

over to the baths, and had a look around Riddiford Park.

At 2.30 we resumed our meeting by singing hymn 60, and the reading of the Crusader Psalm, Miss Bradshaw leading in prayer.

Miss Kirk was complimented on her appointment as J.P., and it was pointed out that the majority of women chosen are members of our W.C.T.U., of which the W.C.T.U. is justly proud.

Miss Kirk thanked the Hutt Union for their hospitality, and also the Trustees for the use of their property. The closing service was then read by Miss Oates, which brought the meeting to a conclusion.

The members were then entertained at afternoon tea, and we all felt the better, and the wiser for the time spent together.

NORWAY'S PROHIBITION.

Norway's Prohibition was the wet brand. It allowed the sale of wines, beer and ale, of less than 12 per cent. alcoholic content. This kind of prohibition is what Norway has now repealed, not the bone dry prohibition of the U.S.A.

Last year the Liquor Bill in Quebec under Government Control was 47, 620,507 dollars. Prohibition Ontario with 572,000 more population had a Liquor Bill of 5,014,000 dollars. Quebec had 956 business failures, while Ontario with its quarter of a million more population had only 624.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL.

Hugh John Macdonald, a son of the late Sir John Macdonald, Winnipeg's Police Magistrate, says it is far less difficult to secure convictions under Prohibition than under Government Control.

Attorney-General Craig, of Manitoba, where Government Sale of Liquors is permitted, says: "Drinking has become a pastime of boys and girls all over the Province. Sons and daughters of Christian homes are being entrapped, and we have allowed conditions to develop that are eating into the vitals of our very life."

NOTES FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK.

WHAT DO YOU EAT?

Sir Arbuthnot Lane has been making very drastic statements. He says people have no more right to be ill than to be criminal. True words, but in advance of the times. He is luckily for himself, not a poor unknown professional, so he can speak out and fear not the B.M.A.

SCHOOL DOCTORS.

This leads us to ask, are we doing the right thing in examining our children in schools and creating around them an atmosphere of dread. Psychologically this is wrong. Watch children carefully, give physical training, but teach the child that health, not disease, is its natural condition. Then we shall not have nervous girls, carefully feeling their throats and asking, "Mother, do you think I have goitre? School Doctor felt my throat very carefully."

We realise the value of school doctors, but we strongly object to the children being frightened and taught to expect to be ill, and to have all manner of diseases.

MARRIED TEACHERS.

Once again this old question has cropped up. The Nelson Board has failed in its duty to the children, and particularly to backward children. They turned down a teacher of special qualifications because she was married. So the children got the second best because the lady was single. Most people would think a married woman more suitable, especially for backward children. Why turn away highly qualified teachers because they are married? Is it a crime for a woman to marry? Is it good for the State to penalise marriage and motherhood?

Two members of the Board realised their duty and voted to secure to the children a "teacher of outstanding ability, whether married or single."

MARRIAGE A DISABILITY.

There is yet another aspect of this question. Do Education Boards think that women who have been earning £250 a year, will sacrifice this position to become an unpaid household servant, just legally entitled to food and clothing. It may suit a Board of Males to think

women should be content with food and clothing, and even for that have to humbly ask her lord and master.

When motherhood is considered worthy of a payment, it will be time to talk of debarring married women from earning. We note that Male Boards are not at all anxious to dismiss married charwomen and washerwomen, though presumably these cannot make such suitable arrangements for care of their family as professional women can do.

SAD SCENE.

A Domestic before Christchurch Court was sentenced for the 188th time in 8 years. The Magistrate thought gaol was the best place for her. She objected to doing the six month's hard ordered her, and it took 3 or 4 policemen to remove her. In gaol she gets no drink, why not make the country as dry as the gaol, and then these poor victims would be as safe outside gaol as inside it.

DON'T ARREST A DRUNK.

Some time ago Constable Macartney of Dunedin arrested a drunken man, and ever since has been maliciously persecuted and prosecuted. The charge against the man was dismissed. He then proceeded against the Constable for wrongful arrest. Two Constables and the Keeper of the Watchhouse swore the man was drunk, yet a wise jury gave a verdict for damages against the Constable. Then the Constable was prosecuted for perjury, and very rarely does a New Zealand Magistrate express himself as strongly as Mr Bundle, S.M., of Dunedin, did when referring to the evidence in this case.

He dismissed both charges, saying "that the evidence for the prosecution was almost wholly biased," impregnated with falsehood and flavoured with malice."

The witnesses should consider themselves fortunate that they were not made to change places with the accused.

Surely now, this man will have to stand his trial for perjury for the protection of Constables who are fearlessly doing their duty.

"Swoop down, yon beetling mountain,
And raze that jutting cape;
A world is on your anvil,
Now smite it into shape!"