

1883.
NEW ZEALAND.

JOINT EDUCATION PETITIONS COMMITTEE

(REPORT OF), TOGETHER WITH MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS, EVIDENCE, AND APPENDIX.

Report brought up 29th August, 1883, and ordered to be printed.

ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

Extracts from the Journals of the Legislative Council.

TUESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF JULY, 1883.

Ordered, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider, and inquire into, and report upon any petitions presented to this Council alleging grievances resulting from the existing system of education; with power to call for persons and papers, and to report within one month; and with power to confer with any similar Committee of the House of Representatives."—(*Hon. Colonel Brett.*) [Three honourable members required that the Committee should be elected by ballot. The Committee having been thereupon balloted for, the Hon. the Speaker announced that the Hon. Mr. Acland, the Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, the Hon. Mr. Miller, the Hon. Dr. Grace, the Hon. Mr. Hart, the Hon. Mr. J. Johnston, the Hon. Mr. Lahmann, the Hon. Mr. Dignan, the Hon. Mr. Menzies, and the Hon. Colonel Brett would constitute the said Committee.]

THURSDAY, THE 26TH DAY OF JULY, 1883.

Ordered, "That all the petitions presented to this Council alleging grievances resulting from the existing system of education now before the Public Petitions Committee be referred to the Select Committee specially appointed, 24th instant, to inquire into this subject."—(*Hon. Colonel Brett.*)

TUESDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1883.

Ordered, "That five members be added to the Joint Education Petitions Committee, and that the said members be chosen by ballot. The said members having been thereupon balloted for, the Hon. the Speaker announced that the Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, the Hon. Mr. Bonar, the Hon. Mr. Holmes, the Hon. Dr. Pollen, and the Hon. Mr. Reynolds would be added to the said Committee."—(*Hon. Colonel Brett.*)

TUESDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF AUGUST, 1883.

Ordered, "That the time for bringing up the report of the Education Petitions Committee be extended for seven days."—(*Hon. Colonel Brett.*)

Extracts from the Journals of the House of Representatives.

WEDNESDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF JULY, 1883.

Ordered, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider, and inquire into, and report upon any petitions presented to this House alleging grievances resulting from the existing system of education; with power to call for persons and papers, and to report within one month. Such Committee to consist of the Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. McIlraith, Mr. Munro, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. J. G. Wilson, and the mover; three to form a quorum."—(*Mr. Pyke.*)

THURSDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF JULY, 1883.

Ordered, "That the Education Petitions Committees be empowered to confer with any similar Committee appointed by the Legislative Council."—(*Mr. Pyke.*)

FRIDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF AUGUST, 1883.

Ordered, "That Standing Order No. 178 be suspended, in order that the number of members on the Education Petitions Committee may be increased to fifteen, by the addition of Mr. Fergus, Mr. Fish, Mr. C. J. Johnston, Mr. Dodson, and the mover."—(*Mr. Swanson.*)

FRIDAY, THE 17TH DAY OF AUGUST, 1883.

Ordered, "That the Education Petitions Committee have leave to postpone making their report for one month."—(*Mr. Pyke.*)

REPORT.

THE Joint Committee appointed to consider, and inquire into, and report upon petitions alleging grievances resulting from the existing system of education have the honour to report that, inasmuch as the Committee have not been able to carry out an exhaustive inquiry into the grievances from which petitioners affirm they suffer under the operation of the Education Act, they do not see their way at present to make any specific recommendation on the subject. The Committee, however, recommend that the minutes of proceedings and evidence accompanying this report should be printed.

DE RENZIE BRETT,
Chairman, Joint Committee.

29th August, 1883.

1—I. 11.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

Legislative Council.

THURSDAY, 26TH JULY, 1883.

The Committee met this day at 10.30 a.m.

Present : Hon. Colonel Brett, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies.

Order of reference read.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. Dignan, the Hon. Colonel Brett was appointed Chairman.

The Hon. the Chairman was requested to communicate with the Chairman of the Committee appointed by the House of Representatives, and to suggest that this Committee proposed to meet the Committee of the House, if convenient, on Tuesday, the 31st July, at 11 o'clock, in the Joint Committee room.

The Committee then adjourned.

TUESDAY, 31ST JULY, 1883.

The Committee met this day at 10.50 a.m.

Present : Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Lahmann.

The minutes of last meeting were read and confirmed.

The Hon. the Chairman laid before the Committee a statement of the number of petitions presented praying for an alteration in the Education Act, with the number of signatures attached thereto.

The Hon. the Chairman intimated that the Committee appointed by the House of Representatives proposed to meet this Committee, and to deliberate as a Joint Committee, at 11 o'clock.

The Committee then adjourned.

House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, 20TH JULY, 1883.

The Committee met pursuant to notice.

Present : Mr. J. Buchanan, Mr. Munro, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Turnbull.

The orders of reference of the 18th and 19th July were read.

On the motion of Mr. Munro, *Resolved*, That Mr. Pyke do take the chair.

Resolved, That the Chairman be instructed to apply to the Petitions Classification Committee to forward all petitions relating to education to this Committee.

Resolved, That the Chairman be instructed to apply to the Public Petitions Committee for any petitions relating to education that may have been referred to that Committee.

Resolved, That an abstract be made of petitions relating to education presented to the House, showing the number of such petitions and the number of signatures thereto, by whom presented and from what districts, with an abstract of the prayer of such petitions.

Resolved, That the Committee do now adjourn until such day as the Chairman may appoint.

TUESDAY, 31ST JULY, 1883.

The Committee met at 10.55 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present : Mr. Pyke (Chairman), Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Munro.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The petitions called for at the last meeting, and an abstract of them, were laid upon the table.

On the motion of Mr. Munro, *Resolved*, That this Committee do now confer with the Committee appointed by the Legislative Council.

The Committee then adjourned to meet the Committee appointed by the Legislative Council, to deliberate as a Joint Committee, at 11 o'clock.

Joint Committee.

TUESDAY, 31ST JULY, 1883.

Present : Legislative Council—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Colonel Bret, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Lahmann. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Munro, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

On the motion of Mr. Pyke, *Resolved*, that the Hon. Colonel Brett take the chair.

The orders of reference from the House of Representatives of the 18th and 19th July, and the orders of reference from the Legislative Council of the 24th and 26th July, were read.

Mr. Pyke laid before the Joint Committee the petitions relating to education that had been presented to the House of Representatives; and read an abstract of the same, stating the number of such petitions and the number of signatures attached thereto, with the prayer thereof.

The Hon. the Chairman laid before the Committee a statement of the number of petitions presented to the Legislative Council, praying for an alteration in the Education Act, with the number of signatures attached thereto.

Moved by Mr. Pyke, That Bishop Redwood and Bishop Hadfield be invited to give evidence before the Joint Committee, which was agreed to.

Moved by the Hon. Dr. Grace, That the Primate of New Zealand be summoned to attend as a witness.

After the question had been put by the Hon. the Chairman, but before the votes were taken down, Mr. Turnbull, a member of the Committee, entered the Committee-room. The Hon. the Chairman asked if it was the pleasure of the Committee that Mr. Turnbull's vote should be taken down. The Committee assented thereto, and the votes were accordingly taken down with the following result :—

Ayes, 5.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Turnbull.

Noes, 5.—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Dick, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Mr. Munro, Mr. Wilson.

The numbers being equal, the Hon. the Chairman gave his casting vote with the Ayes, and declared the motion carried.

Mr. Barron objected to Mr. Turnbull's vote being taken, on the ground of his not having been present when the question was put.

The Hon. Dr. Grace asked leave to withdraw his motion, and on the question being put leave to withdraw was granted.

The Committee then adjourned until such day as the Hon. the Chairman may appoint.

FRIDAY, 3RD AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present : Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Lahmann. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Munro, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read.

Upon the question being put by the Hon. the Chairman, "That these minutes be confirmed," a division was called for, and the names were taken down as follows :—

Ayes, 6.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. Feldwick, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Lahmann.

Noes, 2.—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Dick.

The motion was therefore carried.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Dick, and seconded by the Hon. Dr. Grace, That, it having been shown by the Hon. the Chairman that the vote given by Mr. Turnbull was irregular, it is hereby resolved that the motion of the Hon. Dr. Grace, as recorded at the last meeting, be considered as not having been put.—Carried.

A statement of the additional petitions relating to education received by both Houses was placed before the Committee.

Bishop Redwood, Roman Catholic Bishop of Wellington, attended and gave evidence, which was taken down.

Bishop Redwood was thanked for his attendance, and retired.

The Hon. the Chairman placed before the Committee an official memorandum from the Registrar-General, giving statistics compiled from the Census of April, 1881, showing the population, the numbers and proportions per cent. of the population belonging to different religious denominations, and the number of schools and scholars for the fourth quarter of 1882.

Resolved, That the memorandum be attached to the evidence.

Resolved, That this meeting do now adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday, the 6th instant.

MONDAY, 6TH AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present : Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. J. Johnston, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Mr. De Lautour, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fergus, Mr. Fish, Mr. Munro, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Turnbull.

The order of reference from the House of Representatives, dated the 3rd August, That the number of members on the Education Petitions Committee be increased to fifteen, was read.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Hon. the Chairman read a letter received from Bishop Moran, asking to be allowed to give evidence before the Committee.

On the motion of the Hon. Dr. Menzies, *Resolved*, That the Hon. the Chairman be desired to inform Bishop Moran, in reply to his letter requesting permission to give evidence before the Committee, that the decision of the Committee will be made known to him during the course of the day.

Bishop Hadfield, Episcopalian Bishop of Wellington, was in attendance and gave evidence, which was taken down.

Bishop Hadfield was thanked for his attendance, and retired.

On the motion of Mr. Fish, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Miller, *Resolved*, That Bishop Moran be informed that the Committee will be happy to receive any evidence that he may wish to offer on Wednesday next, the 8th instant, at 11 a.m.

The Committee then adjourned until Wednesday, the 8th August, at 11 a.m.

WEDNESDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present: Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Hon. Dr. Pollen, Hon. Mr. Reynolds. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fergus, Mr. Fish, Mr. C. J. Johnston, Mr. Munro, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. Swanson.

The order of reference from the Legislative Council, dated the 7th August, That five members be added to the Joint Education Petitions Committee, was read.

The minutes of the previous meeting were then read and confirmed.

Bishop Moran, Roman Catholic Bishop of Dunedin, was present, and gave evidence, which was taken down.

Bishop Moran was thanked for his attendance, and retired.

The Hon. the Chairman stated that he had received a letter from the Rev. Mr. Bavin, asking to be allowed to give evidence, which was read.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Buckley, That it is desirable that evidence should be taken of two or three laymen from the Roman Catholic side.—Carried. Subsequently, the motion was allowed by the Committee to be withdrawn.

The Hon. the Chairman was requested to inform the Rev. Mr. Bavin that the Committee would have no objection to receive his evidence at the next sitting day.

Resolved, That the Committee do now adjourn until Friday, the 10th instant, at 11 o'clock a.m.

FRIDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present: Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Hon. Mr. Reynolds. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fish, Mr. Munro, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Swanson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A letter dated the 8th August, received by the Hon. the Chairman from Bishop Hadfield, together with a copy of the Chairman's reply thereto, were read.

Moved by Mr. Barron, That the request of Bishop Hadfield to have his letter of the 8th August printed with the minutes of his evidence be complied with.—Carried.

Moved by Mr. Pyke, That the evidence taken by the Committee be printed and circulated amongst the members confidentially.

Moved by the Hon. Dr. Menzies, as an amendment, That the Chairman of the Joint Committee be requested to ask the sanction of the Legislative Council to get the evidence printed, and that the Chairman of the Committee of the House of Representatives be requested to ask for similar permission in the House.

Upon which a division was called for, and the names being taken down as follow:—

Ayes, 11.—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Fish, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Mr. Munro, Hon. Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Swanson.

Noes, 8.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. Feldwick, Hon. Mr. Hart, Mr. Pyke.

Amendment carried.

Hon. Mr. Menzies's amendment was then put as a substantive motion, upon which a division took place, the names being taken down as follow:—

Ayes, 9.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fish, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Mr. Swanson.

Noes, 10.—Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Mr. Munro, Mr. Pyke, Hon. Mr. Reynolds.

Motion negatived.

Moved by Mr. Feldwick, seconded by Mr. Fish, That, it having been intimated to the Committee that Bishop Luck, Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland, desires to give evidence, his evidence be received if tendered, and that the same be intimated to him.

Upon the question being put, "That further debate on this motion be adjourned for the present for the purpose of hearing the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Bavin," a division was called for, the names being taken down as follows:—

Ayes, 14.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Fish, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Mr. Munro, Hon. Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Swanson.

Noes, 5.—Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Pyke.

Debate accordingly adjourned.

The Rev. Mr. Bavin was then requested to attend. The Hon. the Chairman proceeded to examine him, when a discussion arose with reference to the question put by the Chairman, who thereupon requested Mr. Bavin to withdraw during the discussion. It was ultimately agreed that the same questions which had been asked previous witnesses by the Chairman should be put to Mr. Bavin.

Mr. Bavin was recalled, and gave evidence, which was taken down.

Mr. Bavin was thanked for his attendance, and retired.

The motion of Mr. Feldwick, "That, it having been intimated to the Committee that Bishop Luck, Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland, desires to give evidence, his evidence be received if tendered, and that the same be intimated to him," was then put by the Hon. the Chairman to the Committee.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Reynolds, as an amendment, That the Chairman cause an intimation to be made through the Press reporters that the Committee is willing to take such evidence on the working of the present education system as may be tendered to it. Upon which the Hon. the Chairman ruled that he could not accept it as an amendment by way of addition, but recommended the Hon. Mr. Reynolds to move it as a substantive motion.

The motion of Mr. Feldwick was then again put to the Committee and carried.

Moved by Mr. Barron, That the Chairman cause an intimation to be made through the Press reporters that the Committee is willing to take such evidence on the working of the present education system as may be tendered to it.—Carried.

The Committee then adjourned until Wednesday, the 15th instant, at 11 a.m.

WEDNESDAY, 15TH AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present: Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. J. Johnston, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Hon. Mr. Reynolds. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fish, Mr. Munro, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read, corrected, and confirmed.

The correspondence and telegrams which passed between the Hon. the Chairman and Bishop Luck, of Auckland, and Bishop Moran, of Dunedin, were read and approved.

On the motion of Dr. Grace, *Resolved*, That the first transcript of the shorthand notes of Bishop Moran's evidence be sent to him for his revision by the first mail.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Holmes, That the following gentlemen—Mr. Tole, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Pilliet, Hon. Mr. Rolleston, Mr. Montgomery, and Mr. Hislop—be summoned to give evidence before the Committee.

Upon the question being put to the meeting it was negatived.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Reynolds, *Resolved*, That the Chairman cause an intimation to be made to the Wellington papers, as well as through the Press reporters, that the Committee is willing to take such evidence on the working of the present education system as may be tendered to it.

Mr. Shrimski, M.H.R., attended and gave evidence, which was taken down. Mr. Shrimski was thanked for his attendance, and retired.

On the debate as to whether the evidence should be printed or not, it was decided that the question should be considered by the Committee after all the evidence had been taken.

The Committee then adjourned until further notice.

TUESDAY, 21ST AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present: Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Johnston, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Reynolds. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Mr. De Lautour, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Fish, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The order of reference from the House of Representatives, dated the 17th August, granting extension of time for one month for bringing up the report, was read.

A letter from the Rev. Mr. Coffey, curate of St. Marks, desiring to give evidence before the Committee was read. The Chairman stated that he had written in reply informing Mr. Coffey that the Committee would meet to-day, and that if he could come at 12 o'clock the Committee would probably be able to receive his evidence.

A letter was also read from two school-teachers, with the Chairman's reply thereto, which was approved.

Bishop Luck, Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland, was then requested to attend, and gave evidence, which was taken down.

Bishop Luck was thanked for his attendance, and withdrew.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, That the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Coffey be received on Thursday next, at 11 o'clock.—Carried.

Moved by the Hon. Dr. Grace, and seconded by Mr. Dodson, That after Thursday next no further evidence be taken by this Committee.

Moved by the Hon. Mr. Bonar, as an amendment, That further consideration of the Hon. Dr. Grace's motion be postponed until Thursday next, and that notice of the motion be given that no further evidence will be taken after that day.

Upon the question being put a division was called for, the names being taken down as follows:—

Ayes, 5.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Mr. Swanson, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

Noes, 8.—Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Mr. De Lautour, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. Dodson, Hon. Dr. Grace, Mr. Turnbull.

Amendment negatived.

Hon. Dr. Grace's motion was then put as a substantive motion, upon which a division was called for, the names being taken down as follow :—

Ayes, 9.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Mr. De Lautour, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. Dodson, Hon. Dr. Grace, Mr. Turnbull.

Noes, 4.—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Mr. Swanson, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

Motion carried.

The Committee then adjourned until Thursday, the 23rd August, at 11 a.m.

THURSDAY, 23RD AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present : Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Hon. Mr. Reynolds. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fergus, Mr. Fish, Mr. C. J. Johnston, Mr. Munro, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Rev. Mr. Coffey was then requested to attend, and gave evidence, which was taken down.

The Rev. Mr. Coffey was thanked for his attendance, and withdrew.

Moved by Mr. Barron, That, notwithstanding any former decision arrived at by the Committee, such further evidence may be taken as the Committee may from time to time determine.

A debate ensued thereupon.

Moved by Mr. Fish, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Miller, That the debate upon this motion be adjourned.—Carried.

Moved by the Hon. Dr. Grace, That this Committee adjourn until to-morrow.

Moved by Mr. Barron, as an amendment, That the Committee adjourn until Monday next, at 11 o'clock.—Carried.

The Committee then adjourned until Monday, the 27th instant, at 11 a.m.

MONDAY, 27TH AUGUST, 1883.

The Committee met at 11 a.m., pursuant to notice.

Present : Legislative Council—Hon. Colonel Brett (Chairman), Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Hon. Dr. Pollen, Hon. Mr. Reynolds. House of Representatives—Mr. Barron, Mr. J. Buchanan, Mr. De Lautour, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fergus, Mr. Fish, Mr. C. J. Johnston, Mr. Munro, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Swanson, Mr. Turnbull, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The debate upon the motion of Mr. Barron, That, notwithstanding any former decision arrived at by the Committee, such further evidence may be taken as the Committee may from time to time determine, was resumed.

The Hon. Dr. Grace moved to amend the question by leaving out all the words after "That," with a view to insert the words "as an *ad interim* report, it has been established by the evidence submitted to this Committee that the Catholics conscientiously object to the State system of education, and have consequently been compelled to establish schools of their own, which they are maintaining at their own cost, and are thereby subjected to a great hardship, as they are thus contributors to two systems of education."

Upon the question being put, "That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question," the Committee divided, and the names were taken down as follow :—

Ayes, 15.—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Fergus, Mr. Fish, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Mr. Munro, Hon. Dr. Pollen, Hon. Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Swanson, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

Noes, 12.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Hon. Dr. Grace, Mr. C. J. Johnston, Mr. Pyke, Mr. Turnbull.

So it passed in the affirmative.

Then, the original question was put, upon which the Committee divided, and the names were taken down as follow :—

Ayes, 10.—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Fergus, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Mr. Munro, Mr. Swanson, Mr. J. G. Wilson.

Noes, 15.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. Fish, Mr. C. J. Johnston, Hon. Mr. Lahmann, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Mr. Pyke, Hon. Mr. Reynolds.

So it passed in the negative.

Moved by Mr. Fish, That, inasmuch as the Committee has not been able to carry out an exhaustive inquiry into the grievances from which petitioners affirm they suffer under the operation of the Education Act, it does not see the way at present to make any specific recommendation on the subject.

Upon the question being put, the Committee divided, and the names were taken down as follow :—

Ayes, 12.—Mr. Barron, Hon. Mr. Bonar, Hon. Mr. Dick, Mr. Fergus, Mr. Fish, Hon. Mr. Hart, Hon. Mr. Holmes, Hon. Mr. Menzies, Hon. Mr. Miller, Mr. Munro, Hon. Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Swanson.

Noes, 11.—Hon. Mr. Acland, Hon. Mr. Barnicoat, Mr. J. Buchanan, Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley, Hon. Mr. Dignan, Mr. De Lautour, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Feldwick, Mr. C. J. Johnston, Hon. Dr. Grace, Hon. Mr. Lahmann.

So it passed in the affirmative.

Moved by Mr. J. Buchanan, That the minutes of proceedings and evidence be reported to both Houses, and they recommend that they be printed.—Carried.

Moved by the Hon. Dr. Grace, That the Chairman be authorized to bring up the report.—Carried.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

FRIDAY, 3RD AUGUST, 1883 (Hon. Colonel BRETT, Chairman).

Dr. REDWOOD, examined.

1. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Dr. Redwood, there have been received by Parliament fifty-one petitions from Catholics, bearing 7,223 signatures. You have heard one of those petitions read, and also two petitions signed by the Anglican Primate of New Zealand. Will you be good enough to answer a few questions on the subject? First, I would ask, what is your position in the Roman Catholic Church?—I am Bishop of Wellington, New Zealand.

2. What is the extent of your diocese?—It comprises all New Zealand, except the Provinces of Auckland and Otago including Southland.

3. What is the number of Catholics in your diocese?—According to the statistics we estimate them at 38,000.

4. What is the number of children of both sexes educated in the Catholic schools in your diocese?—I have had a return made, which shows the number to be 4,563.

5. What is the proportion of Catholics in New Zealand to the whole Christian population?—As far as we have generally been able to find out it is about one-seventh.

6. Have the Catholics a conscientious objection to availing themselves of the State system of education?—If you will allow me, I will read a short statement I have prepared of the Catholic grievance, which I think will put the question before the Government in a way they have not yet heard it. The Catholics maintain that a grievous injustice has been inflicted upon them by the present law of public education in the colony. That injustice is shown by the following facts: It is a broad and notorious fact that there are 70,000 Catholic citizens in New Zealand; it is a broad and notorious fact that, during the last four years, the country has spent two millions in support of public education; it is a broad and notorious fact that the aforesaid 70,000 Catholic citizens are excluded from the schools of the colony by a law which, in their regard, is penal;—not that they have been excluded by an express enactment of the law, but by the conditions under which that law is administered—conditions which their consciences forbid them to comply with. Again, it is a broad and notorious fact that, throughout the colony, wherever a sufficient number of Catholics is found to erect a school, Catholics do erect a school or schools, and do maintain such school or schools solely at their own expense, and at great sacrifices, as statistics will undeniably prove. Further, it is a broad and notorious fact that these 70,000 Catholics in the colony are not idiots; and, therefore, it must also be a fact that their conscientious objections must be very great, since they make such enormous sacrifices to keep their children out of the public schools and in their own. From these facts it is plain that they are the objects and victims of a very grievous injustice. The law of education in the colony assails at once their pockets and their consciences, and practically produces the same effect as if the majority of their children were expressly excluded from the schoolroom. That law inflicts a grievous injustice upon them, because they contribute their fair share towards the revenue of the country, and have equal rights with their fellow-citizens to share in the expenditure of that money, without being forced to violate their consciences; but, in the matter of education, they receive no such share. They are compelled to contribute money to the education of other people's children—children of people who are well-to-do. They, as citizens, bearing the common burdens of citizens, are called upon to pay a double tax—to pay for their own schools entirely, and, to a large extent, in the teeth of their conscience, for the children of others. Is that fair? Is that just? Is that equitable? Is that politic? Our object is not to repeal the present law but to amend it, so that, without violation of principles we are bound to maintain at every sacrifice, we may avail ourselves of it. If that law is not amended the consequence will be to instil into the minds of Catholics, that is, of one-seventh of the population, an unutterable detestation of the legislation of the land. Is that politic? Is that to the colony's advantage? We ask for nothing more than what is done in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. We ask not for other people's money, but for our own, which is now taken to build and support schools, both primary, normal, and high, which we cannot use; to build and support schools in which other people's children, often the children of well-to-do people, are educated. We do not ask even as much as the Catholics in Canada are receiving. There, every shilling paid by the Catholic people goes by law to support the Catholic schools; and they receive, in addition, a fair share of the moneys voted by the Central Legislature. And non-Catholics are exactly on the same footing; there is even-handed justice. We do not, we could not, we would not, ask for more. Now, I can corroborate this by a few statistics, to show the enormous extent of the grievance which I am sure no one could be aware of until they heard the figures. The total number of schools in my diocese is fifty-seven; the expenditure in buying land for schools has been £12,473; cost of

buildings, £84,466; annual cost of maintenance and working, £11,702; number of teachers, male twenty-eight, female 119; estimated value of services of teachers (because many are not remunerated, partly through deficiency of funds—we have estimated the value of their services according to the rates generally paid), £14,033 per annum; number of pupils, 4,563. The details of those figures in tabulated form I hand in to the Committee, and I will read some general observations which are appended to the table. I may add that the cost of buildings as presented in the above table does not include any church or chapel. 1. In some places we use the church as a schoolroom for want of a special building. 2. We employ more female teachers than male for want of money, though in some cases the former are more efficient than the latter. 3. We call attention to the fact that our annual cost of system multiplied by five (number of years since the existence of present public system) amounts to £58,510. 4. The public expenditure in four years (we speak from the beginning of this year) has been, say, £2,000,000. Share due to Catholics as one-seventh of the population, say, £70,000; and in the Diocese of Wellington, containing about one-half of the Catholic population of the colony, our annual share would be, say, £30,000. At the end of present year multiply by five and you have $£30,000 \times 5 = £150,000$. Add this to cost of system for same period of five years and you have $£150,000 + £58,510 = £208,510$, saved by us to the Government. Then, add our expenditure for land and buildings and you have $£96,939 + £208,510 = £305,449$, or, in round numbers, over one-third of a million pounds saved to the Government.

7. *Hon. Dr. Grace.*] I understand you to allege that half of one-seventh of the gross annual public expenditure on education, multiplied by the number of years the public system has been in operation, the total amount to which the Catholics of your diocese would be entitled is £150,000, which, added to what you have yourselves paid for maintenance for five years, £58,510, makes £208,510, and adding to that what you have spent on land and buildings, £96,939, the total is £305,449?—Yes.

8. So you mean to say, in point of fact; that the Catholics of your diocese, owing to their conscientious objection to the State system of education, have been mulcted to the extent of £305,449 in five years?—Yes.

9. Therefore your contention is that, in justice and equity, they are not only entitled to consideration for the future, but that, if the matter was looked upon in a business-like light, they would be entitled to a refund?—Yes, if you push it so far, in strict equity. That is the way it stands.

10. Your object, I presume, in submitting these figures is to show what is the extent of the grievance the Catholics are subjected to?—Yes.

11. So you place before us not only the sacrifices they have made but the share of wealth they have lost, and you base that on the ground of their conscientious objection to the system?—Yes, that is so. Evidently men would not make such enormous sacrifices otherwise.

12. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Have you stated the endowments you have received?—We have none except 150 acres near Porirua, received for Maori education, which brings £38 a year. Then, there is a small piece of land in Wellington, left for white and Maori orphans by Sir George Grey when Governor, which brings in some £30 or £40 a year, as far as I remember.

13. Can you declare that the Catholics in general do object to the State system?—Most decidedly. Nothing can exceed their objection to it.

14. From what source do you obtain your teachers?—As far as male teachers are concerned, excepting the Brothers, we generally advertise for them, and generally upon their presenting good testimonials and showing their efficiency we secure good teachers. With regard to female teachers, we generally do not obtain them in that manner. They are brought up in our convents; and then we have nuns.

15. Have the Government any supervision over your schools?—They have if they wish, and we invite their Inspectors to visit our schools. Here is an extract from the report of a Government Inspector on one of our schools at New Headford, near Lincoln: “Examined by Inspector W. L. Edge. 49 on roll, 47 present, 44 presented, 29 passed; percentage, 65.”

16. Do you receive children of other denominations for instruction in your schools?—We do.

17. What is the percentage of non-Catholics?—Not very great. The secular schools being free deter many from coming except to our high schools, where we have a certain number from other denominations.

18. Do you consider the non-Catholic children coming to your schools are fairly instructed according to age—according to what is done in your own schools?—I am not prepared to answer that question.

19. Do you know anything about the religious instruction of the non-Catholic children who come to your schools?—No.

20. Great care is taken with the religious instruction of your own children?—Yes.

21. Do you believe in the secular system of education?—I cannot say that I do by any means.

22. Then, you are a strong supporter of denominational education?—Yes; but we do not want to repeal the present Act if the people of the colony want it, but we cannot avail ourselves of it without violating our consciences.

23. Are you conversant with the system in England?—To a certain extent; I am not well posted up in it. As far as I remember there are Catholic schools receiving grants—so much per head for attendance and so much per head for results as shown by Government examinations.

24. Do you think that would meet the views of the present petitioners?—Partially perhaps; I cannot say that it would wholly. I will read a few lines I have written suggesting what I think the Catholics would accept. Of course this is only on my authority. I do not speak for Dr. Moran or for the Bishop of Auckland. They may differ from me in details; but for myself I say this: What, then, do we want? 1. We want our schools to be on an equal footing with the public schools. 2. If the Education Act is modified, so as to have a general system of payment of results established, we accept our chance. 3. If not, we ask for a fair capitation grant, based on what is given to public schools of the same class or standing as ours, including training schools for schoolmasters

and mistresses. With regard to scholarships, we claim that they should be open to the children of our schools as well as to the children of the public schools, because they come out of the public funds, to which we are contributors. And, as extensive endowments have been made to public schools of a certain class, we deem it fair that our capitation grant shall be increased in proportion to the fairly estimated amount from such endowments to which, according to our numbers, we are entitled. On the above or equivalent conditions we are prepared to accept—1. The programme of studies adopted in the public schools. 2. The books, with the exception of objectionable books in history : we say objectionable, because there are some smaller abridgments of history which we could accept. 3. The Government Inspectors to examine on secular matters only, no questions on religious matters being asked. We are also prepared to buy our school land and erect our schools at our own expense, though it would be fair to ask Government pound for pound, because in the past we have expended large sums for the purchase of land, the erection of schools, and the payment of teachers, thus saving the Government a considerable expenditure.

25. *Hon. Dr. Grace.*] What is your idea of the system of payment by results?—I judge by the system in England, which I believe to be this : They pay so much per head for attendance in order to get the children to come to school. When the child has attended so many days in the year, so much is given by the Government—that is a law of mild compulsion. Secondly, there are examinations by Government Inspectors, and all those who come up to a certain standard get so much per head.

26. So I understand you to allege, if the Government had a system of general payment by results—that being the basis and leading principle of their system—within the lines of that system, your schools would be willing to come?—Exactly.

27. Always provided you were allowed to object to certain histories?—Yes.

28. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What is your opinion of the petitions from the Church of England : “Your petitioners are convinced that any fully satisfactory measure for education by the State should contain a provision for grants-in-aid being made to schools set on foot by any religious denomination, provided that the attendance and secular instruction in such schools shall come up to the required standards which satisfy the Government Inspectors”?—I thoroughly indorse that.

29. The petition asks that grants-in-aid should be made to schools?—That is, of course, what we want?—So far, that is exactly our views.

30. Then, the petition further says : “Your petitioners are further of opinion that the Education Act should be so amended that provision may be made for the communication of religious instruction in the public schools by ministers of religion, or by persons duly authorized by them, to the children belonging to their respective communions within school hours”?—That I cannot agree with.

31. *Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley.*] Will you explain your objections to that?—It is asked that ministers or other persons authorized should go to teach religion in State schools in certain hours. We object to that because such schools would still remain secular schools. Religion would be made a part of secondary consideration in the eyes of the children, who would have constantly before them the differences of religion, which would certainly lead to harm and would bring religion into contempt in their minds. That is my view. A minister of one denomination would be in the school one day and another of a different denomination the next, and the children would see the differences. We could not be satisfied with that. We want our children brought up as Catholics ; then we are willing to give what the State requires in secular knowledge. Under that proposal we should have no control over the masters, and there might be an infidel master in a school whose constant influence would quite outweigh what was done by a clergyman in a short visit. I am not prepared with all our objections to that proposal at the moment, but those are two.

32. *Hon. Dr. Grace.*] What means did you resort to to get the statistics you have given the Committee?—I sent to the parish priest in each place questions which form the heads of the table I have handed in, and their answers are what I have given.

33. Are your parish priests in the habit of keeping these returns upon which they may be supposed to have these particular figures?—Certainly ; they all keep returns of their schools for their own purposes.

34. Is there any system in your diocese by which you have annual or periodical reports on the condition and cost of education?—Well, I cannot say annual, but periodical.

35. So that it may reliably be contended that the data you now furnish the Committee was in a condition of antecedent preparedness before it was called for by you?—Certainly.

36. At what sacrifice to the Catholic population personally or individually is this system attended by, and can you cite any instances showing specific individual pressure upon certain persons of this system?—The pressure is almost continual. We are constantly asking them to pay money. We are asking them to pay for the support of our schools weekly or monthly. In some cases we have had to make a house-to-house collection for new schools. For instance, for the Brothers' School here we are asking 6d. a week from every adult Catholic in the town, and that has been going on for over twelve months I think.

37. What was the cost of that school?—The contract, interest, furniture, &c., amount to over £4,321.

38. Do the parents of children pay a weekly sum for the education of their children?—They are supposed to do so, though some find it so hard that we admit them free.

39. Is that the chief source of your revenue?—That is the only source. There may be extraordinary collections. The schools are supported by fees per head paid weekly or monthly by the parents.

40. Speaking in ordinary terms with regard to the value of money, do you think that tax for the education of their children is a great strain upon parents?—In some cases it is a very great strain, particularly when there are several children. In all cases it is a strain, because the parents might send their children to free schools. They see their neighbours' children educated by public funds, and they have to make this sacrifice, so that it is like a penal law.

41. What is the system as between children who pay and those who do not? Do the parents

who do pay know who are those parents who do not pay?—Not always, because it is a delicate matter. It is left to the teacher or parish priest. They may see that a man and his family are hard up, and they let the children come free.

42. Do you ever refuse children on account of parents not paying?—Not to my knowledge; never. I would not allow it.

43. How many boys have you here at school?—240.

44. Do you inspect that school yourself?—Yes; and also invite other gentlemen to attend the examinations.

45. Are you satisfied with the standard the boys reach?—Yes; they reach a fair standard, as far as I can judge. They have been very fair at each examination at the primary schools. At the high schools our boys compete very fairly for the Civil Service and for commercial offices.

46. *Hon. Mr. Dick.*] You say you have 4,563 children attending your schools?—Yes.

47. Are you aware of the number there should be of school-age?—I could not exactly tell. As a guess, I should say between five and six thousand.

48. Would that be according to the ordinary proportion of children of school-age to population?—I have not considered the matter sufficiently to say.

49. Are these 4,563 all Roman Catholics?—The vast majority. There are some few exceptions.

50. At the Convent School, for instance?—There may be a few exceptions, but only a few.

51. What about the other children? Are they uneducated?—In some places we have not been able to establish Catholic schools. In thinly-populated districts we have not had the funds. There, of course, our children have to go to the public schools. We have to tolerate it, making the best of a bad bargain.

52. Then, you have a number of children attending the public schools?—They must, because there is no other school; but always against their will. We have to give them religious instruction as best we can, although in a very lame manner we find practically.

53. Then, would not that alter the amount you would be entitled to as you show?—Not by very much. I have always been below the mark in those estimates.

54. Have you any Roman Catholic teachers in the public schools?—We have some.

55. And Inspectors of Schools?—Not in my diocese, I think. I believe there is one in Auckland, Mr. Sullivan.

56. And there are teachers in Auckland too?—I suppose so.

57. In Westland?—I know there are some Catholic teachers in the public schools, but I do not know where.

58. Where there are those teachers, are there not likely to be Catholic scholars too?—There may be, but not where there are Catholic schools in the same place.

59. Is there any Catholic school in Auckland?—I know there are several; but I do not know much about Auckland, and cannot speak of them in detail.

60. Well, the teachers you have, are they engaged entirely to teach?—I think so, to the best of my recollection.

61. Do not the sisters in convents do other work besides?—No; I think not. There are special ones engaged solely in teaching. If they have other occupations, it would be only merely their devotions. Their business is to teach. I do not speak of lay sisters; all the teaching sisters devote themselves to that.

62. There have been a considerable number of petitions this year from Catholics; do you know whether any effort was made to get up those petitions?—No effort, except the simple fact that it was made known to the Catholics that it would be a very good thing to have petitions; and they were invited through the public Press to sign.

63. They were encouraged to petition?—The Catholics in general were always encouraged to take legitimate means to redress their grievance, and they knew that petitions were one of those means.

64. You calculate that there are 70,000 Catholics in New Zealand?—I think you will find they are quite that from the statistics.

65. And the petitioners number 7,223?—Yes; there are no children's or females' signatures to the petitions from my diocese. I was asked in conversation, and I said it was advisable that no women or boys under a certain age should sign.

66. *Mr. Barron.*] Your petition prays that you may be placed on an equality with other colonists?—Yes.

67. You are aware that the system offered under the State schools is offered equally to all colonists?—It depends upon in what sense you take the word equal.

68. Our State school system is open to be availed of by every person in the colony?—Physically that is so; but morally not.

69. *Mr. Dick.*] You do go in where there are no other schools?—Yes; we cannot help that. We always tell the people that it is only in case of necessity they are allowed to send their children there, because we do not admit they should be exposed to the danger to be met there. Of course, if there is an infidel teacher, his influence cannot be overcome. It permeates their very life.

70. You think religious training more important than general knowledge?—It depends upon the sense in which you take it. If you look to the last end of man it is certainly more important. It is even more important in this world. It is better that a man should be honest and moral, than that he should know a certain amount of arithmetic.

71. *Mr. Barron.*] You admit that complete unity is quite impossible?—Yes; that is quite utopian.

72. So, by being placed on an equality, you mean with a majority of your fellow-colonists?—I mean in matters of religion we should have full religious freedom; upon that ground we should have our children taught in our own schools; and, generally, that we should be compensated for the sacrifice we make.

73. Of course you are aware that our public schools are not taken advantage of by many outside your own particular Church?—Certainly.

74. And the objection is that the moral tone of the public school is not such as they would like their children to acquire?—Yes.

75. And, in consequence, they keep up private schools, to which they send their children. So that, if we are to have a change in our system, you admit that those who object to the moral tone of the public schools, whether on religious grounds or otherwise, should have a voice in that change?—I suppose so; I do not see any objection. We do not ask for others; we only speak for ourselves.

76. Is it from the absence of religious training in the State schools, or rather that the religious training given is not in accord with the opinion of your Church, that you have an objection to the State schools?—It would be from both. I cannot see how religion can be taught in the State schools, as we understand religion. We also object to the kind of teaching there might be there, because we do not believe in what is called common Christianity, because there is no such thing existing. We contend each religious denomination should have its own schools, if they think fit, and not be taxed double. We do not want for ourselves what any other religious denomination should not have, if it thought fit. We do not want to repeal the Act, but to see it so amended that we could make use of it, and get the funds we contribute.

77. You object altogether to the State system of education, because you think it never can be satisfactory as far as you are concerned?—Yes.

78. And that if a majority of the colonists think otherwise you must bow to the decision of the majority?—I beg to differ from that. I say that minorities should not be bound down in matters of justice. If majorities want to do an injustice, minorities should be heard; that is done in all legislation. Possibly the minority now may become a majority, and it cannot be treated with injustice simply because it is a minority.

79. *Mr. J. G. Wilson.*] Are you aware whether there was ever at Home a combination between Catholics and other denominations for some form of moral training?—Not as far as I am aware; I am not personally aware of it.

80. Cannot you suggest some middle course to meet the case?—I am distinctly of opinion that no middle course is possible.

81. *Hon. Dr. Grace.*] Except, of course, payment by results?—Yes.

82. *Hon. Mr. Dick.*] Are you aware of a book published in Dublin containing selections from Scripture for Irish schools?—I believe it exists, but it is a perfect dead-letter. I do not know if the Catholics were parties to publishing the book, but it is a dead-letter. It was only to get over a difficulty with regard to English legislation; but it certainly was a dead-letter.

MONDAY, 6TH AUGUST, 1883.

Bishop HADFIELD, examined.

83. *The Chairman.*] My Lord, What is your position in the Church of England?—I am Bishop of the Diocese of Wellington.

84. What is the extent of your diocese?—It extends from the Waimata River, on the East Coast, to the Tipoka Stream, a few miles on this side of Parihaka, and north to the Taupo country.

85. What is the total population of your diocese?—I believe about 68,000.

86. How many belong to the Church of England and how many to the Catholic Church?—About 33,000 to the Church of England. I do not know how many Roman Catholics there are.

87. What is the proportion belonging to the Church of England to the total population of New Zealand?—About 43 per cent, according to former official papers. I have recently not seen them distinguished.

88. And the Catholics?—I do not know.

89. How many State schools are there in your diocese?—I do not know.

90. Can you state the number of Catholic schools in your diocese?—I do not know.

91. Are there any schools supported by the Church of England in your diocese?—No daily schools. We had two of the best schools in Wellington for many years until the present system was started. We have higher schools—one at Wanganui and one at Wellington.

92. Are there any Catholics in them?—I think not. We had Catholics at Wanganui some years ago, but some representation was made to their parents, and they were withdrawn.

93. Have the Catholics a conscientious objection to the State system of education?—I should think, without any doubt, they must have a conscientious objection to it.

94. Do you find the Catholic children have a better knowledge of Scripture than the children of other denominations?—I cannot answer that question.

95. In non-religious branches of education are the Catholics quite up to the current standard?—From all I have heard I believe they are. I have no personal knowledge on the subject.

96. Have the Presbyterians, Wesleyans, &c., in your diocese any objection to attend the State schools?—I do not know. Our children attend the State schools, but many of us have a strong objection to it. I, for one, if I had children who could not be educated elsewhere, would not send them to the State school, whatever might be the legal penalty.

97. Then, you do not approve of the State system of secular education?—I feel strongly convinced that a system of secular education is absolutely mischievous. I conceive the only object the State can have in educating its citizens is to make them good citizens, and it appears to me that mere secular instruction, such as physical science, can have no tendency to make people better citizens. As far as my acquaintance with history goes, there has never been a system of education in any civilized country where there was not some training with the view of teaching children that there was some divine power to whom they were responsible, and to enforce moral laws. I therefore think that a system of secular education is absolutely mischievous.

98. Then, are you opposed to denominational education?—There is a sort of prejudice against the word denominational, and therefore it is rather difficult to say what my view is. But my impression is that the State is bound to respect the conscientious objections that the Roman Catholics have, and that I, at any rate, and many Churchmen have, on that subject; and that, being taxed with the rest of the community, we being sufficiently large bodies in many places to require schools, we ought to have payments from the Government to support such schools, just as those who believe in secularism have. I have never heard any valid argument advanced against such a system.

99. What is your opinion of the educational grievance of the Catholics as stated in the petition you have heard read?—I think their conscientious conviction is that no education is at all satisfactory for children that eliminates religion as an element of education. With this conviction I do not quite see how they can allow their children to go to schools where the whole time is occupied with secular subjects, and where they have so many lessons to prepare at home that no leisure is left for their religious instructions by parents or others.

100. What would you suggest for the removal of this alleged grievance?—I think that if the Roman Catholics or any other body have a school they ought to have exactly the same payment as other schools, provided they supplied the same amount and quality of secular education which the Government schools give, and which the Inspectors require.

101. Here is a petition from the Primate which asks for grants in aid of schools. I will read the clause: "That your petitioners are convinced that any fully satisfactory measure for education by the State should contain a provision for grants-in-aid being made to schools set on foot by any religious denomination, provided that the attendance and secular instruction in such schools shall come up to the required standards, and satisfy the Government Inspectors." Do you approve that?—I would not limit it to a matter of aid. I think a school which any religious body might establish would be entitled to quite as much as the Government give to the State schools. I think the great object should be to remove a grievance. Considering that the Government spent £288,000 on education last year, I think that amount might be reduced, and that in a short period, if voluntary efforts were called out in reference to such schools, that the burden upon the public finance would be reduced. At Home the Church of England supplies £750,000 a year to the support of its schools, which relieves the Government to that amount. I should say that a similar saving would be the case here, were our system so altered that it should not be a constant source of irritation to the Roman Catholics and a great portion of the body to which I belong.

102. There is this also in the petition of the Primate: "(2.) Your petitioners are further of opinion that the Education Act should be so amended that provision may be made for the communication of religious instruction in the public schools by ministers of religion, or by persons duly authorized by them, to the children belonging to their respective communions within school hours." Do you approve of that?—As far as I understand the meaning it is this: that there are parts of the country where the population is so sparse that it would be impossible to establish different schools for each body, and that therefore religious instruction should be given in the one school by the clergymen, or other person for that purpose, by the different bodies. The paragraph does not conflict with the first paragraph, but merely supplements it for such cases as these.

103. Do you consider, then, that the reading of the Bible in the day-school is imperative?—I do not think the mere reading of the Bible would answer any beneficial purpose. It certainly would not suit the Roman Catholics' views, nor mine altogether. If I were to give my opinion as a citizen I should say it was discreditable to any Government to establish schools from which the Scriptures were excluded. I think it is a national sin. But speaking in my capacity as Bishop I do not think it would at all meet the wishes of the Church. The Church could not be satisfied with the mere reading of the Scriptures—to be possibly read at random by perhaps an irreligious teacher, or to be treated in an irreverent manner. For my part I do not approve of mere Bible-reading in schools.

104. *Hon. Dr. Grace.*] I understand the system of payment by results in England to be this: that the Government pay so much for every child that attends school—no matter what school—and also pay a certain sum in compensation for the efficiency attained by a certain percentage of scholars. Would such a system meet the views of the petitioners of the Church of England here?—I think it would. I do not know that I quite understand the point as distinguished from payment for attendance.

105. The system is supposed to consist upon the operation of two principles: The first that a mild compulsion should be brought to bear upon the managers of schools to get a sufficient attendance to secure the capitation allowance. The concurrent principle is that the State should not be satisfied merely with securing the attendance, but should stimulate efficiency by giving an additional sum of money on a certain percentage of pupils reaching a certain standard?—I have not thought out the question sufficiently to give an answer.

106. I thought it probably covered what you meant, and, as it was a system in operation in England, it appeared to me, taking your evidence, that it would meet all the difficulties. It appeared to me on the surface that it would meet the difficulty of the non-interference by the State in education, that it would meet the case of non-State schools already established and to be established, and that it would be an alteration of our system, in effect, instead of a breaking-down of the machinery?—I have not sufficiently thought it out to give a distinct answer.

107. *Mr. Munro.*] Do you think it possible for the different denominations to agree upon a text-book containing religious teaching similar to what was adopted by the Irish National School Commissioners?—I do not think it would be possible.

108. *Mr. Swanson.*] I apprehend your proposal would have the effect of completely bursting up the present system. If each denomination received a certain share of the money, would it be possible to keep up a thoroughly colonial system of education under that system?—I do not see the least difficulty. There might be a little difficulty in the transition state, but I do not see the least difficulty if the same amount of secular education continued to be given to the satisfaction of a Government Inspector.

109. How would all the denominations get on under your proposal—the Church of England, Catholics, Presbyterians, Jews, Freethinkers, and all the rest of them?—I do not know whether all denominations would care to avail themselves of it.

110. If the two principal denominations availed themselves of it there would be precious little left for the State schools?—It would depend upon the numbers. I do not believe in the efficiency of very large schools. I believe the children would be better instructed if the schools were smaller. I think children are better taught if there are only about a hundred in each school under an efficient teacher. In all the large towns there would be no difficulty at all.

111. In the country there are many schools of less than twenty children, whose parents belong to different denominations. How would you do there?—The second paragraph of the Synod's petition was intended to meet that. In such a case I should merely ask that religious teaching might be given at a certain hour.

112. You can do that now?—No; we cannot enter the school during school hours.

113. You can go in on Sundays, Saturdays, holidays, and every day after school hours?—Yes; and find no children there.

114. Then, you must have very little control over them? Do you expect the State to have schoolmasters to round the children up?—No. I do not think there would be any more difficulty in getting them to school under the system I propose than now.

115. Is the master to be present when the clergyman visits these small schools?—Yes; that is what I meant.

116. Then, the State is to pay for the teacher to be there to keep the children together while the clergyman examines them?—There are always difficulties in small details, but I do not think mere difficulties as to details should cause the colony to be burdened from one end to the other with a mischievous system when there is no occasion for it.

117. The State here recognizes no particular mode of faith. Would this paying to the different bodies not be a distinct recognition of religious denominations by the State?—Yes; recognition so far as payment was made. There is recognition now under the provisions of the Marriage Act. There would be no further recognition than that of all denominations being recognized under the Marriage Act.

118. But are they distinctly supported by the State? If I understand you, you simply mean that the schoolmasters in these schools would be practically appointed by the clergy of the different denominations, and dismissed by them, but paid by the State?—Not necessarily by the clergy.

119. Well, it comes to that, I think. The master will be the servant of the denomination, and paid by them, and they will receive the money from the State?—My contention is that if a Roman Catholic or Church of England school supplied precisely the same amount of secular education at the same price as any other State school, and chose to give some religious teaching over and above, that is a matter to which the State ought not to object or to be concerned about.

120. This thing has been tried, and this is how it came out: In certain cases it was proved that the State paid the master or mistress, and the money the denomination was to pay was not paid. It was found the State was paying the whole thing?—Then there was bad inspection and supervision on the part of the State.

121. And the various denominations thought they should have a second Inspector, who should report as to the attendance, efficiency, and so on; and I remember he made one inspection, on which he reported favourably, on the Queen's Birthday, when the children were all away. There were various discrepancies like that. Under your system we should be liable to abuses of that sort, whereas now by Government inspection it is all prevented?—I do not think such abuses ought to have existed.

122. But it has been tried?—I do not think the system I suggest has ever been tried.

123. *Mr. Fergus.*—Do you say that the State is bound to respect the conscientious convictions of every citizen?—Quite so.

124. Not the conscientious convictions of a majority of the citizens?—I do not see what the majority have to do with it.

125. There are different religious bodies with different beliefs. You think the State is bound to respect the convictions of every body, or every person, and to make a system of education to suit every one of those bodies?—I think so, if the State meddles with education at all.

126. You are opposed to the present system of education?—I am decidedly.

127. Are you aware whether the bulk of Churchmen are opposed to it?—I think the bulk are, but I am not quite certain.

128. You are not aware whether the bulk of Churchmen are or are not opposed to it?—Some of us are hoping to test that question. We have hitherto hoped for an amendment of the law, but I think we are now establishing an organization for the purpose of testing that before the next election, and then I think those holding the view I do will take care to vote in a block on that subject.

129. If the conscientious convictions of every person were respected in education, have you any idea of the increased cost that would be entailed upon the colony?—I think it would be lessened.

130. How?—By calling out voluntary efforts for schools in which people would take an interest.

131. Are you not of opinion that the State is the people, and that it is a matter of indifference whether the money comes directly from the State or indirectly in the shape of contributions or school fees? Do you not think the State is more entitled to pay the whole cost of education, seeing that the money is then subscribed by every one in proportion to his means? Do you not think there would be an increased burden of taxation by your system?—I do not. I think the present is a demoralizing system, that it has a tendency to destroy self-reliance, and that it really injures the community by destroying the sense of self-reliance in the rising generation. If people's own exertions were called out instead of everything being done by the State, it would be far better for the people, and would not lead them to depend so much on the State.

132. But would not the cost, whether to the State or the people, be greater than now?—I do not see why it should be, because the same amount would be given at any rate, and no more, if the number of children was the same.

133. But if the large schools, which more than pay their way with the present capitation, were broken up into three or four, would not the total cost be larger, wherever the money came from?—I do not think so, because the number of assistants, pupil-teachers, and so on in the large schools tend to increase the expenditure quite as much as having more but smaller schools. I would not venture to give a distinct opinion as to the difference of cost, having never calculated it.

134. In Dunedin we have five or six thousand children, for which we receive only £24,000 a year. The cost is only about half, leaving the surplus to be divided amongst the small country schools. Supposing each body had its own school in that city—perhaps there would be twenty or twenty-five of them—do you not think the money received from the State would barely cover the cost?—It appears to me that, if in large schools children cost £4 a head to educate, it would not be more expensive to divide them. I do not think large schools reduce the cost.

135. Do you know under the present system what is a paying or a non-paying school to the Education Board? For a school with thirty children the capitation grant is £120; the school does not pay because we cannot keep it going for that. We have hundreds of schools with less than thirty, and consequently all losing concerns, and we have to draw on the surplus from the larger schools to keep these small schools going. Well, what I wish to prove is that if these large schools were broken up into several small ones there must be a considerably greater expense to the State. You said you do not approve of mere reading the Bible?—I did.

136. In sparsely-settled districts, how would you meet the difficulty? The teacher would have practically to be the nominee of the strongest body, perhaps of one or two settlers only. Then, he would have to give religious instruction as prescribed by his patrons?—I never intended that the mere schoolmaster should give the religious instruction there, but that the ministers of different denominations might have access at certain times to give religious instruction. This would be only in the small country schools.

137. That would mean three-fourths of the schools in the colony. You think the present system is detrimental to the well-being of the people?—I do.

138. Have you had any experience of the effects of a purely secular system and of a religious system in after life upon the people?—My reading is pretty extensive on this kind of subjects. I am pretty fairly conversant with the irreligious school system of France. During the many years it has been in existence it has turned out a lot of infidels and communists. I get that experience from reading, but I am quite capable of thinking out these matters for myself. My own conviction is that to bring up human beings without any religion whatever is necessarily to weaken the whole moral character of men, and therefore to make them bad citizens. In Greece, Rome, and every ancient nation that I have read of, there was always some religious instruction, and young people were brought up to fear some supreme being or deity who was to punish wickedness and injustice. It is something almost novel that a system of education should be established where religion is absolutely banished. I think the world has never had experience of such a thing.

139. Have not the poor in France, as a rule, always been educated in schools under the direct control of the clergy?—I am speaking of the lycées and schools under the management of the Government, from which religion has been banished.

140. But nearly all the schools in France for teaching the poor have been generally under the control of the clergy?—I am afraid not, not in the large towns. I lived some years in France, and I know there were many schools where there was no religious instruction.

141. Have you had any experience in the management of schools to enable you to judge the comparative results of religious and absolutely secular schools, or is it merely theory?—I have had a good deal to do with schools in superintending and arranging them. I started myself the two schools I spoke of here in Wellington, and I have taught in schools when a younger man.

142. Have you had any experience of schools for a number of years taught exclusively under the secular system?—No.

143. *Mr. Turnbull.*] The population in the towns being larger, would you first limit your system to the towns?—Possibly. It would be difficult to establish where there were small numbers.

144. As to building schools in large towns, the Catholics have built whole schools without any contribution from the State?—I believe they have.

145. That would be a great saving to the State if it were laid down as a condition that there should not be less than one hundred children to a school, and that the different bodies should erect their own schools?—I do not see why a special tax should be laid on a religious body. If the State is to build the school for the secularists, why not for the Roman Catholics or for us?

146. But, entirely to prevent your system running to excess, should there not be some such condition to prevent the number of denominational schools being too large, and consequently the expense to the State?—The Government should be quite satisfied the school was necessary, if it was to be built with Government funds. Before it was started the Government should be satisfied there were sufficient numbers to warrant its being carried on.

147. You would not make any attempt to lower the standard?—Certainly not.

148. So the State would get all it pays for?—Exactly.

149. And you propose to teach something essential besides?—That is what I mean.

150. *Hon. Mr. Menzies.*] You are really in favour of what is usually called denominationalism?—That is really what I mean, although there is a prejudice against the word.

151. Further, you think religious instruction in schools should only be given by the clergy or persons appointed by them?—Quite so.

152. Does your reading extend to the German system of education?—Many years ago I read Cousins's Report of the German system, and I have read occasionally on the subject since, but I do not know exactly how the matter stands there now.

153. Some century ago the Bible was excluded from the State schools in Germany?—Yes.

154. Then, has it been restored?—I really do not know at the present time.

155. *Mr. De Lautour.*] If schools were aided for the churches, are you of opinion that the teaching should be free?—That is a question for the Government. I think free education has a tendency to destroy the spirit of self-reliance.

156. But, if the State schools continued to give free education?—Then, of course, we ought to give it in the same way.

157. Do you think your Church would find the funds for building if the responsibility for the cost of building were put on them, and they merely got the capitation?—The subject, I think, has never yet been considered. I do not know why we should be required to do it if the State built for the others.

158. At present there is a great deal of difficulty in finding money for the churches?—Yes.

159. And the Catholics, without the incitement of capitation, are building schools, are they not?—I believe they are, and supporting them liberally with their own funds.

160. *Mr. Barron.*] You are aware the present system was framed to give secular instruction apart altogether from religious instruction?—Yes.

161. And you have said that the system is entirely mischievous?—I think so. I think it is not only mischievous but thrown away. I have heard from more than one schoolmaster that this smattering of physical science, for instance, that is given to children of eleven or twelve, is absolutely useless, and simply burdens their minds and interrupts their learning other subjects; and I have been told by schoolmasters that they do not believe that one out of a hundred two years after leaving school would be able to answer a question on those subjects. Therefore, the teaching in that respect is simply thrown away.

162. So the imparting of general knowledge apart from religious instruction is mischievous?—I do not say that. I say you should not leave out what is the essential point in all education.

163. I understand you to say that the present system is entirely mischievous?—I think so, from the utter want of religious instruction.

164. So that, really, a system of secular instruction without religion must be mischievous?—Exactly so; it makes men lopsided, because it develops one set of faculties only and not another.

165. Do you think, then, it would be better to leave children entirely ignorant?—No; I do not think so.

166. But you think a system of giving wholly secular instruction is prejudicial to the State?—If it takes up the whole time of the children, as this system does. It not only takes up all their time at school for four hours, but at home, and leaves them no time whatever for anything else. As to taking their play-hours for religious instruction, that would simply set them altogether against religion. Therefore I would not do that.

167. You do not go so far as to say it would be better to leave children entirely ignorant of general knowledge than to have a State system which does not combine religious instruction?—To have education without religion I think is mischievous.

168. You say that your reading of past history proves that no nation can prosper unless they have some belief in some deity?—I said that to bring up children without it is almost unknown in the world. There has always been some object of reverence and fear. There certainly was among the Greeks and Romans, and there certainly is among the Hindoos, and everywhere else, except in the present system in New Zealand.

169. Then, do you think all children brought up under what we call the idolatrous systems were better citizens than those where there is no religious instruction at all?—I believe people who have the belief that they are responsible to some supreme being who will judge them would make far better citizens than the people who are atheists, and have no belief on that subject.

170. And this would apply to every form of religious faith, in contradiction to those who have no religious faith, including any system that we now call idolatry?—What I mean to convey is this: that a Roman had just as much respect for an oath as we have, and felt that if he broke an oath he would be punished just as much as we do now. That was the opinion of an educated Roman and of the mass of Romans. If people are brought up with no religious education at all there seems not much probability of their making good citizens, and it seems to me a waste of money for the State to give a system of instruction that would have no tendency to make the people good citizens.

171. *Mr. Fish.*] You say your Church is about to take steps to ascertain the feeling of the laity in regard to secular education. Have the laity of the Church of England ever presented any petitions, or asked in any way the clergy to take the matter up or to petition, against the present system of secular education?—All I can say is that they have felt some difficulty with this new system of education of acting at all in the matter. But, in my own travels through my own diocese, and I go through it twice a year, I have heard constant complaints and dissatisfaction with the present system; but they have never taken any combined action as a Church. There have been at different times petitions about it. I have rather discouraged petitions, because I have never yet seen that there has been a good opening for action in the matter. I have expressed my own opinions very distinctly in the Synod. I am one of those who think that public opinion is changing, and will very soon come round to view the subject more correctly. In different parts of the country I have found that, and have come to the conclusion I expressed just now.

172. Have the laity presented petitions to the Synod asking the clergy to interfere in the matter?—The Synod contains lay members, who bring forward these subjects quite as much as the clergy do.

173. Do you not know it is a fact that the laity of the Church of England are totally at variance with their religious pastors on this question?—I am not at all aware of it.

174. Is it not a fact that nine-tenths of the Church of England parents send their children without any protest to the secular schools?—Yes; they do.

175. Do you not think that such religious instruction, as it is necessary to give youth, can be given by means of Sunday-school teaching, and, perhaps, taking an hour on Saturday in school?—I do not think it can be done. We get the children of religious parents to come to Sunday-school; but children whose parents are careless about religion do not come. Those we should be glad to get hold of, but we find a difficulty in approaching them.

176. Then, the Sunday-schools of the Church of England are not well attended?—Fairly well; but they do not include a large part of the Church population.

177. Are as many attending as you think there should be?—No; I do not think there are.

178. Do you not think that attributable to a want of energy on the part of the ministers?—No; I do not think so, because the ministers have so much to do in a country like this. I think the reason is because they have no religious teaching in the daily schools, and so the necessity of religious teaching does not enter their heads.

179. So you think it absolutely necessary that each child should receive every day of the week a certain amount of religious instruction?—I think so.

180. You do not think to establish your proposed system would increase the cost on the whole. Assume that this city has six State schools now. Do you not think if the system you propose were put in force that necessarily the number of schools must be increased?—The number of schools would have to be increased, but possibly the number of children would not be much greater, and therefore not the expense.

181. Is it not a logical sequence that it must be much greater?—Not necessarily, because I think the larger the school the larger the expense in some respects.

182. But would it not be more costly as regards the cost of schools. You cannot build twelve small schools as cheaply as six large ones?—It would perhaps entail more cost at first, but I think it would save by-and-by when voluntary efforts were stimulated.

183. Suppose we assume as a fact that such a system would be so costly as to break down all State interference in education, would you still be prepared to support the system you advocate?—That is an hypothesis that I think need hardly be contemplated, because I do not think it would have that effect.

184. Is your belief so strong as to justify you in saying this: that even if the present system were broken down you would still retain your views?—I should say so, assuming that a new system could be built up on the destruction of the old one, as I believe it could.

185. Do you think it extremely likely that members of your own Church would contribute to the system you advocate?—Yes. I think it would encourage voluntary subscription. In England £750,000 a year is subscribed by Church people.

186. Is it not a fact that in the colony it is a general reproach against members of the Church of England that they fail to contribute even the proper maintenance of the churches and clergy?—The question is simply irrelevant to the subject I have been brought here to be examined on. I must decline to answer it.

187. If my premises were correct I was going to ask, was it likely that the same members would contribute voluntarily to schools? Then, we are to gather, I take, it from your opinion, that there should be religious instruction in school—not only Bible-reading. We should therefore introduce a system of sectarianism, and have religion taught by teachers of various sects?—I have nothing to do with sects.

188. Supposing there were Church of England schools, you would object to Roman Catholics teaching in them?—Yes;* it has always been understood that there would be what is called a conscience-clause, that those who wished might withdraw when religious instruction was given.

189. Would your objection extend to a Wesleyan or other dissenting person teaching religion?—I should object to persons of my own flock being taught by those who were not of my flock.

190. *Mr. J. Buchanan.*] Do you think the designations of the present system—free, secular, and compulsory—are correct ones?—I suppose so.

191. Do you hold it is purely secular?—I should want a definition of what is meant by secular.

192. I use it this way: a total exclusion of all religious views?—Formerly secular teaching was teaching by the authorized priest of the parish. That would have been secular teaching as distinguished from teaching by the orders or regulars. The usual meaning of the word now is the exclusion of religion.

193. The present system does not do that entirely?—Yes; it does it utterly.

194. Is there no recognition whatever of religion in the class-books?—I do not know. There is nothing of what I call religion in the class-books.

195. Is the system entirely free?—I believe it is. I suppose it is.

196. Is it wholly compulsory?—I am given to understand it is. I cannot claim to be an interpreter of the Act.

197. Are you aware that there are sections of the population excluded from the present schools?—I know the Roman Catholics are generally.

198. I am not speaking of those who are excluded by reason of their faith; I meant the neglected class. Has it come within your experience that neglected children are excluded from these *pseudo* free schools?—I do not know.

199. Are you not aware that some Committees will not admit to the schools what are popularly called "Arabs," ragged children?—I have heard so.

200. Then, should the Act be amended so that certain Committees should not be able to keep out these neglected classes?—I have heard of individual children being refused, but not classes.

201. Do you hold that that is in conformity with the spirit of the Act?—I should think not.

202. Assuming they are so excluded, can the system be called free?—Scarcely so.

* NOTE BY WITNESS.—There must be some mistake here; what follows "Yes" must have been in reply to a question bearing on small country schools to be opened at special times to various religious teachers.

203. *Hon. Mr. Miller.*] Do you say you would not consider mere reading of the Scriptures of any value in the schools supposing all classes could agree to read selected portions at certain times without explanation? Would that be of no value in the event of the system you propose being impossible?—I should object to that, because I do not believe any person could be appointed to select passages that would satisfy all denominations. Who would you have? Should it be the Minister of Education?

204. You think it is not possible to agree upon passages?—I think not. It would exclude the Roman Catholics.

205. Are there not passages of Scripture to be met that all might agree upon?—There are, but I think not to satisfy everybody—certainly not us, and I think not the Roman Catholics.

206. If passages could be agreed upon, do you think that would be better than nothing?—I do not think it would, because, in my opinion, it would be a sham. It would not satisfy the people more than the present system.

207. Surely the children would go away with the texts imprinted upon their memory, and they would recur to them in after life?—I do not think it would be of any real benefit. It would, moreover, be in the power of the master to use Scripture in an improper and irreverent way.

208. Then, in the event of the State refusing this denominational system, there would be no alternative?—I do not know of any.

209. Except, of course, the various denominations having their own schools?—Yes.

210. *Hon. Mr. Dick.*] Was the petition from the General Synod unanimous?—As to the first paragraph I think it was, but not as to the last. I objected to it.

211. Did the whole of the members of the Synod think it was the duty of the Synod to send such a petition?—I think so, though one or two may have objected to the terms. Some objected to the last paragraph.

212. The second paragraph, that means that each denomination must have its own teacher or religious instructor for these children?—I think that was intended to apply merely to country schools, where it would be impossible to have different schools for each denomination.

213. It does not say so?—I think that was intended, and that it is supplementary to the first paragraph.

214. Your idea is that each denomination should have its own instructor?—Yes.

215. You think religion should be taught every day?—Yes.

216. And in school hours?—Certainly.

217. If there were children of half a dozen denominations in one country school, how would you arrange they should be all taught the same day?—It could not be done in some country places.

218. What would you suggest as a remedy?—Possibly in country places the people might agree among themselves.

219. Would you be willing in small schools that a Wesleyan teacher should teach your scholars?—No; I would have a conscience-clause.

220. But you say you would teach religion every day. Would you have one clergyman every day to go?—It would be a matter of arrangement, no doubt. It would be impossible that a clergyman could go every day to country schools; they have not sufficient time.

221. But you would not allow the denominations to unite and give religious instruction unitedly?—Not unless they agreed. Possibly they might agree in country districts. The Wesleyans and others do not object to our teaching.

222. Have you seen the class-books of the State schools?—Yes.

223. Have you seen Nelson's Reader?—No.

224. Do you consider no religious class-book to be of any avail?—A mere allusion to religious subjects does not, in my opinion, meet the question at all; not in the least degree.

225. You would be satisfied with nothing short of each denomination doing its own work?—I think nothing less will satisfy the country.

226. You rather prefer that each denomination should have its own schools, and be paid by results?—Exactly so.

227. Do you extend that to all denominations—even the non-Christian?—I do. I think all citizens alike being taxed, none should have any special burden thrown on them that others have not. No denomination should be subject to a heavy special tax to support schools of their own. It is immaterial whether they are Chinese or Jews: they pay taxes like the rest of the community; and, if they will supply the amount of secular education which the Government requires, I think they are entitled to a due quota of any Government grant.

228. *Hon. Mr. Acland.*] As to the first clause of the Primate's petition, do you think that would be brought into force except in large towns?—I do not think so; only in moderately large towns.

229. In large towns, then, you think it could be?—I think so.

230. In some districts you think it would not be brought into force?—I think not.

231. The second clause would apply to the more scattered districts?—Yes; with a conscience-clause.

232. You think it probable that in some cases the different denominations would be able to agree upon a person who could give religious instruction?—I think possibly in country districts they would be able to very often agree on some plan for the purpose.

233. You consider that an hour on Saturday, in addition to Sunday-school teaching, would be sufficient in such a case?—It might be all that would be possible.

233A. You think it undesirable to drag the children to school apart from school hours?—Very undesirable. It cannot be done.

234. You think that would be very likely to set the children against religion?—I think so.

235. *Mr. Feldwick.*—The Primate's petition asks for grants-in-aid. The present capitation is £3 15s. I suppose you agree that denominations with separate schools should also bear their

share of the cost of the general schools. Suppose your body received as low as £2 per child, would that lead to schools being started?—I think we have a right to claim as much as any who receive free education from the State.

236. Do you not think it a general duty to pay towards schools that take the whole scope of the population, and consequently that the amount to be given to denominational schools should be less?—Certainly not. I cannot conceive any possible reason for giving them less. They are as much State schools as the others if they give the same amount and quality of secular education.

237. You are not prepared to say what you would think to be a sufficient grant-in-aid?—Nothing would be sufficient unless our schools were placed on an equality with other schools.

238. A grant-in-aid implies something less?—I do not know that that was intended. I think we should not be inclined to take anything less.

239. As to secular instruction, do you agree with the provisions of a Bill, introduced by Mr. Curtis in 1878, that secular instruction in denominational schools should be imparted only during the same number of hours as in the State schools?—My opinion would be that any schools supported by the Government for the denominations should be required to supply exactly the same amount of secular instruction as is given in the State schools. I do not go into details as to time.

240. You would determine the results by examinations?—Certainly; and abide by the results.

241. *Mr. Swanson.*] Will you define what you mean by religious instruction?—I think the Government, as such, have nothing to do with the specific doctrines of any religious body.

242. That is hardly an answer to my question?—No one system of religious teaching would satisfy all schools.

243. I want to know what would satisfy you—what you mean exactly by religious instruction for your schools?—I really do not know what answer to give, without going into the Church Catechism, the Thirty-nine Articles, &c., to a length that might perhaps be inconvenient to the Committee. I really am unable to answer that question.

244. Take the financial aspect of the matter. If you got the same money for the town schools, what is to come to the country ones, because the greater proportion of the money by your plan would be spent in the towns?—I do not think it would make any difference. I do not think it would necessarily multiply the country schools.

245. What I want to know is, how the country schools could come into existence at all and pay their teachers, because the capitation allowed for the towns is a great deal more than it takes to run the town schools, which are large. But if they were broken up into small ones by the denominations, they would claim all the money, and there would be none for the country?—I think it is a mistake on the part of the Government to give a higher capitation to the town schools than is required.

246. The Central Board of Education get the money in a lump sum. They distribute the money, and keep the schools going. Would the denominations claim the whole of the money?—I really have not gone into that question.

247. Would you have religious instruction given every day?—I should in schools entirely in our own hands.

248. And what would become of the children in the country?—We could not go to them every day. We should do the best we could.

Correspondence relative to foregoing Evidence of Bishop Hadfield.

SIR,—
I have the honour to return the evidence corrected. I am not aware that I have made any corrections in any way affecting the sense of my evidence. I have noticed at foot of page 16 an error. The answer could only have been given to some question in reference to schools considered in the Primate's petition in the second paragraph. If printed as it stands I should like my note to appear.
J. Fynes-Clinton, Esq., Clerk of Education
Petitions Committee.

Wellington, 7th August, 1883.

I have, &c.,
O. WELLINGTON.

SIR,—
I have the honour to request your attention to a few remarks in reference to evidence given by me on the 6th instant before the Committee on Education Petitions. Some questions were put to me which seemed to imply doubt as to my qualifications for giving an opinion on the value of a purely secular system of education. This somewhat surprised me. I may further add that I hardly expected to have questions put to me on finance, &c., which seemed to imply that I had come prepared with a draft Bill to supersede the present Education Act. I make no claim to special knowledge. I did not ask to be examined. I attended the Committee in obedience to your summons. I gave my opinion for what it was worth. If my evidence should be printed, may I ask that this may be printed with it, otherwise I think it may be misunderstood and be misleading.
The Hon. Colonel Brett, Chairman of Committee on
Education Petitions.

Wellington, 8th August, 1883.

I have, &c.,
O. WELLINGTON.

MY LORD,—
I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 8th instant, just received. The subject of your letter I will communicate to the members of the Select Committee. I do not anticipate that there will be any objections to the request contained in your communication.

8th August, 1883.

I have, &c.,
DE RENZIE BRETT,
Chairman.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Wellington.

WEDNESDAY, 8TH AUGUST, 1883.

Bishop MORAN, examined.

249. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What is your recognized position in the Roman Catholic Church?—Roman Catholic-Bishop of Dunedin.

250. What is the extent of your diocese?—It comprises the Province of Otago, including South-land of olden times, and Stewart Island.

251. What is the area, do you suppose, in miles?—Probably two hundred miles square.

252. What is the number of both sexes attending the Catholic schools within your diocese?—1,530.

253. Are you aware of the proportion of Roman Catholics in New Zealand to the whole European population?—The last census showed it was about one-seventh.

254. Have the Roman Catholics any conscientious objections to availing themselves of the State system of education; and do you believe that the Catholic parents, sooner than send their children to the State schools, would rather forego their being educated at all?—With regard to the latter part of the question I wish to put that aside for the moment. With regard to the first part of it I think the efforts made to establish schools for themselves, and the numbers who have signed the petitions, prove that they have conscientious objections to sending their children to Government schools. With regard to the latter part it is difficult for me to give a decided answer so as to meet every individual case, because people when placed under the necessity will endeavour to do the best they can under the circumstances—doing what their conscience will permit them to do under protest. It would be very difficult for me to say whether they would allow them to go uneducated altogether or send them to Government schools under protest. That question I could not undertake to answer. I think some would prefer to do it, and a good many too.

255. What do you mean by protest—a protest from the priest?—A protest on their own part. They would do it unwillingly, under the influence of coercion.

256. What is the number of Catholics in your own diocese?—The last census showed 16,400, and I calculate now there would be 18,000.

257. How many State schools are there in your diocese?—I cannot exactly say, but I think there are about two hundred altogether, but I could not be certain; I have not counted.

258. All these are supported by the Government?—All the State schools are.

259. How many schools have you solely supported by the Roman Catholics in your diocese?—Eighteen.

260. Are the schools attended by other than Roman Catholic children, and, if so, please state the probable percentage?—There are very few of other denominations attending our schools, perhaps between two and three dozen; not more. Some of them have none at all. The great majority have none except Catholic children.

261. Do these Catholic schools receive any endowment or assistance from the Government of the colony; if so, please state what they receive?—They receive no assistance whatever, and never did.

262. What is the annual charge made for each of the pupils at your schools?—It varies according to the means of the parents. If they can afford to pay 1s. a week we expect them to do so in our primary schools.

263. Do you give free instruction to those who cannot afford to pay?—Yes.

264. And have you any of this class attending your schools?—We refuse no one in our primary schools.

265. Has any attempt ever been made to influence the religious opinions of the pupils of other denominations in your schools?—None whatever.

266. How are the funds provided for establishing your schools?—On the voluntary principle; people contribute.

267. Do you consider the parents of other Christian denominations have objections to their children attending Roman Catholic schools?—Decidedly, they have.

268. Do you find the Roman Catholic children have a better knowledge of Scripture than children of other denominations, and in other branches of education are they quite up to the current standard of education?—I say Yes to the latter part; the former I am not able to give an answer to as to what the religious knowledge of children of other denominations may be; I have not examined them.

269. Have you any objections to Roman Catholic schools being under the supervision of Government Inspectors?—Not the least.

270. From what source do you receive school-teachers?—We receive them from the school public generally.

271. Are they solely educated by themselves for that purpose?—No; we get many that come from Home, from the Old Country, and we sometimes advertise for them. Sometimes teachers come and offer their services, and if we find them eligible, and they suit our circumstances, we employ them.

272. Do they undergo an examination before you appoint them as teachers?—Not a formal examination. We inquire as to their qualifications. They have generally letters of recommendation from persons whose opinions we respect; but we have no formal examination.

273. Do you disapprove of the State secular system of education, and, if so, please state your reasons?—I disapprove of it entirely. I think it is calculated to injure the community at large very seriously. I do not look on it as really a system of education. I regard it as a system of instruction in secular matters, which is the smaller and less important part of education.

274. Do you approve of denominational education; if so, upon what grounds?—I approve of denominational education on the ground that there only real education can be given, and cannot be given anywhere else.

275. Will you please state to the Committee the Government system of education, its machinery, ramifications, explain its workings, and give all the details possible of its efficiency and cost?—It is rather a general question and not very easy for me to answer. I do not know what precisely you mean by the Government system of education. If I am to answer the general question in a general way, I say the Government system of education is really not a system of education at all. It does not deserve the name, because it excludes the most important part of education. I mean the exclusion of religion. We found all education on religion, whilst we teach secular subjects to the best of our ability: we always hold that in subordination to the teaching of religion.

We take special care to train our children in morality, under the guidance of religion also, because we hold that without dogma there is no sanction for morals whatever.

276. Do you give daily religious instruction in your schools?—We do.

277. Do you disapprove of the Bible being read in schools, except by a priest or a minister of the denomination to which the child belongs?—I distinguish between our own schools and other people's. With regard to other people's schools I have nothing to say. If they wish to read the Bible, very well; that is their own affair. We do not allow the Bible to be read without note or comment in our own schools.

278. What guarantee can the State have that the schools are furnished with the necessary educational material; that is, that the masters are competent, and that the pupils receive the standard of education current in the State?—Their Inspectors will find out that. Of course, the Government have nothing to do with our schools now.

279. Who are the principal examiners of your schools in your diocese now?—I am myself. I examine them all in the course of the year.

280. What alterations would you suggest in the State system of education to remove the alleged grievances of the Catholics?—Put the Catholic schools on a footing of equality with the Government schools of the country. I hold as a principle that, as the Catholics are citizens and taxpayers, they have the same right to the expenditure of the education money—at least a share of it—as other citizens of the country, and that the Government are bound to do for Catholic children what they are doing for other people's children.

281. Are you conversant with the system of State education which obtains in England?—Partly I am. I have studied the question very much, but they are introducing so many changes that it is difficult to keep *au courant* with them, but from the speeches of the President and Vice-President of the Council who look into educational matters in England I learn a good deal of the changes made from year to year. With regard to the system of education—or at least the administration of it, because the principle of it is fixed by Act of Parliament—I ascertain from these sources that there are two descriptions of schools under the educational code of England and Scotland. You have first of all the denominational schools, then the School Board schools. Each denomination has its own schools. These were built originally by contributions of the people, aided by the State. The aid given by the State until recently was a considerable amount. In each case what was granted was supplemented by voluntary offerings. Then, in addition to that, you have the Board schools. These schools are conducted by Boards elected by the ratepayers in the places where the School Boards exist, because they are not in every locality, only in certain places. These schools are built entirely by the rates, and are supported partly by the State, partly by the rates, and partly by the contributions of the children. With regard to the denominational schools they are supported entirely by a certain capitation given by the Government, by voluntary efforts, and school fees; so that one set of schools have all the rates for their maintenance, and the other set of schools are obliged to do without any aid whatever from the rates. I found also that, whilst three millions of pupils or thereabouts attended the denominational schools, 800,000 attended the Board schools; and the Board schools, with 800,000 pupils in England and Wales, receive all the rates, whereas the schools with three millions of children receive no aid whatever from the rates. And that is the state of things against which a considerable portion of the people of England are now rising in insurrection. They say it is exceedingly unjust that the Board schools should have all the rates. I consider that is unjust, and I fancy that public opinion is shaping itself in the direction of repeal of the law.

282. Would the English system meet the views held in this country?—No; because it would only be to a great extent a perpetuating of the present injustice.

283. Do you think that the impression throughout the whole intelligent portion of the Catholics would meet your views as now expressed?—I am quite sure it would.

284. The first clause of the petition of the Anglican Synod is as follows: "That your petitioners are convinced that any fully satisfactory measure for education by the State should contain a provision for grants-in-aid being made to schools set on foot by any religious denomination, provided that the attendance and secular instruction in such schools shall come up to the required standards, and satisfy the Government Inspectors."

285. Have you any objection to that?—None whatever.

286. The second clause of the petition says: "Your petitioners are further of opinion that the Education Act should be so amended that provision may be made for the communication of religious instruction in the public schools by ministers of religion or by persons duly authorized by them, to the children belonging to their respective communions within school hours."

287. Do you indorse that?—No; not in the public schools; because I think it would be most injurious to the children. It would lead them to a contempt of all religion. Various conflicting religions would be taught there—religions under various conflicting principles.

288. You do not think a layman is a proper person?—Yes; I have no objection to laymen teaching children religion. It is on the score of the evils arising from the children seeing people going there and teaching conflicting systems, and the teachers being diametrically opposed to one another on many points.

289. The third clause is: "Your petitioners are also of opinion that local Committees should be empowered to direct that specified portions of Holy Scripture be subjects of instruction in the schools under their control, the rights of conscience being observed. What is your opinion on that clause?—I am opposed to it entirely. On the same principle—or nearly on the same—I am opposed to the previous clause, because I do not see how the thing proposed could be done. What religion would they teach? I do not see what religion they could teach? There is no such thing as a common Christianity in reality.

290. *Hon. Dr. Grace.* You stated that your schools refuse no pupils?—That is correct as to our primary schools.

291. How do you manage in the case of what are ordinarily called ragged children?—We refuse no one. First of all, we refuse no Catholic, and no others as a rule apply to us. We refuse no Catholic, except a boy who has been at our school and has been committed to the industrial institution for ill conduct. We do not readmit him into our schools for a long time. That is the only instance in which we refuse any pupil admission to our primary schools.

292. In the practical working of your system, how do you manage to secure that children come clean in person?—Our teachers look after that. If it is a serious case the clergy remonstrate with the parents, and ask that the children be sent clean to school; and if this is not done we have the children washed and made decent before they come into school.

293. Are many of the children educated in your diocese the children of poor parents?—Yes. I dare say the majority of my people are poor; but we have no abject poverty in the country any where. I am speaking of people of small means—labouring people, and with large families.

294. Can you say whether this weekly payment or payments for the education of the children is felt a severe financial strain?—A very serious strain. There are many with very small wages, comparatively speaking, and they have to pay the expenses of the Church, also contribute towards the erection of schools, and then support all these schools. It is a very serious matter for them.

295. Can you state, from your own knowledge and observation, whether the class termed "ragged children" are practically refused admission to the State schools?—I am not able to say from my own knowledge; but I have heard that they have been refused on what I considered fair authority; but I am not able to state it as a fact within my own personal knowledge.

296. Can you state, from your own observation, whether or not the ragged children in the City of Dunedin, for example, are being educated by the State?—I think some are educated by the State.

297. You have said you believe the standard of efficiency in your schools is equal to the standard current in the State schools?—Yes.

298. You arrive at that from personal examinations conducted by yourself?—Or that, together with the fact that we get pupils who have been at the Government schools, and who have not made much progress. At the same time I wish to qualify the latter statement. Their want of efficiency may not be the fault of the system; it may be the fault of the children themselves; but, judging from the percentage of marks made by the children of public schools at their examinations and the percentage gained by children of my own school, who are put through a more severe test and examination, I come to the conclusion that our children are certainly as efficient, and more efficient, in many instances.

299. Is there any system in operation in England* which, if brought into operation in this colony, would satisfy the Catholics of this colony?—No system that would satisfy us. The Catholics in England are intensely dissatisfied with the present system, but the system there is very much more equitable and just than the system here, but it does not satisfy the Catholics or the Church of England.

300. Do you understand the system which is ordinarily defined as the system of payment by results?—I do.

301. How would you define that system?—It means this: that there should be first of all a certain allowance as an average attendance of pupils. I consider that only fair to the teachers, because children are not all equally clever, and parents are not always solicitous that they make progress, and it is very disheartening to a teacher to be placed in an unfavourable position through no fault of his own. I consider that the system ought to include payment on a certain average attendance, and then any further payment should be made in accordance with the results produced from his teaching in the school.

302. Would such a system meet the views of the Catholics of this colony?—Quite; they would be very glad indeed to have such a system.

303. What average of attendance would you consider reasonable to form the basis of such a system—the lowest average of attendance?—That would be decided entirely by the circumstances of the locality. An average attendance which would be fair in one locality would not be fair in another. The average attendance in a thickly-populated locality should be more, in my judgment, than that required in a sparsely-populated one. That is a mere matter of detail altogether.

304. I understand that you said that the payment by results will satisfy you as a petitioner?—Yes, fully.

305. *Mr. Feldwick.*] You said that the fee in your schools is 1s. per week per child?—That is the charge we have in our common schools.

306. Do you know of cases of special hardship if the charge were enforced?—I know many instances of special hardship, but we do not enforce it in cases of hardship. In cases such as men out of employment and helpless widows, we make up the sum ourselves in order that the teachers may not suffer. In one school I had I was obliged to pay £25 one year, £26 another year, and £27 4s. another year in order to make up for the fees, so that the teacher should not sustain a loss.

307. So that the teachers' salaries are precarious, depending on these fees?—We generally give them a fixed salary, and if the fees do not amount to the salary we have to make up the balance.

308. Do you think, in the event of State aid being given, you would have schools in the smaller towns?—Certainly; we have them in the smaller towns at this moment. We had a school for years at which there were only fifteen Catholics, and we paid a teacher for teaching these fifteen children.

309. What would you say in the case of sparsely-populated rural districts where there is a Government school?—That is an exceptional case, and must be treated exceptionally.

310. You are aware that in Mr. Curtis's Bill those not availing themselves of State schools should provide their own buildings. Would you be prepared to do that?—We are prepared to take an instalment of justice on the understanding that we are liberty to demand full justice.

311. Have you formed any idea of what would be a sufficient sum to be paid per child based on

payment per results?—My answer to that is this: I think we are entitled in justice and equity to the same capitation allowance as is given for other people's children.

312. Perhaps you have some idea of what would be sufficient?—I suppose we would be satisfied with what the other people got.

313. Then the amount would have to be fixed by the Education Boards, according to what was paid to other schools?—Certainly; we ask no more.

314. *Mr. De Loutour.*] I think you said you had eighteen schools in your diocese. I did not observe whether you told the Committee the cost of those schools?—For land and buildings for school purposes, £30,500, in the last twelve years. I am not able to give the statistics before twelve years ago, as I only came to the country a little over twelve years ago; but during my time in the country we have spent on the erection of schools, and providing sites and buildings for school purposes, £30,500. I cannot state accurately what the cost of maintenance has been during that period, but I could give a very good guess. I know what the maintenance would cost the Government—£5,500 a year. It does not cost us so much as it would cost the Government, owing to the manner in which we work; and I think I am speaking justly and truly when I say it has cost us about £3,000 a year. The way I arrive at that is this: we have at the present moment nine male teachers, independently of pupil-teachers, and thirty female teachers, independently of pupil- and assistant-teachers, and, taking one with another, all round, they cost us about £100 a year, and that would make about £3,000 annually, and that is about what it costs us; and the cost to the Government, for the same number of children, would be £5,500.

315. Is not the pressure upon your people more excessive in country districts than in thickly-populated districts?—I do not know that it is more excessive, because of the extra cost on the buildings and the enhanced value of the land in the thickly-populated parts.

316. In some country districts are there not a greater proportion of Catholics—for instance, at St. Bathans?—I am not prepared to say that Catholics are in the majority in some country districts. I am not prepared to say that even at St. Bathans they are in a majority; but I think at St. Bathans there are more children attending the Catholic school than attending the Government school. I am under that impression, but I am not certain.

317. *Mr. Munro.*] Is there any possibility of the bodies agreeing amongst themselves as to a class-book containing religious instruction?—None whatever; at all events, so far as we are concerned.

318. There is no common Christianity?—Not for us. We must teach our religion wholly and fully, or not at all.

319. You know the system agreed to—that of the Commissioners—in Ireland?—The Catholics were never a consenting party.

320. Would the Catholics be content with a capitation grant?—They will be glad of anything in the direction of justice, but they will never be satisfied with anything short of complete justice.

321. *Mr. Swanson.*] I think you stated that the Catholics never received any endowment or monetary assistance from the Government?—None whatever in my diocese.

322. Do you say, as an absolute fact, that the Catholics have received no educational endowments?—Not in my diocese.

323. I am talking about the Catholics of the colony?—They have some small endowments in other dioceses.

324. Do you consider it the duty of the State to see that its children are educated?—I do not think it is. I think the State is going beyond its function in becoming a schoolmaster.

325. Do you think the majority of the Catholics of the colony are of that opinion?—Yes; those who are capable of forming an opinion, who are sufficiently educated and sufficiently instructed to understand the question.

326. Are you aware that some such proposition as you have made has been in practice in the colony, where the money was divided amongst the different denominations?—Yes.

327. Are you aware that it broke down completely?—No, I am not; nor do I believe it either.

328. Are you aware that the people of your denomination in Auckland actually petitioned to have a different system?—That does not prove that the denominational system broke down. It proves maladministration in Auckland, if you will, but it does not prove that the denominational system broke down.

329. If the Government find the money for the different denominations to pay the teachers, will that not transfer the servants of the State—the teachers—to be the servants of the clergy?—No.

330. For instance, would you not claim the power to dismiss any teacher that does not suit you?—Yes.

331. Then whose servant will he be?—I should be able to dismiss him, but I would not interfere with the State paying him. The State can watch over the expenditure of its own money, but under the denominational system I will not have a master in my school who misconducts himself.

332. Have you any objection to anything now taught in the State schools?—Yes; there are a great many things taught which are odious to Catholics.

333. Will you state an instance?—Take the histories. Any one acquainted with the histories will know that there are many things offensive to Catholics in these books.

334. Would it satisfy you if these histories were altered or dismissed from the schools altogether?—No; because I am opposed to the system altogether.

335. Would it be possible for the clergy to overtake the religious education by teaching on holidays, Sundays, and after school hours—if they were all energetic, and devoted as much time to it as you appear to do?—No.

336. If this system of education you propose were agreed to, would it not have the effect of breaking up the present system of education?—I will divide my answer to that question. First of all, even if it did, that would be no objection to my mind, because I am opposed to the system on

principle. It would be a good thing, I think, to break it up. Secondly, I do not think it would do so, for everybody except ourselves is satisfied with the present system.

337. Did you hear these other petitions read?—I did.

338. Were those petitioners generally satisfied?—Apparently not.

339. Do they represent as large a denomination as you do?—The answer is this: they have not erected their own schools. We have, and by doing so show we are in earnest, and express and emphasize our dissatisfaction; and, as long as the other cannot do something similar, I do not think there is much in the expression of their dissatisfaction.

340. You do not think they are very much in earnest?—No.

341. *Mr. Fergus.*] What proportion of children of school-age have you in your diocese?—We have not many able to go to school who do not go to our schools.

342. What is the proportion of Catholics to Protestants and others in your diocese?—One in nine, as far as I can make out.

343. Are you aware of the number of children on the public-school rolls?—The average attendance was 16,000 three or four years ago.

344. The number on the school rolls, not the average attendance?—I think twenty-two or twenty-three thousand children, as well as I remember.

345. There are 26,000. If the proportion is one in nine there must be of necessity a very considerable number of children attending Government schools?—Not necessarily, for the simple reason that many people in my diocese are unmarried, and have no families; there are great numbers of miners and servant-girls who are not married; consequently we have not our due proportion of children in our population.

346. You would not be satisfied, I understand, with the establishment of Catholic schools in the larger centres?—No; I would not. I want Catholic schools everywhere I could have them.

347. You would give the same right to all other denominations you claim for yours?—Certainly.

348. Have you considered the question of additional expense that would be entailed by the colony by the division of the schools?—Even as far as we are concerned I do not think there would be necessarily additional expense.

349. There would be no additional expense in cutting up many of your schools in the larger and even in the smaller centres?—Not necessarily, because Parliament could very easily readjust its expenditure to the circumstances.

350. Do you not hold that education is a protection against crime?—To a small extent. Statistics prove that as secular education extends crime of a certain class and order extends.

351. But you still think to some extent it prevents crime?—It may do so.

352. And especially such education as you would give would prevent it?—I hope so.

353. Even after all is done there must be a considerable number of Catholic children attending the Government schools in very sparsely-peopled districts?—I do not think there is a considerable number.

354. We have petitions before us in favour of Bible-reading in schools. Supposing this power were granted to the School Committees, and was exercised in the schools which are in very sparsely-settled districts, would you have any objection to the Catholic children attending those schools?—Certainly.

355. Then, they would object to the State system in as far as it admitted Bible-reading in schools. Could you not induce them to attend those schools, however few they might be?—That is altogether an exceptional case, and would have to be treated exceptionally.

356. There are a number of petitions from your diocese before both Houses of Parliament. Who signed those petitions? Were they signed by adults, people over the age of twenty-one years?—As a rule, so far as I know, they were. We advised that the petitions should be signed by men, and men only, over twenty-one years of age. There are some exceptions I am aware, but not many.

357. In the centre of Dunedin, have some of the petitions been signed by boys of fourteen or fifteen?—There may have been a few, but there must be very few. The petitions were signed by men, but many men did not get an opportunity of signing; if they had, there would have been a great many more signatures.

358. *Hon. Mr. Barnicoat.*] I understood you to say that the State system of education in New Zealand was always unsatisfactory to the Catholic body?—I did not say that. I say the present system is unsatisfactory.

359. Can you say whether in every instance the late provincial system of education was unsatisfactory?—To us it was.

360. In every instance?—In Otago and Southland it was from the first.

361. Can you say how far the system provided in Nelson was satisfactory to the Catholic body?—It was partially satisfactory, because an effort was made to do them justice, but it was not full, because they did not get equal treatment with other denominations.

362. The separating body appointed its own Committee: that would be satisfactory of course; and the separating body received the same sum per head for the children actually taught as was found to be the cost of educating the rest in the same school district?—We have no objection to that whatever.

363. Then, the separating school was open to all children without fee?—Well, of course, we have no objection to that either; not the slightest.

364. It was subject to the inspection of the Government Inspector as regards secular things, and had to provide secular education to his satisfaction?—I consider that very desirable.

365. And the religious instruction was given to the satisfaction of the promoters of the school, without any interference from the Inspector; but religious instruction had to be given at pre-arranged hours, so that parents of children should be able to withdraw their children?—I have no objection to that. I would accept that.

366. Those are the prominent features of the system. I understood you to express assent to them except as regards the first—that the schools should first be erected at the cost of the separating body?—Yes. Why should not the State erect schools for our children, when it erects them for other people's children, when I say there would be admission into the school for every one, and there would be no interference with the religion of those who were not Catholics? Of course, I consent to that. I think it is perfectly just—not only politic, but just. I think it would be an obligation on the promoters and governors of the school not to attempt to interfere with the consciences of other people.

367. Do you think it right that religious instruction should begin at prearranged hours?—Yes; we do that ourselves. That is our practice.

368. *Mr. Barron.*] I understood you to say that no attempt had been made to influence the religious opinions of children of other denominations at Catholic schools?—Yes.

369. Are you aware whether any attempt has been made to influence the religious opinions of children attending the State schools?—I am aware that such has been the case.

370. Is it in the lesson-books, or simply through the teachers?—It is done in a variety of ways. It is very hard to know what books are used in the Government schools. There is a great variety of books, and some of the books are very frequently changed in the schools, which is a very great evil, and a cause of expense to the parents. I believe, generally speaking, now there are what are called the Royal Readers. I have looked over them carefully, and have not yet discovered anything to which I could positively object. With regard to the histories used in the schools there are many things to which I do object. With regard to what I complain of—interferences with the Catholics—there are some teachers so senseless and bigoted that they cannot restrain themselves—cannot keep themselves off the Catholic conscience. There are some cases of that sort; and the whole tone of the school is entirely anti-Catholic. The teachers are all non-Catholics, and the pupils are non-Catholics; and very many are exceptionally bigoted, and are constantly insulting Catholics in their play-hours and when going to and from school.

371. I understand you to mean that this is one of your strongest objections to the present system?—My strongest objection is one of principle. I say that the secular system, on principle, is one that the Catholics cannot accept.

372. Even although it was possible to remove the objections as to religious opinions?—I hold that the difficulties cannot be removed. The system is quite opposed to our principles. I sincerely believe there is a desire on the part of very many not to interfere with us; but I say that interference is inseparable from the system. It is impossible that the Catholics cannot but be offended and injured by the system, simply because of the system it is.

373. Your objection is that no system of education is possible that is not founded on dogmatic teaching?—I say no real system is possible without that.

374. You say that the Government is bound to do for Catholic children what they do for other children: the Government are giving a free, secular, and compulsory system of education?—The State is bound to do for Catholic children in the matter of education—are bound to give out of the public funds devoted for the purpose of education a share to the Catholic children equal to the share given in proportion to other people's children.

375. But I understood you to state that the Government was bound to make the same provision for Catholic children which it is making for other children?—What I mean is this: to give the Catholic schools the same allowance given to non-Catholic secular schools.

376. The State is providing one system, free, secular, and compulsory, free for Catholics as well as for other colonists; therefore, when you say the Government is bound to do for Catholic children what it is doing for other children, to that extent I presume you admit it is doing so?—Now, I affirm, the Government is expending exclusively on the secular sect the entire revenues of the country devoted to educational purposes. The Legislature is doing that with its eyes open, because it knows that the Catholics are opposed to the system on principle, and will never accept it; and the Catholic people are taxed as if they accepted it like other people. Therefore, I say it is unjust to expend on the secular sect the entire revenues contributed by the whole of the people of the country.

377. Then the Education Act, as passed by the Legislature, is unjust to the Catholics because they are taxed to maintain a system of education which they cannot use?—Precisely; that is my contention.

378. You hold it is unjust to tax Catholics to maintain a system of education of which they do not approve?—Yes.

379. That system of education is provided by the Government of the country; the Government of the country is elected by the people of the country. Is it not as unjust to tax Catholics to maintain a Government which is unjust to them in the most essential particular—this of education—as it is to tax them to maintain a system of education which is unjust?—Not equally unjust, but it is unjust. The Government has no right to perpetrate an injustice on any man in the community.

380. You say the education system is of first importance?—Nothing of greater importance.

381. Therefore, when you say it is not equally unjust, you mean more unjust?—I mean nothing of the sort, because "more" is not "equally;" they are not synonymous terms.

382. *Hon. Mr. Hart.*] You said you object to Collier's History of England as used in the State schools: What are the titles of the histories used in the Catholic schools—what are the names of the authors?—There are a variety of histories used in Catholic schools. We use the Christian Brothers' books in some schools, and the Catholic History of England in others. The publisher of the Grandwell series sent to me the mail before last copies of these books used by the London School Board, and asked me to look over them and give him an order if I approved of them. In a literary point of view they are excellent, and there is nothing objectionable in them at all that I could see. Therefore I sent an order for some, and shall adopt them; but hitherto we have been obliged to use what we could get.

383. *Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley.*] Your evidence has been directed altogether, I think, towards what we call elementary schools. Have you erected any schools for higher education in your diocese?—A good many. There is a college for boys and a high school for girls at Dunedin, and high schools at Oamaru, Queenstown, and Invercargill. No donations have been received from the State towards the erection and maintenance of the schools at Oamaru, Invercargill, and Queenstown. We have received nothing from the State for any purpose; they are all supported by the voluntary contributions of the people.

384. Have you had any experience as to the result of teaching the Bible in the public schools?—I only know one thing, and that is a statement made by Dr. Moorhouse. He stated, in his evidence given before the Commission in Victoria, that one of the ablest and most zealous of his clergy went to a Government school to give Bible instruction. He had the class before him, and they read the Bible; and then he told them to shut their Bibles while he interrogated them on what they had read. They did so, and showered the Bibles at his head. That is all I know of the result produced by the reading of the Bible in schools.

385. *Mr. J. Buchanan.*] Are the same facilities as to railways extended to Catholic children attending their schools as are afforded to children attending the State schools?—I think they are all on a footing of equality at present.

386. Have you had any experience of the working of School Committees?—No; none except what I read in the public papers.

387. Then, you could not state whether they put in force the compulsory clauses?—I have seen it stated in the newspapers that they passed a resolution to that effect in Dunedin; but I am under the impression that it has been equivalent to a dead-letter, or almost so, at all events, but I could not speak positively.

388. A question was put to you with reference to the effect of education. I think you said you did not hold that education prevented crime?—Yes, I did. I said I did not think it contributed to the prevention of crime.

389. Are you of opinion that it really changes rather than diminishes it?—That is the result of my reading on the point.

390. And with reference to the question of Bible-reading in schools, would not your Church hold it as an infliction—a further disability—if that became compulsory, even if the conscience-clause were introduced?—I would look upon a regulation to the effect that the Bible should be read by the teacher as a decided grievance. That would positively exclude every Catholic from teaching in the schools.

391. *Hon. Mr. Acland.*] You were asked a question with regard to whether you objected to free, secular, and compulsory education, would you agree on principle to the free and compulsory, without the secular?—As applied to Roman Catholics I would have no objection to that whatever.

392. With regard to sparsely-populated districts, in cases where the number of children was not twenty-five, taking the proportion of one in seven, there would be some Roman Catholics in that district—in such cases would you think it desirable that the Catholic children should attend State schools or not attend them at all?—I would prefer that, but that would be an exceptional case.

393. If the grants-in-aid were made on what you consider the principle of justice, would the Roman Catholics attempt to establish schools in those districts where, say, the Roman Catholic children did not exceed twelve? That would depend on the circumstances of the case. If we found ourselves able to put a school there we would.

394. I have seen by the papers that insults have been offered to yourself and other members of the Roman Catholic religion. Do you think the opposition is specially to Roman Catholics, or is it rather in favour of infidelity?—I would not be able to answer that question as I do not know the motives of the people.

395. The opposition is, so far, shown mainly to Roman Catholics?—I cannot say as to the others. If you ask me what is to blame for it, I have no hesitation in saying that it is the unchristian tone of the system that is to blame for it.

396. Do you think that free, secular, and compulsory education has any tendency towards producing an increase of infidelity?—I am decidedly of that opinion.

397. *Hon. Dr. Menzies.*] I understood from what you said that you considered full justice to the Roman Catholics would be to give them the same amount of aid as other children in the colony receive. In other words, that the funds should be equally distributed according to the number of children and the proficiency in the different schools. Then you went on further to say that, when the Government paid this subsidy, you should have the power of dismissing the teachers; that would apply equally to the other denominations?—We would not interfere with the others in the least.

398. I understand the principle laid down to be that, while the Government pay for the education of the children, the denominations would have the control over the teachers—have the power of dismissing them?—The power of dismissing them for moral delinquencies—the same as under the National Board in Ireland.

399. What I failed to observe was whether the function of the Government extended any further than the simple payment?—The Government, of course, would have power over the masters if they were inefficient, and did not properly discharge the duties of teaching the subjects for which they were paid. If the Government provided the funds to support the schools, of course they would have a very potent voice in the regulation of the schools. A Catholic school would cease to be a Catholic school if the authorities of the Church had no authority over it.

400. You consider it a matter of principle that you should have a concurrent power with the Government as regards the dismissal of teachers?—I think so. We should, of course, have teachers in the schools approved of by the authorities of the Church, otherwise they would cease to be Catholic schools; and the principles of the denominational system would be evaded altogether. What I would do as to Catholic schools is this: we would be prepared to satisfy the Government that they

got value for their money. Beyond that the Catholic authorities would have the control—that is, the control of the teachers. We would satisfy the Government that they got value for their money, and if we do not give them value for the money let us have no money.

401. In all other points the Government control would continue?—Yes; as to the inspection of the school, the amount of secular knowledge of the pupils, and as to the fact whether the school gave value with regard to the money paid. Beyond that we would give the Government no control.

402. But on all secular matters they would have. What would be the effect of a school not giving value?—If the Inspector was not satisfied with the school as to efficiency the money could be withheld.

403. *Mr. Fish.*] I presume I am correct in assuming it to be your duty as bishop, and also the duty of your clergy, to instruct the laity not to send their children to the State schools?—Yes; we do it.

404. Do you think if yourself and the clergy were to refrain from giving that instruction that the laity would send their children?—I do not think they would. I am quite sure they would not as a body.

405. Referring to Otago, I believe I am correct in saying that when Father Moreau had charge of your present diocese the Catholic children went to the provincial schools?—I am not aware of anything of the sort, because I found, on coming to Dunedin, he had a Catholic school himself.

406. Are you prepared to state that a large number of Catholic children did not then go to the provincial schools?—I do not know; I was not there.

407. You say that, in endeavouring to interfere with education, the State is going beyond its functions?—No; I did not say that. I said the State, in becoming the schoolmaster of the country, is going beyond its functions.

408. Supposing it should be proved, on going into figures, that the denominational system would be entirely beyond the means of the State, would you still advocate as you are now doing?—As the logicians say, *nego suppositum*.

409. We may assume, then, that the teaching of the young, according to your belief, should be directly under the control of the various religious denominations?—I do.

410. *Mr. Dodson.*] Were the colleges and high schools included in the eighteen schools?—Yes.

411. *Mr. Barron.*] I understood you to say that the introduction of Bible-reading into State schools would prevent the employment of Catholic teachers. There are Catholic teachers now in that employment?—Very few. There are one or two pupil-teachers. There is one *bonâ fide* teacher, a female, that I know is now so employed. I think there is one pupil-teacher in Caversham.

412. If Bible-reading were introduced into the State schools it would prevent the employment of Catholic teachers?—Yes.

413. *Mr. J. Buchanan.*] Have you heard that in the neighbouring colonies the system of Government education has developed peculiar evils of its own, in Victoria and New South Wales?—Judging from what I have read I have come to that conclusion. Of course I have no personal knowledge of it.

414. Are you aware that, at this present moment, one of the Parliaments is so engaged in amending the law in reference to offences against young females as to increase the punishment for teachers in public schools?—There is a Bill before the House to that effect, I think.

415. In reference also to the employment of teachers by your denomination, have you not peculiar facilities for obtaining aid of that kind at a very reasonable rate, arising from the circumstance that it becomes a religious duty?—Yes; it is only on that account we are able to have schools in many places where, without that aid, we could not possibly have schools under present circumstances.

416. Those ladies and gentlemen are, of course, content with a very moderate maintenance?—Content with a mere living.

417. In fact, the system is somewhat analogous, I think, to that which once prevailed in France, when the Frères Chrétiens were the teachers?—Yes.

418. *Mr. Swanson.*] If the State pays the teachers of these denominational schools, would not that be practically giving State aid to religion?—No; because they are paid for teaching secular subjects.

419. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Is there anything further you would like to say to the Committee?—On the part of the Catholic body I have come here to ask the Parliament of the country to do what we conceive is an act of justice, and what we conceive as the Parliament of the country they are bound to do—that is, not to take from us money which they spend upon other people's children, but let our own children have the money we ourselves contribute for educational purposes. We think that is just, and that is our demand. The matter of education in accordance with our principles is one of life and death with us, and we consider we are under an injustice and suffering a hardship in being obliged to pay our share of the taxation of the country without profiting by the expenditure on education; and to be at the enormous expense of providing schools for our own children—a thing we are now bound to do—paying towards the free education of other people's children.

(Telegram.)

REPORT of my evidence is correct. I authorize you to put my signature to it. Letter by post.

Hon. Colonel Brett, Parliament House, Wellington.

Dunedin, 24th August, 1883.

BISHOP MORAN.

FRIDAY, 10TH AUGUST, 1883.

Rev. RAINSFORD BAVIN, examined.

420. *Hon. the Chairman.*] Mr. Bavin, you have expressed a wish to give evidence here on the grievance of the Catholics and others in regard to the education system of the colony?—I was not aware of the specific nature of the investigation. I understood, in a general sense, that it was on certain proposed amendments of the Education Act.

421. What is your position in the Wesleyan Methodist Church?—I am chief pastor in this city, and for the present year I am President of the Wesleyan Conference of New Zealand.

422. Have your body presented any petition to Parliament in regard to the Education Act?—Not that I am aware of.

423. What is the number of Wesleyans under your charge?—There are three churches in the city with sitting accommodation for 1,100, 250, and 150; that is the actual sitting accommodation.

424. How many do your body number in the colony?—About 40,000 according to the census returns.

425. Have you any special schools of your own?—Only one in the colony.

426. Do the children of your denomination attend the State schools?—Yes, generally speaking.

427. Have you any religious objection to their attending these schools?—None whatever; on the contrary, speaking as pastor to my own members, I encourage them to attend. I think it is a very admirable system.

428. How many children are there at this one school you spoke of?—Not more than fifty; it is only a small infants' school, existing under very peculiar circumstances.

429. Are you aware that the Catholics have a conscientious objection to availing themselves of the State system?—I am.

430. Are you in the habit of visiting the State schools?—Yes. For many years past I have been more or less associated with the public system. In Nelson I was a member of the School Committee for two years, and, as such, I visited the schools. At Wanganui I was Chairman of the Grammar School Committee; and I have held an appointment for some years under the Minister of Education as Inspector of teachers in one particular department. On these accounts I have had pretty full opportunities of familiarizing myself with the public schools of the colony.

431. Are you aware that the Catholics have schools solely at their own expense?—Yes.

432. Have you visited any of them?—No.

433. In visiting the State schools, have you found many Catholic children in them?—I am not able to answer that question.

434. Have you examined any children in the public schools as to their religious knowledge?—No.

435. Can you tell the number of schools the Catholics have at their own expense?—I have no means of knowing beyond having observed generally that in every important centre they have their own schools, and usually, I believe, efficient schools.

436. Are you aware that there are children of other denominations attending them?—Yes.

437. Are there any Methodists at these schools?—Very few indeed.

438. Do you find that parents of your denomination have any great objection to their children attending the Catholic schools?—They have.

439. Upon what principle?—I am prepared to say they have conscientious objections.

440. Can you state that the Catholic schools are under the supervision of the Government?—By no means, as far as my information goes.

441. Do you think they have any objection to it?—I am not able to answer that question.

442. Do you approve the State system of secular education?—I do not approve of the operations of the present Act in so far as the course of instruction provided under it must be purely secular. I should like to be permitted to say that in making that statement in no sense do I claim to represent the Wesleyan Church. I am quite aware that, both as regards ministers and people, we are divided on the question. A good many very excellent ministers and members approve the present system, secular and compulsory as it is, while on the other hand I am prepared to state that a great number—I am not prepared to state the proportions—of ministers and members are aggrieved at the operations of the present Act, with myself, for this twofold reason: first, that there is no recognition whatever of the Divine Being; secondly, that the Bible is a proscribed book.

443. Do you approve of the Bible being read in all schools daily?—I do, provided that it shall be guarded by a strong conscience-clause, and that the power is left in the hands of the local Committees. I state this because I know there are some of the day-school teachers in whose hands I, for one, would be very sorry indeed to see the reading of the Bible permitted. They are pronounced sceptics, and for that reason, taking the thing as it is just now, I should prefer Bible-reading being permissive, the power being left in the hands of the local Committees.

444. Do you object to the principle of laymen reading the Scriptures?—Not at all. I say this because I do not want one who avowedly disbelieves in a God or the Bible to be called upon to read the Bible in the day-school.

445. Then, you condemn the Government for appointing teachers not in any way suited for that office?—I think it is a misfortune and a wrong that persons who are known to be sceptics should be appointed to that office. I do not think any great proportion are of that class, but, seeing there are some, I should be prepared to say, without disturbing the existing order of things, let the question of Bible-reading be left in the hands of the local Committees. That is the view I hold.

446. Do you approve of denominational education?—I am not prepared to reply to that question in the affirmative. I scarcely know what it means. If it means, Do I wish to see the present national system broken up? I say, No; certainly not. But I think the withholding of the Bible from the day-schools is imperilling the present system in New Zealand, for which I have fought for years past. I think allowing the Bible to be read would be a valuable means of

strengthening and consolidating the present system of education. At the same time I have no objection personally against grants-in-aid being made to those denominations who cannot conscientiously send their children to the present schools; always provided that their schools are under Government inspection, and that the payment is according to actual ascertained results.

447. The statistics say the Catholics number one-seventh of the population. Do you think it would be wise and just that they should have a fair proportion of the grant for education given them for the support of their schools?—I could not single out any particular religious communion, but I am prepared to say that, in my own judgment, I see no objection against any religious body that through conscientious objections could not send their children to the present schools receiving payment from the State for secular education imparted by them under Government inspection, according to ascertained results.

448. Do you consider that any relief should be given the Catholics on the grievance they allege they suffer?—Personally I think so, on the ground that any grant-in-aid made to them or to anybody else for the secular results produced in their schools is not money granted to build up a religious system. The State takes no cognizance whatever of the religion or irreligion taught in the schools; but this money is paid on account of secular educational results produced; and if these results are satisfactory to the Inspectors appointed by the Government, and in every other respect their schools come up to the standard prescribed, then I fail to see that there is any wrong done in that, or that the grant in any sense can be said to be a grant to that particular denomination. It is on account of secular results produced only.

449. What alteration of the present Act would you suggest to remove the grievance of the Catholics without inflicting injustice on other denominations?—I am not prepared to answer that question except so far as the statement I made just now is an answer. I am prepared to say what alterations in the Act I should personally like to see.

450. Have your denomination made any claim to the Government for anything for denominational schools?—Not since the Act of 1877 has been in force.

451. Then, your body does not object to the present system?—We have not taken any action as a body, although, in my own judgment, such action is looming. I do not think it will be long before there will be action in favour of Bible-reading in schools, but not beyond that.

452. In your visits to the State schools, do you find that the children of other denominations besides yours are backward in their knowledge of Scripture?—I have no means of ascertaining, inasmuch as the course prescribed under the present Act is entirely secular. If you mean, Do I consider that under the operations of the present Act there is any considerable amount of religious ignorance in consequence? I am prepared to say I believe there is.

453. Do you think secular education tends very much to infidelity?—No, not very much. I am not prepared to say it does. At the same time I believe the outcome of the present Act is to withhold the knowledge of God and the Bible from a number of children—I will not say a considerable number—who neither get this knowledge from the Sunday-school nor in their homes. They do not, therefore, get it at all. I have ascertained that as a fact. And I believe there is a considerable increase of “larrikinism” and crime as the outcome of it.

454. *Hon. Dr. Grace.*] Will you state what you mean exactly in saying you believe the withholding of the Bible from schools is imperilling the present system?—I mean there is a growing amount of dissatisfaction with the present Act in consequence of the exclusion of the Bible, and thus it is alienating many of those who had been supporters of it. Generally speaking, we went in heartily as a body for the present national system, and consented to give up our day-schools for it—we had some important schools in Canterbury, for instance—on the understanding, I believe, that the repetition of the Lord's Prayer and Bible-reading was then contemplated under the national system. But, in consequence of the Act being entirely secular, I am bound to say that, in my own judgment, a good many of our own people, and a good many of the public generally, are becoming dissatisfied with the Act. And I think that any provision in the Act which occasions any large or growing amount of complaint is imperilling the system.

455. Were the schools your body had before 1877 efficient and satisfactory?—I believe they were, both to our body and to the Government Inspectors.

456. Were you in the habit of receiving State aid?—Yes.

457. To what extent?—It was under the provincial system. I do not remember the exact amount. In Canterbury, for instance, it was the amount prescribed under the Education Ordinance of the province.

458. It was of material assistance?—Yes.

459. Did you supplement that amount by the voluntary system?—We did.

460. To what extent do you suppose your voluntary contributions went on a capitation basis. Was it a heavy tax?—No; it was chiefly in the shape of school fees, which, together with the capitation allowance, almost supported the schools. I was Acting-Chairman of the School Committee in Kaiapoi for a year, and, as far as I can remember, the only actual cost upon us outside the fees was the cost of erecting and maintaining the buildings.

461. What were the school fees?—I am not able to say precisely. They ranged from 4d. to 8d. or 9d. a week. I know we had a graduated scale in the case of families. If there were several children in a family, there was a proportionately smaller fee.

462. Did you find that the parents complained of the cost to them of that system?—I do not remember that we were troubled with any serious complaints. I know there was trouble in collecting the fees. On the whole I consider it was an objectionable system having the fees.

463. On account of the difficulty of administration?—Yes.

464. What alterations in the present Act would you personally like to see?—In the interest of the Act itself, for I heartily believe in a national system of education, and I long to see the present system strengthened and made more effective—in the interest of that I simply propose, in the first place, that the schools should be opened by reciting the Lord's Prayer; secondly, that the

permissive power of having Bible reading should be given to the local Committees; in the third place, I should like to see the question seriously considered whether the Wednesday afternoon of each week should not be given up so that ministers and others duly accredited might, in their own way and in their own, or in the school buildings, just according to their own consciences, impart religious instruction. My reason is that ministers and churches are blamed, I am quite aware, for not doing their duty in imparting religious education. I find it is practically impossible to do it. The children are under high pressure. The home lessons and the work of the school become so exacting that often there is no time left, and there is no brain-power or fitness left. Saturday afternoon is a most inconvenient time for parents. I should very much like to see tried the giving-up of Wednesday afternoon in this way. I observe it is done in some superior schools, *e.g.*, the Wellington College, where there is a holiday every Wednesday afternoon. I do not see why that might not be tried as regards the primary schools. These are the only alterations I should like to see in the Act.

465. *Hon. Mr. Reynolds.*] You would have no objection to any religious denomination having State aid?—That could not conscientiously avail itself of the public system.

466. Who is to decide as to conscience?—Themselves.

467. Not the Government?—By no means.

468. Do you think the Wesleyans would take advantage of that permission—in cities, for example?—I am satisfied personally, were those concessions I have referred to made, no such application would be made by us; but, if the present secular system is maintained intact, I am not prepared to say, in my judgment, it is not improbable. There is a growth, in my opinion, of feeling in this direction; but, as this is purely a matter of opinion only, I wish to be exceedingly careful how I speak on behalf of the Church to which I belong.

469. Do you know the feelings of other denominations in the matter; for example, do you know the Episcopalian body would go in for denominational education?—Well, I think myself, if this were allowed—Bible-reading optional with the Committee, together with anything like a provision for an afternoon a week to be set apart—I do not think myself, to any considerable extent, the Episcopalian Church would then object to the present system.

470. Do you know sufficient of the Presbyterian Church to give an answer with regard to them?—Only just my own opinion, which is that they would welcome the present system then, and would never dream of establishing different schools of their own.

471. Then you would give grants-in-aid to Freethinkers as well as to other religious denominations?—I am prepared to abide by my statement—to any who have conscientious objections, and they should decide that for themselves.

472. *Mr. Swanson.*] Would you propose that the Bible should be read in the schools by the scholars verse about by the teacher, or how?—I have no particular feeling as to the mode; I would leave that in the hands of the teacher to provide what selections should be read.

473. Would you recommend that passages be selected, or have indiscriminate reading?—I would recommend that the common-sense of the teacher be trusted in the matter; I would leave it to him.

474. How would you propose to utilize the Wednesday afternoon in a large school?—As far as the schools are concerned, my proposition would be to close them all on Wednesday afternoon.

475. And let each denomination use their own or other buildings?—Just as they might arrange. For instance, in Nelson we found no serious difficulty in closing the schools an hour earlier on Wednesday afternoon, as we could do under the present Act, where all the Protestant clergymen were at that time on the Committee. We secured the four hours of teaching required by the Act; and we were able to agree amongst ourselves, and we selected the Provincial Hall and gave religious instruction there as per agreement betwixt ourselves as ministers.

476. You think the present system might go on with satisfaction to your society, provided the Wednesday afternoon were given for that purpose? I think so. I say, again, it is satisfactory now even as it is to a considerable proportion of our people, who are prepared to accept the Act just as it is, and would make no concessions to anybody.

477. Who would oppose the Wednesday afternoon proposal?—Yes; who would oppose any alterations for fear of interfering with the present Act. But there are a considerable number I know who would approve the suggestions I have made.

478. You are in favour of national education?—Yes.

479. Do you not think that giving grants-in-aid would have the effect of weakening the present system?—I do not. I think all the talk about the thin end of the wedge and so forth is mere chaff.

480. Well, as the Episcopalians and the Catholics are the large majority of the people, if their clergy are to be trusted as representing the people, they insist on denominational education. Well, if they got half the money granted to them, without speaking of other denominations, could we carry the Act on as we are?—My own opinion is that if Bible-reading were permitted in schools, and opportunity given for imparting religious instruction by the clergy or others in the way I suggest, that the great bulk of the Anglicans throughout the colony would accept the national system. No doubt it would be as you say if the Anglicans were to avail themselves of grants to any large extent.

481. I apprehend that the subsidizing of any denominational schools means that the clergy should have the appointment and dismissal of the teachers?—Not necessarily or exclusively the clergy. It has never been so with us.

482. But the denomination would?—Yes.

483. And the State would have the pleasure of paying them.—Yes.

484. Would it not, then, be in effect, whatever the theory might be, that if the State paid the schoolmaster a good salary, that would be all the salary he would get?—My own feeling is that what the State wants to see is a certain amount and quality of education.

485. Yes; but suppose the capitation were paid to a good school, would not the master get a good salary?—Of course, it would depend upon the rate of capitation allowed.

486. The surplus on the capitation for the big schools is now taken to help the smaller ones. If the full present capitation was allowed for a denominational school, say, with a hundred scholars, would not that be ample payment for the teacher?—I should think it would.

487. Then, he would be paid by the State to give religious instruction gratis to that denomination. Would not that be the State paying for religion?—I think not. What the State wants is a certain amount of secular education, and, if any religious body produced that in their aided school, that is all the State should know.

488. But still the fact would be that State aid was being given to that Church?—I am not able to reply further.

489. *Mr. Feldwick.*] Do you not think the absolute removal of the Catholic children from the public schools would remove the main objection to Bible-reading in the schools?—I do.

490. I believe your body is one that greatly promotes Sunday-schools?—Yes.

491. It has been a matter of principle with your body always?—It has.

492. Are they well attended?—They are.

493. Do you, by means of such schools, get hold of the children of all your members and adherents?—As a rule we do.

494. There are cases where you do not?—Yes; but not among the destitute and poor.

495. Do you think sufficient religious instruction can be given on Sunday only?—I do not.

496. You think it should be given daily?—I think there should be a recognition of God and the Bible daily. I do not think religious instruction should be given in the public schools daily.

497. You said you would employ one afternoon a week for the children to come to the buildings of these particular denominations?—The schools being closed on one afternoon would give the opportunity for that. My point is that at present we have not that opportunity.

498. Have you seen the operation of what has been called the drafting system in a public school?—Yes.

499. It was done at Kaiapoi, I believe?—Yes.

500. Was it objectionable?—Not as far as I know. I never saw anything objectionable in it.

501. Was it not likely to have the effect of creating sectarian feelings in the minds of the children?—By no means, as far as I know; no more than their going to different churches and Sunday-schools on the Sunday has.

502. *Mr. Dodson.*] I gather that, while you do not want religious instruction given in the public schools, you do not want the children to think that the Bible is excluded and the Supreme Being banished from the schools?—Yes.

503. Also that you think if the State pays for education it should be payment only for results ascertained by competent inspection, and so paid to any one, no matter what name the school goes by?—Yes; on the part of those who cannot conscientiously avail themselves of the public system.

504. And, if that was done, do you not think that would remove the objections of the Catholics to the present system?—I think it would remove their grievance at any rate.

505. *Hon. Mr. Barnicout.*] Probably you are acquainted with the Nelson system?—No; not the system there previous to 1877.

506. Can you give the Committee any information as to the working of the Nelson system before 1877?—I am not able.

507. You are not aware, perhaps, that the Catholic body, or any separating body, was subsidized under the Nelson system?—I am aware of it.

508. Are you aware that the system worked smoothly and satisfactorily to the community generally?—I have always understood from all sources in Nelson that it did work satisfactorily and well.

509. Both to the Catholics and the community generally?—So I have been informed.

510. *Mr. Barron.*] Do you believe in physical training as well as instruction in general knowledge for children?—I do not believe in the State incurring large expenditure, such as I have seen on the west coast of the South Island and in other places, in providing gymnasiums and other means for such training. I would heartily approve of some main principles and some simple instruction being imparted by the teacher; but I disapprove entirely of large expenditure by the State for the purpose, such as I have seen in some parts of the colony.

511. You think, for instance, that in a separate shed such training as you have named could be given with advantage?—I do.

512. You would take a certain part of each day from general instruction and use it for Bible-reading?—I value Bible-reading itself as a means of instruction.

513. You think the system of general instruction is of the first importance?—I think that, in order to have efficient Bible instruction, one afternoon a week could be taken.

514. You are satisfied the present system of secular education is thoroughly complete; but you think it would be better if it included some religious instruction?—Yes.

515. Even one-tenth of the time given to general instruction. You do not want religion to permeate the whole course of instruction; but you want some one or two hours a week set apart for it?—No. All I would ask for in the day-school is that the first half-hour each day be set apart for simply repeating the Lord's Prayer and reading portions of the Bible.

516. *Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley.*] Did you say you would leave the selection of portions of the Bible to the local Committees?—I said, I think, taking the system as it is, the condition of things throughout the colony as they are, it would be wise to leave it optional with the Committees as to whether Bible-reading should be allowed or not.

517. Then, would the Committee have the selection of the portions of the Bible which should be read, or should the teacher have the right to read any portion he thought proper?—I think it should be left to the teacher. I would not dream of referring it to the Committee. I mean just

this: In point of fact there would be a few cases throughout the country in which it would be known that it would be unwise and utterly inconsistent to ask the teachers to conduct Bible-reading. I take it that in those cases the Committee would, under all the circumstances, say there should be no Bible-reading. But, all other things being equal, the Committee would, I presume, permit Bible-reading in the school, and I would leave the rest with the teacher.

518. Supposing the Committee did not agree?—It means going by the majority.

519. Then, if the majority carried it against a minority, would not the minority be treated with injustice; would not that be the same as at present?—I think not; because, however anxious the community or the Committee may be, the Bible is a proscribed book, and cannot be introduced.

520. You consider religious teaching a necessary branch of education?—I do.

521. I think, before the present Act came into operation, you had some very efficient schools belonging to your body?—I believe so. I know there were in Canterbury.

522. Well, from your experience of people who were then scholars and are now members of your flock, do you consider they are better educated, as far as religion is concerned, than those of the same age now attending the public schools?—Of course, the public system has only been in vogue a few years, and one cannot compare them.

523. Then you are not in a position to say?—No.

524. I gather from your evidence that the teaching in Sunday-school only is not sufficient to religiously educate children?—I did not quite wish to convey that, although I think it is not sufficient. But there are a great many children who are compelled to attend the day-schools—the system being compulsory—who are not gathered into our Sunday-schools. In Wellington some of the ministers have compared notes, and we find there are many children who do not attend any Sunday-school, and of course we cannot compel them.

525. *Mr. J. Buchanan.* Are you aware that under the present Act Committees can order Bible-reading, with the consent of the teacher, before school hours?—I am quite aware of that.

526. What is the objection to it, then?—It is found wholly impracticable. The present hour fixed by the teacher and Committee for opening the school is found to be sufficiently early, at any rate, to get the children present. To ask them to come half an hour earlier is placing the whole matter of religious instruction at such a serious disability and disadvantage that it is entirely unworkable.

527. The addition of time would be found unpalatable to the children?—Yes; and it is impracticable, I think.

528. I presume the Wednesday-afternoon instruction you suggest would be dogmatic instruction?—Assuredly, if we agree as to what the word means. I mean religious instruction something over and above the mere reading of the Bible—that is, the Bible explained as well as read.

529. The reading in the public schools of the Bible you mean to be without note or comment?—Yes.

530. And the instruction on Wednesday afternoons should be illustrated by explanations by those who could afford it?—Yes; I do not prescribe what should be done, however, during that time. I suggest Wednesday afternoon to be set free entirely, so far as the Act is concerned.

531. Do you hold that the objection of the Catholics to the present system is of a more radical character than the objections which exist among other denominations?—I am scarcely prepared to answer that question.

532. Do you not think it is founded on stronger reasons of conscience as against Protestants?—I believe it is.

533. If to the present system Bible-reading was added, would it not increase their dislike to the system?—No; I think not. At any rate, I think logically and consistently it would not, inasmuch as I judge—simply from what I read and hear—that they condemn the system as a godless system of education, and then they could no longer apply an epithet of that kind. At the same time, I should have no hope of making the public system acceptable to the Roman Catholic citizens of the colony.

534. Do you think if their children were no longer attending the public schools the way would be paved for a more cordial co-operation among the other religious bodies?—Possibly it would.

535. Do you not think that the numbers of the Catholics justify an interference in their favour which does not exist in the case of objectors from their fewness?—No; I do not think so. I could not put it on the ground of numbers at all.

536. Not even as a matter of expediency?—No.

537. There are other bodies whose numbers are very few? I may name them. There are the Jews, and there are what is termed the Freethought people. Their numbers, compared with those of other bodies, are so few; and would you think that they would become immediately entitled to the same rights of separate provision for their own children that might be granted the Catholics simply on the ground of numbers?—I think they would be entitled assuredly, and that it would be accorded to them as it was accorded under the Nelson system, as I understand it.

538. That would be purely a denominational system?—No. I believe, on the other hand, it would not imperil the present system of education. We should have the great central system, with a few of these adjuncts and subsidiary education bodies attached. Except in the case of the Catholics, I do not anticipate myself that there would be many other schools of importance either as to number or size.

539. That, you think, would be the practical outcome?—Yes.

540. You are aware, possibly, that the Catholics exercise a deal of self-denial in providing schools of their own—that their body must do it. I am not aware of it. I am told so.

541. Their providing schools must be attended with a certain heavy expense?—Yes.

542. Are you aware that any other body do that?—I am not.

543. Then, is it a matter of fair inference that they do not hold the matter as of so much importance as the Catholics do?—I presume it is.

544. Their schools you believe to have been efficient?—I have understood so.

545. Have you any experience outside the colony of the working of a national system?—Only from what I have gathered from papers. I have taken great interest in the Victorian system, for the simple reason that ten years ago I was as strongly opposed to Bible-reading in schools as anybody—I was pronounced as a secularist. I watched with the keenest interest the progress of the movement in Victoria; but when I saw what I considered to be secularism run mad—when I saw Professor Pearson, acting under the department, eliminate any reference to the very name of God and Christ from the school books—I am not ashamed to say I was brought to a standstill, and I felt compelled to change my opinions. I have thus watched the system with a good deal of interest, but I have had but little opportunity of personally becoming acquainted with any other system than our own.

546. You believe, then, there is a better side to man's nature, which needs to be cultivated by religious instruction?—Yes.

547. Have you heard that legislation is at this moment impending in Victoria with a view to preventing certain evils in connection with young females which develop themselves in connection with the national system there?—No; I am not aware of that.

548. Not as a mere matter of public report?—No.

549. You think, with the exception of the alterations you suggest, the Act still works very well?—I think so.

550. And that the amount of secular instruction given is of a satisfactory character?—I think so—almost too satisfactory.

551. *Hon. Mr. Acland.*] You think where any number of persons or any denomination establish a school of their own, which is submitted to public inspection, and satisfies the Government as regards secular instruction, it would be entitled to a grant?—Personally I would not object to that.

552. You think they would have a claim to it?—Yes.

553. As to Wednesday-afternoon instruction it might be given in rooms belonging to the different denominations, or in the public school-rooms if arrangements could be made?—Yes.

554. You consider Saturday practically useless for giving religious instruction?—I find it is so.

555. It would set the children against religion?—Yes; I think so.

556. Do you think the present system has a tendency to increase absolute scepticism?—I think so in certain classes—those who are not reached by the Churches, but lie outside the reach of the Sunday-schools.

557. But where they can be brought under that influence that can be averted?—Yes; I think in the case of that section of the day-scholars who cannot be got into the Churches or Sunday-school it has that tendency.

558. *Hon. Mr. Hart.*] Are you aware that Dr. Moran has said that, if Bible-reading were introduced in the public schools, all the Catholic teachers would be compelled to leave them?—I am not aware of that.

559. *Hon. Dr. Menzies.*] I understood you to say just now that the acquisition of religious knowledge by children in schools is secondary to the acquisition of secular knowledge?—I never wished to convey that impression. Of course, I conceive that the moral and religious education of the young is of vastly more importance than secular training to the child.

560. In other words, do you consider that religious knowledge should be the basis of all instruction?—I consider that to be the case.

561. *Mr. Barron.*] Then, if it should be found impossible for the State to get the agreement of the majority in the State to a system of instruction which would include Bible-reading instruction, and it became necessary to abandon the present system, do you think that the denominational system should be encouraged by the State?—Well, seeing that I do not believe such an alternative either probable or necessary, I think it is scarcely needful for me to answer the question, as my whole conviction runs the other way. I think what I have suggested would have a tendency to build up the present system, not do destroy it.

562. You are aware the difficulty has been to get people to agree what "religious instruction" means?—I object to religious instruction becoming any part of State education myself. All I ask for is the day-schools to be closed one afternoon in the week, leaving all else to be done outside the day-schools. This would enable the ministers and Churches to do it.

563. You are still of opinion that if the State must have some system of education it should impart general knowledge only, than have no system of education at all?—Yes; I think so.

WEDNESDAY, 15TH AUGUST, 1883.

Mr. S. E. SHRIMSKI, M.H.R., examined.

564. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You are aware there has been a large number of petitions to Parliament this session in reference to the subject of education. You know generally the subject of those petitions?—Yes.

565. You are a member of the Hebrew persuasion?—I am.

566. How many Jews are there in New Zealand?—According to the last census 1,535, I believe.

567. Do your people take advantage of the State system of education?—They do.

568. They have no conscientious objection to their children attending the State schools?—Not the slightest.

569. Do you believe in secular education?—We do.

570. Then, are you opposed to the Bible being read in the State schools?—We are.

571. Would your people forego sending their children to get the advantages of education in the State schools if the Bible was read in them?—To a great extent. Our object is to have our children educated with the rest of the population, so as to grow up one family. If you bring the Bible into the school you create a bar and an ill-feeling among the children which you can never erase from their memory. So we strongly object to Bible-reading in the State schools.

572. Have you any schools solely your own?—Only Sunday-schools.

573. Who conducts them?—The rabbi in each place and volunteers.

574. Do you not think the non-reading of the Bible tends to crime?—I do not think so. I mean as far as Bible-reading is concerned. With us it is read at home and in the Sunday-schools.

575. Are you aware that the Catholics have a conscientious objection to their children attending the State schools?—From their statement I believe they have.

576. Do you know they have schools at their own expense?—I believe they have.

577. Do you believe in denominational education throughout the country?—I do not.

578. Why?—First, it has on the Continent of Europe created a great deal of bitter feeling between classes: this has been shown clearly up to the present day. Then, as far as we are concerned, we have been misunderstood, that we are keeping to ourselves, and do not associate with our neighbours, whereas our desire is quite the reverse. Our object is that our children should associate with those of the general population, and that all should grow up educationally as one race.

579. Then, you approve thoroughly of State education?—I do.

580. Would you suggest any means for removing the grievance of the Catholics?—I cannot do so.

581. *Hon. Mr. Holmes.*] Do you think the Catholics or Episcopalians who object to the present system have an equitable claim to grants for separate schools out of the Consolidated Fund?—That I cannot go into. I confine myself now to the views of our own people.

582. *Hon. Mr. Reynolds.*] Did the Jews ever object to send their children to the Otago schools when the Bible was read in them? No. They are a peaceable, quiet, community, and they did not wish to make any complaints, but at the same time they felt that it was hurtful to themselves and their children. They never complain. Even under the tyranny which has existed in Russia they put up with it.

583. *Hon. Mr. Holmes.*] Do not the Jews accept the Old Testament the same as we do?—Yes; they do, and that is read in their Sunday-schools.

584. *Hon. Mr. Barnicoat.*] Do you think any great evil would arise to the State system if those who object to it were allowed a separate grant for their own schools—a grant proportionate to the number of scholars in their schools, which should be open to all children, with a conscience-clause?—Yes. That system marks off children as belonging to a different denomination, and they are at once taunted with it.

585. Do you speak from experience?—Yes. I was brought up in such schools, and I have seen the same thing in the colony.

586. Are you aware of any New Zealand school established on that system?—Yes; I have heard complaints.

587. Where have you seen such schools?—In Otago.

588. They did not work satisfactorily?—Yes; but still there was a great deal of ill feeling among the children.

589. Do you know anything about the Nelson provincial system?—I have heard it was similar to that of Otago.

590. Have you any reason to believe that while a separate grant was made to the Catholics in Nelson the system was endangered thereby?—I cannot say; I was not there.

591. *Mr. Barron.*] Do the Jews attach importance to religious instruction?—They do.

592. Is it considered of the first importance?—Decidedly.

593. How is religious instruction imparted to the children?—After they leave the day-schools they go once or twice a week to the school at the synagogue, and they go there on Saturday and Sunday.

594. That is purely for the purpose of religious instruction?—Solely.

595. They keep it distinctly apart from instruction in general knowledge?—Yes.

596. As a matter of fact, different classes of teachers would be required to give instruction in general knowledge and in religion?—Just so.

597. Have you ever found the moral tone of your children lowered, or their religious convictions disturbed, by their being educated at the State schools?—Not at all.

598. Has your form of religion been in existence long?—I think it has, long before any form of religion known to us now.

599. Longer than the English or Catholic Church?—From history I believe it has.

600. Do your coreligionists ever try to convert others to your form of faith?—We never do.

601. Do you know how many Jewish children have been sent to the industrial schools?—As far as I know, none.

TUESDAY, 21ST AUGUST, 1883.

Right Rev. Dr. LUCK, examined.

602. *Hon. the Chairman.*] (After the Clerk had read a petition, signed by Roman Catholics, praying for equity and justice in the matter of education): In all there are sixty-five petitions to the same purport as this which you have just heard read, and they are signed by 10,568 persons. There is also a petition from the Synod of Christchurch, signed by the Primate of New Zealand, the Bishop of Christchurch. I wish to ask you a few questions with regard to the subject of these

petitions, and you can answer them as briefly as you like. Should there be any question which you would rather not answer, you are, of course, at liberty not to do so. I do not anticipate there will be any such questions. What is your recognized position in the Roman Catholic Church?—Bishop of Auckland.

603. What is the extent of your diocese?—My diocese is commensurate with the Province of Auckland.

604. Give an idea of the extent in miles?—I am only a recent arrival in New Zealand, and therefore I am not very well up in the geography of the colony at present. The diocese, however, extends over the Province of Auckland.

605. What is the number of Roman Catholics in your diocese?—About 17,000.

606. What is the number of children of both sexes educated in the Catholic schools within your diocese?—About 1,380, as far as I can ascertain.

607. What is the proportion of Roman Catholics to the whole population of Christians in New Zealand?—I am informed that it is one-seventh; but, as far as the population of Auckland is concerned, it is about one-sixth.

608. How many State schools are there in your diocese?—I am not able to inform you at the moment, but it is a thing that can be easily ascertained. It is, of course, the number of State schools there are in the Province of Auckland.

609. There are a considerable number?—Yes.

610. How many Roman Catholic schools have you solely maintained in your diocese?—Thirteen.

611. Are these schools attended by others than Roman Catholic children; if so, please state the probable percentage?—There is a small percentage, I believe, in every school that are not Roman Catholics; but, as far as I can judge myself, it would be about 10 per cent.

612. Do you find that the parents of other Christian denominations have any objection to send their children to the schools?—Those who send their children have, of course, no objection whatever; but, no doubt, there would be a great many who would have a very decided objection.

613. Do these Catholic schools receive any endowments or assistance from the Government of the colony; if so, state the amount received?—None of the thirteen I have referred to receive anything at all; but there are two schools that have received assistance—one of them the industrial school for girls at Ponsonby—that receives a capitation grant.

614. Are these Catholic schools, then?—The one I have mentioned is a Catholic industrial school.

615. And is this school kept by the Roman Catholics?—It is managed entirely by the Roman Catholics. But the capitation grant, I may add, is quite insufficient; it is only £10 per head.

616. How are the funds provided for maintaining these schools?—In different manner, according to the system followed in the district. They come from the voluntary contributions of the faithful, from the school-pence of the children, and from the subsidies of the Roman Catholic clergy.

617. Do you think the Roman Catholics have a grievance through the Government not affording assistance to their schools?—It is so self-evident that I need only reply that the grievance is a very great one indeed.

618. Do the parents of the children cheerfully subscribe towards maintaining the schools, and what is the annual charge to each pupil?—As regards the first portion of the question, I may say there are a certain number who do not contribute anything at all; they are too poor, and are taken in gratis. But, speaking of the Catholic body as a whole, it does cheerfully contribute, though grudgingly at the same time—that is to say, they protest against the injustice of the legislation, but, rather than sacrifice the Catholic education of their children, they do so.

619. What is the amount charged for each pupil?—That, again, is relative. The charge varies. As I have said already, some are received gratis. A certain number in some of the schools pay as much as 1s. per week. Others, again—in the boarding-schools, for instance—pay so much per annum. At Ponsonby I think it is £20 or £30 per annum, but at the present moment I forget the exact amount.

620. Then, those parents of children who are able to do so do pay for the education of their children?—Yes.

621. Have the Roman Catholics any conscientious objections to avail themselves of the State system of education, and do you believe the Catholic parents would consent to send their children to the State schools rather than forego their education?—That, again, is a double question. As regards the first part, we have a very decided conscientious objection. It is not for me to address the Committee at length in support of that objection, but if you wish to know the grounds of our objection I will be very happy to state them. As regards the second part of the query, we hold that secular instruction is a necessary part of education, and Catholic parents, who have not the opportunity of procuring Catholic education, would prefer to take what they can get, and supplement the secular instruction as well as they can. But it is a very decided grievance.

622. As Bishop of the Diocese of Auckland, are you opposed to those children receiving education at the State schools?—Most decidedly.

623. I think you have already stated that there are some children who do attend the State schools?—You must bear in mind that Catholic education in Auckland is behind the day, owing to the circumstance that the Catholic diocese has been left so long without a bishop. The Catholic population is a poor population; and I am in a position to show by figures that, notwithstanding this circumstance, what we have done certainly speaks well for the zeal and conscientious sense of duty of the Catholics of the diocese.

624. Do you and your priests attend your schools regularly—periodically?—Certainly.

625. How often in a week?—There is no fixed time. In some of the schools the priest is in the school every day. But as many of our schools are conducted by the Sisters of Mercy there is less necessity for the personal supervision of the priest than there would be in schools differently conducted. In some of the schools the priest attends only once a week.

626. Then, there is absolutely daily religious instruction in some of the schools?—Yes; in all of them.

627. Do you find that the Roman Catholic children have a better knowledge—this question may appear a little invidious, I admit—of Scripture than children of other denominations? Probably you are not able to answer the question?—I think I am in a position to make an answer from my own point of view. I say that since for good reasons we do not constitute the Bible as a text-book of religious instruction, so neither do we regard Scripture history as a standard as to whether a child is well instructed in his religion. However, I may safely say that our Catholic children are better instructed in religion than the children attending State schools, and better informed as regards the matter and substance of Holy Scripture; but as to whether they are better up in chapter and verse I am not able to state.

628. In other branches are they quite up to the current standard?—Quite so, I believe. I have assisted personally at the examinations at these schools, and I have been very greatly astonished with the results. I think they compare very favourably indeed with the schools in England. I have not assisted at any of the Government school examinations; but, from what I have heard, I am inclined to think that the secular instruction in Catholic schools is quite up to the standard of the Government schools, if not above it.

629. Do you find that any of the boys stand for honours in the New Zealand University; if so, with what success?—Not many. As to the success, I may mention that one boy in the Onehunga school was first in the class. But, to be candid, our boys' schools are much weaker than the girls' schools. It is only now that I have taken steps to procure more efficient masters that I hope we shall be able to do a great deal more for our boys' schools. At Onehunga and the Thames, however, the schools are efficient; but those in Auckland I do not feel proud of.

630. Then, your Church is not opposed to the boys going in for University honours?—Certainly not.

631. Have you any objection to Roman Catholic schools being under Government inspection?—On the contrary, I advocate Government inspection; it promotes a healthy competition.

632. Who performs the inspection of Catholic schools, and to whom do they report?—There are annual examinations at the schools, which are conducted before the public, and at which the clergy always assist. I assist myself, and therefore I am able to form a judgment of the results from what I see. In the case of other reports, which do not come under my own personal experience, the reports of the examinations reach me at least indirectly, if not in a formal manner.

633. From what source do you receive your school-teachers, and what standard of efficiency do you expect before appointing them?—The principal source from which we get our school-teachers in Auckland is from the Sisters of Mercy—ladies who specially dedicate their lives to the work of education; and, as I have said, I am on the point of procuring the services of some teaching Brothers, who make it the object of their lives to educate the young. I have not had occasion yet to accept the services of lay teachers.

634. Do you find any teachers in the State schools of the Roman Catholic faith?—I believe that there are some, but it is not a matter which comes under my knowledge in any particular way.

635. Do you approve of the secular system of State education; if so, state your reasons?—In answer to the first part of the question, I have a most decided objection to it. My reasons I might expatiate upon at very great length. Education affects the whole man, his moral and intellectual being, and the secular system omits entirely the moral training, which, after all, is the most necessary element to enable a man to go through life as he ought.

636. Then, you are not opposed to the reading of the Bible in State schools?—I am most pleased that it should be read in the schools under a conscience-clause, and for the denominational religious instruction of such as make the Scriptures their text-book, but not for Catholic children, whose religion is taught them in their catechism.

637. Are you opposed to the Bible being read by laymen?—Do you mean by laymen in schools or laymen generally.

638. Laymen in schools?—There is no objection to laymen reading the Holy Scriptures for their own benefit, but if by reading the Holy Scriptures you mean imparting religious instruction, we always require that the person who imparts it should be competent for the purpose; and, as a rule, laymen are not competent to undertake this duty without the concurrence of the priest.

639. Do you consider that secular education has a tendency to infidelity and crime?—Alas! it has a very decided tendency that way, and that is the reason why the Catholic clergy make such a decided stand against it. We need not go far—or rather we need go far, because we are at the antipodes—to see the results of secular education in Europe.

640. Then, you do not believe that the religious instruction of children should be left to parents solely?—Certainly not, because the parents are not constituted teachers of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

641. And do you think that among the working-classes the parents have the necessary time?—Not only very frequently they have not the time, but very frequently also they are not models of Christian virtue.

642. Then, do you approve of denominational education; if so, on what grounds?—Certainly I do, on the grounds that it is the only fair system. If the State wishes to encourage the secular instruction of its citizens it has certainly a right and a duty to respect their conscientious convictions, and, as there is no other system in which that is capable of being done, the denominational system has undoubtedly my earnest and best wishes.

643. Is there any attempt made to influence the religious opinions of other denominations in the Catholic schools, and have you known of any converts having been made to the Roman Catholic faith?—There is no effort made whatever to induce the Protestants to attend our schools. They are never expected to come, nor do they come, to the religious instruction. I have never known of any Protestant child becoming a Catholic, but there are instances where, in after life, they have joined the Church.

644. Will you please state the Roman Catholic system of education, its machinery, and ramifications, explain its workings, and give all the details possible of the efficiency and cost?—How many hours will you give me? A question of this sort cannot be answered to do it justice in the space of a few minutes.

645. What alterations in the State system of education would you suggest to remove the alleged grievances of Roman Catholics without inflicting injustice to other denominations?—There we enter upon a rather large field. In the first place, our only claim is fair-play and equity. In order that that should be accomplished, there would no doubt have to be very great changes indeed, because we should require to have a fair share of public money, as well as a share of school endowments, and assistance in the maintenance of normal schools. In a word, we should be on a footing of equality with our fellow-colonists. If I may make a suggestion I would propose that as a first instalment of justice there should be some consideration shown to the Catholics for this reason: the children whom we educate in our schools represent a positive saving to the State. It is reckoned that every child costs the State £4 per head. We have 6,000 children or thereabouts in the colony that are being brought up in the Catholic schools at a cost free to the State, and I think, therefore, we should get that amount which is saved to the State, and which would represent a grant of, say, £24,000. If we turn these children out of our schools, and on to the State, the State will be called upon at once to provide for those children, to build schools, and provide for their education generally. The £24,000 would of course be exclusive of the amount necessary for the erection of new schools. We have got our own buildings; we have raised them at our own expense. Although the Diocese of Auckland is behind the rest of the colony on account of the peculiar circumstances in which we have been placed, still I find we have expended a sum of £28,000 in the establishment of schools, not including maintenance. The amount has been spent in sites, buildings, and school furniture and fittings. I might add that this £28,000 does not include the two schools for which we have had Government aid.

646. May I ask whether you have any debt on your schools?—Yes; there are debts.

647. What amount?—That is a matter that I have not gone into, but it is relatively small—I should say £2,000 or £3,000.

648. Do you think that the cost of maintaining the schools is fully commensurate with the advantages obtained?—Most decidedly so; so much so that if we could only have a greater number of schools I feel confident that the advantages to be obtained by the colony at large—the social body of the colony—would be very great indeed. We see the effects of the want of proper education at the present day. “Larrikinism,” and the rest of it, proceed from the want of education.

649. What guarantee can the State have that these schools are furnished with the necessary educational material—that is, masters and so on?—Their guarantee would exist in the inspection of the schools by the State. I would add that the efficiency of a school arises more from the results than from fittings.

650. As a recent arrival from England, are you conversant with the system of State schools in England?—Yes; it is a system which perhaps is a shade fairer than the system which exists here, but is certainly far from being just. The State system in England enjoys a grant from the Privy Council, and from the taxation of the public, whereas the Catholic schools enjoy only capitation grants from the Privy Council, but are excluded entirely from the rates which are raised for the Board schools. Although they have certainly outstepped the reasons and motives for which they were originally founded, yet, with the enormous wealth they have at their command, they unquestionably tend to press out all competition.

651. Then, do you think that the English system would meet the views of the petitioners?—No; it would be a shade better, a step higher, but certainly would not be right or fair.

652. [First clause in Synod's petition read.] Do you believe in that?—Entirely.

653. [Second clause read.] Do you believe in that clause?—Yes; we are quite at one there.

654. [Third clause read.] Do you believe in that?—No; not entirely. I join issue with that, because we do not look at the Committees as being the parties to whom the right of teaching religion belongs, and therefore the appointment of teachers ought to depend upon the bishops and priests of the Church. But I agree very nearly with all that has been read.

655. *Hon. Mr. Dick.*] You state that the want of religious education is productive of crime. Do you state that from statistics?—No; I have not gone into the matter fully. But it is the conviction which has gradually and surely grown up in my mind.

656. By religious instruction do you mean any sort of religious instruction?—Of course, I am not going to preach a sermon to the Committee. We always uphold the rights of other denominations to impart their own kind of religious instruction.

657. And their instruction will hinder crime as well as the Catholic instruction?—Certainly.

658. Then, you have not compared the proportion of crime in France and Italy, or France and Ireland?—Not numerically; but we must neither look at France nor at Italy as model Catholic countries. It is a very sad sight indeed. But I think we might look at Ireland—I do not speak of it in connection with the political troubles in which that country has been involved—but certainly the moral standard of virtue in Ireland is far higher than in many other European countries.

659. But France does not give religious instruction?—It gives something worse than what our colony gives. It gives a positively atheistic education. Ours at any rate is negative. In France it is positively atheistic.

660. From statistics, do you suppose that there is more crime in France than in Italy, where there is a religious education?—I am afraid we cannot look upon Italy now as a specimen of a Catholic country. Certainly, since political changes have been introduced into Italy, crimes have been vastly increased, and, if we compare Italy of to-day with Italy of fifty years ago, the statistics of crime will be far greater. This is only plain common-sense. If children are not taught to do themselves and their passions violence, they follow the natural inclinations of their fallen nature, and give way to crime. The great advantage that the denominational system has over the secular

is that it maintains the principle of authority—the principle that there is a moral standard to which it is our duty to conform ourselves. In the secular system this is ignored or not brought forward prominently, and the consequence is that the visible and tangible has all its own way, and the principles of Christianity are forgotten and ignored, and at last despised.

661. Then, does not very much depend on the character of a religious teaching that is given?—Certainly; it depends in a great measure, but not entirely; because, of course, the Catholic Church is one that maintains the strictest code of morality, and the English Church, the Wesleyans, and Presbyterians have all retained a great deal of what the Catholic Church teaches, and therefore it is all in the right direction.

662. *Hon. Mr. Reynolds.*] Do I understand that you would grant the same privileges to every other denomination as to Roman Catholics?—Yes; fair-play.

663. That is, a fair contribution from the public funds?—Yes. The Catholic Church does not claim that all the colonists should be brought up to be Catholics; it only speaks for itself. It claims that amount of justice which it also claims for everybody else.

664. *Mr. De Lautour.*] You told the Chairman that the cost of the buildings in Auckland was £28,000?—Yes; about that sum.

665. But we have no indication yet as to what is the cost of maintaining these schools?—I am sorry I am not able to give the precise figures. I may safely say, however, that the cost comes up to about £2,400 per annum, which, of course, represents a considerably smaller outlay than for the State schools, having the same number of children.

666. I think you stated that your schools were supported by the school-pence of the children and subsidies given by the clergy?—Yes; and also, in the first place, the contributions given by the parents—the Catholic body at large.

667. Where do the subsidies given by the clergy come from?—They come ultimately from the generosity or charity of their respective congregations.

668. Then, really, these also come from the Catholic laity?—Yes. There are also certain cases—as in my case—in which a bishop gets subsidies outside the colony altogether, such as from Europe. These also help to do the work.

669. Regarding the £2,400, the fees given help to pay that sum?—Yes.

670. I understand you to say that was the cost of maintaining the schools each year?—Yes.

671. *Hon. Mr. Reynolds.*] Without fees?—Including the fees. The fees fall far short.

672. *Mr. De Lautour.*] I do not think we have got very clearly yet what are the grounds of the Catholic laity's conscientious objection to the State system. You thought we were asking you to go at some length into the question?—The grounds are these: that children have to be brought up as Christians and as citizens, and we contend that when the child is educated only with a certain amount of secular instruction he is only partially educated, and to be properly educated he must be provided with a moral training, by which he learns his duties to his fellow-creatures. And, as it is important, therefore, that children should be educated both in their intellectual and moral being, we have a most decided objection to a system which excludes the moral part of their being, and looks simply and solely to the intellectual portion.

673. Then, you consider a moral and religious training synonymous?—In that sense, Yes.

674. Do you mind telling us whether your clergy directly teach that the parents should keep their children from the State schools?—Where we have schools which are competent and efficient, then we should certainly have no doubt about pressing upon the Catholic parents the necessity of fulfilling the first duty of a parent, which is to educate their children as they ought to be educated; and clearly they lie under the obligation of sending them to those schools where alone they can be educated properly.

675. *Hon. Mr. Menzies.*] Whom do you consider to be the proper authorities to give this religious or moral instruction in schools?—In the first place, it is the first duty of the parents to bring up their children in their tenderest years with the first principles of religion. Then, as the children get more fully developed, it happens very often that a good Christian home is also the best place for a truly moral and religious training; but in all cases it has to be supplemented by the teaching body of the Church, because it is the special duty of the bishops and priests of the Church to fulfil the precept of our Lord to go and teach all things that He commanded them.

676. The Committee has understood you to say that you approve of denominational teaching, and that the State should contribute the same capitation to Roman Catholic schools as to other schools. It is clear that there may be a divided control there. What do you consider would be the line of demarcation between the State on the one hand and the denomination on the other?—The School Inspectors would be of two classes, as we have in England. There are State inspectors and religious inspectors. It is the duty of the State inspectors to ascertain that the secular knowledge is up to the mark, but it does not come under his province to inquire what the amount of religious knowledge is.

677. And with whom would rest the appointment and dismissal of teachers?—The State for the secular inspectors and the Church for the religious inspectors.

678. Then, there would be two sets of teachers?—No; two sets of inspectors. There would be a State inspector, who would examine the children in geography, grammar, and so forth, and would pronounce whether they reached the required standard, and another inspector would make his round in order to ascertain the extent of religious knowledge.

679. Then, I understand you to say that the teachers appointed by the Government would teach all the secular branches, and that the instruction in religious and moral subjects would be given by the denominations?—I think we are going on different lines a little. You seem to suppose that the secular teachers are simply and solely appointed by some Central Board of Education. As I take it, we have our Catholic schools, and we appoint our teachers. If these are found to be inefficient, then the State says, "This will not do; you must have efficient masters."

680. Then, I understand now that it would not be the State who would appoint the teachers, but the managers of the schools?—Yes.

681. *Mr. Fish.*] Having the answer to the last question, we gather this : that you advocate the various Churches appointing the teachers, and the State appointing the Inspector?—Yes.

682. Is it not a fact that a large number of the Catholic children in Auckland attend the State schools?—Unfortunately it is true.

683. Do you find that portion of the Catholic children who attend the State schools any worse in their moral and religious bearing than those who attend the Catholic schools?—We find that they are very much more deficient in respect to their parents, and in their conduct in after life ; that they go wild.

684. Have you had time enough to know what they do in after life? Is not the system too young?—“By their fruits ye shall know them.”

685. Have you had time to find out what their fruits are?—Others have. In Auckland, where the girls have had a much more efficient training and teaching than the boys, the result is that the Catholic young men of the last generation have almost disappeared. But, on the contrary, with the female portion of the diocese it is so true, as I know by the number of dispensations that are required for mixed marriages. The Catholic girls have not got the Catholic young men ; they cannot find them.

686. Then, in Auckland you have got a lot of bad little Catholic boys and a lot of good Catholic boys, and you attribute that to the circumstance that some go to the State schools and others do not?—Not as the sole cause. There will always be both good and bad. There will be a cockle with the wheat.

687. Are we to understand from your answers that you consider dogma a necessary part of education?—Certainly, from a Catholic point of view.

688. Then, the Catholic boy or girl taught religion without dogma would be ill taught?—Certainly.

689. Are you aware that the denominational system has been tried in Auckland?—I understand, from the history of the past, that there was an unfortunate attempt made at something of the sort, which has proved to be a failure. But we must not argue that, because a failure has occurred in an individual case, therefore the system is bad.

690. You stated in answer to a question a short time ago that there were peculiar circumstances attachable to the Catholics in Auckland?—Yes.

691. Would you mind saying what those peculiar circumstances are?—Principally these : that the Catholic Church, in order to flourish and work as it ought to do, requires the co-operation and assistance of its bishops ; and it so happens that the Diocese of Auckland has for years been acephalous—without a head, without a bishop—and, of those bishops who were appointed, some only remained for a short period, as in the case of Dr. Croke. His successor came in a very feeble state of health, and was not able to take an active part in the government of the diocese ; and the result has been that the Catholic Diocese of Auckland has been left without the fostering care of its natural guardian and overseer.

692. Are you aware that the Catholic clergy have been refused permission to impart instruction in the State schools after hours?—We never applied for it.

693. Do you not think that the clergy of every denomination could instruct without breaking up the present system?—I am afraid they might be liable to a repetition of the same scene as Dr. Moorhouse stated had occurred at Melbourne.

694. *Hon. the Chairman.*] What was that?—One minister had a shower of Bibles at his head.

695. *Mr. Fish.*] Supposing the State was to say, “We will put aside one half-day per week for religious instruction.” Would not that suit the Catholics?—It would be better than nothing, but it would not satisfy us at all ; because with us religion necessarily pervades the whole life, as we live and move and are in the presence of our Maker. Religion half a day in the week is certainly better than nothing, but is open to the objection that it is relegating religious instruction to the parents.

696. Then, it is necessary that religious instruction should be given to a boy every day, the same as he takes his breakfast?—Certainly. It need not always take the dogmatic form. But, when religion is a thing that is only allowed to come to the surface as it were on sufferance, it breeds contempt in the minds of youth.

697. Do you not think that the evil to the boy or girl would be as great by having too much religion taught?—Certainly ; we may have too much of a good thing ; but in moderation, and in the proper proportion, it would not be an evil.

698. You will be prepared to admit that if a denominational system were established in this country it would largely increase the cost in the administration of that system?—Perhaps it might. Even though it should, I maintain that the advantages to be derived would be amply commensurate with the extra cost.

699. Assuming that, the extra cost would be so great that it would cause the whole system to collapse, that is to say, that it would be beyond the means of the country to provide such a system?—No doubt it will before long under the present system. We cannot afford to go every year and spend half a million of money.

700. Then, suppose that it is too much for the State, would you still advocate the same system that you advocate now?—Certainly ; but it is open to argument as to whether it is the business of the State at all to provide education for the children of those who are in a position to pay for it. The State may properly come in and subsidize the poor parents.

701. Then, you would rather the State did not educate at all unless under a denominational system?—Certainly.

702. *Mr. Swanson.*] Do you not consider it the duty of the State to educate its children?—Not to assume to itself the duty of education. On the basis of Christianity I maintain that it does not belong to the State primarily. It belongs first of all to the parent, and secondly to the Church, whatever the Church is. The State then comes in to subsidize, the same as we subsidize penury and want.

703. The State lays down that ignorance of the law is no excuse for breaking it?—Yes.

704. Do you not think it is a duty, therefore, to teach the people so as to prevent their breaking the law?—Very properly the State comes in to subsidize the system, and see that destitute children are properly brought up. Hence the duty falls primarily on the parents to see that their offspring are brought up as good Christians.

705. If a parent fails and denominations fail, is it not the duty of the State then to step in?—I should have no objection to that.

706. Where the responsibility lies, as it does, on the State, it will be the duty of the State to see to the education of the people, providing that their conduct depends on their education. For instance, supposing the advocates of denominational education fail in making good citizens, do they take the responsibility of their becoming paupers and criminals?—We rather put ourselves on the level of paupers by having our children educated at the expense of others, when we could and ought to do it at our own expense.

707. The State has found that parents either did not, would not, or could not educate their children, and that the denominations failed utterly?—I am not prepared to admit that the denominations have utterly failed. That there may have been faults and failings I may be able to concede, and therefore the State can properly step in and have a share in the work. I think, however, this is carrying us a little beyond the subject, because we only claim equity and justice.

708. If the State put its funds at the disposal of denominations, and they have failed utterly, is it not time for the State to step in?—Yes, and do its duty. The question is, however, whether the State will step in and do its duty. We have States of all colours and shades—the atheistic amongst the rest, which admits no duty.

709. I think that the State is wholly responsible. For instance, if there are any criminals to punish, any property of its subjects to defend, or its poor and destitute have to be looked after, the denominations do not take charge of these things. This is the province of the State; the State is the common parent?—Yes, certainly.

710. Is it not the duty of the common parent to see that its children are properly educated?—Certainly, when the natural parents fail.

711. I am talking of the State? It is then the duty of the State to fulfil that duty which belonged to the parent, and to bring the children up in the religion of that parent.

712. But I am talking of the duty of the State to all its children?—I claim no other parent but my father and mother. The State did not beget me. The State is the social body; it is a convention; it is a very real thing; but at the same time it is not father and mother.

713. Is it the duty of the State to see that your property, for instance, is not damaged by a foreigner?—Certainly, because my rights are there interfered with. Of course, we have been using metaphorical language in speaking of the State as a father and mother; but our real father and mother are naturally the directors and instructors of their children. If they fail the State should step in.

714. Is it not the duty of any set of men, being in that position, to see that their children are properly educated?—Certainly. I am not excluding all State interference in education. But what I contend is that it is not the business of the State to be the sole educator.

715. Then, is it not the duty of the State to give such education as all denominations may be agreed upon?—Decidedly not. Conscience belongs to individuals, not to bodies; and therefore, if an individual has a conscientious duty to perform, it is the duty of the State not to interfere with conscience. It would be cruel and unjust on the part of the State to ignore the religious convictions of its subjects, and force upon them a thing which would be contrary to their consciences.

716. Does your Church preach that generally?—Certainly.

717. Are you aware of any Catholic State, where there is a Catholic majority, where they do not allow some of the State funds for education?—The Catholic Church never gives any grant to any religious education which it does not know to be the true one. This great cry for State education is entirely one of our own times.

718. If the State appoints inspectors, and the denominations appoint teachers and dismiss them, and the State pays them, would not that be State aid to that particular Church?—We are arguing again on different lines.

719. We are not arguing at all; I am asking you a question. I do not argue with a gentleman like you; I would have no chance?—When I said “argue,” I meant that our lines of thought were running on two parallel lines.

720. You have said that the bishop would appoint the teachers, or, at all events, approve of their appointment and dismissal, and, practically, you would have the patronage of all the teachers in the province?—Not so; that is a matter which is always left to the local clergy.

721. I mean the clergy. The Church in your case does not mean the people, it means the clergy?—Yes.

722. And the Church would have the appointment of these teachers as well as their dismissal?—No; the dismissal, as regards their secular accomplishments, would be under the State Inspector. We put it to the State to appoint an Inspector.

723. If the religious training was not up to the mark you would dispense with the services of the teacher?—Not necessarily. We do not commit the religious training to these teachers; it is done by the priest himself. The catechism may be intrusted to the lay teacher, but the teaching of authentic Christian doctrine is committed to the priest.

724. Still, if he neglected teaching the catechism and these other matters which the school is expected to teach, you would see your way to dispense with the services of such a teacher?—Possibly.

725. Then, the real power would be with the clergy?—Yes.

726. And would not every teacher be practically your servant?—Certainly. I deny that the schoolmaster is the servant of the State.

727. If the State paid the teacher and the teacher taught the catechism, would not that be State aid to the Church?—Certainly not directly; it might be indirectly.

728. Very well. Are all these religions which “the sun shines on,” as far as the Queen is concerned, equally true?—Certainly not.

729. Would not the State, then, be giving its money to the propagation of error in certain cases?—That is a Catholic view, but it is not a Protestant view.

730. I only want to get at the facts?—The State has no conscience whatever; it is very elastic, and whether we are Jews, Protestants, Catholics, Mohammedans, it does not matter one bit to the State.

731. Would it be wise for the State to give its money to the propagation of error?—That is a question I need not go into. Practically, here we are in New Zealand with a Christian Government, which maintains that Christianity ought to be taught, and yet, as a matter of fact, Christianity is excluded and therefore it is the duty of all Christians, including Catholics, to raise their voice against such a system.

732. The teaching of the Church, I suppose, has always been in the same direction?—It insists upon its followers being taught their religion, and pursuing the end for which they were created.

733. You are quite willing, then, to have the denominational books, and you are agreeable to the State imparting secular education and appointing a secular inspector?—Yes; although in the matter of denominational books we do not want any dictation either. Religion is so subtle that it pervades nearly every book; many books which profess to be purely secular are most positively irreligious. We should be sorry to see the works of Voltaire put as a class-book for our children.

734. I think I have seen some historical books used which are written in a way that would be calculated to set people together by the ears?—If so, such books ought not to be encouraged. I am afraid that books of that sort have been in universal circulation in the State schools as against the Roman Catholics and their religion. I do not wish to say that to offend any one. But, as a matter of fact, it is not fair that books should be put into the hands of children which, instead of informing them, actually misinform them and give them false impressions. Therefore, the selection of the books to be used in the schools should be intrusted to the management of the school.

735. Is it not possible that in certain cases, under such a system, absolute sedition might be taught?—If so, let it be repressed.

736. Would not the most effectual method of repressing it be to allow the State to have the charge of education altogether?—Certainly not; because you suppose an exceptional or individual abuse of a good thing. It does not follow that, because one man is a murderer or traitor, therefore the whole body are to be treated as murderers and seditious people. I do not know that there has been such a case, but, suppose some seditious book had been put into the hands of children, does it follow that the State should step in and say, “We will have the whole thing under our own sole management for the future?”

737. I think you said that education in the Province of Auckland had got a little off the rails through the absence of the Bishop?—Yes; and I consider it to be a little off the rails at the present moment.

738. Was it not while the Bishop was there that it went off the rails?—I know what you are driving at, Mr. Swanson, and, although I am not in a position to defend my predecessor, I am given to understand that there has been mismanagement which I am not called upon to defend.

739. I am merely referring to the schools now?—I presume you are coming to the North Shore.

740. No, not at all. Do not think that. I never mentioned the North Shore, and I would not do so at all. That is, in fact, going outside the question. I think the affair you hint at was due to the man in charge, not to the Bishop. I have very good means of knowing that. But, at this particular time, of which you are speaking, I hope you will admit that it was high time the State took charge of education in Auckland?—If you find children swarming with vermin it is quite clear to me that some interference was reasonable.

741. If the thing broke down so completely there, then, is there any guarantee that it might not break down again?—Yes.

742. What is it?—In the first place I do not admit your hypothesis that it did break down so utterly. Even if it did it is no argument against the system. Because it failed once it is no reason that it should fail a second time.

743. The State system, I think, has not failed?—With due deference it is certainly not an unqualified success, and if it is not an unqualified success it is a partial failure.

744. We will say that it is a partial failure, though I do not see it. The other system was a total failure?—There we differ too.

745. Will you point out any instance of an exception?—I am in ignorance of the place in a great measure. I hold, however, that if a citizen is brought up with a knowledge of the necessity of leading a good and moral life that is something very tangible indeed, something better than mere arithmetic. And, if it had not been for the moral training given to the children at the time you allude to, I do not know where the Catholic flock, of which I am the Bishop, would be now. I have to thank God that there are many useful ornaments of society and the Church which represent the fruits of former education.

746. But I am asking you about the Province of Auckland. All the denominations were the same; my remarks did not apply exclusively to the Catholic denomination. Was it not high time for the State to step in?—Supposing it was, it does not follow that the present system is the right one. The State stepped in, as I suppose, because it wished the secular instruction of the children to be improved.

747. You say now that, whatever was the case before the Government schools, the Catholic schools are good schools?—Some of them; but with others I am not satisfied.

748. At all events they are capable of being made better?—Certainly.

749. Do you think the present state of the Catholic schools has not been brought about in a great measure by the rivalry of the State schools?—There is an element of our success in that, for which reason I court State inspection of the Catholic schools, because inspection and competition are always good; but it does not follow that rivalry is the only cause of success.

750. What I want to get at is this: when there was no rivalry on the part of the State the thing went all wrong; and, if the prayer of the present petition and the request that the Catholics make were granted, I think I see that the State system of education must fall to pieces?—The present system must, but not the State education as advocated in the denominational system.

751. But State education means paying the teachers, and, judging from the past, we should then have the same old story over again, because the competition will have been withdrawn, and you will have it all to yourselves?—No; the competition will exist in a most healthy form. There would be just the same competition as there is now; the amount of money to be derived will always depend on the efficiency of the school.

Mr. Swanson: That was exactly the state of affairs before, and I will tell you some things that happened then.

Hon. Mr. P. A. Buckley: I object to this. We are here for the purpose of asking questions, not for the purpose of making speeches.

Hon. the Chairman: I think some of the remarks are irrelevant; but Mr. Swanson is quite at liberty to proceed with questions.

Mr. Swanson: I decline to continue.

753. *Mr. Turnbull.*] You say there are 1,340 children attending your schools in Auckland?—Yes.

754. And what is the annual maintenance?—£2,400. This, however, is only an approximate figure.

755. In that sum do you include the services rendered by the Sisters of Mercy?—Yes.

756. You are fully prepared to admit that the State should have the right to fix the standard of secular education?—Yes.

757. You do not wish that standard diminished in any way?—No; I have a private opinion of my own, though, that children are being educated on an unnecessarily high standard. We want servant-maids to scrub the floors, not to play the piano.

758. But you are quite willing to come up to the standard that now exists in the country?—Yes.

759. You wish active inspection by the Government?—Yes.

760. And that would be the remedy for any evil which has been stated to exist hitherto, because that inspection did not then take place?—Yes; I look upon inspection as a healthy element in the success of a school.

761. *Mr. Dodson.*] Would it not satisfy the people whom you represent if the State paid for all the secular knowledge imparted in your schools?—We should be quite content with that. The imparting of religious knowledge, you may say, costs very little.

762. And that would satisfy the petitioners?—Yes; we go in for nothing short of justice. There is no reason why we should not. Why should we agree to be treated unfairly? We only wish to be on the same footing as others.

763. But you are on the same footing?—No; we do not get any help at all. If we did we should be quite satisfied.

764. *Hon. Mr. Barnicoat.*] If your schools were subsidized by the State at the same rate as the other schools, would you consider the admission fees belonged to them?—Yes.

765. Do you seek total separation from the other children?—The Catholic Church is rather an exclusive body, and, as our religious views differ *toto caelo* from those of others, our religious education differs from that of other Christian bodies. Hence we always like to have our schools to ourselves. There is no other way of managing it. You cannot make separations, and say to one half the class, "This is meant for you," or, "This is not." We are members of one family, and we like our children to be educated together.

766. Would it be possible to separate religious instruction from secular, so as to give religious instruction at a prearranged hour? Those parents who wished it could cause their children to be withdrawn at such times?—That is certainly partially possible, and is the system carried out in England. There are certain hours allotted for religious instruction, beyond which it is illegal to impart such instruction. But religion gives a colouring to every branch of instruction. If you take history, for example, how can you expect a teacher belonging to the Church of England to refrain from giving his own colouring to the history of the Reformation, which would harmonize with the views in which he has been brought up? He may do so quite honestly, without any idea that he is inflicting injustice, and yet the truth is that it would be an injustice to the Catholic people.

767. Then, you do not believe it possible?—I am afraid not.

768. I wish to find out how far the Nelson system of education is possible—but the Catholic bodies do not avail themselves of it?—Our religious education is much more precise and particular than that of any other religious body. The consequence is that in all Catholic schools we can admit Protestants very well, but there is a great deficiency in the religious instruction when our children go to a Protestant school.

769. Would the body that you represent be satisfied with a subsidy such as is receivable by Act—the Education Act—without the Government also assisting in the erection of school buildings?—As a first instalment of justice we would be very pleased to do so; but there is no reason why we should say that we are willing to undergo injustice. Why should we be treated differently to all other denominations?

770. The chief reason is this: the Government would willingly vote money for the erection of schools on their own land, but not on the land of others?—In a case of that sort I dare say we should be very willing to take what we can get. Compensation for the past we do not look for. We expect, however, that as regards the future we shall be all on a footing of equality.

771. *Mr. Barron.*] I understood you to say just now that you failed to see why your faith should be treated differently from that of other denominations at the hands of the Government. What do you mean by that?—*Mr. Barnicoat* had asked me whether we should be prepared to forego any contribution from the Government simply for building purposes. Why should we?

772. You do not mean any treatment different from that of other denominations?—In the present circumstances we have to support all the State schools and our own as well, without any aid whatever.

773. But no other denominations get any different treatment from that?—The other denominations, though with a certain amount of protest, as in the case of the Church of England, have fallen in with the system; they have done so more easily than we do, because our convictions are stronger.

774. So that the treatment you receive is exactly the same as other denominations?—The Government says, "We ignore all denominations." Rather than submit to that we have gone to this sacrifice. The Catholic population, it must be borne in mind, does not represent the moneyed class of New Zealand; it represents the poorer classes, and therefore the sacrifice is all the greater.

776. I understood you to say that secular education apart from religious instruction is productive of crime?—Yes.

777. And that Catholic children were better instructed in religion than other children?—I believe so; in fact, it must be so at present, because all religious instruction is excluded in State schools.

778. Then, you think that the children taught in your schools are better taught than in the State schools?—They have a better chance.

779. You have mentioned in evidence that the proportion of Catholics to the total population of the colony is one-seventh?—Yes.

780. Do you know that it has been shown by statistics that a much greater proportion of the children sent to industrial and reformatory schools in the colony belong to the Catholic faith?—I have heard that asserted; I am not in a position to contradict it. It is a circumstance which I am at a loss to understand if it be true. Of course, statistics are facts, and if it is so I cannot account for it, because as you are aware the moral code of Catholics is stated to be more rigid than that of Protestants.

781. If it has been shown by statistics, however, that there is a much greater proportion?—I have nothing to do but to admit it if the statistics are reliable.

782. You say that Bible-reading by Committees is not sufficient in the way of imparting religious instruction?—Not from a Catholic point of view, simply for this reason: that the Holy Scriptures were never intended to be used as a catechism.

783. Do you not think that the reading of the Bible as a lesson-book in the State schools would have a beneficial effect in moral teaching?—It is fragmentary, and therefore certainly better than nothing, but it is in no wise adequate for the requirements of the Catholic body. We consider that it is not right to make the Bible a text-book.

784. You have said also, or admitted, that the teaching of the Church is of the first importance for the welfare of the State. Do you think the State should be made in all things subordinate to the Church?—You mean as to whether it is Church and State, or State and Church. The view that I take, in common with all bishops of the Church, is that, as the soul is the more noble part of man, and the interests of eternity are greater than those of time, the Church takes precedence as regards its own special sphere of action, but not in other matters which are outside the sphere of the Church.

785. Do you consider that the State should be made subordinate to the Church in all things?—Not in all things.

786. Then, a State system of education which does not impart religious instruction is better than no system of instruction at all?—I should certainly say that the voluntary system would be better than a State system which ignores religion. It stands to reason that, if religion and morality are excluded from education, we cannot tell where our future generations will be. We shall be upside down from a social point of view as well as in a religious point of view. There will be no respect for authority, and respect for authority is the basis of society as well as of religion.

787. You say that the total cost of the system is £2,400 in your province; that is, secular and religious education combined?—That, of course, would not include such things as school fittings, pianofortes, and other expensive articles. These are included in the other total of £28,000.

788. My object is to show whether you impart secular and religious instruction at a less cost than the State does?—We do.

789. How many children are taught for this £2,400?—1,340, if I remember aright.

790. And suppose you were to make allowance for everything that would be a charge against the instruction you impart, how much would the amount be?—I would hardly like to risk an opinion. With the books and such things it might run up to about £3,000.

791. Even then it seems to be much more economical than the State system?—It must be so, because our teachers for the greater part teach not so much for the love of money as on principle.

792. *Hon. Mr. Acland.*] There was a question about the duty of the State to give education to all children. You mean it is the duty of the State to educate those whom the parents do not. You also think that when any considerable body of citizens, feeling themselves unable to use the State schools, wish to educate their children through their own denomination, they are entitled to a grant-in-aid for that purpose?—I will not even go so far as that. I do not see why respectable people should look to the State at all for the education of their children. If they have the means of supporting them they have also the means of educating them.

793. Although the State was paying for the teachers, you would naturally wish to have the power of appointing them?—Yes.

794. Would you object, if the State Inspectors found a teacher was absolutely incompetent, that they should have the power of removing him?—Certainly not.

795. And you would have the power of dismissal in the other way?—Yes.

796. In some thinly-populated districts it would be impossible for a good many denominations to keep up schools?—If we had the assistance that we ask for we should be able to have a great many more schools than we have.

797. *The Chairman.*] Have you any statement now to make?—I think the question has been pretty fully sifted already, but there are one or two reflections that I might make. The State, I understand, has expended within the last six years the sum of £2,000,000 on education. If the Catholic body had had their proportionate share of that £2,000,000 it would represent £350,000, and the annual share as far as regards Auckland would have been £75,000 for the last six years. The Catholic expenditure on education has been £28,000, and the cost of maintenance £4,000. It would be unfair to look on the whole of this amount as the actual saving to the State—a certain number have been brought up in the State schools—but we will deduct a proportionate amount on account of Catholic children who have gone to the State schools, and there remains a balance of £80,000 in our favour, which has been saved to the State by the Catholic population in the Province of Auckland. We are now only asking for common justice, and there is no getting over the facts and figures I have given to the Committee.

THURSDAY, 23RD AUGUST, 1883.

Rev. RICHARD COFFEY, examined.

798. *Hon. the Chairman.*] You are a clergyman of the Church of England, in charge of a parish in this city?—Yes.

799. Are there any schools solely maintained by your religious body in this city?—Not that I am aware of.

800. Are you in the habit of visiting the State schools?—No.

801. Can you state the number of Roman Catholic children attending the State schools in Wellington?—Not as a matter of fact; but I believe they are exceedingly few.

802. Do you approve of the present State system of secular education?—Emphatically No.

803. Do you believe in the reading of the Bible in the State schools?—That is a question I cannot answer off-hand. If the Bible had been introduced as part of the system when it was first inaugurated I might have acquiesced in it as the least of two evils; but, now we have launched into a system of secular education, from which the Bible has been excluded, I do not think it expedient, on the ground of policy and of principle, to accept as a concession to our just demands the mere reading of the Bible, which might, unless other conditions were attached to it, prove a hindrance to the object we have in view rather than a help to it.

804. Will you state fully your reasons for objecting to the State system?—Yes. I presume that the State, in undertaking this important work—(1.) Desired to make men good citizens. Now, nine-tenths of the failures in this respect are due to want of self-government, yet no provision is made for the promotion of self-government; hence the New Zealand educational scheme is radically defective. (2.) I hold that religion is the chief factor in teaching men self-government, and the New Zealand educational scheme practically excludes religion. (3.) This exclusion is based upon an assumption that the Sunday-schools can teach religion—an assumption which is contrary to fact. It is manifest that an hour a week is not sufficient. It is also manifest that the Sunday-schools can only reach such children as are sent, and it is notorious that the children who are most in need of religious instruction are those not likely to be sent to any Sunday-school. (4.) I object to the present educational scheme because the New Zealand Church, represented by her Synods, especially by her General Synod, is dissatisfied with the present Act, and desires that it should be amended in the direction indicated by the petition just read, and bearing the signature of the Bishop of Christchurch as Primate. I beg to remind the Committee that this petition is the outcome of the laity as well as of the bishops and clergy, for voting is by orders, and there must be a majority of each order before any resolution is carried. (5.) I object as a patriot, for criminal statistics and revolutionary movements prove that knowledge may be used for wicked purposes. Moreover, there are many who account for the widespread “larrikinism” which prevails in Australia and New Zealand by pointing to the secular character of education imparted in these colonies. I agree with this solution; and a visit to any gaol would be instructive to many. (6.) I object on grounds of abstract justice to the New Zealand Educational Act. It is manifestly unfair to make Roman Catholics, Jews, and others who cannot avail themselves of the Act pay towards the maintenance of the scheme. In fact, the Act is in this respect a veiled penal tax, and that, too, in a country where liberty of conscience is supposed to exist. The Act must irritate and alienate a large class of men. History shows the danger and worthlessness of penal Acts. (7.) I object in the name of statesmanship. For it is a maxim of political economy that the State should not interfere unnecessarily. There is here an interference beyond what is necessary. The English system shows clearly that a national system may advantageously embrace voluntary schools. The business of the State is to supplement not to supplant voluntary effort. (8.) I object as a free-trader. For the New Zealand educational system is a monopoly, with the usual consequences—an enhanced price for the article produced, and a deterioration in the quality of work, due to the absence of any healthy competition. The English Education Act illustrates one of my contentions. The cost of educating a child in England in the voluntary school is £1 14s. 9d; in the Board school, £2 1s. 6½d. But, when allowance is made for fees, &c., the cost to the State for the voluntary school is 14s. 10½d.; while in the Board school the cost is £1 11s. 5½d.; that is, more than double. There is no account taken in this comparison of the cost of administration or the money sunk in buildings, which would make the comparison still more in favour of the voluntary school. To illustrate the tendency towards costliness, I may add that Mr. Forster, when introducing the measure into Parliament, stated that 3d. in the pound would suffice, whereas the average rate for England is 5d.; in London it is 7d.; and in some districts it reaches 2s. 6d. in the pound. As the English Church educates fully half the children, and, as the

Nonconformists educate a large portion of the remainder, it is clear that but for the voluntary schools the School Board rate would be oppressive beyond endurance. Lastly, I object to the New Zealand Education Act because—(a.) It is denominationalism in the worst form, namely, in the form of the secular school of thought. It is a concession to that very class that is likely to prove dangerous to the State. The fact that there are many Christian men in favour of it cannot alter my contention. (b.) It does not reach the very poorest—the class for which a national system should specially provide. (c.) It is, then, seeing that these poor who do not avail themselves of it pay taxes, a tax on the poor for the relatively rich.

805. Do you consider that purely secular education tends to increase crime and infidelity?—I do.

806. Do you consider that religious instruction should be left to parents—I mean taking the people at large?—As the people at large are incapable of giving it, I should think that absurd—like asking a man who has no arms to do manual work.

807. Do you think the Sunday-school is sufficient for religious instruction?—No; it is something which, if supplemented by something more, is useful.

808. Do you approve of denominational education?—Yes; on the grounds of justice and efficiency.

809. Do you consider the Catholics have a grievance under the present system?—Yes, a crying grievance.

810. What would you suggest to remove that grievance without doing injustice to other denominations?—I would have the system which prevails in England, where there is a denominational and a secular system, and where we hear of no grievance.

811. Do you approve of the first clause in the Synod's petition in relation to that?—Yes; but I would go further, and say that any individual man who was capable of educating should be recognized as well as denominationalists.

812. Do you approve the second clause in the Synod's petition?—I should be satisfied with that. There is a great deal of talk about ministers going to give religious instruction to children at the fag end of the day, or early in the day, but that must end in failure, and would give the children a distaste for religion.

813. Did you approve the third clause?—I should not oppose that. I should, of course, consider it absolutely necessary to consider the rights of conscience in any school the State recognized. I object rather to the wording of the clause. I would not leave it to the School Committee to select the portions of Scripture to be read. There might be an infidel or secular Committee elected, who might select undesirable passages, and the consequences would be disastrous.

814. *Hon. Mr. Dick.*] Did you attend the meeting of the Synod a few months back?—No.

815. *Mr. Fergus.*] You say the voluntary system is the cheaper in England, therefore you approve it. Have you considered that system with reference to New Zealand?—Yes; it must be manifest if the State had not to build the schools there would be less expense to the State. The denominationalists would not ask the State to build their schools. If the denominational system were recognized there are half a dozen buildings in the city which could be at once used as schools. And it is known that whenever the Government undertake a thing it is not done in the cheapest way; the object is to fleece them as much as possible.

816. The Bishop of Wellington has said the denominations would not be prepared to build the schools—that it would be unjust to ask them to do so?—I was not aware of that. I do not agree with it. We have the schools.

817. What number of pupils would constitute a strong school?—That is a very important point. It would be for the State, who undertook to pay money and recognize schools, to lay down conditions as to number. Perhaps forty or fifty—as many, at any rate, as would give full work to one teacher.

818. Do you know what it costs the State to teach a school of thirty children?—I should say about £6 per head.

819. On schools of not over forty we lose now an average of about £60 a year. Well, if all the large schools were split up into small ones by a denominational system, where would you raise the balance of the cost above the capitation?—I think the schools then could be worked for half the cost, as in England.

820. Well, supposing there was a school of twenty or thirty, with the present capitation of £4, would that be sufficient?—I see advertisements for teachers at salaries of £100. I think a denominational school would be more efficient for that £100, because there would be a great deal of voluntary work done.

821. But there are many other expenses besides teaching—cleaning, firing, repairs, and so on?—That would be.

822. You are assuming that all the parents would be members of the Church of England. In a small district where the total number of children would only make a small school—the parents would be of all denominations—you could not have the voluntary system there?—I presume the English Board system would be adopted.

823. Would you charge school fees in denominational schools?—I would charge fees in all schools. I think that is one cause of objection to the present system.

824. How much would school fees for all the country amount to per year?—I suppose about £200,000. The principle is more important than the amount.

825. *Mr. Fish.*] We are to assume that it is the opinion of the bishops and clergy of the Anglican Church that the denominational would be preferable to the present system?—Yes.

826. Can you tell us whether the bishops and clergy represent the feelings of the laity, or simply your own in this matter?—That is a difficult question. If you want a sound, wise opinion about medicine, the bulk of the people are unable to give it; you go to those who are capable of giving it. I say the bulk of the people are capable of giving only an ignorant opinion about this

matter, and I strongly suspect there is a large proportion who do not sympathize with their wise and learned teachers.

827. Then, do you admit that the bulk of the laity of the Church of England are in a state of dense ignorance in that respect?—I am sorry to state they have been largely leavened by evil example and evil living. Many of them were brought up in dissent, and you cannot change a man's skin with the change of climate.

828. Then, you admit that the clergy do not represent the laity in this matter, on account of their ignorance?—The only true test we have of the feelings of the laity is this: that in the Diocesan and General Synods we have elected lay members. A majority of the lay members must have assented to the resolution in the last General Synod to send this petition, and they expressed the educated opinion of our laity. I do not think they expressed the uneducated opinion of our Church people.

829. Can you tell the Committee that Church people do not send their children freely to the State schools?—Certainly we do. We make the best of the system, but we object to it.

830. Have you heard any serious objection from the laity of your Church against the present system?—Except so far as their opinions have been expressed in the Synods. It is not customary for the laity to teach their clergy, and therefore they are not likely to express their opinions to me.

831. *Mr. Swanson.*] What do you mean in saying they are not likely to give an expression of opinion in your presence?—I think they would be more disposed to learn than to teach.

832. I presume the intelligent portion of the laity are those who agree with you?—I do not know what deduction you infer. The representative laity agree with the clergy.

833. Do the electors of the colony agree as a body with the clergy?—How am I to gauge their opinions unless I gauge it by the only test available—the test of their representatives in the Synods who are elected.

834. Are not the representatives sent to this House equally as fair a test of the opinions of the people as any sent to the Synod?—Most decidedly not on this matter, for this reason: that on the hustings nothing must be said about religion, therefore this question cannot come upon the hustings at all. I know this question has arisen at the hustings, "Shall we have the Bible in schools or not?" but that is not the question at issue.

835. Has not this question been the question before the electors for the last three elections?—Apparently it was, but as a secular question; and, unfortunately, the class of people who govern elections are not the persons who take an interest in Church matters. I have heard it said in Wellington that two or three persons can carry any election. It looks, therefore, as if it was a caucus system.

836. Are you aware that the clergy in preaching sometimes tell the people how they ought to vote?—I am not aware of it; but I think if they do they behave very properly; they are as capable of giving an intelligent opinion as any one else. Laymen do the same thing to an infinitely greater degree with half the amount of knowledge.

837. But is it not caucusing to use the Church for that object?—I think if the clergy find themselves pressed they would be justified in using that means. Those people who provoke caucuses are the parties blamable.

838. Do you consider it is the duty of the State to see that the children are educated?—Yes, to see that they are educated.

839. If the denominations have had the assistance of the State in money and buildings and land to carry on education and failed, was it not the duty of the State to take it up?—It would have been the duty of the State to see that the conditions of any grant were carried out.

840. And if the contractor did not do the work, what then?—I presume it must be done by some one else.

841. But suppose the State took the work in hand when the contractor failed?—Then, that is violating the maxim that the State should not interfere in any business unless necessary.

842. But is it not necessary to educate the people?—It is not necessary to take education out of the hands of the people. I do not admit that the previous system broke down, and if there were two or three failures that was no reason why the State should take the whole thing upon itself.

843. If the State has for any reasons taken the education of youth into its own hands, is it not as well that it should teach those branches of knowledge that all parties are agreed upon?—That is begging the question. All parties are not agreed upon it. You eliminate a factor which some parties consider paramount, and assume there is agreement when there is disagreement. I would rather have a boy taught the three Rs, with the fear of God, than all that can be taught in the schools if he is made an infidel.

844. If the State is to teach the children, would it not be best for the State to keep clear of religion, and to teach only what most of the different sects have agreed upon?—I have first to grant your "if," and then to answer upon an hypothesis.

845. Is it desirable the State should see her children educated?—Will you define education? I hold that the education of the religious and moral element in man is an essential element in education.

846. Is it better that the children should grow up without education than that they should grow up without religion?—There is no such alternative. It is an assumption.

847. *Mr. Munro.*] What is the character of the religion you would have taught in schools?—I would let the different sects recognized in the State each teach their own religion. To get a common measure of religion is out of the question.

848. Do I understand you to say each sect should be at liberty to teach its own doctrines?—Yes.

849. You do not think it possible for the religious denominations to agree among themselves as to a common text-book containing religious instruction?—No; experience teaches us that that is

absolutely impossible. You have to eliminate so much to suit different parties that you have nothing but the grand idea of a God left.

850. A man taught that would be a better citizen than if not taught any religion at all?—Quite so.

851. Do you mean that denominational education means teaching the dogma of the different sects?—The State would only know what was taught the children in secular matters. The State should pay capitation for ascertained results in secular education, and allow the different denominations to do as they chose as to religious teaching—the State would know nothing of that.

852. *Hon. Mr. Barnicoat.*] Do you think those who had separate schools, whether large or small, should be satisfied if they received the capitation the State pays now?—Speaking for myself I should be satisfied. I should think the State would say to those who would not use the State schools, “We will give you so much per head for educating your children in your own school.” You strike out a general rule in that way, and all reasonable people would be satisfied. Of course, there would be some unreasonable people who would never be satisfied.

853. The State now pays £4 per head. Do you think the petitioners would be satisfied with that £4 whether their schools were large or small?—I think the denominationalists ought to be satisfied with that. I would be.

854. *Mr. Barron.*] Did I understand you to say that you were opposed to the present system, as excluding three-fourths of the people?—No; my opinion—whatever it is worth—is that, for one reason or another, the present system is not in accordance with the wishes of three-fourths of the people.

855. Then, you object to the system because you consider the majority of the people has not a system of which it approves?—Yes.

856. Then, should not any change in the present system be only such as would be approved by the majority?—I presume that is the law on which all changes are made. From an expression of opinion, which has been asked for, I believe it has been found over a limited area that the majority object to the present system.

857. Do you say your chief objection is that the system is not approved by the majority?—That is not my chief objection. My chief objection is that the present system practically excludes religious instruction.

858. You are aware that by our system of representation Parliament is supposed to be elected by the majority of the people?—You lay a stress on the word “supposed;” but I am also aware that on this matter it does not represent the wishes of the people.

859. But, whatever the outcome may be, the theory is that Parliament represents the majority of the people?—Yes; that is the theory—a pious fraud.

860. Do I understand you to say it is the duty of the State to educate the people?—I presume the State, in violating a political maxim, had some object in view—that is, the making of good citizens. I think it is right the State should see that the people are educated. I say the State should supplement, not supplant. It has supplanted. If the State saw any child that was not being educated, the State should see that it was educated. It is not doing that now, for the compulsory clauses are not being worked satisfactorily, and therefore the most dangerous classes of the people are not being educated at all. The people who are attended to are those who would attend to themselves, and the people who should be attended to by the State are not attended to at all.

861. You consider it the duty of the State to see that all children are educated?—Yes.

862. Then, any system approved by Parliament may be presumed to be adopted by the majority?—No. That is contrary to my conviction.

863. *Mr. J. Buchanan.*] Have you any experience in reference to the administration of the Act in Wellington?—No. I have been on a School Committee, and might be still a member, but holding my views I thought it was not quite loyal to them to remain a member. I have been more or less connected with education myself, and I was manager of three schools in Ireland. The manager there has the sole control of all schools under him. The schools under my charge were practically denominational. We had the two systems combined. I was one of the few clergy in Ireland who thought it was compatible to allow the State to interfere at all in schools.

864. When a member of the Committee, did you find it was the desire of the Committees to bring within their schools the children of every class in the community?—We had nothing to do with that matter. We met once a month, and attended to the affairs before us. There was a proposition made to bring into operation the compulsory clauses, and it was negatived. We felt it would be impossible to do it. I believe the same Committee has since declared they are in force, but they are a dead-letter.

865. Are there any officers to enforce it?—I believe not.

866. Will the police enforce it?—I am not aware.

867. Then, virtually, there are children left out?—Practically there are children who are not educated.

868. They are practically excluded?—There is no actual physical exclusion, but there is a *vis inertia* to keep them out.

869. Virtually, for what are termed the Arabs, there is no admission?—I believe there is a large section who are not in the schools.

870. Would it not be the duty of the State to recognize a distinction of classes, and provide ragged schools?—I am afraid that would not act in the colony. I think it would be the duty of the State to compel all to come in, and let those who object go out.

871. Is not the Act in favour of the better classes, rather than in favour of the poor?—Most decidedly.

872. *Hon. Mr. Acland.*] If the State does not educate all children down to the lowest, do you think the present system is practically a failure?—I should say it is a failure where it ought especially to succeed, and that it is a success where it is not required.

873. It is a failure amongst the class who most need assistance?—Laying stress upon what it ought to do, I say it is a failure.

874. If the system of granting State aid were begun, do you think it might be best brought in force in the large centres?—I conceive only in those centres.

875. And in the scattered districts the present system would have to be worked?—Yes.

876. The secular subjects taught in the aided schools should be up to the State standard?—Yes; the aid should only be given on ascertained results by State Inspectors.

877. And the teaching of dogma in such schools would be a separate subject?—Quite so; the State would have no knowledge of that.

APPENDIX.

ABSTRACT OF PETITIONS.

From Roman Catholics.

RECEIVED by Legislative Council, 59 petitions, containing 7,294 signatures; received by House of Representatives, 62 petitions, containing 9,293 signatures: total 121 petitions, 16,587 signatures. Prayer: That your petitioners are conscientiously opposed to the system of public education established in this colony. That they have, in consequence, established Roman Catholic schools, and maintained them at their own expense. That, under the circumstances, they feel themselves aggrieved at being compelled to contribute towards the maintenance of a system of education from which they derive no advantage, which puts them at a great disadvantage, and which is practically the cause of their being subjected to double taxation. That they are persuaded that, if they are to be treated as justice and equity dictate, their schools should be put on a footing of equality with public schools, or they should be exempted from taxation for public-school purposes. That they respectfully pray your honourable House to take the premises into consideration, and to devise such measures as will secure to the Roman Catholics of New Zealand justice and equitable treatment. And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

On behalf of Dunedin Catholic Literary Society.—Received by Legislative Council, 1 petition, containing 3 signatures; received by House of Representatives, 1 petition, containing 3 signatures: total, 2 petitions, 6 signatures. Prayer: That this society, established for the especial purpose of promoting the intellectual culture and higher education of the Catholic youth of Dunedin, is deeply impressed with the injustice to the Catholic body of the present system of education as established under the Education Act of 1877—a system which practically closes the State schools to Catholic children, and in Otago debars them from competing for scholarships, since the Education Boards have, in the exercise of their discretionary power, imposed conditions on the tenure which Catholic parents cannot accept for their children. That, under these circumstances, the Catholics throughout New Zealand have been constrained to establish schools of their own, and feel naturally and reasonably aggrieved that they should be compelled to contribute to maintain a system of State education from which they derive no advantage. That it is entirely a misapprehension to suppose that the agitation for justice and equity in the matter of public education originates with and is confined to the bishops and clergy of the Church. The Catholic laity have proved how deeply interested they feel, and how conscientiously earnest they are, by heavy and sustained sacrifice, as witness the highly-organized schools established throughout the colony, affording a sound elementary education, with careful moral training, to thousands of children. Your petitioners therefore respectfully pray your honourable House to take the premises into consideration, with the view of affording such relief as in your wisdom may seem fit.

From Members of the Church of England.

Received by Legislative Council, 2 petitions, containing 1,858 signatures; received by House of Representatives, 2 petitions, containing 1,888 signatures: total, 4 petitions, 3,746 signatures. Prayer: That your petitioners are convinced that any fully satisfactory measure for education by the State should contain a provision for grants-in-aid being made to schools set on foot by any religious denomination, provided that the attendance and secular instruction in such schools shall come up to the required standards and satisfy the Government Inspectors. Your petitioners are further of opinion that the Education Act should be so amended that provision may be made for the communication of religious instruction in the public schools by ministers of religion, or by persons duly authorized by them, to the children belonging to their respective communions, within school hours. Your petitioners therefore pray that effect may be given to the foregoing representations.

On behalf of the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church of England, in General Synod assembled.—Received by Legislative Council, 1 petition, containing 1 signature; received by House of Representatives, 1 petition, containing 1 signature: total, 2 petitions, 2 signatures. Prayer (in addition to the foregoing): Your petitioners are also of opinion that Local Committees should be empowered to direct that specified portions of Holy Scripture be subjects of instruction in the schools under their control, the rights of conscience being observed.

From Inhabitants of New Zealand, in Favour of Present System.

Received by House of Representatives, 52 petitions, containing 4,727 signatures. Prayer: That your petitioners view with very great concern the determined efforts that are being made by the Roman Catholics of New Zealand to secure an alteration in their favour of the Education Act now in force in the colony. Your petitioners understand that the Roman Catholics have already petitioned your honourable House, urging that they derive no advantage from the present Education Act as a reason why the Act should be amended as they desire. Your petitioners are convinced such representation of the Roman Catholics, if made to your honourable House, cannot be sustained

as true, the facts being that, not only are there several Inspectors under the Act and a large number of the teachers who are Roman Catholics, but it is also true that a very large number of Roman Catholic children are being taught in the common schools. Your petitioners would therefore humbly pray your honourable House to maintain intact the present free, secular, and compulsory clauses of the Education Act, and not allow any alteration therein to be made upon representations that are manifestly untrue, and which your petitioners are assured can be so proven should your honourable House decide to secure a return showing the facts of the case. And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

NOTE.—The following additional petitions have been received since the bringing up of the report: Inhabitants of New Zealand, in favour of present system, 9 petitions, containing 1,060 signatures.

STATISTICAL RETURN showing Population, Number of Scholars at the different Schools, Religious Denominations, and Number of Public and Private Schools in the Colony.

1. POPULATION of New Zealand, April, 1881, under and over twenty-one years of age, exclusive of Chinese and Maoris (Census Volume, page 64) :—

	Persons.	Males.	Females.
Under twenty-one years	258,560	129,833	128,727
Over twenty-one years	226,369	134,777	91,592
Totals	484,929	264,610	220,319

2. Population of New Zealand, 31st March, 1883 (exclusive of Chinese and Maoris), 517,129 persons.

3. Number of scholars at the different schools, for the fourth quarter of 1882 :—

	Persons.	Males.	Females.
At public schools	87,179	45,082	42,097
At superior schools (aided by Government) ...	1,899	1,327	572
At private schools	10,051	4,147	5,904
At industrial schools and orphanages ...	1,113	629	484
Totals	100,242	51,185	49,057

4. Numbers and proportions per cent. of the population of New Zealand, belonging to different religious denominations, as shown by the census of April, 1881 (Page 218) :—

	Persons.	Proportions per cent.
Episcopalians	203,333	41.50
Presbyterians	113,108	23.08
Methodists	46,657	9.53
Other Protestants	30,873	6.30
Catholics	69,039	14.09
Other denominations—		
Latter-day Saints	271	.06
Jews	1,536	.31
Mahometans	7	...
Pagans	4,936	1.01
Others	237	.05
Of no denomination, unspecified, or "objected to state"	19,936	4.07
Total population	489,933*	100.00

5. Number of public and private schools in the colony during the fourth quarter of 1882: Public schools, 911; superior aided schools, 17; private schools, 262; industrial schools and orphanages, 10: total, 1,200.

30th July, 1883.

WM. R. E. BROWN.

* Including 4,936 pagans, principally Chinese; or 5,004 Chinese, principally pagans.