

quence of the defects of an institution which they supported and recommended.

The facts which I have noticed only confirm the views put forward in my former paper. The divided responsibility of management between the government and the trustees, and the limitation of liability of the managers are both fatal to the security of the depositors; so that there is not in charitable savings' banks, as now constituted, that reasonable amount of security that any honest man can advise his poor neighbour to trust to them.

The object of providing a perfectly safe place for the deposits of the poor, is a matter of such importance in our present state of civilization, as to demand our best exertions to have the requisite means adopted for securing it. For this purpose, there are two measures which seem to be indispensable.

The first is, to extend to all joint-stock banks the facilities for repaying deposits to minors, married women, and the representatives of deceased depositors, now conferred on the savings' banks. The importance of this change is shown by the number of persons in some of the classes to which I have referred, who are depositors in savings' banks. Thus it was ascertained at Manchester, in 1842, that one-fourth of the depositors are minors; and one-fourth, women-servants, milliners, dressmakers, and needlewomen.

The next measure is to extend the plan of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to a considerable portion of the public debt, and to have it so arranged as to be a convenient investment for the poor. There is no reason why the whole business of registering the public debt should be monopolized by the Banks of England and Ireland, and transacted in London and Dublin only.

The example of the subscriptions to the recent loan raised by the Emperor of the French, shows how ready the poorer classes are to invest in government security; and the money order office in our Post-office shows that a large part of the business of banking for the poor can be cheaply and efficiently conducted by the officers of a public department.

The first step towards the adoption of such measures is to produce a conviction in the public mind, of the utter instability of savings' banks as now constituted, and that conviction I have endeavoured to create.

III.—*Russian Serfs and British Laborers.*—By Henry Wynne, Esq.

[Read 19th March, 1855.]

At the present period any inquiry into the social resources of that vast country which is carrying on a stupendous struggle with the bulk of the civilized nations of Europe, must possess peculiar interest, and a comparison of the state of its peasantry with that of our own country may be suggestive of many hints of practical importance. And if this be, as I believe it to be, one of the most valuable uses of the study of history, or the investigation of the

circumstances of other countries at distant periods of time, the same principle may be expected to hold good when applied to a country co-existent in time, but distant in position, and equally differing in social institutions. Indeed, an inquiry into the political institutions of Russia has peculiarly this character of an historical research, as, though not absolutely stationary, she is a laggard in the race of civilization; and the condition of her peasantry is to a great extent similar to that which once had existence in most of the continental states of Europe, and from which we have risen by the gradual advance of civilization and progress to our present improved state; as, with all its faults and all its hardships, the condition of the free laborer must be admitted to be when compared with that of the serf. The latter is, as I shall shew, deprived of the exercise of the highest, and what ought to be the most inalienable privilege of our nature, the free exercise, direction, and consequent improvement of whatever faculties each individual may have been blessed with.

All men are not equal, and never will be equal, but it is one of the most essential prerogatives of humanity to possess a capability of improvement. To better his own condition, or the principle of self-love, is one of man's strongest instincts; and to be allowed free scope in the application of his energies for that end should not only be his privilege, but is proved by reason and experience to be one of the most powerful agents in advancing the civilization and progress of that aggregate of human beings which forms the society of each country.

The relative position of the higher and inferior classes of society in Russia is not very different from what it was in Europe formerly, and is that which will naturally obtain wherever *right* has not been recognized as at least a co-ordinate element in government with *might*. One class owns the land, and possesses besides a right over the labor of the class below them.

There are two forms which this command over the labor of others assumes wherever existing in the world. The one is what we call *slavery*, a word unknown in our constitutional vocabulary, but with the horrors of which we have been made but too well acquainted, as it prevails among our transatlantic brethren. The other is the qualified and milder form of serfdom.

Though now to be found only among the nations of Slavonic race in Europe, it is not of peculiarly or exclusively Slavonic origin. Up to the period of the French revolution, there remained traces of prædial servitude in France; and though it sooner disappeared among us, our earlier histories, in classifying the ranks of the nation, make mention of two grades of serfs, the one mere personal chattels of their masters, while the other were said to be "*adscripti glebæ*," and could only change masters with the soil to which they and their labor were attached. We find formal acts of manumission in the reign of Henry VIII., and serfdom did not fall into disuse till the reigns of Elizabeth and James I.*

In the second class above mentioned, the serfs of Russia are to be numbered. Every proprietor of land estimates his possessions not

* Barrington's Observations on Ancient Statutes, 273 et seq.

according to the number of acres, but according to the number of *souls* on his estate. Each of these (which only include the males) is bound to labour three days in the week for the benefit of his master. By law, the serf cannot be sold without the land to which he is attached ; but this provision is often evaded. The master can exercise corporal discipline over his serfs, but he cannot, as in the slave states of America, sunder nature's holiest ties by separating families. A serf sold apart from the land becomes a crown peasant, and his master loses dominion over him. The serf cannot own immoveable property. In absolute principle, indeed, the whole property of the serf, moveable or otherwise, belongs to the master. In practice, however, no master in this manner robs his serf. Public opinion, that great law of nations, even in Russia will not allow of this ; and above public opinion is suspended the fear of assassination. The master can hire out the services of his serf. And while the serf cannot live in any town without the consent of his master, he can, even when furnished with a passport, be at any time recalled, and must give notice of his whereabouts to his master. And whatever trade he may be able to carry on, he must pay to his master an arbitrary rent, called in Russian "obrok," proportioned to his earnings.

I have stated enough to shew how burdensome and galling are the restrictions imposed on the wretched lower order in Russia.

The rights they have are partly imposed by law, and have partly crept in with custom. Thus, by custom one-half of the land is allotted to the laborer in return for the labor of three days in the week. However, even with this amount of land and labor for their own uses they are not a thriving or hard-working set. Badly furnished as the country is with roads and means of transit, they sometimes cannot sell the surplus produce of their land at any price, and therefore have no motive to increase the produce beyond what will supply themselves, their families, and cattle with food ; while the state of ignorance in which they are kept prevents them from having that foresight which would compensate, by the reserve of good harvests, for the dearths which bad harvests bring upon them. A picture is drawn by a very intelligent traveller in Russia, himself connected by family ties with the country, of the populace whom he saw, under favorable circumstances, at a village *fete*.—"These people," he says, "were not oppressed. They were under a kind and considerate master, and wanted for none of the necessaries of life. They, therefore, as individuals, were not to be pitied, and, knowing no better, were probably contented with their lot. But the chain of slavery was on their minds, as of the Russian peasantry at large. They know they can do nothing to change or improve their condition, and therefore have no stimulus to energy—no habit of thinking and acting for themselves, and are, in fact, mere grown-up children, and as such they are treated by law and custom."* The masters, indeed, are bound to support their house slaves, but the effect of this regulation has none of the beneficial results of the

* Rev. R. Venables.

system under which the relation of master and servant is governed by the laws of mutual contract, which may be determined by either of the parties. Under this system, so long as they can succeed in escaping punishment, their object naturally is to work as little instead of as much as possible. They know they cannot get a better situation by the exertion of greater industry and obtaining a high character for efficiency; while, however dirty or lazy, the master cannot get rid of them. The benefit of their additional exertions would be gain to the masters alone; and as every one is urged to overcome the disagreeability of work (which is in itself an evil), with a view to his own advancement, it would be contrary to natural principle to find them more industrious than is necessary to avoid the opposite sanction of the law of labour—punishment.

The burdensome nature of the Russian restrictive rules, even in the class above the serfs,—that to which it might be hoped their industry might raise them by enabling them to buy their freedom—is illustrated by the envied position of the foreign residents, who, as Mr. Kohl states in his account of Russia, possess all the privileges of the subject without sharing his burdens. “Without paying taxes, without furnishing recruits, not subject to any guild or corporation, they may work and trade freely from city to city throughout the whole empire. The Russian Government naturally seeks to incorporate the ‘*inostranzi*’ with the subjects of the empire. Now and then there appears an edict that all foreigners who have been settled a certain period in any part of the empire shall, without ceremony, swear allegiance to the Russian flag; which puts them all in a fright. As a merchant or artizan who has not obtained any particular rank (*tschin*) by service to the state, could not register himself in any class but that of merchant or citizen, and as such would be liable to military service, the discipline of the stick, and other pleasures of the same kind, every device is tried of course to avoid the sentence. Some leave the empire for a while, and come back with new passports as newly arrived foreigners; others contrive to procure them without leaving the country, or slip through in some other way, and so manage to transmit their privileges to their children, who are also registered as foreigners.”

The great evil of any forcible interference with natural liberty (beyond, of course, what may be necessary for government) is shewn by the fact, that the arbitrary regulations made from time to time, by way of palliating the great original wrong, are often productive of mischief in other directions, and in other ways quite unlooked for. The description given by Mr. Kohl of the condition of the Esthonians and Lettes of the Baltic provinces well illustrates this proposition. After many fruitless attempts at insurrection, the Lettish serfs were partially emancipated by the Emperor Alexander I. Mr. Kohl thus sums up his sketch of them:—

“The condition of the peasant of the Baltic provinces is now about as follows. He is no longer bound to the soil, but may, after half a-year’s notice to his lord, quit the estate. In the same way the lord may, after half a-year’s notice, force the peasant to leave the place of his birth. This alteration can be but a small benefit to the serf. His situation must become quite intolerable before he

resolves on leaving the spot on which he was born, and where he has passed all the days of his life—the home of his fathers, his relatives, and his friends, to take advantage of a right of self exile. Besides, the noble has always a hundred ways by which, if he wish it, he can detain the peasant. Difficult as it is for him to gain subsistence, he is continually needing little helps and loans from his landlord, of which payment can at any time be demanded in a way to make departure impossible. Though the right which the peasant has thus obtained is so frequently useless to him, the counter right of his master of banishing him from his native place is very often turned against him. Formerly, a noble could not get rid of his serfs; and whenever they were in want, he was bound to support and maintain them. At present, the moment a serf becomes useless or troublesome, it is easy to dismiss him; on account of which the serfs in some parts of the provinces would not accept of the emancipation offered them, and bitterly lamented the freedom, as it was called, which was forced upon them. The Lette often mournfully complains that he has lost a father and kept a master; and the lord often refuses the little requests of his peasants, saying, ‘You know you are not my children now.’ No lasting good effect can be expected from the emancipation law, till the further step shall have been taken of granting the peasant the right of acquiring property in land. Only then will he manifest a wish for improvement; only then will he struggle to raise himself from his present abasement.”

Yes! because it is a slavery and a badge of slavery not to be allowed to possess the fruits of accumulation, and abstinence, and labor, in any form in which these fruits may be realised. Because, only when this restriction shall have been removed will he be really free. Because, only then will the *increased* productive powers of the lands of the smaller holders afford a field for the labor which, under the circumstances, is superfluous on the estate from which the serf has been dismissed.

All over Russia, as we learn from other sources, the master must support his serf; and if the serf becomes a beggar, the master may be fined. Here again we may trace how imperfectly arbitrary regulations can afford relief. In the case of the agricultural peasantry, indeed, this responsibility, as well as the gradually improved tone of public opinion, has led to the custom of making a competent allotment to the serf. But in the case of the house serfs or domestic servants, it leads to galling restrictions, especially restrictions on marriage; as the increase of this class of unproductive laborers beyond a certain amount, instead of being beneficial may be the ruin of the master. Indeed, in many cases the serfs are felt to be such a burden; but their emancipation is as yet delayed from several causes. In some instances, from the pride of the lords—who have been known to refuse permission to purchase their freedom to serfs, who by commerce had attained to wealth immeasurably beyond their lords. In some, from the ignorance and carelessness of the peasants; and in some, from a deep-rooted feeling on the part of these latter, that there is a connection which must always subsist between them and the soil; that as they have so long belonged to the soil, the soil shall yet belong to them; and that they will

rather bide their time for such result than accept any partial ownership, and acquire personal freedom accompanied with certain payments in the nature of a rent.

The legislators have always been the higher class; here they are owners of the soil and of the serfs, and they have, of course, been influenced by a view to their own supposed interest. Even so early as the reign of Tsar Boris, in the sixteenth century, they resisted any measures of liberation to the serfs, and continually have they strenuously resisted relaxing the local ties which bound them to the soil; fearing that if allowed to change their place, they would naturally flow from poorer lands to those which gave a more abundant produce, and consequently could afford a better remuneration to its cultivators. They put forward the specious plea, that a great deal of the land of the country would be thrown out of cultivation. No doubt many estates would have been so, and their proprietors would have certainly been ruined, and were right for *their own* sakes to guard against such a possibility, but not for the sake of the *country*. It cannot be determined that the entire production of the land and labor of the country would have been less than it was. Nay, it is certain that removing the shackles from industry would have made it greater. All that can with certainty be inferred is, that there were estates yielding a return in the nature of rent prematurely, or sooner than in the natural progress of events they would have begun to do so, in consequence of the previous full cultivation of the best lands.

The diminution in the value of their property, which was anticipated by the Russian nobles, is analogous to the fall which *has* taken place with us in the rentals of the proprietors of those poor lands which were forced into cultivation by the extravagant height of war prices, —(I mean those of the late war, when the rise was uncompensated by the self-adjusting scale of a free trade)—and which were thrown out of cultivation by the lowering of those prices, consequent on peace and the removal of commercial restrictions—naturally thrown out, as they were the portions on which produce was raised at the greatest expense.

In all points in which they can be brought into comparison, we do not find in the case of the serf the same amount of fearful oppression as in the case of American slavery. When by partial emancipation the lord is relieved from the burden of maintaining his serfs, he of course seeks to reduce their number to what will be sufficient to work his estate with profit. He cannot, however, like the farmer reducing his stock of working cattle, which is the course pursued by the American slave owner, sell the serf and enrich himself with his value. He can, indeed, as we have seen when speaking of the Baltic provinces, make him, after a notice to quit, leave his native place, that he may not be burdened with his support. This conduct is dictated by his self-interest, and is not very different from or more oppressive, perhaps, than the extradition which takes place under the working of our own law of settlement. The Russian knows when the maintenance of the serf is likely to become burdensome instead of profitable, and till then will not dismiss him; till then, he is directly interested in his labor.

As soon as it became the governing principle of legislation with us, that every one should have a right to be, at least, kept alive, it became necessary to impose the liability somewhere. And as there was no *proprietor* who derived obvious benefit from each individual's labor, and the area of the whole kingdom was considered too extensive to be usefully applied, a local liability has been adopted in this kingdom as the basis of the poor law. Many other considerations have had influence in determining and defining this local liability besides the assumption that, as the country at large benefited from the increase of productive labor in general, so on a smaller scale would each locality. But the gain being very indirect, and its exact amount not very easily, or perhaps possibly appreciable, while the loss or contingent burden was visible, obvious, and palpable, the governing bodies of different localities have ever shewn the greatest jealousy in admitting, and great harshness in removing laborers. Much grievous injustice and oppression have been exercised—not least with regard to the inhabitants of this country; and I dare say many of my hearers have been among those whose hearts have throbbled indignantly at the record of some case of peculiar hardship such as are brought before us occasionally by the public papers.

Guardians act on the same principle of self interest—shunning responsibility—which prompts the lord of the Baltic peasant. But in this latter case it is the lord only who knows his interest, and acts accordingly. The serf is degraded far below the meanest of our free laborers by the utter ignorance in which he has been kept, and which seems ever to attend every state but that of freedom. The enslaved soul cannot worthily improve, or become what alone deserves to be called educated. Now, in this country, however backward we may still be, we have been and are every day making greater efforts for the education of the inferior classes—for their moral, and, consequently their physical advancement and well-being.

On the contrary, no provision is made for the education of the serf. Nay, he is not allowed admission into any of the public schools until he has been emancipated.

It is the absence of such aids, and his entire want of education, which to a great extent cause the present backwardness of the Russian; for the peasants naturally are endowed with no mean share of ability. They are very versatile and full of resource, and, as is but too usual among the uncultivated, this quality is shewn in the lower development of cunning. They systematically and successfully over-reach those with whom they deal, and are, I believe, among the most expert pickpockets in the world. I have met with an anecdote of a gentleman who, being aware of this propensity beforehand, resolved to keep his hands in his pockets while he stood on the deck of a steamer preparatory to starting, and only took them out for the momentary purpose of taking leave of his friends; but, on returning them to his pockets, he found the latter empty.

However, it is not only in these evil forms that the talent of the Russians shews itself. They have displayed great aptitude in learning the various manufactures, which some of the nobles have

set up on their estates with the surplus labor of their serfs. In these, they produce manufactured articles of very considerable merit, and of very showy outward appearance, though not equal to those of more advanced countries in minute finish and excellence of detail. The reason of this, however, is not the incompetence of the workmen, but the vice of the system under which they work, and under which they do not obtain the increased skill arising from minute subdivision of labor; while they are secured from foreign competition by high duties on foreign goods. Indeed, Russia at present affords an exact illustration of the case which the French school, called *par excellence* the Economists, suggests of a landed nation by high duties establishing manufactures *prematurely*, so to speak. They have started up not in the natural order of things, from the spontaneous division of labor; and though the nobles who have established them have been driven to it in many cases in self-defence, it by no means can be inferred that no more labor and capital could be applied with profit to the cultivation of the soil of the country, if a system of free and independent labor had prevailed.

Indeed the reverse is clearly the fact. Slave labor is generally admitted by economists to be more expensive and less productive than free labor. It was the conviction of this truth which, according to Mr. Hallam, caused slavery to disappear in the middle ages earliest from the Italian states, then the most enlightened and cultivated of Europe. The Italian Church, I am aware, lays claim to a great share of this merit—with what truth, or how far it does not concern us now to inquire, for no steps have been taken by the Greek Church in a similar direction.

In manufactures, Adam Smith notices that all improvements have been made by freemen who had an object of their own to gain, in diminishing the amount and increasing the productiveness of their labor, (and in agriculture the same principle will hold good); and that the manufactures of those countries in which they were carried on by the slaves of the rich, for the benefit of their masters, have never attained a very high place in the market of the world.

It is very clear that the productive powers of the land in Russia have never been properly called into play. The system of husbandry is the thriftless one of constantly recurring fallows. Under this system, forage never can thrive, and cattle cannot attain the quantity and quality desirable. Can we wonder, however, that, to use the words of a Russian writer, "a simple routine presides over all the operations of agriculture. People sow, cut, and harvest not at suitable seasons, but at such times as their fathers were accustomed to do, reckoning from certain holidays which are more or less moveable according to the ancient calendar in force in this country."

Many, very many incidental branches of inquiry seem to arise on every side as we proceed. One point to which I would wish to direct your attention, is the different way in which the results of war may affect the labouring classes of the two countries, and this will involve some consideration of the Russian taxation and military system.

War, and the interruption of the natural relations of commerce consequent thereon, are admitted by all to be great evils. But their incidence may differ according to the different habits of the nations. It occurs to me that the indirect results of war would fall more immediately on the laboring classes in this country.

Though Russia is not our greatest market, still it is, especially since we have become a corn-importing country, a very considerable one, and the deprivation of this market would necessarily have some effect on our commerce. But as it is with our manufactures we purchase the raw produce we import, an immediate loss would be inflicted on the operations in those branches of trade which, to the extent of the excluded market, would become less productive, and the wages of their labor reduced, or some of the workmen thrown out of employment. As the quantity of food at the same time imported into the country will be diminished by the amount of materials supplied by the food-exporting country, the means of supporting life will become dearer, and the poor man will find his hardship, instead of being compensated, arise from both causes simultaneously. With us the self-adjusting powers of a liberal commercial policy may counteract these evils, and prevent them from being so severely felt. I am speaking of what is the natural tendency in the two classes of countries.

In the country which exports the food of the laborer, a check to commerce will prevent the importation of those manufactured articles with which it was paid for. But as these are not largely used by the lower order of peasants, it is not on them that the deprivation thence resulting will immediately fall. The peasant can generally be supplied with all that he requires from the homely manufactures which every country furnishes. The stock of food for his consumption is not diminished but increased, and the inability of disposing of the portion usually exported will make abundance of food procurable at the lowest price. The higher classes will suffer both in being deprived of their usual conveniencies and luxuries, and from their inability to dispose of their surplus produce, the source of their ordinary revenue.

But though the results of war and the check to trade thence following do not fall thus immediately on the fund for the laborer's subsistence, there are two ways in which it comes round to press severely on him in greater proportion than with us. I mean, the items of increased taxation and military service.

Under our system, while an increased revenue must be drawn, we endeavour to make it be borne as nearly as we can by the different classes in proportion to their ability; and the removal of indirect taxation from articles of the first necessity tends to prevent the price of what the lower classes consume being enhanced further than by the operation of the natural causes I have already alluded to.

In Russia, on the other hand, a system of direct taxation on income is unknown. The nobles are entirely exempt from taxation, and the revenue is raised by a system of very high customs and excise duties, and by a capitation tax on all the male serfs. I give an extract from a letter of M. Sabauroff, a Russian gentleman, to shew how severely this presses:—

“The tax with us which presses on agriculture is purely personal; it is levied on every male once in three months, and paid into the chest of the government of the province. There is also another local tax for the district; but these taxes are so essentially personal and levied on the individual, and not on the property, that there are immense landed estates, belonging sometimes to nobles, but more frequently to traders and others not privileged to possess serfs, which absolutely pay no tax at all. This is a defect, for the burden of course falls on the shoulders of the poor, not on the rich.

“I have told you that these taxes, though nominally small, are burdensome, and I will shew you why. A peasant's family on an average consists, we will suppose, of a father in the prime of life, three children, and an infirm old man. These compose the males, and we may reckon three of the other sex. Of all the family, the father alone is an able-bodied laborer, and the rest can do little or nothing towards gaining a livelihood. The labor of the father, therefore, must support eight persons, and pay the tax for five, —four roubles a head per annum for the crown and two for the district; six roubles per head, or thirty roubles in all.

“But the tax must be paid in bank assignats, while produce of every kind is sold for money, the latter currency being here [why is not stated] worth eighteen per cent. less than the former. We must therefore add five roubles for this difference, and the result is that the tax amounts to thirty-five roubles in the year practically falling on one individual; and to raise this, he must sell the produce of two of his four acres of arable land, and with the remainder support his family. Half the year, then, must be occupied in working for his master, and half the remainder must be employed in raising the means of paying his taxes. The peasant, therefore, has, on the whole, but three months in the year to labor for his family. The dues paid by the crown peasant are three times as great, but he has all his time and all the land to himself, instead of dividing both with a master.”

In the case of war, if—in addition to the effects I have already mentioned as arising from the interruption of commerce with this country, and, on account of our naval power, with far more than this country alone—it be attempted to raise a revenue by any considerable increase of customs duties, that course may entirely fail, as not only will consumption be checked to the degree that always naturally follows an increase of taxation, and therefore of price; but the purchasing power of the higher or purchasing classes will have already been diminished, from the source of their revenue being dried up, and any increase in the other branch of taxation will fall with unmitigated severity on the poor cultivators of the soil.

With respect to military service, there is more in the nature of compensation for the miseries otherwise induced by war with us than among the Russians.

In our system of voluntary enlistment, there is some source of employment open to the unemployed artisan when thrown out of work; and since we seek to draw men to our service when the exigency requires it, by holding out greater inducements in the

shape of increased bounties, larger pay, or improved condition of our soldiers, a source of livelihood is opened, which to many individuals may be as good, if not even better than their former occupation, as it is chiefly the lower grades in every branch who will be thrown out of employment. It will not, certainly, be as beneficial to the country at large as if they had all continued productively engaged.

In Russia, on the contrary, the ranks of the soldiery are filled by a compulsory conscription. At certain periods, each district is obliged to furnish a certain quota of recruits. The serf at the expiration of his period of military service continues a free man, and does not return under the dominion of his master. But so great are the hardships the soldier is subjected to, so severe is his discipline, and so grinding are the tyranny and peculation practised upon him, that enlistment is regarded with the most vivid feelings of repugnance. Every device is resorted to in order to escape it. The peasants run away, and hide in deserts and caves, and they feign disorders, in spite of the severest penalties, and even have recourse to severe mutilations to render themselves unfit for military service. It is held out as a threat of punishment over the serf, and to make a soldier of a refractory serf is one of the severest and most dreaded sentences.

The subject we have been considering is so extensive, as well as interesting, that I am conscious of having been able to treat it most imperfectly. It is a suggestive one, however, and many an application which time precludes me from making will be made by my hearers.

Two great lessons, however, will force themselves on every mind from the comparative view we have been taking. One is, that we should cherish as well as pride ourselves on that personal and commercial liberty with which we are blessed above most other nations, and endeavour to extend it, as well by guarding against its degenerating into license as by other means. The other is that we should not only not relax, but strenuously augment, our efforts to enlarge and improve the education of the people.

Even with regard to the production of material wealth, Mr. Senior ranks the qualities of the laborer as the first of the causes which affect the productiveness of labor. Education expands and develops these faculties. This will not only necessitate but render safe and possible a continual increase of liberty, and will enable us not only to maintain our present high position, but to advance with rapid and glorious steps in the onward march of moral and material progress.
