

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.