

Mr O. Columb (Wakaitipu) was convinced of the necessity of a second Chamber to check any rash legislation, considered the elective system as much preferable to that in vogue at present, and was sure when the good sense of the people was consulted in the matter, that the new Chamber would be composed mainly of well-tried politicians.

Mr N. Griffen (Te Aroha) was satisfied the measure if carried would not work out well in practice and maintained that ample time was provided for giving measures proper consideration in the various stages through which they pass in the Lower House.

Mr A. Quelch (Peninsula) was of opinion a second Chamber was a necessity, because the actions of the Lower House at times required the curb. An elective one would place more power in the hands of the people. He agreed with hon Member for Christchurch as to the intelligence of the Lower House, but considered some of its members a trifle too clever. The arguments used against the House of Lords had nothing to do with the question before the House. The Opposition speakers had certainly not suggested a better scheme.

Mr O. E. Haughton (Halwell), who made a capital speech, said he would support the motion so fairly stated by the hon Member for Dunedin, but regretted in doing so the necessity of voting with the Government. Criticising the hon Member for Te Aroha's remarks, he said J. Stuart Mill, who occupies the first place among the political economists of the century, and was a real radical, and not a wolf in sheep's clothing, was in favour of a second Chamber and not opposed to it as the hon Member had tried to prove. W. E. Gladstone, who, from his high position, ought to know something about politics, had introduced a second Chamber into his Government of Ireland Bill. He wound up with a vigorous onslaught on the Ministry for their action, the Premier being singled out for special attention.

Mr A. Chiaroni, senr (Palmerston), opposed the motion, and pointed out the absurdity of electing a man to the Lower House and then sending up another to look after him.

Mr J. J. Dunne (New Plymouth) was thoroughly convinced of the need of a second Chamber, and heartily supported the proposal before the House.

NOTES.—Carolyn, Chiaroni, Griffer, Hally, P., Hughes, J., Hestford, Mooney, McCormack, T., Smith, Stronach, Waters, Wilkins; teller, McCormack, H.

PAIERS.—Connor, senr. and Connor, junr., Cahill and Coughlin, Geerin and Cantwell, Heley and Drumw, Marlow and Lynch T., O'Neill and Pearson, W., Woods, J., and Woods, W.

ARISTOCRATIC CHEEK.

THE following are passages from a tissue of impudence published in the London Times by a mob of Catholic Unionists—lords and swells, as well as fools and knaves—headed by that egregious prig, the Duke of Norfolk. The manifesto is that against Home Rule of the Tooley street tailors, to which we referred last week:—

"We cannot but believe that such a rule wou'd prove injurious to religion.

We are aware that some Catholics confidently rely upon the influence of the Irish ecclesiastical authorities to mitigate or to avert the evils of such a government, but we must sorrowfully acknowledge that we cannot share this hope. We have ever felt the deepest admiration for the many signal virtues of the Irish clergy. We are familiar with their heroic history. We are not unmindful of the benefits we have received at their hands. We know that now, as always, hundreds of Irish priests wholly devote themselves to their sacred duties and that their labours bear abundant fruit amongst their flocks.

But these considerations cannot blind us to the undeniable fact that hitherto they have failed to cope with the revolutionary tendencies of the present movement. We cannot forget the repeated boasts of the extreme party that some of the most extravagant developments of their system have been openly countenanced or tacitly approved by the majority of the clergy, nor can we affirm that those boasts have been unfounded. We are not aware that they have been publicly denied or challenged by the ecclesiastics whom they concern, and, while we are unable to point to any body of evidence tending t

T. M. CARROLL,

PHARMACEUTICAL CHEMIST,

(By Examination)

☞ Apothecaries' Hall, 11 RATTRAY STREET, ☞

DUNEDIN.

Mr T. McCormack (Invercargill) said the motion, if carried, would result in the formation of a class Chamber. As to the use of a second Chamber, he pertinently asked if it prevented the gridironing of lands or the passage of the present iniquitous Education Act. In theory the bicameral system is a beautiful one, but in practice, to use a colonial phrase, it "won't wash." He characterised the system as expensive, cumbersome and vicious.

Mr D. Falkner (Buller), in a brief speech, supported the motion.

Mr J. B. Callan (Dunedin) in reply, thanked hon Members for their complimentary remarks, and said he was pleased at the excellent debate which had arisen out of his motion. One Member had termed his speech oily, if so he hoped there would be sufficient to roll it through the House. Some of the speakers had gone off the track, as there was no analogy between the House of Lords at Home (which was hereditary) and our own Legislative Council. A second Chamber was always a difficult matter to deal with in a new country. His main argument about Lower House Members being subject to passion, he said, was untouched. If the second Chamber was abolished there was no other organ in the Constitution to act as a restraining check upon impulsive legislation—of course leaving the Royal veto out of the question. John Bright favoured a second Chamber, and the leader of the present Birmingham school (Chamberlain) also approved of one. All experience has proved that uncontrolled power, whether individual or collective, has resulted in absolutism. He maintained if the Bill was a good one, although the Upper Chamber sometimes delayed the passage of it, if the people insisted on it, the measure inevitably became law, and instanced the case of the Catholic Emancipation Act. As a final appeal he mentioned the case of Gladstone's latest legislative scheme for the better government of Ireland where a second Chamber was involved, and the fact that Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, whose liberal instincts were so well known, also favoured a second Chamber, and had lately written an article on the subject in one of the reviews.

The House divided on the question.

AYES.—Callan, Columb, C., Columb, J., Davis, Dunne, Eagar, Ford, Fergusson, Haughton, Hally, J., Hughes, P., Miller, McKeay, Quelch, Rogers, Woods, D. W; teller, Falkner.

but them, we cannot but remember with grief many incidents which go so far to justify their truth.

Above all we are unable to ignore the significant circumstances that the politicians whose conduct we have described have been able to retain, and now enjoy, the approbation, the favour, and the strenuous support of the active majority of the Irish clergy.

We can see no adequate reason for proposing that under Home Rule the Irish clergy would be better able to induce their people either to discard revolutionary leaders or to renounce revolutionary causes than they are under the present Constitution of the United Kingdom. It seems to us, on the contrary, certain that Home Rule must inevitably lead to speedy and progressive developments of the revolutionary spirit, and must thereby aggravate those very evils which the Irish ecclesiastical authorities have hitherto failed to combat with effect. For a time, indeed, as politicians, the clergy might acquire fresh powers by successive compromises with the popular movement, but those powers, in our judgment, would infallibly fail whenever it was sought to use them to moderate the popular passions or to check the popular career. We believe that under these circumstances a section of the Irish people must ultimately be brought into conflict with the Church, and we cannot look forward to such a struggle without the gravest apprehension. It is certain to be fruitful of many scandals. It may result, as similar struggles in other hands have resulted, in spiritual calamities yet more grievous.

For these, amongst other reasons, we, as British Catholics, are opposed to the policy of Home Rule. We respectfully submit them to the attentive consideration of our Catholic countrymen."

The Liverpool *Catholic Times* refers to the above as follows:—

We read with no little amazement the address of the British Unionist Catholics published in the *Times* at the close of last week. The signatories are, it is true, a small body, and their influence on the public life of the country is not very notable, but they include quite a number of titled personages, and we expect common sense at least to be associated with respectability. Evidently political passion has in their case proved too much for the safeguards of reason since they have placed themselves in a uniquely ludicrous

D. DAWSON, Practical Watchmaker & Jeweller, All kinds of Watches, Clocks, etc., Repaired under my own supervision
Exchange Court, Princes Street, DUNEDIN.
Jewellery Manufactured and Repaired on the premises. Old Jewellery Bought, made up into Fashionable Designs, or Exchanged.