

through all generations. Long after the pebble is at the bottom of the lake the circles multiply and expand on the surface.

A second objection will help us still farther to see the fallacy of the argument founded upon proportion. It is argued that as virtue is its own reward, and vice its own punishment, so the sinner is sufficiently punished while upon earth, and need not have hell superadded. I answer—if there is anything in this argument, it holds equally true of *heaven*, and therefore, as virtue is its own reward, man is sufficiently honoured here, and need not be called into heavenly felicity. By parity of reasoning this latter position is impregnable. I shall not, however, rest the argument on this obviously true position, but shall maintain *that punishment is not regenerative*. The whole issue may be staked upon that declaration. The objector makes his fatal mistake in imagining that punishment may *regenerate* the criminal. Many religious persons, too, err on this point. Hell itself, if it were allowed to be intermediate and not final, could not convert man to Christianity! It might terrify men—impose terrible restraints upon them—but as to changing the heart and bringing rebellion to its knees, it might be as powerless as a passing storm.

Take an instance; a felon has undergone a term of imprisonment, yet he may leave the prison as great a felon as he entered it. The mere fact of his having been in gaol for six months does not make him an honest man. The law could touch only his *body*, his *heart* all the while might be plotting further schemes of crime. Punishment in itself is not a regenerator. Nor does the objector himself think so. Would the objector admit such a felon into his house, or wish him to be the companion of his sons? Does not the objector himself feel unsafe in the presence of such a man? At this moment in one pocket you have money and in another you have a gold watch: now hear me.—*the person who is sitting next you is a ticket-of-leave man!* You start! Be calm, I pray you! Remember your own smooth-faced and amiable philosophy which teaches that vice is its own punishment, and therefore the man has been tormented, and remember that you insist on *proportion*, and that this man has been in the colony and has earned a fair reputation there! Still, one hand is on the money, and the other on the watch. Why, if punishment necessarily regenerates the heart, the man is as good as you are and as much to be trusted. Invite him home! Hold friendly intercourse with him upon colonial life! Don't punish the man *for ever*; where is the *proportion* between a day's crime and life-long infamy? *Where?* The objector denies the very creed he advocates! He would have God's *infinite holiness* do what his own *faded morality* cannot do! He would have the *Sun* overlook defects which his own *rusklight* brings into startling prominence! He would have a *King* embrace a filth from which a *pauper* would recoil. Remember that the question is one which appeals to your *moral sense*, not to your *philosophy*, not to your *benevolence*, but to your sense of right and wrong; and if *you*, whose moral faculty has been blunted and perverted, turn with horror from the idea of fraternising with an impenitent convict, how can He, whose purity is infinite and unchangeable, look with benignity on a man whose heart is full of uncleanness, whose lip is burning with blasphemy, and in whose hand is the rebel's weapon? "Yet saith the house of Israel, the way of the Lord is not equal!"

The objector fails to see that the argument which he founds upon vice being its own punishment is practically denied in all the penal arrangements of society. If vice is its own punishment why should the thief be imprisoned or the murderer executed? Why not leave each to the tormenting remorse