

The *Herald* claps the Council on the back for having frustrated the advanced legislation of the Lower Chamber. It admits that the introduction of the Labour party into the House had been attended by a useful political growth, but rather inconsistently congratulates the Council on having thwarted the growth in question. The Council, in fact, have very effectively done so. Two of the Bills rejected by them were of radical importance, namely, the Land for Settlements Bill and the Conciliation and Arbitration Bill. So important, indeed, were these, that the country cannot possibly permit of their being finally shelved, but must make them prominent questions in the approaching elections. On the other hand, we have to acknowledge the debt due to the Council for their rejection of the ridiculous Bill to legalise any extreme of noise in our towns to which the Salvation Army might be impelled by their unrestricted fanaticism. This was a measure that must have endangered the public peace, for the patience of people knowing that the law would afford them no protection could hardly be depended on. The Army, in their saner moments, if they have such, may themselves feel grateful. There are certainly moments in which a man might feel thankful to be protected from himself. That the *Sydney Herald*, meantime, should rejoice in its belief that our Legislative Council is sufficient to thwart the "forces of progress" was only to be expected. It may be feared, nevertheless, that its rejoicing is not destined to be of any great endurance.

Sir Robert Stout, as we learn from the Wellington correspondent of the *Otago Daily Times*, is coming out with a brand new platform for the future legislation of the colony. Indeed he contemplates, as we are told, nothing less than an entire change of the constitution. It tickles us, meantime, to find that we were quite correct in another guess we made with respect to the Inangahua election. Did we not ask whether Mr O'Connor's support of the eminent candidate was due to a belief that he would find in him just the man he wanted to second him in his effort for the abolition of party government? It will not do to give Sir Robert the credit of originating this proposal, which it seems he has adopted. But, then, no one who has any acquaintance with Sir Robert Stout will give him credit for origin-

the most accomplished and most polished lady-writers of the day—that is, Mrs Lynn-Linton, a lady, we doubt not, who commands the admiration of Mayfair itself. And, then, you know, there was the famous Lady Morgan. She never meant any insult to the maidens of her native land when she dubbed one of their sweetest and most charming types the "wild Irish girl." Wild, besides, is a word expressive commonly of timidity, and that is a quality of which no woman need be ashamed. As to our other part of speech—"varmints"—oh, no, we never said that. Mary-Anne, if she understood her grammar aright, must acknowledge that the word as we quoted it was an adjective. There was, therefore, a distinction and also a difference. Our contemporary does not believe that anyone has raised the No-Popery cry. Doesn't he? Well, that is his own affair. We hope, for the sake of his sincerity, that he does really believe every one to be as nice as he seems to think them. But as to the TABLET creating a bogey, the No-Popery cry had attained to patriarchal age before the TABLET was born or thought of. Nor did we intend to set the Catholic women fighting against anybody. We warned them as to an agitation that had been openly proclaimed, whatever may be our contemporary's beliefs or unbeliefs, and advised them to be on their guard, and in that we simply did our duty. Our contemporary, moreover, talks like a whale. He will permit of no more religious differences in the Colony. He says he wants no such business in any part of the land. "And what is more," he adds, "we will not have it." More power to your elbow I say we. Very little fishes, nevertheless, have ere now talked like whales—to the amusement of their hearers.

Mr C. W. Purnell, who is another candidate for Ashburton also seems generally sound on the education question. We take the following passage from his address to the constituents:—"While I think it is the duty of the Government to see that all the children in the colony get a primary education, I do not see that it follows that the Government should do the entire work of education itself; and I have always considered that a great mistake was made when starting the education system, in the Government undertaking to do the whole work of education itself. Instead of trying to stamp out all

WHEELBARROWS

Are very useful articles, but if a man wants a bicycle a wheelbarrow won't do him any good.

Buy your BOOTS for the work that will be expected of them if you want them to suit.

We are headquarters for everything in the BOOT and SHOE LINE.

SEE AND BELIEVE.

CITY BOOT PALACE,

Corner George & St. Andrew Sts.,

J. McKAY, Proprietor.



ality of any kind. In catching up a hobby at second hand, and riding it to death, lies his forte. No doubt it will transpire in due time from what quarters he has collected the other planks of his platform.

Mr I. R. C. Cunningham-Graham, who is a candidate for the representation of Ashburton, in addressing his constituents the other night is reported by the *Mail* as having expressed himself very plainly on the education question. He referred to the demand for Bible reading in the schools, which he said had his heartiest sympathy. "There was another point," he continued, "on which his audience would not perhaps acquiesce. They knew that for certain reasons our Catholic friends were unable to participate in our educational system. The reasons were that there were certain passages in the Bible which they did not see in the same light with us. As a proof that they were staunch in their belief they had spent £60 000 in schools and he thought they were entitled to consideration. If grants were made to denominational schools it would relieve the pressure in the public schools. As an instance the Borough school had been in a congested state and Hampstead school had been built to relieve it. The Church of England school close by was kept empty. The latter school, he had no doubt, would start at once if a grant were allowed to it. Besides it was to the interest of the State to bring the subject up to fear God, and money devoted to that cause would be well spent. If a grant were made to these schools in the large centres, such schools as Bishop Julius proposed to collect the waifs and strays from the streets, would be instituted, and these waifs and strays would receive a religious education and would be returned to the State good citizens. He had heard that the Presbyterians were agreeable to grants being given, provided the Bible was read in schools."

"Part of speech? Mary-Anne." There is our benevolent contemporary, the *Napier News* again holding up an admonitory finger at us. Our contemporary says it was "most unseemly and unbecoming" on our part to speak of the fighting women of the Colony as "wild women" or "varmints." But "wild women" is an expression that we quoted, with inverted commas too, from one of

the private schools, many of which are excellently conducted, I think the Government should rather have fostered them, and only established public schools where private schools were wanting. A great deal of money would have been saved to the taxpayers in that way, and the instruction in public schools would have benefitted by the rivalry of the private schools. The parents, and not the Government, are primarily responsible for the education of their own children. Now, if a child's parents are satisfied with the purely secular teaching which it gets in the secular schools, well and good; but if the parents consider that religious teaching ought to be made an essential and integral part of its daily education, and the public schools do not afford that instruction, upon what principle of justice are those parents compelled to pay the entire cost of their children's education out of their own pockets, while other parents, whose children attend the public schools, get the cost defrayed out of the public exchequer? In both cases the child is educated—the requirements of the State are satisfied in that respect—and the parents alike contribute towards the taxation. Why should a man be penalised, as it were, for wishing to give to his child a religious education? What I should support is, that reasonable capitation grants should be paid by the Government for all children attending private schools who could pass the same examinations as are required in the public schools. These examinations should be conducted by the Government inspector, who should have just as free access to any private schools claiming the grant as they have to the public schools. The grants-in-aid would be given for secular results alone. The inspector would simply ignore the religious teaching and would look only to the secular results. I should, however, restrict these grants to schools in towns, because if the system were extended to the country districts the result might be, in some thinly populated localities, that the most numerous denomination would set up a private school, and all the children in the district would virtually be obliged to attend it. I do not quite understand why such vigorous opposition should have been manifested to the proposal for grants-in-aid to private schools. It has even been asserted that it would destroy the present education system. But how could it possibly destroy, or even injure it?"

For Cash. Blankets, 5s 11d pair. Full Dress for 4s 11d. Umbrellas, 1s 6d. Everything at Wholesale Rates.

LONARGAN & COMPANY  
DUNEDIN