

on the deferred payment system. The Chief Surveyor, it is said, was sent up expressly to report on this land, and he reported that it was not fit for cultivation.

Now it strikes us that the men who are residing on the spot, and have had years of experience in the locality, ought to be better qualified than a racing official from Dunedin to decide as to its capabilities. Be this as it may, these men are satisfied to settle on this land; and it certainly is strange that in a country such as this, where millions of acres are lying uncultivated, and in which our politicians unanimously declare their earnest desire for settlement, these men are not permitted to purchase or rent a few hundred acres of the waste lands on which they happen to be residing.

But stranger still is this fact: that on the same run the Government sets apart 2,500 acres of shingle under the deferred payment system, an acre of which, we believe, no man can be found to take up. Why is it that land not fit for the plough is offered for settlement, and that the land the people want is refused them? As we said before, we cannot say for a certainty; but there are those who think that the Government is more the friend of the large proprietor or runholder than of the small proprietor, and that it consequently so administers the law as to give the capitalist an undue advantage. Nor are these latter without grounds for their opinion. What has been said above as to the Shingle Block, coupled with the impossibility of men securing the freeholds and leaseholds they want, and that would just suit them, renders the opinion very probable.

But there is another reason, and not a bad one. Our Superintendent has now an Executive of his own choice, one that thinks and feels with him, one that acts harmoniously with him. He and they, it must be supposed, share each other's opinions. If, then, the Superintendent is in favor of a few large landed proprietors, as in the home country, it must naturally be supposed that the members of the present Executive are of the same mind. Again, if the Superintendent thinks that a small number of large landed proprietors is really necessary for the good of the country, we must, of course, suppose his own chosen Executive is of the same opinion; and consequently, both he and they cannot be very zealous in administering the laws so as to raise up a numerous small proprietary. We do not affirm that they may not hold such an opinion conscientiously, or that they may not be able to advance strong reasons in support of it; but what we say is this, that if they do hold this doctrine as to large proprietors, they are very unfit men to be entrusted with the administration of our land laws.

Now, we have lately come across a volume containing the Votes and Proceedings of the 21st Session of the Provincial Council of Otago, 1865-6, and have found in the Appendix, p. xvi., a number of resolutions on the land question, as given notice of by Mr MACANDREW, November 20. The preamble to these resolutions is very remarkable, and is deserving of special notice at this time.

Mr MACANDREW, then a member of the Council, says:—
"Whereas the great object of our land regulations ought to be the speedy and beneficial occupation of the country by men and women; and whereas a moderate number of individuals or families occupying extensive land estates, would tend to promote the future greatness and safety of the body politic; and whereas the existing land regulations of this province are not conducive to these objects, it is expedient to amend the same as follows," &c.

That being Mr MACANDREW's matured and deliberate opinion, it cannot be expected that he would very heartily, when Superintendent, execute laws made for the express purpose of preventing "a number of individuals or families occupying extensive landed estates." With these words of Mr MACANDREW before them, men should not be surprised at the action of the Roxburgh people, nor at the general dissatisfaction on account of the administration of the land laws.

We totally disagree with Mr MACANDREW's opinion. To act on it would cause the ruin of the colony, and prevent it from becoming a prosperous and peaceful country. To adopt it would be to begin at the wrong end. Experience proves that the tendency of land in all civilized countries is to accumulate in the hands of individuals. This inevitably arises from various causes, amongst which may be stated the power and influence of capital, and the pride of family. Start with a large landed proprietary containing a small number of persons, and before many generations there will be found fewer proprietors and enormous land estates. Even in France, where the subdivision of land is compulsory, this tendency of land

to accumulate in the hands of individuals has been found to operate. The force of events and the accumulation of wealth will introduce landlordism only too soon. The colonists who begin with making their land appanages of great families, are preparing for their descendants, in a not very remote future, both beggary and slavery.

IS THE 'LYTTELTON TIMES' "HIGHFALUTING."

We would answer the question if we only knew the meaning of "highfaluting." Our friend the Otago 'Guardian' has never had the courtesy to give us the definition we so ardently desired. But though we cannot answer this question, we can affirm that our contemporary the 'Lyttelton Times' has been dreaming lately. In its issue of the 4th inst., which we had not the pleasure of seeing till this week, our contemporary of Canterbury tells its readers that "there is a very considerable section" of Roman Catholics who are perfectly satisfied with the Ordinance—"Education"—"who cheerfully pay their rates, and who are convinced their children are more likely to receive a better education by the maintenance of a thoroughly national, than by reverting to a purely denominational system. They are convinced, as are the great majority of the people, that religious should be separated from secular instruction, and that the provisions of the Ordinance on this and other points are essentially just."

Without intending the least disrespect to the 'Lyttelton Times,' we beg to assure our contemporary that in the above extract there is not one word of truth. Will the "Lyttelton Times" name the Catholics who are in favour of the Canterbury system of education? Will he be so good as to name the localities where this very considerable section of Catholics is to be found? We challenge the 'Lyttelton Times' to name even a few Catholics who are in favor of the Canterbury system of education. And until he does so we shall hold him guilty of deliberately calumniating his Roman Catholic fellow subjects.

Further on in the leader from which we have just now quoted, the 'Lyttelton Times' says "that a large percentage" of Roman Catholics "are opposed to any alteration in the leading principles of the Ordinance. They are perfectly satisfied, and have no wish for a change." Where are these Roman Catholics to be found? We know the Colony as well at least as the 'Lyttelton Times,' and the Catholics of the Colony a great deal better; and we have no hesitation whatever in saying that a greater untruth in reference to Roman Catholics has never been stated. If the "Lyttelton Times" had said that Roman Catholics, almost without a single exception, were sighing for an alteration in the leading principles of the Ordinance, were dissatisfied and wished for a change, the Editor would have borne testimony to the truth.

Again, our contemporary says, speaking of Father GARIN'S School in Nelson, "if Protestants were not afraid to send their children to this Roman Catholic School, conducted under the superintendence of a Roman Catholic Priest, why should Roman Catholics object to an unsectarian system of education? Why should they in short, cast upon Protestants who are in a large majority, and most of whom cheerfully accept the Ordinance, the slur that attempts will be made in the District Schools to tamper with or insult the peculiar religious opinions of any section of the community! If as Mr STAFFORD says, no doubt correctly, Protestants could send their children to a Roman Catholic School, and implicitly trust its Roman Catholic directors, why should Roman Catholics object to do the same in regard to schools that are neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic? Where is their grievance?" This is certainly a very peculiar mode of reasoning. The 'Lyttelton Times' is easily satisfied with arguments. Because a few Protestants in Nelson send their children to Father GARIN'S School, therefore all Roman Catholics in the Colony should not object to send their children to Protestant, or godless schools! Again, because some few Protestants trusting in Father GARIN'S honour, which has been well proved during four and twenty years, voluntarily send their children to his school in Nelson, therefore all the Catholics of Canterbury should not complain of being compelled to send their children to godless schools! Because, forsooth, a few Protestants choose to have their sons educated in a Catholic School, therefore there is no grievance in compelling Catholics to send their children to be educated in schools which they abhor because they are intrinsically dangerous to their faith and morals, and in which, as they know only too well from experience, the teachers for the most part will both tamper with and insult their "peculiar religious opinions."