

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.