

Correspondence.

(The Editor is not responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents.)

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

(To the Editor.)

Sir,—In the last number of the Danville "Normal Instructor," New York, which is one of the leading State school teachers' journals in America, the following extract appears:—

"In nearly every part of the Broad British Empire provision is made in the official syllabus issued by the various educational departments for the children to learn in school hours the Ten Commandments. Many of the State School authorities encourage the displaying of the laws on the walls of the school rooms. Our attention is called to this by a circular sent from Wellington, New Zealand, sent out by the "Decalogue Committee," urging that the laws of that State be made conformable with those of other parts of the Empire, and provision be made for the repetition or memorising of these in the school. They urge that 'a knowledge of these laws is in the interests of character building and good citizenship, and is also an aid to good government.'"

As the children in the State Schools of New Zealand are not taught the Ten Commandments, which are the foundation of our British laws, I beg to suggest that parents and school committees at once petition their own members of Parliament (and also candidates for the same) to urge that the Government Printer be instructed to print and supply free to all State School Committees sufficient copies of the Ten Commandments for each of the class rooms, with a recommendation that they be learned by the scholars.—I am, yours truly,

A NEW ZEALANDER.

P.S.—Nearly all New Zealand Education Boards allow School Committees to display the Ten Commandment charts, but unfortunately these charts are unprocurable in New Zealand. The National W.C.T.U. of America instructs all Unions to get the Ten Commandments into the State Schools in America, as Jew, Protestant, and Catholic are agreed upon the Ten Commandments.

STOP! LOOK OUT FOR THE BOGEY!

(To the Editor.)

Madam,—As the fateful April 10th draws near, I am impelled to add my voice to the many that are sounding a warning all over this Dominion. Everywhere we hear it being said that this is the grandest opportunity we have ever had of voting our be-

loved country "dry." We have a simple issue, unconfused and direct, we win or lose by a bare majority, we have support from thousands who have never before taken a keen interest in the matter, we are not hampered, as in the past, by the necessity of trying to make us do the work of 28, and of cutting out all expenditure that is not absolutely essential. And yet we tremble lest the 11th of next month may see us still held fast within the tentacles of the Drink Octopus. And why? Because of the apathy from which it is so difficult to arouse many whose argument is: "It doesn't affect me one way or the other. I'm not going to bother"; or because of the neglect of many others, well-meaning enough, but not deeply convinced that on **them** rests the responsibility of freeing the land from evil, and therefore easily put off from doing their duty as electors by considerations of their own personal convenience; or because of the mistaken notion that if the present poll is in favour of the Trade, there will be a better chance before long of striking another blow, without the "compensation" clause, that is a stumbling block to so many staunch Temperance partisans. That this last is a serious menace is shown by such facts as the following: A friend of mine recently visited a house in the country where there were eight votes, all of which have always been cast for Prohibition hitherto, but on this occasion none of the household intended to vote because "they did not like compensation." After hearing the explanation and arguments of my friend they were convinced that their attitude was wrong, and gave their decision to vote for Prohibition as in the past. To all who may feel similarly inclined to refrain from exercising their vote, I would say, Do not fall into the error of supposing that you will be able in a few months to vote out the Trade without compensation. If this poll fails, it will be years before drink is banished, for it will be years before so favourable an opportunity offers itself for "securing a majority against it."

And what is this compensation that is so strongly objected to? The real truth of the matter is that the hated compensation was given years ago when that clause was inserted in the Licensing Bill making Prohibition, if carried, inoperative for over four years. The present proposal of the Efficiency Board is practically commuting the **time** compensation for a **money** payment; it is paying 4½ millions, or less, for the purpose of securing **immediate** Prohibition. Will anyone seriously maintain that it is not worth paying that sum to save the country the misery and degradation resulting from four years more of the drink curse? Nay, rather, it is a good business proposition! Think of all the bright boys, the promising young men who will fall victims to the temptations of the open bar during

that time; think of the unhappy, poverty-stricken homes, the ruined manhood, the impaired efficiency of the nation, to say nothing of the millions that will have to be spent in dealing with the crime and poverty produced by the Liquor Traffic. Men and women, no matter what your feeling has been against compensating a Trade that works such untold harm, take a broader view of this present aspect of the question, and let nothing prevent you from casting your vote for Liberty on the 10th of April! Do not risk the bitter regret that will assuredly be yours if you let the golden opportunity slip, and fail to record the vote that will help to make New Zealand free from this curse of the Drink Traffic.—I am, etc.,

KATE M. EVANS.

10, Hiropi Street, Wellington,
March 12th.

ABOLITION OF PROXIES.

(To the Editor.)

Madam,—As a resolution will be brought forward at the Convention next month to do away with proxies altogether, we should be glad if you would state in the "White Ribbon" what will be gained by such amendment to the Constitution.

If the proposal is carried, it will mean that a Union that is not in a position to pay either the whole or part of a Delegate's expenses will be unrepresented unless some member of the W.C.T.U. in its own district can go at her own expense. It seems to us that this would bear hardly upon the smaller Unions, which are as much entitled to representation as are the larger ones, and we feel that in all our regulations special consideration should be given to those who are working under greater disadvantages. It will also mean that members who have not been selected to represent their district, but who are so keenly interested in the work of the W.C.T.U. that they attend Convention as visitors, will have no opportunity of a seat or a vote, but must remain simply onlookers. Some of the leading members of our Unions are decidedly diffident about allowing themselves to be elected too frequently, thus shutting out younger and less experienced members, and if this resolution were carried, Convention would suffer a serious loss in thus being deprived of their wider experience and judgment.—Yours in Union work,

MARIAN JUDSON,
Rec. Sec., Nelson Union.

(There are several advantages in doing away with proxies:—

(1) As the Constitution now stands we have in Convention besides the ex-officio members, three classes (a) Delegates who are members of the Union they represent; (b) Delegates who are members of a Union in the same district as the Union they represent. These are elected by the Union, and must be instructed by them