

138. The Acting-Primate in his address to the Synod gave a history of these trusts, which is set forth at pages 7 and 8 of the proceedings?—Yes.

139. He says: "Perhaps a short reference to history may be desirable to make this matter more clear to new-comers or to the rising generation among us. At the time when our constitution was drawn up, and the General Synod began to act, there were three bodies holding properties in New Zealand for church purposes independently of each other. There were the representatives of the Church Missionary Society; there was the Synod of the then newly formed diocese, with its endowments derived from the Canterbury Block, and an Act of the Provincial Legislature then in power had decided that this property should be subject to the authority of the Diocesan Synod; and there was, thirdly, the Bishop of Christchurch, as a corporation sole, holding the 14,000 acres of church property which had been vested in him. The Bishop obtained an Act of the General Assembly of New Zealand which authorised him to transfer to the General Synod, as the body contemplated in the Religious, Charitable, and Educational Trusts Act, this mass of church property held by him. The two other bodies refused to place their property under the authority of the General Synod, hence variety in the manner of holding was introduced and thus the ambiguous language of our church law. The amendment of the Bishop of New Zealand Trusts Act obtained from the General Assembly in 1865 was to enable the State to recognise a Diocesan Synod as a representative body of the church in order to cover the Christchurch case, and the Church Missionary Society managed its property by an agent authorised by its governing body in London. You will see, therefore, from this brief account that wherever such words occur in the constitution or canons as 'property held on behalf of the General Synod' the only properties referred to as not so held are those of the Diocese of Christchurch and the Church Missionary Society, and such terms are not to be interpreted as implying that the church allows any other diocese than that referred to to hold property independently of the General Synod." Is that an accurate report?—It is accurate generally, with one slight inaccuracy—that is to say, this property of the Church Missionary Society is held in trust by the New Zealand Mission Trusts Board, a corporate body.

140. This particular land that is the subject of our inquiry was conveyed by the Bishop of New Zealand to the Bishop of Wellington and other trustees on the 13th May, 1862, under the authority of "The Bishops of New Zealand Trusts Act, 1858"?—Yes.

141. And the present trustees are their successors?—Yes.

142. Were you present at Christchurch at the meeting of the Synod in 1898?—I was.

143. Did any general discussion take place there with regard to these trust properties?—There was a discussion that arose on the question of the Porirua trust, and as giving the mind of the church through its highest body as to the meaning of these trusts I might refer you to the series of resolutions which were adopted by the General Synod at its session in Christchurch, and which were an instruction to the Porirua trustees. One instruction was, in regard to the scholarships that were to be founded from the revenues of the Porirua trust, that, whilst Europeans were not to be excluded, preference was in all cases to be given to Maoris. It did not say that Europeans were not to get the benefit, but it practically means that, so long as there were Maoris available and suitable, preference should be given to them.

144. You have had something to do with the trusts in the Auckland Province?—I have had to do with the St. Stephen's School for fourteen years, and I was a trustee of the Auckland trusts for a considerable number of years. I have been closely associated with the work of St. Stephen's and the Queen Victoria Maori School for Girls.

145. Can you tell us shortly the terms of the trust?—It is for "the education of the children of our subjects of both races, and of children of other poor and destitute persons, being inhabitants of the islands in the Pacific Ocean." I may say that this Auckland trust, and the Porirua trust, and the Otaki trust, and, I believe, the Wanganui and Wairarapa trusts are all identically the same language. Then, the trust is this: "To hold unto the said Bishop of New Zealand and his successors, in trust nevertheless, and for the use and towards the support and maintenance of the said schools so long as religious education, industrial training, and instruction in the English language shall be given to youth educated therein and maintained thereat." I draw the attention of the Commission to the fact that there is a distinct difference between the trust at Te Aute and this general trust. The Te Aute trust is not limited in the way that the Auckland and these other trusts are. There is no indication of the character of the instruction to be given in the Te Aute School; there is a wider scope in the Te Aute trust.

146. *Mr. Lee.*] It does not say what religious instruction?—No, it is not definite; but it is to be religious instruction under the control of the Bishop of New Zealand.

147. *The Chairman.*] So that in the Auckland school industrial training is required by the trust?—Yes, it is obligatory.

148. Can you tell us what your experience has been as to the beneficial effects of industrial training amongst the Natives?—I think it is exceedingly good. Maori boys are just the same as European boys, and in dealing with them you have got to deal with boys of different capacities and different aptitudes. The great bulk of the Maori boys are not adapted nor fitted to receive a thoroughly good classical education. But there are some who are so fitted, and I say there ought to be an institution to which these Maoris could be sent to get that classical training. But, in my opinion, technical training is best for the great bulk of them. We of St. Stephen's recognise that Te Aute offers an opportunity to give a secondary education to those Maori boys who are adapted for it. Therefore we do not give any boy a secondary education at St. Stephen's. If we have a boy who is suited for it we generally secure his admission into Te Aute. Therefore, our boys get an ordinary public-school teaching, but, in addition, they get technical instruction. We are very glad to have Te Aute to send our particularly clever boys to, and I think it would be a loss if there was no such place. Of course, there are two ways of looking at it. I have often been pressed myself to introduce higher education into St. Stephen's. I have always steadfastly