heavier taxation is in front of us, and we must meet our new burdens in the only way they can be met by honest people, namely, by hard work, thrift and enterprise. If we do not proceed in this way to meet our liabilities, we shall suffer much privation. We must expect that after a while the prices of our exports will fall, and this may entail the reduction of wages. Of course the fall in prices will mean that the cost of living will be less, but our capital for production will be restricted, and it may mean that living may have to be reduced to a lower standard. Everyone must deplore even the suggestion of such a thing, and the only way to keep the standard high is to resolve not to expend our means for that which profiteth not.

Efficiency of Labour.

Labour, it is often said, is the basis of wealth; it is the foundation on which prosperity must be built, but without saving and thrift there can be not stable prosperity. To make labour efficient, three things are needed; a higher physical life, a higher intellectual life, and a higher social or ethical life. Let us briefly examine these three needs. A sick person, we all admit, cannot be an efficient worker. We must therefore regard public health, as our highest concern. Have we considered the many things required to obtain and maintain public health? A few may be enumerated. We need clean cities and clean dwellings, sunlight and pure air. These cannot be obtained if we have narrow streets and no open spaces and no gardens, and if we tolerate slums and crowded tenemente. Wide streets are sunlight. The height of buildings should be limited. It is true, so far as Wellington is concerned, that we have a great advantage. We have a huge reserve seven miles wide in our harbour which cannot be built upon, and our southerlies bring health-giving ozone from the Southern Ocean. But those who laid out our city had not the ideas we have now about garden cities, with wide streets and beauty spots. Our cities and dwellings, too, must be kept narrow streets must be widened and in- sanitary dwellings demolished. No one class or party can be blamed for our present conditions. The blame rests on the community as a whole.

It is a pity, however, that forty years ago we were not alert, enough, and had not vision enough to lay the foundations of our city on broader lines. May I add a personal note? It is over 44 years ago since I pointed out to the Wellington people the need of wider streets, and how they might be secured. We must have more and better dwelling houses, and greater amenities for our people. Much has been done in this respect since I first knew Wellington, now about 45 years ago, but much has yet to be done. In tact no one who saw Wellington 45 years ago could have imagined that so many improvements would have been made in this time. We must march forward, considering what will tend to make our people physically strong.

Drink and Smoking.

Our youths should be in the open air, and in the sunlight, as much as possible. They should be encouraged to play outdoor games and to lead an out-door life. They must learn that indulgence in alcohol or tobacco or other drugs tends to physical degeneration, and not to the strengthening of their powers. This indulgence in the drug habit must be given up if we are to maintain a healthy race. The liquor question is prominently before our people, and the point of view regarding alcohol has completely changed during the past twenty years. Alcohol is of no use but an injury to a healthy person, and is rarely required by one who is sick. How long, I wonder, is the alcohol habit to be allowed to injure our race? There is another evil that is increasing amongst our young people—the smoking of cigarettes. I have on several occasions in my walks from my house to my chambers counted the number of youths. I have seen smoking, and I have been ap- palled at the number. In one day I noticed eighty per cent of youths dressed in khaki smoking cigarettes, and on several days I have noticed a

majority of those going to offices and shops puffing away at cigarettes and pipes. It is a habit that is most harmful. Elbert Hubbard—and no one was more favourable to youths having amusement and fun—denounced the cigarette habit, and I quote a sentence or two from his very important pamphlet, "The Cigarettist." He said:—"Cigarette smokers art often active, alert, competent men. They are quick to see an opportunity, ready to take advantage of it, appreciative, sympathetic, kind. But when you see such a one, he is in his prime, at his best; his star is at the zenith., not on the horizon or at nadir. Never again will he be as much of a man as he is now. His future lies behind. He is not growing into a better man. He is not in the line of evolution. If you want a man who will train on, flee the cigarettist as you would a pestilence. He will surely disappoint you. And the better and brighter your young man, the faster his descent to Avernus.

Cigarette-smoking is all right until the habit begins foreclosure proceedings, then Reelzebub himself (prince of lawyers) cannot vacate them—you go to the devil's auction."

Do we appreciate the vast number of cigarettes on which duty is paid for home consumption every year? For nine months of 1918 there were 616, 413lb weight of [*unclear:* cigarettes enteren] for home consumption—the number would be approximately 380,000,000; and for the whole year, if there was the same rate of consumption, there would be about 500,000,000 500,000,000. With duty added the cost of tobacco per annum, including cigarettes, etc., is about one and a quarter million pounds, and if we add to that vast amount importers' profits, and expenses, and retailers' profits and charges. I should think another quarter of a mil- lion would be a moderate estimate, and that would meun a sum of £1,500,000 spent on tobacco.

The annual cost of alcohol is about four millions: all this is waste and tends to inefficiency. Dr. Kellog, in a lecture recently deli vered in New York before the National Associations of Life Underwriters stated that the mortality of moderate drinkers is double that of abstainers, and that the records of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company, covering a period of 60 years, show that the mortality of smokers is 57.6 Per cent. greater than that of non-smokers. From a mere economic point of view we cannot afford the waste that is going on in the use of alcohol and tobacco in this country. It is now about £5,000,000. Even if indulgence in these two drugs were not harmful, their use is indefensible, for they do not make our people efficient and they are a waste of money. Neithet alcohol nor tobaccois a necessity. An incident in Sir Isaac Newton 's life might be recalled in this connection: who, when he was asked why he never smoked, replied, "I am unwilling to make to myself any necessities."

Open-Air Life.

We must encourage our young men to seek amusement in other directions. There should be numerous open spaces tor gaames, and there should be public gardens, rending-rooms, art galleries, boating sheds, bathing places, and naturalist societies—everything that will tend to the upbringing healthy people and the giving to our young people sensible and reasonable amusement in the open air. What are the habits of some of our youths? Many get up in the morning just in time to get their breakfast; and are not out of doors before breakfast. As soon as they have breakfast they start for shop or office or work and on the way three-fourths of them will be seen smoking cigarettes. Even at work some of them are allowed to smoks. In going to, and coming from lunch, there is more smoking, and on leaving business in the evening there is recourse again to the cigarette. After dinner there is smoking again, and perhaps if there is no visit to a picture theatre, the worship of the goddess Nicotine will continue. Very few ever open a book they do not take a hand in any out-of-door game. What do they know of the life-giving forces of fresh air and of sunlight? If they want to live a healthy and rational life they should get up early in the morning certainly not later than six o'clock in the summer and seven in the winter. They should get outside as soon as possible for a swim or a walk, or engage in some naturalist work, taking an interest in plant-life or in entomology, and spend some time in reading. One night every week they ought certainly to spend other suggestions that might be made for the improvement of their physical health. Let us never forget that as the Prime Minister of England has said you cannot have an Al nation with a C3 population.

Intellectual, Needs.

I come now to a second need, namely, a higher intellectual life. That can only be obtained by study—by a love of books. A course of study in the leading literary works that have been published in England and America would help to broaden the mind, and profitably occupy the time of our young men and women. No doubt we have many good students in our Universities, and no doubt we have many good students who have never been in a University College, but they are few—they are in the minority. Workers' Educational Association are now started, and these, it is hoped, will be continued and extended. We also need better and many more reading-rooms. We ought also to encourage and increase the membership of our young men's clubs, where

there should be rooms set apart for reading, as well as for games in bad weather, like chess and draughts, and cards, provided there is no gambling. Encouragement should also be given to debating classes and to lectures. Our young men should be encouraged to put their thoughts on questions of the day in writing. We need still greater development in our educational machinery, and in deeper study for more light on literary and scientific subjects. If we are to be a great people we must have further intellectual development. We must remember that in the past as in the present the leading nations or peoples are those who have excelled in mental and industrial training.

The third need of peace is a higher social or ethical life. There has been a great development in humanism amongst the British race during the last fifty years, and humanism is well devloped amongst ourselves. One has only to consider how our Dominion has rallied to the aid of those who went to the war; what gifts have been freely given; what work they accomplished, and how the poorest amongst us were a generous if not more generous, than the rich; and during the fateful [*unclear:* epidem.] we have had we have seen thrilling examples of the same humanism, and of true heroism. We have found our people working together, caring nothing for differences of nationality, or of religion, or of beliefs. All have joined to help those who needed assistance, and the poorest were as ready as the wealthy to lend their aid. Humanism has brought amongest us a new force which can be still further developed. Many partitions have been erected amongst us that keep us apart; class partitions, theological partitions, party partitions, but when the need comes for some great human effort for human life, for human happiness, we are glad to notice that thosethose partitions have broken down. They have been so broken down during the past four years of sore trial and suffering. May this habit continue to grow!

Settlement of Disputes.

For the sake of humanity and of peace we need to have all our disputes settled by judicial tribunals. The most thoughtful, the most enlightened and the most civilised of the human race see that the only chance of preventing war is to have great tribunals to settle disputes between nations. In all civilised communities disputes, between individuals are settled by judicial tribunals, and all industrial disputes, as well as other disputes amongest ourselves, will have to be settled in this way. Strikes ought to be unknown; lock-outs ought to be unknown. If there is any dispute between employer and employee an Arbitration Court ought to settle it. We must also realise that we must consider the rights of our neighbour as well as our own affairs, and unless we have love and consideration for our fellows we have not succeeded in attaining a high social life. This is one of the needs of the future. We must have a humanist religion. It in not to be expected that people can get rid of their past beliefs and past associations; but I do not see why all religionists—by whatever name they are called—should not unite to gain this great object of having an ethical and social life that will no longer tolerate crime, harshness, cruelty, or domination, and which will insist that every dispute between citizens must be settled according to rational and humanist principles. That is what is meant by Peace, and it is one of the most pressing needs of all nations. The way of evolution does not come by Bolshevrk practices, no r by war; revolution is war, and often the worst kind of warfare. If we attain these needs I have mentioned, we shall have gone far towards the attainment of a new and ideal state, whose people will have a religion according to the definition given by a recent writer, who, when asked what religion is, replied: "To love justice and mercy, to pity the suffering, to [*unclear:* consist] the weak, to forget wrongs and remember benefits, to love the truth and liberty, to cherish wife and child and friend, to make a happy home, to love the beautiful in art and in Nature, to cultivate the mind, to be brave and cheerful and to make others happy, to fill life with the splendour of generous acts and the warmth of loving words, to discard error and destroy prejudice, to receive new truths with gladness, and to cultivate hope; to do the best that can be done, and then be resigned. That is religion."

vignette

VERTICAL FEED. The Best Sewing Machine ever produced, whether for Family. Use or Manufacturing, is the New Davis Vertical Feed MACHINE. EVERY MACHINE WARRANTED. WILL LAS T A LIFE TIMET VERTICAL FEED. VERTICAL FEED. Sews any fabric from Lace to Leather; has the Automatic Self-Regulating Bobbin-Winder, Tension and Take-up; always in order and never fails to do its duty; produces the best quality of work in the greatest variety; requites no instruction; the illustrated printed directions alone are needed; made from the finest material by expert workmen. TRY IT, IT HAS NEVER FAILED TO GIVE SATISFACTION. NO GOGS, NO FEED TEETH, NO ANNOYANCES, NET CASH PRICES—FROM £7 10s. UPWARDS. TO BE HAD ALSO ON TIME PAYMENTS. A. WALKER, SOLE AGENT FOR DUNEDIN. 174, & 176, GEORGE STREET.

The Resurrection of Christ. A Lecture Delivered by ROBERT STOUT, The President of the Dunedin Freethought Association, at a Meeting of the Association Held in the Princess Theatre Dunedin, On Sunday, the 10th October, 1880. Dunedin: "Woodfield, Jolly & Co., General Printers, Octagon. 1880.

The Resurrection of Christ.

I Have chosen for the subject of my address "The Resurrection of Christ." In opening the session of our Association I spoke of the Inspiration of the Bible, and to the address I then delivered there were several replies. In one it was said that whether the Bible was inspired or not, whether every word was infallibly true or not, did not affect Christianity. That the keystone of that system was the Resurrection of Christ. Grant it was said that Christ rose from the dead and Christianity was divine. I do not think that even were this granted, Christianity could be proved to be divine. To-night, however, I propose to examine—(1) The Evidences of the Resurrection—the Bodily Resurrection; (2) What the Resurrection, if true, could prove.

In every thing we do, we act on certain assumptions. For example, we all believe the sun will set and rise again; that there will be summer and winter; cold and heat. We all believe that men cannot fly in the air; that heavy bodies, if dropped from the top of a house, will fall to the ground; that all men will die. These and many other things are taken for granted. We do not require to prove them. Why is this? Is it not that we are guided by the recorded experiences of humanity? Underneath all our belief rests this—that nature is uniform. Granted like circumstances in all respects, and like results will follow. Oats will not grow in the best of soils if wheat be sown, nor potatoes come from turnip seed. Nature is uniform. Then, again, in our daily life we act on another supposition. That the existence of rare things—the happening of unusual events—requires greater proof before we believe in the existence of these things, or in the happening of these events, than is required for the belief in common occurrences. If a person tells us he has been a stone on the top of a hill, we do not doubt it. If he tells us that he found gold there, we might not question it, as we live in an auriferous country. But if he told us he found a steamer on the top of a hill, we would not believe him. Nay, if he told us that he had found some diamonds there, we would at once ask him what lapidary has tested them. Again, if he said he saw a bird flying, we would express no surprise, but if he told us he had seen a cow going through the air, without the aid of anything, we would be inclined to ask the police to proceed against him under the lunacy statute, so that he might be examined by two doctors, to see if he was fit to look after himself and his affairs. Again, I ask, why is this? Is it not that we believe in the uniformity of nature, and that we do not believe in, the happening of things that contradict all prior experience. If, then, the universal experience was that once a man died his body became dust, we would require most strong, most clear, most satisfactory evidence to overturn all prior experience. For what must the evidence do? It must show that not only something unusual happened, but it must contradict all prior observed phenomena as to the death of men. If, then, the Resurrection of Christ was unique, if it was an event that never had happened before, and the like had never happened since, what kind of evidence should we require? Would we not require the careful statements of known people of probity? Would the statement of one person be enough.? Would even two suffice? Suppose you were told on the testimony of four people whom you know, whom you could cross-examine, that a man had flown through the air without any adventitous and, what would you say? Would you not conclude that it was more likely they had been deceived, than that such a thing had occurred? And if the witnesses did not leave any statements themselves; if, moreover, they lived in an age when belief in the impossible was widespread; in an age when—to keep to tin subject I am dealing with—resurrections from the dead were not rare, would you not infer that they were deceived, rather than that such an event had occurred? Which is the more probable? Tested by probability, it will be admitted that it is more likely that the believers in the Recurrection were deceived, than that all the previous experience of the world has to be overturned. Indeed, the position of Hume on miracles—a position which, as Mill said, could not to reiuted—was this:—

"A miracle," he said "is a violation of the laws of nature; and at A firm and unalterable experience has established these laws the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined. Why: it more probable that all men must die; that lead cannot of itself remain suspended in the air; that fire consumes wood, and is extinguished by water; unless it be that these events are found agreeable to the laws of nature, and there is required a violation of these laws, or in other words, a miracle, to prevent them? Nothing is esteemed a miracle if it ever happen in the common course of nature. It is no miracle, that a man seemingly in good health, should die on a sudden; because such a kind of death, though more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happened But it is a miracle that a dead man should come to life; because that has never been observed in any age or country. There must, therefore, be an uniform experience against every miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation. And as an uniform experience amounts to a proof, there is here a direct and full proof, from the nature of the fact, against the existence of any muracle; nor can such a proof be destroyed, or the miracle rendered credible, but as an opposite proof which is superior. The plain consequence is (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention), 'That no testinsony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be

of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish, and even in that case there is a mutual destruction of arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after deducting the inferior.' When anyone tells me that he saw a dead man restored to life, I immediately consider with myself whether it be more probable that this person should either deceive or be deceived, or that the fact which he relates should really have happened, I weigh the one miracle against the other; and according to the superiority which I discover, I pronounce my decision, and always reject the greater. If the falsehood of his testimony would be more miraculous than the event which he relates, then, and not till then, can he pretend to command my belief or opinion."

Now what are the evidences of the Resurrection? The Resurrection is mentioned in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The Acts of the Apostles detail the ascension, and what St. Paul says of seeing Jesus I shall also refer to. Taking the four gospels, the first question that will arise is, Are they the productions of the men whoses name they bear? This opens up a wide question, and it would require more time than I can devote to the subject to state to you the results of the recent criticism. In an article in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," Dr. Abbott states the position very fairly, and from it I may briefly summarise what fearless critics, and yet Christian ministers, say about the gospels:—

First, "That Matthew and Luke's Gospels are later than Mark's—that Mark's was written first. That Mark, however, borrowed from documents or books containing sayings and doings of Christ, and that Matthew and Luke borrowed from the same books. That Luke wrote his Gospel certainly after 70, and probably in 80, and Matthew and Mark wrote their's before the fall of Jerusalem. That one proof of Mark's Gospel being the earliest is that he omits accounts of manifestations of Christ after the Resurrection, and has less of the supernatural element introduced than any of the other Gospels. As for the fourth Gospel, it is exceeding unlikely that John wrote it, and it was later than Luke's."

As to its accuracy, Dr. Abbott says:—" If the fourth Gospel is historically accurate, then (on the supposition of the identity of these two narratives) the three synoptic Gospels are historically inaccurate. But if the synoptic narrative is historically accurate, the narrative of the fourth Gospel must he considered rather a new dramatic version than an independent historical account."

In another part of his article it is pointed out that it was not till the end of the second century that John's Gospel was authoritatively quoted as the work of John.

Other critics go much further than Dr. Abbott, the author of "Supernatural Religion," says ("Supernatural Religion," p. 246, Vol. II.):—" We may now briefly sum up the results of our examination of the evidence for the synoptic Gospels. After having exhausted the literature and the testimony bearing on the point, we have not found a single distinct trace of any of those Gospels, with the exception of the third, during the first century and a half after the death of Jesus. Only once during the whole of that period do we find even a tradition that any of our Evangelists composed a Gospel at all, and that tradition, so far from favouring our synoptics is fatal to the claims of the first and second." This refers to the tradition that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. 'See "Campbell on the Gospels," p. 3. Campbell was Principal of Marischal College Aberdeen.)

As to the fourth Gospel, the same author says, (Supernatural Religion, p. 476, Vol. II.):—

"We have seen that, whilst there is not one particle of evidence during a century and a half after the events recorded in the fourth Gospel that it was composed by the son of Zebedee, there is, on the contrary, the strongest reason for believing that he did not write it."

At the very threshold of this enquiry, therefore, we are met with this difficulty—that the authors ot the Gospels, the four witnesses that are called are unknown—that what any of them wrote we do not know, for who wrote the Gospels is more matter of conjecture than of absolute proof. Can then a reasonable man believe everything extraordinary on such testimony? Can the evidence of the Gospels be weighed against the concurrent testimony of all the ages?

But let this be waived. Let us assume—a great assumption—that the Gospels were written by the persons whose names they bear. We must remember that from the orthodox standpoint the Gospels are believed to have been dictated by the Deity. We would therefore expect to find in them a greater harmony than would be found in the writings of men who had not had such guidance. If, however, we find that not only the accounts disagree, but that they are irreconcileable what are we to conclude? Suppose you were a juryman called on to decide a case on the evidence, and four witnesses were called to prove to you any ordinary occurrence, nothing violating the uniformity of nature, what would you require? Would you not expect that in the main parts of the story there would be agreement? For example, let the question be that a certain man cut down a tree on his neighbour's laud; there are four witnesses called; one says the tree was cut down in the morning, another that it was in the afternoon, one when it was dark, and another when the sun was shining. Then one said there was one person present, another that more than one were present; in fact, that no two of them agreed in detailing the occurrence—would you not conclude that their testimony was not reliable? If this would happen about no unusual occurrence, what shall be said when the subject of enquiry is one that contradicts post experience? I am

afraid that many people read and re-read the accounts given in the Gospels, of Christ's Resurrection, and fail to see wherein they disagree. Let me bring before you some of their points of divergence, and let me here state that I assume Christ died. Had I time I might show that if the Gospel narratives are accepted as true this is not clearly proved. Let this point however also be waived.

If we take the time when the visit to the Sepulchre was paid, and the discovery that Jesus's body was not there, we find a great difference.

Matthew says—In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week. Now the end of the Jewish Sabbath was Saturday afternoon—tit any rate some time between 12 noon and G in the evening.

Mark says—And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary, etc., had bought spices to anoint him.

In Luke the women are said to have got spices before the Sabbath, This does not contradict Mark. The probability is, therefore, the spices were obtained on what we would term the Friday.

Mark then continues—" And very early on the first day of the week they came unto the Sepulchre at the rising of the sun."

Mark then makes the visit on Sunday morning at sunrise.

Luke says—Now upon the first day of the week very early in the morning they came unto the Sepulchre.

Luke and Mark agree.

John says—The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene when it was yet dark.

Here, then, about the time of the visit there are three accounts—which one is to be believed?

Then take the names of those who went to the Sepulchre, they whose testimony we are to believe—for the writers of the Gospel are not stating what they themselves saw—save John, perhaps.

Matthew says—Two women—Mary Magdalene and the other Mary.

Mark says—Mary Magdalene, Mary the Mother of James, and Salome (three women).

Luke says it was—Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the Mother of James, and the other women—(several women), John says it was Mary Magdalene alone—(one woman).

There is, therefore, no agreement as to who went to the Sepulchre. Let as take what they saw:—

Matthew says—There was a great earthquake, and the women coming to the Sepulchre saw an angel from Heaven come and roll back the stone from the door of the Sepulchre and sit on it—and that his countenance was like lightning, his raiment white as snow, and ho struck such terror into the keepers that they were rendered insensible, they became as dead men.

Mark, Luke, and John all agree that the stone had been rolled away when the women came to the Sepulchre, and none of them mention an earthquake, or the terror of the keepers.

Matthew says—The women saw the angel sitting on the stone at the door of the Sepulchre, and this angel spoke to the two women.

Mark says—The women saw nobody outside the Sepdcbre—but inside the Sepulchre they saw not an angd, but a young man draped in a long white garment Sitting on the right side of the Sepulchre.

Luke says—The women saw nobody outside and when they went inside they saw no one, and they were much perplexed. In the midst of their perplexity Two Men stood by them in shining garment.

John says—Mary saw nothing on her first visit, but simply that the stone was taken away.

Here, then, you have four accounts all differing as to what the women saw, when they went to the Sepulchre.

Matthew's account—One angel sitting on the stone.

Mark's—A young man was sitting inside.

Luke's—Two men standing inside.

John's—No one out or in—on the first visit, on the second Two Akgels inside, but in different positions from the two men mentioned in Luke. Let us see what the writers of the Gospel say the women heard:—

Matthew says—The angel spoke to the women, saying Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus which is crucified. He is not here, tor ho is risen, as he said. Come see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and, behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there ye shall sec him; lo I have told you.

Mark—The young man said: Be not affrighted, ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified, he is risen; he is not here. Behold the place where they laid him. But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that be goeth before you into Galilee; there ye shall sec him, as he said unto you.

Luke—The two men in shining garments said: Why seek ye the living amongst the dead? He is not here, he is risen; remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying: The Son of Man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men and be crucified, and the third day rise again.

John says—That before Mary Magdalene went to the Apostles nothing was seen or heard, but on her

second visit to the Sepulchre she looked in and saw two angels in white, one at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. The conversation that took place was only this: The angels say—Woman why weepest thou?

She said unto them—Because they have taken away my Lord.

So far, then, as to what took place between the women and the persons they saw at the Sepulchre there is no agreement.

In Matthew and Mark the one angel, and the young man tell the women that Christ has gone to Galilee, and that the disciples will see him there. Luke's only reference to Galilee is that of a prophecy having been made there, and in John no such conversation takes place, but on the contrary, John goes on to state that. Mary turned round and saw a man that she believed to he the gardener, but who when he said "Mary" she recognised to be Jesus.

Taking the next part of the narrative, what did the women do?

Matthew says—They departed quickly with fear and great joy, and did run to bring the disciples word.

Mark says—They went out quickly and fled from the Sepulchre, for they trembled and were amazed, neither said they any thing to any man, for they were afraid.

Luke says—They returned from the Sepulchre and told all these things to the eleven and to all the rest.

John says—Mary Magdalene ran and came to Peter and John, and told them that Jesus had been removed from the Sepulchre.

Here, then, there is disagreement. Mathew and Luke agree in saying the women at once told the disciples. Mark says the women told no one, and John states that only Peter and John were told.

What next occurred?

Matthew says—That on the road from the Sepulchre the women saw Jesus and worshipped him, and that he told them to tell the disciples to go into Galilee, and that the disciples "went away unto Galilee, unto a mountain where Jesus had appointed them," and when they saw him they worshipped him; but some doubted.

Mark says—That after the women had fled from the Sepulchre Jesus appeared to one of them, to Mary Magdalene, but when she told this to the disciples they did not believe her. Then that he appeared to two disciples when they were walking into the country, and also to the eleven as they sat at meat in Jerusalem, and that as soon as he had finished speaking to the disciples he was received into heaven and sat on the right hand of God.

Luke states that on the report being brought to the disciples, Peter ran to the Sepulchre, and saw nothing save the linen clothes. Two disciples going to Emmaus were overtaken by a man whom they did not recognise, and after eating with him he vanished out of their sight. This they believed to be Jesus, and returning to Jerusalem to tell the eleven, Jesus appeared to the eleven in Jerusalem, and that he led them out to Bethany, and was then carried up to Heaven, and never seen again.

John says that Peter and himself went to the Sepulchre, John arrived first, looked in, saw the linen clothes lying, but did not enter. Peter went in, saw the linen clothes wrapped in a bundle. John then went in, and they both returned, seeing neither man nor angel. Mary Magdalene then looked in, saw the angels, and after conversation with them turned round, saw a man that she thought was the gardener, but on his saying Mary she called him Master. That on the same day, when the disciples were assembled together, Jesus came in their midst, how it is not said. The doors were shut, and if he was clothed in his earthly body, then he came through the shut door. Then, that eight days after this, Jesus appeared to the disciples again. A third time he is seen at the Sea of Tiberias by Peter, Thomas, and some others. Nothing is said of the ascension.

In fact, in no detail is there any agreement as to what happened after the apostles were told of the Resurrection. One thing more I must note. I have shown that, according to Matthew, the women were present when the stone was rolled away. The angel was seen coming from Heaven, rolling away the stone, and sitting on it. How comes it that, if Christ rose with his body, that it is not stated, either in Matthew or in any of the Gospels, that anyone saw him walk out of the tomb? There does not seem to have been any eye-witnesses of the actual Resurrection. The angel invites the women to enter the Sepulchre, not to see Jesus, but to behold an empty tomb. But there are still further disagreements. According to Luke, Jesus ascends to Heaven from Bethany on the day of his resurrection. According to Mark he ascends on the same day from Jerusalem. According to Matthew he meets his disciples once only, and that is on a mountain in Galilee. According to John there is no ascension, but he meets them thrice—twice in Jerusalem and once at the Sea of Tiberias.

If we put the appearances in a tabulated form we have, according to Matthew, two appearances—

- To the women;
- To the Eleven in Galilee.

According to Mark, three—

- To Mary Magdalene;
- To the two disciples;

- To the disciples at meat.

According to Luke, three—

- To Cleopas and his companion;
- To Peter;
- To the Eleven and others.

According to John—

- To Mary Magdalene;
- To the disciples without Thomas;
- To the disciples with Thomas;
- To several disciples on the Tiberias Lake.

And if we refer to Acts, we find yet another account—quite a different one too—of what occurred after this visit to the Sepulchre. The writer of Acts says he was seen alive forty days, and then that, at the end of that period, the ascension took place. I ask every unbiassed person if he can believe any story on such testimony as this? But that is not oil. None of the writers of the Gospels says plainly—I saw Christ after his crucifixion. No doubt it may be inferred that same of the writers were amongst the disciples when it is said Christ appeared to the disciples, but none of them say they saw Christ. I have said the writers of the Gospels do not say they write from actual personal observation. They report what others saw, and hence what they had been told. Is it not surprising that the witness who seems to have been most favoured with the appearances—to whom Christ first appeared and oftenest—was Mary Magdalene? a lady that had been deranged, or to use the unscientific language of Mark, who had been possessed of seven devils. Now-a-days, if a person who has been of unsound mind says he saw a vision—that a person reported to be dead, believed to be dead, appeared to him and spoke to him—he would be at once placed in a lunatic asylum. If you peruse the certificates granted by doctors, and filed in our asylum here, you will find that delusional insanity is very prevalent, and that if any person, apparently otherwise sane, says he saw a vision, or spoke with a dead man, that is sufficient ground to warrant the doctors certifying he was insane. The account given in the Acts directly contradicts that mentioned in all the Gospels, I have read many works in, which the attempt has been made to reconcile the Gospels and the Acts. I ask you to read the Gospel narratives, and then the attempts at reconciling them that have been made, and yon will be compelled to say that the narratives are so conflicting that yon could not credit the happening of even a common occurrence on such testimony. Can it be believed that four or five historians, pretending to give an honest account of the same story, nay, being inspired by Deity, and thug guided in writing their narratives, could thus differ in their accounts? Nay, more, could anyone imagino that if the ascension had been known to the disciples, neither Matthew nor John mention it, and that Mark says it occurred from Jerusalem and Luke from Bethany. As to St. Paul's testimony. 80 far as the account of his conversion, given in the Acta, is concerned, it cannot be said that there is any evidence of Christ's Resurrection. Paul believed he saw Christ. Be had what we would term a vision. The persons who were with him on his journey did not see what Paul saw. Paul's vision was subjective, not objective, and therefore, so far as Paul's testimony is concerned, there is no proof of Christ's Resurrection. Paul's own account appears in the First Epistle of Corinthians, and it differs from that of all the Evangelists, and from that recorded in the Acts. According to Paul Christ rose on the third day, he was seen by Cephas, then by the *twelve*, than by 500 brethren at once, then by James, then by all the apostles, and, lastly, by St. Paul. You will observe in this account not one word of the appearances to the women or to Mary Magdalene, no mention of the talk with the two disciples. And, then, who were the twelve? Judas was surely not amongst the disciples at the time of this Resurrection. Judas, according to Matthew, hanged himself before Christ was crucified. Had he been also raised from the dead, or what? The appearances to James and to the five hundred are new, and as to the appearance to Paul, this cannot have been prior to the ascension. Instead, therefore, of Paul's narrative strengthening the stories as told in the Gospels, it weakens them. How comes it that none of the writers of the Gospels recorded the appearance to James nor to the five hundred? Why this silence if they knew of these appearances? James does not mention it, nor any of the apostles. Peter states the fact of the Resurrection generally. Mor need I stop to point out that, in Paul's opinion, all the appearances are alike. The subjective appearance that he thought he witnessed is not differently described from that which he says the five hundred saw.

And here I might leave the inconsistencies, the discrepancies, the irreconcileable differences that the various stories show without further remark. It is, however, of some importance in viewing a history, to remember the age in which it was written. The historian may have been a man unconsciously biassed by the spirit of the times in which he lived. For example, if we find him recording an occurrence which seems rare, if not improbable, we may well ask what were the beliefs of the time. If we read of able judges in the reign of the Tudors or the Stuarts, stating their belief in witches, we express no very great surprise, because we know that in these times a belief in witchcraft was almost universal. Nor do we feel surprised that in the olden days wise men believed the earth was flat. The wise even were not in advance of their time. Was then a Resurrection from

the dead rare? Let us remember that Christ's was not the only Resurrection from the dead recorded. Matthew says:—

"The graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his Resurrrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many."

Surely this was a most wonderful thing;—quite as wonderful as Christ's Resurrection. Persons who had been dead for some time got out of their graves and went to Jerusalem. What became of them afterwards is not stated. Did they die a second time? How long did they survive—or did they go to heaven? But Resurrections from the dead were not confined even to these.

Luke records the Resurrection from the dead of the son of the widow of Nain, and of the daughter of a Ruler of the Synagogue—of Jairus. John records how Lazarus was raised from the dead. Mark records only the Resurrection of Jairas' daughter, and Matthew also records it, and those of the "saints" I have before mentioned. In the Old Testament we have recorded two ascensions Enoch's and Elijah's. Both are supposed to have gone to heaven without dying. And as far as Elijah's power to work miracles is concerned, we find it stated that he raised from the dead the son of the widow woman with whom he boarded. Nor did Resurrections from the dead end with Christ's Resurrection. Augustine in his City of God mentions several. I quote what he says, as translated by the author of "Supernatural Religion." (For the orginal see Dombart's edition, Vol. II., p. 504, Lipsiae, 1863. This edition is in the Otago University Library).

"Andurus is the name of an estate, where there is a church, and in it a shrine dedicated to the martyr Stephen. A certain little boy was playing in the court, when unruly bullocks drawing a waggon crushed him with the wheel, and immediately he lay in the agonies of death. Then his mother raised him up, and placed him at the shrine, and he not only came to life again, but had manifestly received no injury. A certain religious woman, who lived in a neighbouring property, called Caspa-Hanus, being dangerously ill and her life despaired of, her tunic was carried to the same shrine, but before it was brought back she had expired. Nevertheless, her relations covered the body with this tunic, and she received back the spirit and was made whole. At Hippo, a certain man named Bassus, a Syrian, was praying at the shrine of the same martyr for his daughter who was sick and in great peril, and he had brought her dress with him; when lo! some of his household came running to announce to him that she was dead. But as he was engaged in prayer, they were stopped by his friends, who prevented their telling him, lest he should give way to his grief in public. When he returned to his house, which already resounded with the wailing of his household, he cast over the body ot his daughter her mantle which he had with him, and immediately she was restored to life. Again, in the same city, the son of a certain man among us named Irenæus, a collector of taxes, became sick and died. As the dead body lay, and they were preparing with wailing and lamentation to bury it, one of his friends consoling him, suggested that the body should be anointed with oil from the same martyr. This was done and the child came to life again. In the same way a man amongst us, named Cleusinus, formerly a tribune, laid the body of his child, who had died from sickness, on a memorial of the martyr, which is in his villa in the suburb, and after he had prayed, with many tear), he took up the child living."

We have no more evidence for the Resurrection of Christ than we have for those who were raised prior to, and since Christs death. What becausesbecauses of this statement then, that if Christs Resurrection be proved Christianity is proved?

The Resurrection of Christ was not unique, nor does the story of his ascension stand alone? Elijah seems to have gone up to heaven with quite as much *eclat* as Christ. If then neither Christs Resurrection nor his ascension was unique; if neither stands alone in history, can we conclude—even if we believe both—that Chrit was God? The jump that he would be asked to take, to cone to such a conclusion, would be a large one. How can such a "miracle" prove that what appeared to be a man was God? And if Christ was not God, how is Christianity the Divine system is defenders assert it to be. I go so far as to say that were it provd—conclusively proved that Christ rose from the dead and ascended to heaven, which means disappeared out of sight to those on earth, for I cannot interpret the phrase otherwise—and that such a Rcsurection and ascension were recorded of no one else—still that could not be evidence of Christ's Deity. Of what could it bo proof save of the fact itself? No inference could be drawn save perhaps that it was wonderful. How do we know how Deity manifests himself? How are we told anything of Deity? Grant that a man once ded is restored to life, and vanishes in the sky out of sight, would tht prove the man was God or the doctrine of the Trinity? Wht right would we have to draw any inferences from the fact? We might say it was unusual, and that there was something peculr about that man that was not present about ordinary men, but wht more could we say? Even if the man had said, if I ascend throuh the sky, this will prove all I said was true, would that be ay evidence that what he said was true 7 Would an ascent throuh the sky prove aught save so far as going up into the sky was concerned, the man had powers that his fellowmen did not posses. This story of the Resurrection and ascension however does nt stand alone. It is one of a series, and it is told in a way that wre we to accept it as true, wc would be forced to accept as also tre, the stories of witches, of fairies, of ghosts, of Resurrections, &c., with which the literature of a, byegone

time abounds. I would ke to know what became of the bodies. Can we really believe tat Elijah's body and Christ's body, their flesh, their bones, went up to heaven? Were their composition changed? If so, how?

But it has been said, though the narratives in the Gospels may seem conflicting, and though there were other Resurrections, how do you explain the belief of the early Christians? I do not desire to shirk such an enquiry. Let me first of all state that the belief of Paul and of the early Christians was that of a bodily Resurrection. In the Gospels also the Resurrection of the just is spoken of, and hence it is that when Matthew records the rising of the saints he is particular to state that their bodies rose, and they 'went into Jerusalem. This belief in the Resurrection of the body is now almost dead in the Christian Church of to-day; a few still believe in it no doubt, but the mass believe not in a bodily but a spiritual Resurrection. It is not now believed by many that the soul rests in a sort of torpid state until the last day, and that then the body gathered from the elements will be re-made, and the soul enter it. The popular belief amongst Christian sects is that the soul at once reaps the rewards of its deeds. In early Christian times the belief in the Resurrection of the body was all but universal amongst the followers of Christ. And Christ's Resurrection was to them therefore the earnest of their Resurrection. It is thus Paul argues in the Epistle of the Corinthians. To Paul the Resurrection was the fact on which the whole of Christian preaching rested, and his argument was this:—

"Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no Resurrection of the dead? But if there be no Resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen? And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. I. Cor. xv. 12, 18,14.

The proof of Christ's Resurrection was that there was a Resurrection of the dead.

To those, then, who believed in the resurrection of the dead, who from their youth had been trained to believe that Enoch and Elijah had both ascended to heaven without dying, and who also believed that people once dead could be restored to life, Christ's Resurrection does not seem very wonderful. It is true that, notwithstanding what I might term the strong public opinion in favour of resurrections, there were even in that credulous age some doubters. Matthew records that on Christ appearing to the disciples on the mountain in Galilee "some doubted." (Matthew xxviii. 17.) But is the fact that a creed has many votaries a proof of its truth. Christianity is not even yet the religion that has the most adherents, and that from of Christianity that can count the most millions has still its miracles. The apparitions at Knock, the Virgin and a little lamb carrying the Cross, the cures of Lourdes, are believed in by pious Catholics. It is no evidence of the truth of any occurrence that some people believe that it happened. Good people, pious people believe in Buddhism. Able men are Mahomedans, and every phase of Christian belief has its votaries. And what shall be said of modern spiritualism? Hundreds, thousands, nay, perhaps millions, believe that spirits visit the earth, and are seen by men and women. And if it comes to be a mere question of evidence, there can be produced testimony for spiritualistic phenomena far more reliable than can he produced for Christ's Resurrection or for Biblical miracles. How, then, can belief be a test of truth? Men have died for what they believed to be true, but did that prove they were right? To say, then, that Christianity is a great fact does not help the defenders of Christianity a bit. Buddhism, Mahomedanism, Catholicism, Protestantism, Brahmanism, the Hebrew faith, and Spiritualism, are all great facts. Is the existence of an "ism" a proof of its truth? "Four hundred and seventy millions of our race live and die in the tenets of Buddhism." (Arnold's "Light of Asia," preface.) Yes, to quote Arnold's "Light of Asia" again—"To Gautama has been given this stupendous conquest of humanity; and though he discountenanced ritual, and declared himself, even when on the threshold of Nirvana, to be only what all other men might become, the love and gratitude of Asia, disobeying his mandate, have given him fervent worship. Foresta of flowers are daily laid upon his stainless shrines, and countless millions of lips daily repeat the formula,' I take refuge in Buddha.'"

I have now briefly dealt with the alleged Resurrection of Christ, and I submit I have shown that, as reasonable men and women, we cannot say it has been proved. I have also shown that if proved, Christianity as the system of religion granted by Deity to men would not be proved. But has it not lessons for us? When we see how many myths men have believed in, in the past, how in the name of religion, and led by their emotions, men have committed such huge crimes as history records, is there not need of us, if we disbelieve the popular creed, coming boldly forth and saying so? By continued iteration and reiteration men may be trained to belive anything. Hardly anyone now contends that a belief in a falsity can do much good to a man. That stage of the controversy we have left behind us. Falsehood can do humanity no good. Men cannot be male better, or more moral by believing a lie. If, then, it is truth alone that can help mankind, why should we be afraid or ashamed to criticse the popular beliefs, and, if they cannot stand the brunt of criticim to discard them. If we do so we will throw overboard the Resurrection of Christ. But do we thereby lose any influence that Chrst shed on humanity? Not at all. Jesus Christ was a religious reformer—he hated formalism. I fancy if he were to enter some of the Christian Churches of to-day and saw the genuflexions, be bowings, the posturings, and heard the prayers, he would be nclined to do what he is said to have done in the temple when he drove out the money changers. He was a freethinker. The cred of the past had no authority for him. His creed was short, shorer far, than the

Apostles' creed, and be had neither thirty-nine articles, nor Shorter Catechisms, nor Syllabus. To as, if he was a man, he is ever a great example. Make him Deity, and his influence is weakened, for we can never be expected to do what Deity did. Throw a halo of mystery round his life and death, and yon detract from the man. But let us contemplate Jesus Christ as a Jewish Reformer—as a man—who went about doing good, and he becomes one whose life has its lesson for us. To many the belief that Christ was Deity has been of much comfort, bat which, I ask, is the grander conception of humanity? That which can contemplate the great men of the past as men not gods—or that which says the world's heroes were either gods or inspired by God. If we could say Behold the man, look at his life, look at the influence it has shed on the world, would not we be able to stimulate a purer morality, a higher life, than if we were to say be was a god, and to ask men to believe about him things for which we have no evidence. Let us also believe that the world is progressing, that the golden days are not behind us, but in front of us—and that we need not be scrutinising the past to find out its creeds—and to treat these as our jailers. No, let us remember:—

New occasions teach new duties. Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward, who would keep abreast of Truth.
Lo, before ns gleam her camp-fires; we ourselves must pilgrims be.
Launch our Mayflower, and steer boldly through the desperate winter sea;
Nor attempt the Future's portal with the Fast's blood-rusted key.

Woodifield, Jolly & Co., Atmospheric Printing Works, Octagon.

GORE BROTHERS, WOOD AND COAL MERCHANTS, Sell Coal and Firewood cheaper than any firm in Dunedin, at prices that defy successful competition. Send for List of Prices, and judge for yourselves. GORE BROTHERS. Cumberland Street, near Hanover Street. ALL ORDERS ATTENDED TO SAME DAY AS RECEIVED

THE PENNY POST Is the cheapest weekly paper published in Otago, it contains SIXTEEN COLUMNS of well-selected reading matter, consisting of Novels, Ladies Column, Yankee Drolleries, Poetry, Scientific Notes, Local Skits, and General News. Subscription, 1s. 6d. per quarter; 3s. per half year; 6s. per annum, post free. P.O.O. payable to the Manager. Copy sent post free upon application. OFFICE: 60 PRINCES STREET, DUNEDIN.

SAMUEL READING, DIE SINKER, LETTER CUTTER, ENGRAVER, &C. ATHENÆUM BUILDINGS, OCTAGON, DUNEDIN.

THE ECHO, A Weekly Newspaper, devoted to Freethought on all subjects. EPITOR - - - ROBERT STOUT. Price per annum, 8s. 6d.; posted,:0s. fid. Subscriptions received by Publisher Echo, corner Arcade and High Street.

Patriotism Address Delivered by Sir Robert Stout. Chief Justice of New Zealand, in the Victoria Hall. Invercargill vignette Monday. December 17th, 1917.

Address by Sir Robert Stout.

The following is the full text of the address delivered at Invercargill on Monday by the Chief Justice:—

We are citizens of no mean country. New Zealand is not a vast territory like Australia. The area of that island continent, as it has been called, is greater than the area of the United States of America if Alaska is left out. The area of the continguous States and Territories amounts to a little over 3,000,000 square miles, and that of Australia, Tasmania, and New Guinea is about the same extent. New Zealand has an area equal to the area of England, Wales, Scotland, and half of Ireland. It is about half the area of Germany in Europe, and its territory is about half that of France. We have heard much of late of Belgium, Rumania, Switzerland, and Serbia. The area of New Zealand exceeds the total area of all those four nations. The population of those nations was, before the war, about 20 millions of people. New Zealand, however, had only about one million people. In all that makes life desirable New Zealand is equal to any country in the world. It has beautiful forests, rich mineral deposits, and large, level, and fertile agricultural and pastoral lands. Its climate is all that can be desired. We are geographically more favorably situated than most parts of Europe. Let us see how we stand in reference to the sun. Do we realise that the 47th parallel of southern latitude passes through the centre of Stewart Island, and that the 50th parallel of northern latitude passes through Land's End in England? All the territory of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland is further from the sun than any part of New Zealand—even Stewart Island. No part of Germany in Europe, or of Holland, or of Belgium is so near the sun as Invercargill. We have a climate of eternal spring on all our seaboard, and almost all Europe has a more severe winter than any part of New

Zealand. In the United Kingdom there may be said to be five-months of winter, and in Scotland cattle have to be fed indoors for about that period. In the North Island of New Zealand our flocks and herds do not require housing or feeding indoors, and except in providing winter food, such turnips, outside, and to some of our stock oaten chaff, our flocks and herds in the South Island do not require to be housed or to be fed indoors. Another test of our climate may be of use to us by looking at the situation of our towns. Invercargill is about the same latitude in the south as Lausanne, in Switzerland, is in the north; Wellington the same as Barcelona, in Spain; Christchurch is about the same as Marseilles; Auckland as Cadiz, in Spain; and Halfmoon Bay about the same latitude as Paris. There are hundreds, nay, thousands of people in the North Island who have never seen a fall of snow, and there are thousands who have never even seen snow on top of a high mountain or hill. Even in Stewart Island frost in the winter along the shores is unknown; in fact, along the sea coast of Stewart Island there is less frost than you will get even in Hawke's Bay. It is said, however, that the latitude of a place is not everything so far as heat or climate is concerned. This is true. We know that the effect of the Gulf Stream in Western Europe is such that there is warm water along its western shores right up to the north of Norway: but we also have a warm current striking Stewart Island, which comes from the Queensland coast. Our climate is more equable as a whole than any climate in the world. Then we have a great asset in our scenery, in our mountains and our lakes, in our forests, in our rivers, in our perpetual glaciers, our highest mountain being no less than 12,359ft in height. Our West Coast sounds—our fiords—are unequalled in grandeur by any inlets in the world. With such a country and such surroundings as we possess, we mast become the home of a strong and able people. We have not the heats of Australia, nor the frosts of the northern United States or Canada. We have another great advantage to start with: we have a goodly race settled in New Zealand. Our early settlers, and those who have come to us since, are physically, mentally, and morally strong people, and in such a country as New Zealand we can look forward, surely, with hope and faith to a great future for our new nation.

We have made considerable advances since our colonisation began. We have vast flocks and herds. Fifty years ago our sheep numbered about 5,000,000; today we have about 25,250,000. Our cattle have increased in the same period nearly tenfold. We had then about 250,000; we have now a little over 2,500,000. We have numerous other domestic animals. Our trade has also increased so that during the past year (1916) it amounted to nearly £60,000,000—namely £59,625,670, and before the war—namely, in 1913—our total trade amounted to £45,275,024, a total trade per head of £42 7S 3d.

"The Fortunate Isles."

We have in our country all that tends to the training and uplifting of mankind. We have a public school system that is found in all parts of New Zealand—infant schools, primary schools, secondary schools, technical colleges, and university colleges. We have also a system of scholarships that gives aid to acquire a high education to every bright son or daughter of New Zealand. We have four university colleges established, and we make provision for granting degrees even to those who may not be able to attend university colleges but who may be self-educated. We have numerous philanthropic associations, all tending to weld us together in the love of humanity and for progress. We have art societies Mattered throughout New Zealand, also literary societies, and we have begun a literature of our own. We can now count amongst those born in New Zealand poets, artists, writers, inventors, and we need not be ashamed of New Zealanders when they go abroad and compete with the inhabitants of older countries in arts and sciences. They have been successful in England, in America, and on the Continent of Europe. That we have a strong race and a healthy country can be shown by our death rate. The death rate of New Zealand in 1915 represented 9.06 per 1,000, and in 1916 9.64. It was as low as 8.87 per thousand in 1912. This compares more than favorably with the death rate of any part of the world. There is no country in Europe with such a low death rate. In the United States the death rate in 1914 was 13.6 per 1,000, in England and Wales it was 14. in Scotland 15.5. in Germany 15, in France 19.6, whilst in that isle where, according to the poet, "every prospect pleases"—Cevlon—it was 32.2 per 1.000. The death rate of the Commonwealth as a whole was 10.51 in 1914. None of the States of Australia has had such a low death rate as that of New Zealand.

The Value of Thrift.

We have done much to train our people to thrift. The deposits in our banks and the number of people insured in New Zealand are great. I prefer to take what advance we have made before the war. In the, Post Office Saving Bank in 1914 the total amount to credit of depositors at the end of the year was a little over £19,000,000. The private savings banks in the same year had nearly £2,000,000. The amount of deposits to the

credit per head of population amounted in 1915 in New Zealand to £21 19s 7d. The amount insured—the ordinary life insurance—in New Zealand amounted to nearly £41,000,000 in 1915, and in industrial insurance nearly £3,000,000. Our land has been greatly improved since 1840, when our first immigrants landed, and the total value of our land, with improvements, amounted in 1916 to £389,164,729. We have ships and railways and roads and motor cars, and all the amenities of a highly-civilised life. Our prisoners relatively to our population are few, the death penalty has rarely to be imposed, and we are a law-abiding and law-honoring people

A Free Government.

We have the freest government on the face of the earth. Adult suffrage prevails in the election of our Parliament. Our Parliamentary election is triennial, and the piping "of an Act of Parliament by the King has rarely happened. We have "a government of the people, by the people, for the people." We are a democracy. With all these advantages to soil, of climate, of people, of civilisation, of free government, surely we have a right to look forward with hope to the future. The pages of history lie before us, showing the enormous advances that mankind has made. A Greek poet, 440 years before our era, could write of the conquests of man. May I quote a few lines from Sophocles in the 'Antigone.' He said:

Many the forms of life,
Wondrous and strange to see;
But nought than man appears
More wondrous and more strange.
He, with the wintry gales.
O'er the white, foaming sea.
'Mid wild waves surging round.
Wendeth his way across;
Earth of all gods from ancient days the first,
Unworn and undecayed.
He, with his ploughs that travel o'er and o'er,
Furrowing with horse and mule,
Wears ever year by year.

And speech and thought, as swift as wind,
And tempered mood for higher life of States,
These he has learned, and how to flee
Or the clear cold of frost unkind,
Or darts of storm and shower.
Man, all-providing, unprovided, he
Meeteth no chance the coming days may bring.
Only from Hades still
He fails to find escape;
Though skill of art may teach him how to flee
From depths of fell disease incurable.

And if a poet had to exalt the glory and prowess of man to-day, he could say much more than Sophocles said 2,500 years ago. What a wealth of invention there has been in even 50 years; and there is not a year that passes over our heads but what gives us more knowledge and more command of Nature by man.

When we consider what mankind has done, what our own race has done, what our own communities of New Zealand have done, may we not feel proud and he elated at the conquests of our people? We have shown during the present war that heroism is not extinct, that courage is as great as ever, and that self-sacrifice and love of country still inspire our fellow-citizens. A Norwegian poet, Bjornst-jerne Bjornson, wrote a patriotic poem called 'The Norwegian Song,' and I think that some of its lines might be sung by New Zealanders. He said:

In my land will I dwell,
And my land will I till;
Hers my prayer and my arm
And my children shall be.
Her soil I will defend,
And her wants I will tend,
From her uttermost hills to the sands of the sea.
Hers is sunshine enough,
Hers are seed fields enough,
If we all give our strength to our dear native land.
So sweet our Norse song,
And our might is so strong
That her fame must rise high if together we stand.

And he winds up by saying:

Oh, dearest on earth is this land of our birth,
As it was, as it is, and as yet it shall prove;
For the love that springs forth
For our home in the north
Makes the northland wax great with the fruits of our love.

What is Our Prime Duty?

The question we have now to consider is What is our duty to this our land of New Zealand? We are living in a world where there must be a continual struggle if man is to maintain his position and make any progress. We have many enemies to fight; we must keep our banner of liberty always flying. There is often a continual struggle by coteries of men to get the control of our government. Some people want to dominate their fellow-men, and if any party dominates our institutions, then liberty disappears. The government of the people by the people for the people must ever remain our watchword and motto. If it ceases to be government of the people by the people for the people, than democracy has vanished. There are often seen in our midst what must be termed forces of evil. We develop habits that do not tend for the advancement of the race, and we see in all countries in the world, even in the most civilised, habits and customs that tend to deteriorate mankind. It was well said many, many years ago by a Swiss geographer that mankind could only advance where there was a perpetual struggle with Nature. He said that a temperate zone produced the best quality of mankind, because there had to be a continual struggle for life preservation; that if Nature was dominant, as in the Arctic circle, mankind deteriorated; and if life was too easy, bread and water being sure with little effort, as in the tropics, where the struggle for existence was unknown, man degenerated. The only hope for humanity lay in a continual struggle for existence. And perhaps the fact that Southern New Zealand has a more rigorous climate than the balmy north may lead to the production in the south of a more vigorous race than in the north. Our south-westerlies that strike Foveaux Strait are not all evil. We have struggles in our midst; we have many evils to fight. May I point out to you one evil, what I may term the drug habit? We see in use amongst our people two drugs—namely, alcohol and tobacco. We have not been troubled in New Zealand much with the opium habit; it exists in different phases in our midst, but not to any large extent. In some countries it is a great menace to human life, and tends to great degeneration. The opium habit is not confined to China; it is found, though not extensively in many large towns in the world. We look upon the taking of alcohol and the using of tobacco as not being any menace to our civilisation. Are we wise in underestimating the evil influence of these two drugs? Let us look at the question from a mere money point of view. We are spending in New Zealand many millions a year on these two drugs. I estimate the expenditure at £5,000,000. We spend as much on these two drugs as we spend on all our Government departments, save Post and Telegraphs and Railways, and these two departments give us a revenue. Such expenditure is utterly unnecessary for any good purpose. The use of the drugs by a man does not make him a stronger man physically or a better man morally or a wiser man intellectually. Taking the lowest ground, it is a wasteful expenditure of our resources; but when we consider the

physical effects, the moral injury, and the intellectual debasement that follow from an extensive use of these drugs, then it becomes surprising that we should treat their use in the kindly way that is common in our midst. One great evil amongst our youths is cigarette smoking. It seems to me almost universal, and it is not surprising that a disease called "cigarette heart" is not unknown amongst our young men. Cigarette smoking tends to slackness in business and to inefficiency, as well as being a potent cause of ill-health. It lowers the staying powers of our youths. For the cigarette habit no argument can possibly be made. Cigarette smoking is not periodic—it is continuous—a slow, insidious, sure poison. Its results can be foretold as accurately as the expert doctor can foresee the end of incipient locomotor ataxia.

Prevention Better than Cure.

There are diseases also from which we suffer that we do not take sufficient means to prevent. We cannot expect a robust race except our public health is carefully guarded. The physical basis must be the basis on which our moral and intellectual advance must be built. Without physical strength we can do nothing, and yet what are we doing as citizens of this great nation to build up our physical strength and our public health?

Prevention of Slums.

We have not the slum areas that they have in large cities in Europe and in America.. We have, however, the beginning of this evil state of things, and it is necessary for us if we are in maintain the physical standard of the race, to look after the health of the people in the towns, as well as of those in the country. To adequately undertake the supervision of public health we ought to have town-planning; we ought to insist on open spaces; we ought to insist upon sanitary dwellings We know what has happened in England, where the best sanitation schemes have been inaugurated. In what are termed the garden cities in England the death rate has, in some instances, fallen to about six per thousand, and I do not see why our death rate should be any higher in New Zealand than it is in these garden cities; but we know that in every large town in New Zealand there are areas that ought not to be allowed to exist. We ought to have everywhere fresh air and sunlight, and every attention paid to cleanliness.

Capital and Labor: Improve the Relations.

There is another question that stares us in the face, and that is the need of some new regulations in reference to labor. There has been during the past few years a continual contest between what is termed capital and Labor. We have had strikes innumerable both in New Zealand and in Australia, and the waste of money has been great. There is the utmost need for some reform in our industral life. If there are industries in our midst that cannot afford to pay adequate wages, so that those who are employed in them can obtain decent lodging, decent clothing, decent food, and decent amusements, then that industry is of no use to the community. There are many ways in which this problem can be solved. We have attempted to solve it by having an Arbitration Court for the fixing of wages, and if that Court is to be a success its decrees must be obeyed. There is no use in having an Arbitration Court if the decrees of that court can be flouted by either employer or employee. I believe that such a Court is one means of settling the labor trouble, and the Court must have the widest possible jurisdiction. It should find out what the profits of the employers are, and, second, whether the business is a proper or profitable one to have in the community, and third how the employees spend their wages. If, I repeat, the business is such that it cannot afford to adequately and properly maintain those engaged in it, then that industry should be abolished. I do not believe that we have any industries that cannot afford to pay wages to provide reasonable lodging resonable food, reasonable clothing, and reasonable amusements for those who are engaged in it.

Advocates Profit-Sharing.

Another matter that will have to be considered is whether there could not be some arrangement made between Capital and Labor to give Labor some share in the profits that are made in any industry in which Labor is engaged. This system of sharing profits has been tried in France, in some other Contimental countries, and in England, and where they have had judicious employers and judicious employees it has been a success. It will

not succeed, however, unless there is a spirit of loyalty to a great end—the brotherhood of men— operating in carrying it out. I believe we will also have to constitute a court to fix not only the wages but the prices of goods, and our people seem favorable to such a court being tried. There is no use, however, in creating tribunals if we do not realise that, there can be no progress without order, and unless there is obedience to the law we ourselves have made. There must be civic peace. Those who engage in strikes and violate the orders of a court are not good citizens. If there were no courts having jurisdiction to settle disputes a strike might in some instances be justifiable; but where we have a tribunal with due representation of both Capital and Labor there is no excuse whatever for setting aside the decrees of such a court, nor for a party to the proceedings in a court to fix, without regard to the other party, the wages and conditions of Labor. Every strike is a blow struck at true democracy—at the brotherhood of men. Some of our people demand the fixing of prices and of profits, and that, may have to come in the near future. But what is the use of fixing prices of goods if the owners can set the rate at defiance? Now, a strike against the rate of wages, or of the conditions of labor, is civil war. It is flouting the law, and it is doing more: it is showing that the Stale ought not to fix the price of anything—of labor, or labor products. No man who justifies a strike can justify the fixing of prices of goods or profits. There is yet another industrial problem demanding solution, and that is

The Discontinuity of Employment.

Workmen are employed one week and are out of a job the next. This is seen in various employments, and is a great waste of efficiency, and of labor and of capital, too. How is this irregular or unsteady employment to be dealt with? It is prevalent in our pastoral and agricultural in- dustries, is to be seen at our waarves and in other industrial departments. Many remedies may be suggested. So far as pastoral and agricultural work is concerned, it might be met by having those who work on farms provided with houses and small allotments, so that when out of work for wages they might have work of their own to do. At present, shearers travel in Australia and New Zealand, and in this way fairly continuous employment is found for them; but I doubt if it is an efficient system of work that necessitates men leaving their families and travelling thousands of miles every year. The other system of having small allotments with intensive culture to attend to when their work on a farm was not, required would, I believe, be more efficient so far as labor is concerned, and better for laborers. There is much intensive culture that could be followed, such as producing fruit, honey, flower seeds, eggs, etc. Another remedy is that the employees should have diverse work to do: when one kind of work was not required another kind could be undertaken. Let us take, for example, waterside workers. They should, in my opinion, be selected for their character and industry, and the infrequency of their work should be done away with. They should have fixed salaries, and the employers—the harbor boards, etc.—should provide accommodation for them—perhaps in flats near their work, the flats to have restaurants, kitchens, etc.—and there should be some arrangement arrived at, perhaps with municipal councils or other employers of work, for employment to be given to the harbor board employees when there was no work on the wharves for them. There is not doubt a scheme could be devised to get rid of discontinuous employment were we only to face the question.

The Burdens of War.

Another problem which, if we are patri- otic, we must consider is the enormous burdens that have been laid upon us by the war. On the 31st March, 1917, the Public Debt of New Zealand, including the debt of the General Government and local bodies, had risen to about £150,000,000—was in fact. £150,236,239. No doubt we have large assets for much of that expenditure, but consider what such a debt means! it means over £6,000,000 a year in interest. How are we to meet the large amount of taxation that must be imposed upon the Dominion? Our debt next year will be increased by many more millions. How will we ever be able to meet the interest on this enormous debt, coupled with the many duties cast upon the Government—duties the expense of which can be paid for only by taxation—our public health, our education, our roads, our streets, etc.? There are only two ways in which we can get of grinding taxation and the lowering of the standards of life. First, we must be thrifty—the abolition of all wasteful expenditure on things that are not necessary—and, second, by greater efficiency in our industrial life. We must have greater production. Science must be applied to our main industries, to our pastoral industry, to our agricultural industry, and to various other industries that are now in their infancy—our manufactures, our fruit farms, etc. We need scientific education in order to make our people efficient producers. We have not yet half developed the resources of this country, and the only hope for us lies in greater thrift and greater efficiency. I have already spoken about the need of the abolition of slums, and steps are being taken to say that where they do not exist they shall not be created. That touches on a question that has

been dealt with in a very able book called

'Eclipse or Empire.'

For example, there are towns in England on which there are thousands of tons of soot thrown out of chimneys which fall in those towns every year. The air is bad—everything is bad for the maintenance of human life. Now, we are placed in New Zealand in a peculiarly good position so far as energy is concerned. We have so many storehouses of water in our lakes and rivers that by transmitting water-power into electricity, we would be able to provide all the energy, all the firing, all the light necessary for 12 million or 20 million of people from our water-power. If we were to create this water-power into electricity we could have smokeless cities, clear, sweet, and clean; and the result, as far as regards the health of the people and in the enjoyment, of the people, would be surprising. This is within our reach if we choose to be patriotic and efficient. With electrical energy utilised we could have all our factories clear of coal dust, and we would not see men with blackened faces and grimy clothes pouring out of our factories at the close of the day. Even where electrical energy is not used, there are some factories in America where arrangements are made for factory hands to change their clothes. Each hand has a cupboard for the purpose of keeping his clothes. He goes into the factory clean and comes out clean, leaving his dirty clothes behind; and in many factories there are hot baths for all the factory hands to use before they put on their clean clothes and go out of the factory and go to their homes. Why should we not have such a system in New Zealand? There is

Great Waste in our Social Life

in many directions. We will have to have greater co-operation in domestic life and in our social life generally. I was much struck at the improvements that have been made in many ways in America. Let us take a very simple thing—roadmaking. In America they are making hard concrete roads far quicker than we make them, far more lasting, more efficient, and at a great saving in expense. Let me illustrate what can be done in America. When America went into the war she had to create camps—or, as they call them cities—for her soldiers, and Lord North-cliffe, in one of his papers on what America had done during the war, said: "Early in July there lay, 300 miles outside San Antonio. Texas, a stretch of ground round with a difficult kind of scrub or bush. By July 6 there appeared an army of between 9,000 and 10,000 workmen, of every known Nationality, directed by voting Americans of the Harvard and Yale type. The 10,000 arrived in every kind of conveyance—in mule carts, farm waggons, house cabs, motors, and huge motor vans. At the end of tile day's work, when the whistle had blown, the scene resembled that of some eccentric, elabmately-staged cinematograph film. Together with the army of 10,000 men came many kinds of sets of automatic machinery and hard concrete roads were made with a thorough nessand permanence which should attract attention in Europe. In this new town outside San Antonio 12 miles of rails, 25 miles of road, 31 miles of water pipe, 30 miles of sewers were accomplished in 45 days. . . . On August 25 a considerable part of the city was ready for occupation. The strongly and comfortably built huts wove provided with heating arrangements for the winter, and baths (hot and cold) are attached ton each building. There are vast stores and vast blocks, several post offices, a huge bakery, laundry, stables for 1,300 hurten and nudes, hospital, schools—in all between 1,200 and 1,300 buildings, And what has been done in Texas was being simultaneously done in 15 other parts of the country." Contrast that with what we did at. Trentham with what we did in making the road between Wellington and Petone.

"We Must be More Efficient.'

But there is something else to be considered, and that is what is termed the soul of the race. We must, if our race is to be a great race, have the highest ideals kept ever before us. Man does not live by bread alone, nor even by industries alone; man, as a social being, must have a high ideal of social life. It is our duty to look after the weak ones of our State. Let us ever remember that both as individulas and as members of a social organisation we must try to eliminate the weak by making them strong. We must so act that all may become strong. It would however, be a poor race that worshipped strength alone and eared nothing for the weak, but left them to their own poor resources. We need kindly actions; we require hospitals, and we must give of our strength to help the weak; we mast cultivate love for others. A kind act may help the weak; we must cultivate love for others. A kind act may help a fallen brother or sister, but it has another merit. If has been likened by an

American writer to an Australian boomerang. The boomerang when thrown, returns to the thrower so a kindly act done comes back to the doer, and it elevates him in the scale of being perhaps more than it helps the recipient of the kindness. Let us apply this.

Prison Reform Must Not Stop.

What are we to do with those in our midst who are anti-Social, who violate our laws who (touse a legal term break the peace? Forgiveness will not do; we may thereby encourage disorder. A society that treats a lawbreaker just in the same way as it treats a good citizen is pursuing a dangerous policy. The Civil Magistrate, as was said long ago, has still to be a terror to evildoers, and [*unclear:* a] praise to them that do well; but punishment, if inflicted, need not be a complete refusal of freedom to the culprit. There must he an effort to reform and redeem the violators of our law, and they must be treated as erring sons of men, not as mere outcasts. There are many new ideas afloat now on prison reform. We have tried what is called the probation system. It means letting the lawbreaker at large, but subject to certain limitations on his freedom. He cannot go where he likes, nor can he do what not likes, and on the whole great success has attended its operation. Perhaps it may be extended. Why should not a violator of our laws not have his political as well as social or personal privileges restricted for some time till he shows that he has realised what the duty of a citizen signifies? If it should happen that it was not safe to allow the violators of cur law at large, that they must be interned, we will have to see that their training must be of a civic and of an industrial character. The men who should be in charge, at all events, of our prisoners under 30 years of age should be wise schoolmasters accustomed to deal with wayward youths—of youths wanting mental or moral balance. The schoolmaster and the doctor and the specially trained warder should be in charge of our institutions for interned people, and in the places of internment there must be profitable and trained labor and many educative agencies. Amusements will have to be provided for as well, and kindness must reign. We will best reform our weak and stupid law-breakers by work, equation, and kindness. There will be a residuum who may have sunk so low in the Social-scale that they will be as unable to use freedom as if they were mentally afflicted. They may have become social degenerates. Even for them, although they must remain without freedom to go where they please, we will have to try to give them some happiness in life, and the boomerang will come back to our people. It is not therefore a mere struggle for industrial efficiency or for the production of wealth in which we are engaged: it is

A Fight for a Higher and a Nobler Race;

a race with physical strength, brain power and kindly heart. We must have a high idea of social life and of the capacity for untold progress of mankind. What a struggle it is! It is not surprising to find pessimists amongst us who think that the day of the millennium will never dawn. Even those things that seem at first sight to make for progress often delay it. We me longing for peace and brotherhood. What a number of associations we have whose aims are high—churches, philanthropic associations bearing all Kinds of names clubs, lodges, friendly societies, etc., etc., and yet how often do they hinder true corporate unity of the people of a, nation and delay social progress. How often it happens that the welfare of an association whatever name it is called, comes to be looked upon as the must important object to be attained. We want our church, or our society, or our club, or our political party to dominate; the mission of the association is ignored; the welfare of all ceases to be our aim, and our effort is partial or sectional. Patriotism means that humanity and nationality must count for more than party. Let me illustrate this by a story from France. A stranger was sympathising with a French woman because her husband had left her and joined the army. The French wife expressed her astonishment at this sym- pathy. She said; "Of course he had to go; "I am only his wife; his country is his mother." If they have many such in France we can understand what French

The Crux of the Problem.

How can we create true patriotism? May we not recall the past? What is behind us as a nation and a race? The deeds, of our ancestors from whom we have sprung are behind us. Who has not read of what many a thin red line has done an our countless battles? Are there not names of heroes that are for ever remembered because of their courage, their loyalty, their ability, and their glory? And have not our hearts been stirred within us in the present, great war by what our lads have done on the fields of Gallipoi, of Egypt, of Palestine, of Greece, and of France; and our sailors have shown that Trafalgar was not the last great battle our Navy fought. We have

behind as also the struggles made by our ancestors for liberty and righteousness. Often in the past our ancestors hace fought not for glory, not for riches, not for honor, but for liberty alone, which they said no good man loses but with his life Our children are not going to forget the deeds of glory of our ancestors. They may have to fight, as we had to fight [*unclear:* otuola], with wild beasts at Ephesus, but the will struggle on, and fulfil their duty to their nation, to the race, and to humanity. This war has bound us together: it has made us feel as one; our differences in politics and in creeds have been forgotten. The few shirkers and pacifists are not worth mentioning: and may we not hope when the war is over that we will take more interest in inculcating civic duties and civic peace and civic brotherhood! Our schools should be the true training grounds for love and brotherhood, where children are riot separated from children because of their parents' beliefs. We hopo to see true patriotism everywhere, and love reigning, where children in their games and in their studies will not be separated by barriers of nationality or creed. Citizenship will be the biggest thing. We can look with hope to the future; in the dim distante it may be, but a new vision and a new earth are coming. Human life will be more sacred, and future social life will be pure, and our cities will be clean and sweet, with no slums, no bad citizens menacing our civilisation; liberty will reign, man will tell his thought to man, and all will recognise that truth alone can make men free. Our education will be higher. The knowledge of the Sixth Standard is too restricted a vision for me future man; life will be on a higher level; each will work for all, and all will work for each. A *State* conscience will be created, and brotherhood will dominate all our actions. Poets have seen this vision; prophets have foretold its coming; woe to us if we do not struggle to attain it. It we do not, our race will pass away, as many past races have gone, and other races will take our place. What is the Golden Age? you may ask and may I quote to you an American poet for the answer:

Have you heard the Golden City
Mentioned in the legends old?
Everlasting light shines o'er it,
Wondrous tales of it are told.
Only righteous men and women
Dwell, within its gleaming walls,
Wrong is banished from its borders,
Justice reigns supreme o'er all.

We are founders of that city,
All our joys and all our groans
Help to rear its shining ramparts,
All our lives are building stones;
But the work that we have builded,
Oft with bleeding hands and tears.
And in error and in anguish,
Will not perish with the years.

It will be at last made perfect
In the universal plan,
It will help to crown the labors
Of the toiling hosts of man:
It will last and shine transfigured
In the final reign of right,
It will merge into the splendors
Of the City of the Light.

Star Print, Dunedin.

Prisons and Prisoners Prisons and Prisoners and vignette

By The Chief Justice Sir Robert Stout

Prisons and Prisoners

Being a Lecture delivered on Sunday Night, 28th July, 1918, in the Unitarian Free Church, Wellington
By the Chief Justice, Sir R. Stout.
Reprinted from the Dunedin Evening Star.

To-night I propose to address you on one phase of our social life—on our prisons and prisoners. It is a branch of a much larger question—namely, in what relationship does the individual stand to the State? The State is the name we use for the community as a whole. The individual is a part of the State: he has, it is said, his rights or his privileges, and the State power is not unlimited. What the exact relationship is to be has, in the past, led to much discussion, and even at times to civil war. It is doubtful if the problem of "the One and the Many" in State action, or in metaphysics, has been solved, or ever will be solved. The problem changes as man develops, and if it is said our views of morality have changed, and will yet chance, as Professor Frazer points out in his preface to his work on 'Taboo,' we must expect that this relationship of "the One to the Many" may assume different phases as time goes on. In all social life wherever men are living in a community there must be rules for the guidance of conduct, and these rules must be observed by the dwellers in the community. There must be some tribunal to enforce these rules. Were this not the case, the strongest, the most tyrannical, and the most uncoscientious would rule, and slavery, not liberty, would prevail. Order in its truest sense would be unknown. We must recognise that all human beings are not equal. There is not equality of physical strength, of mental ability, nor of moral quality amongst our people. It has been so in the past. We recall the career of tyrants, as well as the lustre shed on humanity by men and women of genius, and the lives of persons of both sexes whom we call saints. But though we recognise that disparity, not equality, prevails amongst human beings, we still lay it down as the basis of our social life that there are certain inalienable human rights—the right to live, the right of freedom and of liberty so long as the exercise of that freedom and that liberty does not interfere with the liberty and freedom of the other members of the community. Our hope is that the moto of the French Revolution. "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," will have an abiding home in all communities.

In dealing with the subject of 'Prisons and Prisoners' we must begin by acknowledging that there must be rules—we call them laws—in our social life. As Professor Frazer has pointed out, the most primitive social communities had such rules, and, if they were infringed, swift and sometimes drastic punishment was inflicted on the offender. Wherever there is any community, however primitive—or, as we sometimes say, savage—or however developed, enlightened, or free, the offender against the laws of the community is punished. It is so in our private societies or associations or unions. The most democratic of our voluntary societies punishes the in finger of its laws. It may be by a fine, or by the expulsion of the offender, or it may be by giving him an opprobrious name. Have we not heard a fellow being called a "blackleg" if he has offended the rules of some trade union? And the calling of that name may have an injurious effect—perhaps more injurious than even a short term of imprisonment. All communities, there fore, recognise that there must be rules, and that these rules must be enforced; and if the community is a free community they will be enforced by an enlightened public opinion through independent tribunals.

The rules of the community are made for the preservation of life and of liberty. A breach of such social rules constitutes a crime which, when committed, strikes a blow at social order. No free community can permit disorders which threaten the lives and the liberty of its people. These must be put down. The question is how host to prevent their occurrence and recurrence.

You may remember what the author—a New Zealand settler—wrote in his book called 'Erewhon' about the treatment of those who broke the laws of that community. The public offender in 'Erewhon' was sent to a hospital, and the sick were sent to gaol. I wonder if the founder of the Moutessori system of child education had read 'Erewhon.' In a school, conducted according to the Montessori methods, a child who is "naughty," who breaks the rules of the school is treated as being sick, and is quarantined in the school room. No other child goes near it, and though the child has books, pictures, and the usual Montessori articles given to it, it is left severely alone until released from quarantine. We have not yet followed the example of the people of Erewhon, but our ideas of prison management have greatly changed, and who knows but that we may yet come to recognise that the proper name for our prisons is "Erewhon hospitals." In the past it was believed that criminals were possessed by demons. Some of us may have heard of a man being indicted—that is, formally charged in our courts as a murderer, the indictment stating that "not having the fear of God before his eyes, hut being moved and seduced by the instigation of the Devil, . . . "did kill and murder "... the person named. The Courts did not require this statement to be proved. We use no such terms nowadays in our indictments. The time was when our gaols were "pest" houses, and the danger of prisoners spreading the contagion was so great that flowers were placed on the bench to prevent infection. As an example of how long old customs tarry with us,

you will often see a bunch of flowers put on our bench at criminal trials. The belief in Demoniac possession is dead save amongst a very few illiterate superstitious people, and the health of our prisoners is higher than that of law-abiding citizens.

The treatment meted out to out public offenders is according to the offence committed being proved before a jury or admitted by the accused. Our statutes provide that in cases of murder a capital sentence is imposed. For less offences there are these provisions:—

- The offender may be allowed free "on parole," it may be termed—that is, he or she is allowed to go free, and will not be called up for sentence unless there is some new misbehaviour. "Parole" is sometimes granted even though the offender may have been previously convicted. In such a case ho is not imprisoned.
- If he is a first offender, and has hitherto borne a good character, he may be released on probation—that is, he is not sent to prison, but he has to obey certain rules or conditions. Some of these may be that he has to pay the whole or part of the cost of his prosecution, or take work approved of by the probation officer, or reside in a certain district, or not go out after 6 o'clock or some other hour at night, or not smoke cigarettes, or not enter a hotel, or not taste intoxicating liquor, or report himself to the probation officer at certain times, or pay some recompense to the citizen he may have injured.
- He may he sentenced to reformative detention. On this senence, if he is a youth, he is generally sent to one of our out-of-door prisons like Waikeria or Kaingaroa, or to Invercargill. The main difference between such a prisoner and one sentenced to ordinary imprisonment is that he is at once placed Wider the jurisdiction of the Prisons Board. The are may recommend probation or discharge. A reformative detention sentence is sometimes given alone, and it may be for any term not exceeding 10 years. It is sometimes given in addition to and along with a sentence of imprisonment, with or without hard labor. This imprisonment sentence is called the "head sentence," and the Prisons Hoard's jurisdiction does not arise till the head sentence has been served.
- He may be sentenced to n term of imprisonment with or without, hard labor. If the sentence exceeds two years' imprisonment, the Minister of Justice may, when half the sentence has been served, allow the Prisons Hoard to consider the case, and the board may treat the prisoner as one sentenced to reformative detention.
- An offender who has been guilty of two sexual offences or four other offences of a specified kind may be declared an habitual criminal. This declaration alone may be made, or he may be sentenced to imprisonment and this declaration added. If declared an habitual criminal his sentence is an indeterminate one, and he is only released from gaol on the recommendation of the Prisons Board, unless he is pardoned by the Governor. There is also provision for those guilty of continued minor offences being declared habitual offenders, and these are dealt with as if they were habitual criminals. This declaration is not often made.

The First Offenders Act was passed in 1886, and; has proved very beneficial. So far, it may be said that between 80 and 90 per cent, of those released on probation have not cmur again before our Court as offenders. Many habitual criminals have been let out on probation, and some have been discharged after a term of probetion some have been released several times on probation. Many of these seem incorrigible, but the Prisons Board has wisely determined that they will not close the door of hope even to the hardened offender. The board realises that it must try and try again to give even the worst habitual criminal a chance to reform, so long as he is not a menace to the lives of our citizens. Some have been redeemed, and are now, as far as is known, living honest lives. And of others what James Russell Lowell said is true:

Men ain't made angels in a day,
No matter how you would and labor 'em.

Before dealing with the prisons. I may mention that provision is made for habitual criminals and the reformative detentionists earning some money when in gaol. The amount that may he earned is 3s 3d per week. This is banked for them, and earns interest. When thew are released the money is paid to them, or used for enabling them to become industrious citizens. I understand this privilege is to be extended to all prisoners.

There is no need to mention police or minor prisons, where only persons on remand, or who have had minor sentences passed on them, are, confined. The principal prisons which illustrate the method followed in our detention system are:—

1. Invercargill, which has our most upto-date prison. It is a fine building, built of brick, stone, and concrete, entirely by prison labor. The cells are airy and well lighted, and to most of them the sun has access during some part of the day. It has a large gymnasium and a lecture or school hall. The building is well situated, well

drained, has a garden round it, and it has every convenience. Most of the inmates work out of doors. Very important reclamation works have been done over a large area, and part of this reclamation has been set aside for a prison farm. The prisoners work well, and appear to work harder than free men. In the gaol concrete blocks are made, and concrete roofing for buildings. Telegraph poles are made of reinforced concrete. There is n school and a schoolmaster provided. This new depaiture in prison life has been very successful. In Invercargill, however, as elsewhere, there are mental degenerates that are almost impossible of much development. Provision is made for physical drill and gymnastic exercises. There are also lectures delivered in the winter evenings, and debates are held amongst the prisoners. The prisoners have the rise of a library. Physically, the prisoners are much improved by their detention in Invercargill. They gain in weight and in muscular development. The rations here are larger than in the North. Everything is done to encourage mental development and moral stability.

2. Poparua is a new farm prison, It is situated a few miles out of Christchurch, on the plains. Buildings have been put up by the prisoners; the land is used by a farm. In 1916—I have not yet seen the 1917 report—there were, outside the gress-area, 210 acres under cultivation. 122 acres were in oats, 22 acres in potatoes, 6 in mangolds, 17 in turnips and silver bet, 24 in mixed grasses, 16 in lucerne, and 3 in ordinary vegetables. There were about 450 head of sheep, and the increase of lambs was 120 per cent. Many improvements have been male on the farm. The prisoners generally lead an open-air life but, in addition to farm work, a few of them are making reinforced concrete telegraph poles and concrete building block.

3. Lyttelton is one of the old type of prisons, and will no doubt soon be declared obsolete. There is some quarrying done by the prisoners. Inside this goal all the boots, shoes, and slippers required by he prisoners in the various prisons are manufactured. There are also some made for inmates of mental hospitals. The workmanship is very good.

4. Addington is the female prison for the Dominion. We have very few female offenders. Of the daily average of prisoners in all the Dominion prisons in 1916. 895 were males and only 82 females. This is much to the credit of our women. The prison buildings stand in the middle of a large garden. The inmates do gardening work, raising both vegetables and flowers. They have also done much Red Cross work in making garments, etc., for our troops. No less than 5424 articles were made by them in 1916. Lectures ave given occasionally to the prisoners. There is much need of the classification of prisoners, especially in this prison, where hardened offennders are associated with young girls and first offenders.

5. Wellington Prison is an old prison, and is badly arranged, and will no doubt soon be declareed obsolete. Prisoners in Wellington do brickmaking at Mount Cook Reserve. There are two workshops there, where engineering work is done. At Point Halswell various public works have been constructed, such as houses, jetties, roads made etc. In 1916 801,000 ricks were made. There is a large tailoring estalishment in the prison, which furnishes the uniforms for the prison staff of the Dominion and clothing for the prisoners.

6. Waikeria is a prison farm of about 1,200 acres in extent. A fine brick and stone and concrete building has been erected by prison labor. The building is well arranged, and well lit and comfortable. The farm is being improved, and roads made in and near it. In time it will become an excellent farm, and I hope it will remain a prison farm, and become a place for training prisoners to scientific farming.

7. The Waipa Prison Camp has, unfortunately, been closed in the meantime. It was an ideal situation, overlooking the Green Lake, and is not far from Rotorua. It had cubicles for prisoners in a garden full of flowers and vegetables, and the inmates did gardening and tree-planting. There were no walls surrounding it, and the beauty of its situation is not excelled by any house site in New Zealand. The words of the old poem by Lovelace was true of it:

Stone walls do not a prison make.
Nor iron bars a Cage.

8. Kaingnroa is a prison camp arranged on somewhat similar lines to Waipa, Here are cubicles in a flower garden, each prisoner having a separate room for himself. The prisoners are engaged in tree-planting and gardening, and do a little farming. They raise all live vegetables they require. In 1916 they planted 2,933,100 trees, and dug 1,583,700 holes for tree-planting. At this camp there is a fair library, and a room that can be used as an assembly room. The prisoners sent here are mainly first offenders or others of good conduct. There are in this prison camp several prisoners held for breaches of the Defence Act and Military Regulations. A public conscience is evidently becoming awakened even amongst lawbreakers, for some prisoners who were confined for ordinary crimes refused to speak to the defence and military prisoners, saying they would not work with them, as they were a disgrace to the Dominion in shirking their responsibilities under our military law.

9. Auckland has a large and splendidlybuilt stone prison. It was built by prison labor. It is the finest

building of its class in New Zealand. In if are almost all the habitual criminals. The only out-ofdoor work done is quarrying and some building work on the gaol site. There is a school connected with the prison, with a schoolmaster in charge, meeting three nights a week. There is excellent physical drill in the prison. It is a building of the old common type of gaol, and it is so situated that there is little opportunity for out-of-door work.

We have had a prison camp near Rotoaira, where prisoners have made a most useful and necessary road from Waimarmo Plain towards Tokaanu.

The Minister of Justice has lately published the returns of the value of the work done in the gaols for 1917. It amounts lo £43,211, whilst the total cost of the prisons was £81,000. The earnings included, amongst others: Farm improvement, £3.645; boots, shoes, and slippers, £1,283; domestic work, £5,000; treeplanting and public works, etc., £15,083; etc., etc. The number of trees planted up to the end of 1916 for 16 years is 36,539,800. It is only just to our gaol management under our provincial system to state that in Dunedin, before the abolition of the provinces, in some years the value of the work done by the prisoners would, if it had been done by free labor, mure than equalled the total maintenance of the gaol.

I think we may congratulate ourselves on what has so far been accomplished in prison management. Many prisoners are being trained to an industrial life. Many are liaving a neglected education improved. They are free from any temptation; they are living a healthy life; and their wills are being disciplined, in one or two of the gaols they are not denied what may be termed pleasures and amusements. Much, however, remains to be done. May 1 sketch some things which could be done without entailing much expenditure.

The records show, as I have stated, that female offenders are relatively few in number. We have, however, some who have had many convictions recorded against them. Their offences have never been very seriors, but they are going in and coming out of gaol perhaps two or three times a year. Many of them seem incorrigible, and they ought not to be associated with young women or with first offenders. In my opinion, just as we recognise that there are persons who are chronic invalids, and for whom we provide a special home, so we should establish a home for these chronic offenders. It should be in a garden some distance from the town, and their sentences should be indeterminate. For their own sakes and for the safety of the community they should not be released until it was clear that they could not physically nor morally barm others. The reformation of drunkards should be attempted by similar methods. No doubt the Salvation Army has done good work at Roto-Roa and Pakatoa but there is not, and cannot be, the strict discipline in these Army homes that exists in a Government institution. The Salvation Army retreats could still be utlised by those who desire to go to them for voluntary treatment. There should be some training in self-reliance given to all our prisoners. We know what has been done in some places in the United States. There games are allowed, such as baseball, etc., and there is a tribunal established, presided over by prisoners that deals with prison offences. Some prisons there have mutual welfare leagues that provide for classes and lectures. It is said that the prisoners who sit in judgment on prisoners for breaches of the rules of the prison are more strict than visiting justices. Might we not try this system in New Zealand for the purpose of training our prisoners in self-control aind self-government. A prisoner should not only feel and know that he is (and for, arid that our community desires to Sit him, a good citizen, but he should fuel that he is trusted, and be should be allowed to begin to rule himself and realise his duty as a citizen. Further, in my opinion, all our gaols should be openair gaols, and the moro work that our prisoners can do out of doors and in the sun will be the better for them.

There is another reform to be undertaken, so that industry and thrift—two of the things which prisoners usually lack—should be encouraged. Our prisons are not at present self-supporting. Why should they not be self-supporting? Prisoners ought to be able to make the farms pay. Suppose we gave them the buildings free, and charged them a moderate rent for the farm proper, and credited them with the work done in improvements, and with some share of the profits on the sale of the produce, if there was a profit alter all expenses were paid they should get credit for it.

Were they made participators in the profits there would be a great incentive to work, to become efficient and to be thrifty. Prisoners require to learn the industrial spirit and the habit of thrift They need educating; they need discipline; they need industrial training; but they are human beings, and we must give them hope, and their lives should be made pleasant so long as discipline and training are not neglected. We have got rid of the idea of Demoniac possession Let us make another advance forward; perhaps a spark of goodness lies hid in the worst of them that we can develop.

Is there any hone that crime will ever cease? It was said long ago that the poor would always be with us, and we must make up our minds that there will be lawbreakers till the public conscience is awakened and the millenium arrives. But humanity is progressing, and we must have faith in the future, and we must have patience whilst ever working for a higher social life. If one considers the causes of crime, the need of work, of hope, and of patience will manifest. Heredity plays an important part in the causation of crime. We recognise heredity in the physique of men, and we know that mentality descends. There are abundant instances of both

physical and mental traits being inherited. We have proof of that in the history of many families. For instance, many most eminent scientists claim Erasmus Darwin as all ancestor, and the Gregory Family has a record of more than a score of eminent and literary and scientific members. The Stephen family is equally celebrated, and so is the Cecil family, whose history stretches back to the days of Queen .Elizabeth. One representative of to-day is Mr Arthur Balfour, and he is as able as any of his ancestors in the Elizabethian era. Moral and immoral tendencies are also hereditary. One degenerate family during three or four generations produced about 300 undesirable citizens—forgers, thieves, prostitutes, etc., etc., and in our Eaols we find authenticated examples of eredity. Then we have criminals every now and again coming to us—from beyond the seas—whose past habits give no guarantee that they will become good citizens. We have also mental degenerates in whom only is a thin partition dividing them from the insane. Poverty in some eases leads to crime, and above all, there are social habits and social surroundings that tend to destroy strength of will, and which cloud the moral faculty. We have, for example slums, with overcrowding, which makes decent life Impossible. There is not much of this in New Zealand, but it is not entirely absent. Further, there is the menace of drug habits. We have not yet realised that alcohal is a poisonous drug that weakens the will of men and women and directly leads to crime. Directly, at least, one-third of our crime can be attributed to alcoho. This I know from my own experience in dealing with crimes and criminal:. Indirectly, perhaps, it has even a greater effect in the causation of crime. It car not-be questioned that some people can use alcohol without apparently any injurious results, but every year alcohal claims as its victims a third of our prsoners and perhaps half of our inefficients. And even the cigarette habit has a most deleterious effect on our youths. In deaing with these two drugs alcohol and tobacco—people who wish to see crime lessened and etlicicncy promoted can rerder most valuable service. We must have what is termed a State or a public conscience. We have heard much of late of "private consciences." It is well to have a conscience of some kind, it is well to be guided by moral considerations; but if a man or a woman sets his or her conscience above the dictates of the public conscience it does not bespeak an exalted moral attitude. I am not referring to those who are called "conscientious objectors" to our laws. Some of them, as the Quakers, having an heredity and a history behind them, are honest. The Quakers have ever been forward in public services. There are some not Quakers whose "conscientious" objections are but disloyalty to our State and thinly-veiled treason. If in the peril which besets the State some of her citizens do not rise to help her to maintain her existence they certainly should not be allowed to take part in the governance of the community, nor allowed the liberty, privileges, and freedom that loyal citizens possess. Fortunately there are not many such amongst us; but there are a few. They are just as criminal as the men who do not recognise the right of liberty and the claims of property.

We need a public conscience. We need to make sacrifices for the welfare of our people and of humanity. Emerson said that it we desire reform we should begin to reform ourselves. Are we now doing our duty to our country? Passing through our public gardens we often see notices placarded thus "Protect Your Own Property." That we need such notices shows that the public conscience is not fully developed. Why should we treat property that belong to the Government or the State with less care than we give to our own? Why should juries sometimes give verdicts in actions against the Government they would not give against, an individual? Would such a thing happen if we had developed a keen public conscience? And seeing how many of our weak fellow-citizens fall through the alcohol habit, is it not right that we should appeal to the strong amongst us for their help in combating this evil? Should we not feel an obligation to prevent the downfall of the criminal and the inefficient amongst us who stumble through our social habit of alcohol drinking? The National Efficiency Board have recommended that alcohol shall be abolished. Will you help? Unitarians do not rely on past sacrifices for the salvation of humanity; they recognise that if humanity is to go forward men and women of to-day must, make sacrifices for their race and for humanity here and now. Let us as individuals set an example by following the example of the United States and Canada in abolishing the trade in intoxicating liquor.

I understand that a suggestion has been made that New Zealand shall—to use an American phrase—become "dry" but that a vast sum of money some £4,000,000 or £5,000,000) shall be paid to those engaged in the traffic as compensation for depriving them of the monopoly to sell intoxicants. The basis for this proposal is first, that alcohol drinking is a great social evil; and, second, that the traffic is a must profitable one. If these grounds are admitted. I fail to understand on what principle of civil or moral right, compensation should be paid. There has been no pledge by the State that this monopoly can be or will be continued. Many districts of New Zealand are "dry," and no compensation has been paid. Most of the United States and most of the provinces of Canada are "dry,"' and no compensation has been paid. Then we have had the bars of our own hotels closed at 6 o'clock, and no compensation has been paid. Why compensate or compromise with those who are injuring the State? If we have vast sums of money to spend there are many reforms for which money is required. We need money for our industries, for our public health, for the introduction of electricity, for the completion of our railways, etc. If compensation is to be paid, would it not be more just to compenstate the dependents who have been injured through the drunkenness of the father or the mother? In our prisons and in

our mental hospitals are many victims of alcohol, and, alas! there are many who have come to an untimely end by its use. Should not the families of these be compensated? In some of the American States there is a Civil Damage Law, which enables a family that has been injured by the breadwinner being hurt or killed through alcohol to sue for compensation from the supplier of the liquor. If the conscience of the Stale were keen, is there any doubt how the moral issue would be settled? Further, what is this but a compensation for an unearned increment? The Error! Hyperlink reference not valid of public-house property has been raised by public-house licenses being restricted and by the increase of population.

Let us realise our duty to the State and to humanity. If we do we shall be content to sacrifice much to ensure progress and to procure the weak and the fallen to be re-established. The individual conscience must be subervient to the public conscience. The need of selfsacrifice must be realised by the men and women of to-day. There are many calls on us; there are many social problems to be solved, and it is only by keeping the ideals of duty and self-sacrifice ever before us, and obeying the conscience for the benefit of the State that we can hope for advancement. True manhood and womanhood rests on self-government, self-knowledge, and self-sacrifice. As Tennyson has said:

Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control—
These three alone lead life to sovereign power;
Yet not for power (power of herself
Would come uncalled for), but to live by law,
Acting the law we live by without fear;
And because right is right, to follow right
Were wisdom in the scorn of consequence.

Star Print, Dunedin,
Woman Suffrage in New Zealand.
By Lady Stout.
Price 1d. The Woman's Press, Lincoln's Inn House, Kingway, W.C.

THE WOMEN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL UNION. Telegraphic Address: Telephone WOSPOLU, LONDON. 2724 HOLBORN (3 lines). Offices: LINCOLN'S INN HOUSE, KINGSWAY, LONDON. Hon. Treasurer: MRS. PANKHURST. Hon. Secretary: MRS. TUKE. Auditors: MESSRS. EDWARD MOORE & SONS, Chartered Accuntents 25, Creaby Sqoare, E.C.

BUY "The Suffragette." Edited by CHRISTABEL PANKHURST. The Official Organ of THE WOMEN'S SOCIAL AND POLITICAL UNION. Of all Neweagents ONE PENNY WEEKLY.

Woman Suffrage in New Zealand.

Reprint, March, 1913 2 M.
By Lady Stout (wife of the Chief Justice of New Zealand).

FROM time to time one is met by the statement that the enfranchisement of New Zealand women has had no effect except on Temperance Reform. When legislation affecting women and children is mentioned one finds that complete ignorance of its significance and purport prevails amongst otherwise well-informed people. One reason is that law-abiding persons and others whose interests are confined to their own pursuits and amusements do not take the trouble to investigate the conditions of life by which they are surrounded. Another reason is that the women's vote in New Zealand has never been a "sex vote," and was secured by the goodwill and co-operation of men and women without arousing any bitter sex antagonism.

Men of worth of both parties have always been ready and willing to develop the woman's point of view in legislation for the improvement of the social, economic, and industrial conditions of women and children. Any restrictions, and there are many, that have been imposed upon women's labour and hours of work have been in the interest and with the full concurrence of the workers themselves.

What Woman Suffrage has accomplished.

The following list of Acts will show that it is well for the home and the State to be governed by the united vote of men and women:—

An Act to admit women to practise at the Bar.

University Act, making absolute equality for men and women in education, scholarship and degrees.

Education Act—equality of both sexes. (Co-education which is universal in the Primary, Secondary, and University education, except in High Schools and Private Schools, has proved an unqualified success.)

Compulsory Attendance at Continuation Schools Act—equality for boys and girls.

Technical Schools Act—equality for both sexes.

Old Age Pensions.

Servants' Registry Office Act.—This Act, which makes it compulsory for Registry Offices to be licensed, ensures the safety of young girls, especially in connection with the white slave traffic. A writer in the *Morning Post*, in belittling this Act, is evidently unaware of its significance.

The Adoption of Children Act.—No premiums being allowed to adopting parents, and a magistrate's sanction being required, safeguards children from cruelty and neglect.

The Protection of Children Act.—Strict regulations and the inspection of boarded-out children prevents baby-farming.

The Destitute Persons Act makes the maintenance of relatives compulsory, and removes burdens from the Charitable Aid Boards and the ratepayers, besides increasing individual responsibility.

The Testator's Family Maintenance Act empowers the Supreme Court to cancel any will which does not make sufficient provision for the testator's wife, husband, or family.

The Succession Act provides a fair division of property to wife, husband, or family. There is no male entail, and landed as well as personal property can be equally divided.

The Inalienable Annuities Act ensures maintenance for defective and invalid children, and prevents their portion being seized for debt.

The Maintenance Act provides for the maintenance of wife and family, and makes provision for maintenance orders being enforced in adjacent colonies. It also makes provision for wages to be paid to prisoners for the maintenance of wife and family. A woman can sue for maintenance while living with her husband.

The Industrial Schools Act provides schools for criminal or neglected children, from which children are boarded out and their wages banked by the Government. Subsidies are paid to private bodies which maintain industrial schools and orphanages, but all such schools must be under Government inspection.

The Maternity Homes Act provides a fortnight's accommodation in a Maternity Home. Visiting midwives and maternity allowances to expectant mothers are provided for women in their own homes.

Subsidies are paid to the Salvation Army and other bodies for rescue and reformatory work.

A deserting husband or the putative father of an expected illegitimate child may be prevented from leaving the country.

The Criminal Amendment Act ensures adequate punishment for sexual offences—from five years' to life imprisonment, with floggings, is given according to the seriousness of the offence and the age of the victim. (The indeterminate sentence makes possible life imprisonment for moral imbeciles, degenerates of both sexes, and habitual criminals.)

The Prison Reform Act substitutes reformatory for punitive methods in dealing with offenders.

The First Probation Offenders Act has been the means of saving many offenders from a criminal career.

The Indecent Publication Act is used to suppress indecent pictures and immoral literature and plays.

The Shop Assistants Act protects the health and wages, and regulates the hours of shop assistants.

The National Provident Fund Act provides for a contributory form of insurance.

The Juvenile Smoking Act prevents indulgence in cigarettes by boys under 16.

The Children's Court Act has been in operation for some years, and has been the means of much kindly and preventive work amongst juvenile offenders.

The Divorce Act makes the conditions for divorce equal for both sexes. In it there is a provision by which in the case of a husband suing for divorce, if it is proved that his unfaithfulness had driven the wife to a similar act, the divorce can be refused. In the case of the wife suing for divorce the same rule applies.

Women can get compensation for slander, under the Women's Slander Act, without having to prove that the slander has damaged their reputation.

The Municipal Elections Act provides that both husband and wife have a vote in the qualification of the one or other.

The Legitimation Act is similar to the Act in Scotland by which a child may be legitimised on the marriageof the parents and receive equal shares in property, equal rights and the status of a legitimate child. Provision is made for distribution of the estates of illegitimate children to the mother and her relatives to the exclusion of the father and his relatives. Illegitimate children can be registered in the name of the father. There are many other Acts which safeguard the lives and well-being of children.

The influence of the women's vote is seen and felt in all our legislation, although no attempt has even been made to arouse sex antagonism. The sense of justice which prevails, and which insists upon the punishment of

the guilty party instead of his victim, in cases of seduction, has attained a high level in New Zealand.

There are many cases in which the voice of honest indignation has been raised against the man whose neglect and selfishness have driven a shamed and hunted girl to desperation, which clearly prove that the tone of morality has been raised and the sense of justice aroused in men as well as women.

The Factory Laws, which provide equal pay for equal work for men and women, and ensure healthy conditions of work and a minimum wage of *£1* 5s. per week for women, which have made sweating impossible, show the benefits working women have received as the direct or indirect result of the power of the vote. I have the testimony of Mr. Tregear, who was head of the Government Labour Department for twenty years, to the effect that the present generation of women think that things were always as satisfactory, and have forgotten that their mothers had to work for so little wages and so long hours as their employers willed.

The Compulsory Military Training Rill, which has had the hearty support of the women of the Dominion, was welcomed as a protection to their homes. The provision in the Bill for the exclusion of alcohol from the military camps was insisted upon as a safeguard from temptation to their sons.

The Temperance regulations which have reduced crime and drunkenness in the districts in which they are enforced are an example of the voting woman's foresight and care for the future of her children and her home.

Amendments to the Pensions Act to add 50 per cent. to old age pensions, when the pensioners have children under 16 years of age, and to pay 7s. 6d. to 10s. per week to widows, irrespective of age, who have young children, have been passed, with the concurrence of the Opposition, who knew that they were acceptable to women voters, who had to be reckoned with at the General Election.

The real power of the woman's vote in New Zealand is not in opposition, but in its harmony and co-operation with the men's vote. A house divided against itself cannot stand, but the united and loyal comradeship of men and women have secured for New Zealand reforms in legislation which are making the Dominion a paradise for men as well as women and children.

Anti-Suffrage Argumenta Refuted.

The following statements have been made by "AntiSuffragists" without evidence or proof of their accuracy. I shall try to prove that they are false by quoting reliable statistics and admissions made by men who are opposed to the suffrage for reasons which it is unnecessary to summarise.

1.—*Women do not want the vote*.

The same statement was made in New Zealand and disproved at the first election in which women took part as electors. There were five petitions presented to Parliament at various times, containing in all 31,872 signatures, but 109,461, or 78.48 per cent., of adult women registered and 85.18 per cent, of these voted. There were three constituencies in which there was no contest.

2.—*Women do not use the vote*.

Several writers have stated that, "contrary to expectation," women *do* use the vote in the ratio of 78 to 80 of the men's vote. A writer in the *Standard* quoted the reduced percentage of 78.26 at the last election without stating that the men's vote had also decreased 2 per cent. The most convincing proof that women are more willing to vote than formerly is that 99.76 of the adult women registered in 1908 compared with 78.48 in 1893. The percentage of men who registered was only 99.54. Many women were unable to record their votes, but if it was understood that women have often to drive or ride for long distances over rough country roads, and have to take their children to the poll with them, the British voter would be more than astonished at their zeal. All women, married and single, have a vote, yet we find that the Englishman, who does not have to take his family to the poll or undergo any discomforts in recording his vote, shows less willingness to vote than the women of New Zealand.

3.—*The Government is purely parochial, and has no real similarity to an Imperial Government*.

We find the British House of Commons dealing with very domestic matters such as drainage, water supply, meals for children, education of infants, boot factories, shops, flannelette nightdresses for babies, overlaying of infants, maternity allowances, and a hundred and one small parochial matters. In New Zealand we have made greater strides than Britain in Imperialism. We have adopted Compulsory Military Training. Proposals for Imperial Federation, representation of the Dominions at Imperial Councils, and an Imperial Appeal Court were submitted to the Imperial Conference by delegates representing women voters. Our representatives were consulted in Defence and International Politics. In the name of their constituents (men and women), they demanded the right to be consulted on all Imperial questions. Their proposals were rejected by the "Imperial Government," which fails to realise, as Australia and New Zealand women do, the need of a United Empire. The Dominions have been before instead of behind Britain in the realisation of Empire. It seems as if women had by their influence developed an Imperial conscience as well as a moral and altruistic standard in domestic legislation.

4.—*Home life has been ruined by the vote*.

Home life and all the conditions for happiness have been improved by giving men and women an additional mutual interest and equal power in determining the future of their children.

5.—*Women would neglect their homes*.

This cry was very loud before we got the vote, but now we have the testimony of "antis" that no such calamity has befallen the homes. There are instances of women who spend their days playing golf and bridge (they do not take the trouble to vote), but there is no case on record in which the vote has been blamed for neglect of home.

6.—*The vote would cause dissension in homes*.

An "anti" visitor from New Zealand, in a letter to the *Morning Post* of August 4th, 1910, wrote: "It has brought about no family quarrels to speak of," and so he did not speak of one, much as he would have enjoyed the opportunity! No one has ever mentioned one such case during the eighteen years since the Franchise became law. There have been family quarrels caused by bad cooking, hats and frocks, education of children, religion, late hours at clubs, over-indulgence in champagne, and other matters of less significance, but no case in which either husband or wife has blamed the vote for unhappiness in their married life.

7.—*Drunkenness has increased as a result of the temperance regulations secured by the women's vote*.

The statement is one of the half-truths so dear to the "womanly anti-mind." The number of cases has increased, but the percentage has decreased. With an increase of 22,284 in population the number of cases is bound to increase. New arrivals, numbering 12,000 from the country that refuses to enfranchise its women, may account for the increase.

8.—*There is more alcohol drunk in the no-licence districts than formerly, and secret drinking has become the rule*.

Compared with other parts of the Dominion there was only a twelfth part of beer and a hundredth part of wine and spirits consumed in the no-licence area. There has been a reduction of 90 per cent. in drunkenness in no-licence districts and crime has almost disappeared. The testimony of judges, magistrates, doctors, clergy, mayors, and other leading citizens verifies this statement and court records prove it.

9.—*New Zealand women are "Anti-Gambling."*

(What a blessing they are "anti" something!! It ought to make an Imperial bond with the Anti-Suffra- gists.) They are not all "anti-gambling." Even if they were, does it denote a low standard of womanhood or constitute a danger to the State?

10.—*Women are for Peace*.

Perfectly true, and we are proud to follow the example of King Edward, the Peacemaker of Europe. "Women are for Peace" because they suffer more than men in time of war. Although they believe that all International disputes should be settled by arbitration, they answered the Empire's call by sending their sons to South Africa. They support compulsory military training because they believe that the best way to secure peace is to be ready for war. The fact that the only parts of the Empire which have recognised this are Australia and New Zealand, where women have the vote and where their vote would have counted as a factor in opposition, is a conclusive answer to the "anti" cry that giving votes to women would imperil the safety of the Empire. The votes of British women in the Dominions helped to save the Empire in time of peril, and we have no reason to believe that the women of the Motherland are less loyal or less patriotic than their sisters under the Southern Cross.

ii.—*Crime has increased*.

The ratio of crime has decreased, and the largest number of law-breakers in New Zealand are new arrivals from Britain, Of 3,159 convicted prisoners received in gaols in 1909, 1,502 were from the United Kingdom and 47 came from other British Possessions. In 1910 there were 1,538 from the United Kingdom and only 1,263 New Zealand born prisoners. The New Zealand born form 68 per cent, of the whole population, but only 35 per cent, of the total number in gaols. Our crime is traced to the country where women are voteless.

12.—*Immorality and the illegitimate birth-rate have increased*.

The moral tone of the community is on a much higher level than before the suffrage. The illegitimate birthrate (which was always low), has decreased, and the rate per thousand unmarried women has also decreased, although there is more freedom and independence amongst women, and marriage is contracted at a later age. It is only the "anti-obsession of sex "that could find any connection between illegitimacy and the vote. The "antis" are unable to look at any subject from a wide and rational point of view, and always bring sex and its vices or weaknesses into the discussion of matters which depend upon physical, mental, moral, and climatic conditions.

13.—*The birth-rate has decreased*.

The birth-rate decreased before the suffrage, and began to increase in 1899. In 1909 it was 27.29, compared with 24.4 in England and Wales in 1911. The increase in the number of children attending school was so great

that thirty-five new public schools and one private school were opened in 1909. Our natural increase in population is 18.07 per 1000, compared with 12.13 in England and Wales.

14.—*The rate of infant mortality is a disgrace to New Zealand*.

The rate of infant mortality is the lowest in the world, and has decreased 30 per 1,000 since the suffrage. In 1909 the proportion of deaths of infants under one year was 61.6, as compared with 120 in voteless England and Wales. The deaths of children under 5 years of age, per cent, of mortality at all ages, was 23.55 m 1909. In Dunedin the low rate of 4.86 per cent, proves that in a short time we shall be able to save all babies except those suffering from "the sins of the fathers."

15.—*Women will be treated with discourtesy at the polls*.

During eighteen years New Zealand women have been treated with consideration, respect, and courtesy, not only at the polls, but at the declaration of the poll. No "anti" has ever ventured to state that the vote has unsexed women, or lowered the status of womanhood.

16.—*Undesirable women will vote*.

No doubt they will, but they will not be able to outvote the more "undesirable men" who have reduced them to the "undesirable" state. In New Zealand "undesirable women" are "not in evidence" since women got the vote.

17.—*Labour legislation has ruined the country*.

The Dominion is more prosperous and trade is brisker than it has ever been before. The total trade increased from £33,788,778 in 1908 to £35,336,.715 in 1990. The increase was still greater last year.

18.—*Capital has been driven out of the country*.

Capital is always going somewhere, according to the Opposition Party in every country. If capital remained in a stocking, it would denote stagnation of business. Unlucky people complain, but others have prospered.

19.—*Education has made servants scarce*.

The same complaint is heard in England. The remedy—and New Zealand women are urging its application—in more practical training and less education in useless subjects.

20.—*Farmers have been ruined by grandmotherly legislation*.

Farmers were never more prosperous. The New Zealand Farmers' Co-operative Association's turnover for 1910 was £2,961,688, an increase of £510,784 for the year. There has been an increase in occupied land, and a decrease of twelve only in the number of holdings of over 20,000 to 30,000 acres. There are eighty-four holdings of 50,000 acres and over. There has been a great increase in the number of small holdings, from 1 to 10,000 acres. There has also been an increase in the number of freeholders owning land, from small holdings up to 20,000 acres, but a decrease of holdings above that acreage. There is now only one estate of 150,000 acres. The decrease in large holdings is not altogether due to land taxes or lack of labour, but to subdivision on the death of the original owners. The Labour Laws have compelled farmers to provide decent accommodation, good food, and a living wage for their men. There are wealthy men, but no millionaires, in New Zealand, and no grinding poverty or sweated labour.

21.—*Women are women, and men are men*.

In New Zealand, after eighteen years of equal suffrage, women are still women, and very womanly and domesticated women, and men *are* men, and very manly men.

Conclusion.

The *New Zealand Graphic* quotes the Leader of the Opposition Farty as having said of New Zealand: "This country is a good country; everything is right in it save the Government"!! This bears out my contention that all the criticism hurled at New Zealand is only a matter of "ins" and "outs."

Another M.P. said that before women got the vote finance was the only matter of interest in the New Zealand Parliament, but that now the safeguarding of child-life, the interests of the home and the race, and every measure for the betterment of the State and the stability of the Empire was considered and adopted with enthusiasm.

An account of the election (of 1911) which has just taken place in New Zealand proves that the women are more interested in their electoral rights than at any previous time. The following quotations from a leading daily *(The Evening Post*, Wellington) will be of interest as showing the view of one on the spot who has every facility for obtaining reliable information:—

"It is fairly generally recognised that the women's vote has been a powerful factor in promoting temperance and social reform.", . . "Even if woman had not the time or the inclination [this is only a supposition, mind] to study politics, candidatorial man has to work on the basis that woman is carefully weighing his words." ..." Never for one momen does he forget the woman's vote." . . . "There is perhaps more evidence of activity among the women for this election than for any previous one." . . . "This power of woman at the ballot is to grow still

more formidable."

Garden City Press Ltd., Lstchworth, Herts.

One year's Subscription, post free, 6s. 6d. (Foreign, 8s. 8d.) Six months 3s. 3d. (4s. 4d.) "The Suffragette." (Price Id. The Weekly Newspaper of the Woman's Serial and Political Union). Published every Friday at Lincoln's Inn Home, Kingsway, W.C. FDITED BY CHRISTABEL PANKHURST. To THE CIRCULATION MANAGER, "THE SUFFRAGETTE," LINCOLN'S INN HOUSE, KINGSWAY, W.C. Please send each week for one year six months one copy of "THE SUFFRAGETTE," to Name Address for which I enclose s. d. Where filled in, this form is the posted, together with postal order, in The Circulation Massager,"The Suffirights." Lincela's Ice House, Kintsway, W.C.