

to help the poor suffering woman ; but her claim upon *us* was merely a claim on our compassion. She had no *right* ; nor had any third party a right to thrust his hand into our pocket, and, out of our hard-earned twelve pounds, to assist Jock Laidlie's mother.

But if this was the true state of things with regard to the earnings of a single summer and autumn, accumulated with an eye to the coming winter, could there be any new element introduced simply by multiplying the summers and autumns some thirty or forty times, and by making their accumulated earnings bear reference, not to the winter of the year, but to the winter of life ? Assuredly not, say we. The principle would remain intact and unchanged, however largely the seasons or the earnings might be multiplied. But suppose, further, that these earnings of forty years were to be invested in a house or a piece of land, would not Jock Laidlie or his mother have some right to share in them then ? Would not their conversion into earth and stone, or into stone and lime, derive a right to Jock or Jock's mother ? Paley has a very elaborate argument on the subject, from which he seems to arrive at the conclusion that it would. " All things," says this writer, " were originally common. No one being able to produce a charter from heaven, had any better title to a particular possession than his next neighbour. There were reasons for mankind agreeing upon a separation of this common fund ; and God, for these reasons, is presumed to have ratified it ; and as no fixed laws for the regulation of property can be so contrived as to provide for the relief of every case and distress which may arise, these cases and distresses, when their right and share in the common stock were given up or taken from them, were supposed to be left to the bounty of those who might be acquainted with the exigencies of their situation, and in the way of affording assistance. And therefore, when the partition of property is rigidly maintained