

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.