

1880.

NEW ZEALAND.

CAVERSHAM INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL :

(REPORT OF COMMISSION APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO THE WORKING AND MANAGEMENT OF).

Laid upon the Table by the Hon. the Minister of Education, by leave of the House.

No. 1.

The Hon. the MINISTER of EDUCATION to W. L. SIMPSON, Esq.

SIR,—

Education Department, Wellington, 13th July, 1880.

The Government, in compliance with a request which has been made to them, have deemed it advisable that an inquiry should be made into the management of the Otago Industrial School at Caversham.

I have the honor to request you to be good enough to consent to hold the proposed inquiry, in conjunction with Mr. A. C. Strode, of Dunedin.

It is not thought necessary that a commission should be issued by the Governor. Should you and Mr. Strode favour the Government with your services, I will send you the correspondence on the subject, which contains a statement of the matters respecting which an inquiry has been sought. If, after consideration of the correspondence, you should consider it necessary to examine witnesses on oath, a commission by the Governor will be issued in the usual way.

I shall be obliged by your kindly replying by telegram.

W. L. Simpson, Esq., R.M., Dunedin.

I have, &c.,

WM. ROLLESTON.

[NOTE.—Similar letter to above sent to Mr. A. C. Strode.]

No. 2.

The Hon. the MINISTER of EDUCATION to W. L. SIMPSON, Esq.

(Telegram.)

Wellington, 26th July, 1880.

Re Industrial School inquiry. Please look into correspondence with Rev. Davis concerning clergymen's visits for religious instruction, and report thereon, and recommend best and fairest course to follow regarding such visits, so as to make satisfactory provision without unduly interfering with general education, and the proper routine work of the institution. Also please inquire into and recommend generally as to best arrangements both for the inmates of school and children placed out on all points which appear to you and Mr. Strode deserving of consideration. Further correspondence just received will be forwarded by post to-day.

W. L. Simpson, Esq., Dunedin.

WM. ROLLESTON.

No. 3.

MATTERS to be inquired into *re* Caversham Industrial School.

1. To inquire whether the children mentioned in the return laid upon the table of the Legislative Council have been placed out under His Excellency the Governor's power of delegation, clause 7, Abolition of Provinces Act; and, if not, by what authority have they been so placed.

2. To inquire by what process six boys and nineteen girls have been adopted—some of the latter by single men apparently—there being no power of adoption in either the English or Scottish law. And may not adoption prove to be synonymous with slavery?

3. To inquire whether the master of the Industrial School applied to a Resident Magistrate for permission to return certain children to their prostitute mother, and, notwithstanding the committing Magistrate's indignant refusal, the children were so returned.

4. To inquire whether there may not be other and similar cases to the above.

5. To inquire into the following system which prevails in Dunedin: A vagrant with a child at the breast is brought before the Police Court, the woman is committed to the gaol, and the infant, probably a few months old, is sent to the Industrial School. Two years ago six of these unfortunates,

deprived of their natural aliment and warmth, perished in one year. The matter was reported to the Government, who directed that in future the infants were to be farmed-out. The average mortality of the infants so farmed-out is very high this year. The Commission to report upon this blot on our civilization.

6. To inquire into the dangerous position of a number of the younger children, who are sleeping three in a bed in an upper room, where they would all be inevitably roasted to death in the event of a fire. And whether space could not be found on the ground floor, from the ample accommodation at present occupied by the master and his family.

No. 4.

The Hon. T. FRASER, M.L.C., to the Hon. the MINISTER of JUSTICE.

SIR,—

Wellington, 6th July, 1880.

In my letter of yesterday's date it escaped me to mention that before leaving Dunedin I visited the Industrial School, when I informed the master that it was my intention, if possible, to have all the placed-out children put under the protection of the police. The master deprecated any such movement on my part.

Mr. Weldon, Chief of the Police, informed me that, without any extra cost to the colony, the police could periodically visit and report upon the condition of the children. On that occasion Mr. Weldon informed me that the police had interfered in one case of cruelty to placed-out children on the Wakatipu.

I have, &c.,

The Hon. W. Rolleston, Minister of Justice.

T. FRASER, M.L.C.

No. 5.

REPORT.

SIR,—

Dunedin, 23rd August, 1880.

In compliance with the request contained in your letter of the 13th July, asking us to hold an inquiry into the management of the Otago Industrial School at Caversham, and accompanying such request by a series of questions to be inquired into, numbered from one to six both inclusive, we have made the inquiry, and have now the honor to state our views upon the several matters which came under our notice and are touched upon in the questions. We have had before us all the persons who in our judgment we deemed could afford us information, and their evidence will accompany this report.

Matter No. 1.—With reference to this question, we requested the master to produce all warrants authorizing the licensing-out of the children named in the return alluded to. He was enabled to produce them all, with the exception of those for numbers 21, 26, 34, 40, 43, 52, 99, and 100, which, apparently, he says, had been mislaid, or had miscarried on their transit to or from Wellington. One of those warrants he recollects transmitting to Wellington; but he never received it back. The whole of the warrants produced to us were strictly in order, and signed either by His Excellency the Governor himself, or by some one holding his delegated powers.

Matter No. 2.—With reference to this question, we found that, although in the return of children alluded to the word "adopted" is used, that word is only meant to express that the child was licensed-out, the warrant in both cases being precisely the same. We took exception to the word "adopted" being used, inasmuch as it has no existence in the Act, and only tended to mislead. The master, seeing the force of our objection, promised in future the word should not be used. As regards the remark that some of the girls had been licensed to "single men, apparently," we found that in every instance the whole of the children had been licensed-out to married men, with one exception, that exception being in the case of Mary T— to the Rev. Father Crowley, a Roman Catholic priest at Lawrence. This girl was licensed-out two years ago, her age then being ten years.

Matter No. 3.—In connection with this question, we have taken particular pains to ascertain the correctness of this statement, and the only case that we discovered as giving any colour to it was the case of a family named J—, the circumstances of which were as follows: On 16th October, 1877, five children, one an infant twenty months old, were committed by the Resident Magistrate at Outram to the institution, the abandoned character of the mother, and the father's avocation taking him constantly from home, being the reasons. On 22nd October in same year the father applied to the master of the institution for the release of the children from the institution. The master declined to release them, saying he would write to the committing Magistrate; he accordingly did so, in terms of the copy of letter attached (marked A). On the 24th October, 1877, the Magistrate replied to the effect that he would not consent to release the four elder children, but he saw no objection to the infant being returned to its parents during the good behaviour of its mother. This letter is attached, and marked B. The master, consequent upon this communication, licensed the infant to the father. On the 4th of February, 1878, the Magistrate sent a telegram to the master withdrawing his consent to the infant being any longer intrusted to the mother's care, and on the 5th of the same month the master, in a letter to the Magistrate, asked him to instruct the police to return the child to the institution. This was not done, and consequently the child remained with its parents. A copy of the Magistrate's telegram and the master's, marked respectively C and D, are attached. With reference to the other children, we find that in July, 1878, the master received a letter from the wife of the Magistrate, in her husband's absence in the North Island, requesting him, in consequence of the mother being at the point of death, to allow the four children in his custody to visit their mother. This letter has been mislaid, but it will be found alluded to in a letter by the master to the Magistrate, dated 15th July, 1878, a copy of which is attached. In view of the circumstances of the case, the master allowed the four children to go and see their mother, as desired. The mother died, and the father then requested that the children might be licensed to him. The master, in consequence, wrote to the Magistrate on 15th July, 1878, a copy of which letter is attached (marked E), asking if he had

any objection to the children being so licensed to the father. The Magistrate replied, *vide* letters attached (marked F and G), and dated 17th and 23rd July, 1878, respectively, stating that, seeing the mother had died, who was the main cause of the children having been committed, and the father had given up the avocation of a carrier, and consequently was better able to supervise the children, he offered no objection to their being licensed out to the father.

Matter No. 4.—On inquiry, we find that the case referred to in matter No. 3 is the only one having any connection with the circumstances detailed in the question.

Matter No. 5.—We find that the system here referred to does prevail in Dunedin, inasmuch as the Neglected and Criminal Children Act makes no restriction as to the age when children are to be committed; and it is to be feared that Magistrates, upon very slender grounds, are induced to commit infant children to the institution, whom, we have not the slightest hesitation in saying, ought not to be so committed. We find also that careless parents, particularly those whose offspring are illegitimate, resort to all sorts of means to take advantage of the institution, and get rid of the trouble of raising their infant children. We admit that parents so indifferent to their parental duty are unfit to have charge of children; but nevertheless we are of opinion that, with a view to prevent the abuse of the institution, the Act might with advantage be altered so as to prevent the admission of children to the institution under the age of twelve months, unless in extreme cases, as where the mothers have to be sent to gaol. Children under the age of twelve months cannot, we think, be contaminated to any extent by evil example, and, as a rule, are not subjected to cruel treatment. Both the surgeon and master have repeatedly brought this subject of the committal of infant children under the notice of the Magistrates and the Government, pointing specially to the mortality resulting from the system. The master states that four infants died in the institution during the year 1878, and not six, as stated in this question. With regard to the question of infants being “farmed-out,” we presume that it has been intended to say “placed out,” as farming-out of infants is a system of the most objectionable character, and we should imagine, therefore, would never have been sanctioned by any Government, far less suggested. At the suggestion of the surgeon and master several children have been “placed out” with separate wet-nurses, with the view of lessening the mortality by providing the children with the nearest approach to their natural aliment. Within the last twelve months four children have been so placed out, two of whom have died. This is a high percentage of death; but, from the surgeon’s evidence, we are of opinion that it is more than probable the whole of the infants would have died had they been kept in the institution. It was for the reason that these four were weakly children they were so placed out. On this question we are of opinion that the system of placing out infants with wet-nurses should prevail as extensively as possible, for, as the surgeon remarked, the herding together of a number of infants in the institution is a near approach to the much condemned system of baby-farming. The children which have already been placed out are regularly visited by the master; and the surgeon, when he is required, attends them.

Matter No. 6.—We considered it our duty to examine minutely the sleeping accommodation of the institution, as also the master’s quarters. It is quite true that, for want of sufficient sleeping accommodation, a number of the younger children have to sleep three in a bed in upper rooms. With regard to one in particular of these rooms, we are of opinion that it is unsuitable for the purpose, not so much from the fact of the children having to sleep three in a bed, as that the roof is most objectionably low, nor is the means of ingress and egress sufficient. This, we think, however, could, with a very small expenditure, say, £54, be remedied and the room made suitable for the purpose. As to the danger from fire, we found that it was at a minimum, not at all greater, if so great, as the risk attending an ordinary wooden private dwelling-house, the precautionary measures adopted by the master against fire are so ample and satisfactory. In answer to the question as to whether space could be found “on the ground-floor from the ample accommodation at present occupied by the master and his family” for some of the younger children, we certainly feel bound to say, after examination, that the quarters assigned to the master and his family are not at all in excess of their absolute requirements, and should not on any account be curtailed.

In reference to the subject of the Hon. Captain Fraser’s letter of 6th July—namely, his desire to have all the children licensed-out put under the protection of the police, to be reported on by them periodically, we think that such a course is open to objection. We agree with the master in thinking that it is most desirable to bring up the children in the institution as free as possible from the feeling that they are in any way different from other children, and to carry out the idea that the master and matron are to be looked upon in the character of parents, and the institution a home. We think it would be antagonistic to this idea if they were to be placed directly under police surveillance. The present practice of the master is to encourage a correspondence between the children licensed-out and himself, and when this correspondence is not regularly kept up he asks the assistance of the police to make inquiry as to the satisfactory condition of the children or otherwise. This assistance has always been freely given. We find that this system has hitherto worked very satisfactorily, and should not at present be disturbed, particularly as we think it would tend to diminish the interest it is evident the master takes in the children licensed-out as well as those in the institution. The fact that there have been several instances of children licensed-out coming to the master and asking to be taken back to the school is the strongest evidence of the feeling existing between master and children. It would be advisable, with the view of facilitating the correspondence with the children and police, which, considering the number of children, is no easy task, that lithographed forms be supplied to the master; this would also enable the register of the correspondence which is kept to be more easily so kept.

Re Religious Instruction.—We have the honor to state that, in compliance with your request contained in your telegram of 26th July last, we have perused the correspondence on the subject, and have made full inquiry into the whole matter at issue.

We find that up to 1877 very few ministers of any denomination, with the exception of the Roman Catholic priests, ever visited the institution for the purpose of imparting religious instruction to the children. From the attendance book we find that, for the seven years previous to 1877, the Roman

Catholic priests paid 202 visits, while the Protestant ministers only made thirty-seven visits. In 1877 the Rev. Mr. Davis, then a student of theology, commenced his visits, and about the same time other Protestant clergymen began to pay regular weekly visits, taking it each in turn. Mr. Davis, however, at this time declined to have his name placed on the same list as the others, and for a time, to suit Mr. Davis's wishes, he was accommodated separately on the same day of the week as the others. This proving to interfere with the routine of the school, the master appointed Saturday evening for Mr. Davis to attend, and this course was continued up to October, 1879, when the Thursday was again reverted to, as the master wished the Saturday evening in summer to be devoted to the recreation of the children. In April last Mr. Davis seems to have become sick, and unable to attend the institution for some considerable time. On resuming his visits to the institution the master informed him that it was now necessary that he should take his turn with the other Protestant clergymen, as he could not be accommodated with a separate room, as now only the two schoolrooms were at the disposal of the clergy on Thursday. The one was occupied by the Roman Catholic priest and the other by the Protestant clergymen, including two of the Church of England, in their turns. Mr. Davis again refused to take his turn, and discontinued his visits. It came out in the course of our inquiry that the master had seen fit to call Mr. Davis's attention to some remarks that he (Mr. Davis) had made to the children on denominationalism, which the master considered injudicious. Under the circumstances it is quite possible that the master may have allowed this to influence him a little in not being over-anxious to provide Mr. Davis with separate accommodation, although we are satisfied that, with the accommodation at his disposal, it would be impossible, without disorganization, to afford ministers of every denomination separate apartments, or to do more in that direction than is done at present—namely, giving up the two schoolrooms on Thursday, one to the Roman Catholic priest and the other to a Protestant clergyman.

The Rev. Mr. Davis contends that, inasmuch as, upon the committal of the child to the institution, it forms part of the Magistrate's order that the child should be brought up in a certain faith, it would be impossible satisfactorily to teach the tenets of the Church of England without having a separate room. By "The Neglected and Criminal Children Act, 1867," section 17, it would appear that the Magistrate, when committing a child to the institution, is compelled even to state the denomination to which, in his opinion, the child belongs; and the Government make no provision for carrying out the terms of it, but depend on the voluntary services of ministers of all denominations. Bearing in mind this clause, and the fact of no provision being made, we are of opinion that the only course open to adopt with regard to the religious instruction of the children, with a view of interfering as little as possible with their secular education, and seeing that the children in the institution may be said to be divided into three classes—Roman Catholics, Church of England, and Presbyterians—the latter embracing all other Protestant children, would be to set apart one hour in one day of the week for a minister of each of those denominations to attend and give religious instruction to their children respectively. The master ought, therefore, to be directed to make arrangements accordingly. On this subject we would desire to state our views. We deem it very desirable that the Act should be amended in the direction of either abolishing clause 17 altogether, or only recognizing two classes—Roman Catholics and Protestants—in connection with the persuasion, creed, or denomination to which the children are supposed to belong. If this were done it would become comparatively a simple matter to provide for the religious instruction of the children, which could be carried out in a similar way to the system adopted in gaols and many kindred institutions—namely, by a Protestant chaplain and a Roman Catholic priest. The division into two classes suggested by us is, we think, a far preferable course than that at present prevailing, of the Magistrate, in almost every case, having in an arbitrary way to say to what denomination a child belongs, the parents being of no religion.

Generally, we would express our great satisfaction with the management of the institution, and the suitability and zeal of the master and matron. The buildings are, however, for the most part only of a very temporary order, and afford only scant accommodation for the number of children at present in the institution. We would specially bring under your notice a statement of the master to the effect that if the Government would set apart 250 acres of really good land to be farmed by the inmates of the institution, that he (the master) was confident that the institution would require no further pecuniary aid from the State. This idea we consider thoroughly practicable, and, if a piece of good land could be found in a convenient situation, we would recommend the suggestion being carried into effect.

We have, &c.,

A. CHETHAM STRODE.

W. MAURICE SIMPSON.

The Hon. the Minister of Education, Wellington.

NOTES of Inquiry made at the Industrial School, Caversham, on 6th August, 1880.

Elijah Titchener, master of the Industrial School, states that all the children whose names appear in the return of the children licensed-out laid upon the table of the Legislative Council, with the exception of the first six, were licensed-out by me as master, under warrants. The first warrant, that of Alice L —, purports to be issued by His Honor the Superintendent of the Province of Otago; but I observe now it is not signed. I received the warrant from the then Provincial Solicitor through the post, and until now I did not observe that it was unsigned. The warrants in the case of Elizabeth W —, No. 8, and Charles D —, No. 9, are signed respectively by the Deputy-Superintendent and the Superintendent of the Province of Otago. No. 10, the warrant for Morris A —, is signed by Mr. George McLean, Executive Officer for Otago. No. 22, the warrant in William P —'s case, is signed by the Superintendent of Otago, as likewise from No. 1 to No. 6 inclusive. The warrants for 21, 26, 34, 40, 43, 52, 99, and 100 I am unable to produce, although I am satisfied that in every case of a child being licensed-out the necessary warrant was made out by me and sent to Wellington for the necessary signature. All the warrants for the other children named in the list are signed by the Governor of the colony, and are now produced. I have never in any one instance taken upon myself

to allow a child to leave the establishment to be licensed-out without preparing a warrant in due form for transmission to Wellington for signature, and I never omitted to transmit them. This disposes of matter No. 1.

Matter No. 2.—With regard to the six boys and nineteen girls having been adopted, I explain that, although the word “adopted” has been used, these children are precisely in the same category as those licensed, the same form of warrant having been used in these cases, and the same police surveillance used. In reference to the statement that some of the nineteen girls have been adopted by single men apparently, I state positively that such has not been the case in any one instance since I have been master of the institution, with the exception of Mary T—— to the Rev. Father Crowley, Roman Catholic priest. This girl was ten years of age when she was licensed-out, exactly two years ago.

Matter No. 3.—I have never “applied to a Resident Magistrate for permission to return certain children to their prostitute mother, and, notwithstanding the committing Magistrate’s indignant refusal, the children have been so returned.” In the case of the family, J——, who were received into the institution on 16th October, 1877, committed by the Resident Magistrate at Outram, the father, Louis J——, applied to me, on the 22nd October, 1877, for the release of his children from the school. I declined, and wrote to the committing Magistrate, who authorized me, in terms of his letter now produced, to license the infant child, twenty months old, to the father; and I did so. After the child was so licensed-out, the Magistrate, three months after, withdrew his permission, when I wrote to the Magistrate requesting him to instruct the police to rearrest and bring the child back to the school, which was never done. In the early part of July, 1878, I received a letter from the Magistrate’s wife, who wrote in her husband’s absence in the North Island, asking that the other children in my charge should be allowed to go home and see their mother, who was dying. I permitted them to go, and informed Mr. Fulton, the Magistrate, accordingly by letter. The mother died, and I subsequently received a letter from the Magistrate approving of my action, and permitting the children to be licensed to the father, the mother being dead.

Matter No. 4.—Answered under heading No. 3.

Matter No. 5.—I have frequently earnestly protested against the system referred to in this article, but, the Act giving the Magistrate no discretion, the system still prevails. In 1878 four infants died under my charge. I received no special instructions as to the farming-out of infants, but, at my suggestion, several have since been placed out with separate wet-nurses, quite a different thing from farming-out. Within the last twelve months four infants have been placed out, two of whom have died. I take every possible precautionary measure to insure every care being taken of the infants placed out. I, in company with the medical officer of the institution, frequently visit the children.

Matter No. 6.—I take every precaution to prevent the chance of fire, and I do not think the risk is greater in this institution than in any ordinary dwelling-house, perhaps not so great, as I have trained the boys to act as a fire brigade, and have also, with the assistance of the boys, provided an ample water supply. With regard to the question as to whether space could not be found in my quarters for the children referred to, I will leave that for the actual inspection of the gentlemen making the inquiry.

On the Hon. Captain Fraser visiting the institution prior to his going to Wellington he stated his intention of getting the police to make inquiries of the children placed out and report direct to the Government. I suggested that the continuance of the present system was preferable. At present I keep up a correspondence with the children, or the persons with whom they are placed, and with the police, and up to the present I have found the system work well.

Robert Burns.—I am a legally-qualified medical practitioner, and medical officer to Industrial School. Have been so since its establishment. I had on various occasions to report the inadvisability of having children under twelve months committed to the institution, as, without having a nurse to each child, it would be impossible to rear them, and my reports may have led to the system of having had children in a few cases placed out with wet-nurses, and this system I much prefer to having those very young children in the institution. My opinion is that having a large number of babies in the institution necessarily reared by hand would be practically instituting a baby-farm, a system so much condemned in Britain, and almost every other place. The children placed out by the institution were each given to a separate nurse. When requested I visit the children so placed out. I cannot say from memory the percentage of deaths among infants before any were placed out; but I have no hesitation in saying that the mortality of those placed out will be lower than if they were retained in the institution. I certainly am of opinion that the institution ought to have larger sleeping accommodation, but I cannot say as medical officer that the children’s health has suffered from this cause. There is one apartment which would be much better of having the roof raised, and a new entrance to it might be provided. The fact of three sleeping in a bed has had no detrimental effect. As to risk of fire, I think it less in the institution than in a private house built of wood. As medical officer I would not countenance the increasing of the sleeping accommodation at the expense of curtailing the master’s quarters. Generally, I would remark that, with the appliances at command, the institution is as complete as it could be, and, if more ample sleeping accommodation was provided, and a small detached building to be used as an hospital for the isolation when necessary of infectious diseases, I would pronounce the institution complete. As medical officer I have a very high opinion of the present master as being particularly suitable for the institution, as likewise is the matron, and I would say that the good health of the children is due to their unremitting care and attention.

Henry Houghton.—I am Honorary Inspector to the Industrial School, and have been so for about three years. I would call the attention of the gentlemen making the inquiry to numerous cases of commitment of children under twelve months, and the necessity of some prohibition being inserted in any future amendment of the law. As regards the religious teaching of the children, the order of the Magistrate has invariably been carried out in its integrity. The practice has been to allow the Roman Catholic priest attending the institution to have a separate room on one day in the week, at a special hour, for the instruction of the children of his faith. Until within the last three years the clergy

of the Church of England made no provision for the religious teaching of children to be brought up in that faith. Any religious teaching afforded to such children was given by ministers of other Protestant denominations, at irregular times. On my assuming the duties of Honorary Inspector I was struck with the paucity of visits paid by ministers of the Protestant denominations. On reference to the attendance book it will be seen that during the preceding seven years the Roman Catholic clergy had visited the school on 202 occasions; other clergymen on 37 occasions. I was so much struck that I drew the attention of Dr. Stuart, of Knox Church, to the fact, and to the number of Presbyterian children in the school. Immediately after a Presbyterian clergyman was appointed to Caversham, who made weekly visits. About the same time clergymen of the Church of England began to visit the school, and a young student, a Mr. Davis, belonging to the Church of England, began to give regular instruction. I believe it was in March, 1877, he commenced, and continued doing so until six months ago. I am not aware that any interruption was made to his teaching up to that time, two clergymen of the Church of England visiting the school during that time in turn with other Protestant ministers. The master complained to me about six months ago that he had not accommodation for three clergymen giving instruction at once—that was the Roman Catholic priest, Mr. Davis, and the Presbyterian minister. I told the master to make the best arrangement he could, so long as the discipline of the school was not interfered with. Subsequently I received a letter from the master, complaining of Mr. Davis's teaching, and the demand he was making for the separation of the Church of England children from all other Protestant children, and that he (the master) had no accommodation for such without disturbing the routine work of the school. The particular teaching complained of was, when addressing the whole of the Protestant children, he (Mr. Davis) stated that the Presbyterians and other dissenting bodies were further removed from the truth than the Roman Catholics. I took no notice of this, but some time after Mr. Davis addressed a letter to the master, demanding as a right accommodation to be found for him to instruct the children of the Church of England. I told the master that his request could not be granted, and he must take his turn with the other clergymen of the Church of England. The other clergymen of that Church had made no demand for separate accommodation, or expressed any desire to teach the children of their Church separate from the other Protestant children. The first time I again heard of this matter was when I received from the master the letter of date 22nd July, 1880, received by him from Bishop Nevill.

Elijah Titchener.—Mr. Davis commenced his visits in 1877. At this time the school was visited regularly every week by a minister of one of the Protestant denominations, including the Church of England. A register was kept, and each took it in turn. Mr. Davis, to my knowledge, refused to have his name placed in the same list as the others. To meet Mr. Davis's wishes, as he would not take his turn with the others, I allowed him to visit the school every Saturday evening, and this practice continued up to October, 1879. Mr. Davis then discontinued his visits. I heard nothing of him until two months ago, when I learned sickness had caused him to cease his visits. He about two months ago visited the school, and wished to instruct the children on Thursday afternoons. I told him he could not be accommodated, as the Roman Catholic clergyman had one schoolroom and the Protestant clergyman the other. I had no place to give him on that day. The dining-room, which had at one time been allowed to be used, could not now be, as it was required for a laundry. During the time that Mr. Davis came on the Saturday evenings he took the whole of the Protestant children to teach, not selecting those of his own faith; and it was on one of those evenings, while all the children were assembled, that he made use of the expressions I communicated to Mr. Houghton. I was present and heard the expressions, and drew his attention to them, and told him, if that was his teaching, I could not allow the children belonging to denominations other than the Church of England to receive his teaching. This was shortly before he was taken ill. On Mr. Davis's return I could not have given him Saturday evening, even if he wished, as I devote Saturday evenings to readings and music with the whole of the children.

The Rev. Henry J. Davis states: I have been in the habit of visiting the Industrial School for about three years, or nearly so, weekly. Up to about twelve months ago my visits were made on Thursday afternoons, at 3 p.m. For about the first nine months I had the whole of the children not classed as Roman Catholics assembled in the schoolroom for religious instruction. I was the only one giving religious instruction at that time to the Protestant children. At the expiration of the first nine months a minister of some of the other Protestant denominations began to visit regularly on Thursday, when the Church of England children were separated, and I instructed them by themselves; and I think I did so for about eighteen months. The master then represented to me that it was inconvenient for me to visit on Thursday, and for some months I consequently made my visits on Saturday evening, being the day named by the master. On the Saturday evenings I taught all children sent to me. To the best of my belief there were only Church of England children sent; there may have been others. This arrangement lasted for four or five months, I should say, when the master represented to me that Saturday evening was an inconvenient time, being, in the summer time, the only opportunity the children had for recreation. I, in consequence, resumed my visits on Thursday afternoon. I was then allowed to have one or two class-rooms at 3 p.m., the other Protestant ministers having the use of the other room. This last arrangement continued until I took sick about April last. The Rev. Mr. Byng, of the Church of England, paid irregular visits during the period I have spoken of, and when he was there I gave way to him, and he taught the children. Mr. Byng taught the whole of the Protestant children on the occasions he was there. Up to the time I was ill the Roman Catholics were accommodated in the dining-room, I believe. I was absent from the institution by reason of sickness for more than six weeks. I resumed my visits at the end of that period, and was told by the master that he had not sufficient accommodation to enable me to get a separate room, as the Roman Catholics were occupying one of the schoolrooms now, and that I would require to take my turn monthly with other ministers, which I refused to do. He (the master) had previous to this to make arrangements with the other Protestant ministers as to my visits. The master offered me the use of the schoolroom on Sundays if I would take it. My other arrangements would not admit of this. I have since then discontinued

my visits, having handed over the matter to the Bishop. I had conversations with the master on several occasions as to my teaching, he having seen fit to find fault with my teaching, and particularly when I, on one occasion, in addressing the children, said that English dissenters were further removed from dogmatic truth than Roman Catholics. What led to my making any such remark was the fact that the master had informed me that the children had been calling each other Presbyterians, Catholics, &c. He considered that I, in desiring to teach the Church of England children separately, was helping to perpetuate these differences. There may have been other children than those of the Church of England present when I made the statement above, but I had not asked for them. The master seemed to object to my attending weekly, and having a separate room after the other Protestant ministers began to visit regularly.

Enclosures.

A.

SIR,—

Industrial School, Caversham, 22nd October, 1877.

The bearer, Mr. Louis J—, has called on me this morning, with the intention of taking his children from the school. I have informed him that I could not take upon myself the responsibility of liberating them without consulting you, you being the committing Magistrate. I would therefore respectfully request that you would be pleased to let me know whether it would be in accordance with your wish that the children should be liberated.

I would beg to state that, should you consider it advisable, I could license the children to the father for the period for which you committed them; and, should the mother misconduct herself again, I could withdraw the children from their parents.

I have, &c.,

E. TITCHENER,

Master.

James Fulton, Esq., Resident Magistrate, West Taieri.

B.

SIR,—

Outram, 24th October, 1877.

In reply to your letter of the 22nd instant, referring to Louis J—'s application to withdraw his children from the Industrial School, I have to inform you that I called yesterday, but found you out.

I have informed J— that his children were not committed without grave consideration on my part, and after long personal acquaintance with the way in which they have been not only neglected, but trained in evil habits, by the example and precepts of their drunken and depraved mother. Under these circumstances I will be no party to placing the children under the same evil influences, nor of letting the mother have control of them until she has shown by reformed habits that she has turned over a new leaf.

As, however, the little one (twenty months old, as I am told) cannot be contaminated by her mother's conduct, and seeing that the father has his eldest daughter at home, who can save the child from neglect, I have no objection, if you can legally see your way to it, to consent to its being restored to the parents during the good behaviour of the mother, with the distinct understanding that, if she breaks out again, the child will be at once taken from her and returned to your care.

With regard to the two girls, I am given to understand that Mrs. J—'s married sisters, both, I believe, highly respectable women, intend to apply to have their nieces licensed to them. To this I can have no objection, provided they distinctly understand that while under their charge they are not to be committed to the mother's care, even for a time, until she has shown herself worthy of the trust.

I have, &c.,

JAMES FULTON, R.M.

Mr. E. Titchener, Master, Caversham Industrial School.

C.

(Telegram.)

I WITHDRAW my consent to Caroline J— being any longer intrusted to her mother's care.

Mr. Titchener, Caversham.

Outram, 4th February, 1878.

JAMES FULTON, R.M.

D.

SIR,—

Industrial School, Caversham, 5th February, 1878.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram of yesterday's date *re* child Caroline J—.

I am really at a loss to know what to do. I have 234 children in the school; every corner of the place is full, and what to do with another I do not know. I have written to the Government, stating the circumstances in which I am placed; and Dr. Burns, the medical officer, has written to Mr. Watt, the Resident Magistrate in Dunedin, stating that it "is fraught with danger to all inmates and officers to make a single fresh admission." The infants are simply poisoning each other, and, to make matters worse, the whooping-cough has just made its appearance among the children. But, as a matter of course, if you order the child to be returned to the institution I must take it in.

I am afraid I am going to have something to do to get the maintenance money from J—; I have made repeated demands, but can get nothing.

In the event of your ordering the child to be returned, may I beg that you would instruct the police stationed near you to rearrest and bring the child here.

I have, &c.,

E. TITCHENER,

Master.

J. Fulton, Esq., R.M., West Taieri.

E.

SIR,—

Industrial School, Caversham, 15th July, 1878.

I have the honor to request that you will be pleased to inform me whether Louis J— is fit and proper person to take charge of his children.

Some little time ago I received a letter from Mrs. Fulton asking me to allow the children to go home to see their mother, who was dying. I permitted J—— to take them away, on the distinct understanding that they should be returned. He now applies to have the whole of them licensed to him. I am pleased to say that I have plenty of accommodation; and if you consider that J—— is not a fit person to take charge of his family, I will correspond with the Superintendent of Police, and have the children brought back.

I have, &c.,

E. TITCHENER,

Master.

James Fulton, Esq., R.M., West Taieri.

F.

Outram, 17th July, 1878.

SIR,—

During my absence in the North I find that the circumstances connected with the family of the J——s under your care have altered, owing to the death of the mother.

As I understand your institution is crowded, might I suggest for the consideration of the Inspector the propriety of letting out the children to the father on trial for a period of, say, six months. He professes a desire to have charge of them, and, as he has given up the business of a carrier, he may be able to exercise reasonable supervision. You may remember that it was owing to the mother's drunken and immoral habits, and the father's continued absence from home, that the children were committed to the Industrial School.

I have, &c.,

JAMES FULTON.

The Master, Industrial School, Caversham.

G.

Outram, 23rd July, 1878.

SIR,—

In reply to yours of the 15th instant relative to J——'s character, it is probable that a recent letter of mine will have answered your queries. I may say that, in my opinion, it would be a very reasonable thing to let J—— have his children on trial, as I previously suggested. His character would not have justified me in sending his children to the Industrial School.

I have, &c.,

JAMES FULTON.

The Master, Industrial School, Caversham.

By Authority: GEORGE DIDSBUXY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1880.

Price, 6d.]