

the Church, no rights, save the right to work, while men claimed the privileges of office. If any special work needed to be done, it was to the women that the Clergy looked to see it carried through, and, as a rule, they were not disappointed. It was only right, therefore, that those who formed a majority of the Church-goers, who cared most for the welfare of the Church, and expended so much energy in its interests, should, at least, share equally with men in the honours of office.

The objections to the proposal were feeble and paltry in the extreme, and altogether unworthy of such an august assemblage. Worse still, both bitterness and fear were a good deal in evidence during some of the speeches. One high Church dignitary, with rancour in his face and voice, drew a picture for the benefit of the Synod. "If you grant this concession now, said he, "you will by and by find these seats you now fill occupied by some *very* intellectual and *very* strong minded women, who will carry everything their own way, and the few of you who have any courage left, will be found stealing round by those walls and corners, and timidly pleading for what you want. This speech was received with great hilarity by some of the members, but the speaker was in deadly, solemn earnest. He alluded to the *female* mind more than once, and that in no complimentary manner. He strongly objected to the motion because it was against primitive church principles, and against the teaching of St. Paul.

Another clergyman said that he considered the step a "dangerous experiment," and that it would be most undesirable that women should enter the arena of ecclesiastical politics; such a course being clearly at variance with the spirit of the Church Catholic, and might add another obstacle to the Union of the Anglican and the Catholic Churches! Two of the speakers said that women might be "troublesome" if allowed voting power, and several thought that such a position would be outside "woman's sphere."! One layman feared that if women got any power, they might want more, and that then the men would disappear altogether. Indeed this argument was used frequently by the oppositionists during the discussion. "The granting of the vote" said another prominent layman, "is calculated to lead to a large amount of domestic misery, and will tend to revolutionise Church and social life." One gentleman said it was much better to let things remain as they were,

as he did not think there was any danger that the women would strike, as some had feared!

A few of the speakers were loftily and kindly considerate for women, lest their limited powers should be over-taxed. "They do so much now, that it would be a shame to give them any more responsibility" was the burden of their song. Suffice to say, that the bitterness, the insult, the fear, the antagonism, and, at best, the superiority expressed by some of the members towards women was amazing and indeed appalling. One is led to speculate as to what kind of mothers these men had, and to wonder whether they had ever loved or respected them. Sir John Hall, in a very able reply, spoke of the great work women had done and were still doing in the Churches. Most of their Sunday School teachers were women. He repudiated the absurdity of men claiming any superiority over women. St. Paul had not done so, but was himself associated with women in the work of the early Christian Churches.

In the Mother Country, women held office in the Church, and he believed that he was right in saying that in New Zealand women were now eligible for election to the Vestry, although they could not vote for vestrymen. He only wished he could change his sex for one year, so that he might test the matter. In the Auckland, Wellington, and Dunedin Synods resolutions in favour of Women's Enfranchisement had been passed, and he knew it could only be a matter of time for the motion to pass in the Canterbury Synod.

The voting was as follows:—Clergy, Ayes 15, Noes 23; Laity, Ayes 18, Noes 11. The Bishop (who is in favour of the reform,) therefore declared the motion lost.

## Public Morality.

[CONTRIBUTED.]

The apparently organised attempts to induce our Legislature to have recourse to "reporting" cases of venereal disease—*i.e.*, to a modified C.D. Act—should arrest the attention of all women. Time and again has Mrs Josephine Butler warned women, not against the re-introduction of the old C.D. Act, which, in all its hideous effrontery, is probably too terrible for England's awakened sensibility, but that in one or another clandestine way "regulation" would be smuggled into the statute books of the Empire. Time

and again has she begged her sisters "for Christ's sake" to withstand it.

We ask, Why this panic stricken cry of the learned professions in New Zealand to-day? We are informed that syphilis is on the increase, and that infant mortality is great. The infantile mortality of New Zealand is the lowest of Australasia [Year Book, 1899], nor does it seem to be materially increasing. In 1893 the total number of deaths of children under one year was 1600. In 1894 it went down to 1507. In 1898 it is quoted as 1510. During the year 1898 twenty-nine deaths were registered as caused by all venereal diseases. Why, in the same period, 21 deaths were also registered as from gunshot wounds, and 23 from hanging! In 1893 diarrhœa claimed 132; in 1894, 170; in 1898, 236. In 1893 cancer claimed 332; in 1894, 408; in 1898, 471, and consumption 597. Here is increase indeed!

That the evil is present we admit; that it may even be more common than statistics show, we are ready to believe; that it ought to be stayed there cannot be a doubt. But what is the remedy? We oppose intervention on the lines of "reporting" (1) because it is bound to be unjust, and fall more heavily on the innocent than on the guilty; (2) because on account of the subtle nature of the disease it would be—has already been proved to be—useless; (3) because it would greatly increase suffering: women and men, in dread of the "reporter," would refrain from seeking medical relief in the earlier and only curable stages of the disease; (4) because black-mailing would become an every day pastime! What, then, is the remedy?

It must aim, on the one hand, at cure or alleviation of present disease; on the other, at prevention. The National Council of Women has repeatedly advised that private wards should be provided at our general hospitals for the treatment of voluntary patients. With regard to prevention, the remedy is manifold. We must begin before our little ones are born. We women must see to it that none save men of pure life shall become the fathers of our children. And when our little ones come to watch us from a house of their own—a house strong and healthy, or frail and faulty—that house—

"Which we builded together, thy father and I,  
In which thou must live, O my darling, and die."

it must become our daily care to make them reverence their house as a very temple of the living God. And how