

7:11 P.M. 18
B2
3502

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-003502

PROGRESS.

BY

JAMES PLATT,

AUTHOR OF

"BUSINESS," "MORALITY," "MONEY," "LIFE,"
AND "ECONOMY."

Seventh Thousand.

ONE SHILLING.

LONDON:

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.,

4, STATIONERS' HALL COURT.

1882.

(All Rights Reserved.)

INTRODUCTION.

"Our remedies oft in ourselves do lie,
Which we ascribe to heaven: the fated sky
Gives us free scope; only, doth backward pull
Our slow designs, when we ourselves are dull."

SHAKESPEARE.

"What we have most to desire is to make our countrymen think."
—W. E. GLADSTONE.

"How many new discoveries does not a person make when on some high point he ascends but a single story higher!"—GOSPEL.

"Above all, to be free of 'prejudice,' which sees what it pleases, and cannot see what is plain."—AUBREY DE VERE.

"He who knows only his own side of the case knows little of that."—
J. S. MILL.

PEOPLE are too apt to sneer at what they so readily call "the infinitely little," without remembering that it is often a multiple, and sometimes even an indispensable multiple, of "the infinitely great," at which they have no thought of sneering. The same with poetry; too many imagine poetry morally below them: are they certain that they are morally up to its level? The poet's art requires that he has a keener sense of moral right and wrong than other men. It may not be the poet's mission to moralize on mankind, but the materials with which he must work are such that, while practising his art, he may unconsciously do more mischief than all the professed moralists in Christendom can consciously do good. The poet is the artist who deliberately chooses as material for his art the feelings and actions of men; he is the artist who plays his melodies, not on catgut strings or metal stops, but upon human passions, and whose playing touches not a mere mechanism of fibres and membranes like the ear, but the human soul, which in its turn feels and acts; he is the artist

who, if he blunders, does not merely fatigue a nerve or paralyze for a moment a physical sense, but injures the whole texture of our sympathies and deafens our conscience.

A statesman may undo the good work of his life by sacrificing truth and principle for the moment, under the pressure of political emergency; thereby showing his weakness in thinking that any danger is to be removed by acts of expediency, and his narrowness of vision in not seeing that ere long his "new expedients," being a departure from sound principle, must be more injurious to the people than those he is departing from. True progress needs clear perception of things as they are, the power to see and understand what is seen. There can be no progress by people or nations without obedience to the law of healthy development of the best part of our nature; a steady, persistent struggle after "more light;" the earnest desire for "truth;" an invincible determination to leave the world better than we found it; an onward and upward progress achieved by a knowledge of the laws that cause success, and faithful observance thereof. The philosophy based upon "cause and effect" suits all ages, all climes; it satisfies and stimulates. The point which yesterday was invisible is its goal to-day, and will be its starting-point to-morrow. It is a creed that ever urges mankind on, which never rests, which has never attained its ideal, which is never perfect; as its aim is "progress," for ever and aye progressing. Its belief is, that there is nothing in human affairs that men deem impossible that may not come to pass; nothing that has been done by the *elite* of men but that all men might do; nothing that has once occurred that may not reproduce itself again. It has become essential for the further progress of mankind that they be taught to perceive the regular action of eternal principles, be trained to perceive that "all effects are due to causes."

Mankind will act very differently once they perceive the regularity and consistency of the course of events, and recognize, for development and progress, the superiority of the new creed, based upon law, unerring law—no effect without a cause, the one in exact proportion to the other. It is a hard doctrine, taking

away from pope and priest all power of absolution; it says unmistakably, "There is no forgiveness of sins" except by the real repentance of living a life, to come up to the highest ideal of purity and goodness, and obedience to God's laws, that the best system extant for man's moral and social advancement demands. It puts aside absolutely all idea of death-bed repentance or vicarious sacrifice; the man who leads a sinful life, who disregards the Creator's laws, cannot do so with impunity; if he seems to escape, his children or his children's children will suffer; the punishment is transmitted from generation unto generation "of those that hate me and despise my commandments." When a boy, I remember asserting that man only wanted justice; with more experience of mankind and myself, it seemed that justice would need to be tempered by mercy; but, after a still longer experience of all things, the invariable, inevitable, regular action of law, based upon strict impartial justice, seems to me the wisest and the kindest system for the Creator and created. The cause and effect theory puts aside the conflict between science and religion, and substitutes a creed in harmony with every new discovery of science and surrounding nature; it is upheld by, and satisfies, our reason, morality, righteousness; it tells men they must strive for healthy bodies and healthy minds; their hands must be clean, their minds pure, if they want peace and happiness. You may say that the idea is not practical, while it may be that the world is not yet ready for it; but year by year the people will grow wiser, and the onward progress of the later thought will be marvellous, the people recognizing that it is not a *myth*, but a *fact*, that the sins of the fathers *are* visited upon the children, daily, hourly, inevitably; and that, if a man wishes his descendants to escape punishment—if he has a desire to escape it himself—he must walk circumspectly. It is no use for the drunkard, the improvident, or the profligate to ask for mercy, or say he repents, on his death-bed; it is then too late to mend; he has sinned, he has broken the laws of health or morality; the effect will follow as certain as the night follows the day; "as we;

sow, so shall we reap." Accept as a truth, that no man or woman can lead an immoral or dishonest life without punishment ensuing. They may be sorry, may repent; the anguish and remorse is part of their punishment; the consequences of their wrong-doing cannot be escaped; some one must be—is punished. What, no hope? Yes; resolve at once that "whatever you may suffer for the sins of others, none shall have so to suffer for yours;" and be sustained in your sufferings for the follies of others by the conviction that your steady adherence and obedience to God's laws will gradually lessen, and in time ultimately remove, the punishment, which you will be able to bear, being upheld by the support of your conscience that you are not only paying off a debt left you by your parents, but leaving the world to your successors healthier and better than you found it. This is the creed I offer you; you must decide "under which king" you elect to serve. The plain, unvarnished truth of no forgiveness except by obedience, may seem dry and unpalatable in comparison with the tempting cake of "do as you like, but repent at last." It is a hard mattress I offer you in exchange for a feather bed; a hard, unrelenting doctrine it seems at first sight, but when understood it gives us the support we need in life; it is a stick to lean on that never fails; it may be rough and horny, but it is real, and to be relied on in all emergencies, at all times; it is the same to all people, to all climes, in every age.

I am as anxious for the moral and social amelioration of the condition of mankind as any one, but think the object can only be attained by "removing the causes that impede and check the development of man's intellectual and moral nature;" and I rely wholly and solely on man's doing for himself what theologians teach men to ask God to do for them. I do not ask men to be "content," but to have an abhorrence of the social and moral hideousness that surrounds them. I do not ask men to excuse themselves under the plea of "being born in sin," the innate depravity of human nature, man's incapacity to raise himself, the necessity for a "vicarious sacrifice," but I unhesitatingly assert

that if man be depraved, it is his own fault; that he has the power to rise superior to the temptations that surround him; that he is punished for every sin of commission or omission by the laws of his nature. Theologians call the world depraved; we are all of us apt to call it hard and unfeeling. A poet wrote:

"Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn."

"Yet, even in his indictment, the poet suggests the fundamental goodness of human nature, since he calls its reverse 'inhumanity.' Were human nature bad, to be humane would be also bad; the more humanity, the more depravity. The race records in its language the simple verdict on itself, that to be human is to be good-hearted; the evil heart is inhuman. Really, it is man's ignorance of man that makes countless thousands mourn. The great world moves on its daily round of toils and joys, self-centred as its planet, and heeds little, because it sees little, the agonies of those crushed beneath its wheels. But when it does see such, when its unheeding rush and roar is arrested by some salient tragedy, when its innumerable eyes are fixed upon a deed in which all the evil powers of nature are seen venting their triumphant cruelty upon innocence and excellence, then the human race has but one heart, purely good; under it, the depraved is shown to be not man, but monster; the excellent is immortalized" (M. D. CONWAY).

The old belief lowers man and crushes his aspirations, by putting his advancement upwards outside of himself; makes him a mere puppet, a sport for the inscrutable dispensations of Providence. Blind faith is honoured above the sublimest of acts. The new system entirely reverses this; it raises man's self-respect, gives a dignity to his nature, stimulates his desire to observe and think, to progress, by telling him plainly that all advancement rests with himself alone; encourages him, by explaining that, by the inevitable action of God's laws, every effort onwards makes him stronger for still climbing upwards; that obedience to law will slowly but surely remove the ills that

have been inherited through the disobedience of his predecessors and his own. It explains to his awakened intelligence the wisdom of God's regulation of the universe; it repudiates with horror that cruel lord so many sects exult in, who says, "Vengeance is mine," as though our loving, merciful Father was on a level with the ordinary assassin. Above all, it teaches that being truly religious means living a life with a desire to obey the laws of God, supported by the belief that not only is it our duty to do so, but that we can only be happy by ascertaining and yielding a willing, reverential obedience to the laws of nature; seeing in all His laws that God is love—that the doctrine of original sin, the fall, atonement, eternal damnation, is so horrible that mankind shudders, and must fain think that

"A loving worm within its sod
Were diviner than a loveless God
Amid His worlds."

Men have grown beyond their creeds; their *acts* belie their faith. The heart of humanity is man's true providence. The people need to be taught to have more faith in human nature; it is to those who have had this instinct strong within them that we owe all efforts at progress—the civilization of the earth. The steady pressure of the good against the evil in the world is irresistible; our mission is to hasten its action, to learn wisdom from the experience and failure of the past. Let the lesson of suffering and misery compel us to learn and teach the laws of well-being; let us zealously remove the shadows of error from men's vision, and open their eyes to the light of truth; ascertain and teach all men the laws of human progress, and how to develop true, good, honest men upon the earth. To do this, we must tell the people to beware of those who teach "that morality can save nobody, that good works without faith are but filthy rags in the sight of God, that the only fatally wicked thing is unbelief." It is this perilous kind of teaching that I object to, and ask you to act as though your life were an estate which you inherit, in which you have a life interest; an estate that,

let it be ever so meagre, still holds for you many treasures; an estate I want you to feel it to be your duty to bravely and faithfully improve for the benefit of others. Briefly, be men, and depend on your obedience to God and rectitude towards and before men, rather than the old idea of submission to man and abjectness before God. What a curse we inherit in the morbid teachings of the past, that are still impressed on the mind in early life! What mischief is that first lesson in selfishness taught to children, that the supreme object of existence is to save their own soul—that death is but a small affair, the passage from an accursed world to a blissful paradise! It is a wonder that mankind have progressed at all. The good inherent within us must have been strong to have overcome the teaching that developed all that was selfish and bad. Yet the past teaches us that since the reign of man began, the good has developed and the evil has steadily diminished before it. As from the woods and fields of these islands the wolves and vipers have nearly disappeared before human culture, so in the world at large the wolfish and venomous passions of mankind have been steadily driven towards their strata of extinction. We inherit the cumulative worth and excellence of the world; let us so use it that at our death it be consigned as a sacred trust to the good men that will follow us, ourselves dying with the conviction that the legacy is bequeathed unimpaired and improved, every benefit transmitted, and examples of excellence added. Progress means to toil and study, to nourish the mind and heart with pure and patriotic aims, using your power to clasp together the hands that have smitten, the hearts that have been estranged—to teach men by your own success what a man can do. Goethe said to a youth who proposed going to seek his fortune in America, “Your America is here or nowhere.” There is always scope for earnest workers; before enterprise and endeavour every barrier must yield. Do not let your aim be title or ostentation, but to make the most and best of all your powers for the good of mankind; so that no mischance, no blow of fate, can destroy your work, but it shall rise on grandly over your grave, as by the labours of your life.

As the old social superiorities defined by birth and resting ultimately on force and conquest, tend to disappear, we must create new social superiorities, marked enough to compel the respect of the multitude for their fitting leaders, and attained by enough of effort to give to the character of those leaders the same force and self-confidence which were previously won in war. Unfortunately, "wealth" is the form of superiority which the multitude tend more and more to respect as the traditional reverence for birth declines. Wealth is a tolerable criterion of merit, as indicating diligence, ability, and thrift in those by whom it is made, and habits of refinement, as a rule, in those by whom it is inherited; but there is too much "ill-gotten wealth" in the world to allow us to respect it without inquiry, and the "dishonest" rich man has the opportunity to do much mischief to his fellows. "Intellectual superiority," based on a belief in the government of the world by "fixed laws," the wisdom to see that as "we sow, so also do we reap," seems the most promising method for the progress of the race; the leaders of the people possessed of that knowledge and culture which *ought*, and, properly acquired, I think *must* make them look on human affairs as philosophers, and not as adventurers or partisans; a body of men who, by their devotedness to truth and the public weal, by the thoroughness and unselfishness of their lives, and not seeking for "social rank," will not press their services on the multitude, but whose opinion will direct public thought, and constitute a weighty court of appeal from popular passion and prejudice, instead of, as now too often, misdirecting and misleading it. Party politics are the cause of half our troubles; men of both sides think of their party, the effect this or that will have on party interests, and they sacrifice their principles, forgetting that it is only by adhering to "principle," truth, and honesty that the happiness and prosperity of all classes can be promoted. We must mind, lest in escaping from monarchical despotism, we do not fall under mob despotism—the greater evil of the two. "The ethos of monarchical despotism and of mob despotism is the same;

both are tyrannously repressive of the better sort" (ARISTOTLE). Absolute equality is impossible. As Burke remarks, "The deceitful dreams and visions of equality and the rights of man end in a base oligarchy"—of all oligarchies the most fatal to liberty. Take France: in no country, not even in Russia, is individual freedom less. The State is as ubiquitous and as autocratic as under the worst of Bourbon or Oriental despots. Nowhere is its hand so heavy upon the subject in every department of human life; nowhere is the negation of the value and the rights of personal independence more absolute, more complete, and more effective. Be warned; beware of modern Liberalism, those "Radicals" who judge "liberty to lie in restricting the liberties of others." Centralization, obedience to the caucus, the *clôture*, passive obedience and blind submission to party leaders, destroy individuality; they mean death to personal liberty, to what we understand by "the rights of the subject."

In describing what seems to me should be our action at the present time, it is not my wish for you to infer that blame is attributable to the leaders and teachers of mankind in the past. Men had to ride in coaches until railways were constructed, but the man would be considered insane who kept to the coach after the train was at his disposal. The same argument applies to those who still want men's brains to travel by the old road, when a newer and better, one more in accord with the age we live in, is within man's reach. Without for a moment wishing to disparage the many august institutions which have rendered mankind essential service in the past—aye, even monastic institutions, which rendered great service to humanity, and which will not be forgotten by just men,—still, it must be remembered that there is something far more worthy of our admiration and gratitude—the efforts of those who have led the way in the strife of moral freedom against the bondage of tradition, the persistent efforts of those dauntless wills for freedom of the soul to range into the supreme regions and commune directly with the Creator. The highest education of the human soul is to teach it to strive to live in conformity

with the laws of its Creator. This seems to me the end and the beginning, the supreme object, of existence—a worthy ambition to get mankind, like the different forces of the same army, to display, even in the diversity of their rules and tendencies, that variety in unity which constitutes the fruitful loveliness of a true religious faith, and which alone can insure that enthusiasm for the accomplishment of human perfection, or demonstrate how high mankind can attain. There are, have been, always will be, men that cling tenaciously to old ideas, old forms, old ways; so long as they are passive, they only harm themselves; they are of no value to mankind, as to stand still is not the law of natural progress; the men that benefit their fellow-men are those who believe in reformation, in improvement, who have before their mental vision a high ideal which they are ever striving after, and which they believe is attainable by persistent striving for. Without such men and such views ever before men, mankind would still be but a little removed from the beasts that perish. Progress is not made through those advisers who will never move a step forward until compelled, but by those who, seeing what has been done from the time of primeval man, when humanity was scarcely to be distinguished from the brute creation, until now, when he stands erect above all created things, and bends the mighty forces of nature to his will, advocate a belief in “laws of progress,” a belief in the invariable action of the laws of nature, which has enabled him to make, if at times slow, a sure and steady progress—the result of a living faith; as “the power, whether of painter or poet, to describe rightly what he calls an ideal thing, depends upon its being to him not an ideal, but a real thing. No man ever did or ever will work well but either from actual sight, or sight of faith” (RUSKIN).

Have faith in the wisdom of God; believe you have the latent power within you to meet the duties of your position, to do what is required of you, if you firmly resolve to accomplish it. Such, at least, has been my experience, and must be my apology to those of my readers who, mayhap, having been less fortunate,

may think I have seemed too positive in asserting, that "failure and success" are not the result of accident or fate, but every man has, more or less, great latent powers within him, and that it rests with himself to use his energies in developing the same, or to allow them, by his want of effort, to lie there undiscovered and unused, or, still worse, to misuse or abuse the powers, physically, mentally, and morally, that his Creator has so liberally bestowed upon him. Briefly, a man is like a mine: each one contains stores of hidden wealth, but it requires sustained, systematic exertion to get at them. Cease, therefore, deluding yourselves by saying it is not within you, but ascribe the failure to get it to its true cause—viz., because you have lacked the intelligence and industry to discover and secure it. The best gift of parents to their children, teachers to their pupils, pastors to the young of their flocks, is to inculcate self-denial, self-government, the magic power of patience; to distrust themselves, but to have no fear of the future, but an implicit faith in results according to their deserts—a faith in honour, in principle, in the cause and effect theory for the government of the world.

Be prudent in your ventures, as although to fail in a small thing does not always indicate that you will fail in a larger one, still you cannot expect the world to take the failure in the smaller as an earnest of your success in the greater. Be thrifty from conviction, from principle, from the desire to be independent of help from others; be economical and methodical with your time; think of the present, utilize it; it is the best basis for your success in the future. To live in the past, or be dreaming of what the future is to do for you, is to waste the present. Believe with me, there is no such word as "finality;" or, if there be, it is hidden in the shadows where human perfections and dreams of the philosopher lurk in hopes of a brighter day. And when, after climbing the steep hill of progress, and straining with great difficulty to approach the summit, we pay the debt of humanity and join the majority, we leave the work to our successors, with clearer vision and more fixity of purpose,

we shall feel that whatever advance we have made has been worth the making; but the higher we ascend the more we shall perceive remains to be done, the more human happiness to be accomplished, the more human progress to be attained. Do not be deterred by those who will say, I ask for the "impossible," but strive to do all that is possible; do not be discouraged by difficulty, but do your duty—work and wait hopefully. Remember, in the depth of winter, beneath all the frost and rime, the mighty work of germination progresses. Everywhere, noiselessly, invisibly, Nature's mysterious forces are active, weaving their wondrous tissues, getting ready for the spring-time that is sure to come, alike to Mother Earth and to her wearying, longing sons. Have faith, do your part, and leave the rest to God. It is so sad a sight, so many sacrificing their lives because, through their impatience, their want of earnestness, their want of trust, we find that when the bright season is too long delayed, instead of joy at its coming, from too many a despairing heart the cry bursts forth, "Too late! too late!" It is false; it is never too late, whilst life remains to us; we can do the best with what we have; and it is on this earnest desire to do our duty, and make the best use of our talents, that all real progress depends. Man's destiny is "progressive civilization." He has been released from a state of legal dependence; it is in his own power to be "intellectually" and "economically" independent. To do either, he must be self-helpful, self-reliant. In time it will be seen that none are really so much interested in law and order as the industrial classes. Labour is their only capital; by it they must earn their own emancipation. They have freedom; they have the right and, I believe, the opportunity, by labour, thrift, and the development of their individuality, to make progress. Let the individual work with an end in view, the resolve to acquire "property" by his own labour and thrift; and obey God's law, "progress."

"The unripe grape, the ripe, and the dried. All things are changes,
Not into nothing, but into that which is not at present."

- MARCUS AURELIUS.

PROGRESS.

CAUSALITY.

"Fate steals along with silent tread,
Found oftenest in what least we dread;
Frowns in the storm with angry brow,
But in the sunshine strikes the blow." COWPER.

"Coming events cast their shadows before." CAMPBELL.

"We find in the constant harmony of nature a sufficient proof in favour of the immutability of its laws. Every miracle would involve their infraction—a process to which nature would submit as little as to any other intervention in its empire, in which everything, from the gnat which dances in the sunbeam, up to the human mind, which issues from the brain, is governed by fixed principle."—TURTLE.

"CAUSALITY" is that faculty of the human mind which impresses its possessor with an irresistible conviction that every phenomena or change in nature is caused by something, and hence, by successive steps, it leads us to the "First Cause" of all. It is the reasoning faculty by means of which, looking at the actions of men, we are able to consider the motives, or moving causes, from which their actions proceed; it is the faculty which looks beyond the surface, and perceives the dependence of phenomena, and explains to mankind that what seems mere juxtaposition or coincidence is caused by that invisible bond of connection we call "cause and effect." Without it, a juryman has great difficulty in convicting on circumstantial evidence; without it, men are blind to remote consequences, and are apt to stigmatize as visionary all intellectual perceptions which their own minds cannot reach; without it, men reject principle as vain theory, and are captivated by "expedients."

and represent these as the *beau ideal* of practical wisdom. Causality is opposed to dogmas and creeds; reason seeing in such but obstinate stumbling-blocks to progress. Causality has weakened, and must ultimately destroy, the bigot's sway; blind faith must recede as reason advances. Causality sees in the world's woe and misery the result of disobeying the laws of our being, and advises men to get rid of distress, sickness, crime, by conforming to those laws.

Without a belief in cause and effect, the world seems a chaos to the human mind, and man views with terror the operations of nature when they depart at all out of the usual course; so to the majority "life" is like a ship in a storm. Like life, the sea, when calm, seems delicious, enjoyable; but in life's journey, when sorrow comes to us, or, if on the sea, we encounter a storm, we begin to complain of the miseries of life, the implacability, the hardness of nature. But, properly trained to grasp "life" as a whole, we should view the ills we suffer in a more philosophical spirit, and see the "benefits" of the storm as well as its terrors; and we might then consider if wrecks of life or vessels need be. To those who differ, I submit respectfully the following for their reflection. Six vessels leave a port at the same time; from the first, one or two of the six seem unable to overcome the opposing force of the ocean; but, presently, a storm begins, and one out of the six vessels is wrecked, and cargo and life wholly or partially lost. How is it that only one out of the six is lost? Why is it that the other five have not been sunk? There can be but one answer. The wreck is not caused by the "hardness of the natural laws," but by man's blindness, ignorance, or prejudice. The lost vessel was not "fit for the work it had to perform" when it started, or the man or men in charge of it did not understand how to manage it. Captains, like tradesmen, and warriors, and statesmen, may pass through life as fairly successful men if not called upon to act in a crisis or storm in the years they are in command. But when men are in discontent, trade is stagnant, or the foe is equally powerful, then with us, as to the captain in command during a

storm, the time has come to prove whether we are equal to our duty.

"Wise men learn the laws that govern men and things, and obey them." Mankind needs, above all else, a clearer and clearer understanding of themselves and the world they live in. The time is past when man could with impunity leave himself in the hands of priests, with their narrow and warped views of things—men fallible like themselves, yet, in their pride, wanting to bind their fellow-men hand and foot, and leading them blindfold whither they wist. Heed them not, until they teach you to have faith only in "the laws of God," which faithfully observe and reverently obey, and you will find life enjoyable, and bear its troubles bravely, feeling within you a sense of the divine presence in your efforts to work with Him.

"O human soul! so long as thou canst so
Set up a mark of everlasting light
Above the howling senses' ebb and flow,
To cheer thee and to right thee if thou roam,
Not with lost toil thou labourst through the night!
Thou mak'st the heaven thou hop'st indeed thy home."

As a rule, believe me, success and fame are fairly proportioned to desert; and if you have failed in your allotted task, your failure, however hard you may have toiled, is attributable to some deficiency on your part. And if a writer has been forgotten, the presumption is, that whatever be the merits or beauties of his work, its loss of hold upon the memory of mankind is but one example of the operation of the law of the "survival of the fittest." Let no one say that we live in an age of scepticism; it is not so; I wish to goodness it were. We live in an age of "indifferentism;" nay, worse, we live in an age that has not the moral courage to express its doubts, for "fear of the consequences," and what Mrs. Grundy will say. Doubt, instead of being censured, should be encouraged, and will be when the world has advanced far enough to realize that

"There lives more faith in honest doubt,
Believe me, than in half your creeds,"

But the doubt *must* be honest, from a sincere desire to know the *truth*. The truth! What is the truth? Why, that "God is the soul of the universe"—a belief that will nourish and keep in healthy activity our body and soul, making us feel in communion with "our Father"—the earth our home, the night of heavens as a lot of little stars belonging to our homestead; life like a bright spring morning—the freshness of youth, the bubbling outflow from a spring of joy; all morning to us, within and without. Ah! if we could but think of mankind as "good" instead of "bad"—destined to a happy earthly life, instead of a life of misery—the punishment for sin, a fatal teaching; goodness is there, we should think of it in the human soul, as with the harvest, which at one stage, when we talk of it, lies all underground, with an indeterminate future; yet the germ is prospering in the darkness, and later on it will put forth delicate green blades, and by-and-by the trembling blossoms will be there, but liable to be dashed off by an hour of rough wind or rain. As with the goodness of the harvest, so with goodness in life; each stage has its peculiar blight, and may have the healthy, generous life choked out of it by a particular action of the foul land which rears or neighbours it, or by damage brought from foulness afar.

Materialism—the doctrine that matter by itself is adequate to account for all the phenomena of the world—is utterly contrary to the theory of "cause and effect." Materialism denies that in the system of the universe is to be found any trace of divine or spiritual activity. The doctrine, from the age of Democritus to the present day, has had many followers—probably at no time has it had more than now; "Kraft und Stoff," by Büchner (Force and Matter), proving the "immortality of matter." "One generation passeth away, and another cometh, but the earth endureth for ever" (*Bible*).

"Imperial Cæsar, dead and turn'd to clay,
Might stop a hole to keep the wind away.
O that that earth which kept the world in awe
Should patch a wall t' expel the winter's flaw!"

In these words, perhaps unknowingly, the great Briton, Shakespeare, enunciated a truth which, in spite of its clearness and simplicity, is even to this day not generally acknowledged by naturalists. "Matter is immortal, indestructible. There is not an atom in the universe which can be lost. We cannot, even in thought, remove or add an atom without admitting that the world would thereby be disturbed, and the laws of gravitation and the equilibrium of matter interfered with. It is the great merit of modern chemistry to have proved in the most convincing manner that the uninterrupted change of matter which we daily witness, the origin and decay of organic and inorganic forms and tissues, do not arise, as was hitherto believed, from new materials, but that this change consists in nothing else but the constant and continuous *metamorphosis of the same elementary principles, the quantity and quality of which ever is, and ever remains, the same.* Matter has, by means of the scales, been followed in all its various and complicated transitions, and everywhere has it been found to emerge from any combination in the same quantity as it has entered. The calculations founded upon this law have everywhere proved to be perfectly correct. We burn a piece of wood, and at first sight it appears as if its constituents had been consumed in fire and smoke. The balance of the chemist, on the other hand, teaches us that not only has nothing been lost of the wood in weight, but, on the contrary, the weight has been *increased.* It shows that the collected and weighed products not merely contain all the constituents of the wood, though in a different shape and combination, but, in addition, such materials as the constituents of the wood have attracted from the air during combustion" (LUCHNER).

"The carbon," says Vogt, "which was in the wood is imperishable, it is eternal, and as indestructible as the hydrogen and oxygen with which it was combined in the wood. This combination, and the form in which it appeared, is destructible; the matter never."

"The carbon we meet with in the spar crystal, in the woody fibre, or in muscle, may, after the destruction of these bodies,

assume a different form in other groupings, but the elementary principle can neither be changed nor destroyed" (CZOLBE).

"With every breath which issues from our mouth, we expire a portion of the food we eat, and of the water we drink. We change so rapidly, that we may be said, after the lapse of four weeks, to be different and new beings; the atoms are exchanged, but the mode of their combination remains the same. The atoms are in themselves unchangeable and indestructible; to-day in this, to-morrow in another form, they present by the variety of their combinations the innumerable forms in which matter appears to our senses. All this while the number of atoms in any element remains, on the whole, the same; not a single particle is formed anew; nor can it, when formed, disappear from existence. Proofs innumerable can be adduced to this effect. Dissolution and generation, growth and decay, proceed everywhere hand in hand—an eternal chain. With the bread which we eat, the air we respire, we attract the matter which has formed the bodies of our ancestors thousands of years ago; and we return a portion of our bodies to the external world, in order shortly after to receive it again" (BUCHNER).

The link which binds man with nature we may not trace; the greatest mystery of the world, "how the Creator became possessed of His omnipotence and power," we shall never solve. But, desirous for the truth only, the human brain must search for, and find, its nourishment upon the soil of experience and of facts, as all our knowledge grows up from this soil, and as all the wealth of the human mind is but an accumulation of the treasures so obtained. Infinitely slow has been the evolution of the human mind from its primitive state, oppressed, as it were, by the natural forces, until it arrived at an independent condition. With the growth of this independence, the fear of, and the dependence on nature must give way, and the knowledge of the laws imminent and immutable in nature must displace the superstition which torments the ignorant and prevents the free development of his powers. With every step in advance, science conquers fresh soil for law and order, and

removes superstition. The struggle has been great; it took a long time for the mind to shake off the fetters of the natural forces, so as to feel the desire of inquiring into the laws of nature, and to overcome the scruples of the superstitious, who regarded it as impious for man to try and find a clue to the government of what seemed to our forefathers an immense chaos of natural phenomena.

To the theological mind illness and suffering are dispensations of Providence; so whereas the discovery of chloroform was to the philosophical mind an indication of God's wisdom, in giving man the means to produce temporary unconsciousness under difficult operations and in cases of difficult labour, it was opposed for the latter purpose by theologians, as a profane attempt to abrogate the primeval curse passed upon women.

"Cause and effect" gives us this fact, that man is not, as hitherto erroneously assumed, physically and mentally separated from, and opposed to, nature; but that he is the product of nature's gradually developed forces; and, further, that this nature is not a chaos of incomprehensible, lawless forces, but a connected whole, subject to eternal laws in a constant state of progressive development, so that, in the lapse of time, the most stupendous effects are produced by apparently insignificant causes; and, further, that the universe, the suns and planets, the wonderful organisms, from the minutest infusorium up to the antediluvian giants, and even the human mind in its grandest manifestations, are composed of, and produced by, the same materials and forces! This is a standpoint which, in magnitude and sublimity, yields to no other; and, could it be occupied by all (many years must elapse ere this may happen), a spirit of repose, security, and kindness would be infused into the minds of men, and genuine humanity would obtain the victory over the gloomy spirit of the past. The silly disputes about theological creeds and ceremonies, which have done so much injury to humanity, and prevented its progress, will cease; and the horrors and persecutions to which they gave rise will be superseded by universal philanthropy. Man, no longer

deeming himself a stranger to nature, which has formed and given him all he possesses, will now consider himself to be nature's noblest and best son; no childish fear of spirits or supernatural influences will frighten his mind or impede his free progress; nay, religion itself will become more spiritualized by the elimination of the crude and senseless imaginings of past times, inasmuch as the supreme government of the world will no longer be considered as the attribute of a personal arbitrary power, giving and interrupting its own laws, but as the highest law itself, the source of all phenomena. From this purification of our conceptions science will derive the greatest advantages, since nothing has so much impeded its progress as senseless natural and supernatural explanations. If this couch for mental laziness be removed, science will acquire a fixed character in the search for objective truth, and no appeal to supernatural influence or interference will blunt the stimulus which incites men of science to search out the truth. What cannot be traced in its connections is on that account neither unnatural nor supernatural, but is simply a problem the solution of which is reserved for the future. That our knowledge as regards the universe is confined within narrow limits, does not justify arbitrary and unscientific assumptions, which render real knowledge to a certain extent impossible.

It is waste of time speculating upon the "original" first cause. Logically, there is no evidence of a first cause. Philosophically, we say organic beings derive their existence from previously existing organic beings. There must be seed before we can get fruit, &c.; but how the "original" of each species of living thing, or the first seeds, came into existence, we know not—shall never know. Let it pass. Practically, all we want is to prove to men that in the world as it now is, the best basis for man's training is, that there can be no "effect" without a cause; and satisfy the inquiring mind as to the existence of a Creator, whom we call God; because in the universe every systematic investigation or inquiry strengthens what is already known of the vast and intricate dependence of

all things upon each other, which makes them appear to be parts of a system of unity in the management of this world. And even when the connection falls short of dependence, or of any visible relation, the same impression of unity is conveyed in the prevalence of close and curious analogies which are not the less striking when the cause or the reason of them is unknown. Every part of the human organism is fitted to conditions which would all be destroyed in a moment if the forces of gravitation were to change or fail. This world of ours is bound to the other worlds around it. This earth is part of the vast mechanism of the heavens. The forces by which that mechanism is governed are forces which prevail not only in our own solar system, but, as there is reason to believe, through all space, and are determining, as astronomers tell us, the movement of our sun, with all its planets, round some distant centre, of which we know neither the nature nor the place. If you think of gravitation, light, heat, and how beautifully this group of powers work together; and how all the forms of matter, both in the organic and inorganic worlds, depend on one or other, or on all of these,—it gives to the mind a certainty of unity—one universal agency in the mechanism of nature.

What this sublime power is we know not; it is useless to give any abstract definition of what it is. What we have to do is to observe the effects of everything around us upon ourselves, and to understand that our conception of the energies and forces we have to deal with in nature is confined to our knowledge of what they do, and how the external world acts upon our organs, bodily and mentally; at the same time never overlooking the fact of the matchless power that is behind to produce the harmony throughout all nature, and thus keeping our minds above the mere mechanical definition of things; rising by the lower truth of the discovery to the higher truth of the Creator of what we have discovered. Life will always remain that "mystery of all mysteries,"—the greatest wonder of creation; the "nucleated cell" which, to all our senses, and to all our means of investigation, appears absolutely the same, build-

ing up the molecules of protoplasm, now into a seaweed, now into a cedar of Lebanon, now into an insect, now into a fish, now into a reptile, now into a bird, now into a man. And in every germ this development can only be "after its kind." The molecules must obey; but no mere wayward or capricious order can be given to them. The formative energies seem to be as much under command as the materials upon which they work. For, invisible, intangible, and imponderable as these forces are—unknown and even inconceivable as they must be in their ultimate nature,—enough can be traced of their working to assure us that they are all closely related to each other, and belong to a system which is one. Out of the chemical elements of nature, in numerous but definite combinations, it is the special function of vegetable life to lay the foundations of organic mechanism; whilst it is the special function of animal life to take in the materials thus supplied, and to build them up into the highest and most complicated structures. This involves a vast cycle of operations, as to the unity of which we cannot be mistaken; for it is a cycle of operations obviously depending on adjustments among all the forces, both of solar and terrestrial physics; and every part of this vast series of adjustments must be in continuous and unbroken correlation with the rest. If we cannot explain what the directive agency is, we can ascertain how it works. We must cease to look on "nature" as something outside of us, and consider more thoughtfully and carefully what man's place in nature is, what his work is in that unity which he sees and feels around him. He must look up more; realize in body and mind that he is a part of, and included in, the grand scheme of creation, and feel that he has the power to work, however humbly it may be, with that Power which, by the aid of a few elementary substances, has caused an untold variety of combinations, and, by virtue of this variety, has brought into play a vast variety of parts—results attained by a system of mutual adjustments as immense as the variety it produces, as minute as the differences on which it depends, and as centralized in direction as the order and harmony of its results. When once man recognizes the

"Power" that thus subordinates a few elementary forces to the discharge of special functions, and to the production, by adjustment, of one harmonious whole, "doubt" will cease to haunt his mind, certainty will take its place. He will have more definite convictions upon the great question of human life, once he can positively decide that the universe cannot be "the monster jest of a great Aristophanes in heaven." Heine could not make up his mind upon this point; yet he had the power of appealing to our highest and basest feelings. When he has drawn the tattered and poverty-stricken reality of life with a hand as pitiless as that of Swift, he suddenly pours upon it the strange light of some heroic or romantic ideal, and so kindles our hearts to enthusiasm at the same moment that he fills them with disgust. For the spiritual world is always present with him, sometimes as a mere doubt or question, but oftener as the substantial reality by which all the appearances of life must be judged. Which of us can appear before that bar with cheeks unflushed and eyes unaltered? Heine could not. In ever-varying tones of mockery and sadness he confesses that his life, too, has been rent asunder by the great world-discord, and opposes the "thou shalt" to "thus I act." Always behind the deformed and pitiful figure which he exhibits with so scornful a smile, he perceives the sweet and stately vision of what might and ought to have been; and his wit always becomes fiercer and more cruel in exact proportion to his love for the ideal which the reality can thus distort and caricature. It may be doubted whether any but a German can fully understand his "Deutschland,"—with its passionate love masked in so infuriate a hatred, with its silent depths of tenderness, its pathetic appeals to all the greatness that dwells in the soul of the nation, the holiest memories of the past, and the highest possibilities of its future, to arise against the present so base and loathsome.

If men would but believe in "causality," if the cultured class would but exercise their influence, what social discord and misery mankind would be spared. Radicalism has and does check progress as much as Conservatism. It is the extreme

views of Radicals that drive men back into the Conservative ranks. Men want reformation, not revolution; they want the true genius of the nation, the men of progress, to have power and dominion. But when brought face to face with the means that the Radicals would employ to accomplish their object, thoughtful men shrink back in terror and disgust; they recoil from this destructive policy, and instinctively feel that the wishes of "Liberals" and "Radicals" are, though seemingly the same, diametrically opposed to each other. The one wants to build up, to repair the weak places; the other wants to pull down, to eradicate and destroy. Revolutionists have always ruined the kingdom they wished to save. Why? Because no social revolution or change of government can do away with misery and suffering; because they cannot, or do not, remove the causes thereof. They fail to see that man's aspirations cannot be satisfied with a mere change of outward condition; they overlook the fact that our human restlessness and pain are the results of no mere passing fever, but the symptoms of an organic disease which the quack, in the form of a political agitator, may pretend to cure, but which the most skilful physician can but palliate. Men who can look upon life without prejudice or prepossession may attempt to heal, but a much larger knowledge of human nature is needed before any real or permanent cure can be effected. We must, all of us, really feel ashamed of the pettiness and inadequacy of our human life. We must dare to look into the darkest abysses of our nature, and tell what we see there; half a truth is better than a whole lie. We must grasp the facts of life as they are, not keep striving to reproduce the past, to revive its sentiments, and galvanize its convictions into what was at best but a ghastly mockery of life. We want a greater consciousness of the actual world—life as it is—our daily experience, its impressions or observations carefully noted and thought over,—and all things about us will have a deeper and greater significance. But to attain this, the mind must begin its work perfectly free and open. We must not be fettered or biased by the influence of creeds or

sentiments. Man will never be free, or think correctly, whilst the ghosts of the past still retain their terrors over his mind, making him tremble whilst he derides them, because he still half believes in a hell he shudders at—built upon a tale of sin, that gives the sense of horror whilst in the thrill of a forbidden pleasure, and embittering the sweetness of stolen waters. Modern thinkers are often accused of being as credulous as those whose "faith" they ridicule. There is much truth in the reproach; but for a time this must be so. Ages of progress are ages of doubt, and the doubt implies a former belief, a state of intellectual ferment, of rapid spiritual transition, which at one moment was clinging so lovingly to the past, and in the next was clinging—although but timorously, still passionately, and with outstretched hand—to the belief of the future. The time of doubt, of infinite despair, is past, and the intellect yearns—blindly perhaps, but with infinite hope—for a belief that will supply a more lasting faith in the future. It is a hard struggle to break off the old spiritual yoke, and one need feel he is fighting in a sacred cause, that of Truth, to break through the formalism and conventionalism of one's class in society; and at times when the horizon does not seem clear to the mental vision, there will come the distant tone of a church-bell; old memories are awakened, and plead with an almost irresistible power for the old supremacy. It needs much thought to give up the idea of being "heirs to eternal life;" man with his infinite longings to restrain and bind his thoughts, hopes, and desires to the present world. But the ethical mind, with stern, intellectual honesty, will, can only believe what seems true; and such men, if they fall, heart-broken, before the old shrines, cannot profess a belief in creeds because they are old, or pray in the orthodox manner, when their reason tells them such actions are but with them a mockery. "I ask you, instead, to try and realize "heaven upon earth." Men have done great things; believe me, if you will but trace effects to their causes, and remove the obstacles to moral and intellectual progress, a noble future lies before you. I am perfectly aware how often

efforts to noble in their aspirations have been so poor in their achievements; how quickly the period of illusion has been followed by disillusion; that with the falling away of religious belief, many of our best men think the effort to realize a noble life is past. But, spite of all, I have hope of the future. It is an age of great progress; the transitions in every state of society are more sudden and vaster than heretofore. "Necessity," that stern monitor, urging us on, with "hunger" as an inseparable companion, will compel us to look more seriously at the great problem of "life," and what we are to do with it. It is not an age for "artistic ideals," but it is the age for "practical ideals." Men will be compelled to feel the reality of life, the imperative necessity of looking at it in earnest; and though the ordeal will be a trying one, I have faith in Nature's remedy, "sharp necessity," making him develop his latent powers, and discover, as he has the power, the cause of his present misery and unhappiness, and, having done so, getting rid of the effect by removing the cause thereof, and henceforth living a life built up upon self-denial and self-help, as opposed to the present life of indulgence and prayer for help and forgiveness.

But the world jogs on; who troubles himself about such things as "causes"? Nature punishes, but the people are not at all uneasy—a very common sort of blindness. For, in general, mortals have a great power of being astonished at the presence of an effect toward which they have done everything, and at the absence of an effect toward which they have done nothing but desire it. Parents are astonished at the ignorance of their sons, though they have used the most time-honoured and expensive means of securing it; they are surprised at their want of success in life, although they have studied their own whims and not their children's aptitude to excel in the art or profession they have liked to put them to. Men fail in business, and are astonished. It is all a lottery; luck has been against them, they tell us. If it had not been for this competition or that influence, things would have been different. They are blind to their own deficiencies; they will not get to the cause of their

failure. Husbands and wives are mutually astonished at the loss of affection which they have taken no pains to keep; and all of us in our turn are apt to be astonished that our neighbours do not admire us, or estimate our capacity so highly as we do ourselves. Man wants an earnest desire for truth, why the world is as it is; and he will find the truth is something different from the habitual hazy combinations begotten by our prejudices and wishes. "Faith" no longer suffices for the souls that are troubled and tried with the unrest and unquiet doubts of our day—doubts so general, and by men and women of such high moral character, that it has become imperative that theologians should at once understand and admit that a man's nature may be profoundly devout, and yet unable to accept a great deal of what is usually held as religious belief. I have been told that it would be wiser to be silent if we cannot accept the belief that religion demands; but it seems to me a dastardly act to put forth opinions, and yet shrink from stating the inevitable sequence to be deduced therefrom. If I have doubted there being a heaven or a hell, it has not been to take away from others their belief in the one or the other, but only to endeavour to make people try harder to make a "heaven on earth," and, dying, have a place among those

"Immortal dead who still live on
 In minds made better by their presence; live
 In pulses stirred to generosity,
 In deeds of daring rectitude; in scorn
 For miserable aims that end with self;
 In thoughts sublime that pierce the night-like stars,
 And with their mild persistence urge man's search
 To vaster issues."

Let all earnest men of every creed give the wealth of their intellects to the study of "how man may become divine;" let all free themselves from the restricted area of any special dogmatism, whether religious or scientific, rising to that impersonal region mostly unknown even to philosophy; seekers only for Truth; with a belief that "God is all, and all is God;" and who

recognize as the most perfect man he who is most fitted for the universe in which we live—fitted for it because his *whole* faculties have reached their highest and most harmonious development; his actions based upon the highest principles; his life's actions a translation of his thoughts into conduct; wise enough to see that wealth, power, pleasure, offer no certain or satisfactory reward; and that the only security for happiness is to have a mind filled with the love of the infinite and eternal, striving to perfect man's nature by cultivating the love of others, recognizing in morality "that it is not an ultimate element in the analysis of the existing world, but that it is the name of the instinct by which the growth and healthy development of the race is eventually conditioned;" perceiving in the laws of Evolution what one of its apostles has said, that "in its moral aspect it is a power that leads man ever onward and upward, and which encourages his brightest anticipations of the ultimate triumph of good over evil, of truth over error, of knowledge over ignorance, of right over wrong; that the real philosopher, who fixes his hopes on a perpetual approximation to that absolute truth which he may never actually grasp—who, forgetting those things which are behind, is ever reaching forth to those which are before, and who is constantly striving upward, so as to reach, or help his successors to reach, a yet loftier elevation,—is thus best fulfilling his duty to the great Giver of his own powers of thought, and to the divine Author of that nature in which he deems it his highest privilege to be able to read some of the thoughts of God." Man must be made to see that "order is the law of the universe," and himself an integral part of that vast system of which, as Spinozism expresses it, "God is the centre." Order is not maintained by, *it is*, the Supreme Being. Call order Divine, and you have Spinoza's God. *Deus sive natura*. It is a grand privilege, being able to read some of the thoughts of God, to hold communings with "the living garment of Deity." We shall then feel that "blessedness is not the reward of virtue, but virtue itself." We should have such faith in God, that we have no fear of death, whether it be our long last sleep or the

transition state to a better life to come, as we feel that God will take care of us. The mind cannot be troubled as to the future if one's belief in God is based upon the Supreme Being whom we have got to know, love, and obey, as the Law-maker of the universe. The essential point is to liberate the mind from the thralldom of false ideas, the teaching of the past, that made good men do such cruel things in obedience to a wrong notion of principle—a teaching that steeled the heart, and suppressed its gentle impulses, under the erroneous idea that it was necessary to make men religious—viz., look at things from this or that theologian's point of view, and from the false and erroneous notion that God wants an eye for an eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot; justified to a certain extent by the hereditary transmission of defects from parents to children, which *primd facie*, supports the religious teaching "that the sins of the father shall be visited upon the children." I know of no better example to show the difference between the *old* and the *new* method of looking at things. The *old* teaching made men blood-thirsty and brutal, kept them down to the savage, and kept active within them the revengeful instincts of beasts, spite of the teaching of Christ, who taught the doctrine of humanity, and told men to "love one another." But the evil of the more barbarous doctrine clings to us now, and still taints our laws and religion. "Religion" is like a beautiful flower, from which may be distilled healthful medicines and fatal poisons. The lesson of vengeance, of man's fall, future and eternal punishment, is the poison that has sapped all the healthy vitality out of man's nature. We want the religion of humanity, the teaching of Christ, to uproot this fatal and destructive teaching. We want men to understand the necessity and wisdom of the law that compels the children to bear the faults of their father. We want them to understand it is a loving law, the best possible for man. We want men to comprehend that it is cruel to themselves to be revengeful, to want an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth; that men will be wise and happy in proportion as they recognize the truth that all men are brethren; and that we should forgive

their faults, as we would they should forgive us if we had committed a fault; to remember always in our judgments the teaching of Him who rebuked those who would have punished the woman who had done wrong, in those immortal words: "He amongst you who is without sin, let him cast the first stone."

Believe me, God is merciful. We lose a father, mother, wife, sister, brother, and for a time feel as though we had lost all that made life bearable or enjoyable; but "time" dulls our memory of the past. There is nothing heartless in this. A wife or husband dies, whilst the one left behind is still young enough to feel the necessity for a companion. There is no want of love in marrying again; there is nothing heartless in forgetting a lost bride or bridegroom, whilst still cherishing the desire for a home in which she who has gone was to have been, or was, the presiding spirit. A true man or woman desires a home, and will fail to find contentment in varying scenes or changing acquaintances. The home is essential to live life happily or well. Talk of love in a cottage as sentimental! It may be so; but it is a charming picture, pleasant to dream of in every age or clime, that cottage, overgrown with roses, embosomed in a fertile valley, rich in varied colours, all blending together and making one harmonious whole, and fragrant with the odour of a thousand flowers, resounding with the song of birds and the hum of honey-laden bees; a home to be happy in, and make one delight in devoting oneself to the interests of those about, and so adding to one's happiness by enjoying the respect and esteem of all about one. Life must be viewed in a more joyous, hopeful spirit. No one objects more than myself to the advice of "taking things easy," but no one has a greater objection to the idea that will spoil all enjoyment in this life, by viewing existence in "too serious a spirit." There must be troubles and worries in our daily life; but take my advice—do not think about the disagreeable things; turn your back on them, and think of something more pleasant; if you feel inclined to cry, you will conquer it most effectually by trying to laugh. There is some truth in the belief that the more we appre-

ciate the good, the greater will be our annoyance at the bad. But, practically, what is the use or benefit of bothering your head and worrying yourself about the things "that are done;" or, still worse, in wasting your time, and making yourself miserable, in anticipating troubles in the future, that may be, and mostly are, but the creations of a diseased and morbid imagination. Keep bold of the substance—"the present"—and do your best in it; grasp it, hug it, enjoy it. Think of life as a peach; pluck it, appreciate its delicacy and beauty, and enjoy it thoroughly. Cease to think of the shadow—"the future"—unless it be to revel in the possibly increased delights it may bring over the present. Do not lie awake and think of trouble, but recognize that night is the time for sleep. See nature's kind thoughtfulness in giving us this respite, to sleep and forget all the troubles flesh is heir to. So you will enjoy life, and at seventy be as happy in disposition, as hopeful and light-hearted, as you were at seventeen. I do not mean that you are to be callous over troubles or misfortunes, but I want you to look them in the face, grapple them manfully, see your fault in bringing the trouble upon your shoulders, resolve not to err again, repair the mischief, and do not exaggerate trifling difficulties into serious evils. Briefly, make the best and most of our summer hours; let reflection and memory of the past remind us that we have lived and loved purely and well—have revelled in the youth and beauty God has bestowed so liberally upon us, not for one season of youth only, but for all our lives, unless we mar them with our own ill deeds. You may say it is not, cannot be, always summer. Granted, the autumn will come, the winter also, with its frost and snow, and the spring, with its bleak and pitiless winds; but they are all in season, all help by their variety to make life happy and enjoyable. So, in all the varied phases of life there is always a *best*, unless we ourselves have done our *worst*. We must be brave and true to ourselves day by day. There must be no looking back on the blissful "might have been." We must, to enjoy life, to be happy, look steadily on *what is*, and do our best with it. Be wise with the wisdom that nature teaches; train your mind so

that the trees and the flowers will whisper to you of their Maker; feel blest and happy with the gift of life, and so use it that it may be a blessing and a happiness to others. Be happy in feeling you are obeying God's laws, and rewarded for so doing, by feeling that He is "always present" with you, so near, that time, trouble, death, have no terror for you; heaven seems as near as earth, eternity as time to you. This state of mind must come to mankind once they study nature and nature's Maker and Governor, and rise above the prejudices and weaknesses of their nature by a larger culture and a fuller knowledge of the world and what is therein. Man has been bound in fetters, has moved and lived as if misery and trouble were a "matter of course." He has wasted his time and powers, and wants waking out of the lethargy that benumbs his faculties. He must feel that he is free to study everything and explore everywhere; that it is his duty to make out things for himself, to be a thoughtful, rational, sensible being—wise enough to see that honesty is the only policy, and to feel that an "honest man" is truly the noblest work of God; honest enough to be free of prejudice—that worst of prejudices, the feeling that "there is a difference between you and "that other fellow" who has dared to dissent from your views. It is not so bad now as it used to be, but there is quite enough of this feeling of superiority still left. It is a failing with nearly all sects, this opinion of their own spiritual superiority; creating a narrowness of view and a bitterness of spirit, a want of charity in judging of the acts of others, that makes it often a question for me to consider whether the religion of the world is not more odious than its want of religion.

By elevating the moral tone of the people, you greatly increase the happiness of family life. It is a great thing for the people to be contented and happy, starting in the world with a "practical" education that will help them onward, and develop individuality and independence of character—an education that will not give a distaste for work, but a real liking for it; raising their intelligence, making them all anxious

to know what is going on in the world; believing in progress, and that there is but one way to attain it. "The child is father of the man;" therefore, be careful how you educate the child. Let the rules and method you teach him as a child be such as will secure his welfare as a man; make him understand that "change" is the pre-eminent characteristic of growth and vitality. Yet it is necessary that in making changes we remember the value of an abiding element of permanency in all things. The English Constitution has undergone many changes; it is not the creation of an exacting State, but "has grown," and this cause has given it its permanence and strength. The Three Estates are no longer the same that they were in former days, either in their relations to themselves or towards the people. They have been changed by a constant adaptation to the wants of society. Each new development of the nation demands modification in the government. Power naturally struggled before it yielded. New securities for justice and good government were resisted as unwarrantable innovations; but the invariable issue has been, that by various methods, whether of force or pacific progress, the nation has developed its institutions so as to meet the requirements of each age. We grumble now at hardships, but think of what our ancestors had to suffer, when the nobility, with their castles and retainers, were treated, with the sovereign, as joint owners of the country, and levied, for their own personal benefit, grievous feudal dues and taxes on the people. It took a long time for the nation to grow entirely out of this bondage—those days when the lords and their dependents revelled in patents, sinecures, reversions, pensions, and grants of national property. The House of Lords is an institution of vital necessity to preserve the liberties of the people; it is essential to the duration of a popular government; it is needed to give weight, stability, and a permanent, because popular, authority to a second House; it is necessary to restrain prominent members in the House of Commons. If the Commons were sole masters, history would repeat itself; a Caesar would soon terminate a power to which nature had given no durability. The Long Parliament, by force of circum-

stances, became supreme lord in England; a great man quickly mastered it, as if it had been a child. A single assembly, the National Convention, regenerated a powerful nation, amidst the applause of the most fervent popular enthusiasm, and imposed, by astounding military successes, moral principles on the whole world; in a few years it sank, contemned and unregretted, under the blows of military despots. Why? Because there was no restraining influence; the Chamber of Peers in France was destitute of weight. England has escaped these convulsions, because she has solved this most arduous of political problems, and has reared up by slow growth a Second Chamber, strong by inherent force, and pledged by the source from which that force is derived, and its constitutional position, to identify itself in all substantial points with the cause of the people. If the people be wise, they will jealously watch and preserve to the House of Lords this power; seeing in this body the safety-valve of the State—the necessary barrier to ambition in the other House o'erleaping itself. Its indirect influence is very great, in compelling Radical Ministries to think of what the "Lords" are likely to pass; and it is only by retaining its power, like the Judges, of being above intimidation by the measures of the Commons, that it can continue to perform public services without which no popular government can long exist, or national prosperity continue.

It would be a check to progress to abolish the House of Lords, or our present system of monarchical government. We have virtually a Republic, but are free from its vices; and as the masses begin to use the greater power they possess, the necessity for a House of Lords becomes greater, not less. Our system may be costly; we have the power in our hands to remedy this; the people's representatives have the sole control of the public purse. But, costly as it is, it gives us security of life and property; and this Second Chamber is of vital necessity as a barrier to mobocracy outside, and the ambition of agitators within the House of Commons. And as the power of the latter becomes greater, wisdom would suggest strengthening, certainly not weakening, the power that holds it in check; for it must

not be forgotten that the Second Chamber has a very powerful indirect influence in restraining legislation within such bounds as are likely to meet the approval of the other Chamber. The peers are above popular opinion; few members of Parliament dare be. The fear of losing his seat, of being beaten at the next election, has an effect upon his speeches and his votes. Rich peers, whose position is established, can think of the general interest, and decide according to the intrinsic merits of political measures, in a manner impossible for men dependent on constituencies. A privileged caste is one thing, but a body of men naturally conservative by their position is another. The former would be a hindrance; the latter is as useful for the safety and well-being of the people as any form of Liberalism which can be named. Two Houses, elected directly by the people, of really equal authority are an impossibility. This was the fatal weakness of the Athenian Council. The American Senate has hitherto escaped it, in consequence, chiefly, of a peculiarity which is not found in England. The United States are not a homogeneous nation, but a federation of sovereign States, and the senators who are chosen by each State singly are ambassadors or plenipotentiaries, rather than an ordinary Upper House. In England, as society is now constituted, the government belongs to the House of Commons; the determination and conduct of the national policy is the inevitable prerogative of the Commons. But a strong House of Lords is needed to moderate the political movement; and it would be difficult to devise a better system than ours, combining as it does a lofty guarantee for independence, combined with real responsibility—a result, not of theory or statute, but of natural growth out of the sagacity of Englishmen and the general principles of the Constitution. The people often err. Sir R. Peel, as Minister, proposed Catholic Emancipation, and was unseated on that account by his constituents at Oxford; but this very marked disapproval did not prevent him from successfully passing his measure. The men of Devonshire rejected Lord John Russell when nominated Minister by the

Crown ; but the Queen adhered to her choice, and he governed all England. These eminent statesmen were responsible to "public opinion," and not solely to their own constituents, and "public opinion" sustained them against the condemnation of their own constituents. The Lords have to act upon a similar basis, and their value, as well as their strength, depends upon their accurate discernment of what the people really wish. Since 1832 they have never rejected the proposals of the country without some solid support in the country ; and whenever the nation has finally made up its mind, whatever may be their private sentiments, the Lords invariably yield. Their special duty is to resist the momentary will of the Commons, frequently backed by the passionate feeling of the people, whenever there is special reason to believe that it is only momentary. The fiercer the excitement of misguided people, the greater the violence done to good sense and the public weal, the more directly does the House of Lords, by resisting, stake its existence as a security for its patriotism. It is the temptation of members of Parliament to be careful for their own advancement, and to be absorbed by the rise and fall of Ministries. It is the danger of constituents to think of themselves and to forget the people—to provide for the interests of Birmingham or Manchester, and to cast on others the care and difficulty of upholding the honour and safety of all England. Without a House of Lords, the interests of the whole people may be sacrificed to the interests of those who have most influence for the day in the Commons. "There are particular moments," says the distinguished American, Story, "when the people, stimulated by some singular passion, or some illicit advantage, or misled by artful misrepresentations of interested men, may call for measures which they themselves will afterwards be the most ready to lament and condemn. In these critical moments, how salutary will be the interference of a body of respectable citizens, chosen without reference to the exciting cause, to check the misguided career of public opinion, and to suspend the blow until reason, justice, and truth can regain their authority over the public mind." The peers are not beyond the influence of party, or,

indeed, of selfishness, but their position is so secured by rank and wealth, they have so much to lose and so little to gain by legislative changes, that the casting vote may be safely left in their hands, as the maintenance of general prosperity must ever be paramount with them, above all other considerations.

There is no greater danger to any nation than to depend on the "will of one man;" for the safety of a people, they should be taught to believe in "principles," not in the man. Idolize the man who best carries out the right principles, but never forget that it is the "principles" you are honouring. Hero-worship is a dangerous thing when the principles are submerged in worship of the individual. We see this in what is called "Radicalism," which is not a principle, but a method of work, and when put in the place of principle, it becomes tyranny. "Liberty for all, with the least possible sacrifice of the liberty of the individual," is my idea of freedom. And we get more freedom under a constitutional king than a demagogue, under a dictator than a mob—that fickle body, changeable as a weathercock. "Principle" is the safety-valve for both the nation and the individual. If not restrained by principle, the man is led on by a dangerous and fatal ambition—an ambition that, like sea-water to the thirsty wretch on wrecked raft, is but a snare that leads him to destruction. A constituency elects a member not believing in an oath; he is honourable enough to say so. But the law only allows the privilege of affirming; to Jews, Quakers, and Separatists, and as he belongs to neither of these sects, the man desiring to be a "legislator" for others should show a respect for "law," not a defiance of it. To demand your right to do this or that, and to attempt to enforce your right by the power of a "mob," to force your entrance into a body you have been declared legally or constitutionally disqualified for, is a proof of the necessity of safety-valves to guard the Constitution against "Radicalism," or the power that listens to no law or reason, but thinks it can awe by its numbers. The sensible policy is to do as the Jews and Quakers did,—hide your time. I would abolish all "tests."

most certainly all "disabilities" on account of religious opinion. One man has as much right in the House of Commons as another, having been elected; but he must conform to the law, as no man is fit to be a "law-maker" who begins by defying the law. To maintain a nation's freedom, law must be observed; and if wrong, the proper constitutional measures taken for its repeal. Civilization means a respect for the law, and the sacrifice of your will to it.

A people who mean to remain free and independent, should place under the eyes of the rising generation the examples and memories which strengthen souls, form character, infuse courage, and consequently form what is most noble in national training. "Never despair" must be their motto. In all histories there are periods of disaster—times when the struggle seemed hopeless; yet, dying without hope, the example has been set of doing one's duty thoroughly to the end. And the history of the world shows that Time is just, and the reward will come, if the people have faith and can live up to their ideals. At times it may seem necessary to have a "Dictator" for a few years, but the principle is unsound, and the remedy is worse than the disease; for progress needs freedom for each individual to do the best he can with his talents, freedom for the co-operation of all, freedom for the association of efforts in trying to obtain the best form of government, by a people resolved to be free, to toil willingly, pay honestly and cheerfully, and to be tranquil and at peace. If a nation, like an individual, falls within an inch of ruin, there must be a cause or fault. Some sin by excess of weakness, others by excess of arrogance and despotism, the majority by a culpable indifference; but the lesson history teaches us is, that, by the individual or society, everything has to be paid for. There is but one God, whose laws for the government of the universe indicate unmistakably a wisdom and desire for the greatest happiness possible for all His creatures; it is for us to recognize the blessing of living under the "supremacy of fixed, invariable laws," that "every effect has its cause," that "as we sow we reap."

ACQUISITIVENESS.

"With all thy getting, get wisdom."

"The eminence, the nobleness of a people depends on its capability of being stirred by memories, and striving for what we call spiritual ends—ends which consist not in immediate material possessions, but in the satisfaction of a great feeling that animates the collective body as with one soul" (GEORGE ELIOT). The object of my writing is to make men think more of this world, not in being more worldly, but to ennoble and spiritualize the daily life, to see that life is a grand thing, industry a blessing, thrift a virtue, foreseen and provided for by the Creator in giving to mankind the desire to acquire, to possess, to succeed. But the success I would have men aim for is not to do as too many "successful men" have done. I would have mankind industrious and thrifty, with a desire to acquire as though in obedience to a divine edict within them, and not striving for success as it is generally understood. How do the majority succeed? By a minute knowledge of details, the faculty of getting work out of those they employ, a toughness of heart that enables them to screw everything possible out of all they come in contact with; and, above all, the tact of using judiciously inferior materials, of giving less than they profess to give: a life of deceit and meanness, punished by their children squandering the ill-gotten gains in reckless extravagance. Success of this kind is a farce, if it satisfies you I frankly admit that you may, in the year 1882, acquire wealth more rapidly if you will follow in the beaten track, wink at, join in, or outdo your competitors in roguery, feeling that debt hopelessly incurred is no dishonour, the departing from the straight path of fair trading no disgrace. Rather than succeed by the so-called "tricks of trade," I would have you fail ten thousand times. Yet the majority of our "successful men" held up by

teachers as an "example" for aspiring youths to follow, are those who have given an unswerving attention to the "main chance," men who will tell you that it is impossible to serve "God and Mammon," who will laugh at you as a fool to trust a man's word, to believe in a man's honesty. Ask such men to act in obedience to the dictates of their conscience, to do to others as they would be done by, they will laugh at you,—such language is unintelligible to their minds, incomprehensible to their base souls. Their business is to "make money." Ask them, one and all, these men of the world, and they will tell you it is "impossible" to act up to "principle," to be "honest." Therefore, as a matter of necessity, they are ready and willing to part with their self-respect, honour, and honesty, to make money. They go to church or chapel, they profess a belief in this or that, but by their daily acts they give unmistakable evidence that they are worshippers of Mammon, and know not God. I shall be ridiculed, and critics have accused me of being "arrogant enough to assert that man can serve God and Mammon." Yet, spite of all, I assert, unhesitatingly, that "there is a holy way of doing the business of the world in production and distribution;" spite of competition, it is possible to earn more than one need spend. Expenses may be heavier, profits less, still the desire to "acquire" has been implanted within man's brain, and the Creator, in giving the desire, has arranged for man to satisfy it in an "honourable way," if he but will so to do; and the time will come when the success of a man will be tested not by what he has acquired, but how he has acquired his wealth. In passing judgment upon a man as to his capacity for his vocation, the gauge of his capacity will be his measure of success in accordance with the standard of doing right. We all know what is right. "By the acts of their lives men must be known and estimated." "You ask too much of 'poor humanity,'" I am told; but I only want men to know the causes of success and failure, the importance of not letting opportunities slip through their fingers; to see that men, good men as they are called, spite of a good start in

life, and without indulgence in a single vice, fail most disastrously in the game of life by muddling their means away. Society condemns garbling, licentiousness, and drinking, as expensive vices, ruinous indulgences; but the losses from "want of management" are a thousand times greater; and there will be evidence of a higher code of commercial and social morality when the day comes (and come it will) when the man who cannot make his incoming and outgoings balance will be looked upon as little better than a thief.

"Who is the honest man?"

He who doth still and strongly good pursue,
To God, his neighbour, and himself most true."

HERBERT.

Visionary and utopian as the idea may seem, the time will come when men will preach of "this life," and cease to talk of "another life," as if it only began on the other side of the grave. The "future life" is a grand conception; if used to keep alive hope in the human soul; men living their lives, sustained by the thought of the "life of the future in this world," sustained in their efforts, supported in their struggles, happy in the consciousness that by their industry, their thrift, their acquisition of knowledge, of what is true, they have removed some of the obstacles that impeded their own progress; and so they will retire to rest content in the contemplation of a "better life here," for those who will follow, when their allotted term of life is over.

It may be accepted as an axiom that all human action that tends to progress and civilization is primarily motivated by one desire—the desire to acquire property; and, conversely, that without this desire, and without the means of gratifying it, no progress of any kind is possible. Poverty and riches, obscurity and dignity, are, in other words, the positive and negative poles of all social energy, and from one to the other of these the currents of action flow. There is one great example that will show us the truth of this: I mean commerce. In the case of commerce, the truth of what has just been said is self-evident.

for not only is the constant struggle and ambition of the individual needed to advance civilization,—it is needed also if we would keep civilization from retrograding.

“To preserve our material civilization even in its present state, there is a vast amount of skill and knowledge requisite, which men will only take the trouble to master for the sake of some adequate reward, and which, in the absence of any incentive to master it, might readily become lost to mankind altogether. But this is not all. If it is thus evident that there must be a minority to direct labour, it is still more evident that there must be labour to direct. There must be the delicate labour of the skilled operative; there must be the brute labour of the born and bred toiler. It is only through such agencies that railways, telegraphs, steamers, the diffusion of knowledge through printing, and the acquirement of knowledge through travel, can be still preserved among us; and all these agencies are extinguished by equality. Equality, then, can mean nothing more than ruin. It can mean no process of levelling up—no levelling up to the higher conditions, no levelling up even to the middle ones, but a general levelling down to a level below the lowest. Presently, too, it would be seen to mean something beyond this. It is conceivable that, through the appliances of civilization, the people might unite so as to destroy civilization; but they would be parting with their strength in the very act of using it. The appliances through which they could unite, either physically or in sentiment, are appliances that would go to ruin if they ceased to labour to maintain them; and with the falling to pieces of this vast material tissue, the proletariat would be once more disunited, once more broken into fragments, torn asunder by local ignorance and by local interest, and would consequently once more fall under the dominion of the strongest few. Inequality would be seen to be a phoenix, which, not only, if it died, would die amidst flames and ashes, but which out of those very ashes would be sure to redevelop itself” (W. H. MALLOCK).

We want a new conception of Conservatism; men so proud of

and commerce is in this respect the image of all progressive, of all civilizing activities. It is the image of invention, and invention is the essence of economy, and of manufacture, and the practical application of science. Progress in all these branches would have been impossible—if we only saw the matter completely, it would have been *unthinkable*—without the desire in individuals to acquire property, and without the certain prospect before them of being able to do so.

I belong to no party or sect, but can appreciate and willingly acknowledge any action by Whig or Tory, Mohammedan or Christian, that will make men more healthy, wealthy, and wise; with the wisdom of perceiving that life is a glorious privilege, a grand heritage, and that it is the duty of all men to make the best of this world. To effect this object, men must rise above the mechanical details and dogmas of the theologians, the claims of party so strenuously urged by the politicians. The amelioration of the social condition of the people can only be obtained by teaching them how to help themselves, by giving them correct principles to guide their lives by, and demonstrating to their common sense the value of labour, steadiness, thought, and thrift. The masses are becoming a great power, —it is necessary they should understand how to use it; inspire within them the desire to acquire; let them have a stake in the country, an interest in the maintenance of our Constitution. We owe much to Liberal reformers; they removed by their skill, energy, self-sacrifice, the encumbrances that weakened the building, and thereby strengthened it. But the Liberals of 1882 have yielded to Radicalism, and unless this power is checked, they will destroy the fine old institutions that have been so carefully built up. We must hope that the good sense of the people will awaken in time to see that Radicalism means spoliation, ruin. Any scheme that tends to equalize property must tend to paralyze civilization in the very act of diffusing it, and to debase the coin in the very act of distributing it. Let the ideal state it aims at have ever so many things to recommend it, it contains in itself the elements of its own dissolution;

or not only is the constant struggle and ambition of the individual needed to advance civilization,—it is needed also if we would keep civilization from retrograding.

“To preserve our material civilization even in its present state, there is a vast amount of skill and knowledge requisite, which men will only take the trouble to master for the sake of some adequate reward, and which, in the absence of any incentive to master it, might readily become lost to mankind altogether. But this is not all. If it is thus evident that there must be a minority to direct labour, it is still more evident that there must be labour to direct. There must be the delicate labour of the skilled operative; there must be the brute labour of the born and bred toiler. It is only through such agencies that railways, telegraphs, steamers, the diffusion of knowledge through printing, and the acquirement of knowledge through travel, can be still preserved among us; and all these agencies are extinguished by equality. Equality, then, can mean nothing more than ruin. It can mean no process of levelling up—no levelling up to the higher conditions, no levelling up even to the middle ones, but a general levelling down to a level below the lowest. Presently, too, it would be seen to mean something beyond this. It is conceivable that, through the appliances of civilization, the people might unite so as to destroy civilization; but they would be parting with their strength in the very act of using it. The appliances through which they could unite, either physically or in sentiment, are appliances that would go to ruin if they ceased to labour to maintain them; and with the falling to pieces of this vast material tissue, the proletariat would be once more disunited, once more broken into fragments, torn asunder by local ignorance and by local interest, and would consequently once more fall under the dominion of the stronger few. Inequality would be seen to be a phoenix, which not only, if it died, would die amidst flames and ashes, but which out of those very ashes would be sure to redevelop itself” (W. H. MALLOCK).

We want a new conception of Conservatism; men so proud of

the freedom that has been so hardly gained, and so appreciative of the privileges they enjoy under our mixed Constitution, that every effort would be made to make it a model government. The wisdom of reformation and timely concession should be recognized as the truest Conservatism. The first requisite of true Conservatism is foresight. Humanity grows, and foresight is necessary to secure room for its future expansion. Conservatism has been in the past too much like a wall built round a growing tree; this is a false Conservatism, which is sure to be rent and ruined by the energy which it opposes. The true Conservative looks ahead, and prepares for the inevitable. He wants to protect what is, and therefore wisely forestalls revolution by securing, in due time, sufficient amplitude for the national vibration. He is an unwise statesman who wants to impose his notions, however right they may be in the abstract, upon a nation unprepared for them; but he is no statesman at all who, without seeking to interpret and guide it in advance, merely waits for the more or less coarse expressions of the popular will, and then constitutes himself its vehicle. In virtue of the position which he occupies, his knowledge and insight ought to be in advance of the public knowledge and insight; and his action, in like degree, ought to precede and inspire public action. Those men are not statesmen who present a picture to the people that excites the popular imagination, and makes them discontented with things as they are. Those political agitators incur a fearful responsibility who excite the people by some vivid appeal to their imagination, holding forth some improved condition to the masses—changes that to the imagination may seem easy to accomplish, and, if accomplished, full of nothing but benefits, whilst the critical common sense of the people is in abeyance; but when once reason asserts her sway such attempts are seen to be impossible, or, if possible, ruinous to attempt. Suppose the people are starving; a wise ruler would not force the bakers to give their bread gratis, but find out something to be done that would be for the benefit of the country, and employ the people, or raise a subscription or levy taxes to enable

them to buy the bread. So, too, in the case of rent, statesmen should try and ascertain the cause why the people are too impoverished to pay it,—not assist them legally to evade paying what they have contracted to pay. It is surprising how many sensible men lose their balance over that bugbear, “rent.” What is “rent”? A, having capital, invests his money in the purchase of land; B, who lives by his skill and labour in extracting from land those products kind nature has bestowed upon the earth, offers to pay A a certain rent for the use of his land. The rent, by a certain class of thinkers, is said to be “unfair”—viz., that as land is limited, and the demand for it unlimited, therefore the State must step in and protect the weak tenant from the strong landlord. But it is a well-known fact to all political economists, and those who understand the laws of “supply and demand,” that the capitalist class will bid against each other for any and every article or investment, land or otherwise, until it fetches a price that will yield to the buyer a rate of interest according to the value of money and the remuneration it is obtaining at the time. A having bought the land at its market price, asks of B a rent that will give him in return for his money a rate of interest equal to what “money” is getting. And I fail to see why “rent” is to be arbitrarily reduced by the Legislature, any more than the manufacturers’, merchants’, bankers’, or any other investors’ interest from capital embarked in their respective occupations. Some argue that as the farmer’s capital depends upon the seasons, over which he has no control, the State should protect his capital from confiscation; but it is a very serious matter for the State to try and meet every “exceptional” condition in the struggle for life of its individual members. It seems to me that when a statesman leaves “principle” for “expediency,” he not only takes a very dangerous, but a very arrogant step when he puts himself or his laws in the “place of Providence” to help people. Any man worthy of being a statesman must know he has not the power to put aside the laws of “supply and demand.” It is absurd to talk of landlords being cruel and exacting in asking for the interest, called rent, for the

use of their property—a rent you have agreed to pay, a rent that if you cannot make the land yield, others more able and skilful can. Besides, all the Court can do is to make the present tenant's landlord take £10 instead of £20. The tenant knows its real value; and when he parts with it, he will exact a premium from his successor, the interest of which will be equivalent to the £10 per year the law has robbed the landlord of; so that it is only the present tenant who is benefited by the Act, and to the extent of his benefit is the amount of loss by the landlord. To do good, you must create, or discover a faculty of production hitherto unknown. This depends upon the people, who should only ask of Government to be "let alone." The whole action of the land law, in its every aspect, rightly or wrongly, is but to "transfer property from one man's pocket into another's." The price of commodities, rent of land, interest of money, the State has no control over, and it is unwise for it to interfere. If the law is to reduce rent because a farmer says he cannot pay it after having promised to do so, the law may reduce interest and the price of commodities for a similar reason. If the farmer is to be helped because he has a bad season, why not help the tradesman who suffers also by bad seasons, unfavourable weather, the change of fashion, &c.? If the State reduces the landlord's rent because of a bad season, to be fair to both parties, the State, as a matter of equity, should make the farmer pay more rent to the landlord when he has a good one. The result is due to the inherent productive power of the land; and if the owner of the land has less because the yield is bad, he is entitled to more when the yield is good. In taking a house or farm for a period, the rent is based upon the "average" result—the only fair method between buyer and seller. It is not honest to subtract for a bad year, unless you are equally prepared to give more when you have a good one. But time will show with rent, as it has proved with all other attempts to regulate prices, the wisest policy is "non-intervention." Let buyers and sellers make their own bargains. "Ah," some one says, "but the landlord has rights beyond other traders; he can distrain for his rent,

whereas a tradesman has to accept a composition." But is a trader satisfied with the same rate of interest as a landowner? If the landlord class are to be liable to bad debts, rent generally must be increased to pay a larger interest, to cover the increased risk of loss. Consols go to par in times of peace and prosperity, but in times of war they fall to a price that will yield an interest to cover the increased risk. It is the same with everything, and no power on earth can stop the natural action of the law that regulates interest according to the safety or risk of the investment. "Extortionate rent" is a fallacy; an article will, can only fetch what it is worth. If you give twenty shillings for a thing worth ten shillings, who is to blame? Can the State find "brains" and common sense for its people? "Bad seasons!" has it taken us till the year 1882 to find out there are bad seasons? They are necessary evils, to teach the people to be "thrifty." Farmers, like traders, with the necessary capital, enterprise, industry, and energy, will prosper, spite of, because they are prepared for, bad seasons. The duty of the State is to leave men to the action of nature's law, "the survival of the fittest," and time will soon get the incapable men out, and their places will be taken by those who have the capital, skill, and energy to extract from the land the greatest yield that can be obtained therefrom. Debt for the occupation of land differs in no essential point from debt of other kinds; it only differs because it is easier for the Radicals to misrepresent it to the imagination of the tenants. The value of land depends on supply and demand; its price must, spite of all man's laws, be what it will fetch in the open market, and this is regulated to a great extent by the productiveness of the land. It is a fact that rent must fall as the value of what can be got out of land decreases, and the value of land, like the value of Consols, depends upon the value of money; people buy it at that price which will, in the rent paid for its use, give the interest the money is entitled to. There are no worse counsellors for the State than those who try to make justice look like tyranny, or laws that are really robbing Peter to pay

Paul, to look like justice. Such tricks mean destruction to the State, a stoppage of progress; it is holding out to the eyes of the people a land of promise that seems to give them heaven for hell, but which will be found by the sternness of reality to conceal a wilderness so hideous, that, by comparison, their present condition is a paradise. For, putting aside all plausible sophistry, it is the attempt to substitute might for right, law for justice—law supporting the radical idea that "property is theft;" and a law that begins with land must ultimately attack all property, or, at least, all those gradations of property by which society is made to have a base and a summit, with the many poor below and the rich few above. No one is more aware than myself that society is far from being perfect; I have always maintained that man has the power, when he wills earnestly so to do, to remedy many of these imperfections, but I deny that "injustice" to A, to benefit B, can benefit society. If for tenancy at will some more secure form of tenancy is to be substituted, the alteration should be made with justice to all parties concerned, and in a manner so precise and intelligible that no misconception can arise. No law can permanently get over the difficulty created by a large demand and a small supply; no legislation can stop, divert, or control the action of such natural laws. We may hedge about any system of tenure with endless legal technicalities and restrictions, but we can never, practically speaking, prohibit a man who has a distinct interest in land from dealing with it to his best advantage. We may fix judicial rents, but we cannot stop the seller from getting of the buyer what land is worth in the shape of fines and premiums. We cannot prevent tenants or small freeholders from selling or letting their property at the best price they can get. We cannot prevent copyholders from selling their interest, or borrowing money on it, which amounts to the same thing as putting an increased rent upon the land. We may transfer the power of taking more for land than we think it is worth from A to B, but we cannot destroy that power. Nothing can do so but a natural adjustment of prices.

Such natural adjustment can only be brought about through the growth of sounder economic ideas, through an increase in the quantity of land, a decrease in the number of people wanting it, or the discovery by them of some means of support other than agriculture. To improve society is one thing; to pull it down, another. It is wise occasionally to remove the rubbish and lumber; it is very unwise to put our crowbar to props and pillars as well. Real reformation is to ameliorate, not to destroy, society. Too many people think, if Parliament does a thing it must be right, that they are omnipotent and irresponsible, and that no form of property is held but at its will. So a certain section who use the word "equality" for the purpose of holding a *higher* place in society, say, "Expropriate the landlords, and redistribute their land." And, judging by what has been done, it is conceivable that Parliament may do this—nay, much more than this. But, though it made laws and unmade them; it would still be not omnipotent; there would all the time be a greater law-giver than it, whose laws it might, indeed, break, but not long with impunity. That law-giver is human nature itself, and its laws are those by which all human civilization is compelled to construct itself—the laws of property, of inequality, and of obedience. These laws, it is true, may seem hard; but under some of her aspects is not Nature hard everywhere, and is she not more hard on us the more we disregard her? And this social law of hers is indeed a stone which, if it falls on us, will grind us all to powder. Politicians who think they can act so as to elude these laws, are dangerous; they are luring the nation to dissolution, under the guise of progress. Such men cannot be too strongly reminded that there are two prospects open to men—advance and retrogression; and that the latter, as possible as the former, has been taught us terribly many times by history. The surest means to insure retrogression are attempts at impossible progress by passing human laws with an idea of putting aside natural laws. By such action during any crisis in our history, civilization is much retarded; we lose in a few weeks

the results of many ages—the belief in the justness of natural laws. We are too apt to forget that barbarism is only a few steps behind us, and as soon as we lose a few paces, or begin to go back, it recommences. Our civilization is not the first that the world has known; in some ways it is not the greatest, and there is no reason whatever to suppose that it is exceptionally stable. This is certain, the struggle for existence here for the masses, certainly for the middle class, will be harder than heretofore. To insure progress, to maintain our position, to prevent dissolution, we need a greater knowledge of, and more faithful obedience to, the economic laws. We want a true Conservative policy to strengthen the building in all its weak parts, to remove all unnecessary ballast or expenses that overweight the vessel; we want extra supports to the pillars to preserve the building, and not the throwing aside of the principal timbers, “liberty,” and “justice,” without which the desire to “acquire” will languish and die; and few understand what a powerful leverage this desire to “possess,” and to get interest on what we have saved by self-denial and thrift, has been in sending the good barque Civilization so far on her road.

There are men so utterly idle, incompetent, or thriftless, that they must go to ruin. You cannot alter this by Act of Parliament; “*you must alter the men.*” The Ballot was to stop bribery and corruption; the Election of 1880 was the vilest in our history. It is the same with the Land Law. It is not the system that is wrong; *it is the tenants.* The real statesman, the real patriot, the only man worthy of our homage, is he who tries to alter the tenants, to alter the voters—who teaches both to respect their manhood, teaches both their *duties* to the State, teaches both to rise above the mere selfish indulgence of the moment. It is a sign of weakness, morally and intellectually, to use the power of the law to pander to their idleness, thriftlessness, and want of moral sense, by yielding to their demands under the plea of “help against oppression.” This was the cry for the Ballot, and for the Land Law; and the latter will no more cure the evil than the former has.

We come of a good stock; our forefathers fought manfully for our institutions; we have been a law-abiding people; but we are apt to be led away by the picture of the "rich landlord and the poor tenant." We do this because we all of us have an idea that we pay "too much rent;" yet fail to see how illogical is our complaint, as we would not part with what we have without being paid a premium for it. Is it or is it not a fact, that we no sooner get possession of a man's house or land for a period of years, and wish to sell it, than we want a large sum as a premium for parting with it? The appeal to the masses to touch property requires the greatest care; and statesmen should remember this fact, that, up to the present moment, a want of respect for, or equality in property, has meant the same thing as savagery, and that respect for, and inequality in property, has always coexisted with what we mean by civilization; it has always, that is, coexisted with every kind of progress. Do not be misled by those good-hearted but bad advisers, who tell you "men are to be considered before wealth;" therefore free trade, machinery, letting "a limited class have possession of the land," &c., is a crime against humanity. It is not true. Free trade, machinery, rent left to the value land fetches in the open market, supporting *more* and not fewer inhabitants, all inventions, the removal of any restrictions or monopoly, the sacredness of life, the security of property, the inviolability of contracts, the more a nation recognizes its duty in fulfilling all its obligations as a sacred duty,—these are all conducive to peace and prosperity, all rouse man's highest faculties, urge him upward. It is not the spendthrift, but the thrifty, that helps forward progress; to acquire, to possess, to increase the national capital, is essential for progress in the arts, for progress in the sciences, for progress in the conquest by mind of matter. Every heritage of thought, or beauty, or legal wisdom, that has come down to us from the past, has come down to us from societies built up by inequality, and divided into rich and poor, privileged and unprivileged. There is not one of the great

civilizations of the past but tells with a solemn plainness this hard truth. Babylon and Egypt, Athens and Rome, and modern Europe through all its changes, are all unanimous and unequivocal in their witness to the truth of this law of nations, "inequality," and that the steady progress of civilization has depended upon, as it can only subsist by, the sacredness of life and property by every member of the community. Therefore, I ask the people to hesitate before they accept the radical dream of the future, which is, to unite what have hitherto seemed incompatible, the amenities of progressive civilization with a disregard to the rights of property, with the equality of stagnant savagery. To purify and elevate national life, we must give stability of character to the individual; teach him self-help, self-reliance, thrift. There can be no progress except by peaceful reform of the Constitution. Laws must be made to protect the property of all alike—the landlord as well as the tenant, the employer as well as the employed; not to benefit the poor at the expense of the rich, or *vice versa*. Theologians must put forth a larger and nobler ideal; they must tell men it is their duty to God to strive nobly, and striving with all their might and strength, to fulfil their duty in this world to their fellow-men, by the exercise of all their power and influence for the amelioration and improvement of domestic, social, and political life. The Church must think more of this world, or men, in throwing aside the legend, will, unfortunately, throw away the truth also. The Church must ally itself with philosophy; it is useless opposing facts of divine government with a cosmogony based on Scripture. The subject is a difficult one, but the facts of nature are not to be put aside because this or that sect thinks they do not agree with the Bible. Science may seem too arrogant, but we must remember the opposition she has encountered, and "a fact" is to science as sacred a thing as belief is to the theologian. This is certain, that the "health and wealth" of society need a closer observance of, and obedience to, the laws of God; and at present science is man's best teacher, until the theologian will use his common sense, descend from the

"infallible" position he has assumed, and work with the reformers of our day in elevating mankind, and give him a "possible ideal" that will enable him to resist the degrading influences which are eating into our moral life. We must read in another way than heretofore the expression that "there's a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will." It is a truth, yet not a truth. We are subject to the divine laws; we must submit to them; but it rests with *ourselves* to observe their action, to obey them, to develop our faculties for a certain end, to watch events, and shape the course of events in our favour, or to our purpose, if we will. We want men to strive for obedience to God and the State, for the good of all, and not for mere self-advancement; children trained to sobriety, industry, economy, and charity. Religion affects to deal with the highest elements of human nature, and yet ignores, treats with disdain, the knowledge philosophy and science give here of the commonest and widest truths that concern man. Neither philosophy nor religion can account for the whole of thought, the whole of life. Philosophy has to explain how religion has to effect, by the truths of philosophy, the elevation, the purifying, the enlargement of the national ideas and aims; there is no other way to insure stable and fruitful progress. The present antagonism and want of methodical, concerted action between the two powers of knowledge and sentiment, weakens the moral stamina of the country, wastes its fibres, dissipates its resources, fetters and arrests its progress. We want a revolution in the method of human thought, in the ideal of man's life. We are fearfully prodigal with our resources. Economy is needed in human thought more than in anything else. Theology, in its long history, has raised human nature to periods of wonderful energy; but what does it do now to vitalize and discipline the intellect, absorbed as it is in its desperate struggle with science, fact, history, common sense? Economically, its great power is wasted, because it refuses to ally modern thought with its feeling; because, through adherence to old beliefs, it is

unable to systematize the logic of modern thought, to disentangle, and take advantage of, the accumulated masses of modern knowledge. Why keep up this useless struggle against the hard facts of this external world? Law, sequence, struggle, imperfection, decay, are so familiar to all minds, that they have split the conception of Almighty Benevolence till it bursts and cracks around us. Theologians revolt our understanding with their claim to make their Providence absolute and ubiquitous, when the world of law is everywhere visible in the environment of man, and, so far as we can see, is the ultimate principle therein, manifested to the eye of man. They should base their idea of the fatherly protection of God upon His laws; appeal to man's reverence through the justness of those laws; appeal to his awe and admiration by the wonderful foresight manifested in their operation; show to man that he is dependent on, and yet distinct from, his surroundings; as he has the power, if he wills, to learn how to control or direct the action of those laws; make him feel that he is a truly human power, capable of a sublime ideal and profound sympathies; show him how great he may be, yet make him recognize the limits of his power. His strength will depend upon his accepting and recognizing the bounds of his might; humbly conscious that in certain fields his human heart is supreme, and that in these fields are to be found the solid parts of human happiness. Let us all strive to make life worth living; keep active the hopes and experiences which are the springs of its present and most lasting joys—the aspiration to keep our life as far as possible apart from that of the brutes; surround it with a dignity and grace; stimulate the noblest activity in men and communities; make them think; make them see they cannot infringe God's laws with impunity—that consequences are unpitying. Our deeds carry their terrible consequences, quite apart from any fluctuation that went before—consequences that are hardly ever confined to ourselves. On the other hand, obedience benefits ourselves and others; and the internal consciousness of a life spent in the desire to do one's duty will bear us up under the

cares and toils of our present experience, gladden the heart, beautify and exalt the life. Begin at once, my friend; let the past be past: "it's but little good you'll do a-watering the last year's crop;" think only of the present; and do your duty with all your might; seeing in life an inheritance to employ your faculties, trained in skilful, courageous labour; of that hand determined to work upward, as a painstaking, honest man, with a conscience within you urging you to do well the daily tasks before you. You may have to work to the last; it is our duty to do so. You may die poor, but live so that when you leave it shall be said, "He was a man of trust;" that the master who employed you shall say, "Where shall I find his like?"

Nature has sown bountifully the seeds of saving. Thrift, by which we satisfy the principle within us that prompts us to acquire, arises from the desire to better our condition; but, as more fully explained under "Capital," this principle of accumulation is for the benefit of others as well as ourselves; so it comes with us from the womb, and never leaves us till we go into the grave. In the whole interval which separates those two moments there is scarcely, perhaps, a single instance in which any man is so perfectly satisfied with his situation as to be without any wish for alteration or improvement. An augmentation of fortune is the means by which the greater part of men propose and wish to better their condition. Increased means do not always bring greater happiness; but the desire to increase your capital, the doing so by abstaining from present indulgences, is, even if done with selfish notions, likely to do good to others; at least, it is putting aside a present enjoyment within your reach, and treasuring up the means that may enable another to gratify. It is a duty we owe to society to save and accumulate, to reserve and put by from the present for future use. And that nature wishes and intended us to save is proved by the fact that, though the principle of indulgence and expense prevails in almost all men upon some occasions, and in some men upon all occasions, yet in the greater proportion of men, taking the whole course of their life

as an average, the principle of frugality seems not only to predominate, but to predominate very greatly. Hence the strong accumulation of the national wealth. It is the same with bankrupts: we hear a great deal of unsuccessful projects, but the number of prudent and successful undertakings is everywhere much greater, or the nation could not exist. But, although not initiated by us, this progress, this very existence, depends upon our obeying the instinct of acquisitiveness implanted in our brain. There can be no consumption unless something is produced to consume; the busy bees must outnumber the drones; they must produce, not only for their own, but for that large class that are maintained and live by the produce of other men's labour. Fortunately, the instinct to acquire is a very strong one; and, also, that this instinct makes men having much, want more; so they seek for means to use it so as to increase it, and by employing or lending their money to others who employ productive labour, they gradually add not only to their own wealth, but the nation's. But if, by any unfortunate mishap, property became so insecure, or so unremunerative, that men were not disposed to save, but the reverse, and the "unproductive labour" increased out of proportion to the productive, they would consume so as not to leave enough to reproduce for the next year. Not saving, briefly, would be like leaving us without seed for the next year's crop, and society must collapse. The nation will decay so soon as the frugality and good conduct of its members is not able to compensate for the waste of its unproductive members. The Divine Economist, the infallible Ruler that guides us, has done His part to prevent this by implanting in man that strong instinct of self-preservation, that causes in every age the uniform, constant, and uninterrupted effort of the majority of men to better their condition; the principle from which public and national as well as private opulence is originally derived, and which has been, and, let us hope, ever will be, powerful enough to maintain the natural progress of things towards improvement, in spite of the extravagance of government, the errors of adminis-

tration, the misconduct and prodigality of individuals. Like the unknown principle of animal life, it has the power to restore health and vigour to the constitution, in spite not only of the disease, but of the incorrect prescription of the physician. My prescription for the nation to satisfy its acquisitiveness—and the annual produce of the land and labour of any nation can be increased by no other means—is “economy.” Labour, but be thrifty; resolve to save, to acquire. The national wealth depends on the increase of the wealth of the individuals it is composed of. You must, therefore, to increase the wealth, increase the number of your productive labourers, or increase the productive power of the same number of labourers. There is only one way of doing either: increase your capital. You cannot increase the “number of labourers” unless you increase the fund that maintains them; you cannot increase the productive power of the labourers you have already except by machinery or superior tools. To buy them, you must increase your capital; increase it to that extent, that you can afford to transfer it from your circulating capital to your fixed capital. I am assuming that you have been compelled to make the most of the labour you have by the wisest arrangements experience can supply for the proper division of employment, so as to make the most of the labour at your command. But even here the essential requisite is “more capital,” as division of labour means a larger staff of labourers; and to keep men engaged in one way, and dividing the work into a number of parts, requires a much larger capital than if the same men could be employed on every different part of the work. To test the value of acquisitiveness, compare the state of our nation at two different periods, and if you find that the annual produce of its land and labour is greater than at the former; that its lands are better cultivated, its manufactories more numerous and more flourishing, and its trade more extensive, then I say, without fear of contradiction, that it is because of this instinct of acquisition, that the result is due to the members of the nation who have “saved,” and that the improvement is due, wholly

and solely, to an "increase of capital" wisely used in the employment of productive labour; and the progress of a nation depends upon the increase of the "thrifty" class—depends upon the gradually increasing proportion of "productive" over "un-productive" labour in the community.

Acquisition has a higher mission. All are bound by humanity to help the starving and the homeless; and although many pass by and take no heed, those who wish to help must acquire, to enable them to do so. "Pity without relief is like mustard without beef." You must not only grasp the wants of others, realize the misery of the large mass of people who, in pelting rain, cutting sleet, and bitter cold, have not bread to eat, nor a roof to shelter them; but to feed them and to house them, you must have acquired the means, you must have saved out of what you had to spend. God foresaw that there would be men thoughtless and improvident, and wisely counteracted the tendency to waste and be thriftless by giving to mankind the still stronger instinct to acquire, to save, and to feel an irresistible impulse to help those in need, and to have a greater pleasure in giving to others than in spending upon indulgences for oneself. There is no greater pleasure than in giving bread to the hungry, lodging through the bleak nights to the homeless, help in any way that will mitigate the wretchedness of the most miserable of human beings; or a step higher, and with the helping hand befriending respectable families when the breadwinner is struck down with illness, and stopping their homes from being broken up, or enabling men to make a fresh start in life by a new suit of clothes or other help; or, better still, lending the money to enable men to take to the business of their employers if they retire, or to buy a business and get a start in life. In asking you to keep active within you the desire "to acquire," believe me, it is not my intention that you should be more selfish, but that it may enable you to help those of your fellow-men who have not been blessed so bountifully by nature with this faculty—so important to the progress of humanity.

CAPITAL.

" Brave conquerors!—for so you are,
That war against your own affections,
And the huge army of the world's desires."

" Heaven doth with us as we with torches do;
Not light them for themselves : for if our virtues
Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
As if we had them not. Spirits are not finely touch'd,
But to fine issues : nor nature never lends
The smallest scruple of her excellence ;
But, like a thrifty goddess, she determines
Herself the glory of a creditor,
Both thanks and use."

SHAKESPEARE.

CAPITAL is the result of saving ; it is the " accumulation " of the past, the produce those who preceded us have left behind for our use. It is impossible to have capital without labour ; but " industry is limited by capital." You wish to build a railway or a house, or make machines, and buy material to manufacture it into goods ; but such acts are quite impossible unless some of our predecessors had abstained from consuming what they had, and saved or put by for the benefit of others. To buy the material, and employ men to make the machines and convert the material into goods, needs a fund to buy food, &c., for all engaged, until the completed product can be exchanged for money. The same argument applies to houses, railways, &c. The number of men collectively that can be employed by any country is limited by the amount of capital it possesses. You will see, therefore, the necessity of economy, of thrift,—above all, of saving, of living within your income. A nation is merely a multiplication of individuals, and an increase in the national capital can only take place by individual saving. How to make the individual industrious and thrifty, *to save*, is the problem of every age, but more especially

of ours. Men must be raised in their own eyes; their self-esteem must be aroused; they must recognize that the making reasonable provision for the future is a proof that the man's moral and intellectual faculties are developed beyond the average. It is useless having better wages, larger incomes,—in fact, they do a man harm, morally and economically, unless at the same time we educate him, or he educates himself, up to his income; for the less educated he is in comparison with his possessions, the less good are his possessions likely to be either to himself or to any one else. To give employment to our people, we want capital; to obtain increased capital, we must strive, by our education of the individual, to make him a "saving man;" to be this, he must have some character, some intelligence, some foresight; he must be a careful liver in this world, he must be a moral man. The people require to be trained "to take heed of the morrow;" when they only possess sufficient to maintain them for a few days, they depend upon their daily labour to replace what they consume; they have no capital, but once they possess sufficient to maintain themselves for months or years, they are capitalists; and will want to derive an interest or profit from what they possess; as people seldom like to touch their capital fund, but, on the contrary, are anxious to increase it; and so the invaluable habit of saving is formed. It is the duty of every man to put by, to save, to increase in some way his stock of clothes, furniture, investments; to put by a something for the future, to strive daily for a something beyond his immediate consumption.

Capital is divided into fixed and circulating. It is "fixed" when employed in the improvement of land, the purchase of useful machines and trade fixtures, or in all such things as will yield a revenue or profit without having to circulate any further. The circulating capital is that employed in the purchase of stock, goods to sell again; as there is no profit to the trader until he sells them for money, and that money yields him but little till it is exchanged for goods, so his capital is always going from and returning to him again,

and it is by such successive exchanges that he gets his profit to live by. So money thus employed in buying to sell, to buy again, is called circulating capital. Different occupations require very different proportions between the fixed and circulating capital employed in them; but in all it is advisable to limit the "fixed" or sunk capital to its minimum. Many men are ruined by forgetting this rule. They have done well; their trade is increasing; they are induced to rebuild their premises, and in so doing they *sink their capital* in bricks and mortar, and their trade being to buy and sell, the same can only be maintained or extended by an increase of "circulating capital;" they have locked up the tools necessary to do their work with, and have forgotten that fixed capital does not pay like circulating capital. The manufacturer puts on the price of goods interest for the capital he has sunk in machinery; the merchant puts it on for the money he has spent in building in the shape of rent. But "interest of capital" does not pay a tradesman's expenses; to do this, he must use his capital over and over again. In fact, his success or failure will depend upon the number of times he turns his stock over in a year. This quick turn-over by the skilful trader is the advantage he has over the manufacturer; the latter gets interest for money sunk in plant, and for the money he has to advance weekly to pay wages, buy material, &c., but he cannot make the same turn-over that the merchant is able to do with the same capital. A manufacturer must have capital; a good financier is able in a cash trade to do without capital altogether. In coal works, mining, and railways the fixed capital is very great. Fixed capital should be considered as "investments" for men to put their capital into after they have left trade. The less "fixed" capital a man has whilst in business, except what is absolutely required for his trade, the better for him. The capital of a nation, like that of the individual, should be fairly proportioned between its fixed and circulating. The fixed capital that yields a revenue to the nation is its stock of all useful machines and instruments of trade which facilitate and abridge labour, all buildings which not only

procure a revenue to the proprietor who lets them for a rent, but to the person who possesses and uses them in the way of trade, as shops, warehouses, workshops, farmhouses, stables, granaries, &c., when used as instruments of trade. A dwelling-house is quite different, as, though it may yield a revenue to its proprietor, it cannot yield any to the public, nor serve in the formation of a capital to it; and the revenue of the whole body of the people can never be in the smallest degree increased by it, as the revenue which is derived from such things must always be ultimately drawn from some other source of revenue. They are not in themselves (except as necessities of life) reproductive, like the improvements of land, money profitably laid out in clearing, draining, enclosing, manuring, or reducing it into the condition best adapted for tillage and culture. An improved farm is like those useful machines which facilitate and abridge labour, by means of which fixed capital an equal circulating capital will yield a *much greater* revenue to its employer. Akin to this, but until lately not thought so much of, is the value to a country of the acquired and useful abilities of its inhabitants. Think for a moment of the sum spent yearly in education, the cost of food, clothing, &c., of every member of society, before he can produce one penny's worth; the years spent in study for a professional life, the time spent in learning a trade or handicraft,—and you will see what an immense sum we have in “fixed capital” in our skilled labour; for if these talents are the capital of the individual, so are they likewise that of the nation to which he belongs; and we are at last awaking to this fact, and it is to be hoped, by technical schools, by a more practical system of education altogether, we may, with our people, as with our machines, so improve our manufacture of all kinds, that the improved dexterity of the workmen will so improve as to add to the value of his labour, and, like the machines, repay its cost with a profit.

Every fixed capital is both originally derived from, and requires to be continually supported by, a circulating capital. No fixed capital can yield any revenue but by means of a

circulating capital. It is useless to make unless you can sell. The most useful machines and instruments of trade will produce nothing without the circulating capital which supplies the materials they are employed upon, and pays for the maintenance of the workmen who make them. Land, however improved, will yield no revenue without the circulating capital, which maintains the labourers who cultivate and collect its produce. To maintain and augment the stock which feeds, clothes, and lodges the people, both fixed and circulating capitals are necessary; and it is by the judicious use of these two capitals that the yearly consumption of the nation is replaced, and with a profit. To insure this successful result, the nation must remember that as so large a part of the circulating is being continually withdrawn to be added to the fixed capital, the circulating must in its turn receive continual supplies of fresh capital, without which it would soon cease to exist. The two great factors are the land and manufactures. The farmer extracts from the land food, provisions, wool, &c., which he gives to the manufacturer, and the manufacturer replaces to the farmer, in the finished state, goods to replace what has been worn out, and the provisions, materials, and finished work that made up the circulating capital.

England has arrived at that period of a nation's history when it is essential that the capital should be as productive as possible. The people must not only be taught to save money, but to wisely use it. It is not by augmenting the capital of the country, but by rendering a greater part of that capital more active and productive than would otherwise be so, that banking has the power to increase the operations of a country. Money in the hands of the people is *dead stock*, which, so long as it remains unemployed, produces nothing to the individual or the nation; but, by banking, we are enabled to convert a dead and useless stock into an active and productive one; as, by the aid of the banker, it gets lent out to those who will buy materials with it to work upon, machinery to work with, stock to sell again and yield the distributor something both for himself and his country.

To enable a nation to augment its capital, the capital it has must be used productively. For example, the capital employed in manufactures adds generally to the value of the materials worked upon, that of the workmen's maintenance and the master's profit; the wages advanced for the labour being generally restored in the improved value of the materials upon which the labour has been bestowed. This is called "productive labour," labour carrying in its finished state an extra value fully equivalent to the cost of its production. But the labour of a menial servant, on the contrary, adds to the value of nothing; his maintenance is paid for out of revenue; its cost is never restored; it is "unproductive labour." A man grows rich by employing a multitude of men in manufacturing; he grows poor by maintaining a multitude of menial servants. What is true of the individual is true of a nation, which, when it becomes rich, is apt to forget that capital, wealth, will soon vanish unless engaged in works that will reproduce it; the nation must become poor that employs too great a proportion of its people in "unproductive labour." This argument applies also to the civil, military, and diplomatic servants; the less they cost, the better for a nation; they are, *one and all*, "unproductive labourers;" they are maintained by, and live upon, the industry of other people. They may be a necessary evil, but, as wise economists, we should keep down the cost of their services, however humble, useful, or necessary they may be, to its minimum. The capital spent yearly in their maintenance is neither fixed nor circulating; it is *lost—gone*. The effort of their labour of this year will not purchase it again next, unless we again supply the necessary capital. This explains productive and unproductive labour: the one leaves a result after the effort, that will enable it to perform the same labour next time, and again and again; the other absorbs the capital paid for it in the very act of performing the service. In a new country, like America or Australia, progress is made because the "unproductive" bear but a small proportion to the "productive" members of society; but in countries like our own, we are

nearly smothered with unproductive professions, from the gravest to the most frivolous. Many useful, others quite useless, but, useful or useless, "unproductive;" their work does not leave behind it, to the credit of the nation, that something in the shape of *new produce* that will exchange for the same quantity of labour again; it is work that perishes in the very instant of its production. That this "unproductive" labour should be kept at the minimum is clear enough, when we remember that *all* of us, whether we labour at all, whether our labour be productive or otherwise, are *all* equally maintained by the land and produce of the country; and this produce, no matter how great, must have certain limits, and this limit will depend upon the smaller or greater proportion in a year employed in maintaining unproductive hands, as the greater the number of unproductive, the less produce will there be for the productive, or for society, as, if we except the spontaneous production of the earth, the year's result must depend upon the amount of productive labour. There is this difference between a nobleman and a rich merchant or manufacturer: the former feeds more idle than industrious people, more "unproductive" than "productive" labourers; the latter, whilst employing a large number of servants, out of his yearly income, spends the bulk of his money, his capital, in the employment of reproductive labourers. Fortunately for England, she has great capitals employed in trade and manufactures, and our annual produce is wanted to replace that capital, to enable us to maintain our staff of productive labourers. In a country where there are too many idle rich, there is sure to be too many idle poor, because the proportion of the fund devoted to productive or unproductive labour must necessarily determine the general character of her people as to industry or idleness. We are more industrious than our forefathers, because in the present times the funds destined for the maintenance of industry are much greater, in proportion to those which are likely to be employed in the maintenance of idleness, than they were two or three centuries ago. Our ancestors were idle for want of a

sufficient encouragement to industry. In mercantile and manufacturing towns, where the bulk of the people are chiefly maintained by the employment of capital, they are, in general, industrious, sober, and thriving, as in many English and in most Dutch towns. Advantageous situations for manufactures or as depôts for storing and distribution, always attract capital by the employment they afford for it; and when capital is attracted there is plenty of employment; it is the cause of industry. London is very advantageously situated, it being a city which trades not only for its own consumption, but for that of most other cities and countries in the world; besides having the advantage of being the capital of Great Britain, and therefore the city where its principal revenues are spent; it is therefore free from that idleness which corrupts a city or town maintained by revenue alone, this pernicious influence being counterbalanced by the industry of the larger number employed by capital in productive labour. The proportion between the capital and labour of a kingdom or city regulates the proportion between industry and idleness therein; for wherever capital (that is, money used for productive purposes) predominates industry prevails; wherever revenue (that is, wealth, or the interest therefrom) is spent in unproductive labour, idleness will prevail. What is needed to increase the demand for labour is more capital—that is, money requiring to be employed in an industry that will pay for the labour it is employed upon, and leave a profit to pay for the use of, and augment that capital, ready to employ more labour. By no other means can Great Britain hold her own. Every increase or diminution of capital, therefore, naturally tends to increase or diminish the real quantity of industry, the number of productive hands, and, consequently, the exchangeable value of the annual produce of the land and labour of the country—the real wealth and revenue of all its inhabitants. The nation cannot exist unless its people are economical; they must not only be industrious, but “saving.” It is truly said of the individual, “It is not by what he earns, but by what he saves out of what he earns, that he

becomes rich." The same argument applies to nations; it is useless the people being industrious if they waste the result of their earnings; their industry has only done them harm; they have contracted extravagant habits, desires that only "good times" can gratify. This was markedly the case with the operatives of Great Britain from 1870 to 1874, and proved what Professor Hearn says: "If an uneducated man becomes suddenly rich, we see, from the limited extent of his former wants and the undeveloped condition of his desires, he literally does not know what to do with his money, and rushes into the most extravagant and ludicrous of follies." The old proverb is quite true, that "a fool and his money are soon parted." It surprises me more every day I live that such a practical people as the English are considered to be, should neglect utterly, in their training of the young, subjects such as trade, money, capital, nature's laws for the wealth and health of her subjects. The law of supply and demand is, or might be made, easy enough for all to understand; it should be the subject of ordinary conversation in a "commercial country," where, instead of that perpetual cry, "How bad trade is!" "No money to be got," &c., the people should, by their previous education, be comparing the present with the past, and be talking over the best means to "increase the nation's capital," and the manner to employ the same to the best advantage of themselves and their fellow-men. You all want wealth; well, get it. There is only one way to get capital,—spend less than you earn; only one way to increase capital,—employ it in that productive labour which pays for the labour and leaves a profit that will add to it; and by these two processes—"thrift in the formation of capital," and thoughtful use of it in productive labour—individuals must get rich, and the nation prosper. And, spite of all that may be said to the contrary, no nation can be happy or contented unless its people are being employed in that thoughtful and judicious manner that their prosperity, being built upon "obedience to nature's laws," is not only certain, but brings peace of mind with it. Our present haphazard system,

or, rather, no system, with its feverish restlessness, from the "uncertainty" each man feels as to his position, high and low, in doubt if to the end of his days he will be able to "earn his daily bread," would be quite unbearable were it not for its "incessant work," that leaves the anxious mind little time to reflect upon the insecurity of its position in the world. To many men, Sunday, instead of being the "day of rest" after the week's hard toil, is a day full of gloom, the brain having leisure to review the difficulty of holding one's position. Men talk of the tortures of the Inquisition, the dread of the hangman. Pshaw! they are temporary troubles—a fiercer trial to bear, true; but soon over. Think of the merchant who has built up a goodly structure, has got into a certain social position, who lives before the world as a man of position; yet within this man's soul is the certain knowledge that his struggle is useless; his day is past; he is unable to stem or turn the tide; his expenses and losses keep up, but his trade or his profit gradually, but surely, is slipping away. Few but those who have undergone it can estimate the difficulty of meeting one's payments, whilst the trade is developing, or if a season be bad, or a sudden change in fashion leaves you with heavy liabilities to be met, and stocks unsold that need to be sold for you to meet your payments; yet this torture has to be borne, is borne, by many men, patiently,—aye, apparently as imperturbably as Earl Beaconsfield seemed to feel the taunts levelled at him by envious rivals. But, however apparently indifferent men may seem to vile abuse—and this man, with iron will, had his full share—they are felt. Public men must expect this, but tradesmen might be saved from this horrible torture of a seemingly inevitable failure before them if they were properly trained for the duties they have to undertake. Stamp on every youth's, aye, and man's brain, in letters that remain indelible, ever present to them, that capital can only be increased by parsimony; but be careful to warn them against meanness,—simply guard them against prodigality, reckless waste, and misconduct. Teach them the value of "economy," the duty of all to save; how to use wisely

and well the capital they do save ; to have faith in their fellows ; and lend their money at interest to others to use, if they cannot use it themselves ; or, if they lack the power of knowing whom to trust—and few possess this power—lend their money to bankers, who will lend it for the employment of labour. Let people see that it is essential for the State that capital be made and used. As the capital of an individual can be increased only by what he saves from his annual revenue or his annual gains, so the capital of the nation, which is the same with that of all the individuals who compose it, can be increased only in the same manner. It is, therefore, a public duty to be thrifty, to save so as to get capital, to use that capital in such a way that it will increase with the growth of society, as it is by saving, and not by industry, that the capital of a nation increases. Industry provides, but accumulation is due solely to economy and parsimony ; as, whatever industry might acquire, if economy did not save, and parsimony store it up, capital would never be greater. So, without parsimony, nations could not grow ; as it is only by increasing the fund for the maintenance of productive hands that we can increase the number of hands, by the product of whose labour value is added to the product upon which it is bestowed, and the nation progresses in wealth and civilization. The Malthusian idea is unnatural ; we may, therefore, expect it to be wrong, however plausible it may seem. Ireland suffers from stagnation, not from over-population. The sooner and the sharper the Irish are made to obey the laws, the sooner anarchy is overcome, and property and life are secure, the better. We must get rid of the incompetence, the insubordination, the evil habits. The Irish must be plainly told to trust to themselves, to be industrious and thrifty ; and if the land were properly cultivated, and the people contented, peaceful, and having a respect for law and the rights of others, there would be confidence. Capital would flow in, and the great water-power, the magnificent western natural Harbours of Ireland might in time become great manufactories, and great ports of American trade, giving employment to thousands

upon thousands, who now, in the best of times, have only a bare subsistence, in an unfertile soil, and with a watery climate. Instead of artificially reducing the population, we should study nature's law—how to maintain the greater number; and the first fact that strikes us, as we might expect from what we already know of nature, is, that as population depends upon capital, so that capital, if wisely and prudently used by us, will, in its use, be increased, and have added to it an increase that will employ and maintain the larger number of productive hands it has caused to be born. The multiplication of the people is a favourable sign; some think there are cases where it is not so; but my opinion is, that an increase of numbers is a proof of growth in general prosperity, that the one naturally follows the other. The most healthy sign is a general growth, not merely a great increase here and there; and growth in the smaller and less important towns implies a discovery and utilization of advantages more likely to be lasting than the increase in the large towns dependent upon the success of a single trade, or gross accumulation of capital.

Capital should be sacred, should be remunerated; and property will need the law less to protect it, interest and rent will be paid more willingly, when the people understand what obligations they are under to capitalists. The country would soon be ruined if we were all of that generous, reckless disposition people so love, so free to give, not restrained by the thought of "how hard it is to get." There is a large class, also, who live by their invested capital, but refusing themselves nothing, the revenue does not suffice, and they have to take, year by year, a little from the capital also, to make the two ends meet. Of such men it may be said that, "like those who pervert the revenue of some pious foundation to profane purposes, so do these men pay the wages of idleness with those funds which the frugality of their forefathers had, as it were, consecrated to the maintenance of industry." The men who live up to the income they earn by their labour are nearly as bad; the line is very close between doing this and living beyond it; or, as is too commonly the case, they

“anticipate” the wages of their labour, get into debt, which is “spending their wages before they have earned them.” Such men have not the right idea of duty within them; and if the prodigality of some were not compensated by the frugality of others, the conduct of every one who lives up to or beyond his income would soon tend not only to beggar himself, but to ruin his country. Contrast the action of the man who not only frugally saves, but thoughtfully invests or uses his money as capital, adding his share to the funds absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the people, for their employment in productive labour, and so by his help aiding the annual produce of the land and labour of the whole country—the real wealth and revenue of its inhabitants. “By what a frugal man annually saves, he not only affords maintenance to an additional number of productive hands for that or the ensuing year, but, like the founder of a public workshop, he establishes, as it were, a perpetual fund for the maintenance of an equal number in all times to come.” A man left with capital which has been earned by labour, and used in the employment of productive labour, ought to feel that it is incumbent upon him to guard the fund, keeping it for the maintenance of productive labour. But the spendthrift—the man who lives up to or beyond his income—is a traitor to his duty; he thinks of himself only; he does not add to, but *diminishes* the funds that are necessary for the employment of productive labour; and if all were to be as selfishly thoughtless, every year there would be a diminution in the funds to pay labour with, and consequently a lesser annual produce from the labour. - So that it seems quite clear that the spendthrift is not the boon he is generally supposed to be. He is often said to be “his own enemy,” but he is also a public enemy; and the frugal man, who is often ridiculed and sneered at for his parsimony, is really a public benefactor. This opinion is not general, because few people think, and in a great nation the profusion or imprudence of some is more than compensated by the frugality and good conduct of others; still, it is right we should give the merit where it is due.

Capital must be employed usefully, profitably, or it cannot pay interest. Every injudicious and unsuccessful project in agriculture, mines, trade, or manufactures, tends to diminish the funds necessary for the maintenance of productive labour. It is immaterial that in every such project the capital has been consumed by productive hands; if, by the injudicious manner in which the men have been employed, they do not reproduce the full value of this consumption, they produce the same result as prodigality; they have "diminished" the fund that maintains the productive increase of the country. This is an answer to those who argue that we owe all wealth to labour—those men who have given the working class so false an estimate of their worth in the annual produce of the nation. The mere labour is the least important of the three factors in the result; the essential elements for national progress, for national prosperity, are capital, and the "skilful use of labour in making the most of it." If a nation's wealth depends upon labour, if labour is the essential and principal element, the best way to make a nation wealthy is to increase labourers. Experience proves the contrary. Labour, like the raw material, is a necessary adjunct; but the mere labour, like the material, is useless, and of no value, unless acted upon by skill, and supported by capital. Capital, like trade and labour, should be free; the law is not wanted to interfere. Some countries have prohibited the charging of interest on money; in our own times men condemn those who charge interest as being usurers. But as something is made by the use of the money I lend, it seems to me fair and equitable that that something is due to the lender and not the borrower of money. In other countries there is what is termed a "legal rate;" but with fixing the rate of interest, as with fixing the price of goods and land, all such laws are virtually inoperative. Money, like goods, will fetch, and should fetch, what it is worth at the time it is lent; that value will vary according to the demand in relation to the supply there is to meet. If six persons want to borrow a hundred pounds each, and there is only five hundred to be lent, it will, must be worth more; at all events, it is certain to

tol more than if five people wanted to borrow a hundred pounds each, and there were six hundred ready to be lent. Nature relies upon this law, and she is right; it is the wisest law, the fairest law; for all parties, at all times, that it is possible to conceive. Another safeguard is the facts of experience to guide us in our decisions. Capitalists ought to know, it is part of their business to know, the market value of money; and experience teaches us that if parties are willing to pay much higher than what an article is worth, they must be in bad credit, or the venture they want the money for is one with more than the ordinary risk; and the capitalist, therefore, who is emptied, for the sake of extra pay, to run the risk, should blame his own folly if he loses his money. Considering the losses that are made in speculative investments, they pay no better, collectively, than sound investments; it is only a kind of gambling; you hope that in your particular case the lucky ticket will be drawn. But all prudent people will, and do, keep to the safe investments; and nature relies on this instinct for the greater part of the capital to get into the hands of those men who will employ it to the greatest advantage. No law, therefore, can reduce the rate of interest below the lowest ordinary market rate at the time the loan is contracted. And as the price of labour must be regulated by the price of food, it being self-evident that the labourer must receive a sum in money that will give him power to buy the wherewith to live, so the price of land, spite of all human laws, will rise or fall according to the rate of interest. A man has money; he hesitates whether to lend it, to invest it, or to buy land with it; and if the rent of land will not pay him so well, or yield him so high a rate of interest as Consols, &c., no one will buy land; and as one by one are compelled to sell, land falls to that price that will enable the buyer to get out of it the same value in rent that he could get by buying stock, &c. People have been much surprised that land and house property have lately sold so well. When interest was 10 per cent., land was commonly sold for ten and twelve years' purchase. As interest sunk to 6, 5, and 4 per cent.,

the price of land rose to twenty, twenty-five, and thirty-five years' purchase. I can remember that fifteen or twenty years ago, no one would buy leasehold property unless it paid $7\frac{1}{2}$ or 8 per cent. ; mortgages were 5 or 6 per cent. ; freehold, 4 or 5 per cent. ; but good leasehold property is bought now, if it pays 5 or 6 per cent. I heard of a case where an offer was made to buy, to pay only 4 per cent., and no chance of increased rental for thirty years. Mortgages have been made, to my knowledge, on leasehold property in 1880 at 4 per cent. ; and why not ? If good property, with leases of not less than fifty years, and only two-thirds of the value advanced, you may as well lend on mortgage for seven years, that pays you 4 per cent. for your money, as put it into Consols that do not pay 3 per cent. People think a sovereign is always worth twenty shillings, forgetting that its value varies in the price of the article ; that when we say goods are dear, we really mean that " money " is cheap—that is, it wants *more money* to get the same article. So with interest for the use of money ; it varies according to the demand for it. Money in 1881 was abnormally cheap. Consols, May 7, 1881, reached the highest price during the century. The money price was $102\frac{3}{4}$, and, deducting the interest accrued for four months and seven days, which would be about $1\frac{1}{8}$, the price ex-dividend may be taken as $101\frac{1}{8}$. This is over the highest price touched in June, 1852, when Consols rose to 101 ex-dividend. There can be no safer index than the high price of Consols as to the supply of capital wanting employment ; it is a bad sign ; it indicates a want of faith in their fellow-men, or a want of enterprise in developing the national resources ; it indicates that capital is being used for the purposes of revenue, instead of being employed in " reproduction," and in employing productive labour. When trade is bad, capital is not being used as it should be ; labour is not being employed in production ; the merchant and trading class have less to distribute. Every class suffers when skill and capital are not busy together giving employment to labour.

FREE LABOUR.

" Sons of labour, keep ye moving
 Onward in the march of mind,
 Every step your paths improving,
 Leaving olden tracks behind ;
 Every soul-enslaving fetter
 Burst, and break, and cast away,
 That the world may be the better
 For your needs some other day.
 Be no longer led like cattle,
 Custom-bound to feudal laws ;
 Glorious is the mental battle
 Waged in freedom's sacred cause ;
 Cast the glamour from your senses,
 Dare to look for purer light ;
 Credal fears are priestly fences
 Barring up the road to right."

J. M. PEACOCK.

We have got rid of corporations with their exclusive privileges, which necessarily restrained the competition in the towns where it was established to those who were free of the trade. In the olden times every one had to serve an apprenticeship under a master duly qualified before he could obtain this freedom. The bye-laws of some of these incorporated trades regulated the number of apprentices which any master was to have, and the number of years each apprentice was obliged to serve—both clauses intended to restrain the competition to a smaller number than might otherwise be disposed to enter the trade. Limiting the number of apprentices each master could take, restrained it directly ; increasing the expense of the education by a long apprenticeship, restrained it indirectly. By the 5th of Elizabeth, commonly called the " Statute of Apprenticeship," it was enacted that no person should for the future exercise any trade, craft, or mystery at that time exercised in England unless he

had previously served to it an apprenticeship of seven years at least; and then what had before been but the bye-law of certain trade corporations became in England the general and public law of all trades carried on in market towns. This statute was repealed in 1814; but the impolicy of all human legislation in this direction was painfully manifest whilst the statute was in operation. Being limited to market towns, country villages were excluded. A person therein might exercise several different trades, though he had not served a seven-year apprenticeship to each, for the convenience of the inhabitants, as the number of people was not sufficient to supply each trade with a particular set of hands. But the operations of the Act being limited to those trades established before the passing of the Act, caused the greatest inconvenience; as it was held, for example, that a coachmaker could neither himself make, nor employ journeymen to make, his coach-wheels, but must buy them of a master wheelwright; this latter trade having been exercised in England before the 5th of Elizabeth, and therefore "protected" by the statute—that is, limited to those who had served their apprenticeship thereto. But here comes the greatest injustice (and it is so with all "exceptional" legislation, when man tries by his "finite" knowledge to remedy by his expedients the action of the eternal laws of the "Infinite"); a wheelwright, though he had not served an apprenticeship to a coachmaker, might either himself make or employ journeymen to make coaches, the trade of a coachmaker not being within, or protected by, the statute, because it was not exercised in England at the time when the statute was made. The canny Scotch knew better; there was no general law as to the duration of apprenticeship; the terms varied, and when long in any corporation part could be redeemed by payment of a fine; and in most towns a small fine was sufficient to purchase the freedom of any corporation. The weavers of linen and hempen cloth, the principal manufactures of the country in years gone by, as well as all other artificers subservient to them, might exercise their trades in any town corporate *without paying any fine*; in fact, there was no

country in Europe in which corporation laws were so little oppressive as in Scotland. Apprenticeship was altogether unknown to the ancients. The Roman law is perfectly silent with regard to them. There is no Greek or Latin word which expresses the idea we annex to the word "apprentice"—viz., a servant bound to work at a particular trade for the benefit of a master, during a term of years, upon condition that the master shall teach him that trade.

"Compulsory labour is not worth much."

From very early times the contract of apprenticeship was hedged round and defined by restrictions designed to insure fairness of dealing on each side, and more especially to favour the party who entered upon it as a minor. There was this peculiarity about apprenticeship: it was the only valid agreement by which an "infant" under twenty-one years of age could bind himself effectually for a long period of time; as, although some of the relations were parties to the deed, and could be sued for damages if the youngster repudiated the agreement, yet this was not essential, as many "apprentices" were and are bound solely by virtue of their own act and deed. The legal writers have always been careful in distinguishing the relation of master and apprentice, as against that between master and servant. With the apprentice, the important stipulation in the deed is, that the youth or girl shall be *taught*; with the servant, that he or she should work, learn, and obey. Unless the agreement specifies that the "trade," "craft," or "mystery" is to be taught, it is a mere agreement for "hiring" and service. The master of the apprentice legally took the rights of a parent, and had the prerogative of administering "reasonable and wholesome corporal punishment," such as a father or schoolmaster may inflict. On the other hand, he was bound to provide medical attendance, food, and physic for his charge, and to help him even if he was incapacitated from work by illness. You may take a horse to the water, but you cannot make him drink; the apprentice was not bound to learn, though expected to do

so. But he was bound to work, and to conduct himself properly; so that idleness, sauciness, disobedience were punishable offences, and gross misconduct legally justified the master in dismissing his apprentice. The system was open to many abuses on both sides; and in France, so soon as the Radicals came into power, loud protests were made against the tyranny of the masters, and the position of the apprentice was denounced as a state of "temporary servitude." In England, the treatment received by chimney-sweeps' apprentices, who were always small in stature, so as to be able to climb up the chimneys which were to be swept, came before Parliament in 1840, and was compared by Sir R. Inglis to negro slavery; and another speaker declared that it had "led to more misery and more degradation than prevailed in any other Christian country." At about the same time, Dickens attacked the mischiefs of parochial apprenticeship; and what with the storm of indignation thus aroused, and the conviction that apprenticeships in general were a clumsy and inconvenient species of contract, they rapidly declined in favour, having ceased some years before to be obligatory, except by local custom.

The "working class" has had plenty of advice at all times, but the present state of British commerce should fully convince them that it was no "unfriendly voice" that warned them as to the inevitable consequences of a deterioration in the quality of our manufactures, due to two causes—the low *morale* of the manufacturer, and the want of technical knowledge lowering the average calibre of our skilled artisans. In the olden times the employer was a "master" of his trade; into his house he would take youths to learn his craft, the master himself working and teaching, feeding and clothing them during a seven years' engagement, and receiving from them in return the value of the services which, as they became more apt in their work, they were able to render. There can be no doubt of the advantages of this thorough training by the continuous care and example of the master. The ancient trade guilds grew and acquired their legal status upon this usage as their very foundation, and a seven years' apprentice

ship formed the one necessary qualification for the possession of the right to exercise the following of any occupation or employment, art or craft, recognized amongst the handicrafts of the time. With the extension of trade and the wider use of machinery, the number and power of the adult employed workmen increased, and with their increase of power came a jealousy, on the one hand, towards the masters; on the other, towards the apprentices, who were regarded as cheapening labour when employed in too great numbers. The conflict which arose between employer and employed gradually merged into one between capital and labour. By dint of strikes, the workmen at last prevailed, and in attempting to bring about a limitation in the amount of apprenticeship labour, brought about a result of quite another kind, and one far more disastrous than the evil sought to be remedied—the destruction of all the best and most important features of apprenticeship. Mr. George Howell has well delineated the outlines of the change as follows: “But a change was coming o’er the spirit of the dream: another day was dawning fraught with still greater issues to the journeyman, for, instead of the old system of master and craftsman, there grew up quite another kind of mastership and of hiring. The master had already begun to be less the craftsman and more of the employer. Capital was fast becoming the great motive power. Streams were first utilized, then steam; complicated machinery was being substituted for hand labour in many of the growing industries of the time; the master no longer worked at the trade himself, he directed and found the capital. The number of persons employed was also greatly augmented; instead of the old fealty between master and men, there came estrangement more and more, until sometimes the work-people scarcely ever saw their veritable employer. Under these circumstances, the conditions of apprenticeship were completely changed, not suddenly, but gradually, until the apprentice became merely the boy worker, with less wages but more solemn engagements than a journeyman. The master to whom he was bound no longer taught him his trade; he was, so to speak, pitchforked

into the workshop to pick up his trade as best he could, or to learn it from the many journeymen who were there employed. It was no one's duty to teach him; there was no pay and no responsibility."

I have been an employer for over thirty years, and never had but one apprentice—the first as he was the last—experience having told me that it was unjust both ways; as, to take his labour without remuneration, or to teach what it depended upon his own diligence to acquire, was unjust to him, whilst, having bartered my freedom to discharge him if he did not work so well or do as much as if he had been a paid employé, was unjust to me. From that time I have taken all without premium, giving board and lodging for the first three years, but, as a matter of fact, have invariably paid a salary at the end of the second year; but no engagement either side. If their conduct or work was not satisfactory, they knew they would have to go; if they disliked the trade or me, they on their part could leave at any time. All our employés are engaged the same way. No notice is given or expected, and the freedom of employer and employed is, in my opinion, the best for all parties. In the majority of trades a *long* apprenticeship is unnecessary; to invent requires time, but an apprentice is only taught how to copy; he only needs that practice, in fact, which will give the necessary dexterity of hand and quickness of perception. At the beginning of a youth's career, the essential requisite is "diligence," and there can be no doubt that the majority will work with more attention and diligence if paid from the beginning in proportion to the work they perform; or, in those branches where loss might occur from spoiling of material, they will have to suffer for it. All that is necessary is that the youth starts, knowing he will be paid wages as soon as he can do the work for his employer that is worth being paid for. By this method the training is not only less tedious and expensive, but generally more effectual. Economically, it is the policy for the nation. The work of *all* engaged in production and distribution being left free and open to all, all articles reach the consumer

at the lowest price; the public generally are the gainers. "Corporations" and their laws had but one object—putting an "artificial" restraint upon the natural supply of labour, and by thus restricting "competition," nature's remedy for keeping prices to their minimum, the members kept up an artificial price, alike of wages and profit. Any law or system that restrains or prevents competition, and thereby stops a reduction in price, by keeping up abnormally the price of labour and profit, is really a collusion to defraud the consumer. Yet, strange to say, so little was economic science understood, that in order to erect a corporation, no other authority in ancient times was requisite in many parts of Europe but that of the town corporate in which it was established. In England, indeed, a charter from the King was likewise necessary; but this prerogative of the Crown seems to have been used rather for extorting money from the subject than for the defence of the consumer and the liberty of the subject against such oppressive monopolies. "The property which every man has in his own labour, as it is the original foundation of all other property, so is it the most sacred and inviolable. The patrimony of a poor man lies in the strength and dexterity of his hands, and to hinder him from employing this strength and dexterity in what manner he thinks proper, without injury to his neighbour, is a plain violation of this most sacred property. It is a manifest encroachment upon the just liberty both of the workman and of those who might be disposed to employ him. As it hinders the one from working at what he thinks proper, so it hinders the other from employing whom he thinks proper. To judge whether he is fit to be employed, may surely be trusted to the discretion of the employers. The affected anxiety of the law-giver lest they should employ an improper person, is evidently as impertinent as it is oppressive" (Smith's "Wealth of Nations"). Fortunately, the efforts of statesmen to reduce or raise the price of labour are always ineffectual, because it has never been able to hinder any body of men from accepting less than the legal allowance, on account of the indigence of their situation and the number of

their competitors; or from receiving more, by reason of the contrary competition of those who expected to derive either profit or pleasure from employing them. It is a pity, from an economical point of view, that mankind should waste their time in opposing, instead of studying and strictly observing, nature's law of supply and demand for the regulation of the price of money, labour, and, in fact, *all* commodities that are lent or sold.

A man must always live by his work, and his wages must, at the least, be sufficient to maintain him. It is utterly impossible to reduce for any considerable time the wages of the lowest kind of labour below the rate that gives to the labourer the means of subsistence. But, practically, the wages of a man's labour yield more; otherwise it would be impossible for him to bring up a family, and the race of such workmen could not last beyond the first generation; or, the supply of a certain kind of labour being in excess of the demand, and therefore reducing the price, and that price not being sufficient to subsist upon, a certain number would have to go into a different occupation, or emigrate; yet, when the supply became proportionate to the demand for it, the price must rise to the scale that will keep the labourer and his family. Supply and demand must regulate the price of labour, as of any other commodity; it is useless for the employer or employed to combine to fix an artificial price. When the demand for any species of labour is continually increasing, the scarcity of men occasions a competition among the masters; they bid against each other, or, rather, give the higher price asked, because they want the labourers. But if the demand for any kind of labour is decreasing, let the men combine as they may, a certain proportion of them, with hunger staring them in the face, will offer their services at a lower rate, and the master will engage only such as offer to, or will take what, in the depressed condition of their trade, they can afford to pay. Another important point, one too generally overlooked by the men, is the fact that the demand for those who live by wages can only increase in proportion to the funds which are destined for the payment of wages. A man having a greater revenue than will maintain his own family

employs the whole or part of the surplus in maintaining a staff of servants; increase the surplus, he will employ more, or spend more in luxuries; decrease that revenue, he does without the luxuries, and diminishes his staff of servants. The same argument applies to merchants and manufacturers, all employers of industry. Trade is good; new mills and shops are built, the stock is enlarged, more employes are kept by merchants and manufacturers. Trade is bad; the mills work half time, or too often are shut up; shops are closed, or at least not opened, and employes are discharged, or, if they leave, their places are not filled up. So you will perceive how unwise is the antagonism between employer and employed. Both benefit and suffer by the same causes, each is essential to the other; it is to their mutual interest to cheerfully and willingly co-operate and work together; and there is nothing more suicidal than the refusal by the men to make hay while the sun is shining. When there is full work, they should strive to the utmost to keep the supply of material equal to the demand, by more earnest and continuous labour, putting by the "extra wages" to be earned, ready for the reaction that is inevitable. The demand for those who live by wages, by their labour, naturally increases with the increase of national wealth; as, in every department of labour, the employer, as a rule, as soon as his capital allows him, employs other men, so as to obtain a profit by the use of their work as well as his own. The labour fund, therefore, depends upon the increase of capital of the country; and cannot possibly increase without it. It is not the actual amount of the national wealth, but its continual increase, the steady, regular development of the trade of a country, that causes the steady increased demand for labour, and keeps up and occasions a rise in the wages of labour. The last few years it has been a puzzle to many that trade should be depressed, and labour only partly employed; yet our wealth is greater than ever, and money to be had for a nominal rate of interest, and Consols above par in 1881. But it is not the richest countries, but the most *thriving*, those which are growing rich the fastest, where trade is most remunerative,

and the wages of labour the highest. England may be the richest, but America is the most thriving nation in the world at the present time. The most infallible indication of the prosperity of a country is the increase of the number of its inhabitants; it is a decided proof that labour is well rewarded, and that the children, however numerous in each family, can be maintained in such a way as to keep them all alive. The country being prosperous, the people marry young; they are not deterred, in a new country like America, as here in England, by the fear of not being able to keep a wife and children. Here there is an excess of hands in every department of labour; there, spite of the rapid increase of population, the labour fund for the maintenance of labour increases faster than it can find labourers to employ; so the wages of labour keep high, the supply keeps scarcely equal to the demand, and the masters are obliged to bid against each other to get the men. China is the very opposite to America; it is one of the most fertile, best cultivated, most industrious, and most populous countries in the world. But it has long since acquired that full complement of riches which the nature of its laws and institutions permits it to acquire; so the wages fund does not increase, the wages of labour are very low, and it is with the greatest difficulty that a labourer can bring up a family in China. There is no need for any artificial system by man; nature never does her work by halves; all is wisely arranged. Men are wanted; by the natural law, they are better paid; they are tempted, by the confidence of work and plenty, to marry young; the population increases as fast as it can; the labour market is supplied. On the other hand, labourers are in excess; they are badly paid; they find a difficulty in keeping themselves; the future is uncertain; they feel compelled to emigrate, where there is more demand for their labour; or, if they stop at home, they abstain from marrying, or marry later, and the population, in this natural manner, is restrained within prudential limits.

It may be accepted as an axiom that in England, as elsewhere, no matter how wealthy she may be, if that wealth remain

stationary, the wages of labour cannot be high. The funds destined for the payment of wages may be of the greatest extent, but if they continue stationary, if people cease to "accumulate," if the labour fund does not increase, the "labour hands" must increase and multiply in every department beyond the demand; and even if, by combination, they were able to keep up a nominal price, that price must be reduced to the market price by the numbers left unemployed, and by the numbers receiving only partial employment. You may pull this theory to pieces as you will; you may combine, you may pass laws,—do, in fact, what you like,—but you cannot overcome "nature's economic law," that, to increase the wages of the labourer, you must increase the fund that employs labour; that, to keep up the price of labour, you must constantly, incessantly keep on adding by "thrift" and economy to the capital of the country. You must cease, therefore, to pass laws that seem aimed at the "goose that lays the golden eggs." You cannot get on without capital; therefore, render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's. If you want your people to save, your laws must be such that men will be induced to save, feeling that their property is their own, and should bring to them all that it would bring to them in an open market. You are committing national suicide in deterring people from saving by undervaluing capital, through giving it a remuneration that is too low to induce men to save on the one hand, and by laws that take away property from one class under some sentimental idea that it is better that the other class should have it. You cannot break God's laws with impunity. The only way to benefit your class is to see that your laws are, like nature's, "impartial," for the benefit of all. Labour is essential, true; equally essential to labour are the thrifty habits of the people, so as to obtain the "capital" that is to employ, pay, and maintain the labourer.

To estimate at their right value "economy and thrift," we must consider the position of a country where capital is ceasing to be accumulated, where the funds necessary for the maintenance of labour are sensibly declining. Every year this "circu-

lating capital" wanting occupation becoming less, the demand for servants and labourers would, in all the different classes of employment, be less than it had been the year before. Many who had been bred in the superior classes, not being able to find employment in their own business or station, would be compelled by the necessity of living to seek it in a lower; so that the pressure in bad times becomes greater and greater as we descend, the lowest class being not only overstocked with its own workmen, but with the overflowings of all the other classes. The competition in such a state of things becomes most lamentable; the struggle to get what there is, the pressing of hunger, making the competition for employment so keen that the wages of labour are reduced to the most miserable and scanty subsistence that can keep the labourer alive. Many, of course, are shut out from even this hard pittance, and must steal, beg, or starve. Want, famine, and the disease and mortality therefrom, would prevail in the lowest class to a frightful extent, and gradually ascend from the lowest to the highest class of society, until the number of inhabitants in the country was reduced to that number which the capital of the country was able to maintain. I have drawn this picture, that the working class may consider more at its right value the help "capital" is to them, and, also, to induce men to save more, not only for the pleasure of being independent themselves, but for the benefit of such "thrift" to their fellow-beings. My advice is, to be neither prodigal nor mean—of the two, the former is preferable—but to be prudent, industrious, thrifty men, practising "economy" as a duty, shunning waste as a crime to yourself, your fellow-men, and your God,—earnest, honest, thoughtful men, able to say with Whittier—

"I am sick at heart of craft and cant,
Sick of the crazed enthusiast's rant,
Profession's smooth hypocrisies,
And creeds of iron, and lives of ease."

We must also remember that the real recompense of labour is not the money price, but the proportionate quantity of the necessaries and comforts of life which the money received

at different periods of time has been able to secure to the labourers as a body. And, owing to the freedom of trade, the removal of excise and customs' duties, not only has bread become so much cheaper, but many other articles, by which means the industrious poor can command a greater variety of agreeable and more healthy food. Meat used to be a luxury; potatoes and green stuff, at the same time, were rarely seen upon the tables of the middle class. But now meat and all kinds of garden stuff are obtainable, also fruits, &c.; causing the remark, when trade is good, that "luxury" extends itself even to the lowest ranks of the people. Food, clothing, lodging, have all improved for all classes, because not only has the money price of labour increased, but its real recompense—"more to be had for the money"—has taken place, and thereby benefited *all* classes of society. And it is right that "labour" should be paid for fairly. No society can be said to be flourishing, happy, or safe, whilst the far greater number of its members are poor and miserable. It is but equity that the "worker" should have his fair share of the produce of his labour—such a share as will enable him to be sufficiently well fed, clothed, and lodged; that he willingly and cheerfully contributes all he can to the common fund. We want all classes of the people to understand that what improves the position and condition of the "greater" part of a community is a benefit, and not an inconvenience, to the whole. It is admitted that "free labour" is "cheaper"—that is to say, gives more in return for the outlay—than slave labour; inferentially, then, we are justified in assuming that, by raising the character of the labourer, by making him feel contented with his remuneration, we shall derive more from his labour than if he goes to his work discontented, sullen, and disposed to do what he must do to keep his situation, but no more.

The wages of labour are the encouragement of industry, which, like every other human quality, will improve in quantity or quality, or both, in proportion to the encouragement which it receives. Plenty of good, wholesome food increases the strength of the labourer; and if there be a hope, however slight,

of bettering his position, or, by thrift, of putting aside enough to end his days in ease, when no longer able to work, you are giving the stimulus, the incentive, to make your workmen exert their strength to the utmost. All large employers of labour will tell you that when wages are high, the workmen are more active, diligent, and expeditious than when they are low. I am well aware, as an employer, that to some wages are immaterial,—they will do so much work, and no more; but there are others to whom encouragement and appreciation are a wonderful incentive. And it must be remembered that the benefit is not confined to the extra work they themselves do; the influence of “their example” is manifest in a greater amount of work, more or less, from all. Workmen, when paid by the piece liberally, are very apt to overwork themselves, and to ruin their health and constitution in a few years. This applies even to soldiers, who, as a body, are the least industrious of men; for it has been found by experience that if set to work, and liberally paid by results, their officers have had to interfere, as mutual emulation and the desire of greater gain prompted them to overwork themselves, and to injure their health by too excessive labour. For the good of the individual and the nation, we want steady, regular application; men worked so moderately that they can be relied upon to work constantly and regularly. Such steady, plodding labourers preserve their health best, live longer, and execute the greatest quantity of work. We want a system that leads all forward with the hope of acquiring something they have not got. The healthy, progressive state is whilst the nation is advancing to the further acquisition of wealth, rather than when it has acquired its full complement of riches. The condition of the masses—that is, of the great body of the people—is the happiest and most comfortable as the nation steadily progresses. It is hard for the people in the stationary, it is miserable in the declining, state. The stationary is dull, the declining melancholy. The progressive is, in reality, the natural state, and therefore the most comfortable, cheerful, and happiest to all the different orders of society.

Free trade helps free labour. Among the many advantages conferred on mankind by free foreign trade—that is, by the unrestricted interchange of commodities between man and man throughout the globe—one of the most signal is that, in the highest degree and to its widest extent, it promotes division of labour, by which the productive forces of the human race are employed in such a way as to lead to the most efficient and remunerative results. By means of this division of labour, each province produces more abundantly, more cheaply, and in greater perfection, the special articles to which it devotes itself, and all work harmoniously together for the common good. By this system the capital and labour of a country are concentrated on certain employments for which they are most competent; but without division of labour, the capital and labour would be directed to a variety of employments for which they would be the least competent. You require employment for labour; leave labour free, so that each country may settle down to its own special form of industry; and through this division of labour, each would produce cheaply and abundantly those special articles to which it had directed its attention, and each would contribute, to the full extent of its productive power, to the wealth of the world. With trade free, full scope will be given for labour to be fully occupied, with a view to exchanging the surplus of their special commodities for such articles as other nations were more specially fitted to produce; the amount of international traffic would be enormous, and foreign trade would be developed to an extent at present undreamt of. The protective system interferes detrimentally with the division of labour. If the "principle of protection" be correct, why not carry it out to its full extent, by not only isolating, as it now does, nation from nation, but province from province, country from country? Nature, fortunately, interposes a limit, by the diversity of the products of the earth; and nations are compelled to import from other countries, or go without certain commodities. Protection may abridge, but cannot annihilate, foreign trade. You may shut political economy out at the door, if you please, but it will come back by the window.

As for carrying on the affairs of the nation successfully in defiance of it, you might as well expect an engineering work to succeed that was carried out in defiance of the laws of gravitation. By the natural laws, no nation can, without an intolerable degree of privation and suffering, be completely self-dependent; and man is, in order to interchange the special products of one zone with those of another, compelled, apparently against his will, to exercise, at all events to a certain extent, the humanizing influence of international commerce.

No doubt it is very hard to those engaged in certain branches of manufactures when the protection by which alone they have been able to stand, the prop that has supported them, is removed; but though we may pity the innocent victims of an evil system based upon a false policy, our sympathy must not blind us to the fact that the community has for a long period been suffering from the existence of the abuse. We must think of the many, and not let the thought of "the few" stop our hand from destroying the evil; and the longer it has lasted the more just and necessary it is to put a speedy end to it; and as the change is for the national good, the conferring a permanent benefit on the community must overrule our regret at abolishing privileges by which a few gained, but all the rest suffered. All improvements in machinery cause changes that are injurious to some class or other. Railways occasioned a vast displacement of the capital and labour employed in the previously existing modes of conveyance. But although we must sympathize with the sufferers, no one thinks of asking in 1882 that "improvements be prohibited" in order to "protect" the interests which such improvements interfere with. Such transitions are trying—ruinous to some—but the disturbance is limited and temporary, as with all new movements, whether from scientific or political causes, the displaced capital and labour rapidly get redistributed into other channels, while the improvement is universal, permanent, and expansive.

EMPLOYÉS.

"They gave me advice and counsel in store,
 Praised me and honoured me more and more;
 Said that I only should 'wait awhile,'
 Offered their patronage, too, with a smile.
 But, with all their honour and approbation,
 I should, long ago, have died of starvation,
 Had there not been an excellent man,
 Who bravely to help me at once began.
 Good fellow! He got me the food I ate,
 His kindness and care I shall never forget;
 I cannot embrace him, though other folks can,
 For I, myself, am this excellent man "

HEINE.

THE relation of employer and employed is an important question. As a rule, unfortunately, the employer thinks no more of his people than he does of the wheels and cogs of his machinery; and the employed is too apt to regard his employer as a hard and selfish tyrant, whom it is a pleasure to inconvenience and see in trouble whilst one never thinks he is good food for them to plunder. How is this antagonism to cease? When will the truth be apparent to both, that their interest is mutual, and that, instead of being foes, they ought to be friends and allies? The labourer has health, strength, and skill, but they are useless without the capital. The capitalist has money to spend in wages, who is, in fact, the buyer of labour, the root of the productive tree, and the worker the leaves and branches, that depend for their sustenance on the root. Therefore, why quarrel with the root, as without the root the leaves must wither for lack of life, and the branches cannot be able to expand? Yet you may pay your men good wages liberally, but they hate you, because of the idea in their minds that the "capitalist" gets more than his equitable share. Do not forget that the employer has to battle with his class for life as sternly as the labourer

has with his, and they too often overlook this—that beyond his pay for supervision, there is interest of capital to be earned and paid to some one, a reserve fund for deterioration by wear and tear of plant and machinery, the anxiety in every trade from its uncertainty and fluctuation in the value of the articles sold. Instead of thinking of the drawbacks of the employer, they only look at his position from the bright side, and their brows contract, and they look gloomy and discontented, because of the false impression in their minds that “labour is all in all;” ignoring the fact that if “somebody” did not save last year’s seed, there could be no crops this year, and that the seed so saved by the prudence of the few must be bought and paid for by the many who did not save and yet must have it, as they cannot exist without it. The only remedy, and it is in the hands of “every labourer,” is to be thrifty, and to “save,” to be independent of the capitalist, or to share with him the profits of capital. As to the “State” being lender or saver, or stepping in and reducing the price by law to A of the property he has borrowed of B, it is as absurd as it is inequitable. The State can only superintend by paid agents, and no system ever has had, or ever can have, the penetrating watchfulness of the individual, the “private capitalist.”

The most dangerous advisers of our times are those men who use some of Christ’s sayings to justify their argument that there should be no property except in the “community.” Their object is to reduce all men and all women to the rank of bees. They are not only the enemies of their own class, but of every man who dares to have a will of his own, and energy and ability superior to the mass of his fellows, as they aim at a compulsory equality. Yet God has, in His wise providence, made men unequal. The true lover of his fellows desires to raise up the lowest to the level of the highest; the Radical, or Communist, would level down the able and the wise to the low standard of the incapable and foolish, as they take away, with this idea of “equality,” and refusing to pay for the use of property and capital, the principal incentives to progress. Many employers are anxious to deal

fairly with their employés, but differ as to how this is to be best accomplished. I have always been an advocate for piece-work; an interest in the profits, or payment by results, seems to me the most equitable method; but others argue, and very forcibly, that the "most liberal wages" you can give is the simpler and better system. The reply is obvious, that the wages, liberal or illiberal, are taken after a time as a matter of course; and in its present stage of development it does not seem that human nature (there are exceptions) will take an interest in an employer's affairs unless "he has also some interest therein." We have, therefore, in operation a variety of methods,—“the least you can pay,” “fair pay,” “liberal pay,” but in all a “fixed pay;” and having paid what has been agreed, the employer thinks his part is done. Then we have those who pay so much extra per piece or job if the work be more quickly or better done than by the majority, and others who have clubs for the sick and the survivors of those who die in their employ. But I want you to devote your thoughtful attention to the principle of participation by workmen in the profits of employers, which was first tentatively put into operation by the Parisian house-decorator, Leclaire, in 1842, and has since that time made signal progress, for in 1879 there were upwards of forty-six industrial establishments, in France, Alsace, and Switzerland, working upon this principle. In England, amongst other firms, Messrs. Fox Brothers and Co., of Wellington, have had in operation for some years a plan that gives their employés the benefits of the “capitalist” as well as liberal wages for their labour. This firm gives a rate of interest varying from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to 10 per cent. on money invested in their business by their employés, according to the result of the year's trading. This firm also takes a great interest in their work-people's general welfare; and the result is a benefit to both employer and employé, by greater economy and more and better work than by the general system. It must be so in all establishments where men have the power to do a little more or little less work daily, and also to do their work a little better

or a little worse, to be wasteful or thrifty in carrying out details. Practically, the workmen are made partners in the business; they have an interest in the result; the workmen, inspired by hope, giving thorough, honest work; the "old hands" not cast off, like worn-out old tools, but, their days of labour ended, passing the closing years of their lives in peace and independence. The principle of participation, with Leclaire, meant a great deal more than "sharing the profits;" it meant "sharing responsibility." He would have his work well done; and his system meant the moral and social uplifting of the wage-earning class, for he brought the principle into operation in such a form as to make it constitute an education for those brought under its influence.

Edme Jean Leclaire was born on the 14th of May, 1801. The son of a poor village shoemaker, he was removed from school at ten years old, with the scantiest knowledge even of reading and writing, and put to work first in the fields, and next as a mason's apprentice. At seventeen, having arrived, penniless and unfriended, at Paris, he apprenticed himself to a house-painter. After three years passed amidst much privation under a hard master, Leclaire became a journeyman, and after seven more, when only twenty-six years of age, took the bold step of setting up in business on his own account. Extraordinary capacity, energy, and daring enabled him to force his way with signal success and celerity. Within three years' time he had attracted the notice of architects by the excellence of the work done under his direction, and was already employed on considerable undertakings. In 1834 he was called on to execute works at the Bank of France, and on the building of several railway companies; in fact, by this time his success as an employer of labour was definitively assured.

Even had Leclaire done nothing more than this, he would have deserved a high place among the heroes of "self-help," who, though destitute of all extraneous aid, have, by innate force and indomitable perseverance, fought their way from penury to posts of industrial command. But, to his great credit,

Leclaire no sooner saw his own position was assured than, with rare width and generosity of view, he threw himself into plans and efforts for raising the condition of his own workmen, and, ultimately, of the wage-earning class in general. Another set of his has permanently benefited a whole group of workmen—the substitution, in the painting trade, of white of zinc for white of lead. Leclaire having convinced himself that as long as an active poison formed an ingredient in the paints employed, the ravages which it inflicted on the workmen of his house could only be palliated, never effectually counteracted, resolved to make search for some innocuous substitute for white of lead. Though totally ignorant of chemistry, he succeeded, with the help of experts whom he called to his aid, in discovering how to utilize white of zinc for this purpose—viz., how to procure it sufficiently cheap, and make it dry with sufficient rapidity. Armed with these results, he entirely suppressed the use of white of lead in his establishment, and thereby, as far as his own workmen were concerned, put a stop for the future to “painter’s colic,” and all its train of attendant and consequent miseries. It is such men as these who deserve to be remembered and honoured by their fellows; men who, seeing a misery in existence in their immediate midst, do not believe in its being sent as a punishment for man’s sins, which he must meekly and resignedly bear, but who, believing the misery to be unnecessary, and caused by ignorance, attack and crush it as they would a wild beast attacking them. Yet so strong is prejudice, so vicious is that fatal teaching, that men must not inquire into things, that white of lead is used here as heretofore, spite of the example set by Leclaire for the benefit of his men’s health, for saving them from an early grave, saving the nation from having to keep, probably, their widows and children—spite of the facts of experience, which prove that not only is white of zinc perfectly innocuous to the health of the painter, but that work executed with it is both fresher and more durable than that done with the old deleterious ingredient. “Oh, thou of little faith,” is truly applicable to the age we live in. “We do not want faith in

any miraculous interposition through fast days, special prayers, &c. ; we want a "real faith" in God's wisdom and goodness, so that mankind, seeing anything wrong, will resolve to put it right, from a sincere conviction that they must be doing wrong if misery arises from any action of theirs.

"In 1842 Leclair prepared the ground for his first experiment by a very remarkable proceeding. Frauds were at that time numerous in the painting trade, and Leclair foresaw that his scheme of participation would be set down as an attempt to enlist the cupidity of workmen by the prospect of illicit gain. Accordingly, he proceeded to publish several pamphlets, exposing in the most unreserved manner the secrets of dozens of ways in which high pay could be got for bad work even on orders secured by enormous reductions in price. By these publications Leclair, to use his own words, 'compelled people to be honest,' and made it next to impossible for his workmen to swerve from the rule which he constantly impressed upon them, that the most complete honesty should characterize all their relations with the customers of the house.

"On the 15th of February, 1842, Leclair announced his intention of dividing among a certain number of his *ouvriers* and *employés* a part of the profits produced by the work done. The police, who in this saw nothing but a deeply laid scheme for enticing workmen away from other masters, did their best to thwart Leclair's presumed designs by prohibiting a meeting of his workmen, which he had asked permission to hold for the purpose of explaining the advantages attaching to his plan of participation. The meeting was, of course, abandoned, but Leclair gave notice that the division of profits for the year 1841 would take place in accordance with his previous announcement. A section of his workmen had from the first distrusted his offers, and they were supported in that attitude by a newspaper, *L'Atelier*, which accused him of manoeuvring in this fashion in order to reduce wages. When, however, Leclair, after collecting his participants, forty-four in number, threw upon the table a bag of gold containing 11,888 francs (£475), and then

and there distributed to each his share, averaging over £10 per man, it was found impossible to withstand the 'object-lesson' thus given. All hesitation vanished, and was replaced by unbounded confidence. On the profits of the succeeding years larger sums were divided among increasing numbers of participants. Thus, during the six years from 1842 to 1847 inclusive, an average of £750 was annually divided among an average of eighty persons. The share assigned to each participant was proportional to the sum which he had earned in the shape of wages during the year for which the assessment was made. There were, accordingly, wide differences in the amounts of the bonuses severally received, but the average for the period above named came to a little over £9 a year per head.

"In 1838 Leclair had established a 'Mutual Aid Society' for the workmen and employes of his house, which was supported by monthly subscriptions from its members, and offered the advantages of an ordinary benefit club. Its statutes provided that a division of the funds of the society might be demanded at the end of fifteen years from the date of its establishment. Accordingly, a liquidation took place in 1853, and the society was, in the following year, reconstituted on an entirely new basis. Subscriptions from the members ceased, and the resources of the society were thenceforth to consist in a share of profits to be freely given by the house at its annual stock-taking.

"In 1860, Leclair, bent on realizing his idea of a provision for workmen in their old age, proposed to the members of the Mutual Aid Society that they should relinquish their right to a future division of its funds, and consent to the establishment of retiring pensions. He now found himself in presence of a determined opposition. A capital of about £1,000 had accumulated since 1854, and the persons interested in a division declined to forego the considerable sums which it would bring them. The issue was exceedingly critical, for, had the funds of the society been again dissipated, the most characteristic feature of Leclair's scheme could hardly have been developed. He had committed a most serious oversight in allowing the right to

a subsequent division of funds to remain on the statutes of the society after its reconstitution in 1854, and he seemed now on the point of being worsted in the decisive battle of his campaign. Fortunately, for the best interests of his opponents, even more than for his own, he had reserved to himself the means of victory. He pointed out that, though the members of the society undoubtedly possessed the right of compelling a division of its funds, the statutes had conferred on himself an unlimited power of introducing new members, who would be entitled to full shares in the division. By threatening to make a swamping use of this constitutional weapon, and also to withhold the annual subvention hitherto paid by the house, Leclaire induced the recalcitrant members of the society to give way and consent to the creation of a permanent association, and the establishment of retiring pensions.

“ The next step was to confer on the society thus reorganized an independent legal status, and, at the same time, to link its interests indissolubly with those of the house from which it sprang. It was registered as an incorporated society, and made a perpetual sleeping partner (*commanditaire*) in the firm of ‘ Leclaire et Compagnie.’ The words of the founder on handing over the new statutes to the members in 1864 are well worthy of citation here:—

“ ‘ The members of the Mutual Aid Society are no longer mere journeymen who act like machines and quit their work before the clock has sounded its last stroke. All have become partners working on their own account: in virtue of this, nothing in the workshop ought to be indifferent to them; all should attend to the preservation of the tools and materials as if they were the special keepers of them. . . . If you wish that I should leave this world with a contented heart, it is necessary that you should have realized the dream of my whole life; it is necessary that, after regular conduct and assiduous labour, a workman and his wife should have the wherewithal to live in peace without being a burden upon any one.’

“ The annual profits made by the house are distributed as

follows: The two managing partners receive £240 each as salaries for superintendence. Interest at 5 per cent. is paid to them and to the society on their respective capitals. Of the remaining net profit, one quarter goes to MM. Relouly and Marquot jointly, and another quarter to the funds of the society; the remaining half is divided among the workmen and others employed by the house, in sums proportionate to the amounts which they have respectively earned in wages, paid at the ordinary market rate, during the year for which the division is being made.

"It is important to notice that participation in profits in proportion to wages earned is the right not only of the corps of picked workmen who form the regular staff of the house, but also of the apprentices, and even of every casual auxiliary picked up, perhaps only for a single day's work, at the street corner. M. Marquot pointed out to me in the books of the house instances of this minute application of the principle: *e.g.*, one where a man who had done but *ten hours'* work in 1877 received at the end of that year 1 franc 15 centimes as profits on 6 francs 50 centimes earned as wages.

"Down to 1871 the benefits of participation were restricted to the workmen who formed the permanent staff of the house, but in that year they were thrown open to every man in its employ. The impulse which led to the introduction of this generous measure came, M. Marquot informed me, from a quarter to which Leclaire was ordinarily little disposed to look for inspiration. A Socialistic workman not belonging to his establishment had tauntingly said to him in 1870, 'Your house is nothing but a box of little masters, who make money out of the others.' Leclaire felt the force of this criticism, and determined to make employment by the house and participation in profits rigorously coextensive expressions.

"Through the kindness of M. Charles Robert, I am enabled to present here a table showing the amounts paid in wages and in bonuses to labour in 1870 to 1879; the sums given in English money true to the nearest pound:—

Year.	Number of Participants.	Total of Wages.	Total of Bonuses to Labour.
1870-1871	758	£16,257	£2,331
1871-1872	1,038	22,260	2,700
1872-1873	976	29,083	3,590
1873-1874	633	20,327	2,580
1874-1875	827	24,012	3,160
1875-1876	1,052	27,863	4,000
1876-1877	1,081	27,943	4,500
1877-1878	826	25,820	4,600
1878-1879	1,032	23,546	5,200

“These bonuses range from 12 per cent. to 18 per cent. on the amount of wages earned. They average, for the nine years selected, 15 per cent.—a very substantial addition to income.

“The Mutual Aid Society confers even greater advantages. Besides performing the functions of an ordinary benefit club, it bestows a retiring life pension of £40 per annum on every member who has attained the age of fifty, and has worked twenty years for the house, and it continues the payment of half this annuity to the widow of such pensioner during her life. It further insures the life of every member for a sum of £40, to be handed over to his family at his death.

“Conspicuous as are these material advantages, they are far from constituting the whole, or even the principal good attaching to membership in Leclaire’s beneficent institution. Its founder recognized in the principle of participation not merely a means of improving the pecuniary situation of the wage-earning class, but also a powerful lever for raising their moral condition, and with it, of course, their whole social status. Accordingly, he sought to bring that principle into operation in such a form as to constitute an intellectual, moral, and almost religious training for all who came into contact with it.

“With minds expanded and invigorated in this practical school, the members of Leclaire’s house have come to grasp firmly and apply unhesitatingly conclusions which, though no doubt direct consequences of the principles of participation, would hardly be

recognized as inseparably bound to it, except by minds familiar with at least the elements of political economy.

"They know that the more expeditiously work is dispatched, the greater will be the amount of business which the house can get through in the course of the year, and the greater the return on labour which will accrue to each individual workman. Accordingly, abandoning the system of organized waste of time which was thought an excellent expedient for thwarting the master under the old system, they work with self-sustained energy during the hours of labour.

"They know that if the work executed is always of the very best kind, the reputation of the house and their earnings will remain at the highest point, but that every piece of work badly done tends to drive away its custom and prejudice their own interests. Accordingly, the scamping of work and the introduction of inferior or defective materials, in fact, every form of trade dishonesty, is sternly discountenanced by the men themselves.

"They know that the wanton destruction of tools and materials is merely one way of throwing their own money into the sea. Accordingly, this proceeding, which has a certain zest about it when thought to be practised to the sole detriment of a non-participating master, is seen in its true character, and replaced by a vigilant watch exercised over every particle of property belonging to the house.

"The introduction of participation by workmen in the profits of employers admits of being recommended, on a purely economic grounds, as a benefit to both the parties concerned. The increased activity of the workman, his greater care of the tools and materials entrusted to him, and the consequent possibility of saving a considerable part of the cost of superintendence enable profits to be obtained under a participating system which would not accrue under the established routine. If these extra profits were to be wholly divided among those whose labour produced them, the employer would still be as well off as he is under the existing system; but, assuming that he distributes among his workmen only a portion of this fresh fund, an

retains the rest himself, both he and they will at the end of the year find their account in the new principle introduced into their business relations.

"It was on this tangible ground of mutual advantage that Leclair by preference took his stand when publicly defending the system incorporated in his house. He constantly insisted that his conduct had been for his own advantage, and that it was better for him to earn a hundred francs and give fifty of them to his workmen, than to earn only twenty-five francs and keep them all for himself. 'I maintain,' he wrote in 1865, 'that if I had remained in the beaten track of routine, I should not have arrived, *even by fraudulent means*, at a position comparable to that which I have made for myself.'

"We have seen what one unaided man, imbued with this victorious spirit, was able to contribute towards the solution of the great social problem of our day; how, by bettering the relations between capital and labour, to assure to the toiling masses a self-respecting present and a hopeful future. I cannot believe that this consummation will ever be reached through the conflicts of opposing self-interests: it can only be from 'economic science *enlightened by the spirit of the Gospel*,' and pointing over the heads of lower antagonisms to a higher unity, that an ultimate solution is to be looked for."—*The Nineteenth Century*, September, 1880: "A Real Saviour of Society" (SEDLAY TAYLOR).

This "participation in profits" idea would have been talked about, its benefits to both employers and employed observed, and it would have become general, but that it has this great fault in the minds of the "advisers" of the labourers: it asks for "more production" from each worker; whereas they argue that for the "benefit of all," each member should do less. Before any real progress can be made in the condition of the working classes, they must see that, "economically," the capitalist idea is more for their benefit than the principle of the trades' unions. They must think the matter out for themselves; and once they do so, they will begin to survey the industrial world through similar spectacles to those the employers use. "Production" is the power that

causes demand. "Low prices" are of more benefit to the working class than an increased rate of wages, that proportionately increases the price of the articles, and thereby only enables the larger sum to buy what the lesser did. "Increase of production" alone can reduce prices; it is, therefore, "economically," the wisest policy for a nation to adopt that principle which insures the "maximum of production" in all departments of industry at the "minimum of cost." This is not done by a combination to operate on the rate of wages—by directly calling on employers to raise the rate of wages, or indirectly aiming at the same result by regulations directed towards restricting the supply of labour, or by regulations directed towards increasing the demand of labour by lessening the work done by each labourer. All such action is on a par with the old monopolies and protection. The object is "to obtain for labour artificially more than it can obtain legitimately in the open market." You will perceive that in all my books I denounce such action by *all*. But it must be admitted that members of trades' unions are not judged fairly, as it is quite certain that "working men are not the only class who try to create an artificial demand and price for what they have to sell;" on the contrary, the nation has suffered, and is suffering, because this narrow-minded and mischievous principle of "protection of each one's particular interest" is so common to all. When men begin to think out the causes of the miseries of life, and when "economy" is appreciated at its true worth, as the principle that is essential to the formation of those habits of life which will cause foresight and prudence, it will be manifest to them that the happiness of all is obtainable, not by unnatural restraints upon populations or artificial restrictions upon the supply of labour, but by treating the people as a whole, as an army of labourers, with ranks according to their skill and productive powers; each one desirous of producing all he can for his own and the general good, the absurdity of "supplying the wants of humanity" by restrictions and "limits" being seen in its hideous, narrow-minded selfishness; men's reason and con-

science at last masters of the situation. All barriers to the admission of workmen to particular trades; limiting apprentices and the hours of labour; as also the hedging round certain favoured trades with artificial obstacles; the protection of certain industries by levying a "tax" upon others; the forbidding of A to sell to B, but making (or each trying to make) B buy of C; refusing to buy of A certain articles if sold to others, so as to obtain a higher price than the open market would give a seller;—all these actions, based upon similar principles, we must hope, will ere long, by man's own good sense, be put by as relics of the past, when man was but as a child groping in the dark.

In estimating the earnings of the working classes, we must consider the cost of food. In Stockholm, for example, a family of five persons can live as well on £44 per annum as on £60 in Paris, or £80 in London. Again, it does not matter so much what you pay per week to the labourer as the amount of work he does for the pay he receives. British workmen are the highest paid in Europe, yet their labour is really the cheapest to the employer. Thus, the German factories pay their cotton-spinners 12s. a week, the English 17s.; and yet the working expenses of the former are, per spindle, 24 per cent. higher than in England. In like manner, the wages in France are lower, but the cost of working much greater than with us, viz. :—

					Spindles.				
France	10,000	£60
England	10,000	41

Why is this? Because in England the workmen are paid by the piece, while on the Continent the operatives are paid by the day—the most unsatisfactory system for the nation and the individual. Piece-work makes it to the interest of the workman to improve his productive power by skill and dexterity; day-work is a system that offers no incentive to increase production. To get through the day is all they have to think about, and to do no more than they are compelled. The late Mr. Roebuck once said that men could do as much work in ten hours as twelve.

He was right. If men will but work earnestly, if the system of pay be such as to make it their interest to produce *all* they can whilst at work, there is no doubt that the hours of labour might be shortened to the advantage of all. That it all depends on the system of remuneration, contrast the hours of labour by piece and day work: the Germans, paid so much per day, work ninety hours; the English, by piece-work, sixty per week; yet the production per operative is equal. Russian mills work day and night—150 hours a week—but the production per spindle is the same as in England for sixty hours. It is estimated that two Englishmen produce as much as three Frenchmen, and that a Belgian working twelve hours does less than an Englishman in ten hours. Nothing but the cheaper price of food on the Continent could enable our continental rivals to compete with us. Therefore, the more we succeed in reducing the cost of food in England, the more we shall be assured of retaining our supremacy.

This supremacy, we must understand, can only be maintained by "improvements" in our system of production and distribution; the thinking over, ascertaining, and doing *all* that can be done to reduce the cost of every article on the sale of which our existence depends. This depends upon two important conditions: "thrift," so as to avoid all unnecessary outlay, the living at the "minimum" per head, consistently with having all that is necessary by each, and each one producing day by day the "maximum" amount he is capable of doing. On these two points will depend the elevation of the working classes, the progress of the nation; the developing of the "individual," the rousing into greater activity his self-respect, teaching him self-reliance—above all, the thinking of the "rights of others," and refusing to be reduced to a "State nursing," a poor weakling not able to fight his own battles in life, to make his own bargains, but must be "propped" up by the "law." The "survival of the fittest" is nature's law. It may seem hard, but it can be proved to be just, and in harmony with the principle that the minority must be sacrificed to the majority, and not the greater number to the

lessor. Our legislators, wiser than nature, step in, and virtually say, "No matter how incompetent you are, no matter that a 'more capable man' is ready to take the farm and pay its present rental, we see you are a poor, weak sort of fellow, who can only get 5 per cent. out of a bit of land that another fellow could get 10 per cent. out of; and although, for the good of all, it is right that the 'best' should have the land, yours is an 'exceptional case;' so, as you cannot get out of the land what you ought, we will reduce your rent for the use of it to what you are able to make out of it; and, although we know that it is wrong to go against the law of supply and demand, we will try by 'artifice' to secure you tenants now in possession of farms continuous and exclusive possession of them, and protect the 'existing holders' against better men eager to get the farms, and rob the landlord of what his land would fetch in the open market, keep out tenants able with capital and skill to cultivate and improve the owners' property, and force the landlords to accept such a 'fair' rental as we think you poor, weak State nurslings can afford to pay." "Ah! well," people say to me, "you know it was necessary that something should be done; Ireland was in such a sad state, the landlords could not get any rent." I am aware of the disgraceful state Ireland was in, because the law was powerless in the hands of incompetent or "unwilling" holders to make its writs respected, and the great Liberal party, the party of progress, pass a measure that will keep in existence a little longer a large body of men accustomed to a low standard of living, and who want to earn that living without exertion, content with a hovel in which their children can play and live with the pigs and the poultry, and with the "dunghill" outside, or too often with detachments of it inside the door. "Well," you say, "he is contented and happy in his way, and does not want to be disturbed." Granted, but is it right of us to keep him in such a deplorable state, is it wise to make a hero of the man who could only conceive as a panacea for the ills of Ireland a Bill that is full of elaborate and special securities to degrade the individual and give a longer innings to the "survival of the unfittest"? It is a Bill that tempts men, by

every kind of deceit and false evidence, from "time to time" to profit by their own wrong, to make the land they occupy as worthless as possible, and then get the rent reduced. The Bill will drive out of the field solvent, honest, capable men, who would have improved the land and increased the production of the country; it will stop the development of better cultivated fields and more comfortable homes; it will check forethought and thrift; it will demoralize the people. What a different principle of action for the "elevation of the working classes" was enunciated by Channing in his lectures to a Boston audience forty years ago! Therein we see an entire absence of clap-trap and false sentiment, and we have clearly indicated, with a piercing clearness of vision, how to secure the remote goal of a workman's best efforts: "There is but one elevation for a labourer, and for all other men. There are not different kinds of dignity for different orders of men, but one and the same for all. The only elevation of a human being consists in the exercise, growth, energy of the higher principles and powers of his soul. A bird may be shot upward by a foreign power, but it rises, in the true sense of the word, only when it spreads its own wings and soars by its own living power. So a man may be thrust upward into a conspicuous place by outward accidents, but he rises only in so far as he exerts himself and expands his best faculties, and ascends by a free effort to a nobler region of thought and action. Such is the elevation I desire for the labourer, and I desire no other. This elevation is, indeed, to be aided by an improvement in his outward condition, and in turn it greatly improves his outward lot, and, thus connected, outward good is real and great; but, supposing it to exist in separation from inward growth and life, it would be nothing worth, nor would I raise a finger to promote it." Channing is right. The only permanent good to the Irish people, to any people, is to impress on them "self-help," by greater earnestness and thoroughness of action. increased economy, temperance, hygienic knowledge, education, conscientiousness; implant any one of these seeds for a better

life, and you have done more to help the Irish people than if you give them the land they occupy "rent-free."

The same with our working classes. Educate them to see how their interest is bound up with that of others—how, for their own benefit, as well as that of others, it is imperative that each workman produces the utmost within his power, and the work all perfect and completely adapted for what it is intended as the experience of the past, the machinery at his command, and his own concentrated thought and trained skill can make it; employer and employed working in unison, each recognizing the necessity of the other, each appreciating the efforts of the other for their mutual good. "A consummation devoutly to be wished." Is it possible? The experience of the *Maison Leclair* justifies us in inferring that it is; and that the idea of interesting the workman by letting him "participate in the profits" will cause unity where antagonism has prevailed, whilst the beneficial financial result is due to more perfect work and less waste than heretofore. Let us calmly consider the advantages of this "profit-sharing" idea. Common sense and experience confirm the fact that the workman who receives "fixed" wages, and who knows beforehand that however much pains he may take with his work, he will not on that account receive one penny more from his employers, is not encouraged to bring to his work his full physical or intellectual capacity; on the contrary, as we find by experience, he will become more and more negligent and indifferent; and such negligence, or loss of self-respect, is not confined to the workshop only, but invades his family life; as the man who has sunk so low as not to care for the good of the establishment which employs him will, in the end, care as little for the good of his family; the want of an active conscience in the discharge of his daily duties bringing with it, as an inevitable consequence, the steadily increasing degradation of the workman and of his family. Now, what do we find follows from the workmen being tempted by a participation in profits? Quite the opposite; it has entirely altered the

mode of life and habits of the workmen. Under the one system, no one thought save of himself and of his individual interests; under the other, all consider themselves as members of one and the same family, and the good of the establishment is the object of every one's solicitude, because their own personal interest is bound up with it. By this system we get, in fact, "rational communism"—viz., all working together for the common good—but the "individuality" of the individual left intact, for him to do the best he can for himself, and thereby benefit his fellows. What a difference it would make in the yearly balance-sheet of large manufacturers or merchants if each and every man zealously strove to fill up his time with conscientious effort to produce the utmost possible, to collect carefully the fallen chips or waste, to save and economize material and time; no quarrelling as to who should do this or that, but a gentle reminder from a neighbour sufficient to bring to order any workman disposed to be negligent!

*"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, but men decay."*

There is a deal of wisdom in the above couplet. For a nation to live, it must be ever progressing; to progress after a certain period in its history, its workers—the masses—must have a "hope" in their minds, like Napoleon's soldiers, that the marshal's baton is obtainable by all. We want to crush out the thought of our working classes, that life is for them but a struggle for existence—for the mere daily bread. The majority of them think, "None of us can ever come to anything; what is the use of trying?" The share in profits will lay in their minds the foundation-stone of a new way of looking at things, and awaken hopes for the realization of which "saving" by earning and self-denial is seen to be an indispensable condition. You give them an object in life; some will think of purchasing the cottage to live in, others will save to set up a little shop, others to save the sum that will keep them independent of extraneous help, or poor-law relief, in their old age. Once you let them see it is possible to "help themselves," you have taken the safest

way of making them self-reliant and self-dependent; you have awakened the "man" within them; whereas hitherto, by compulsion, total abstinence, or appealing to Government, you have crushed out what little manhood they had. Give men an interest in their work, give them an object to live for, and they will see life in quite a different light; they will stay at home, or become members of literary institutions; they will gradually leave the animal behind; they will grow steadily into manhood; the wife will co-operate with them; the fireside, that has hitherto been so cheerless and unattractive, will be tempting and pleasant; the "home" will supplant the public-house. "An ideal picture," some will say, "but not possible." I do not believe in anything being impossible that is possible; and as regards the usual objection of being utopian, the dream of a theorist, an idealist, I have only to remark that the least poetic man who has succeeded in life is conscious at times of a vein of romance permeating a temperament that he has been proud to style "matter of fact." It is the perception of the ideal side by side with the actual that gives the courage to encounter and surmount difficulties. You may demur to my opinion, but to me it is a truism, that "he who is devoid of imagination rarely accomplishes a great enterprise." We are a singular compound of "hardness" and sentiment; in the daily work, in the mill, warehouse, or office, our actions are influenced and softened down by the poet's appeal to our imagination—

"And the stately ships go on
 To their haven under the hill;
 But oh! for the touch of a vanished hand
 And the sound of a voice that is still!
 Break, break, break,
 At the foot of thy crags, O sea!
 But the tender grace of a day that is dead
 Will never come back to me."

TENNYSON.

But we have "facts" to guide us. The introduction of "profit-sharing" by Leclair, Bord, Billon and Isaac, and others, gives, as a result, workmen the very opposite to what they have

been; every workman devoting his utmost attention to the success of his employer. It must be so. Once the workmen realize that the interests of the employer and employé are the same, and they are treated with respect, as men, not as machines, they will work with all their skill and energy. At present we rely on piece-work, premiums, the raising of wages; but, good as these are, it is still mercenary work—a system not calculated to elevate the man; whereas participation in profits gives us a principle that raises the character of each workman, makes one and all work with a good heart, with all their soul; briefly, makes all do more, and do it better, each man comprehending that all negligence in the performance of his duty is prejudicial alike to his colleagues and *himself*. By the present system, “superintendence” is a costly item; and however vigilant the overlooker, no system can be equal to that which makes it the interest of every worker, for his own sake, to attend conscientiously to every point of detail. From the employers’ point of view, it is like going from hell to heaven; their minds free to develop their business, conscious that they are surrounded by an intelligent industrial staff that, in good or bad times, will secure them the best work attainable; the management going on smoothly, the wheels oiled by this element of justice, harmony, good-will, and the peace that accompanies it. The benefit of the principle of “participation in profits” is not taken from a few isolated cases, but it is below the mark to state that there are at least one hundred continental firms now working on a participating basis. The principle has been introduced with good results into agriculture, railways, banks, and insurance offices; into iron-smelting, type-founding, and cotton-spinning; into a large and varied class of manufacturing and commercial industries, varying in size from the paper mills of M. Laroche-Joubert at Angoulême, with its 1,500 workmen, to the establishment of M. Lenoir at Paris, with its forty house-painters. It is a system that must spread, once employers and employed understand its benefit. I am firmly convinced that it is the system of the future, and see no reason why a method for the employment of labour which is

abroad of so much value, should not prove equally beneficial in England. Our present system is costly, through the losses by bad work, dilatoriness, and waste; the new system gives "excellence of workmanship" and "rapidity of execution." Who can deny that workmen have it in their power to increase the quantity, improve the quality, and diminish the cost of their staple production by more effective exertion, by increased economy in the use of tools and materials, or by a reduction in the cost of superintendence? Briefly, an employer's profit mainly depends on the willing co-operation of his workmen to produce the utmost possible for him by their labour; it naturally follows that, to insure this beneficial result, we require a system that furnishes to the workmen a "supplementary income," dependent upon a "share in profits"—a surplus that is realized in consequence of the enhanced efficiency of the work done under its stimulating influence. The amount of "preventible waste," the time that is frittered away, the material and gear wastefully dealt with by nearly every class of workmen, will not be disputed; it therefore logically follows that English workmen have it largely in their power to enhance employers' profits by contributing better and more economical labour. The initiation must come from the employer; and it is to be hoped that all employers of labour, productive or distributive, whether on a large or a small scale, will examine the subject, with a view to practical action, and begin the system with the conviction that it is to the mutual advantage of employer and employed; the workman making more assiduous efforts in his labour as soon as he thoroughly grasps the motives for increased zeal which participation holds out to him; the employer perceiving that the share of surplus profits he divides is really realized by the "more efficient labour" which participation has called forth, besides the boon of industrial stability, and the support of a united corporate feeling hitherto unknown; and that, by associating his workmen with himself, he is arousing latent aspirations within them, from which great moral improvements may be confidently anticipated.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

"Learn
 That not to know at large of things remote
 From use, obscure, and subtle; but to know
 That which before us lies in daily life,
 Is the prime wisdom."

MILTON.

"Whatsoever thou takest in hand, remember the end, and thou shalt never do amiss."

In the first Napoleon's time, splendid success was secured by, and depended mostly upon, exceptional skill in the general that commanded; but to succeed now, it is requisite to have "efficient" men in the field, the factory, the warehouse—men trained so as to perform their allotted task in the most economical manner, by not only producing more, but producing it better, without any of the drawbacks and losses in the field, warehouse, and factory, when men do their task without the necessary technical knowledge to enable them to do it quickly and perfectly. "Technical education" is the want of the age we live in—alike in employer and employed, the soldier and the general. Germany has grasped this principle, and to it her army is indebted for its successes; the Germans have more scientific curiosity, take more interest in "truth" for truth's own sake, and reap the reward in a serious and painstaking habit of mind, open to receive information, and resolved to see "things as they are," to know all the truth about the universe which can be known. Instead of developing the intellect, preparing it to receive all the knowledge it can obtain, training the people to think, we teach them to believe tradition, and send them forth to begin the world with their brains clogged up with a lot of weeds, instead of good seed, ready for healthy development in the work of life.

To hold our own in the struggle of life, it is imperative that the basis of the education of the youth of this country be

technical, instead of classical. They must be trained for business pursuits; they must have an idea of the life they are to lead; they must be better prepared for gaining their daily bread in the hard struggle, the increasingly harder struggle, of life; they must be trained to do their work well; they must be wise enough to know the false from the true economy—that it is a great error of judgment to sacrifice quality to cheapness, to “spoil the ship for the ha’p’orth of tar,” as we have been doing of late, and thereby bringing the goods of the nation into disrepute. We must elevate, not degrade, our labour. We want trades’ unions to promote greater skill, and to do honour to the most skilful; not to reduce the better men to the level of the worst, and to try by combination to artificially enhance the price of labour. We must have a division of labour, that leaves the man a *thinking* being, not a mere automatic machine; we must have something that will take the place of our “apprenticeship” system. At present our youth are left to pick up their knowledge as best they may; there is nothing to encourage them to “excellence” in their work; and our social views of life are based upon that cursed thing, “false gentility;” so that, instead of the young being trained to follow some mechanical or useful employment, they wish to be clerks, or to sell tape or ribands. Tempt the young out of this senseless groove by cultivating a taste for “handicraft skill” in all the schools; rouse into activity that latent power of inventive skill by which England was made famous; honour labour in every way; stimulate our youth to try and restore to England in the markets of the world that supremacy we once enjoyed, but have lost, by letting others go beyond us, by our indifference to the importance of doing our work well, by our ignoring the fact that, in commerce, the moral laws cannot be infringed with impunity, but that, as with the physical laws, any infringement thereof carries with it a corresponding retribution.

The superiority of the training workmen receive in foreign countries is such that we are being beaten on all sides. It seems incredible that, as stated by Mr. Anderson in his speech

when introducing "technical education" to the House of Commons, on April 1, 1881, "in one of the largest ship-building establishments on the Clyde, he saw in one of the departments a large number of American-made machines, which he was told they could buy *one-fourth* cheaper than in this country." Think over what this means, and if we are losing our commerce, seriously ask yourselves if the fault is not your own. An American machine-maker comes to this country, buys our steel and iron, carries them across the water, pays 83 per cent. for taking them into America, pays higher wages there than is paid in England, brings them back into this country, and yet undersells by 25 per cent. our manufacture. Analyze honestly any other commodity, and you will find the same result staring you in the face. The fault is our own; and if we do not move ourselves, and remove the cause of our decaying trade, we deserve to be beaten, and to receive contempt where hitherto we have had honour. The curse of this country is its complicated system of distribution; there are too many of the distributing class—too many profits that swell up the price of an article between the time it leaves the producer and gets to the consumer. Want of pride in the excellence of the work by the men, enhancing the price by the large profits necessary to maintain the style of living by the middle class, is the cause of England's decline. We must revert to the "laws of economy" in production and distribution; there is no other means of holding our own in the industrial struggle for supremacy. A makes an article; generally he buys the material on credit, and borrows the capital of a friend or banker to carry on his business; he sells on credit to B; B sells the article on credit to C; C sells on credit to D. And as regards the "foreign trade," where we are being beaten, the "agent" steps in for his share, and as shipper, he buys of the retailer; and not satisfied with the commission they get from their clients, too many of them want a commission from the seller, and as with too many buyers, confine their operations to such houses as will give it. The manufacturer, merchant, and farmer class are not, as they used

to be, practical men, "captains of the ship," but simply the capitalists, and therefore needing a better paid class of officers to manage than used to be the case. Manufacturers, merchants, farmers, one and all, spend on an average £500 a year now, where they spent £100 a quarter of a century ago; and this extra remuneration or profit has to be added to the price of the article, as it is really paid for by the consumer. And herein lies one of the reasons why England is not able to hold her own in the world's competition as heretofore. A steel-barrelled gun for which we ask £12, can be bought at Liège for £1. In Belgium labour is cheap; true, but in America labour is dear; and, as Mr. Anderson stated in his speech, if you analyze the return of exports and imports for the year, you will find that it is in these articles, in which "technical education" is required, that exports have diminished and imports increased. The years are 1872 and 1879. The following are the rates per cent. of decrease in value of exports in the latter year as compared with the former. In cotton goods, 18 per cent.; woollen goods, 51 per cent.; silk, 23 per cent.; glass, 30 per cent.; iron, excluding the rough unfinished metal, 16 per cent. The decrease in the aggregate of our exports was 28 per cent. On the other hand, taking the imports, there was an increase, as between the two years, in cotton goods, of 54 per cent.; woollen goods, 40 per cent.; silk, 36 per cent.; glass, 30 per cent.; iron, 49 per cent. The increase of the aggregate imports was 39 per cent. Thus it appeared that not only foreigners, but our own people, were becoming dissatisfied with our own manufactures.

The last few years we have heard of the bad condition of agriculturists. Why is this? If land be not remunerative, it must be because too much is paid for the land, or too little got out of it. The rents asked in certain localities, as the leading thoroughfares in the City of London and the West-end, are ruinously high; it is simply a life of anxiety and drudgery to pay the landlord and tax-gatherer. But, speaking generally, I do not think the rent paid for land by the farmers is more than sufficient to pay interest on the capital necessary to buy the

land; the fault, therefore, to be remedied is the insufficient value extracted from the land by those who have the management thereof. The distributing class are, or have been, able to charge a larger profit to meet their increased personal expenditure; but the farmer's prices are ruled, not by credit, local connection, the caprice of fashion, but by nature's rigid law of supply and demand in the open market. And as there is not the slightest prospect of his ever getting higher prices, except by a failure in the supplies from abroad, that would be ruinous to the country generally, it is imperative that steps be taken to make the yield from every acre of ground more productive than before. Agriculture must be followed by men who can farm their land on scientific principles; we have passed the time when the happy-go-lucky, haphazard system would pay. Men must be taught farming as a profession. Our dilatoriness is disgraceful. We have two agricultural colleges—one at Cirencester, in England; the other at Glasnevin, in Ireland; whereas in France there are 28,000 schools in which agriculture is one of the subjects taught. Prosperity has been a curse to us; it has made the middle class luxuriant in their habits, the working class indifferent to the quantity and excellence of their work. Every shopkeeper wants his country house; every farmer wants to follow the hounds. They must do as their forefathers did—stick to their shop and their farm, and learn before it is too late that success in the one, as in the other, will depend upon their knowledge of their business, the capital they have in their occupation, and the wise use they make of it.

We want technical schools for every trade, profession, and occupation. The time has come when, in the army, the professions, commerce, agriculture, every industrial occupation, we need for the national existence, the utmost economy—an economy in production and distribution—only obtainable by efficiency on the part of each worker and distributor; that is only obtainable by our having properly trained scholars for their respective vocations, from the servant girl to the Premier, which only efficient technical schools can supply. We have Owen's

College, in Manchester; Mason's College, near Birmingham; the Yorkshire College, at Leeds; and the City Guilds, which are making great efforts. It is to be hoped they will persevere, and be as beneficial to the nation in this revival as in the past. It is intended to have a technical university at South Kensington, and instruction will be given in applied physics, applied mechanics, and applied arts, fitting the students to become technical teachers all over the country; and it is the duty of the Government, as soon as possible, to see that a teacher of technical education be attached to every school in the kingdom. On the Continent, these technical colleges are supported by the State and by the municipalities. The Swiss town of Zurich, twenty years ago, spent £100,000 on a polytechnical university, which is kept up at a cost of £18,000 a-year. We are all behind; we must awake, arise, or be left still further in the rear; be men, be like the Englishmen of old, "ever in advance." But it is best to be candid; the struggle will be a hard one to recover the ground we have lost; we must be content at first to be taught. And I cordially endorse Mr. Anderson's opinion, "that a Royal Commission, to visit the technical and agricultural schools of France, Belgium, Germany, and Switzerland, and to report upon them, would be of great benefit in bringing before Parliament and the country, in the accredited form of a Blue-book, the great advantages the industries of those countries are deriving from such schools."

To enable the commercial and manufacturing classes of this country to keep in the front rank in the contest with other nations, the most important requisite is a knowledge of what those other countries are doing. This is certain, they have been beating us in the race lately, and this result seems owing to the great attention that has been paid to technical education on the Continent during the last fifteen years; whereas our progress in the mechanical and constructive arts has been by no means satisfactory, owing mainly to our having no system of training in operation to take the place of the old apprenticeship system. We must place technical training within the reach of all who

need it—within the reach of all those who have a natural talent for it. I object to State education. We are told that abroad the schools make great progress “because they are free;” it is a fallacy this “freedom of payment,” when the work is done by a Government. The *people pay the fees*, and in the most costly manner—in the higher sum raised by taxes. Men should hesitate before trusting themselves to those statesmen who seem disposed to abandon the old-fashioned doctrine that “a man is the best judge and guardian of his own interests.” What is done by men for themselves with an earnest will, is always better and more thoroughly done than it can be done by any Government. Be men, be independent; see the necessity for this higher education; be resolved to have it; refuse all aid; work, save, pay for your own schooling, and for your children’s schooling. There is no real freedom in any country whilst the people are content to be mere puppets in the hands of a paternal government. It has been truly said, “Those who would be free themselves must strike the blow”—the blow I mean, of knocking off the fetters that are a disgrace to our manhood—the fetters that would soon be undone if the people were self-reliant, self-helpful, self-dependent, above help either from the individual or the State. It can be done, is done by Saxony, where more progress is being made, and more is being done in the matter of technical education, than in any other country in the world; and there school fees are paid by the humblest citizen.

For the general welfare of the country, there is no subject which needs reform more than the “Patent Laws.” Without the aid of inventions to utilize and economize, the world could not exist; without their aid, it would be impossible to sustain our ever-increasing population. Inventions have reduced the price of food almost as much as the repeal of the Corn Laws, and they have benefited us equally in nearly every department, to such an extent that one may truly say that a large share of the prosperity of England during the last fifty years is due to the genius of inventors. Yet in this “free trade” country, this country that depends so much upon being “foremost in the fight,

we have laws that put every obstacle in the way, that by their petty obstructions and heavy expenses practically prohibit patents. After the reduction of the Stamp Duty in 1852, three times the number of patents were registered; but the United States register "five times" more patents than we do; and why? Because their tax is small, and ours is large. I patented an article, but shall never patent another; it was too costly to be remunerative, besides the loss of time in red tapeism and at the Circumlocution Office. You may judge of the absurdity and triviality, the needless waste of time, when I tell you that my papers were rejected because "self-acting" was inserted instead of "automatic." We want a scale of stamp duties that will cover the necessary expenses—a scale to make the Patent Laws self-supporting, and not a source of revenue. We want all details simplified as much as possible. Technical education will be deprived of half its benefit unless we encourage inventive genius at the same time by a complete alteration of the Patent Laws. At present we stifle inventive knowledge, or rather deprive the nation of its benefit, by a tax that discourages rather than opens out the minds of those who might be benefactors to mankind, but who are met with that "difficult obstacle," want of money, at the very outset—a cost, in fact, that practically drives mere simple labour-saving tools and instruments out of England's markets; whereas, if we understood what true economy is, we should not only foster the conception, but develop the manufacture of every tool and instrument that would save time and labour, and thereby reduce the price of commodities, and be a national benefit. It is beyond question that in some great industries foreign workmen show to great advantage, in point of skill, by the side of their English class-mates, and the best way to remedy this is to have technical schools, and a technical college that will serve as a connecting link between South Kensington and the technical schools of the country; a college for the benefit of all of the artisan class, intended to watch over and direct every class of workmen, by giving them systematic instruction in the fundamental principles of arts and trades;

schools wherein they will learn the best method of applying their labour in order to effect in the most expeditious and efficient, and therefore the most economical, manner any given object; schools where they will be made thoroughly acquainted with the nature of the materials in which they work; schools, also, wherein will be taught the law of supply and demand, the most economical system for the acquisition by the individual and the nation of capital for the maintenance of labour—not by the few oppressing the many, but in the mutual and pleasurable conjunction of capital, skill, and labour, for the benefit of *all*, by producing and distributing every commodity at the very lowest possible price, between individuals of the nation, and between nations—the world one great brotherhood.

The value of technical education to the world was strikingly displayed in the "Milling Exhibition" at the Agricultural Hall, May, 1881. This international exhibition of flour-mill machinery, of bread-making and baking machinery, and of cereals and farinaceous products, surpassed in magnitude, novelty, and importance any show of a similar kind. The hall was converted into one vast humming mill, busy in manifold technical operations, from the cleansing of the grain to the sacking of the snow-white and branny products, and loading the air of the place with the corny fragrance of meal and flour. To show how ill-informed are the working classes of the difficulty of the masters, and their struggle to hold their position, the competition being so great, we have the fact that the milling operatives in London are agitating for a substantial advance in wages, whilst the masters are alarmed lest their trade should cease to yield a living profit even at the existing rate of expenses. Their business is *not* increasing, unless we include the rough grinding of maize and other corn for animals, and they are threatened with a failure of the future supply of wheat, which is the miller's raw material, and without which his "occupation's gone." Yet, in this serious crisis of his trade, the men want more pay. Why? Because they are ignorant of their real position; they will not think; they will not see that there is a great and progressive diminution in

the home crop, not from misfortune of season only, but from permanent changes in the husbandry of the kingdom; the number of acres of wheat cultivated having fallen from 3,833,000 in the year 1874 to 3,070,000 in 1880. But a far more serious matter for our milling operatives, a matter of life-and-death interest to the 10,000 millers of the United Kingdom, is the extraordinary innovation introduced into their trade—the novel systems of grinding and treating wheat and meal which have wrought wonders for continental and American millers, by which the trade of our millers is taken away, as the enormous and increasing imports do not furnish men, as formerly, with more work; on the contrary, by these improved systems, “flour,” instead of “wheat,” is sent us, as you will see at a glance by this tabular form:—

HOME-GROWN AND IMPORTED WHEAT AND FLOUR.

Year.	Home-grown Wheat available for Consumption. (Estimated.)	Imported Wheat.	Total Annual Wheat Supply.	Imported Flour.
	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.
1875 ...	39,537,000 ...	51,876,000 ...	91,413,000 ...	6,136,000
1876 ...	41,882,000 ...	44,455,000 ...	86,337,000 ...	5,960,000
1877 ...	40,872,000 ...	54,270,000 ...	95,142,000 ...	7,377,000
1878 ...	51,242,000 ...	49,906,000 ...	101,148,000 ...	7,828,000
1879 ...	26,000,000 ..	59,592,000 ...	85,592,000 ...	10,728,000
1880 ...	39,494,000 ...	55,197,000 ...	94,691,000 ...	10,591,000

You will perceive that the importation of wheat meal and flour rose from 6,136,000 cwt. in 1875 to 10,591,000 cwt. in 1880. The value of these imported ground bread stuffs in 1880 was nearly £4,000,000 greater in 1880 than in 1876; the effect being to lower the yearly turn-out of British mills to about the same extent, and this in the short space of four years. It is the surprising growth of the milling industry in the United States which fills our home trade with the most serious misgivings; for whereas the quantity of flour coming from the States was only 1,772,000 cwt. in 1875, it was 3,635,000 cwt. in 1878, and nearly reached 7,000,000 cwt. in 1880. And if you give the question a moment's reflection, you will perceive that this rapidity of

increase must be permanent. Following the natural laws, the milling industry being so successful, new mills are in course of erection in all the principal centres of the milling industry. But the more serious matter for our millers is the "economical" factor, that the substitution of flour for whole grain in exporting lessens the weight for land transport and shipment by about 50 per cent., as the proportion of fine baking flour yielded by the wheat is some 70 per cent., the remaining proportion of inferior flour, offal, and bran being used as a valuable interchange with maize for fattening American cattle. The adoption of bags in place of barrels for packing has economized room in the holds of vessels, and the cost is further reduced by the smaller outlay for bags, and the realizing of their value when discharged in England. "Wise men accept the inevitable;" it is certainly unwise not to face this change in the milling industry. Viewed from any standpoint, the situation is most serious, as at a not very distant future our vast imports from the United States must be mainly, if not wholly, of flour instead of wheat. Now comes the question, why is this? Because the Americans eclipse all Europe not only in the quality of their flour, but in "the economy and perfection of their grinding." They do not stand still, but are ever improving. Even in Minneapolis, with its twenty-two mills, and a capacity for 15,000 barrels daily, and in St. Louis, where nearly 2,000,000 barrels of flour were manufactured last year, the system of milling deemed quite satisfactory no longer than two years ago is at the present moment being remodelled in order to obtain greater mechanical efficiency in the treatment of varied qualities of grain, and to secure in the product a higher percentage of the finest and whitest flour: an example of watchfulness, of knowing the principles upon the observance of which success depends, that our millers must follow if they do not want to fall behind in the race.

The object in all my books is to establish a principle; I have therefore gone fully into this milling question, as the same principle is applicable to "all trades." The keynote to my teaching is, "every effect has a cause." "As men sow they reap." If our sikk

is sent to Germany to be dyed, if our material is sent abroad to be manufactured, if we buy of others what we used to sell to them, if "flour" is sent us instead of wheat,—it is all due to one fact, that we are letting others beat us in the race. We were ahead, but we got conceited; worst of all, we became extravagant, not only in our expenditure, not only in wanting to "spend more," but in that more fatal recklessness of "producing less." Shorter hours, the interference of our Legislature between employer and employed, almost making it a crime the keeping the machinery at work, no matter how urgent the work, and the want of a proper understanding between employer and employed, have lowered our position in the eyes of the world. There is only one way to retrieve it: "find out the cause, and remove it;" produce cheaper and better, and distribute more expeditiously and economically. To do this, every man interested must understand more thoroughly what he has to do, and do that with greater efficiency, and more quickly; being truly economical, not in penurious, miserly abstinence, but determined to "produce more," and to expend in the doing of it as little as possible. I want men to have more enjoyment out of their lives, not less. It is evident that nature did not mean men to be idle either with their brains or bodies. "Six days shalt thou labour," is a glorious edict, not a curse for disobedience, but yielding to mankind, by a faithful observance thereof, the greatest possible happiness. "Every day a Sunday," is a perpetual misery; to get up, day after day, without occupation, is as great a punishment as solitary confinement. To live, men must work; to maintain your position, you must be ever "progressing;" if you are not, you will be beaten by others more earnest in their efforts; "Progress" is the law. Our youth must be trained in the latest thoughts; it is cruel to send them forth laden with a lot of obsolete ideas, burdened with a drag that deprives their minds of free action. The only yearning implanted in youthful minds should be the "desire for truth," ever to be grasping after more light, to be free from the strange hallucinations, foolish conceits,

and inconsistencies of the past. Men should begin the world with a lofty conception of the Deity, a pure morality, deep philosophical thoughts—food that will stimulate and satisfy the religious cravings of humanity; making a heaven of this world, instead of the desert that it is to nearly all of us, because, instead of being kept alive by grains of good wheat, we are choked up with a load of husks, silly puerilities, degrading superstitious ideas, forms, and ceremonies, which have made it such a slow and laborious process for the development of a higher civilization and more refined culture by the intellectual, spiritual, and moral forces inherent in human nature. Unfortunately, this “upas-tree” has strangled too many of us. The “sufficient for the day” theory will ruin us, unless we wake up and shake off its enervating influence.

What is wanted by England is an encouragement of “inventive genius,” by making the obtaining of patents easy and cheap; technical schools to develop the latent talents of the people—a training that will show them the value and power of capital in employing skill to invent and direct, and the absolute necessity of all our manufacturers having the wisdom to see the economy of purchasing the “newest and best machinery” at once, and the courage to put aside one set of machines as valueless directly a better is available. We want the people to understand the value of “thoughtful thrift,” “true economy”—to appreciate the aid machinery is to all, in its labour-saving power, alike for the benefit of the nation as the individual. It is surprising the increase of comfort in every household by the various articles now obtainable of domestic labour-saving machinery—inventions of many kinds for saving the work of the cook, the housemaid, and the laundry-maid. For the kitchen there are many patent cooking stoves and ranges, arrangements for doing away with the dangerous kitchen boiler, smokeless fuel, cooking utensils of American manufacture, very light, and said to be heat-proof and incorrodible. Look around us where we will, there is abundant evidence to show us, that the world we live in is a world of orderly movement, one of intelligible progress,

and hence one where the course of nature can be foreseen. This grand idea of "cause and effect" is equally true of human affairs. We find intelligible progress there—a steady, constant progress, and with seemingly no final bounds. A new era will begin when mankind realizes human life to be a continual effort towards a higher state; when men realize not only that society generally is advancing, but also the way by which it advances, can alone advance—by the struggle for a grander future, by the progress towards true ideas of "what is," by the human spirit grasping at last the truth of the "spirit of law," and putting into practice Montesquieu's conception of law in things social; we shall at last get a systematic saviour of society, once we get extended to society the notion of law, as invariable and unerring in its action as in the physical world. Without such a knowledge of social science, I defy any man, however talented, to be a maker of wise laws, which require that rare genius that combines the philosopher and the statesman. Social science is useless unless it issues in a real political art. Hume, with his great intellect, laid the basis of a complete scientific analysis of society; Adam Smith extended this method by his consummate review of the economic conditions. Nature's infallible remedy, "necessity," will compel us to understand and develop the "science of economics," by adopting the means how to make "nations wealthy" that Smith had the genius to discover. It is a sad disgrace to us that, 105 years after Smith had published his book, "Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," the mass of the people are as ignorant of the subject as they were before the book was published in 1776. It seems incredible that "England" should have sunk so low that, at a meeting held in Yorkshire in 1881, it was determined to appeal to the Princess of Wales to countenance by her example an effort to change the fashion in favour of Bradford goods. Think for a moment of the humiliation to us as an enlightened and practical people, yet so foolish as to think that an expedient in accord with the ideas prevalent in the middle ages could be attended with any permanent satis-

factory results to the manufacturing interests of a district like Bradford! To use Tennyson's beautiful couplet,

"For words, like nature, half reveal
And half conceal the soul within."

Such actions reveal the ignorance we are skilful enough by words to conceal. But nature is not to be trifled with; whether we recognize the fact or not, results will show that we have passed the time when royal support can be of any worth; the conception is degrading to our intelligence. Shall we never learn wisdom from the past? The importation of printed or stained calicoes excited the jealousy and apprehension of the weavers of woollen and silk fabrics; so, to pacify the weavers, an Act professedly "for the more effectually employing the poor, by encouraging the manufactures of the kingdom," was passed in 1699, prohibiting East Indian chintzes being worn here, and only allowing them admittance on condition of their being re-exported. But as love laughs at locksmiths, so nature defies amateur statesmanship. There being a demand for chintzes, capital and skill soon gave the supply; print works were established in or about London, and their productions, both by their cheapness and attraction, taking the public fancy, the weavers quickly found themselves in as bad a condition as before. In 1712 more tinkering legislation was resorted to, in the vain attempt to discourage by Act of Parliament the wearing of calicoes. The ancient weavers, like the modern Irish, knew the value of agitation, and they got an Act passed imposing a duty of 8*l.* per square yard on all printed calicoes, which was doubled in 1714. But the results, as we know now, thanks to Adam Smith, were not satisfactory to the weavers, whose claims caused the enactment in 1720 of a prohibition of all printed calicoes whatever, under a penalty of *£5* on the wearer and *£20* on the seller of each piece of such calico. This law was modified in 1730, when calicoes of linen warp and cotton weft were allowed to be printed, subject to a duty of 6*l.* per square yard, which was altered again in 1774, to admit the all-cotton calicoes of Arkwright.

The duty was at the same time reduced to 3d. a-yard, raised in 1806 to 3½d., and was only wholly repealed in 1831.

The lesson we have to learn from the past is, the absolute inutilty of trying to divert demand for an article by imposing prohibitions or duties thereon, so as to cause that demand to be supplied by another commodity which the legislation is intended to support. The only good result from such legislation is to help the parties over the ruinous transition state, by trying to check the current from flowing too suddenly into another channel. But every manufacturer—nay, every educated man—should know that he is subject to these changes of public caprice or fashion. Nothing is more capricious than the empire of this goddess, and the experience of every trader proves her potent influence to develop or check his trade. The “lucky” ones are those who possess a kind of intuition in discerning earliest the change in taste. It is useless to fight against her whims, as foolish as the old miniature portrait painters, who saw their incomes fade away because they would not enter the lists afresh as colourers of photographs, when their art was put aside by the sudden rush of public opinion in favour of sun-pictures. A few weeks or months often suffice to create a new, and starve out an old, industry. The art of glass-staining was in its perfection when the great foundations of Wykeham, Waynefleet, and Wolsey were made; but the outburst of Puritan iconoclasm quickly destroyed the profits and prospects of the trade, and it has been impossible to revive the art so destroyed. The Puritan revolution destroyed at a blow the business of all theatrical people, of the sculptors, painters, musicians, and pantomimists. The faster a nation progresses the quicker will be the changes in customs and fashions; manufacturers and tradesmen must watch more closely the mobile glances of the popular goddess, be always on the look-out for indications of change. Great fortunes are to be made by understanding how to cater for the foibles and weaknesses of humanity; large fortunes are soon lost by those who, being incompetent to perceive the impending change of styles, are in possession of large quantities of obsolete, and

therefore unsaleable, goods. It is useless to object to the power of the fickle goddess of fashion; the wise policy is to study her wants, and supply them. Bradford was busy when their bright-haired woollen and cotton mixed fabrics were so high in public favour; and if their goods have been displaced in the market by the thin all-wool dress goods of Roubaix and similar productions, it is quite obvious what Bradford capital and skill should do: viz., have their machinery altered, or buy such machinery as will produce what the public require. To say it cannot be done is childish; "impossible" is a word to be rejected with contempt. It is not the first time in the world's history that a staple branch of a nation's industry has been crippled by foreign competition, or been displaced by a material thought more of. Frankly, we must expect to suffer: we shall suffer, unless we, by technical schools, by museums of trade patterns, by promoting technical skill, and in similar crises as now exist at Bradford, offer at once a large reward to any one who will show how the rival product can be put into the loom and made as well or better, and at as low a price, or lower; or, better still, introduce a novelty of our own to supersede the other. These remedies will come naturally enough once we get rid of our defective system of technical education, or rather the entire absence of any system, and the apathy and ignorance of the majority of those engaged in manufacturing districts as to what is being done outside their own limited sphere. We must have a national museum of materials and designs, also of colour; our dyers are quite behind the age. Dr. Bader told me that when studying colour blindness, whilst from Berlin he got 4,000 shades of coloured wool, in England he could only get 400. We have a deal of trouble with the manufacturers we do with: an article sells: we re-order it; and it is surprising how many will excuse their own ignorance or want of attention, by telling you, as coolly as possible, that it is impossible to reproduce what has been produced. It is a mortifying reflection that, whilst the raw materials from which all coal-tar colours are made are produced in our

country, the finished and valuable colours are nearly all manufactured in Germany. The crude and inexpensive materials are exported by us to be converted into expensive colours that have to be bought by English dyers and calico printers for use in our staple industries. The cause is obvious enough: the success of Germany is due to the long-continued attention which their numerous universities have paid to the culture of organic chemistry as a pure science, and also to the general recognition amongst Germans of the value, from a merely mercantile point of view, of high scientific training. In proof of this, it may be mentioned that each of two of the largest German colour works employs no less than from twenty-five to thirty highly educated, scientific chemists, at salaries varying from £250 to £500 or £600 per annum. Some effort ought to be made to revive this branch of industry, and put it on a footing worthy of a manufacturing country. That it is not I have found in my own limited experience, having tested the colours of goods by acids and exposure to the atmosphere, and proved that chrome blacks will not stand either, and that indigo on chrome blacks is reckless waste, as a good copperas black without indigo will stand acid and atmospheric tests better than chrome with indigo; and that a copperas black, indigo-dyed, will never change colour. Yet, although I have put the results of my experience before manufacturers for years, the effort, so far, has been in vain; the dyers go on in their old way.

Mr. William H. Ablett presented a memorial to the Vice-President of the Council, some years back, in favour of the establishment of a Museum of Trade Patterns at South Kensington; but the idea turned out a failure. As usual, we made the exhibition a series of little shops, an advertising medium for pushing houses; the "educational" idea, the germ of the suggestion, was overlooked. We want museums for the studios to have the opportunity of attending to see what is being done best all over the world in each branch, with schools to train the hands and brains in the particular work they will have to do. We should be repaid by having in every industry well practised eyes and hands

ready to take up the newest ideas—how a rival material is made, how it can be put into the loom and copied, or be improved upon. All that is needed is the training beforehand, and the opportunity for experienced and practical men to see collections of goods in their own line, both native and foreign. In this way we generate fresh ideas, originate new combinations, get “novelties” of our own, and shut out in a legitimate manner—viz., by our superior skill in supplying the market with what it needs—rivals we are beginning to fear. Why? Because foreign countries have already done what I say should be done. At Mulhouse the examples of every year’s production of textile fabrics has been pronounced of the highest value in stimulating improvements in manufacture; and two or three years back it was said that Alsace excelled Manchester in the superiority of her high class prints, which were distinguished by taste, elegance, and originality of colouring. The question of technical education has become a “national one.” We need, and must have, permanent technical colleges and museums for fabrics and designs, for every branch of industry throughout the country. It is only by adopting boldly and freely this plan that Great Britain can retain her supremacy in the industrial world. To do this, we must enlarge the general intelligence, and strive in every way to improve and elevate British manufacturing skill. Bradford for dress goods, must be made equal, if not superior, to Roubaix; Spitalfields for silks and velvets, to Ronen; Coventry for ribbons, to Basle and Germany. The Scotch and Irish, who need to work in what is called the sewed muslin or embroidery trade, must recover their share again from Switzerland. If it is a disgrace for a general to lose a battle, it is, and should be considered, equally disgraceful to a town to be beaten in the struggle for a living—the struggle for life. We spend a large sum yearly in teaching people how to “kill”—the art of “legalized murder;” let us begin a new leaf, and use our brains in teaching the people “how to live;” educate brain, eye, and hand; aid the workmen in every branch of industry they depend upon for a living, to acquire the necessary

technical skill—a training that will aid English manufacturing progress. The time has come when we can only hold our own through the acquisition of technical skill by the industrial masses of the country.

Science has, to a large extent, released us from the paralyzing notion of fatality in things evil; but tyranny is a monster that never dies. It has passed into a proverb that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." And why? "Because the spirit of oppression is never destroyed, and, on its part, is sleeplessly vigilant." Who would have believed that the English people—whose passion for liberty is recorded in splendid pages of history, whose resolution to build on these islands a commonwealth of justice and freedom is written on every acre of its soil in their hearts' blood—would yet, in 1881-2, sanction "tyranny" under the guise of benevolence to put aside man's right to make his own contracts, and "law" once again to interfere between buyer and seller? Once more the Government are allowed to lock up the people as "suspects" without trial; and, instead of passing rules that will restrict a debate, they pass the "gag" law of "clôture" to suppress it, and leave the minority at the mercy of a majority. "Liberty!" what crimes are committed in thy name! The "caucus" dictates to the "Liberal" representatives; and in this land of freedom, in 1882, one who had the moral courage to vote according to his conscience was rebuked by the members of a "Liberal" Association, and warned, like a naughty boy, not to err again, or he would lose his seat at the next election. Englishmen must be sadly altered to allow their representatives to be degraded to "delegates of the Birmingham caucus." If the people want to retain their freedom, they must recollect that liberty means "freedom of thought" and liberty of speech; a member of Parliament, as their representative, voting according to his reason and conscience, and not as the mere puppet of a party.—the right of every individual to develop his nature, and do his duty to the best of his ability for himself and the community; True Liberalism will foster, but "Radicalism" must curb and stifle individual efforts.

I am astonished that men should voluntarily return to the "slavery of State control." Before it is too late, see the danger; be men; control your own lives; zealously guard your right to make your own contracts; shake off with contempt and loathing the accursed "paternal" authority of the Government; make your own future; live your own lives, unfettered by the "galling chains" of the law's control. Retain at all costs the right to think and act for yourselves, as men jealous of inheriting a blessed freedom wrung by your forefathers from the very "State" that is again trying to reduce you to vassalage, to enthrall you again in its meshes, under the guise of offering you a "pecuniary benefit" by protecting the weak from the strong. It is an attempt to lure you to destruction; it is asking you to sacrifice your liberty, your personal freedom. Put the tempter aside; tell the State, let the struggle be as hard as it may, you will fight the battle of life, and wrestle with Dame Fortune, however hostile and unpromising her attitude may be. Be too proud to accept "State patronage" even in the shape of "reduced rents;" and, instead of this piece of State quackery, put a stop to reckless waste and mismanagement alike by the State and the individual. It is surprising the "daily waste" in the shape of useless routine, that clings to and saps the strength of nations. The time has come for one and all to adopt the best and most economical system that is in operation, and make the same universal. Learn your business in its entirety, understand thoroughly all its technicalities, master all the details, watch their operation, improve where you can; and remember that there are causes for success and failure, that "if one man succeeds," others can; but it is only by passing through many a March storm. But be of good cheer, for spring—bright, happy spring—will come at last.

"Our doubts are traitors,
And make us lose the good we oft might win,
By fearing to attempt."

SHAKESPEARE.

PRODUCTION.

"Sow good seed, that those who follow
 Future blessings yet may reap,—
 Joy resound o'er hill and hollow
 When we all have gone to sleep.
 Germs of truth and knowledge gather
 On the varied ways we go;
 Know—the present is the father
 Of the future weal or woe."

J. M. PEACOCK.

"WHAT man hath done, man can do," should be your watchword; "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap," be your belief. Never look backward, except to learn the lesson of doing better to-day. Produce, produce all you are able to. Each man has a part to play; the past and the future are nothing in the face of the stern 'To-day!

"O brother man! In action, if thou strive
 By noble deeds to utter forth thy life,
 Better, like heaven silent, canst thou teach
 Than poet e'er can sing or prophet preach."

In production we see "cause and effect" in full operation; it implies a something produced, brought forth, or yielded, as the result of labour, physical or intellectual; as the product of land, the products of the season, the products of manufactures, of commerce or of art, the products of great and wise men. Wherever you trace propagation, there is a cause for the bringing forth, the giving birth to, the yielding after its kind, whether in animal or vegetable life; as the seas produce fish, the earth produces trees and grass, wheat produces an abundance of food, the clouds produce rain, vice produces misery, a good manufacturer produces excellent wares, money produces interest, capital wisely employed produces profit. Therefore, what we have to study is, how to produce from the seed we have

of every kind the greatest possible amount of yield, whether in the animal or vegetable kingdom, the arts, sciences, manufactures, money, &c.; in all, it is our duty to perform our work in such a manner as to realize by our mental and bodily labour, from the earth, from manufactures of every kind, in the production of art—briefly, to bring into being, to cause to exist,—the greatest possible “productive result” from that labour; honouring and valuing all and every kind of “productive labour,” and holding in contempt and scorn “unproductive” labour of every kind.

It is marvellous the power man has of extending and improving the process of production, from producing good crops, good wares, to bringing into being better animals, aye, and better human beings. The history of every nation shows those periods when nations have had to make heroic sacrifices, getting as an equivalent a larger production of great men, filled with the spirit produced from heroic achievement; they are the *products*, the births from body or mind filled with heroic, self-sacrificing enthusiasm.

Ours is the “utilitarian age,” in which, for the benefit of our fellows, it is our duty to study the laws of production, and so perform our work as to obtain the greatest possible product. Man is in want of textile fabrics. Dress is almost entirely made from textile materials. But there are numerous other purposes, as the preparation of our nocturnal resting-places, and table-linen for domestic purposes; the protection and decoration of our dwellings, as curtains, hangings, carpets, furniture covers, &c. As a rule, the various kinds of material have, in the course of time, evolved themselves for definite purposes; but the majority have been affected by the gigantic strides of industrial progress during this century. Sailcloth, with its simple requirements of firmness and tightness, linen for under-wear, all materials that only require thinness and tightness combined, cannot, apparently, be in any way better made than by the old simple cloth texture, and this kind of weaving remains as it used to be centuries ago. There is a better manufacture of the

yarn—weaving by machinery, bleaching, sizing, &c.; so that the mode of preparation has become more refined, without, however, changing much the principal feature of the fabrics. But when we come to all those articles that are used for the purpose of outer wear, be it for men or for women, all that serves for decoration and ornament, all that is subject to the varying taste and the ever-increasing requirements of succeeding periods, we see a marked difference and a great improvement, alike in material, style, and price, between 1850 and 1880. All those engaged in producing articles for the consumption of the millions must observe and obey more rigidly the law of continual change, not only as regards colours and style, but of external quality, the composition and kind of texture required by the age they live in. Bradford manufacturers have suffered terribly the last few years; why? Because they failed to see that the fashion was so to clothe the female figure as to show its natural shape, and their stiff-made goods not admitting of this, women were compelled to wear for their tight-fitting garments the soft, fleecy, hairy goods of French manufacture. When I entered the woollen trade, in 1844, coloured cloths were going out, but dressed goods—hard, unyieldable materials, from the black cloths, for frock-coats, to the “Devon” cloths, hard as a board,—were the only materials to be had. Fancy suitings were unknown, trouserings of a low or middle quality were quite the exception; the masses wore cords and moleskins. The “Elysian” overcoating, introduced about 1847-48, effected quite a revolution in overcoats; and Meltons, or unfinished cloths, in 1850-51 caused another change. Other materials followed in dry finished goods, and dressed goods gradually lost ground, until worsted coatings sent them out altogether, and the stiff, precise, formal, unpleasant cloths gave way to worsteds, elastics, home-spuns, &c.; and in 1882 we have a variety of style, colour, and material—everything that is conducive to improve the appearance in style, comfort, and ease in material, and at “any and every price.”

To “produce cheaply” is the law; so, unfortunately, competition as to price, and not competition as to quality or

excellence is the rule. At first, when showing these "low-priced" goods, it was quite common to have them put on one side in a contemptuous manner, as "rubbish;" but there is the undeniable fact, that all over the world it is the cheapest goods which are in greatest demand—that not enough of these can be produced; and every year, manufacturers, to keep their mills occupied, must study how to accomplish a cheaper, and still cheaper, production of goods. To effect this object, manufacturers must watch for, and obtain, the most economical machines to be had, and be ready to discard any machine they have in use if any other offers that will effect a saving, in economy of space required for manufacture, that will produce more quickly than any other process; the faster production causing a more rapid turn-over of their capital, therefore rendering less capital necessary, and consequently interest upon that capital; think over and save "time" in every detail,—not ready to take advantage of depression in trade to reduce the men's wages, or to put them on half-time, but anxious to increase their weekly wages, by adopting the best method and machinery extant for securing the greatest possible production by the skilful employment of each man's labour. As a rule, however, those machines are the "most economical" that are simple in construction and working, like the McNary machines, as they do not require skilled labour to work them, and a girl can attend to several machines with very little practice. These machines occupy very little space; a straight machine, 7ft. x 8ft., occupies a space of 12 feet square, and produces 2,000 square yards of cloth daily. Another point is to select those machines that reduce the waste of material to a minimum. Briefly, "economy"—a wise, true economy—must be the ruling principle in the minds of our manufacturers; a proper attention to this virtue, in the details of their daily duties, of produce and distribution, is essential to successfully compete with the keen and unsparring competition which now prevails. The consumer must also think more upon this subject, to enable him to obtain the great advantages that

are to be had in every branch of trade for ready money, if buyers will but take the trouble to find out and support those men willing to do them justice. "It is often the little foxes" that destroy the vines; so it is the "little expenses," the "little waste," here and there in the mill, warehouse, and household expenses, that keep it impoverished, and ultimately pull it down. In manufacturing, this is certain, no man can long hold his own who has not the wisdom to see that he has no alternative but to change his machinery *promptly* when an invention appears that will probably effect a revolution in his particular branch of industry. This principle is applicable to all engaged in production; their system must be the "most economical" in operation for them to produce satisfactorily, and to yield a profit. The art of weaving goes back to antiquity, but knitting is a much more recent invention, and the oldest historical records in regard to it do not go beyond the thirteenth century. Weaving gives to all articles a certain toughness; knitting, on the contrary, gives elasticity. Weaving is the simpler form—viz., the straight-line combination of two systems of threads: the chain, generally composed of several hundreds of threads laid one beside the other, and parallel to one another; and the warp, crossing at a right angle the threads of the chain, which are alternately raised and lowered. The simplest form of knitting, which can still be traced in all knitted fabrics, is by bending the thread and forming a mesh, through which another is made to pass, that serves to fix the other. From this fundamental difference there arise strongly marked characteristic differences between woven and knitted goods. As the chain and warp threads are extended during the process of manufacturing, and enter thus into the texture, woven materials generally possess little elasticity in the direction of length and width, corresponding to the direction of chain and warp. The contrary feature distinguishes the knitted fabric. As all the threads of which the material is composed are laying in curved lines, the stuff yields to the slightest stretching, and may be, indeed, drawn in every direction, but returns to its original form as soon as the drawing ceases.

Lee invented a knitting machine in 1589; but it was only a hundred years ago that an ingenious man hit upon the idea of applying the mesh system upon a certain number of chain threads laid beside each other, as on the weaving loom. He succeeded in thus continuing the adjacent threads, and producing a texture very firm and very elastic at the same time. By this mode a large quantity of knitted goods are at present made, chiefly those of all kinds, that are sold in pieces and by the yard. The tendency of our day is for comfort, ease; so that this method of knitting will steadily increase; besides, it has another advantage: it is more perfect. Both systems have the chain or warp as the basis of their operation, but from the moment the work is begun, knitting goes on every moment upon as many points as there are chain threads; whilst in weaving, there are numerous interruptions, to which are added great losses of time. These losses consist in the unavoidable sticking of the shuttle to the boxes, and of half the time used by the shuttle in making its journey. The work of the knitting loom being uninterrupted, it must therefore produce more than the weaving loom; that is to say, it transforms in an equal space of time a larger quantity of thread into goods. This advantage has only been appreciated of late years, which accounts for the "two textile domains" being in competition with each other, instead of working together, as they must in the future: inasmuch as the present power warp, used for knitting of equal width and nature, produces more than a weaving loom, yet the present construction only give 50 to 60 meshes a minute per needle; whereas the new invention of Mr. McNary increases the production to "200 meshes per minute," and must cause great changes in the web and weaving industry. We have here the key-note to "productive" progress, to the great material progress of the last century—"the making more of what we have." The McNary Loom achieves its rapid progress from a production of 60 to 200 meshes in a minute by the exceedingly ingenious combination of the known parts of the existing machines with the happy idea of "avoiding waste."

by using only the actual movements; that is to say, of completely dispensing with the wheels for causing and controlling the movements. It is a quality of perfect organism to be simple, and to fulfil this aim by the simplest means. This should be our aim with all machines; examine them, think over how to simplify their action, remove everything that impedes their action; do for machinery what the steel rail does for locomotion,—remove all friction that checks its progress, leave it free to do its utmost. The weaving loom, even in its most perfect form, is, in many respects, a most imperfect contrivance. In estimating the perfection of a machine, we must remember that what renders a machine a perfect organism in comparison to the human hand, and enables it to facilitate, to transmit, to multiply, and to replace the activity of the hand, is not only the possibility it is endowed with of performing the several movements more rapidly and lastingly than can be done by the hand, which is easily fatigued, but, above all, its almost unlimited capacity of performing simultaneously, or, at all events, in the shortest succession, complicated movements which the hand can only do one after the other. The most perfect machine is that which, at every moment of its activity, performs *all* functions necessary for the achievement of the work assigned to it. In spinning, the *metier fixe*, simultaneously spinning and winding up as it does, is the perfect machine in comparison to the fine spinning machine and the self-actor, which do this alternately.

The last few years afford a striking instance of the philosophy of those well-known lines :

“ There is a tide in the affairs of man
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune ;”

for, whilst some of the “old” manufacturers have had to employ their mills in making goods for other manufacturers, others, more keenly observant of the times, have been coining money; they have seen that the tide of fashion was in the direc-

tion of more elastic goods, and these shrewd weaving mill-owners at once gave all their attention to the web looms. Unless the weaving loom be improved, the web loom must create a revolution in textile fabrics. During the transition there will be a deal of suffering, but there is no evading nature's law of "the survival of the fittest." Changes are inevitable; without these, there could be no progress; and it behoves us all to think more of the law of development. Progress, in its various phases—moral, political, social—is a grand, if difficult, problem to solve, more especially as, through the gigantic progress achieved in the last decade, the bases of our judgment are continually being displaced; and statisticians—who are only just beginning to analyze the combinations of society by thorough examinations of industry, trade, and other arrangements in order to lay the basis of social reform—can hardly arrive at any other inference than that we are in a period of development and transition which warps our minds to definite judgments, and precludes efficient action at the present moment. It is, therefore, all the more important, under these circumstances, that questions of such wide bearing, and by which quite new horizons are disclosed, should be examined with becoming seriousness, and openly discussed, discarding that cheap and indolent antagonism to every innovation, which means to have done enough by turning away from the alleged injuriousness of a progress. However incommencing an innovation may be, nothing can be gained by hostility to it, and the wisest course to pursue is to reconcile yourself to it, and try to turn it to your best advantage. He who sets otherwise is being pushed aside, whilst he imagines he is pushing.

"But for our skill in manufactures, we should never have been able to carry on successfully the great war against Buonaparte" (Perry). No country, in ancient or modern times, has ever passed England in manufactures. The actual importance of the mineral and manufacturing industry may be summed up as follows:—

	Operatives.	Production.
Textile Factories	1,006,000	£190,000,000
Mines	475,000	66,000,000
Metals, Machinery, &c. ..	530,000	100,000,000
Liquors	100,000	148,000,000
Sundries	819,000	161,000,000
	<u>2,930,000</u>	<u>£665,000,000</u>

"What are all the treasures of Potosi or Mexico," says Michel Chevalier, "compared with the magnitude or the beneficent effects of British manufactures? The New World sent to Europe, in three centuries, about £1,240,000,000 sterling of gold and silver, say £4,000,000 per annum. The cotton factories of England produce twenty times as much yearly!"

The following table shows the growth of motive power in the mills of the United Kingdom:—

	Steam.	Water.	Total.
1838 ..	75,083 horse-power	27,900	102,983 horse-power.
1861 ..	375,200	27,800	402,500
1876 ..	2,000,000

It would require 50,000,000 of workmen to supply the place of the above 2,000,000 horse-power.

Ruskin has said that "England's sons are England's jewels; and as with a jewel, so with a man, his future worth depends to a great extent upon the way those who have to do the cutting and polishing execute their work, for the more carefully this is done, the more likely he is to shine in the world." It is surprising so little is done to increase the "productive" power of mankind—to make use of the latent power within every human soul, so as to enable each to "produce," for the benefit of all, to the utmost of his power; instead of which, in any difficulty, the problem is solved by "trying" to do without the labour, and introducing a "machine" to do his work. Machinery is essential to our very existence, but it would be more valuable, as it would be more satisfactory, if, instead of being introduced to displace the men, it were an outcome of their own efforts, their own good sense showing them the universal benefit through its aid.

Machinery has not lowered, but raised wages, directly and indirectly; but, side by side with increased wages, the men require to be educated up to their income, and to understand the value of money; as it does a man no good, either morally or economically, to raise his income without at the same time "educating" him up to his income, for the less educated he is in comparison to his possessions, the less good are his possessions likely to be either to himself or any one else.

The great difference between savage and civilized communities is, that the former only produce for the present, for their own immediate wants; whereas the latter produce all they possibly can, and extract from the soil, the mines, manufactures, an enormous mass that will maintain, besides the actual producers, a large number of other labourers, occupied in producing conveniences and luxuries of innumerable kinds, or in transporting and distributing them from place to place. Besides the labourers, there is a multitude of persons employed in directing and superintending the varied labours, and also a large class whose occupations are of a kind not directly productive, and of persons who have no occupation at all. By the modern system, sufficient is raised not only to support a larger population than ever existed before, but to support them in a more satisfactory manner, and also to support them with a certainty from those periodically recurring famines that were so abundant in the early history of Europe. The greater quantity and better quality of food, clothing, and household comforts are not confined to a small and opulent class; but can be traced through many widening strata in society; and there can be no doubt of what the last half-century has done for bettering the condition of the lowest of all.

The progress made is self-evident if we compare the collective resources of England, Germany, France, America, or any great country, with what it could do fifty years ago; The ability to maintain fleets and armies; to execute public works, to found colonies, to perform national acts of beneficence, to have its people taught—briefly, to do anything which requires expense,

—shows the power of production to be immense, in enabling the people of our day to bear such great outlays, with no sacrifice of the necessaries, or even the substantial comforts, of its inhabitants. As with individuals, so with nations, they vary; some make a more complete use of their productive resources, and obtain, relatively to their means, a larger produce than others. This arises not only from a wiser use of their productive power, but also from their better means of distributing the same. But the production of wealth—that is, the extraction of the raw material for food and manufactures of all kinds, that are necessary for the subsistence, as they are essential for the advancement, of mankind—is a subject too little understood or thought about. Why? Because, as yet, the people have not been trained to believe that there are causes for the riches and poverty of the individual and of the nation, in the past as in the present; and that to create more wealth, or to keep the wealth we have already, the time has now arrived in our history when we should understand more thoroughly the laws of production. Production requires the raw material, and the labour and skill to utilize it. There can be no progress, no existence, without labour by some one. In early times, though there were fruit, roots, wild honey, fish, game, &c., to support life, and no labour required to create, still labour was needed to find and appropriate, and fish and animals had to be killed and cooked. Labour, therefore, in all ages, at all times, has been essential to man's existence; and as the race has multiplied, mental labour has had to be added; it is the superior power directing the inferior, the soul or mind directing the body. What the brain has done for us may be conceived if we look at a piece of mineral substance as found in the earth, and compare it with a plough, an axe, or a saw; or if we look at porcelain and the decomposing granite of which it is made, or a piece of glass and sand mixed with seaweed. We ought to think more highly than we do of what we owe to our predecessors, when we look at the fleece of a sheep, or a handful of cotton seed, and recall to our minds the study and labour that must have been undergone

by "some one" before the result we have the benefit of—viz., cotton cloth and woollen cloth—was obtained. What years of anxious toil had to be undergone—what care, skill, and labour have still to be undergone—to obtain the immense quantity of what is called the "natural material!" as if sheep and seed were spontaneous growths, instead of the reward of thriftd and wisely directed labour. Man could not exist without "progress." Imagine our position now if we had, as in early times, to convert our flour into corn by pounding it between two stones; or the next step in advance, which enabled men, by turning a handle, to make one of the stones revolve upon the other: the muscular exertion being so great, that it was often selected as a punishment for slaves who had offended their masters! But "time," the great reformer, proved at last that even the labour and suffering of slaves was worth economizing; and when their time could be more profitably employed, it was contrived by the brain of man that the upper stone should be made to revolve upon the lower, not by human strength, but by the force of the wind or of falling water. So wind or the gravitation of the water was made to do a portion of the work previously done by labour. This simple illustration gives the key to all "progress."

Civilization means "increased production" by a wiser use of the means at our disposal, and facilities for the distribution of the same at the least possible cost to the market where that produce is most required. To make progress, we need a greater knowledge of our own power; also, of what that power really is. It may be said to consist in the power to grasp facts, to accurately observe, to act always as if in obedience to a higher and superior being. For instance, a workman takes a stalk of the flax or hemp plant, splits it into separate fibres, and twines together several of these fibres with his fingers, aided by a simple instrument called a spindle; having thus formed a thread, he lays many such threads side by side, and places other similar threads directly across them, so that each passes alternately over and under those which are at right angles to it; this part of the process

being facilitated by an instrument called a shuttle. He has now produced a web of cloth, either linen or sackcloth, according to the material. Man is too apt to assume that *he* has done this, forgetting that the "product" is owing mainly to the tenacity, or force of cohesion, of the fibres of the material; and in this, as with every so-called action of man upon nature, we shall find that it is the "properties of the matter" that do all the work, man being simply the agent employed by the Creator to put objects into certain positions, and thereby obtain the desired result. We are accused of being atheists, of wanting to destroy man's reverence for, and worship of, his Creator. Is it so? Read and think for yourself. Is not our work more calculated to teach man what his mission really is, and realize what a splendid work is at his hand, what a glorious future before him, if he would but do his duty thoroughly, and render unto Cæsar that which is Cæsar's? Natural religion is ridiculed by all sects, yet in nature we have what no theological sect has ever yet had—daily proof of the "Living God," evidence in every act of life of His infinite wisdom and justness. We need to alter the prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," to one of thankfulness, that with so bountiful a hand the Creator has supplied us with all we need, if we will but exercise our physical and mental faculties to obtain what we require. Supplication for help is not only an error, it is a sin; the truly religious mind will see that the "want" arises from his own shortcomings; if he appeals for help, it will be for more zealously to do his own part, not in asking God to do it for him. Man will never be happy until he feels within him a proper sense of thankfulness and joy for the blessings within his grasp. We should be more humble, more reverential, if we reflected more upon the contrast between the Creator and the created. The marvellous foresight, the wonderful economy of producing great ends by small means, the utility in this world of the most insignificant agent, is well shown by the great man who has recently left us, and to whom we owe so much for "The Origin of Species," &c., &c.: "Worms prepare the ground in excellent manner for the growth of fibrous-

rooted plants, and for seedlings of all kinds. They periodically expose the mould to the air, and sift it so that no stones larger than the particles which they can swallow are left in it. They mingle the whole intimately together, like a gardener who prepares fine soil for his choicest plants. In this state it is well fitted to retain moisture, and to absorb all soluble substances, as well as for the process of nitrification. The bones of dead animals, the harder parts of insects, the shells of land molluscs, leaves, twigs, &c., are, before long, all buried beneath the accumulated castings of worms, and are then brought, in a more or less decayed state, within reach of the roots of plants. Worms likewise drag an infinite number of dead leaves and other parts of plants into their burrows, partly for the sake of plugging them up, and partly as food. The leaves which are dragged into the burrows as food, after being torn into the finest shreds, partially digested, and saturated with the intestinal and urinary secretions, are commingled with much earth. This earth forms the dark-coloured, rich humus which almost everywhere covers the surface of the land with a fairly well-defined layer or mantle. Van Heuzen placed two worms in a vessel eighteen inches in diameter, which was filled with sand, on which fallen leaves were strewed; and these were soon dragged into their burrows to a depth of three inches. After about six weeks, an almost uniform layer of sand, a centimetre (four inches) in thickness, was converted into humus by having passed through the alimentary canals of these two worms. It is believed by some persons that worm burrows, which often penetrate the ground almost perpendicularly to a depth of five or six feet, materially aid in its drainage,—notwithstanding that the viscid castings piled over the mouths of the burrows prevent or check the rain-water directly entering them. They allow the air to penetrate deeply into the ground. They also greatly facilitate the downward passage of roots of moderate size; and these will be nourished by the humus with which the burrows are lined. Many seeds owe their germination to having been covered by castings; and others, buried to a considerable depth beneath accumulated castings, lie dormant until, at some

future time, they are accidentally uncovered and germinate." ("Earthworms:" C. DARWIN.) What immense results by apparently so poor an instrument! But it is by reflecting on what these, to us, "insignificant agents" are able to produce, that we get some idea of the Creator's power; and the lesson it teaches us is plain enough—what we might do if we thoroughly and earnestly strove to do our duty, and did not waste our powers in acting contrary to, instead of in obedience to, the laws of nature.

We under-estimate the value to mankind of the "inventor," the creator of a process by his thought and experiments, that enables us to make human labour ten times more productive than by its own efforts it could ever be. In fact, without the aid of inventive genius, it would be impossible for mankind to exist; it is labour in the highest sense. The labour of Watts in contriving the steam-engine was as essential a part of production as that of the mechanics who build, or the engineers who work the instrument, and was undergone, no less than theirs, in the prospect of a remuneration from the produce. The labour of invention is often estimated and paid for on the very same plan as that of execution. Many manufacturers of ornamental goods have inventors in their employment who receive wages for designing patterns, exactly as others do for copying them. In fancy trades, it is wise forethought to have the most efficient skill that can be obtained to design or select; and it should be recognized as the "highest class" of labour, as, without its aid, the aid of the other labourers would often not be required at all. In a national sense, the labour of the speculative thinker is as much a part of production as that of the inventor; many inventions having been the direct consequence of theoretic discoveries, and every extension of knowledge of the powers of nature being fruitful of application to the purposes of outward life. The electro-magnetic telegraph was the wonderful and most unexpected consequence of the experiments of Ørsted and the mathematical investigations of Ampère; and the modern art of navigation is an unforeseen emanation from the purely speculative and

apparently merely curious inquiry, by the mathematicians of Alexandria, into the proportions of three curves formed by the intersection of a plane surface and a cone.

"Thought" and "thinkers" put labour into its proper channels, and if men would look beyond the surface, and think less of the daily labourer, and more of those who set that labour to motion, intellectual speculation would be recognized and acknowledged as a most influential part of the productive labour of society; and the nation would see that the portion of its resources employed in carrying on and in reconstructing such labour is a highly productive part of its expenditure. Physicians and doctors are popularly regarded as needless evils, but a little thought will show us they belong to the class of productive labour. For instance, every human being has been brought up at the expense of much labour or cost to some person or persons; this rearing of its population is a kind of seed-sowing by the community, to be reaped with increase from the future produce of their labour. Any labour, therefore, that is employed in keeping up the productive power, in preventing it from being destroyed or weakened by accident or disease, is indirectly productive. Although it is not from economical motives that a person has a limb amputated, or endeavours to be cured of a fever, still, from the political economist's, viz. the national and national-point of view, the labour of a physician or surgeon must be regarded, in the economy of society, as a sacrifice incurred to preserve from perishing by death in individuality that portion of the productive resources of society, which is fixed in the lives and bodily or mental powers of its productive members. So that if the mill, the factory, the warehouse cannot get on without managers, and if the harrow, the sowing machine, though indispensable to produce a crop, does not, in the technical sense, "produce," yet it is a direct producer, so, also, is the labour of the physician, teacher, domestic servant; in fact, all who are engaged in doing a something, and without whose labour the "productive result" would be less, and really "productive labourers," and do not deserve to be classed with "the impro-

ductive" members of society, whilst that expression is synonymous with wasteful or worthless. Production is a misnomer; man has not the power to produce—that is to say, to create; all the thought and labour of all the human beings in the world could not produce or create a particle of matter. To weave broadcloth is but to rearrange, in a peculiar manner, the particles of wool. What you have to do is to consider those to whom you are most indebted—the men who, by observation and reflection, ascertain the properties of things, and show to mankind how to make useful what has been useless. Are these thinkers and inventors, and the skilled directors of labour, to hold the highest place, or are the mechanic and labourer to be all in all? Productive labour means labour productive of wealth. "Brains *versus* limbs" as a wealth-creator, is strikingly exemplified in the lace trade; Heathcote's machinery has been of such utility that Nottingham now produces more than the whole of Europe.

	Hands.	Production.	Per Head.
Nottingham	10,500	£6,120,000	£583
European Continent ..	535,000	5,780,000	11

Comment is superfluous; but the example is a twofold lesson to us: firstly, as to the relative value, to a commercial and manufacturing nation, of inventors, skilled directors, and labourers; secondly, at a period of manufacturing and commercial depression, instead of reverting to obsolete restraints upon production and distribution, the lesson is plain—"Go thou, and do likewise;" find out how to "produce something cheaper and better." If you cannot beat others in one direction, find out other channels where you can. There is the fact, at Nottingham they are simply coining money; but let us render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and give the merit to the inventor of the machines that enable them to do so. But to do so needs the necessary capital to have made and to buy the machinery. Capital is as essential an element of production as labour, as it is capital that affords the shelter, protection, tools,

and materials which the work requires, and to feed and otherwise maintain the labourers during the process of production. To acquire, to save, to have capital to work with, is what present labour requires from the produce of past labour. Capital is as necessary for productive labour as coal to make a fire. To produce, we want buildings, machinery, material, food, and clothing for the producer; at each part of the operation the capitalist is necessary.

The march of civilization has been, in the present century, to some degree identified with the progress of manufactures. The industries that now occupy 12,500,000 workmen in Europe were in their infancy at the period of Waterloo, and since that time the countries most advanced in manufactures have been the most prosperous. If we sum up all branches of manufactures (including mining), we find the result as follows:—

	Operatives.	Production.	Per Operative.
United Kingdom	2,930,000	£605,000,000	£224
France	1,976,000	416,000,000	220
Germany	2,731,000	296,000,000	103
Russia	1,500,000	167,000,000	106
Austria	1,100,000	130,000,000	120
Low Countries	1,130,300	217,000,000	100
Spain and Portugal	610,000	71,000,000	119
Italy	890,000	47,000,000	108
Scandinavia	220,000	20,000,000	90
Europe	12,647,000	£1,993,000,000	£157
United States	2,700,000	846,000,000	312
Colonies, &c.	200,000	50,000,000	100
Total	15,547,000	£3,894,000,000	£260

Of the textile manufactures, employing 3,500,000 workmen, and representing one-fourth of the total value, cotton and wool have by turns held the foremost place; at present they are about equal. The cotton crop of the world reaches 3,100,000,000 lbs., of which the United States produce two-thirds; the other third comes from India, Brazil, and Egypt. The actual number of spindles employed in the cotton trade is 70,000,000, employing 1,230,000 operatives, viz.—

	Operatives.	Spindles.	Spindles to Operatives.
Great Britain	480,000	40,000,000	83
United States	160,000	10,500,000	66
France	210,000	5,000,000	24
Germany	130,000	6,000,000	46
Russia	180,000	3,500,000	20
Switzerland, Austria, India	250,000	5,000,000	20
	<u>1,380,000</u>	<u>70,000,000</u>	<u>51</u>

From the above may be seen the superior efficiency of English operatives, who show twice as many spindles per head as on the Continent, and 25 per cent. more than in the United States. The number of operatives engaged in woollen mills is only two-thirds of that engaged in cotton. The woollen clip has quintupled since 1830, when it was 320,000,000 lbs.; in 1878 it was 1,586,000,000 lbs. In recent years there has been a reduction in the silk manufactures of France and England, as other countries have, begun to make for themselves; so that out of 506,000 operatives, France has 170,000, Great Britain 46,000; the remaining 290,000 are in Germany, Russia, Austria, &c., and produce £14,000,000 for themselves, France £28,000,000, Great Britain £8,000,000. For linen goods, Russia grows half the flax, and the factories of Great Britain consume one-third of what is grown in the world. Ireland was, for more than a century, the chief seat of linen manufactures; but the operatives so long resisted the introduction of machinery, that other countries, especially Scotland, soon left her in the background.

Summing up the textile industries of the world, we find as follows:

	Operatives.	Production.	For Operative.
Great Britain	1,006,000	£196,000,000	£195
Continent	2,013,000	335,000,000	167
United States	410,000	82,000,000	200
	<u>3,429,000</u>	<u>£613,000,000</u>	<u>£180</u>

Textile industry constitutes nearly one-fourth of the manufactures of the age, and is progressing faster than any other pro-

ductive occupation. Forty years ago, Great Britain produced two-thirds of the total dry stock of the world; at present her manufactures are only one-third, although her factories turn out twice as much as in 1840:—

	Cotton Consumed.	Wool Consumed.	Total.
1840 ..	554,000,000 lbs.	128,000,000 lbs.	722,000,000
1877 ..	1,186,000,000 „	206,000,000 „	1,552,000,000

The increased production has caused a great reduction in price, thereby extending the field of consumption. Improved machinery has the same beneficial effect; and so the condition of the masses must improve, as every year the world is raising more wool and cotton. The invention of railways and the building of iron vessels have caused the production of iron to treble in the last thirty years. In this branch of industry we still hold the supremacy, but it is gradually being lessened:—

	1850.	1877.
Great Britain ..	2,250,000 tons	5,603,000 tons.
Rest of the World ..	2,110,000 „	7,065,000 „
	<u>4,360,000 tons.</u>	<u>13,778,000 tons.</u>

When Mr. Bolton, of the Machine Works at Soho, was asked what he sold, he replied, "I sell here what men most covet—power!" In effect, the adoption of machinery and steam has given mankind an accession of power beyond calculation. Steam power multiplies indefinitely the forces of a nation, and in this respect Great Britain is ahead of the rest of the world, and, to maintain her position must ever "keep in advance." It is hardly fifty years since Mr. Scott Russell was told that "to build iron ships was contrary to nature;" in 1878, the iron vessels built were of 380,000 tons, the wooden vessels only 176,000 tons. "Economy" has also been introduced, not only in the saving of time, but in the use of fuel. Instead of 117 tons of coal per day, the Emma steamers now burn only 66 tons. "Fire engines" has helped us here; while our "skyscrapers" are building, vessels for the world, the number of workmen in the steamboat yards of New York fell from 15,000 in 1850 to 770 in 1870.

DISTRIBUTION.

THE laws as to the production of wealth are physical truths to be ascertained and observed; mankind must understand and feel that there is nothing optional or arbitrary in them. Whatever mankind produces must be produced in the modes and under the conditions imposed by the inherent proportions of their own bodily and mental structure. Whether they like it or not, as J. S. Mill says, "their production will be limited by the amount of their previous accumulation; and, that being given, it will be proportional to their energy, their skill, the perfection of their machinery, and their judicious use of the advantages of combined labour. Whether they like it or not, a double quantity of labour will not raise, on the same land, a double quantity of food, unless some improvement takes place in the processes of cultivation. Whether they like it or not, the unproductive expenditure of individuals will, *pro tanto*, tend to impoverish the community, and only their productive expenditure will enrich it. The opinions or the wishes which may exist on these different matters do not control the things themselves. We cannot, indeed, foresee to what extent the modes of production may be altered, or its powers increased, by further knowledge of the laws of nature, suggesting new processes of industry of which we have at present no conception. But howsoever we may succeed in making for ourselves more space within the limits set by the constitution of things, those limits exist; there are ultimate laws, which we did not make, which we cannot alter, and to which we can only conform." Distribution is quite the opposite; it is solely a matter of human institution; the produce being there, it is for mankind to use their faculties and adopt the best method for its disposal wherever needed in the cheapest and most expeditious manner possible.

Individual agency is always the most suitable, working, as it

does, with so much greater intensity of motive when the motive is personal, and with that feeling of individual power, and prompt decisive action, impossible to a society of traders, with directors and shareholders interfering. But it is often asked, as the "smaller men" are being swept away, from the necessity of doing the larger trade our times require, "How are individuals to start in business as heretofore?" As individuals, they cannot; but, as an association of individuals, they can. The idea of the future is not that of "companies," using other people's money, but a company made up of working partners, using their own capital, and superintending their own business; it means a joining together of the capital, skill, and labour of two, four, six, eight, or more men, according to the magnitude of the undertaking. This is certain: the retail prices in every trade must inevitably, sooner or later, be influenced by competition. In the past, the benefit of competition has been lost, to a great extent, by the small trade done by the bulk of men in all trades, thereby necessitating a rate of profit for them to live by that has kept prices up, and also enabling the few firms in every trade that could command a large turn-over to make large fortunes; so that prices to the consumers have been considerably enhanced by the gain of the distributors. The system has been too costly; but the "parcel post," by giving rapidity and cheapness of transport, will make customers less dependent on the local traders, and must assimilate the whole country to a large town, and the benefit of competition in retail transactions will be gradually felt more and more by the whole community.

Distribution, how performed, and at what cost, is a very important question to a nation like ours, where each individual, for the most part, lives not on things in the production of which he himself has borne a part, but by a system of purchase and sale, and it is essential for the benefit of all and every one that the facilities of purchase and sale be the very best possible for the purposes. For instance, an article is to be had in a large town for 10s., that at the suburbs or provinces, or at yonder at a little distance from a five copacation, would cost

12s.; when a 7 lb. parcel can be had from London the following morning for 1s., the dread of competition would compel the local trader to take 11s., or enable the local purchaser to be independent of the higher, because smaller, trader. The prices we have to pay for articles depend on the "command of the market, the facilities for distribution" given us in any locality. We want a system of distribution that would enable purchasers in every part of the kingdom to get the very best value to be had in exchange for their money; and this would soon come if people used their brains, and intelligent perception looked through their eyes at the articles they were buying. We want all consumers to "think more of their own interests;" so that if the price of meat, poultry, fish, vegetables, bread, leather, wool, &c., &c., should fall, there will be a combined action to cause the benefit to be realized by the buyer, instead of the seller. The "tradesman" who neglects to "buy in the cheapest market" is punished by the greater difficulty in disposing of what he has to sell, for there is no disputing the old proverb, that "a thing well bought is half sold." Price, however, is but one element: an article may be good market value, yet not salable; judgment is necessary in selecting the articles that are in demand at the time, as they sell the more readily, and great care, in passing the goods selected, to see that they are sound, and will do credit to the seller by the user or wearer, for by this final test a business must ultimately stand or fall.

Distribution is of great service to the State; but, like every thing else, it should be had at the price it is worth. There would be no inducement to produce articles unless facilities existed for distributing those articles to those for whom they were intended. In England there is a great amount of labour employed in rendering the things produced accessible to consumers. There is the large class of carriers, by land or water; railways, clerks, porters, carmen, sailors, wharfmen, waggoners, coal-heavers; the construction of the implements or vehicles of transport, locomotives, ships, barges, waggons, railways, roads,

and canals; merchants and traders of all kinds; all necessary, and rendering good service to the State. Think for a moment how impracticable it would be, besides the great waste of time and trouble, if consumers could only obtain the articles they wanted by treating directly with the producers. They are too wide apart. Each buyer could not go to Newcastle for his coals, to Yorkshire for his cloth, to Manchester for his calico, to America for his cotton, or to Australia for his wool. As society grew, in order to diminish this loss of time and labour, fairs and markets were had recourse to, where consumers and producers periodically met, without any intermediate agency; and the plan answered well for a time, especially for agricultural produce, agriculturists having at certain seasons of the year spare time on their hands. But as population increased, as the towns grew, it was soon found to be very inconvenient to buyers at a distance or to those employed in trades or manufactures which needed regular application; and another drawback was that these markets or fairs were held at considerable intervals, and the wants of the consumer had to be provided for so long beforehand, or remain unsupplied, that even before the establishment of shops, the supply of many of the wants of society fell into the hands of itinerant dealers, the pedlar or hawker, who appeared once a month, whereas the fair was held only once or twice a year. In time the wholesale dealer appeared in manufacturing towns, who bought in large quantities of the makers, who attended on market day with what they had to sell, and who held stocks for the retailer to buy from as his stock needed sorting up. At present the tendency is to do away with the wholesale merchant, and to bring manufacturers and retailers together without the third person—an inevitable result, as the retailer, in order to succeed, he is now to hold as large a stock, and to make as large a turn-over, as the wholesale merchant of twenty years since; so that there is not the same necessity for a third person in the transaction, and distribution should be conducted on the most economical basis. There is no better system than for the manufacturer to produce at the minimum, by means of the best machinery and

most highly skilled labour at his command, and to dispose of his produce to the retailer in bulk, so as to enable the consumer to buy of the distributing trader at the least possible addition to the manufacturer's price, to cover the cost of distribution—an addition to the cost that would be incurred by the manufacturer if he had to keep a warehouse, stock, and staff in readiness to supply consumers in small quantities instead of in bulk. The present system is really "cheaper" to the consumer, for if the manufacturer supplied direct to the consumer, the latter would have to go to the market, and lose the advantage of our present system—shops for everything, in every locality, where he can get what he wants as he requires. Tailors, shoemakers, bakers, and others, produce the articles they deal in, so far as regards the last stage in the production; but this union of the functions of manufacturer and retailer is only expedient or economical when the article can be advantageously made at or near the place convenient for retailing it, and is, besides, manufactured and sold in small parcels. It is found by experience that even boots and shoes, when required in large quantities, are to be obtained cheaper from a dealer than from a manufacturer, as it is the dealer's business to ascertain from what producer at any particular time the best value is to be had. And this is an important consideration when thinking of the value of the distributing class of traders. If the consumer had to buy of any manufacturer direct, it would be impossible for him to go to a dozen manufacturers to ascertain where the best value was to be had, and we are justified in assuming that the manufacturer would benefit by his ignorance. But it is the "trader's business" to know the state of the market, to know what article each maker does better than his competitor, to get the best value he can for his customers, by causing each manufacturer to compete with his rivals; to use, in fact, in every legitimate manner, that powerful weapon, "competition," in compelling each to give the utmost possible in exchange for the money all so urgently need.

An equally important element in the science of distribution is

the facility for distribution of large and small parcels. Very few comprehend the value to a country of "cheap carriage of goods" from place to place, not only by the railway, but to and from the railway station; yet it will often counterbalance in commercial exchange what is called a "natural disadvantage," more especially in that early stage of industry in which labour, and science have not yet provided artificial means of communication. In the ancient world, and in the middle ages, the most prosperous communities were not those which had the largest territory or the most fertile soil, but rather those which had been forced by natural sterility to make the utmost possible use of a convenient maritime situation; as Athens, Tyre, Marseilles, and the rice cities on the Baltic. Mill truly remarks: "But experience testifies that natural advantages scarcely ever do for a community, no more than fortune and station do for an individual, anything like what it lies in their nature or in their capacity to do. The greatest advantages gratuitously bestowed generally become disadvantages. Neither now nor in former ages have the nations possessing the best climate and soil been either the richest or the most powerful; but (in so far as regards the mass of the people) generally among the poorest, though, in the midst of poverty, probably on the whole the most enjoying. Human life in those countries can be supported on so little that the poor seldom suffer from anxiety; and in climates in which mere existence is a pleasure, the luxury which they prefer is that of repose. Energy, at the call of passion, they possess in abundance but not that which is manifested in sustained and persevering labour; and as they seldom concern themselves enough about remote objects to establish good political institutions, the incentives to industry are further weakened by imperfect protection of its fruits. Successful production, like vast other kinds of success, depends more on the qualities of the human agents than on the circumstances in which they work; and it is difficulties, not facilities, that nourish bodily and mental energy. Accordingly, the tribes of mankind who have overrun and conquered others, and compelled them to labour for their

benefit, have been mostly reared among hardships. They have either been bred in the forests of northern climates, or the deficiency of natural hardships has been supplied, as among the Greeks and Romans, by the artificial ones of a rigid military discipline. From the time when the circumstances of modern society permitted the discontinuance of that discipline, the South has no longer produced conquering nations; military vigour, as well as speculative thought and industrial energy, have all had their principal seat in the less favoured North."

"Progress" needs individuals and races able and willing to work thoroughly and earnestly for a distant object. Most men will work under strong immediate incentives, but the English and the Anglo-Americans surpass every other people in the thoroughness of their application with their ordinary work, and in their capacity of present exertion on behalf of the future. It is a characteristic of the English. Not only in those who work with the desire to become rich, or to get on in the world, but in those who never think of saving or improving their condition, we find the same national steadiness and persistency of labour. It is the habit of the country, so much so that the majority have no life but in their work; that alone stands between them and *ennui*. There are, of course, a minority who are alive to some of the nobler instincts of humanity; but the majority work, eat, drink, and sleep—such is life to them. Climate has something to do with it, but the teaching of ages, that treats this world as "a valley of tears," that regards "enjoyment of life" as a temptation and a snare, has checked the development of the senses, and few of us can enjoy mere existence in repose—in contemplation of the wonderful works and beauties of surrounding nature, and scarcely any pleasure or amusement is pleasure or amusement to us. No nation in the world more needs to be taught the "use of wealth," and, above all, an appreciation of the objects of desire which wealth cannot purchase, or for attaining which it is not required. To improve the national character, "life" must be viewed from a different standpoint; our people must have put before them

not only higher aspirations, but more vigorous and better pleasures—anything that will divert their minds and moderate the all-engrossing torrent of their industrialism. Do not misunderstand me; my object is not to diminish, but to increase, the thoroughness of effort, the strenuous and business-like application to the matter in hand; not only their heart, as it is said, but their "brain," in their work; to produce and do all they are able to do during the hours of labour, and to do it "efficiently," from a sense of duty alike to their employers, the people, and themselves,—to labour with all their might of body and brain; but, for this devotion to labour, to have a higher object in view than mere pecuniary gain, to have a higher opinion of life and of their mission here. This is self-evident,—that the mind of the labourer of a people is limited by their knowledge of the arts of life, but that any progress in these arts, any improved application of the objects or powers of nature to industrial uses, enables the same quantity and intensity of labour to raise a greater produce.

The time has come when our labourers must cease to be mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water." No doubt the English workman, in respect to the work for which he has been specially trained, is skilful. As a workman, therefore, for doing the particular thing his life has been consecrated to, he is superior to all others. In the creation of a steam-engine, he will understand that, and nothing else; and in other circumstances or other branches of mechanics, however closely allied, he will be comparatively helpless to adapt himself to all the contingencies that may arise, to make arrangements for them, and give sound advice, or write clear statements and letters on his work to the various related branches of mechanics. The Franco-German War demonstrated that the time has gone by to treat the soldier as a mere machine; to succeed, the commander needs an intelligent appreciation of, and hearty co-operation with, his efforts. So it is in manufacturing and commercial life; in every branch of production and distribution, we want the "economy of efficiency," the

maximum of result from the minimum of outlay; and this is only to be obtained by the intelligent and willing co-operation of *all* engaged therein. We owe much to invention, and have machinery in use exerting forces too great for human power, and executing operations too delicate for human touch. Without pumps, worked by steam-engines or otherwise, the water which collects in mines could not in many situations be got rid of at all, and the mines, after being worked to a little depth, would have to be abandoned. Without ships or boats, the sea could never have been crossed; without tools of some sort, trees could not be cut down, nor rocks excavated; a plough, or at least a spade, is necessary to any tillage of the ground. From the most simple and rude instruments, man, by using his brains, has steadily, by degrees, got machinery that enables him to do his work in greater perfection. There is still scope for improvement in the machines and the men who use them, for greater perfection in the work done, and the obtaining greater production with a diminished quantity of human labour; and there is still plenty of scope for the labour thus saved being used in other employment. Not only in machinery has the brain been useful; observation and reflection enabled man, by rotation of crops, to avoid the necessity of leaving the land uncultivated for one season in every two or three, and, by improved manures, to renovate its fertility when exhausted by cropping; the conversion of bogs and marshes into cultivable land; pruning, training, and propping up of plants and trees; planting the seeds or roots further apart, and more completely pulverizing the soil in which they are placed. In production and distribution, economy of material, economy of time, getting the goods finished more quickly, so as to get a more rapid turn-over upon the outlay and labour, are the essential points to aim at.

“Steam locomotion is a special feature of the nineteenth century. The same year, 1802, that saw the first steamer on the Clyde, was that in which Trevithick and Vivian obtained a patent for driving coaches by steam. It was not, however, until 1825 that the first railway for passengers was opened from

Stockton to Darlington, which proved so successful that in five years nearly 1,000 miles were constructed.

"In the last thirty years English engineers have built 100,000 miles of railway, at a cost of £1,800,000,000, in various quarters of the globe; the capital being in most cases found by English companies. Some of the contractors, in carrying out the works, have had armies of workmen more numerous than either of the contending fleets at Waterloo, their annual payments for wages being equal to the revenue of a kingdom. The spread of railways is shown in the appended table:—

Year.	Europe Miles.	America Miles.	Africa Miles.	Asia Miles.	Australia Miles.	Total Miles.
1836 ..	550 ..	840	1,390
1840 ..	5,500 ..	4,000	9,500
1850 ..	24,200 ..	20,100 ..	40	44,340
1870 ..	60,400 ..	59,500 ..	600 ..	4,500 ..	1,800 ..	124,800
1881 ..	95,371 ..	92,840 ..	2,000 ..	7,870 ..	2,900 ..	202,021

"The railways that have proved most useful are those of Great Britain, as they carry per mile eight times as many passengers and four and a half times as much merchandise as for average of the rest of the world. The length and the cost of the existing railways of the world are as follows:—

	Miles.	Cost.	Cost per Mile.	Capital per Inhabitant.
United States ..	81,850 ..	2,070,000,000 ..	25,200 ..	2.2 ..
Germany	18,080 ..	870,000,000 ..	20,400 ..	9 ..
United Kingdom ..	17,845 ..	603,000,000 ..	40,400 ..	21 ..
Russia	13,500 ..	270,000,000 ..	18,500 ..	8 ..
France	18,150 ..	380,000,000 ..	33,500 ..	12 ..
Austria	12,100 ..	255,000,000 ..	31,100 ..	7 ..
India	7,500 ..	114,000,000 ..	16,400 ..	0.5 ..
Canada	5,800 ..	77,000,000 ..	13,000 ..	10 ..
Italy	6,100 ..	24,000,000 ..	18,700 ..	3.5 ..
South America ..	4,800 ..	72,000,000 ..	14,800 ..	3 ..
Spain and Portugal ..	5,100 ..	41,000,000 ..	16,400 ..	4 ..
Scandinavia	4,700 ..	29,000,000 ..	6,500 ..	3.5 ..
Low Countries ..	3,270 ..	68,000,000 ..	20,900 ..	8 ..
Australia	3,900 ..	44,000,000 ..	11,200 ..	17 ..
Turkey and Egypt ..	2,200 ..	38,000,000 ..	15,000 ..	2 ..
Switzerland	1,950 ..	34,000,000 ..	15,000 ..	9 ..
Algeria, Mexico, &c.	2,000 ..	31,000,000 ..	15,000
	202,021 ..	5,698,000,000 ..	218,000 ..	10 ..

“The railways of the United Kingdom carry nearly as many passengers as all the other railways of the world collectively, and about one-third of the goods traffic, as shown thus :—

	Passengers.	Aliquot Parts.	Goods, Tons.	Aliquot Parts.
United Kingdom ..	632,000,000	44	215,000,000	29
Continent of Europe ..	575,000,000	39	340,000,000	42
United States ..	195,000,000	13	201,000,000	21
India, Africa, &c. ..	58,000,000	4	42,000,000	5
	<u>1,458,000,000</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>828,000,000</u>	<u>100</u>

“Comparing goods and passenger traffic, we find that in the United States each passenger stands for a ton of merchandize, whereas in Europe the proportion is less than half a ton. Although the English lines are the most costly in the world, they show a better carrying power, as compared with capital, than any others, viz. :—

	£100 capital	Passengers.	Goods.
United Kingdom,	= 90	+ 35 tons.	
European Continent,	= 36	+ 22	”
United States,	= 20	+ 21	”
India, Africa, &c.,	= 19	+ 14	”
General Average.....	<u>40</u>	<u>23 tons.</u>	

“For the same reason, the traffic earnings in Great Britain are much above the average of the world, as appears from the following statement of the traffic and earnings of all nations per mile :—

	Passengers.	Goods, Tons.	Receipts.	Expenses.	Profit on Capital, Per cent.
United Kingdom ..	86,500	13,350	£3,640	£1,933	44
Low Countries ..	23,100	12,200	2,360	1,435	37
Germany ..	11,100	7,450	2,380	1,490	44
France ..	10,700	4,750	2,710	1,315	4
Italy ..	5,750	1,480	1,260	840	24
Spain and Portugal ..	5,550	1,490	1,825	575	54
Scandinavia ..	3,670	1,420	760	450	34
Austria-Hungary ..	2,950	3,940	1,550	910	9
Russia ..	2,610	2,305	2,084	1,380	84
United States ..	2,450	2,605	1,250	830	21
Canada ..	910	912	760	610	14
South America ..	1,920	510	650	440	14
India ..	1,410	..	1,255	605	44
The World ..	<u>7,300</u>	<u>4,110</u>	<u>1,610</u>	<u>990</u>	<u>24</u>

" Passenger traffic averages ten miles to each passenger at a cost of fivepence. Goods traffic shows an average of one cent (halfpenny) per ton per mile in the United States, and one penny in Europe. Working expenses average for the world 60 per cent. of the gross receipts, but in England only 43 per cent. The gross earnings of all the railways of the world are \$3,250,000 weekly, and the net annual proceeds are equal to the earnings of all the vessels afloat (at the usual estimate of \$3 per ton), the railway traffic being summed up thus:—

Gross Earnings	\$325,000,000
Working Expenses	193,000,000
Net Earnings	<u>\$125,000,000</u>

" It is, moreover, remarkable that the number of railway employes is about equal to that of the seamen engaged in the merchant shipping of the world, say, approximately 1,000,000:—

	Shipping.	Railways.
Great Britain	358,000 men.	274,500 men.
Other Countries	700,000 "	750,000 "
Total	<u>1,058,000 men.</u>	<u>1,024,500 men.</u>

" Railway traffic is growing in all countries much faster than population; the English and French lines, for example, showing the following increase of net earnings per mile since 1850:—

	1850.	1870.	Increase.
United Kingdom	£1,020	£1,714	69 per cent.
France	1,070	1,335	53 "

" The latest returns of the locomotives of the world were published by Dr. Eng. in 1872: if we add 25 per cent. for the increase since then, and compare the goods and passenger traffic per locomotive in each country, we find as follows:—

	No. of Locomotives.	Passengers per Locomotive.	Goods per Locomotive.
United Kingdom ..	13,680	41,500	18,500 tons.
United States ..	17,770	11,000	11,400 "
Germany ..	7,300	28,000	18,100 "
France ..	6,210	23,000	10,000 "
Austria ..	3,530	10,100	13,400 "
Russia ..	3,560	9,100	8,000 "
Italy ..	1,565	19,800	5,100 "
Other Countries ..	7,438
	<u>61,200</u>	<u>24,300</u>	<u>13,500 tons.</u>

—*Progress of the World* (MULHALL).

The above statistics are satisfactory evidence of the value of the joint-stock principle; and those who are so fond of asking the Government to interfere should remember that until lately the joint-stock principle was interdicted by law to all but two modes of business—to banking and to insurance in sea risks, and that the object in making the exception was to bestow a lucrative monopoly on particular establishments which the Government was pleased exceptionally to license—namely, the Bank of England and two Insurance Companies, the London and the Royal Exchange. The joint-stock company principle, with limited liability, is of great value in all such undertakings as require an amount of capital beyond the means of the richest individual or private partnership, as railways, gas and water companies, &c. It means production on a large scale by a large capital made up by the combination of many small contributions. I am utterly opposed to the Government undertaking such, and would curtail its functions to its legislative duty of protecting the lives and property of its subjects. The Post Office is quoted as a wonderful example of success and good management; and truly so. It is well managed, and distributes its 1,200,000,000 of letters, and 400,000,000 of newspaper and book packets, and 125,000,000 of post-cards per year with a most creditable punctuality; but the drawback is, that it is regarded, not in the light of a distributive establishment for the public benefit, but as a means of obtaining revenue for the Government. Englishmen ought to be foremost in all

that relates to the machinery of business, the first to originate or adopt the best means of distribution; yet in one of the means of commercial intercourse they have recently allowed themselves to be beaten by Turkey. Incredible as it may seem, it is a fact. A Parcel Post Convention was signed on November 3rd, 1850; Great Britain took part in the discussion, and then asked for time before signing. The matter was delayed until July 1st, 1881; but the English Government were not prepared to sign the convention; yet this most important and useful international business convention came into operation on October 1st, 1891; *Tha'Pey*, Bulgaria, Serbia, Egypt, Montenegro, and other States that we are too apt to consider as barbarians in comparison with ourselves, belonging thereto, and their inhabitants getting the advantages thereof; whilst Englishmen, in this land of "distribution," are denied the immense advantages of its provisions. And why? Because the Post Office is very profitable as it stands, and an international parcel post would be of no use without an inland one. By the International Convention, packets can be posted for any part of England from the Continent for a lower rate than that at which they can be sent from one part of England to another. Now that other nations have it, and Great Britain has it not, there is a positive injury to the country so long as its introduction is delayed, as its existence abroad, while we are without it, gives to foreign traders an immense advantage, that may result in the permanent diversion from our shores of a large share of the carrying and distributing trade. By some means, or other, the "parcel post" and "international parcel post" should be introduced without any further delay, and the country get a system in operation for the distribution of its parcels, and her traders placed once more on an equality with their continental neighbours with regard to their facilities for prompt and cheap transmission of small parcels. We hear a lot about loss of trade, being shut out by "prohibitive duties," yet in this case nothing is said about a Government that practically deprives a large number of traders of their business. The difference in cost,

in addition to the longer time in delivering between private delivery of small parcels over the Continent, as compared with that of the International Parcel Post, virtually shuts the English tradesmen out of the market. Yet a commercial people like ourselves allow a lot of little insignificant States to have advantages we have not; and the few who think about it, ask themselves, "When will the British public enjoy the advantages of an inland parcel post such as Switzerland has?" What is the cause of delay? where is the difficulty? We have the railways ready to carry the parcels to any part of the country, and the Post Office is compelled to have letter-carriers to every village in the kingdom, and they have to deliver the mails to every railway station; therefore, economically, an arrangement is desirable between the two great distributing powers: the one to collect and deliver to the railway companies, and to receive from the railway companies and deliver to the public; the other simply to carry in their trains parcels and letters received from the Post Office, to their destination. Forty years ago, the late Sir Rowland Hill recommended a "Parcel Post," and, in 1867, he pointed out its advantages to the Government of the day; but then, as now, the Railway Companies opposed, and, I think, against their own interests; but they have never appreciated the importance of a cheap and uniform rate for small parcels. At last (March 27, 1882) Mr. Fawcett has intimated that a "Parcel Post" may be considered as one of the things of the future; and stated that parcels will be taken at a maximum charge of 1s. for 7 lbs., with less postage for less weights, and parcels not exceeding $6\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. for 1s. 9d., to any kingdom in Europe (except Russia), and to Egypt and Asiatic Turkey. To make the boon perfect, it is to be hoped that the Post Office will collect on delivery for a small additional fee, as in America. It is only fair to state that since the C.O.D. Company failed here, the Parcels Delivery Company have taken our parcels, C.O.D. for the suburbs, Sutton for the provinces, and Van Oppen for the Continent. The benefit of cheap and expeditious facilities for distributing small parcels throughout the country

would be equal to that of Free Trade and Protection; it would be doing for the public in the shape of small parcels what Sir Rowland Hill did by the penny postage. But for the "Parcel Post" to become that postal auxiliary in the work of distribution it should be, the weight must be reduced, and the maximum weight increased. Why should it cost us 1s. to send a 7 lb. parcel from London to Brighton, when an 11 lb. parcel is sent the same distance in Germany for 3d.? Why should it cost us 1s. to send a 7 lb. parcel from London to Edinburgh, when an 11 lb. parcel is sent from Pesh to Cologne (twice the distance) for 6d.? The cost of distributing small parcels is the same in principle as with letters,—a principle so simple, yet one that the late Sir Rowland Hill had so much difficulty in getting the official mind to recognize. It is true that as the cost of distribution mainly consists in collecting at the one end and distributing at the other, the relative cost of the distance that the letter or parcel has to be sent is immaterial; once in the train, it matters very little, whether the letter or parcel be going one mile or 500. The train must go to its destination, and the cost is but slightly enhanced by its taking 500 bags of small parcels or letters instead of one. The railways ought to see that it is to their advantage to issue tickets according to weight and irrespective of value or distance, for all parcels under 28 lbs.; 28 lbs. and over, to be subject in the same manner to one uniform rate irrespective of value or kind; those at the luggage rate, to go by the luggage train.

We complain of the immoral practices of tradesmen and manufacturers; I assert, our railway system of charges is equally as dishonest and corrupt; they take every advantage of the public that the law will allow. And the law of small parcels is an evidence of how helpless Acts of Parliament are to protect us. Imagine the Legislature of a commercial country like Great Britain passing an Act to "protect the public" with the following clause therein: "For the carriage of any single article not exceeding 500 lbs. in weight, the companies may demand any sum they think fit." A single article 500 lbs.! Why, it is enough, ridiculous

to a practical mind. This is under the head of "Small Articles, Single Parcels," and intended to apply to the "small parcels traffic of the country." What single article can be mentioned that is 500 lbs. in weight? Where there are several railways going over the same ground, competition helps us, and the competing companies in 1877 mutually agreed upon fixed rates; but by their book of charges, I find, in every case, the poor unfortunate small parcel sender is overcharged. For instance, 28 lbs., at a professed rate for carriage of 40s. per ton, is charged 1s. instead of 6d., or "80s. per ton" instead of 40s.; 1 cwt. at 40s. per ton, is charged 2s. 6d. instead of 2s., or "60s. per ton" instead of 40s.; 28 lbs. at 80s. per ton, is charged 2s. instead of 1s., or, in reality, 160s. per ton; 1 cwt. is charged 4s. 9d. instead of 4s. But you see the disadvantage to the smaller trader of paying 8s. per cwt., if he has four parcels of 28 lbs. each, whereas the larger trader, receiving a parcel of 1 cwt., only pays 4s. 9d.; 28 lbs. at 120s. per ton, is charged 2s. 9d. instead of 1s. 6d.; 4 x 2s. 9d. will be 11s. per cwt., under a professed scale of 6s. per cwt.; and they carry parcels of 1 cwt. for 6s. 9d., yet charge 2s. 9d. for 28 lbs. and 4s. 8d. for 56 lbs. The whole system is unsound; the public are powerless; as in modern times, "combination" to maintain high rates is a more powerfully active principle than competition to lower them. The public, as a rule, have no knowledge whatever as to the proper charges to pay for parcels they receive by railway, so pay whatever is asked. The only way to stop "overcharges" is for each person who sends or receives parcels by rail to ascertain at the booking office the authorized rate for the "class of goods" he is sending or receiving. Railway companies are common carriers, and are compelled by law to keep open at their goods station a book containing the several rates from that station to every one to which a through rate for goods traffic is in operation. If you do a miscellaneous trade, get a classified goods index, pack your goods according to whether they belong to first, second, third, fourth, or fifth class rates; and state the class of goods in your consignment note, as "heavy drapery" is charged third class, whilst

"mixed drapery" is charged fourth class rate; and when sent at "owner's risk," say so, as the charge is so much less. The various rates of charge according to description of article afford them great facilities for taking advantage of the ignorant; for instance, they have six rates of charge, varying from 21s. 8d. per ton to 70s. per ton, for the same distance. The *few* who understand will describe their goods, and then the company has no chance of overcharging; but the majority do not understand those varying rates of charge, and it cannot be too generally known that if you do not describe what a parcel or bale contains, the companies' rule is to "always charge the *highest* rate." When writing "Economy" and "Progress," I had to study the subject, but frankly admit that hitherto no idea of such a variability of charge by railway companies had entered my head. I stupidly thought they were above the "tricks of trade;" but they are not. And all this underhand work arises from the same cause as the immorality of traders—the want of moral power to be above the intimidation of "large customers." For returned empty there is a maximum charge for 50 lbs. of 1s., for 112 lbs. 1s. 6d.; but returned milk-cans are sent free. Why? Because of a want of system, of belief in principle, of wisdom to see that they are *indispensable* to all senders, large or small, and that they have the power; had they the intelligence and moral courage, to be honest, and treat "all alike." Traders and railway companies are subject to a certain rate of expenses upon their turn-over; this must be got, or the trader or company will in time fail. Traders and railway companies are pressed by the large buyers or consignors, by whom one competitor is set against another. "What is your rate, So-and-so? we can do better." The trader reduces his price, or gives an extra discount; the railway company puts your goods under Class 3, at 48s. 10. per ton, instead of under Class 4, at 55s. This is the origin of all the mischief: the price is not based upon the rate of profit necessary to pay expenses; and to make up the loss by A,—B, C, and D have to pay more than they ought. "But we keep to our scale," the railway companies will reply.

True, but do you tell the public that you have a scale; that you make "exceptions," that your rates vary according to the material? For, unless the public know it, and tell them of it, the highest rate will be charged. To plead ignorance of what a bale contains, is a paltry excuse; worse, it is untrue. In my own case, I detected and got refunded the difference between Class 4 (55s.) and Class 3 (43s. 4d.),—11s. 8d. per ton overcharge on "cotton goods" sent from a "cotton manufacturer" to ourselves (Manchester warehousemen). A railway company, delivering us goods every day, to plead ignorance of the contents of the bales received from a purely cotton manufacturer, in justification of a systematic overcharge for several years, was adding insult to injury. The pressure put upon the companies is hard, no doubt. How is it met? A large blacking manufacturer obtains a concession; so a large black-lead manufacturer agitates for, and in time gets, the same. "The one article is classified with the other." "Woollen goods," I think, are charged 75s. per ton from Carlisle to London, but the initiated who, in their consignment notes, say "woollen tweeds," get them sent for 55s. per ton. The City magnates will have an advantage; so large warehouses are built, and the bales are consigned there, and put away, numbered, to be sent for as required; but the cost of the warehousing, the trouble of keeping the stock, is paid by the railway companies; and when we consider the value of "room" in the City of London, it is no insignificant concession to have such "bulky stock" as cotton and Manchester goods warehoused for you free of charge. The principle of concession is unsound and vicious in the extreme; if it meant a man or company taking 2s. for his labour instead of 2s. 8d., let him do it; but if it means—and it is my argument that it does mean—making B, C, and D pay for the concessions to A, then, I maintain, the system is unfair, unjust, and, as regards railway companies, ought by the law to be considered illegal, an infringement of their rights and privileges, and the basis upon which they are granted.

The value of facilities for distribution and open ports is

proved by the fact that wheat is frequently as dear in New York as in London; beef and pork realize as much in eastern American cities as in London or Birmingham. Canada and the United States together contributed, in 1880, cattle, sheep, and pigs to the value of about £1,000,000 sterling, constituting 60 per cent. of the live stock in ports of Great Britain, and making up for the shortened supplies from the Continent of Europe. The United States forwarded, during 1890, 7,254,7 cwt. of fresh meats; nearly the same quantity of salted, cured, and preserved meats; and still heavier consignments of bacon: 100 lbs. of live weight yield from 52 lbs. to 55 lbs. of beef. It is developing into an immense trade. The stock-yards at New Jersey City and New York received in 1880, in about equal proportions, 700,000 cattle, 1,800,000 sheep, and nearly as many hogs. They are gathered from many sources, and from long distances; sales are made daily, and from the stock-yards about two-thirds of the animals are taken to private slaughter-houses. Their transport is effected by steamers and barges specially constructed for the trade, and carrying from 600 to 1,000 beasts. The charge varies, according to distance, from 6d. to 1s. Between the Jersey City and New York abattoirs, 2,000 bullocks and 6,000 sheep are frequently killed in one day. The demand from the eastern cities of the United States and England is fully equal to the supply; in fact, the demand for "prime cuts" was beyond the supply until it was met by the transport in refrigerating cars of large quantities of hind-quarter beef from Chicago, St. Louis, and even from Kansas City. For England only the best carcasses are suitable. They are carefully cooled, and remain for three days in the refrigerators at the abattoirs before being put on board ship. They are divided into quarters, averaging from 170 lbs. to 180 lbs., and are sewed in calico. Carcasses of mutton, chiefly grown in Canada, in New England States, and in Kentucky, are also forwarded. Now comes the part for our railway companies to seriously ponder, reflect, and act upon, so as to help the British producers. Ocean freights are lower than they have ever been.

On the best steamers, in refrigerating chambers at a temperature of 36 to 38 degrees, fresh meat is now brought over at the rate of 22s. 6d. per bulk ton of 40 cubic feet; insurance is 15s. per cwt.; landing charges in Liverpool are 2s. 6d., in London 6s. 2d. per ton. The ocean transport of American fresh meat does not cost *one halfpenny* per lb., but from Liverpool to London it is *one penny* per lb. The charge for boxed meat from Chicago to London is 2s. per 100 lbs. A tierce of meat is carried from New York to London for 3s., or at the rate of 15s. per ton; yet the charge for such goods from Liverpool to London is 25s. per ton, or from Bristol to London 20s. per ton. Not only have freights been lowered in America, but, owing to improved accommodation and better arrangements as to ventilation, the losses during transport have been reduced to within 1 per cent. The United States must make progress; her people are equal to the times they live in—see what should be done, and do it. The majority of our farmers have mistaken their vocation. It has been too generally believed that “while the farmer slept the corn grew and the cattle fattened.” The farmer has acted as if he was a passive instrument in the hands of fate; keeping his farm accounts as a trader keeps his books has been thought unnecessary; debtor and creditor entries, details of expenditure, he has taken no notice of; he was a “gentleman,” not a draper or a grocer. So long as he paid his way, he never troubled himself as to how the balance was obtained. Unfortunately, this applies also to too many of our tradesmen. Our graziers and farmers, in order to pay their way, must understand their business, must work and think. Bullocks and sheep must be treated as a compound of a multitude of separate expenditures and profits; every detail on or about the farm must be examined with the greatest exactitude; and on every farm the brain exercised to obtain from natural resources the greatest profit available. You must, if you require perfection of result, descend to a nicety of calculation. It is useless to think that the “good old times” will return; telegraphs and a more rapid system of

communication will stop prices from being subject to the leaps and bounds of olden times. If meat or wheat goes up here, a telegram causes an influt from New York and Kentucky, from New England and Canada. The British farmer must act as if he had an organized army of invaders ready to enter his domains. No dearth of the market is possible against the vast network of machinery and agents in New York, intent upon nothing so much as meeting him at his own door and underselling him, at his lowest quotations. It is not a cheering prospect, but it must be faced; and it is best to recognize the altered state of things, that to succeed, the English farmer must understand his business, and act in every detail of his daily life upon the best principle of business extant. He has an opponent that will not let him be idle. But, above this, he must be thoughtfully, wisely, economically active; as, to live, he must learn from his competitors across the ocean to adapt means to ends, with a cheere-ping carefulness he has hitherto disdained. He must understand that the whole American meat export trade depends upon an accurate computation of expenditure and profit, to which few of our English agriculturists are equal. Scientific farming is needed in England to make English soil surrender the riches which it treasures. The farmer must be trained to his business, and understand book-keeping; he must cease to go hunting; he must remember that he is a tradesman, and must be able to keep his books and balance his accounts, like a tradesman. The farmer who keeps books is an exception. But the time has come when English farmers will not be able to hold their ground either against bad seasons or foreign competition, unless they educate themselves to understand and analyze every farthing of their expenditure, with the minuteness of an American exporter. To succeed, they must study, and copy nature, so as to secure the maximum of result by the minimum of outlay.

PROGRESS.

For men's progress, we want an unshaken belief that

"We mould our destiny; the Future lies
 As clay within our hands, and our own will
 Fashions the Present to the good or ill
 Which in the great Hereafter shall arise
 To damn us, or to lift us to the skies.
 Ours is the purpose which our deeds fulfil,
 Slaves, it may be, or dupes, yet masters still
 Of that which lives most hidden from our eyes.
 But vainly fearful, or more vainly proud,
 We first deny the will which God has given,
 Then robe our kingly maker in the shroud
 Of the foul sins for which we barter Heaven.
 Thus, self-rejected from our high estate,
 We next dethrone our God, and worship Fate."

S. W. HUGHES.

From the earliest period man's courage has been daunted by the perception that, though it might conquer an evil thing, that thing was pretty sure to return. Darkness might vanish before the dawn, but it returned; the storm-cloud cleared away, but it came again; the sickly season might pass, but it came back; the cancer was eradicated only to reappear; the tyrant might be slain, tyranny remained; the struggle seemed hopeless, the doctrine of despair led up to that of "fate." The greatest obstacle to "progress," in every clime and every age, has been "superstition," kept alive by that deadly poison, "ignorance"—the support of "dogma and priestcraft," the cause of "intolerance," that plague of the past. Yet mankind marched on, nothing doubting, step after step, without knowing whither; the spirit of humanity keeping alive hope of a better future within them, until, after a long and terrible battle, "truth" has conquered; liberty, peace, justice, reason, conscience, science, have taken root; and the shoots of the upas-tree planted by the

hands of dogma and priestcraft in every part of the earth will soon disappear, when mankind learns "that nature's laws are eternal, and that her small still voice, speaking from the innermost heart of us, shall not, under terrible penalties, be disregarded." Believe, if you like, that divine love came down to take on itself our sins; in "life" we find there is no Saviour to do the like for us: we shall individually suffer for our mistakes and weaknesses; and the nation must suffer that, by its politics, "curbs," rather than fosters, individual efforts onwards and upwards. If we compare the past condition of civilized nations with their present condition, we shall see how much we owe to this liberty of action by the individual. For many centuries the warlike spirit reigned supreme, and such energies as were not directly devoted to war were devoted to little else than supporting the organizations which carried on war. The working part of each community did not exist for its own sake, but for the sake of the fighting part. From slaves and serfs, through vassals of different grades, up to dukes and kings, there was an enforced subordination by which the individualities of all were greatly restricted. The bulk of the people, until recently, were only thought of by the managers of the State as a "taxable and soldier-yielding mass" and by conscription and the odious press-gang the life and liberty of the individual were sacrificed; they were trained to yield implicit obedience to the "divine right" of "king and priest." We have changed much of this. With the formation of nations covering large areas, the perpetual wars within each area have ceased; and we have now the bulk of the people carrying on the work of production and distribution for their own benefit; and instead of the working part existing solely to support the fighting part, we find the occupation of the fighting part has gone, or only existing to protect in the quiet pursuit of its ends the working part. "Reason and freedom" have removed, one by one, the restraints over individual actions; men are no longer tied to certain localities, nor obliged to profess a belief in, or adherence to, certain religious opinions; the governing body no longer interferes to say this article shall not be made, that dress shall

not be worn, or dictates to men how they shall live. These vast changes have been effected by industry and thrift, by whose aid the "middle class" came into existence, and whose power gradually grew until there has been a change from a social order in which the individual existed for the benefit of the State, to a social order in which the State exists for the benefit of individuals.

"Progress" is written to show that human history is a record of progress. Progress is God's law, which we may hasten or retard, but cannot stop altogether. Every succeeding age starts with a record of accumulated knowledge in the arts of production; of increased wisdom, that enables each generation to get rid of some of the errors of its predecessors. We have, therefore, a continual advancement from a lower to a higher status of intelligence and well-being. We do not mark the progress that is going on; the days and years seem to repeat themselves unalterably. In reviewing the past, it seems at first sight as though there were long periods of stagnation, evils quietly endured for generations, to be suddenly and violently overthrown in sudden amelioration. But, like the "little worms beneath the surface," nature is steadily pursuing her work in her own quiet but inscrutable way. The stagnation is only apparent; there is being acquired a silent accumulation of forces, whose gathered power will, in heaven's own time, and by the inevitable operation of nature's laws, remove the barriers to man's progress. For ages it seemed weary work; man seemed helpless against the "monarch's and the priest's control;" the brain of man was refused the power of thought, except in the "orthodox" manner. No sooner was "thought free," no sooner were the barriers which prevented progress overthrown, than we see in the nineteenth century a progress rapid beyond all precedent; the stream of human development received into its sluggish currents a mighty impulse for the amelioration of the condition of mankind. There is still much to be done; in every age there will be; as, in the ever-shifting condition of man's life, the right of one

century becomes frequently the wrong one. But with "thought" free, it is inevitable that in time we shall see removed all artificial obstacles in the path of human progress; mankind has but to learn and obey the beneficent regulations of the great providential laws; and he must advance, once the laws of development are left unimpeded in their action by the artificial restrictions of the selfish or the ignorant. That progress is the law few in our time will doubt. Evil exists in abundance; yet, honestly and impartially compare existing ills with those of a similar nature one hundred years since, and the evidence of a better and purer state of things is unmistakable. Development is God's law.

There will be no difference of opinion as to the desirability of a more industrious, thrifty, happy people; but how is this to be achieved? I am often told, "Your efforts for the elevation of the masses will be futile" (some even say dangerous), "because you do not include in the work the aid of religion." But, it seems to me, the two attempts might work side by side, and help each other. My object is to "make the best of this world," whilst, logically, the intention of theologians is to secure for man the "next world," not to fit him to perform his duties more satisfactorily in this. Their first—nay, their entire—thought about a man is to "save his soul;" whereas it has always seemed to me that the first step onwards and upwards cannot be gained until you first of all make a man feel that he has a soul to be saved. Religion should be the end, not the means—the *last* thing you talk to men about, instead of the *first*. For progress, talk to men more of, and get them to feel a greater interest in, this world, and all that therein is. Talk to them of what is going on in the world, but in such a way that they recognize something superior to what they see in their daily occupation; take them out of, and elevate their views beyond and out of, the narrow sphere of the public house and the skittle-ground; explain to them the increased value of their work, if, by attending technical schools, they can produce better work, elevate their ideas, raise the level of their thoughts; tempt them to

the British Museum, Kensington Museum, National Gallery; do anything but seem as if all you cared for was to get them into "your church or chapel." They will go there of their own accord, after a time, if you have seats ready for them, and make them welcome, and when there, tell them of their own nature, *as it is*, and what they must do to make the best of it and the world in which they live; explain to them the causes of poverty, illness, early death, miserable, wretched lives; show them the cause of, and remedy for, most of the ills that hitherto they have been told flesh is heir to; explain the reasons of shipwrecks, railway accidents, mine explosions, or any catastrophe of the previous week; not putting it down to the "inscrutable workings of the Almighty," but appealing to the intelligence of their manhood to see the cause—"some neglect by man of his duty, or disobedience to the laws of God," bringing its inevitable punishment as a *warning* that worse may be prevented. Oh! I do so envy the clergy the splendid field that is open to them to ameliorate the condition of mankind, by teaching men how to remove the misery that surrounds them; to improve and elevate humanity; holding before man, if they will, an ideal future, but before it, and above it, stimulating him to a something *here* better than it is; not an ideal life such as the poet and artist would dream of, but a life different from what it is,—an earnest desire to lift those who as yet cannot soar very high a little above the misery and seemingly helpless condition of their present daily existence. The lowest poor may not feel their degradation,—they were born in it, are used to it; but there is a large class whose pride is as strong as their hunger, who still cling to some faint shadow of respectability, who strive hard to earn their daily bread honestly, under whatever adverse circumstances may be pressing on them—decent people trying hard to keep the wolf that is for ever baying from the door. Watch this class, and you will soon see how valuable is the cheering word, the sympathetic help, to those brave fellow-men of yours who are struggling so hard not to descend to the level of the brute.

The fault is in the training given at our primary schools—a fault

not so much in the amount of education as in its nature. In many trades, the training of the hand to work may, and in some must, begin at an earlier age than that at which we allow children to leave school. The taste for technical work should be inhaled at the earliest possible age, and there is not wanting evidence to prove that even a very small amount of manual labour introduced into the elementary school serves to increase the capacity for active employment and the manipulative skill of the fingers. The urgently needed remedy is plain enough; it is a sweeping reform in the kind of instruction given in our schools to boys and girls between the ages of ten and fourteen. The teaching must be based upon the knowledge that the children will have to work for their living, must train them for the occupation by which that living is to be earned, and must cease to be based upon literary studies, which positively unfit them as a class for the duties in life before them. We have been compelled by the altered conditions of the times we live in,—large factories, large establishments, facility of communication,—to do away with the old system of apprenticeship, and we have not given the necessary thought as to how best to supply its place; on the contrary, our present system has added to the evils incidental to the change in our method of training; it has still further unfitted the young for the work they must perform to live; and the first reform needed, imperatively needed, alike for the individual and the State, is the substitution universally in our schools of technical and scientific studies for some of the literary studies at present prescribed. Do not think I am opposed to these literary studies,—quite the contrary; no one appreciates their value more than myself; but I maintain that they must be deferred till a later period in our educational course. If the nation is to maintain its position in the world, the people must view work with different feelings; we must eradicate the “distaste” for; and substitute a “liking” of work; and we must, by a more rational system, give the young such a training as will remove their present mental incapacity through ignorance of technicalities. There must be manual labour in

our schools for all those children whose lot in life is manual labour, so that their fingers will have gained a skill that will carry them successfully past that critical period in the life of every one, whether the life's work of the future is to be regarded with pleasure or distaste. The second point is to train and develop their mental faculties by a technical knowledge that will be of service to them in life. We want, in fact, a "practical education," or development in the child of body and brain, that will make him competent to perform his duties, and a skill and facility in the doing of his work that will give him such pleasure that work will be the delight of his existence. We want a workshop in the school, followed by the school in the workshop; instead of, as now, schools that are made distasteful because the patient has to swallow food he has no relish for, and so revolting to the majority that they avoid all study after leaving school. If the system were more in accordance with men's minds, the majority would, after leaving school, employ their leisure hours in self-improvement, instead of, as now, wasting their precious time in idleness or self-indulgence. Technical schools in Yorkshire and elsewhere have been started the last few years; but we want more than this; we want, in every locality of production, schools that will teach how to produce in the best possible manner the special product, natural or otherwise, of that locality. This principle must be applied to all our handicrafts and industries. To hold our own in the present epoch, our men must be trained to perform more efficiently and intelligently their separate industries. For this they need a more thorough, skilled training; and to secure this, we must begin with body and brain as soon as they are capable of being moulded for the work they are required to perform. This elementary training must be supplemented by schools devoted specially to each trade, as weaving, dyeing, building, &c., &c. We also need, and must have, a teaching that will prepare the young for a commercial and mercantile or counting-house career. I do not mean that in these schools we are to give a merely theoretical technical education, but a sys-

matic instruction, fitted to enable each and every one to fulfil by and willingly the handicraft or work he is intended for. At present, in the shop, at the desk, or in the workshop, our youth's early years are literally wasted; not having been got ready at school for any useful work, they go on errands, do any little odd jobs, fill up the time somehow, because they have not been trained to manual dexterity on the one hand, or had their intelligence cultivated or brightened, so as to be of any practical service, on the other.

We have yearly exhibitions of pictures, &c.; why not stimulate the self-esteem of our working classes by having similar exhibitions of every kind of work; do something, in fact, to make "steady, intelligent workmen" of our people; act as if we not only appreciated, but honoured, and felt a pleasure in rewarding industry; act so as to raise to a premium the services in every trade of such of its members as are noted for their repute for steadiness, skill, and general intelligence; so elevate the "workers" that they shall be sought after by, and not (as now) seek, the employers; so rouse men's self-respect that they will strive to be worthy men—men that, whether they remain workmen, or become foremen or masters, will command the respect of those they work for? We want men to be proud, but let it be a pride in their superior intelligence, their greater technical knowledge, and the pride based on the fact that the said knowledge has been acquired by assiduous, earnest devotedness to their duties at every stage, so that they are *thoroughly* masters of every detail, equal to any emergency, worth their money anywhere, everywhere. I know no class that should be more proud, have a greater respect for themselves, and be able to *compel* others to respect and honour them, than our handicraftsmen; and I know nothing so essential to our future progress, as a manufacturing and commercial nation, as that our educational system should stimulate to activity, and gradually develop to its fullest capacity, the intelligence of our workmen, that they may make the very utmost of their technical skill, so as to produce in every department the greatest

originality of designs combined with the most perfect goods, giving evidence of the thoroughness of execution. Our policy has been wrong; we have made our men into "machines;" let us try to make "men;" it will pay better in the end. There is a "false" as well as a "true" economy. For to obtain intelligent workmen, we must give up much of that division of labour at present thought so much of. What a prospect for the mass of our workmen, to make merely a certain part of a pin, or chain, or anything else, for the term of their natural life! Train the young to know the "different" parts of their work, to avoid "monotony" on the one hand, and the being confined exclusively to the "one talent" for a living on the other. We want "practical" life brought as near to the ideal standard as it is possible; we want the value of the early years more appreciated; we want it to be felt by our "teachers and pastors," that upon that training much of the results of the "after life" of each will depend; we want then and afterwards a system calculated to produce good workmen—able to support themselves at more than the *one part* of a thing, so that they may be self-reliant, and not so dependent upon their fellow-men and their masters as they now are. What an awful waste of time there now is in nearly every trade! Think of the number of men idle, think of the value of the time lost, the labour misapplied, the time spent in making bad things instead of good, wholly and solely for want of proper training at the right time. How shall we remedy this? how best proceed in our attempt to adjust the altered social, industrial, and commercial conditions? We must use our brains, rise above prejudice, be willing to work; give to each trade, locality, and individual the system that is better adapted to develop its capacity to the fullest and best. We want wealth, intelligence, industry to work together, and see what is best for each locality to create and develop, so that it may maintain its own special product, and also to qualify the individual to intelligently utilize the same, and derive the greatest benefit therefrom, through guiding the same wisely and well. This is to be secured

each industrial establishment is so worked as to yield the greatest benefit obtainable from the resources of capital, skill, and labour at its command. No government or central institution can do this; each one must initiate for himself, develop by his own resources, and direct by his own intelligence, his establishment or industry, according to its distinctive needs. Our industrial and trading classes will then be equal at all times to the changes and exigencies of mercantile life. Then, and not till then, shall we be able to form an exact estimate of the "progress" man is capable of making; when once he changes his system, the altered social, industrial, and commercial conditions under which he will live and labour will be an indication that he has ceased to be a machine, and has developed at last into a "man." When this time comes, men will be wise enough to see that the wealth and prosperity of the whole nation depends upon the intellectual, moral, and social improvement of all the people at it is composed of; unity of purpose, a blending of all the energies, that has for its result "an harmonious whole"—each doing his best, not, as heretofore, for "himself," but to promote the wealth, prosperity, and happiness of the whole nation. "Progress" cannot comprehend the logic of an "exception;" there are no exceptions in nature; the Creator's laws are regular and invariable in their operation.

"That God, which ever lives and loves,
One God, one law, one element,
And one far off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves."

"Who sees with equal eye, as God of all,
A hero perish or a sparrow fall,
Atoms or systems into ruin huddled,
And now a bubble burst, and now a world."

The nation must decline that thinks it can outrage the moral laws with impunity. The poets are so cogitating that men will learn and obey the laws of nature by an earnest effort; we made to teach them; instead of teach, we teach our

children everything or anything but their own nature, or how to fulfil satisfactorily their duties in life. We ignore the "present," and teach them the history of the Norman kings, or of the nations of antiquity, or the latitude and longitude of the Cape of Good Hope, but tell them nothing about their own land; and as a rule, when they leave school, boys are utterly ignorant of their own country, the localities of the different counties, or their special productions. There is a religion that can be taught in all schools, adapted for all men—the religion of progress, the religion of nature, the religion of duty, of right, of good, of love,—which explains and prepares men's minds for seeing where their duty lies, of distinguishing good from evil, and why it is good or evil. It is useless merely to root up error, leaving one's soul as dry and barren and useless as sea shingle; take away the falsehoods of life, but replace them with truths. It must be right to improve things in the world, to make it better for man and beast, to do all we can to increase happiness, and refrain from doing anything that will diminish it.

The point is to determine the basis upon which we will try to secure the onward and upward progress of the people. Shall we trust the people? Is human nature good or evil? Experience teaches us that man is not perfect; on the contrary, there is a vast amount of wickedness, folly, and weakness; but there is also a vast amount of virtue, wisdom, and strength as well, in perpetual conflict with the other; and in the steady progression of society upwards, when we consider the net result of all human efforts and struggles in the past, although we may regret that so little has been done, the evidence is irresistible that the influences that go to put things right are stronger than those that go to put them wrong. Let us take life as it is, ready made for us, make what we can of it, extract all the good we can out of it. Do not try to rearrange everything; always grumbling, and spending your strength in conquering imaginary difficulties. "Adaptability" is the true secret of success; it is a power that gives us strength, whereas grumbling and stubbornness mean friction the wearing your life away in a struggle. My friend,

take things as you find them, and use them for your own and other people's good; let every stone in your path be a stepping-stone upwards; there will be some stumbling-blocks, some too slippery to mount,—well, push such on one side, those too small grind into the ground with your heel; never think of stumbling-blocks stopping your progress, but resolutely crush or put aside all impediments to your onward progress. The happy men, the successful men, the progressive people, are those who make the best of "what is." What should we think of a musician if, instead of sitting down to an organ, and racking its keys produce what melody he chose, he were to trouble himself about its mechanism, and wished to remake its pipes and key-board? To all I say, there is work to be done; "find something worth doing, and do it."

The following details are from M. G. Mulhall's book, "The Progress of the World:" "The nineteenth century is remarkable for the rapid increase of numbers among the civilized nations of mankind which have doubled in a lifetime.

	1811	1850
United Kingdom and Colonies ..	17,000,000	42,000,000
European Continent	170,000,000	277,000,000
United States	5,000,000	45,000,000
	<u>192,000,000</u>	<u>364,000,000</u>

Taking collectively the British and United States' populations, we find they have risen from 22,000,000 to 88,000,000— an increase of 400 per cent., while the European Continent rose only 63 per cent. The immediate result of the spread of the Anglo-Saxon race is to make our language assume in the present age the same place that Latin held in the days of the Cæsars. As an American writer has observed, "The world now consists of two nations—those who speak English, and those who do not." In 1801, English was spoken by one-eighth of the civilized people of the world, and to-day it is the language of one-fourth.

It must be remembered that "increase of population depends, in a manner, less on the number of births than on the death-

rate." Sanitary arrangements have proved of the highest value, their results in England being shown as follows:—

	1801 to 1810.	1850 to 1870.
Deaths under 20 years	43 per cent.	34 per cent.
" " " " " " "	52 " "	66 " "

Civilization is unquestionably tending to prolong the span of existence, which is now six years longer in England, France, and Germany than it was fifty years ago. "Among Russian serfs," say Quetelet, "the death-rate is 48 per 1,000, and in free England it is only 20." Most European States have a higher rate of births than Great Britain, and yet their increase is 25, or even 50, per cent. less than ours. The average of twenty-three years (Russia excepted)—namely, from 1852 to 1874—was as follows:—

RATE PER 1,000 INHABITANTS.						
		Births.		Deaths.		Increase of Population.
England	85	23	13			
Prussia	38	27	11			
Austria	40	32	8			
Spain	37	30	7			
Italy	37	30	7			
Russia	41	37	4			
France	26	24	2			

"The birth-rate in England is now 2 per 1,000 higher than from 1853 to 1859; whereas in many of the continental States it is falling. The most notable decline is in France, where the rate from 1810 to 1831 was 31 per 1,000, or one-fifth higher than in the last twenty years. Taking the general average of Europe, there are 6 per cent. more male infants born than females, but the surplus falls to 3 per cent. in Russia, and rises to 16 per cent. among Jews. After destructive wars there is a great excess of male births, as occurred in France after 1815, and still more notably in Paraguay, since the exterminating wars of 1865—1870; the male births in the latter country being eight times as numerous as the females, as if nature sought to restore

the balance of the sexes" (MULHALL). Nature's laws would not be deserving the unlimited praise we bestow upon them if they did not arrange for such a contingency. The law seems to be that when times are hard, and parents ill-fed and anxious, there is an excess of males; and if you watch it in your own experience, you will find that with people who have progressed in the world during the up-hill struggle, the earlier births are males, and when in easier circumstances and the mind free from anxiety as regards the future, there are more female births. After destructive wars this principle acts more universally, and we get an exceptional excess of male over female births. Warner's "Census of Europe for 1872" showed that the preponderance of females had increased since 1850, owing most probably to the bulk of the people being better fed; in Southern Europe the sexes are about even, but in Scotland and Sweden there are 8 per cent. excess of females. In the Northern Hemisphere February is the month that shows the largest number of births; in the Southern, July.

"The highest rate of marriages is in Germany, Austria, and England; the lowest in Ireland; the general average for Europe being 18 per 1,000 inhabitants, but in Ireland only 10 per 1,000, Scotland 14 per 1,000. The number of marriages is materially affected by passing events. The cholera of 1832 in Germany caused a decline of 12 per cent. for the following year; the rise of wheat in England in 1855 was succeeded by a sensible diminution in like manner; and the failure of crops in Sweden in 1868 caused a fall of 20 per cent. in the marriage returns of 1869. The same cause produced a similar result in England in 1870. The rate of sterility is difficult to determine. We know that in the United Kingdom nine marriages out of ten have children, except among the nobility, which show but eight in ten; and this partly explains why so many old peerages are dying out. The proportion of married people is much greater in the south of Europe than in the north. The number of widowers marrying again as compared to widows is at fifteen to ten.

Early marriages are too frequent in England, 4 per cent. of the husbands being under twenty years, as against 2 per cent. in the rest of Europe. The greatest number of women marrying under twenty years is in France. The proportion of illegitimate births has declined one-third in Great Britain and some other countries since 1840, but it has risen in France and Sweden; at present it stands thus:—

	Legitimate.	Illegitimate.
United Kingdom.. ..	95 per cent.	5 per cent.
European Continent	93 ..	8 ..
Jews	98 ..	2 ..

“ It is remarkable that the average of all persons living varies greatly between countries, and the following table shows that the French are the oldest, and the people of the United States the youngest:—

	Average Age of all living, 1870.
France	32 years.
Sweden and Holland	29 ..
Italy	28 ..
England	27½ ..
Germany	27 ..
United States	24½ ..

“ There is in every country an amount of preventible sickness that causes a heavy burden to the nation. This was estimated by Chadwick, in 1842, to amount in England to £14,000,000 sterling per annum. Preventible mortality is also a large item, Mr. Block showing that the death-rate of the workmen's quarter in Paris is double that of the Faubourg St. Germain. There are, nevertheless, some rules of mortality almost uniform in all countries. Thus, married women live longer than single, in spite of the toll of 26 per 1,000 mothers dying in child-bed. Women usually live two years longer than men. In the Northern Hemisphere January is 50 per cent. more fatal than July, the reverse occurring in the Southern. Longevity depends little on climate; the unhealthiest parts of Spanish America abound in half-castes over 100 years of age. The well-known Cardinal de Salis, who died at the age of 110, said the secret of longevity

was to preserve an even mind, to take exercise in all seasons, and to drink a pint of Val de Peñas daily.

"In the food supply of the world mankind has made notable progress in less than half a century, not only by reason of the introduction of railways and steamers, but also by the removal of arbitrary laws against grain. Forty years ago the peasants of Castile and Leon saw their wheat rotting in the subterranean 'silos' provided by Government, because it was forbidden to export it. Forty years ago Great Britain paid famine prices for bread, sooner than repeal the Corn Laws, while the Monjiks of the Don had such abundant crops that wheat was too cheap to pay the cost of freight to the nearest port. Forty years ago, owing to want of roads, the price of grain in Western Prussia was double that which ruled in the eastern part of the kingdom. The following table shows the average of prices in thirty years previous to the epoch of railways and free trade, and compares the same with twenty years subsequent to the said epoch:—

	1820—1849.	1850—1870.
England	83d. per bushel.	79d. per bushel.
France	67d. "	75d. "
Germany	50d. "	68d. "
Austria	41d. "	60d. "
Hungary	35d. "	61d. "
Russia	44d. "	65d. "
New York	69d. "	73d. "
General Average	56d. per bushel.	72d. per bushel.

You will observe the value of "free trade" from this table. Before "free trade," England had to import about "half the wheat" she consumed; wheat was dearer here than anywhere else; since "free trade," you will observe that it is only in England that wheat is cheaper since 1849 than before; and the above table is a convincing proof of the argument that "free trade," by not interfering with the Creator's designs in "supply and demand," of equalizing prices, by causing goods to be sent to the nearest market, thereby prevents the disastrous effects inevitable when the supply of an article like wheat is unequal to the

demand. The English and Americans are the best fed people of the present age, and, therefore, able to accomplish the greatest amount of work. According to Vauban, Bossuet, and Lagrange—three names illustrious in war, religion, and science,—“that country must be considered the most prosperous in which the inhabitants are able to have the largest ratio of meat for their food.” “Besides the three great staples of grain, meat, and wine, there are numerous articles of food technically termed luxuries. The principal are tea, coffee, and sugar, the consumption of which varies as follows, per inhabitant:—

	Sugar.	Coffea.	Tea.
Great Britain	68lbs.	15 oz.	72 oz.
France	17 „	46 „	1 „
Germany	12 „	78 „	1 „
Low Countries	12 „	188 „	1 „
Scandinavia	11 „	156 „	1 „
Italy	10 „	16 „	1 „
Spain	9 „	4 „	1 „
Austria	6 „	15 „	1 „
Russia	6 „	5 „	6 „
United States	45 „	113 „	17 „

“In this table we again see that Great Britain and the United States are the largest consumers—an undoubted proof that they are the most prosperous nations in the world” (MULHALL).

The area of land under crops is increasing in Europe, and still more notably in America and Australia. The mode of agriculture has, moreover, improved more in the last twenty years than in a dozen centuries preceding. France is the most highly cultivated country, thanks to the system of peasant proprietors, for, as the Italians say, “the ploughshare may be silver, but the spade is gold.” This mode of farming will support the largest population per acre, and get most value out of a given area of land; but, economically, it does not pay so well as large farms, the waste of labour being very great. One farmer, like Dr. Glyn, of California, or Mr. Dalrymple, of Dakotah, with a field of wheat covering 100 square miles, can raise as much grain with 400 farm-servants as 5,000 peasant proprietors in France. The

following table shows the quantity of grain raised in each country, and the ratio per male peasant:—

	Acres under Grain.	Bushels.	Per Acre.	Per Male Peasant.
United States ..	161,000,000	2,840,000,000	22½ bushels.	820 bushels.
Russia	153,000,000	1,185,000,000	10 "	116 "
Germany	43,000,000	390,000,000	22 "	215 "
France	43,000,000	340,000,000	21 "	220 "
Austria-Hungary	55,000,000	530,000,000	15 "	180 "
United Kingdom	12,600,000	455,000,000	36 "	540 "
Spain	15,000,000	300,000,000	20 "	160 "
Italy	19,000,000	370,000,000	15 "	140 "
Canada and Aus- tralia.. ..	14,000,000	140,000,000	10 "	850 "

Land tenure in most countries of Europe has been in recent years placed on a better footing than before. At the beginning of the century serfdom prevailed in Germany, Scandinavia, Austria, Russia, and some other countries. Land may be said to average £15 an acre all over Europe, but it sells for double that price in France or England, and can seldom be obtained for less than £60 in the Low Countries. Few countries can rival Great Britain in the value of its farming stock, whether as compared to area or population. At the same time, no country equals the United States in the annual income derived from tillage and pasture. Great Britain is much more heavily mortgaged than any other country, but the rate of interest is the *lowest*, and hence the burden is by no means so heavy as would at first appear.

In 1881 ship-building was stimulated to an enormous extent. The resources of our ship-builders were taxed to the utmost, and they were full of contracts for the next twelve or fifteen months. On the Clyde, the activity had exceeded all previous years. The tonnage of vessels launched had reached a total of 340,823 tons, compared with 242,774 in 1880. Unfortunately, as a set-off to this prosperity, we had the fearful losses of 1881. Never before, since the development of steam traffic, has the list of wrecks and casualties been

so great. From my point of view, these increased losses are unmistakable indications that we want a different standpoint by which to guide our lives. The time has come when mankind must face the question boldly and openly, how the "Creator governs the world we live in;" does "progress" depend on the observance of God's law? Is man's religion to be known by his acts, or by his professions of belief? Are we to believe in "cause and effect," in "law"—invariable, inevitable, unerring law; or in destiny, fate, predestination, Divine interposition? I put this question to you plainly, because it seems to me that upon it rests our future. We cannot "progress mentally," so as to be able to compete with our competitors in 1882, if we are still to believe with Mr. Gladstone, who is reported to have said (see *Times*, January 13, 1882) to his tenants at Hawarden: "Gentlemen, the evils from which you have suffered are due to bad seasons and bad trade. The bad seasons with which it has pleased the Almighty to visit us have caused great losses. It may be that the prosperity of the country required the chastening hand of Providence, that we should be taught to suffer and struggle, so that we might not be too proud of the great power and wealth to which this country has attained." Is there a man living who believes that God has inflicted the bad harvests of the last few years upon agriculturists for this cause? Farmers depend upon the seasons, so do tradesmen; both, if equal to their position, will be cognizant of the fact that bad seasons will come; and both classes should prepare for the rainy day, exercise every vigilance to make the loss as little as possible, and put by in good seasons a reserve, ready to carry them over the bad. Had our Premier done his duty, he would have told his tenants and the farmers of England how they must act in the future, so as to show a profit where latterly there has been a loss. This is quite certain: nature's laws will not be altered, let the competition be ten times keener than it is; and it is folly to ascribe to God's pleasure what is due to man's want of capital, technical knowledge, industry, and thrift. But the farmer, like the

farmer must use his brains; he must observe what is going on; he must study how to improve his operations, introduce new processes where the old are defective, economizing where he can; but, above all, developing in every possible way the resources of the land he occupies, and when the time comes to reap the harvest, when the crops are ripe for gathering, not neglecting the work day after day, but working heart and soul, with his men, to get all cut and carried in the quickest possible time; fully alive to the uncertainty of our climate, and, aware of this uncertainty, protecting himself by the rearing of cattle and the smaller living creatures, such as poultry, and the culture of vegetables and fruits. It seems to me wiser to tell men that, whatever the position in life they occupy, it is their duty to ascertain how to live by their vocations, and, if they fail, that it is because they are not equal to the position they wish to fill. It is wiser, and seems to me more religious, to blame the creature than the Creator, as too many of the orthodox are apt to do. There is plenty for all of us; there is no defect, as regards supply, on the part of Providence; the fault is with ourselves, in not producing, and more wisely distributing the benefits that surround us. What have we to fear for the future? Great Britain has not only a growing population, but a population with growing needs. Not only are we more in number, but each of us has more wants. To satisfy these wants, needs a more intimate knowledge of science, of the world about us, of ourselves and our fellow-men, than heretofore. But this necessity for greater knowledge is a blessing, not a curse. Who doubts the possibility of development, like of man and his systems? The railway system can be extended; new docks can be constructed for more shipping; tramways so arranged as to carry us speedily and comfortably from one end of our great towns to another. Our streets and houses are dimly lighted; this could be easily remedied with better gas, and lamps nearer each other, than at present. Water we should like more of, and pure, canals for the cheap carriage of many articles, as coal, bricks, cement, &c.

We produce much, but the cry every year is, that the demand is not sufficient to keep going our immense productive power; and the distributing classes are beginning to think "their occupation is gone." But it is not so; it is only the mode of occupation that is undergoing a change. There is plenty of scope for all. You have body and brain; they were given you to use; look around, and whatever you decide upon doing, whatever your occupation in life, be in earnest. Let what you do be the best of its kind; exalt your occupation; strive to be of that rare organization—a nature framed to love perfection, and to labour for it. To those who ask, How? I reply, it is simple enough! "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might."

— "Attempt the end, and never stand to doubt;
Nothing's so hard but search will find it out."

HENRICK.

Nations, like individuals, must improve, must make "progress," or be beaten in the race. You may not see it, but a change for the better is always going on somewhere. By progress I mean a bettering of the condition of the masses, materially, mentally, and morally. There may be change without progress. It is the duty of those who aspire to be teachers of the people to indicate how they can act upon the course of change so as to promote it where it is beneficial, and divert it where it is injurious. In every age there is a popular weakness to be resisted, a want of vigour that needs sustenance. To develop our faculties, there must be growth; to improve it, needs a new unfolding of life, whereof the seed is more perfect, more charged with the elements that are pregnant with divine force. We must study more earnestly the laws of development, recognize that in humanity, as in the animal world, the result will be according to the skill we bestow upon the breeding and training. The rate of progress or development will depend upon our own acts, and it will be hastened or retarded in proportion to our wisdom or folly. We must profit by experience, and see the

danger of mistaking a tendency which should be resisted for an inevitable law to which we must adjust ourselves. Life, like fire, to be kept up, needs careful building, then judicious management; thereby we get the maximum of heat from the minimum of coal or labour. We waste a large portion of our life by neglecting the foundation and not carefully preserving the structure; and the same applies to nations. The life of a people grows; it is knit together, and yet expanded; in joy and sorrow, in thought and action, it should be as one family; watching carefully what is going on in the world, and absorbing the best thoughts of other nations into its own forms, improving them where possible, and giving back the improved thought as new wealth to the world, to be a power in the great body of the nations. The soul of a people should be so cultured, that they may depend upon themselves as one when the time comes for any common action; the people, like "one soul," resisting evil—as one soul, to eradicate misery—as one soul, always ready as a seed of fire that may enkindle the souls of multitudes, and make a new pathway for events. Time will be needed; we must wait patiently for prejudices to die out, and in time men will realize what a blessing it is to be rational, what it is to feel the light of the divine reason growing stronger within and without—to see more and more of the hidden bonds that bind and consecrate change as a dependent growth, all the world consecrated with the feeling of kinship—no difference between Jew and Gentile, an universal brotherhood; the differences of the past forgotten; the present devoted to the making of us all feel as if in the future we were children of one Parent, one God. We have done much, we have more to do;

"We never say 'I end here,' if success
Broadens a roadway to an enterprise;
We hew a channel for a freer course,
And travel on and on by every means."

Progress is inevitable when men understand that . . .

"We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths;
In feelings, not in figures on the dial."

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

"Let nobody insist upon the matter I write, but my method in writing. Let them observe in what I borrow, if I have known how to choose what is proper to raise, or relieve the invention, which is always my own; for I make others say for me, what, either for want of language, or want of sense, I cannot myself well express. I do not number my borrowings, I weigh them. And had I designed to raise their estimate by their number, I had made them twice as many." — MONTAIGNE.

AND now, reader; I must claim your indulgence whilst reviewing my work so far. When "Business" was published, it was not my intention to issue more than the first five thousand copies. A celebrated publisher gave it to one of his readers to read, and it was returned with the remark, "He could see nothing in it;" and my religious opinions were objected to. I offered to rewrite the book; but the publisher declined to have anything to do with me. As he understood books, and I did not, his hint was acted upon, and theology omitted. My present publishers declined to take the book in my name; a shilling book by an unknown author was not likely to sell sufficient to pay them for the trouble of opening a new account; so it was taken by them as the property of Mr. Collingridge. The book seemed a failure; I have been told that the publisher intended to send it back to the printer; out of the way, the very day the demand for it commenced. From that time it has had a steady sale. In "Business" the position is taken up, that if *all* men cannot succeed in making a fortune, no one need fail if they understand their business thoroughly, work indefatigably at it, and live thriftily. "Morality" was written to show that "Honesty is the only policy;" that there can be no permanent or lasting success for individuals or nations unless they are wise enough to see that "morality," or "doing to others as they would be done by," must be the guiding spirit of their actions. The intention of "Money" was to get people to think more of the circulating medium; its

action by means of gold, paper money, the value of banks and "cheques;" the necessity for the "currency laws" to be altered, to free commercial men from the anxious dread of not being able to obtain money required to carry on the legitimate trade of the country; briefly, for "money" to be expansive, and to grow with commerce; instead of trade, when extra good, being restricted by artificial restraints upon the issue of money. "Life" describes the impression made upon my mind in a busy career amongst all classes of men; and as many of its miseries seemed to me remediable, and as it has always seemed to me that we suffered enough in this world for our manifold sins and wickedness, my object was to get my readers to try and make the "most of this world" by learning and reverently obeying the Creator's laws, and dismissing 'the next world' from their minds, feeling assured they might safely leave their future in the hands of their Father in heaven. "Economy" was written to bring the subject of Political Economy before the masses in such a way as that they could understand the important subjects of "supply and demand," "free trade," and "taxation"—above all, the value of "thrift"—alike for their self-respect, independence, and success in life. "Progress" has been written to indicate in a brief space the "giant strides" that have been made in every department of industry, commerce, and science since the last century; but its principal intent is to make men more thoughtful, more observant of what is going on around them—not satisfied to leave things alone, in the spirit of those who say, "Fain would I glide down a gentle river, but I am carried down by a torrent," but wisely going with the impetuous stream, and making the best of life as it is. To obtain that peace of mind so necessary now in our hurried life, as also from its business and economical aspect, the relations of employers and employed have been fully gone into, and suggestions made calculated to cause a more cordial feeling between the two classes—one that should be to their mutual, and therefore to the national, advantage.

"Business" may be compared to an engine which has taken

the commercial student safely along his journey, being guided by "Morality," which has kept him on the straight path, and free from upsets; and with healthy body and brain, and his conscience free of anything in the past to reproach himself with; and realizing that for a happy "Life," he must understand that the power of "Money" consists in its wise use, and that misery follows every one who abuses the great power it confers; intelligent enough to know money in its varied forms is not *real* wealth, but merely a medium for the exchange of wealth. "Economy" and the laws of "Progress" being understood, we may trust to the good inherent in all men to leave the future with confidence; the majority will benefit, and by their example cause others to follow in making the best of this world, by an intelligent and reverential use of their powers and blessings. Man must be industrious; he must be thrifty. There must be those who do not spend what they earn; as man is so constituted, that he desires to acquire; it is a pleasure to his nature to save, and not to spend. To spend money, you want time; the busy man has not the time, or values it too highly to waste it; so, as a rule, one generation gathers, and the next scatters. The spendthrift succeeds the miser, but the workers and savers in every age outnumber the drones and the spendthrifts. In every age there are changes in method, new inventions, discoveries that, by saving labour, give greater wealth than usual; but the majority keep on plodding along the beaten tracks, and leave the way open for the daring few to pave the way for a coming generation. Talk to men of middle age, it is rarely but that you are told that the competition is fearful, so glad they are nearly done with it; business ways are turned upside down, and it puzzles them to know what they are coming to. Success is not a sudden thing. To some it seems marvellous how this or that man has got on so suddenly; but who knows how long these men have been silently cutting for themselves the steps by which they meant to climb; the dreary weeks, months, years, in which they have persistently pushed themselves forward to their present goal! Before the grape is on the vine, the seed must

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

have been sown. Press on; have an onward but upward object in view; use your brains; look about and watch the world; understand human nature and its wants; be determined to make progress, but firmly resolved to do so in an honourable manner, serving Mammon, but by obeying the laws of God; and living your life upon this principle, you can rely with safety and confidence upon success in your vocation; and having succeeded, be able to make the best of this life, and use wisely and well the power "money" and the improved social position success has given you, either for the comfort and amelioration of the condition of others less successful, or for your own comfort and happiness.

The moral to be drawn from the six books is: that men are the Creator's stewards, and should endeavour more earnestly to utilize their material, mental, moral, and spiritual powers. The object has been to recall to the "busy many," in a pleasant and readable manner, the principles which should guide their actions in this life; and, from a selfish point of view, to try and convince them by my own experience, strengthened and confirmed by quotations from philosophers and poets of all ages and climes, that by obeying the natural laws, by using their intelligence and common sense, it is possible, socially, intellectually, and religiously, to make of this world a paradise, and the inhabitants therein prosperous, contented, and happy. The Creator rules by law and order, in the natural and spiritual worlds; and although it may be said that "I make too much of this world," the reply is obvious: that if once we get man to view "this life" from a loftier standpoint, make him feel that he is of that higher order of beings of whom is expected a life the result of knowledge, reflection, and a reverent desire to obey his Creator, —if we succeed in doing this, in implanting within his soul the desire to live up to a certain ideal, we have taken the surest means of making him lead a really true religious life, based upon a knowledge of God's laws—laws as immutable as their Author; the wisdom and justice, the perfection and kindness, in those that are at present known to man inspiring him

with an unlimited faith in those that are at present unknown—
 a faith based on knowledge, and not on the traditions and
 theories of this or that theological sect. I mention this because
 so many men for whom I have the highest respect have im-
 agined that my teaching is only for this world; good perhaps; so
 far as it goes, but although sincere, of little use, as it ignores
 the "higher aim," the "future life," to which our hopes, they
 say, are instinctively directed. No doubt

"There are more things in heaven and earth
 Than are dreamt of in my philosophy."

"Progress" will end the series. My task is done, having oc-
 cupied every leisure-moment of my time for the last seven years.
 It is often said by the reviewers, that "Mr. Platt puts forth
 nothing new, his only merit is in his manner of treating the
 subject." The objection is true, I admit the subjects are old.
 In "Force and Matter," by Mr. Buchner, we are told that in
 the world there is the same matter now as at the beginning,
 and will be to the end, but, under various combinations, in
 new forms; so also has my intention been to put new clothes
 upon the old bodies; and make the *tout ensemble*, as attractive as
 possible. The work has been a source of pleasure and mental
 development for myself, and I shall be content if my efforts
 have induced any one to have a brighter view of life, to see
 therein a prospect of happiness, if only to themselves they be
 true; recognizing as a truism, that there is nothing improbable
 that is possible; and that it is their duty, from a selfish, as
 from the higher view, to be industrious, and wisely economical,
 and thrifty; to improve their material position; but, above all,
 to develop, expand, and enlarge their mental and moral
 powers. Reader, make all you can from "Business," re-
 member "Morality," use "Money" wisely, after studying the
 true principles of "Economy," and believe that "Life," ra-
 tionally and wisely led, must end in individual and national
 "Progress." *Adieu!*