

this frightful burden off the backs of our producers, and that is why I distinguish between the borrowing of the past, for the purpose of adding to the burdens, and raising money now for the purpose of lightening our burdens. The only power in New Zealand which can cheapen money is the State, because the State is the only institution in New Zealand which can borrow money cheaply. It is all very well to say that we should simply give facilities to the lenders in England. What has been the history of money-lending to the producers in New Zealand without State interference? The only power that can get money out of the English money-lender at a cheap rate of interest is the State. The State can get it cheaply, and that is why we say the money should be raised by the State. Sir, I say again I distinguish between the borrowing of the past and the borrowing of the present. I do not take the same view of it as the honourable gentlemen on that side. I may not understand the Budget, but I think I do. They frankly admit they do not understand it, and therefore, I think, that discounts their criticism of it. I see prudent, legitimate financing

(c.) At the rate of 150 words per minute. Takes 5 minutes.

I have not heard all that has been said in this debate by a long way. I am quite sure a number of good things have been said, but what I have heard for the most part has not been so much a grave and earnest discussion of financial, economic, and political topics as a series of charges of Ministerial corruption, autocracy, and incompetence from the one side, and indignant denial on the other side, with a good deal of *tu quoque* on both sides. My chief objection to this prolonged speech-making centres in the fact that all the questions which have been talked about, and during which the same statements have been iterated and reiterated, will come up again in the form of Bills for practical discussion, when the details will be before us, and when we can form an intelligent opinion of how the particular proposals will work out the details being of as much if not more importance than the principles involved. Until then, I think that a general indication of opinion might have served every useful purpose. Why should honourable members be wasting their good things at the beginning, when they would tell so much better at the end? The first thing that has struck me on this occasion is the pessimism of my friends on the Opposition benches. They tell you in every mood and tense that the country is going to the dogs—the dumb dogs, I presume, and, if one did not know them, he would be sure they had lost heart because of what they mourn. The fact is, however, that, for gentleman who have a stake in a country doomed, as they say, to destruction, they enjoy themselves privately more than you would suppose. They dine comfortably they have their little jokes, they even indulge in a dance occasionally, and, altogether,—except on these benches, when they seem to be playing a part,—they take after Nero, who fiddled while Rome was burning. Seeing they are not really frightened, far less hurt, might not these gentlemen take heart of grace and, instead of raising difficulties and obstructions, put their shoulders to the wheel and help to speed on the progress of this fair young country? “Now is the winter of their discontent” but they might think of the “glorious summer” that is coming.

What might be done if men were wise!
What glorious deeds, my brother,
Would men unite to do the right,
And cease their scorn of one another!

Dickens tells us of an unfortunate man who could not keep the head of Charles the First out of a memorial he was constantly drawing up, and it would appear as if the aggressiveness of the honourable member has caused his name to be brought into the speeches of most members of this House. The charge he made against a large majority of them almost necessitates individual repudiation. This honourable gentleman, who appears to have assumed the leadership of the Opposition, has been particularly strong in his condemnation of the Government. If he has no objection to this course himself, it is not for others to offer any, but he need not have developed quite so strongly the characteristics of what Thackeray's waiter would call a ‘harbitary gent.’ Of course, the members of the Government are fair game for his or anybody's censure, but the honourable gentleman forgot his tact as well as his courtesy when he spoke of a large majority of the members of this House as dumb, driven dogs. Such a charge would not have been pleasant hearing had it been true, but, seeing there is not, so far as I know the shadow of a shade of truth in the statement, it is simply an insult to a number of gentlemen who hold their opinions as intelligently and independently as does their calumniator. Generally speaking, when the honourable gentleman's denunciation is looked at closely, it turns out—if he will allow me to say so—to be a complaint that those who differ from him have got the upper hand: and so, if he cannot change this state of affairs, he can show his contempt for it. If he cannot convince those who differ from him, he can, at least, call them names and sneer at them, and show how vastly superior he is to the common run of members. The great Lord Beaconsfield defined an agreeable man as a man who agrees with you

Shorthand—Junior.—For Junior Civil Service. Time allowed 3 hours.

INSTRUCTIONS TO SUPERVISORS.

1. Inform candidates before the time for taking up this subject that they may use pen or pencil as they please for taking notes, which should be written on ruled paper but that they must transcribe those notes into longhand with pen and ink.

2. Inform candidates that when once you have commenced to dictate you cannot stop until the passage is finished.