and that no individual under-
ing, or any other, how very
under such circumstances the
would be properly investigated?
a carpenter's position was insecur
ick was 100?. It would be more
ember of the House to inquire
ment than an underwriter,
that yoy would subject himself
ing, and yet he would be ignor
ro many divergencies in the re-
to the time of immersion, and
ment of the vessel. The ques
ate (Mr. Plimsoll) admitted that
but that was no reason for not
tously. He (Mr. Plimsoll) Hoes
shipowner, but to put its hand
ness when it had the chance
ldy would sink with the bubble,
any particular water line, but he
ter objection was that the Bill
of surveyors. Of the 27,000 ship
ly 1,000 were inspected annually
13,000, and the work was satis
ed surveyors, so gave the whole
ny to vote against partially
the late Secretary to the Board of
ade (Mr. Chichester Fortescue)
—that it would cost 500,000?. a
that such was the case,
Committee at Lloyd's
ver to that objection. The small
d left a large surplus in hand.
ed the Bill would be a boon to
Bill would interfere with private

id the hon. gentleman was mis-
t the right of Parliament to intro-
ne of mines; he only questioned
ent.
nt all events that objection was
to be sunk a Government officer
ability to survey the vessel was
for factories; and a man who
must build it of materials of a
ion might go to sea in a vessel
ment. A man might buy an old
ost of a new one being from 10?.
to 20?. per ton, and yet he
es of the former owner, and if the
ccount of the danger, a policeman
ed. Government had given way
ay of legislation. He had never
ive than to the Liberal party,
to appealed to good men on both
ation of the Bill was therefore
r its protection around the brave
and vast numbers of women and
ses which would otherwise over-

seconded the motion. No one
ed the Bill, and he could
ything was done. He was con-
ifle which occurred round their
ing. It was unnecessary to
ities which were provided by the
t. It was not a question of the
ster (Mr. Plimsoll) stated that
quently sent to prison, although
ing, which might be unseaworthy,
es he most cordially supported the

moving that the Bill be read a
y six months, remarked that he
s sometimes went to sea in an
ed that the hon. member had wished
ouse was, that the remedy which
posed was totally unsuited for
ate (Mr. Plimsoll) was singularly
Smith) maintained that any man
ligence or an undue desire or
ation, Whatever might be the
ore God and man. (Hear, hear.)
ever, which should be dealt with
ithe course. (Hear, hear.) He
the inspection of ships to a man-
ture, and it is therefore a ques-
hon. member to do next session
Bill for the protection of life on
ore. Hear, hear.) Government
ing Bill for the security of the
shore, and whereas many crimes
s it was that from
after dark unless he can
d character from the Zoo-
ypark—(Hear, hear, laughter)
Kensington—(renewed cries of
ean round the corner. And it
ate, he might then violate the
ard. Two of the three tribunals
ed should have the power
and no legal status in the court
reign Shipping and the Liverpool
ation, and the Government
as most objectionable. (Hear,
the opposition of the Bill would
ed, and it would be a great
ition as the guilty. The hon.
it was only a small minority of
ing, and in an unseaworthy
ss of Lloyds for the last ten
number of wrecks and casualties
ed, and it was a matter of
ne at the present time, seeing
I laid on the table a measure
his question to the only prac-
rosting as guilty of a misdemean-
ly, if guilty, should be tried.
Kensington—(renewed cries of
ean round the corner. (Hear,
ate, he might then violate the
ard. "Two of the three tribunals
ed should have the power
and no legal status in the court
reign Shipping and the Liverpool
ation, and the Government
as most objectionable. (Hear,
the opposition of the Bill would
ed, and it would be a great
ition as the guilty. The hon.
it was only a small minority of
ing, and in an unseaworthy
ss of Lloyds for the last ten
number of wrecks and casualties
ed, and it was a matter of
ne at the present time, seeing
I laid on the table a measure
his question to the only prac-
rosting as guilty of a misdemean-
ly, if guilty, should be tried.
shipowner that responsibility
him. (Hear, hear.) What was
ed to do? Shipowners should
most injurious to the shipping
and called upon the House to re-

onded the amendment. While
hon. member for Derby in his
ed to the Bill, he had not
Mr. Rathbone's) fear was that
ould tend to increase the very
designed to prevent
shipowner that responsibility
him. (Hear, hear.) What was
ed to do? Shipowners should
most injurious to the shipping
and called upon the House to re-

at considering the Government
ogress on the same subject as
it that the time was inopportune
Bill, which was a most
was merely a humanity dodge
rinciple of cruelty be as impossible,
ing, and he would
ed the Bill, and complained of the
ed the honourable mover with
ing our merchant shipping
amongst 26,000 ships, many of
some accidents should not annoy

supported the Bill, and read
ch was resulting from the abuse
loading. Injury to the Bill would
he Bill a second reading.
ed the hon. member for Derby
ver for Derby in bringing the
Government had in his opinion
s belonging to the Government
ect. He was not prepared to
g, nor on the part of the Board
ritable commercial body un-
the Bill would impose
nder its provisions the Board
ed over unwieldy not only
e United Kingdom but every
country. It was impossible to
ing to be a kind of Board
to be a special survey in every
ing provisions adopted such an
ction interference with the
ed such a laborious and costly
ed that the Board of the Go-
ed satisfied that there was
objects. The Bill would estab-
ed of inquiry in every high
hope of preventing a few out-
of accidents and disasters
ity of life and property
Shipping Act which the
on the table contained several
ect which would be very
as he believed they would prove
ed and attended with less in-
ed that the Board of Trade
at Bill provided that in the case
e there should be a record of
s as to give facilities of proof
ed; that the offence of sending
worthy state should be a mide-
y sailor should be at liberty to
ip which he believed to be in
ion to a seaworthy state; and
ad knowledge of a particular
ered to sea in an unseaworthy

condition brought the matter before the Board of Trade, they should cause an inquiry to be instituted. These proposals would go a long way to meet the excellent and humane object which the hon. gentleman had in view, and he trusted that when they came to a discussion hon. members would give them favourable consideration. Inquiries upon the circumstances it was impossible for him to recommend the House to sanction the principle of the present measure. (Hear, hear.)

SIR J. PAKINGTON pointed out that a very large proportion of the losses of the last year were due to the fault of the master, and urged that as a reason for extending the inquiries to the shipowners.

Mr. S. CAVE said no doubt there was great reason for the Bill which the hon. member had introduced, many lives had been lost from unseaworthiness, from overloading and from deck loading, and any man who sent a ship to sea in a dangerous state was guilty of the most cold-blooded murder. The Government had considered the subject was necessary, but whether it was the proper legislation. When he was considering the matter he was inclined to think that the Government should be made for limiting the insurance on vessels, and for a load line, and that the offence of sending a ship to sea in an unseaworthy condition should be made a misdemeanour; but he had been told that it would be impossible to limit the insurance, and the other two points were dealt with by the Merchant Shipping Bill of the Government. Let the heaviest penalties be imposed upon shipowners who committed any of the faults which caused the loss of ships; but he feared if they went down strict rules to be observed, they would be sure to find shipowners relieved from responsibility. If the hon. gentleman waited till the Government Bill was brought forward he would have the opportunity of introducing the principle of his proposed form of amendments, and that would be a more satisfactory course than to proceed with the present measure.

Mr. Fawcett said it was doubtful whether the Government Bill, containing as it did 700 clauses, would pass this session, and therefore unless they were willing to separate from it the provisions of the present measure under discussion he should be sorry to see this measure abandoned.

Sir J. PAKINGTON said if the hon. member pressed the Bill to a division he should vote with him, not because he approved of the details of the Bill, but as expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fawcett) he had thought the speech they had heard from the President of the Board of Trade had too much of the old Board of Trade about it. He was glad to hear the kind of anxiety expressed to promote the interest of the shipowners, but nothing, or very little, as to the great loss of life which was continually taking place on the coast was attributable to the culpability of shipowners. There were only two ways of settling this question, one was by the Government bringing in a Bill on the subject, and the other was by the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Mr. J. GRAVES said it appeared to him that the House was called upon to vote on a measure which was almost universally condemned. He should not vote for what he regarded as one of the most impracticable and unworkable measures that was ever brought forward in this House. With regard to the load line there was no more difficult subject to deal with than the determining of what was a proper load line. What was a proper load line for one vessel was not a proper load line for another.

Mr. A. FERRIE said the hon. member for Kingston-upon-Hull could not be passed into law this session, the clauses relating to the overloading of ships would be detached and brought forward as a separate Bill.

Mr. PLIMSOLL then withdrew the Bill.

THE PUBLIC PARKS, &c., LAND BILL.

This Bill was read a second time.

COUNTY PROPERTY BILL.

This Bill was read a second time.

CHURCH RATES IN SCOTLAND.

Mr. McLAREN obtained leave to bring in a Bill for the Abolition of Church Rates in Scotland.

LODGERS' GOODS PROTECTION.

Mr. H. SHERIDAN obtained leave to bring in a Bill to protect the goods of lodgers against distraint upon the property of the landlord.

PARISH CHURCHES.

Mr. WEST obtained leave to bring in a Bill to declare and amend the law as to the rights of parishioners in respect of their parish churches, and for other purposes relating thereto.

NEW WRIT.

On the motion of Mr. OLYN a new writ was ordered for Hereford, in the room of Sir Joseph Cockey, who has retired.

The House adjourned at a quarter to six o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY DIVISION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—TUESDAY, FEB. 21.

ARMY ADMINISTRATION.

Motion made, and Question put, "That, in the opinion of this House, no scheme for Military Administration can be considered as complete which does not affect the tenure of the Command in Chief to such a modification as will place the Secretary of State for War to avail himself freely of the best administrative talent that may be at his disposal, independently of any system of promotion existing in the British Army."—(Mr. Trevelyan.)—*the House divided:* AYES, 68. NOES 189.

AYES.

Armitstead, G
Bentinck, G S
Bentall, E M
Brassey, T
Bright, J
Brown, A H
Brown, J A
Campbell, H
Carter, J
Chadwick, D
Cowper, H F
Crawford, R W
Dixon, G
Edwards, H
Fawcett, H
Fawcett, M
Fitzmaurice, Lord
Forster, W E
Fothergill, R
Goldsmith, Sir F
Gourley, E T
Graves, S R
Grieve, J J
Harcourt, W G
Harris, J D
Herbert, H A
Hodgkinson, G
Holland, S
Holms, J
Hoskyns, C W
Illingworth, A
Lancaster, J
Lewis, J W
Lee, T
Leatham, E A
Lewis, J D
Lewis, J J
Lyttelton, C G
Macie, H A
Mackintosh, E W
M'Arthur, W
M'Laren, D
Maclure, S S
Meldy, G
Morley, J
Morley, S
Miller, J
Mundella, A J
Munz, R
O'Brien, Sir P
Palmer, C M
Philips, R N
Rimsell, R

Potter, T B
Price, W E
Price, W P
Rathbone, W
Reed, C
Richard, H
Robertson, D
Russell, A
Russell, E R
Samuelson, H B
Sclater-Booth, G
Sheridan, H B
Simon, Serjeant
Smith, J B
Smith, E
Stevenson, J C
Strutt, H
Taylor, P A
Tracy, C H D
Wedderburn, Sir D
West, H W
White, J
Whitwell, W
Wingfield, Sir C
Winterbotham, H S P

TELLERS.

Trevelyan, G O
Anderson, G

NOES.

Ewing, A O
Figgins, J
Fitzgerald, Lord G
Fitzwilliam, Hon C
Fletcher, I
Floyer, J
Forester, Cols
Forster, W H
Fortescue, Hon C J
Fortescue, Hon D
Fordyce, A D
Gavin, Major
Giladstone, W E
Gladstone, W H
Gower, Hon E F
Grey, Sir G
Grey, Lieut-Col
Greene, E
Grevile, Hon Capt
Grosvenor, Lord R
Grosvenor, Hon M
Grove, T F
Guest, M J
Gurney, R
Hambro, C
Hamilton, Lord G
Hamilton, Lord C J
Hamilton, Lord G
Hartington, Marqs
Hay, Sir J C D
Hedley, J F
Henley, J W
Henniker, J
Hibbert, J T
Hick, J
Hubbard, J G
Hoare, S
Hodgson, K D
Holford, J P G
Hope, A M
Hornby, E K
Hope, A R D
Hunt, G W
Hunt, J
Jervis, Col S
Jervis, Major
Jervis, Capt
Johnstone, Sir H
Kennard, Col E
Kerrison, E
Keown, W
Knatchbull-Hugessen, H
Knox, Hon Col S
Lacon, Sir H L
Laird, J
Lambert, N G
Lawrence, Sir J
Lawrence, C E
Learmonth, A
Leeman, Lieut-Col
Leonard, J H
Leslie, J C
Lindsay, Hon Col
Lindsay, Col C L
Lopes, H C
Lorne, Marquis
Lowe, R
Lowther, W
Lyons, R
Lyons, A
M'Lagan, P
M'Mahon, P
Mellor, T W
Meyrick, T

Milbank, F A
Monck, Viscount
Monck, Hon G W
Mills, C H
Morgan, C O
Morgan, Lord
Neel, Hon G
Neville, R
O'Connor Don, The
Onslow, G
O'Leghlen, Sir C
O'Reilly-Dease, A
O'Reilly, M W
Osborne, R
Palmerston, Sir J
Palmer, Sir R
Parker, C W
Parry, L J
Pease, Sir H
Peel, R W
Pell, A
Percy, Earl
Phipps, C N
Pleydell, J
Pleydell-Bouverie, D
Plunkett, Hon D
Pomfret, Earl of
Rothschild, M
Rothschild, N M
Round, J
Royston, Lord
Sackville, S G S
Salomons, Sir J
Samuda, J D A
Samuelson, B
Sclater-Booth, Sir G
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H J
Simonds, W B
Smith, J
Smith, R
Smith, W H
Stacpoole, W
Stanley, Hon F
Stansfeld, J
Steere, L
Stepney, Colonel
Stevens, M J
Stralefe, T
Stuart, Col
Sykes, C
Talbot, Hon R
Tollemache, Hon F
Turner, C
Vance, J
Verney, Sir H
Vivian, Lieut-Col
Walker, Major G
Walsh, Hon A
Walsh, Hon A
Watkin, E W
Westbourne, W S
Whitbread, S
Wilbraham, Capt G
Williamson, Sir H
Wise, H C
Young, A W
Young, G

TELLERS.

Glyn, G C
Adam, W P

MR. DARWIN ON "THE DESCENT OF MAN."

Mr. Darwin's new volumes on the "Descent of Man," which have just been published by Mr. Murray, form another illustration of that unwearied research and courageous, if hazardous, speculation to which science already owes so much. It is now more than a dozen years since, on a certain evening, two remarkable papers were read before the Linnæan Society. The one was called "On the Tendency of Varieties to depart indefinitely from the Original Type," and had been sent by Mr. A. R. Wallace from the Malay Archipelago. The other was entitled "On the Tendency of Species to form Varieties, and on the Perpetuation of Species and Varieties by Natural Means of Selection," and this communication was known to be a chapter from an unpublished book by Mr. Charles Darwin. In the following year this book was published. The surprise, the opposition, the admiration which it excited were enormous. Many scientific men of the highest standing, some gave in their adhesion, more or less qualified, to a theory which was supported by clear and fable arguments, and by a formidable array of facts. Other scientific men looked askance at it; and clergymen of the school of Wilberforce rushed forward to declare that theology was somehow or other threatened by the destruction of the Divine independence of species. Perhaps the latter may derive some consolation from the fact that Mr. Wallace, the co-originator of the theory, is the author of a defence of miracles against the reasoning of Hume. Be this as it may, the new teaching spread. It has been so generally accepted as to become almost commonplace. We can scarcely recall the fact that only a few years ago a large number of the scientific men of the country viewed with little surprise Linnæus's time-honoured declaration that species, as species, were primordial creations. They were, of course, familiar with Lamarck's theory of the transmutation of species, and the elaborate treatises which had been written on the fertility of hybrids, and the variations among cultivated plants and domesticated animals; but they still clung, in the absence of clear proof, to the prevalent notion that the plants and animals we see around us were literally descended from nearly similar plants and animals, whose origin was lost in the dim and sudden simultaneous creation. Mr. Darwin's doctrine of Natural Selection—or, as Mr. Herbert Spencer prefers to call it, the Survival of the Fittest—had, if it was to succeed successfully, grappled with the first problem of physical nature, and applied a theory to the phenomena of the universe, which, if it does not satisfactorily explain certain strange blanks and abrupt transitions, is in itself at least logically consistent.

On the points in discussion between Mr. Darwin and his opponents, it is not our province to say anything controversial. Whether or not his theories are reconcilable with the principles of Natural Theology, or with a true view of the teachings and limits of Revelation, are questions to which various answers have been given. Whatever is true in a false evidence can be refuted only by true science. Vituperation is worse than useless; it is treason to truth to get into a passion with error. Without entering our own field of theology, we may, we may endeavour within such limits as our space will allow, to give a brief account of Mr. Darwin's latest book, considered as a phenomenon in literature and a chapter in the history of science. The work may be divided into two parts, treating respectively of Man and Sex. The one contains an elaborate treatise—full of minute and painstaking observation—on Sexual Selection, which may be considered as supplementary to the theory of Natural Selection; the other consists of an application of the double theory to the question of the origin of man. Let us state in plain words the conclusion at which Mr. Darwin arrives. "Man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in its habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World." Mr. Darwin half apologises for having given his fellow-creatures the pedigree of prodigious length, but "not of noble quality." Lady readers of his book, however, will learn with satisfaction that they are not descended from "any existing ape or monkey. On the contrary, it is more probable that the ancestors of the Simian stock (for man is supposed to have diverged from the Catarrhine or Old World division of the Simiidæ, which bestows upon us all a pedigree beyond the Norman, or the time of William the Conqueror) were unlike any man or monkey who can now be found in Shoreditch or the Zoological Gardens. Our progenitors, we are informed, lived in Africa, and were distinguished by that ornament the loss of which received Lord Monboddo's serious attention. The successive steps by which Mr. Darwin reaches this climax can only be briefly and imperfectly indicated. In the first place, he studies such evidence as is found in the bodily structure of man of his descent from some less highly organized form. He points out the singular presence of rudimentary structures in man which connect the human being with many other animals—one of these consisting of certain physiological indications that Lord Monboddo was not so very wrong, and another being the blunt point on the Indian Ocean, called an ear. Then he brings forward the traces of correspondence between the ape and the man; among them being a statement which proves that there is some ape-like feature in the human face, as the time "when monkeys smoked tobacco." Wild baboons, we are informed, are fond of beer. When they drink too much, they have a headache next morning, and relish the juice of lemons—probably the nearest approach to the Indian water which the African experimentalist could devise. One monkey, after having become intoxicated with brandy, would never touch it again—thus, adds Mr. Darwin, showing higher self-control than many men. But it is in the direction of his mental powers and his moral sense that the important difference exists between man and the brutes. The interval between the highest type of monkey and the lowest type of savage, Mr. Darwin considers to be immense—greater, indeed, than that between Shakespeare and a microcephalous idiot; but he maintains that it is a difference not in kind but in degree. He gives a thousand instances of the intellectual and emotional peculiarities of the lower animals; and affords us, amongst other things, some remarkable details about the characteristics of our kinsman the monkey. In the Zoological Gardens there was a baboon which always got into a furious rage when the keeper took out a book and began to read aloud—though whether the baboon objected to the sentiment of the book, or to the pronunciation of the keeper, we are not told. Another acquaintance Mr. Waterhouse was permitted to make, sang excellently; and that gentleman describes, with almost a pathetic fondness, the accurate manner in which the monkey beat time through its scales, and hit the correct intervals. Then it is a great mistake to suppose that the monkeys do not use tools. The chimpanzee packs nuts with a stone. The orang is acquainted with the use of the lever. In that way the orang can hurl down stones on their enemies, just like the Swiss mountaineers—and, by the way, any one who has seen a body of Swiss soldiers, will draw his own conclusions. Another monkey covers himself at night with the leaves of the Pandanus. All this is cheering. We judge of a man by the company he keeps, and sometimes by the conditions of his forefathers. We are glad to learn that the lower animals are so kindly, prudent, social, affectionate; and, indeed, after having read various works on the subject by various writers, one almost feels bound to protest against the theory that there is any affinity between man and the ape—as an injury done to the ape.

We cannot enter here into even the briefest description of the pictures of the rise and progress of man drawn by Mr. Darwin in these two striking volumes, nor yet of his theory on the development of the intellectual and moral faculties during personal times. Of course, he gets rid of the conventional notions concerning human instinct and reason. Mr. Herbert Spencer has clearly shown how an animal driven by necessity to supply certain wants, induces in itself a certain modification of a nature which is inherited by similar conditions to become hereditary, and in its turn produces an organic function which may be attributed to instinct or any other hypothetical source. Mr. Darwin's chapters on man as a thinking animal are full of admirable illustration, and show a firm intellectual grasp of the subject. No less full of careful observation, lucid statement, and clear reasoning are his chapters on Sexual Selection, and the influence of that principle on the races of mankind. As for his general conclusions on the subject of the Descent of Man, he anticipates that it will be unpleasant to many people, who, however, ought to reflect with profit on the fashion in which man has reached the top of the organic scale. What was it the good Herr Teufelsdröckh said of the noble savage, "glaring directly from under his fleece of hair?" "Reader, the Heaven-inspired melodious Singer; Infinite Serene Highness; nay, thy own amber-locked, snow-and-rose-complexioned Maiden, worthy to glide sylphlike almost on air, whom thou lovest, worshippest as a Divine Presence, which, indeed, symbolically taken, she is—has descended, like thee, from that same hairy-mantled, flint-hurling Aboriginal Anthropophagus!" It is needless to say, however, what an advance even the Anthropophagus was on the Catarrhine or Old World Simiæ.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

The religious question being the topic for debate at the weekly meeting of the School Board for London the Board met in the Council Chamber, which was crowded with a very large attendance of strangers. The Board met in the Committee-room, and at Guildhall, which was so ill-suited to the unusually intense feeling of the occasion, Mr. Lawrence, the chairman, thought it necessary to express regret that the Council Chamber was not, as before, available for the use of the Board, on the ground that Mr. Buchanan being held there. After the transaction of some routine business the reading of the minutes, Mr. H. SAYER, M.P., proposed his resolution on the teaching of the Bible in schools:

That in the schools provided by the Board the Bible shall be read and "instruction in religious subjects" shall be given therefrom, provided that such instruction be conducted in the presence of the Act in Section XIV. ("No religious catechism or religious formulary which any denomination shall deem to be distinctive shall be taught in the school") be strictly observed, both in letter and in spirit, and that a rule be made in my such schools to attend children to any particular denomination, or to the teaching of any particular school, the Board shall consider and determine upon such rules as may be necessary for the protection of the parents of the district, who may show special cause for exception to the religious instruction of this resolution in whole or in part.

He hoped the resolution would not be accepted as describing his own private opinions of view. He was not to meet in the most satisfactory manner possible the difficulty of the Board to convey the best instruction to the children who would be placed under the care of the Board, and the proposal he now made seemed to him to be the most practical way of applying the spirit of the Education Act, so as to meet the wishes of the people. The spirit of the Act distinctly recognised the necessity of religious teaching, and it was the duty of the Board, the 25th Act, and the 7th and 14th sections laid down the conditions under which it should be conveyed, for they prohibited the teaching of anything which was particular views of Church discipline or dogmas. He admitted that while the Act distinctly recognised the principle of religious teaching, it was not the duty of the Board to make the Bible, although it did exclude distinctive formularies. The Board was to be entrusted with the education of the neglected and destitute children, and it was in some way or other to recognise the Bible as the standard upon which religious instruction was to be given. He quoted the saying of Dr. Matthew Arnold—"Let the Bible alone, but the great majority of mankind, unbroad, and unlearned, will not be satisfied, they will insist that religion ought to be blended with the instruction of their children, even though it may never have blended with their own life and conduct. Nevertheless it must that the Bible should be read in schools. The parents, to begin with, had the protection of the conscience clause, and there might be schools established with denominations of children to whom exceptional teaching might be given if the parents desired. It was the duty of the Board to deal with those exceptions without circumstances any proselytizing influence whatever, or providing machinery for the expression of views or denominational purposes of any sect whatever, from the doing of which they were clearly prohibited by Act of Parliament. It would, of course, be competent for any parents to read the Bible and impart elementary religious instruction without advancing the interests of particular sects. (Hear, hear.) He assumed that there was a great time for religious teaching taught in denominational day-schools did not contemplate the children denominational. He had strong opinions himself on religious subjects, and he should be in every school, but he was not prepared to thrust those opinions on others. It only was that the children should have some sound foundation of religious instruction upon which to form their own opinions when they came to years of maturity. (Cheers.)

Mr. S. MORLEY, M.P., in briefly seconding the motion, said it was desirable to introduce as little change as possible in the existing arrangements, which were working well on the whole, and seemed to be generally acceptable to all ranks and ages might from it obtain that which would be of service to them both in this world and the next; still he was not prepared to press any opinion that it was not wanted. He, however, knew something about working men, and they had a great proportion of them, although they themselves were not particularly anxious to the teaching of that book, desired that their children should not be brought up in ignorance of particular classes who were to be benefited by the new schools. He knew who through them would receive their only opportunity of learning the commonplaces of religion. The teachers, he believed, as a body would scorn the idea of degrading their office for the mere purpose of extending the influence of any sect. He was confident that there was sensible men and women who would offend as few parents as possible, and his own belief was that ten times as many parents would be offended by the abolition of religious teaching as by its introduction. (Hear, hear.) The Board should let it be understood that it was their desire and intention to introduce the Bible, and that it had a fair, honest, unsectarian teaching of it, to be watched by inspectors and other methods most keenly. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Mr. Rogers rose to move the following amendment:

That it is expedient for this Board not to commit itself to any sectarian or denominational teaching, and that religious instruction in the schools under its authority, but rather to judge as that when parents desire it, it be left to the Board to provide for the subjects best suited for that school, and for the community for which it is established.

An abstract resolution like that proposed by the hon. member for Westminster, would be highly mischievous, since it there would be a great deal of discord into a hitherto harmonious assembly, and the result some could not tell. It was not the business of the Board to lay down abstract principles of religion, and it was not the duty of the Board for the best interest of the ratepayers. He defied the Board to say that the teachers could avoid teaching their children distinctive dogmas of particular sects. On the other side, who was to find out whether the teaching was denominational or not? Who was to teach the Bible; the teacher, or the parent? The teacher, or was it to be read, as was so often the case now in a slip-shod way by a child? In every parish or district there would be some who would be dissatisfied, and the children who it had been said might withdraw would be placed in a very invidious position. He was not prepared to run right to place them. (Hear, hear.) Putting aside all questions of sympathy, and looking at this question as men of business the Board was bound to do, it was clear that Education than he was, and he believed strongly there could be no more harm than good to be conferred upon it. He had in his time taught the catechism and all the rest of it, but that system must be now changed for another, and the Board was bound to adopt the best system. Bibles were bound to come to a separation of religious and secular teaching. ("No, no," and cheers.) His advice was to get through religious teaching with as little as from the secular education of the children committed to their charge. The Sunday Schools were all crowded, and in connection with all denominations there were numerous organisations for teaching religious instruction, and to them he would leave it. (Cheers.)

The amendment was not seconded.

Mr. J. CRAWFURD CLARKE proposed an amendment, he believed, to the motion was thoroughly impracticable, and that under its authority the Bible would be teaching would be given, whatever the Board might instruct to the contrary. He hoped the Parliament in their cowardice ought not to have shrunk from the difficulty of settling this question upon the Board, but they failed to perform their duty, choosing to leave it to be revised when the State could no longer legislate for the religious instruction of the people. He quoted Cobden, John Stuart Mill, and Bright, as opposed to compulsory taxation, and argued that the actual operation of this resolution would favour the Church of England, because it had the largest number of schools, and it was at the expense of teachers and managers be infusing, at the expense of other denominations, Church of England teaching where it was not taught now. Was that right as a matter of religious equality? (Cheers.) This question of religious teaching which had failed hitherto in the day schools of the country—("No, no," and "hear, hear") would bring a hornet's nest into the community. He was not prepared to say that