

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.