

DATE.	PLACE.	NAME.	REMARKS.
	Dunedin.	30 A boy.	Not known at the Catholic School, Dunedin or South Dunedin.
	Dunedin.	31 A boy.	Junior pupil, and truant at the Christian Brothers' School. Parents no control over him.
	Dunedin.	32 A boy.	Not known at the Catholic School Dunedin, or South Dunedin.
	Timaru.	33 A boy.	The Rev. Father Devoy writes: "I find that a boy named _____ came to the Catholic School here on April 25, 1881, remained that week, stayed away next week—came again on May 16—remained four days—then disappeared altogether from the roll." The boy had previously lived in Christchurch, and Mr. E. O'Connor describes his school attendance as on a par with that of 29.
	Dunedin.	34 A boy.	Junior pupil at Christian Brothers. No control over him at home.
	Dunedin.	35 A boy.	Junior pupil at Christian Brothers. No control over him at home.

"Lawrence, Sept. 8, 1883.

"Dear Mr. Perrin, _____, about whom you inquire, attended the Catholic school here for about two years before she was sent to the Industrial School. It is altogether absurd to bring her case forward as a proof of the criminal tendency of Catholic teaching because the girl was never a criminal in any sense of the word. The reason of her committal to the Industrial School was as follows:—The poor child lost her mother at the tender age of 18 months, so that she does not remember ever having seen her. Having no mother to care for her or sister to be a companion, and living out in the country, she grew up like a little wild creature. She soon got the habit of going out among the tussocks and flax-bushes instead of going to school. Her father being obliged to work could not look after her, and at last she got so wild, that she remained out all night among the bushes. At one time she stayed away for several days and nights, so that at last, after weary search, her father found her sorely frost-bitten out among the gullies. Then, seeing that the child was really likely to become a wild animal, and not being able to look after her, he thought the best thing was to send her to the Industrial School, in order to keep her from perishing by exposure on the hills. Such is her history. It is ridiculous to bring it forward as an example of the wicked tendency of Catholic teaching.—I am, dear Mr. Perrin, yours truly,

"P. O'LEARY."

EDUCATION PETITIONS.

(From *Hansard* August 23.)

MR. PYKE brought up the report from the Joint Committee on Education Petitions, stating that owing to the limited time at their disposal they had not been able to enter fully into the subject of the petitions and recommending that the minutes of proceedings and evidence be printed. He moved, "That the report, together with the minutes of proceedings and evidence, lie on the table and be printed." As chairman of the Committee appointed by the House, it was perhaps desirable that he should explain the nature of the recommendations made by the Committee. The evidence went to show that a number of petitions were presented to both branches of the Legislature asking for an extension of the present system of education. The number of petitions amounted to 126 and the number of signatures to those petitions was 19,763. On the other hand, forty-nine petitions were presented, with 4,561 signatures, against any alteration being made in the present system. No desire had been expressed in any of those petitions to interfere with the present system. The Committee had considered the matter, and had no specific recommendation to make. They only asked that the evidence should be printed. The evidence disclosed the fact that a large proportion of the population—as nearly as could possibly be estimated one-seventh of the whole population of New Zealand—were dissatisfied with the present system of education. This number had conscientious objections to allowing their children to be educated in the State schools. He might state here, to prevent comment, that all the evidence taken before the Committee was given at the expense of the witnesses. With regard to those conscientious objections the Committee had no specific recommendation to make. Then the evidence showed that this section of the community, the Roman Catholics, had expended the sum of £340,966 in land and buildings for the purposes of education. It also showed that they had built eighty-eight schools, and the number of children educated in those schools was 7,743, showing that a large corresponding saving had been made to the public revenue, not only in regard to the expense of the land and buildings which must necessarily have been expended on the State schools if these children had attended, but also a saving of about £30,000 in the shape of head-money. Then, the Committee had the evidence of Bishop Hadfield and the Rev. Mr. Coffey, tendered on behalf of the

Church of England. The number of signatures to petitions presented on behalf of that body was something like two thousand.

Mr. Fergus rose to a point of order. As a member of the Committee himself he was not aware that the honourable gentleman was stating the case fairly at all. He was not stating the substance of the report which the Committee had asked him to bring up.

Mr. Speaker thought it a most inconvenient practice, on the presentation of a report, to refer to the evidence.

Mr. Pyke said it was essentially the report which the Committee authorized the Chairman to bring up. He was only referring to the evidence in order to justify the request of the Committee. He had confined himself to a statement of facts. He trusted that the request of the Committee would be granted without a dissenting voice.

Mr. Macandrew said the honourable member for Wakatipu had made a very serious statement—namely, that this was not the report which the Committee directed the Chairman to bring up. Was he to understand that the evidence which it was proposed should be printed was entirely voluntary?

Mr. Swanson said that to his certain knowledge, evidence was offered, and it was refused. The question was put to the vote, and it was decided not to take it; but a certain number of members had done all they could to reverse it, and this one-sided report had been brought up in spite of a considerable part of that Committee. He was quite astonished to hear the speech which had been made. There was no authority from the Committee for the Chairman to make such a speech or statement, but he was simply to bring up the report. He (Mr. Swanson) distinctly stated that evidence was refused—evidence of members of the House, many of whom were able and willing to give evidence without a farthing of expense to the country. The Committee was requested to take evidence of heads of departments, but they refused.

Mr. Pyke said the honourable gentleman was quite right as far as he went, but he was not aware of what had happened before he was a member of the Committee, when evidence of Roman Catholic laity was tendered and refused.

Mr. Swanson said it was quite true he did not know what took place before he was a member of the Committee, but nothing which took place before persons were appointed bound them to decisions previously arrived at. He could state however that certain evidence was tendered which would have been no expense to the country, and the Committee refused to take it.

Mr. Montgomery said the report stated that the Committee had not been able to arrive at a conclusion, that they had not been able to make an exhaustive examination of the witnesses. According to the statements which had been made by some honourable members, evidence had been refused, and he thought, if the evidence taken was printed, it should be headed as, "Evidence on one side only." The Committee had not had time to make an exhaustive inquiry. He thought the report of the Committee should lie upon the table, but he earnestly trusted the House would not sanction the printing of evidence of one side only. He should oppose it. He knew that members of the House and others were willing, without expense to the country, to give evidence, but that had not been taken.

Mr. Swanson wished to name some of the gentlemen who were proposed to be examined as witnesses. It was proposed that Mr. Hislop the head of the department, should be examined; he proposed that Mr. Dick, the Minister of Education; Sir George Grey, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Ivess, Mr. Tole, Mr. Sheehan, Mr. Piliot, and other members of the House should be examined. These were all representative men who could have been got without incurring a farthing of expense, but that proposal was refused. He offered some evidence which he could have given himself, both printed and verbal, but that also was refused.

Mr. Turnbull wished to call attention to the order of reference, which stated that the Committee was to report on the petitions presented to the House, and it would have been going beyond the order to have called persons who were not petitioners. As to members of that House, they were so well known and so capable of expressing their opinion in the House that it would have been waste of time to have called them. As to the printing of the evidence, that resolution was come to without a dissenting voice. It was the only point upon which the Committee was unanimous, and he regretted very much that there should be any disagreement about it now.

Colonel Trimble said that surely the order of reference did not direct the Committee to confine itself to taking certain evidence, and it seems that the Committee had met and decided that they should take no lay evidence—that they would only take the evidence of the clergy. Well, who were those clerical gentlemen, that they should know more about the education question than any body else? He happened to be present during the examination of one clerical gentleman who did not seem to know anything about the opinions of the laymen. He said that, if sufficient influence was brought to bear, the lay opinion might be got in their favour. But under the whole of this there was the question whether the present system of education should be continued, or whether they should go back to the denominational system. He had some experience of schools where the merits of that system were brought out, and he could have given some evidence as to the comparative merits of the two systems in training the young, but of course such evidence was not taken. To print clerical evidence in favour of sectarian education was not the work of that House. He should oppose the motion; in fact, he thought the report should not be allowed to lie on the table. It was so entirely one-sided that it was something worse than useless, and ought not to be included in the proceedings of the House at all.

Sir G. Grev held very strong views upon the subject of the present system of education. He believed it to be the most perfect system of education which had yet been introduced into any country. In that respect he was a confirmed secularist, but he did not think they intended to uphold that system by establishing this rule: that they were not to allow people to say anything against it. If it was as per-