

(No. 44.)



1867.

---

T A S M A N I A.


---

## PUBLIC EDUCATION.

REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION, WITH THE EVIDENCE  
TAKEN, AND OTHER DOCUMENTS.

---

Laid upon the Table by the Colonial Treasurer, and ordered by the House to be  
printed, 12 September, 1867.



## PUBLIC EDUCATION COMMISSION.

(Seal.) VICTORIA, *by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith.*

To our trusty and well-beloved the Honorable FREDERICK MAITLAND INNES, Esquire, the Honorable ALFRED KENNERLEY, Esquire, the Honorable PHILIP OAKLEY FYSH, Esquire, JOHN WARD GLEADOW, Esquire, HENRY BUTLER, Esquire, and STEPHEN SHEEHY, Esquire.

### GREETING:

WHEREAS we have thought it expedient, for divers good causes and considerations Us thereunto moving, that an Inquiry should forthwith be made to consider, enquire into, and report upon the present system of Public Education in this Colony, and the best mode of reducing the present Government expenditure under that head, and at the same time of securing the greatest amount of benefit from the advantages placed at the disposal of the community for Educational purposes: Now know ye that We, reposing great trust and confidence in your fidelity, discretion, and integrity, have authorised and appointed, and do by these Presents authorise and appoint you the said FREDERICK MAITLAND INNES, ALFRED KENNERLEY, PHILIP OAKLEY FYSH, JOHN WARD GLEADOW, HENRY BUTLER, and STEPHEN SHEEHY, or any three or more of you, to be Our Commissioners for the purposes aforesaid: And for the better discovery of the truth in the premises We do, by these presents, give and grant to you, or any three or more of you, full power and authority to call before you, or any three or more of you, so many of the Officers and Clerks of Our Department of Public Education aforesaid, and all such other persons as you shall judge necessary, by whom you may be better informed of the truth in the premises, and to enquire of the premises and of every part thereof by all other lawful ways and means whatsoever: And Our further will and pleasure is that you or any three or more of you, upon due examination of the premises, do and shall within the space of Three months after the date of this Our Commission, or sooner if the same can reasonably be, certify unto Us in Our Executive Council in Our said Colony, in writing under your hands and seals respectively, all and every of your several proceedings by force of these Presents, together with what you shall find touching or concerning the premises upon such enquiry as aforesaid: And we further will and command, and by these Presents ordain, that this Our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that you Our said Commissioners, or any three or more of you, shall and may, from time to time, proceed in the execution hereof, and of every matter and thing therein contained, although the same be not continued from time to time by adjournment: And we do hereby direct and appoint that you or any three or more of you may have liberty to certify your several proceedings from time to time to Us in Our said Executive Council as the same shall be respectively completed and perfected: And we hereby command all and singular Our Officers and Clerks, and other persons as you shall judge necessary, and other Our loving subjects whomsoever within Our said Colony of Tasmania, that they shall be assistant to you and each of you in the execution of these Presents.

In testimony whereof We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Public Seal of Our Colony of Tasmania to be hereunto affixed.

Witness Our trusty and well-beloved Colonel THOMAS GORE BROWNE, Companion of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Our Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of Tasmania and its Dependencies, at Hobart Town, in Tasmania aforesaid, this Twenty-second day of May, One thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven.

T. GORE BROWNE.

By His Excellency's Command,

RICHARD DRY, *Colonial Secretary.*

## DAYS OF MEETING.

1. May 22, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members.	15. June 26, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Butler.
2. May 27, 1867.	Ditto.	16. June 28, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Kennerley, Mr. Fysh, and Mr. Sheehy.
3. May 29, 1867.	Ditto.	17. July 3, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Kennerley and Mr. Gleadow.
4. May 31, 1867.	Ditto.	18. July 5, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Gleadow.
5. June 3, 1867.	Ditto.	19. July 8, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Gleadow and Mr. Butler.
6. June 5, 1867.	Ditto.	20. August 9, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Gleadow and Mr. Fysh.
7. June 7, 1867.	Ditto.	21. August 14, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Butler.
8. June 10, 1867.	Ditto.	22. August 16, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Fysh.
9. June 12, 1867.	Ditto.	23. August 19, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members.
10. June 14, 1867.	Ditto.	24. August 31, 1867.	Ditto.
11. June 17, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Kennerley.		
12. June 19, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Butler, Mr. Fysh, and Mr. Sheehy.		
13. June 21, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Butler, Mr. Fysh, and Mr. Kennerley.		
14. June 24, 1867.	<i>Present</i> —All the Members except Mr. Fysh.		

## WITNESSES EXAMINED.

		PAGE
1. May 31.	M. Burgess, Esq., Deputy Inspector of Schools	1
2. May 31.	Mr. P. Canaway, Schoolmaster	2
3. June 5.	Thos. Stephens, Esq., Inspector of Schools	3
June 7.	Ditto	5
June 10.	Ditto	7
June 12.	Ditto	9
June 14.	Ditto	11
4. June 17.	Mr. Brian, Master Ragged School	14
5. June 17.	Mr. Dagnia, ditto	15
6. June 19.	Mr. James Allen	16
7. June 21.	The Bishop of Tasmania	22
8. June 24.	Mr. H. M. Pike, Schoolmaster	26
9. June 26.	The Very Reverend W. J. Dunne	28
10. June 26.	Mr. A. Ireland, Schoolmaster	31
11. June 26.	Mr. R. G. Gray, City Missionary	34
12. June 28.	Thomas Macdowell, Esq., J. P., Member Board of Education	36
13. July 8.	Mr. Rule, Schoolmaster	38
14. July 8.	Mr. Roper, ditto	39
15. July 8.	Mr. Johnston	40
16. July 8.	Mr. Reynolds, ditto	41

## RETURNS PUBLISHED.

	PAGE
1. School Statistics by the Statistician	51
2. Programme of Organisation of Public Schools	52
3. Inspection of Public Schools for 1866	53
4. Examination under Standards	55
5. Religious Denomination of Teachers	56
6. Ditto ditto of Scholars	58
7. Rates of Payments by Pupils	60
8. Estimated Cost of Public Schools in 1867	62
9. Occupation of Parents of Public School Children	63
10. Watchorn-street Ragged School	65
11. Collins-street ditto	66
12. Return of Schools not under the Board of Education	67
13. Annual Value of Property and Population	68
14. Estimated Expense of Hobart Town Public Schools	69
15. Queries addressed to the Special Visitors	70
16. Answers received	71
17. Additional Answers	99
18. Memorandum by the Hon. A. Kennerley, Esq., of his Visits to the Parents of Free Scholars	107
19. Memorandum by the Hon. P. O. Fysh, Esq., of his Visits to the Parents of Free Scholars	108
20. Return of Expenditure by Board, and School Fees received, 1857—1866	109
21. Memorandum by Dr. Butler, M.H.A., suggesting Compulsory Education	110

# REPORT.

To His Excellency Colonel THOMAS GORE BROWNE, Companion of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief of the Colony of Tasmania and its Dependencies.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY.

WE, the Commissioners appointed by Your Excellency "to consider, enquire into, and report upon the present system of Public Education in this Colony, and the best mode of reducing the Government expenditure under that head, and at the same time of securing the greatest amount of benefit from the advantages placed at the disposal of the community for Educational purposes," have the honor to present our Report with the evidence on which it is based.

Having in view the object of the Government indicated in the terms of our Commission, namely, to ascertain whether the liability now borne by the General Revenue of the Colony on account of Education can be consistently diminished, it appears to us that a logical statement of the results of our inquiry should commence with a review of the evidence we have received bearing on the questions of the abstract right, and the practical expediency, of State interference in the matter of Education, and with the expression of our own conclusions upon those questions. For, if it can be established that such interference is wrong in principle, or mischievous in its necessary results, there will be no occasion for further discussion.

The most sweeping and decisive objection to the abstract right of State interference in Education was urged by the witness whose evidence will be found in pages 16 and 17 of the Appendix to this Report; a witness whose qualifications to afford us useful information were thus described by himself:—

Right of State interference.

"In fact (he said) my whole life has been taken up more or less in connection with examinations into questions of Education as regards the internal arrangements of Schools, the course of instruction pursued in them, and the system of Government Education comprehended in the mode of appointing masters, paying them, and providing for Education as a branch of the Public Service." And the principal portion of his evidence was submitted to us in the advantageous form of a prepared written statement.

According to this witness,—“It is as much beyond the functions of Government to interfere with the education of a people as it is to interfere with their religion. \* \* \* It is opposed to all the principles of free trade, and in its ordinary exercise leads to protection in some of its worst forms. John Stuart Mill, although an advocate for Government interference in such matters, would only have it exercised under peculiar circumstances. He holds it to be the duty of a Government to give such pecuniary support to Elementary Schools as to render them accessible to all the children of the poor, either freely, or for a payment too inconsiderable to be sensibly felt. But he goes no further. If not for leaving the spread of education exclusively to the voluntary efforts of the people, he cannot be claimed on the other side.”—Evidence, p. 16.

In a subsequent part of his evidence, this witness referred to Mill's *Political Economy*, “not to any of his fugitive thoughts on this subject,” as the ground of his representation of the opinion of that eminent authority.

It would manifestly be stepping beyond the duty imposed on us, were we to enter any further into the consideration of abstract views than we are constrained to do by the scope of the evidence in which those views are presented. In the present instance, the witness was satisfied with merely alleging that interference with the education of a people did not properly fall within the province of the State, and that it was opposed to the principles of free trade, and with referring to Mill as an authority who could “not be claimed on the other side.” It is not, therefore, necessary that we should do more,—recognizing the weight of Mr. Mill's opinions as we do, but at the same time interpreting them in a different manner from the witness who has cited them,—than quote those opinions at length in a Note,\* and leave them to speak for themselves. For ourselves, we are not disposed to admit that the principles of free trade have any application to the education of a people.

---

\* Now, the proposition that the consumer is a competent judge of the commodity, can be admitted only with numerous abatements and exceptions. He is generally the best judge (though even this is not true universally) of the material objects produced for his use. These are destined to supply some physical want, or gratify some taste or inclination, respecting which wants or inclinations there is no appeal from the person who feels them; or they are the means and appliances of some occupation for the use of the persons engaged in it, who may be presumed to be judges of the things required in their own habitual employment. But there are other things of the worth of



Those principles are based on the operation of *physical* wants, as of food, or clothing: the *want* of education does not belong to the same category: in proportion to the greatness of the *need* the *want* is commonly deficient in the force which would create a supply.

which the demand of the market is by no means a test; things of which the utility does not consist in ministering to inclinations, nor in serving the daily uses of life, and the want of which is least felt where the need is greatest. This is peculiarly true of those things which are chiefly useful as tending to raise the character of human beings. The uncultivated cannot be competent judges of cultivation. Those who most need to be made wiser and better usually desire it least, and if they desired it would be incapable of finding the way to it by their own lights. It will continually happen on the voluntary system that the end not being desired, the means will not be provided at all; or, that the persons requiring improvement having an imperfect or altogether erroneous conception of what they want, the supply called forth by the demand of the market will be anything but what is really required. Now, any well-intentioned and tolerably civilized Government may think without presumption that it does or ought to possess a degree of cultivation above the average of the community which it rules, and that it should therefore be capable of offering better education and better instruction to the people than the greater number of them would spontaneously demand. Education, therefore, is one of those things which is admissible in principle that a Government should provide for the people. The case is one to which the reasons of the non-interference principle do not necessarily or universally extend.\* With regard to elementary education, the exception to ordinary rules may, I conceive, justifiably be carried still further. There are certain primary elements and means of knowledge which it is in the highest degree desirable that all human beings born into the community should acquire during childhood. If their parents, or those on whom they depend, have the power of obtaining for them this instruction, and fail to do it, they commit a double breach of duty: towards the children themselves, and towards the members of the community generally, who are all liable to suffer seriously from the consequences of ignorance and want of education in their fellow-citizens. It is, therefore, an allowable exercise of the powers of Government to impose on parents the legal obligation of giving elementary instruction to children. This, however, cannot fairly be done without taking measures to ensure that such instruction shall be always accessible to them, either gratuitously or at a trifling expense. It may, indeed, be objected that the education of children is one of those expenses which parents, even of the labouring class, ought to defray;—that it is desirable that they should feel it incumbent on them to provide by their own means for the fulfilment of their duties, and that by giving education at the cost of others, just as much as by giving subsistence, the standard of necessary wages is proportionally lowered, and the springs of exertion and self-restraint in so much relaxed. This argument could, at best, be only valid if the question were that of substituting a public provision for what individuals would otherwise do for themselves; if all parents in the labouring class recognised and practised the duty of giving instruction to their children at their own expense. But inasmuch as parents do not practise this duty, and do not include education among those necessary expenses which their wages must provide for; therefore, the general rate of wages is not high enough to bear those expenses, and they must be borne from some other source. And this is not one of the cases in which the tender of help perpetuates the state of things which renders help necessary. Instruction, when it is really such, does not enervate, but strengthens as well as enlarges the active faculties; in whatever manner acquired, its effect on the mind is favourable to the spirit of independence: and when, unless had gratuitously, it would not be had at all, help in this form has the opposite tendency to that which in so many other cases makes it objectionable. It is help towards doing without help.

In England, and most European countries, elementary instruction cannot be paid for at its full cost, from the common wages of unskilled labour, and would not if it could. The alternative, therefore, is not between Government and private speculation, but between a Government provision and voluntary charity: between interference by Government and interference by associations of individuals, subscribing their own money for the purpose like the two great School Societies. It is, of course, not desirable that anything should be done by funds derived from compulsory taxation, which is already sufficiently well done by individual liberality. How far this is the case with school instruction is, in each particular instance, a question of fact. The education provided in this country on the voluntary principle has of late been so much discussed that it is needless in this place to criticise it minutely, and I shall merely express my conviction that even in quantity it is, and it is likely to remain, altogether insufficient; while in quality, though with some slight tendency to improvement, it is never good except by some rare accident, and generally so bad as to be little more than nominal.

I hold it, therefore, the duty of the Government to supply the defect by giving pecuniary support to elementary schools, such as to render them accessible to all the children of the poor, either freely, or for a payment too inconsiderable to be sensibly felt. One thing must be strenuously insisted on, that the Government must claim no monopoly for its education, either in the lower or in the higher branches; must exert neither authority nor influence to induce the people to resort to its teachers in preference to others, and must confer no peculiar advantages on those who have been instructed by them. Though the Government teachers will probably be superior to the average of private instructors, they will not embody all the knowledge and sagacity to be found in all instructors taken together, and it is desirable to leave open as many roads as possible to the desired end. It is not endurable that a Government should, either *de jure* or *de facto*, have a complete control over the education of the people. To possess such a control, and actually exert it, is to be despotic. A Government which can mould the opinions and sentiments of a people from their youth upwards, can do with them whatever it pleases. Though a Government, therefore, may, and in many cases ought to, establish schools and colleges, it must neither compel nor bribe any person to come to them; nor ought the power of individuals to set up rival establishments, to depend in any degree upon its authorisation. It would be justified in requiring from all the people that they shall possess instruction in certain things, but not in prescribing to them how or from whom they shall obtain it.

\* In opposition to these opinions, a writer with whom on many points I agree, but whose hostility to Government intervention seems to me too indiscriminate and unqualified, M. Dunoyer, observes, that instruction, however good in itself, can only be useful to the public in so far as they are willing to receive it, and that the best proof that the instruction is suitable to their wants is its success as a pecuniary enterprise. This argument seems no more conclusive respecting instruction for the mind than it would be respecting medicine for the body. No medicine will do the patient any good if he cannot be induced to take it; but we are not bound to admit as a corollary from this that the patient will select the right medicine without assistance. Is it not probable that a recommendation from any quarter which he respects may induce him to accept a better medicine than he would have spontaneously chosen? This is, in respect to education, the very point in debate. Without doubt, instruction which is so far in advance of the people that they cannot be induced to avail themselves of it, is to them of no more worth than if it did not exist. But between what they spontaneously choose, and what they will refuse to accept when offered, there is a breadth of interval proportioned to their deference for the recommender. Besides, a thing of which the public are bad judges may require to be shown to them and pressed on their attention for a long time, and to prove its advantages by long experience, before they learn to appreciate it, yet they may learn at last; which they might never have done if the thing had not thus been obtruded upon them in act, but only recommended in theory. Now, a pecuniary speculation cannot wait years, or perhaps generations for success: it must succeed rapidly, or not at all. Another consideration which M. Dunoyer seems to have overlooked is, that institutions and modes of tuition which never could be made sufficiently popular to repay with a profit the expenses incurred on them may be invaluable to the many by giving the highest quality of education to the few, and keeping up the perpetual succession of superior minds, by whom knowledge is advanced, and the community urged forward in civilisation.

But by the same witness it was contended that "a stronger objection if that were possible to Government interference with Education is, that it has failed to do more than the people would have done for themselves if left to their voluntary efforts"—an opinion which he held "to be no less true of this Colony than of any of the neighbouring Colonies, and no less true of any of the neighbouring Colonies than of Great Britain and Ireland." It is, of course, impossible to discuss with satisfaction the question of what might, or might not, have happened, in circumstances which were not suffered to arise. It is open in such a case to every one to indulge in those conclusions which best harmonize with his speculative opinions without danger of being refuted by facts. But the circumstance must be acknowledged to carry great weight, that in all civilised and free States, without a single exception, in recent times, when the prevalent political theories have generally tended to circumscribe State functions, something like a rivalry of nations has been exhibited to rescue Education from the uncertainties of chance supply, and chance quality in that which is placed within the reach of the people. This fact is not more apparent in Protestant than in Roman Catholic countries,—in England for instance, than in Belgium\*; it is illustrated as strikingly in France or Prussia with their strong centralised Governments, as in democratic America. And the Australian Colonies, both those which are the most advanced in their social and material progress, and those which have only entered as it were on a national career, are following in the footsteps of the rest of the civilised world.

Government interference alleged to be unnecessary.

England was instanced by the witness whose evidence has been quoted as a country in which the state of Education compared favourably with that of any other country, without the interposition of Government, thirty years since, (Evidence p. 20). The conflicting evidence of another witness will be found in a later page, (22). But the question of fact is one on which there is no paucity of authentic information. The name of Sir J. K. Shuttleworth is identified with the cause of Education; but not more so with State than with voluntary measures for its furtherance. Before he accepted the office of Secretary to the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, he was the founder of the Battersea Training Schools,† and he has written the "History of Four Periods of Public Education," a reliable work, wherein the following passage occurs setting forth its state and prospects in England when the Legislature deemed it incumbent to interpose:—

"The Normal Schools which had been established were struggling with great pecuniary embarrassment. The Parochial Schools were indebted to a great extent to the sacrifices made from the incomes of clergymen of slender stipends, often of humble curates. They still continued to be very meagerly furnished with the apparatus of instruction, and the teachers were generally unskilful, ill paid, and over-worked, having to supply by their own untrained abilities all the defects of the monitorial system. In schools not connected with the Church of England the embarrassments had sometimes become extreme. Several of these Schools were burdened with debts incurred at the period of their erection, at the time of Joseph Lancaster's teaching. Some Schools had been sold for the redemption of these burdens; others exhibited in their accounts a continually increasing deficit. In all School Committees, whether of the Church or of Dissent, the necessity of resorting to continual efforts to sustain the income of the School by public meetings, examinations, sermons, bazaars, fancy fairs, personal canvassing for subscriptions, canvassing by letter, and similar expedients, were confessed to entail a scarcely tolerable burden of humiliating exertion on the promoters of Schools. What had been accomplished towards the improvement of Elementary Education was rare and isolated. The common phenomenon was its disheartening imperfection, if not its complete failure."

Similar evidence might be quoted from numerous contemporary and later sources ‡ representing every shade of religious and political opinion. And at the period referred to, Common School Education was not wholly dependent on pupils' payments. Large endowments were in existence for Church and other Schools, and besides many local associations for educational purposes, the two great Societies known respectively as the National and the British and Foreign School Society were in their greatest vigour. But by both of these the necessity of legislative assistance was avowed if the children of the humbler classes were to be rescued from ignorance with its attendant consequences, and by both was that assistance gladly accepted; by the latter as well as the former, although its most conspicuous and zealous members belonged

\* See Grant Duff's *Studies in European Politics*, 1866.

† "Sir J. K. Shuttleworth and Mr. Tuffnell expended upon this object about £750 a year each." Q. 2336. Their total expenditure was upwards of £5000, of which £1000 was received from the patrons and friends of pupils; £1500 was contributed by their own private friends "with unsolicited confidence and generosity, and £2500 by themselves." Sir J. K. Shuttleworth lived for some time in an adjoining house and closely superintended its progress. Report of Education Commission, 1861.

‡ See Chambers' *Papers for the People*.—*The Education Movement*; Martineau's & Alison's *Histories* since 1815; the evidence of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, quoted in *The Edinburgh Review*, vol. 75, and the article in that publication of April, 1837, where it is stated that in the two populous counties of Middlesex and Lancashire, "There are Schools for only about a fifteenth of the people;" and in reference to Infant Schools—"If we only reckon the large towns as fitted for such Establishments, and as most requiring them, Middlesex and Lancashire would require infant training for five times as many as are at present taught in the whole country."

to communions in religion,\* and parties in politics, the most adverse to State interference in the sphere of exclusive private obligation.

State aid  
alleged to  
discourage  
voluntary  
provision.

It was further insisted that Government assistance tended to frustrate voluntary provision for Education.

"I find (observed the same witness) schemes of Education adopted professedly with the view of assisting voluntary efforts when they are virtually paralysing or stifling them out of existence. That I consider to have been the case in Great Britain and Ireland, and to be no less the case here."—Evidence, p. 17.

"Voluntary efforts" may mean efforts either of an efficient or of an inefficient description, skilled or unskilled. In England assistance is granted from the Public Revenue to Schools which satisfy certain prescribed conditions: it is withheld from Schools which do not satisfy those tests of competence. Inevitably, the tendency of this arrangement must be to "stifle out of existence" those "voluntary efforts" which belong to the latter description,—in other words, are represented by Schools that do not fulfil the conditions required by the Privy Council Committee. This is acknowledged to be the case both in the Report of the Education Commission of 1861 and in that of the Committee of the House of Commons of 1866; and the causes are stated in detail—"Non-performance of the conditions on which assistance is offered, a non-fulfilment of which the principal causes are poverty, smallness of population, indifference, or, as it has been lately called, apathy."—(Report, 1861.) And again,—“School accommodation being insufficient, Masters not certificated.”—(Report, 1866; index, p. 326.) "Adventure Schools," as they are designated, diminish by a process which both indicates the disappearance of unqualified, and the growth of authenticated Schools.

"Voluntary efforts," however, may signify something different from private enterprise in the profession of teaching. Such efforts assume a variety of forms,—subscriptions to schools, endowments, pupils' payments; and they may co-exist with a public provision for Education, or they may be found apart from such a system.

Great Britain and Ireland having been quoted in the objection, what is actually shown by reliable evidence in regard to those Countries? This question is answered in the Report of the Commissioners (1861), in the following terms:—

"While the Government has itself expended on National Education in round numbers £4,400,000, it has been met by voluntary subscriptions to the amount of £8,800,000."

To the same effect is the following extract from the Work of Sir J. K. Shuttleworth:—

"The Parliamentary Grant has hitherto been so administered by the Committee of the Council as to stimulate the investment of large sums in School-buildings by giving about one-third of their value. Between 1839 and 1860 Grants amounting to £1,076,753 have caused an investment of subscriptions amounting to £2,360,226 in School-buildings, or altogether of £3,436,226."

Scotland is that part of the United Kingdom in which a public provision for Education has been longest in operation, and the first Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners (1865) on the Schools of that Country reveals how far the existence of that provision has tended to discourage "voluntary efforts." £60,000 per annum is stated to be the probable amount of voluntary subscriptions for the support of Schools in Scotland—(Evidence, p. 5.)—while the bequests towards Education in ten years in the district of one of the Inspectors, a district comprising only six counties, reached a total of £218,000.†

The abstract possibility of a lavish and unconditional expenditure from public funds on Education tending to stifle voluntary efforts for its promotion, is undeniable. But the difference is equal to one of principle, between the aid which stimulates private exertions, and that which stifles them; or between that which is too niggard to be perceptible, and that by which appreciable results are accomplished.

Government  
interference  
alleged to be  
admissible  
only in favour  
of the educa-  
tion of the  
poor, &c.

By different witnesses, including conditionally the one previously quoted, it was contended, that the interference of the State with Education should be confined to the education of the classes whose situation, either from poverty, orphanage, or crime, obliges it to assume special relations to them. Important principles are brought into

\* See copy of Agreement for Grants to Normal and Model Schools, between the Committee of the Privy Council and the British and Foreign School Society, represented by several well known members of the Society of Friends. Minutes of Council, 1841-2, pp. 66-7.

† Evidence, p. 2, First Report on Schools in Scotland, 1865.

discussion by the distinction thus mooted. As suggested by another witness, Is an eleemosynary principle the only one that should be recognised? or, Are not all classes in a community equally entitled to share in the benefits, of whatever description, which are dispensed at the cost of the Revenue to which all contribute? Avoiding, however, the discussion of the reasons usually urged for a contracted theory of State functions on the one hand, or, on the other, in favour of that theory according to which the relation of a citizen to the State is that of a member of a co-partnership applying the aids which co-operative association provides—"a partnership in all science, in all art, in every virtue, in all perfection,"\* and accepting for the present the position that the function of Government in respect to Education is not a primary or inherent one, but one imposed upon it by the existence of exceptional classes in society, and legitimate only in so far as it is necessary for the sake of those classes, another question then arises: "Is the necessity, so far acknowledged, one which respects only the well-being of special classes, those in favour of which Educational provision is contemplated at the expense of the State, or does it respect the interests of society at large as liable to be affected by those classes?" The answer we are warranted in assuming is, that the exception is based not on the exceptional *rights* of any class, but in the interests of society generally. But is society not quite as liable to be injured by the absence of moral and intellectual training amongst classes possessed of adequate means to pay for such training, but without the inclination to apply their means to that object, as by its absence in the case of those whose poverty disqualifies them to pay for it? And that this class is not an imaginary but a real, and often numerically a considerable one, is beyond controversy. Recurring then to the principle of the general good as that which justifies the interposition of the State to provide Education for the children of paupers or those who cannot pay for it, that principle involves the further obligation of providing Education also for those classes who *can* but *will not* provide it, or compelling *them* to do so, *rather than suffer them to grow up without education*. The practical compromise arrived at in countries in which compulsory methods are declined, while the diffusion of education is admitted to be a State duty with a special reference to the humbler classes, is to allure not only the destitute but the apathetic, by cheapening instruction, and not insisting even on moderate payments where the effect would be to hinder education. The investment is regarded as essentially temporary, and the more so in proportion to its being effective. "The force which will ultimately transform the whole will be the result of Education itself. When the people know that they have even more interest in the education of their children than their rulers have, they will more and more take charge of it."† But Education is the indispensable preliminary condition.

Having adverted to those general questions by which we were met on the threshold of our inquiry, we proceed to the consideration of the system now in operation in this Colony under the Board of Education.

This system had its immediate origin in the proceedings of the Legislative Council in 1853. In the report of the Inspector of Schools (Mr. T. Arnold) for 1852 the following passage had appeared in reference to the Educational provision which existed at that period:—

History of the present system of Education.

"It may be thought that Private Schools supply the want thus indicated. It is difficult to obtain precise information on this point. The result, however, of an inquiry which I have addressed to the Police Magistrates on the subject is to show that there are at the present time about 86 Private Schools in the Colony, with an average attendance of 2270 scholars. In this number neither the College at Bishopscourne nor the Hutchins and High Schools are included, the attendance at which collectively amounts to about 200. Of the 86 schools 69, attended by about 1900 children, are within the Police Districts which include Hobart Town and Launceston; while only 17 schools, with about 370 children, are in the Country Districts. This fact indicates the general character of the great majority of these schools. They are mostly Commercial Schools, of greater or less merit, for the education of the middle classes, at which the terms of admission are such as to exclude the children of the labouring population. \* \* \* There is, however, a lower class of Private Schools, conducted mostly by persons who have been transported, which competes with the Government Schools for the education of the children of the poor. I have reason to believe that these schools are, as a class, insufficient in the extreme; and it would not be one of the least benefits which the elevation and improvement of the Public Schools would confer on the community if the occupation of these *soi-disant* instructors were thereby cut off. On the whole it seems evident that public and private means of instruction together fall far short of what is required in order to make the next generation an educated people."

And Mr. Arnold thus concluded his Report:—

"If I may be allowed to conclude with one or two remarks of a general nature, I would submit that, if the people of Van Diemen's Land are to be really and truly an educated people, two things are necessary:—1st. A vast extension of the School system as regards *quantity*, so that it may embrace the

\* Burke quoted in "A French Eton, or Middle-Class Education and the State," by Matthew Arnold, 1864. Pp. 75-6.

† Kay Shuttleworth. Pp. 569-70.

great majority of all the children between 6 and 14 years. 2nd. A corresponding reformation as regards *quality*. For effecting the first object the most civilised and best-educated countries of Europe have found, by experience, that a School-rate is the best expedient; and it seems likely that England will, before long, follow their example. For effecting the second object, it would be necessary, amongst other things, to make the situation of a teacher one of greater freedom and dignity; to pay him a fixed and sufficient stipend; to test, by examination and otherwise, the qualifications as well of existing teachers as of all future candidates; and, if fit men were not to be found in the Colony in sufficient numbers, to obtain them either from home or by training them here, or by both methods combined."

In 1853 a Board of Travelling Inspectors\*, which had been appointed by the Government "to test by examination the efficiency of the Teachers" of Schools at that time receiving State assistance in connection with the penny-a-day system, in their Report characterised the education at these Schools "as far beneath what the wants of the community called for;" and they urged "that the chief cause of the low state of education in the Schools was the want of adequate remuneration to the Masters."

"The average income of a Master under the existing system is inferior to that of a working mechanic, and in some cases even below the wages of a common labourer. The inevitable effect has been the degradation of the office of a Schoolmaster; and, generally speaking, only persons of inferior qualifications can be got to fill it. What is intrinsically of the very highest importance with reference to the interests of society has thus fallen into disrepute, and is but too frequently had recourse to as a *dernier ressort* by those who cannot succeed in anything else."

In illustration of the statement of the Travelling Inspectors as to the incompetence of the Masters of the Schools in existence at that time for the duties in which they were engaged, we quote from the 23rd paragraph of the Inspectors' Report:—

"Out of sixty-eight Teachers whose Schools we visited, twenty-two were Mistresses, and as such were not invited by us to attend and be examined. Of the remainder, fifteen, after having been invited to attend, either declined or made some excuse, or failed to present themselves at the appointed time; nine were prevented from attending either through accident, or because we have not yet been able to give them the opportunity; three we abstained from inviting for various reasons; and one has been compelled, through no fault of his, to relinquish his School since the date of our visit. There remain eighteen who have presented themselves for examination. Eleven out of these we find, after having examined their papers and taken into consideration the state of their Schools, have qualified themselves to receive certificates of various grades; while to the remaining seven we cannot recommend that any certificates should be granted."

It is not immaterial to observe that the date of the representations which have been quoted was that of a period of unusual prosperity, in which the working classes participated. Wages were high beyond all precedent, amounting in many occupations to from two to three times their average at the present time.

As the result, it may be presumed, of the information obtained by Government, a Draft Education Bill was submitted to the Legislative Council by Message from the Governor Sir W. Denison, on the 12th July, 1853. This Bill appears to have been dropped, however, but a Select Committee was appointed by the Council "for the purpose of taking into consideration the question of Public Education and to report thereon;"† by which a Report was brought up embodying the following recommendations:—

"While they (the Select Committee) attach considerable weight to the reasons which have been urged in favour of a Local Rate for the support of Education, your Committee have, upon mature consideration, preferred to recommend that the necessary funds should be taken from the Public Revenue, and that £10,000 per annum should be set apart for that purpose.

"2. Your Committee agree with the Report of the Board of Inspection as to the inefficiency and objectionable character of the Penny-a-day System; and therefore recommend that that system should cease on the 31st December next.

"3rd. Your Committee are further of opinion that nearly all the evils and inconveniences which have been shown to attach to the Penny-a-day System would be found to connect themselves with the Denominational Schools, as recommended by the Board of Inspection for Hobart Town and Launceston."

"It would necessarily lead to the multiplication of small schools, and thereby either increase the expense to an amount beyond what could be safely charged on the Public Revenue, or perpetuate the employment of inefficient Teachers."

They therefore recommend the adoption, for town and country, of a system of General Schools on the principle recommended for the country Schools in paragraph 14 of the Report of the Board of Inspection; viz.—General Schools "so modified and arranged that children of all religious denominations could attend."

\* This Board consisted of the Ven. Archdeacon Davies, the Rev. Dr. Lillie, the Rev. Wm. Hall, Vicar-General, and Mr. Arnold.

† This Committee consisted of Sir R. Dry, the Attorney-General, Colonial Secretary, Mr. Anstey, Mr. Gleadow, Colonial Treasurer, Mr. Leake, Mr. Chapman, Mr. Nutt, Mr. Walker, and Captain Clarke.

The Committee of the Legislative Council further advised that the duty of working out and superintending the scheme indicated in their Report should be entrusted to a Central Board, consisting of the Members of the Executive and Legislative Councils; that this Board should have power to make Regulations as to the fees to be exacted from parents, and the classification and remuneration of Teachers; and that its operations should be assisted by an Inspector, who should also officiate as Secretary to the Board, and whose duty it would be to furnish an Annual Report. To meet the pressing requirements of the Colony a recommendation was added that the Board should be empowered to procure competent and trained Teachers from England or elsewhere, and to guarantee their employment for a term of five years on incomes varying in each particular case from £150 to £300 per annum, with a free house.

To give effect to these recommendations, the Legislative Council voted for the service of the year 1854, under the head of Education "exclusive of Establishment," the sum of £9415; and a Central Board, consisting of the Members for the time being of the Executive and Legislative Councils, "to superintend the affairs of the Education Department," was constituted by a Government Notice (No. 140) published on the 31st of October, 1853. In that Notice the object of the Government was thus generally defined:—

"The object of the Government in appointing the Board is to establish a system under which the benefits of a sound education may be ensured to those classes who have it not in their power to combine to provide adequate instruction for their children."

It appears, therefore, that by the system adopted in 1854, and which has been in force since then, while the situation of the humbler classes in the community was distinctly kept in view, that system was not intended for them to the exclusion of any classes who might choose to take advantage of the education provided by it. The terms employed—"those classes who have it not in their power to combine to provide adequate instruction for their children"—are vague, but we believe not unintentionally so. They refer to a variety of causes which frustrate combination for the purpose in question—causes both of a local and of a social character. And this interpretation was attached to the system from the first, and acted upon in the various Public Schools established under it.

The number of Schools under the control of the Board of Education in 1854, the first year of its operations, appears to have been 50. The extension of its assistance in subsequent years has been determined by a reference to the number of children likely to attend at any projected School. Where the number does not amount to twenty, aid is granted as far as the state of the funds at the disposal of the Board will permit on the principle of proportioning grants to the sums locally subscribed.

None of the evidence brought before us has tended to show that, in the administration of the Educational Grant, the Board has unduly relaxed the rule under which Schools are assisted. On the contrary, there is reason to fear that there are several localities in which it would be absolutely necessary that the rule should be set aside, if the children residing in them are to receive an education and discipline calculated to fit them for civilized society. On this subject we refer to a letter in the Appendix from Mr. Balfe. The defect therein pointed out is unavoidable, unless under a system which admits of the frequent exercise of discretionary powers. And the exercise of these powers, we are prepared to admit, is not free from liability to local abuse and imposition.

Under the rule observed by the Board of Education in aiding the establishment of Schools, the number subject to its inspection and control had increased between 1854 and 1865 from 50 to 102; and although, naturally, the Schools which have been established at recent dates have been in the less populous neighbourhoods, the number of pupils on the Rolls exhibits no material diminution in relation to the number of Schools. In 1854, to fifty Schools there were 2734 registered pupils; in 1865, to one hundred and two there were 5357.\*

The average daily attendance of pupils in 1854 was 2024; in 1865, 4074, or respectively to the former period 74·03 and to the latter 76·05 per cent. of the numbers on the Rolls. How far these proportions should be regarded as satisfactory or otherwise will be best shown by comparing them with results elsewhere. In respect to England, as a whole, we have failed to obtain corresponding statistics of a later date than the year 1858; and we are led to presume that, with an exception to which we will presently advert, there are none more recent, for these are cited by Mr. Fraser, one of the

\* By the Report of the Education Board for 1866 (which reached us after the greater part of this Report had been completed) the number had increased last year to 8198.

Inspectors of Schools under the Committee of the Privy Council, in a correspondence in the *Evening Mail* of April 17th last, in an argument for which he would have naturally preferred later statistics if such were procurable. Mr. Fraser, then, represents the attendance at the inspected or Public Schools in England in that year as 76 per cent. of the number on the Roll. In the Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry on Education (1861) a Return is quoted from "ten specimen districts" in which the proportion is given at 76·1 per cent. According to the 32nd Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland (for the year 1865) the average number on the Rolls of their Schools was 598,408; the average daily attendance 321,209; the per centage of attendance, therefore, is 53 and a fraction. In Victoria it appears, by the Fifth Report of the Board of Education of that Colony, the per centage of average attendance to the number of enrolled pupils was 74·04. In New South Wales the Commissioners of National Education report that, in 1865, with 18,126 on the Rolls, the average attendance was 12,683, or nearly 70 per cent.—69 and a fraction.\*

Satisfactory however, in a comparative sense, as are the results thus shown in connection with the Public Schools of this Colony, we would point out that these results are *aggregates*, and that in many Schools the proportion of daily attendance to the number of enrolled pupils is not what it is desirable that it should be, although, of course, there are other Schools in which the average quoted is exceeded. Nor are we led to dispute the representations which have been made to us, that there are many children of the School age not reached by the present educational machinery of the Colony, whether that of Government or of "Adventure" Schools. Two questions, however, arise out of this admission: *first*, what classes, if any in particular, are not reached? and *second*, why are they not reached?

Alleged non-attendance of poorer classes, and causes thereof.

It is not a singular circumstance that the classes whose education is the least effectually accomplished should be the poorest and most necessitous classes even where the State cannot be accused of indifference, or parsimony, or narrowness of purpose, in what it ostensibly does to further education. Compulsion being declined; Education being an affair of option; the most necessitous being the most unconcerned if not the most averse,—it inevitably follows that they constitute the bulk of the uneducated. The English Education Commissioners (1861) thus express themselves on this subject:—

"The question as to the feelings with which parents of the poorer classes who are neither in a state of abject poverty nor of reckless and intemperate habits regard elementary education, is one of the most important in the whole range of our inquiry. The Assistant Commissioners have collected a considerable mass of information upon the subject, and their evidence tends to establish two propositions. The first is, that almost all the parents appreciate the importance of Elementary Education, and that the respectable parents are anxious to obtain it for their children. The second is, that they are not prepared to sacrifice the earnings of their children for this purpose, and that they accordingly remove them from school as soon as they have an opportunity of earning wages of an amount which adds in any considerable degree to the family income.

\* \* \* \* \* There are, however, children who never attend school, though it does not appear that they are collected in large numbers in any particular place. In a few instances they receive instruction at home; but the two great causes of absolute non-attendance are poverty and neglect. \* \* \* \* \* The commonest cause, however, of an entire absence of schooling is to be found in the intemperance, apathy, and recklessness of the most degraded part of the population. There are persons, though happily they are few, who entirely neglect their children, and allow them to grow up in a state of beggary and ignorance."

Similar evidence might be quoted in reference to Scotland from the First Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners of Inquiry into the Schools of that Country, notwithstanding all that has been done for Education there, and from the recent Report of the Victorian Commissioners, and also the Annual Reports on Education in New South Wales. There is, in fact, a class in every country composed mainly of the lowest elements of the population, to whom abject ignorance is more congenial than discipline and instruction. Whether this class prevails in Tasmania to a greater or less extent than elsewhere; and, whether its existence is in any degree imputable to the Public School system of the Colony; these are legitimate and proper matters of inquiry. And in respect to the first, while it is difficult to obtain precise information upon it, we are prepared to admit the probability that the class in question is relatively more numerous here than in communities formed without any Convict element. It is observed by Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, that "National Education does not depend simply on the School training of one generation. The first generation of children in School inherit some physical incapacity to learn." How large the number of children coming under the definition of "the first generation of children in School" in our community is, and by what process of parental apathy and juvenile "incapacity to learn," our school-rooms are thinned, are points which need not be insisted on. The more pertinent is the second inquiry suggested,

---

\* In 1866, to an average on the Roll of 5159, the average daily attendance was 3930, or 76·17 per cent.



whether the Educational system of the Colony either in principle, or in the mode in which it is administered, by the Board and by the Schoolmasters under the Board, discourages school attendance among the children of the poorer classes? And first, as regards principle, it is not disputed that the intention of the system is to embrace even the very poorest, nor has it been contended that the Rules of the Board in reference to *free* Scholars are too stringent. But, in the second place, as respects its actual working, it has been alleged by some of the witnesses to be partial and exclusive, notwithstanding the fact exhibited in the note,\* and in p. 32.

"I look (observed one witness) upon its neglect of those who cannot afford to pay the School fees demanded from others in comparatively easy circumstances as its greatest blot. There must be hundreds upon hundreds of parents in this town and in other parts of the Colony who cannot afford to pay ninepence per week for a single child, sevenpence per week each for two, or sixpence per week for three or more. Yet at no one time during the year 1865, which is the latest year for which we have any official returns, were there so many as 1000 children on the books of all parts of the Colony for whom the Government paid capitation fees of threepence per week. The numbers of scholars on the Rolls for that year was 5357; the average attendance 4074. The cost of the Establishment for the year was £12,671 10s. 8d. And out of this the total sum appropriated to the children of the poor, that is to the children of those who could not pay the School fees, was £354 7s. 6d. Whatever imposition might have been practised on the Board in other directions, there could not have been room for much, if for any, in this. None of the claimants for a share in this £354 7s. 6d. could have been other than persons in comparatively destitute circumstances."

Another witness objected to the system, "that it does not serve the end for which it is established, only one-fifth of our juvenile population being educated in the Public Schools;" and he imputed to the Teachers an undue attention to the instruction of the classes of children paying fees to the neglect of "less fortunate pupils."

It is not immaterial to state that the first of these witnesses, in answer to a distinct question as to what personal knowledge he had of the working of the Public Schools, candidly informed us that he had not inspected any of them (p. 21), and that his competence to give evidence on local subjects was by himself alleged to be derived from his occupations. (p. 16 Ev.) The same observation nearly applies to the second witness, who disclaimed personal acquaintance with the schools, and gave his evidence from "hearsay" (p. 31), and by way of inference from facts either real or assumed. Not the less did these admissions make us feel that it was desirable that we should institute a searching inquiry into the fact of whether invidious or injurious distinctions were made by the Public School Teachers between the different classes of scholars. The results of that inquiry are presented in the evidence accompanying this Report, both that orally given by the Inspector of Schools, the Secretary of the Board of Education, and the Teachers examined by us, and in the answers to queries extensively circulated among those persons who are most familiar with the daily conduct of the Public Schools. The concurrence of testimony exhibited in the evidence is too striking to be compatible with the prevalence to any great extent of the abuse alleged; its *occasional* occurrence is unavoidable under any School system, not even excepting one intended exclusively for the children of the upper classes in society. But not satisfied with oral and written evidence, we inspected, without previous intimation, the several Public Schools in Hobart Town ourselves, examined the divisions of scholars into classes, and the different descriptions of pupils composing these classes,—*free* scholars and scholars paying varying fees per week—and were unable to detect any principle of distinction in operation, but the ordinary and legitimate one of relative proficiency in school tasks.

In estimating the number of children for whom the capitation fee is paid by the Board, it ought not to be lost sight of that the Schools under its control are not the only ones in which children of the destitute classes are provided with education. The Queen's Orphan Schools in 1865 educated as well as maintained an average of 511, and the Hobart Town Ragged Schools, which are subsidised by the State, met the requirements of about three hundred more. In reference to the statement that while £12,761 was expended on Education, "out of this the total sum appropriated to the children of the poor—the poor who could not afford to pay School fees—was £354 7s. 6d."—we desire to point out that it is fallacious and misleading. The system of Education in this Colony, as we have already remarked, is not designed exclusively for the *destitute*. It is intended, it is true, mainly for the poorer classes of the community, but the term

---

\* The number in 1866 who paid the full price of their instruction, 1s. and upwards per week, was 1037; the *free* scholars 2698; and the *assisted*, or those who paid less than 1s., 4280.



"poor" is one which admits of considerable varieties in the circumstances of those to whom it is applied; with a regard to which varieties the object of that system is to mitigate the expense of Education in some cases quite as much as wholly to defray it in others. And the special item of "capitation fees" no more represents the total sum expended on "the poor who could not afford to pay School fees," than the School fees paid by paying pupils represents the total cost of *their* education. The precise degree in which the two classes are aided by the State Grant is a question of greater arithmetical subtlety than practical moment, and the limited number (supposing that in fact it were a limited number) of pupils who paid nothing for the Education given at the Public Schools, considered by itself, would neither prove anything against these Schools or the system by which they are maintained, nor necessarily furnish just cause for regret.

Indisposition on the part of numbers to whom the Public Schools are open, either gratuitously or for a moderate fee, to avail themselves of the education provided at them, is undeniable; but the evidence of the Hobart Town City Missionary, and of the Teachers of the Ragged Schools, shows that this indisposition applies equally to those Schools, where the attendance is fluctuating and unsatisfactory. The stimulants of food and occasional gifts of clothing, besides constant visits to parents, "stirring them up to do their duty to their children," are necessary in order to overcome their apathy or aversion. The replies to our Queries from the Local Visitors are almost unvarying as to the general causes which account for the deficient or irregular attendance of scholars: they are causes wholly external to the Schools,—parental apathy, or vice, or destitution in forms which it is beyond the scope of any Day School System, merely as such, to overcome.

A view directly opposed to that of the number of Free Scholars being *less* than it should be (on the assumption of the present system being in effect comprehensive of all classes), has been taken by some objectors to it. It has been insisted that the number is *larger* than is legitimate; and this in consequence of undue facilities being afforded to parents, who are in circumstances to enable them to pay the fees established by the Board of Education, to send their children to the Schools free of charge. We have not found this representation correct, unless to a partial extent. In Launceston considerable abuse of the right of free admission appears to have arisen; but, from the inquiries we have instituted in respect to the circumstances of the parents of non-paying pupils in Hobart Town and some suburban localities, we have arrived at the conclusion that the aggregate of this class would be shown to be much larger than it is in the Annual Returns of the Board of Education but for the consideration shown to parents in poor circumstances by some of the Schoolmasters, who receive payment in job-work, firewood, potatoes, and in other ways, and thus meet the case of many who might claim for their children a Free Education. We refer to the letters of Mr. Kennerley and Mr. Fysh, in the Appendix, giving the result of personal inquiries instituted by those gentlemen.

It is difficult to prescribe or to enforce any general rule, with a view to preventing imposition on the Board in the way adverted to, without incurring the risk of doing injustice to really necessitous persons, and of greater harm to their children, and through them to society, than the State suffers in having to pay sometimes for those who are quite able to pay for themselves. That it would evince a more healthy tone of sentiment in parents, if, instead of shifting the burden altogether from their own shoulders, they made sacrifices in order to educate their offspring is undeniable; but, where the requisite virtue is wanting on their part, and Education by public provision, or no Education, is the alternative, we cannot better express our own opinions than in the following quotation:—

"The argument founded on the danger of pauperising the labourers is a mere mistake: to give a man that which morally lowers him has a tendency to pauperise him: if he is encouraged in idleness or improvidence he is injured; but to give him what elevates his mind and character can never pauperise any one. And there can be no question that the whole family is improved and raised by the real education of the children. Education is one of the few charities that is perfectly safe. Food and clothing may often do as much harm as good. Money left to be given away in bread is almost invariably a source of real mischief; and such charities ought to be abolished by law: for there is nothing in the gift to lift the receiver above what he was before: if he has obtained it by idleness or folly, his idleness or folly becomes justified by the treatment. And not a few districts might be indicated which have been positively demoralized by such bequests; but no neighbourhood ever yet was demoralized by the presence of a well-managed Free School." \*

Blending of  
different  
Classes at the  
Public  
Schools.

Whether any injurious consequences ensue from the blending of different classes at the same Schools, is a question which naturally presents itself at this stage of our Report, and our attention has been directed to it, with a result which generally coincides with that

---

\* "National Education" by DR. TEMPLE. Oxford Essays.

arrived at in other countries where a similar mixture prevails.\* If one class were more liable to prejudice than another, it must be that class which is the superior, not the inferior in *tone*: the children generally of parents in better circumstances, whose attendance at the Public Schools is an affair of choice, and of parental rather than Government concern. That parents of this class continue to send their children to the Public Schools, however, may be taken to prove that any incidental inconveniences in their case are not of a serious character. On the other hand, not the least advantage secured to the poorer classes by being mingled with others of a better social position is,—that a School thus filled is under the most effective supervision: that of parents who may be presumed to be more or less competent to judge of its efficiency and to ensure it. This advantage is one the attainment of which is of the greatest importance where a School is remote from central control or influence. The more external checks of a direct and authoritative character are wanting, the more desirable does it become to have internal securities.

Although no representation has been made to us in explicit terms purporting that the Education imparted at the Public Schools exceeds what is necessary or befitting the station and prospects of the larger class of scholars who attend them, we are aware that an impression to that effect is more or less widely entertained. The due consideration of such an objection involves that of a prior question,—What are the grounds or reasons why Education is promoted at all, whether by the State, or by voluntary organisations, or by individuals? Doubtless, the final reason is to be found in the nature and wants of man and of society. Education is an indispensable condition of moral and intellectual fitness for the duties or the occupations of the world, and of training for a future existence. The tasks of a Common School, in reading, writing, and ciphering—the immediate occupation in these tasks of so much time which might otherwise be misspent—are not the ultimate objects for which Schools are provided. Reading, writing, ciphering, are *modes* of instruction approved by experience on account of their aptness to promote the cultivation of the understanding, and the amelioration of the character either of child or man. Their subservience to the familiar *uses* of life is principally valuable as those uses are in themselves means of improvement to human beings as such. But no acquirement which is not sufficiently matured to become an easy and pleasing resource will ever be cultivated and preserved, although an occasional recurrence may be made to it in order to meet the necessities of life. This, in education, amounts to the frustration of its principal object—its frustration because of the imperfection of that Education. It implies, then, a want of comprehension or adequate appreciation of the purpose for which an educational machinery is put in operation to be satisfied with merely nominal results from it,—the *name* of reading, writing, &c., instead of requiring such proficiency as the capacity of the children instructed in those rudiments of knowledge will allow. To endeavour to attenuate Education; to reduce it to the most meagre outline; to be satisfied with acquirements so indifferent that they will in all likelihood be soon forgotten; to study not how much instruction is requisite to lay a foundation for the future development of manhood both intellectual and moral, but how little can be given and yet pass for Education is both inconsistent and wasteful; for all expenditure of means that is *necessarily* inadequate to accomplish the ends proposed by it is wasteful. The programme of instruction in the Schools under the Board of Education (Appendix B.) does not in our opinion admit of curtailment, even were the class of children attending those Schools confined to the poorest ranks in the community. It does not exceed the standard of Education for the humbler classes in England and Scotland, or even that adopted in Juvenile Reformatories there and on the Continent of Europe.†

Standard of  
Education.

\* Mr. Thomas Crampton, Head Master of the Public School at Brentford, was asked:—What effects so far as you have observed, are obtainable by bringing classes of Scholars of different social position under the same roof? “Most beneficial ones. The superior manners and *tone* of conduct common to children whose parents are in easy circumstances raises by imitation and example.” CHADWICK’S *Letter to the Commissioners of Education*, p. 25.

Dr. Cumming, Inspector of Schools of the Free Church of Scotland, in answer to question: Do you find practically that it is only the children of the labouring classes who attend these Schools? “Oh, no; a great many of different ranks attend. That varies in different Schools; but in many of the Schools there is a considerable proportion of the children of a higher class.”—*Evidence before Scotch Education Commission*, 1865, p. 20.

Rev. Dr. Candlish: “I was just going on to state that as my second objection to the Revised Code; viz. That it ignores another principle of our Scotch popular Education, which is, that different classes should be educated together, and I hold that to be of great importance.”—*Ibid.* p. 100.

Rev. Dr. Taylor: “I suppose it is admitted that the Privy Council System is intended mainly, if not exclusively, to aid Schools for the education of poor children. Now, in our Parochial Schools the middle class is educated as well as the children of the poor. We think this a very important point in any system of Education.” p. 125.

Mr. Gordon, Inspector of Schools under the Privy Council in Scotland: “The Kirk Session and Ministers are empowered to recommend poor children of the Parish to be taught free at the Parish School. The Parochial Boards, under the Act of 1845, by which they were established, now pay for the instruction of pauper children, both at the Parish and other Schools.”—*Ibid.* p. 5.

† See Evidence of the Bishop of Tasmania, p. 24. Miss Carpenter on Reformatories, *Social Science Transactions*.

Economic  
importance of  
Education.

But even in the light of a far seeing economy efficiency in the apparatus of Education will justify itself. In the opening Address of the President\* of the Section of Economic Science and Statistics of the British Association in 1862, attention was directed to the economic elements involved in popular Elementary Education, in terms more satisfactory than any which we could employ, and most pertinent to quote at any period in which the danger is apprehended of the adoption of a policy in respect to Education dictated rather by immediate fiscal considerations than by a reference to permanent interests both social and material:—

“Considering a child to be for our economical purposes an investment, the elementary training and education are necessary to increase the efficiency and productiveness of the capital employed. I have been at much pains on this point to ascertain from employers the comparative efficiency and value of educated and uneducated labourers; and I find one conclusion unanimously agreed to on the subject by all intelligent witnesses of wide experience and observation: that education, even in its present rude, and in many respects objectionable elementary condition, is highly remunerative. Employers who have been at the expense of Schools on high religious and social grounds, concur in saying that success is great on the lower economical grounds. In agriculture, intelligent workmasters are aware of the wide difference in result and value between educated and uneducated, intelligent and unintelligent labour, in the old and ordinary processes. But the expense of ignorance is the greatest in the obstructions which it presents to the introduction of machines, by which wages are augmented, whilst labour is saved. Wheresoever machinery is introduced, increased education and intelligence is proved to be necessary to the production of its best effect. I have been assured by experienced mechanicians that, notwithstanding the progress of machinery in agriculture, there is probably as much sound, practical, labour-saving invention and machinery unused as there is used, and that is unused solely in consequence of the ignorance and incompetence of the work-people.

But we may find important evidence of the value of Education where it has heretofore been deemed by Members of the Legislature to be the least necessary: where it has been supposed that mere machines are required; namely, in the Naval and Military source of employ. Naval Officers attest the fact of the greater efficiency of educated as compared with uneducated seamen, require less expensive superintendence by Officers, and that fewer men can be trusted for acting together. Some Officers say they would work a ship with a fifth less; others with a fourth less; others with a third less of the more educated as compared with uneducated seamen. In the Army, officers, more especially the superior non-commissioned officers, who come into the closest contact with the privates, give similar testimony. Sir John Burgoyne maintains that the sapper, who is an artisan with some education, is, for the ordinary purposes of war, equal to three common linesmen, and is economical at his additional pay. In the new School at Hythe, as well as at the School for Naval Gunnery, the success in shooting is with classes almost as the education of those classes. The effect of the general extension of elementary Education, even in its present condition, would be to bring up the whole of the ranks to the efficiency of those of them who have the best common elementary Education, even such as that is,—the non-commissioned officers; and it would be amongst civilians to bring up the entire body of them to at least the efficiency of the better educated of themselves,—the foremen.

I would now offer exemplifications of the concurrence of economic principle in support of religious and moral principle in Public Education. Treating each child as an investment of capital to be applied productively in honest industry, it is a total loss if he fail from moral defaults. If he turn mendicant, pauper, or thief, he will still levy a maintenance on the public, as a thief must wastefully by spoil, as a criminal in prison or in convict establishments, he will be kept unproductively, generally at double the expense of maintaining a pauper. The insurance table would give him, from the tenth year, the chances of forty years of life and waste, and the waste would be under-estimated at the keep of a pauper, or a total loss of £480 on every case of failure. As a matter of fact coming within my own personal investigations under the Poor Law Commission of Inquiry, not above one third of the children reared in the old parish work-houses with adult paupers, after leaving the work-houses, could be traced into respectable service in self-supporting conditions; and, where the old educational conditions are permitted to continue, there is a total loss of two out of every three investments. By an increase of expenditure for an improved teaching power, by trained teachers in many of the Unions, these losses have been considerably diminished; but in the Schools for Districts of Unions in which the children are kept free from the influence of adult paupers, where a higher order of educational power is employed, though at a reduced rate of expense, —where there is physical training with the military drill, and sometimes the naval drill,—there the moral features of able-bodied children, the failures to the extent of disqualification for respectable employment are reduced to within 2 per cent. of insurance charge upon the investment as against a previous rate of 60 per cent. of failures.”

Religious  
instruction.

Religious instruction, of a dogmatic nature, not being included in the scheme of Education at the Schools under of the Board of Education, it might be deemed to lie beyond the proper scope of our inquiry to investigate their operation in its religious bearings. As, however, the system professes to afford, (1), *facilities* to the clergy of different denominations to impart religious knowledge; and (2), as it contemplates the fact of such knowledge being supplied by extraneous means, it appeared to us desirable to ascertain how far those facilities were taken advantage of, and to what extent extraneous provision, in the form of Sunday Schools, does actually meet the case of children attending the Public Schools. The results of our inquiry under the first head, will be found in the tabulated statement in the Appendix, p. 53. In respect to the second, the information which we found it possible to collect from the Country Districts was unavoidably embarrassed by so many disturbing elements that it would be difficult to appreciate its true significance or value. But in Hobart Town the case is different; and we therefore took the necessary steps to ascertain, as nearly as possible, the precise number of pupils at the Public Schools who attended at one or another of the Sabbath Schools of the City; and we are warranted in stating it to amount to not less than three-fourths of the whole. From a nominal

\* Edwin Chadwick, Esq., C.B.

Return, taken in the second week in July, 708 children are shown to be in the habit of attending some definite Sunday School; and it is explained, in respect to this aggregate, that the Public Schools at the date at which it was taken were unusually thinned in consequence of the prevalence of measles.

It may be proper that we should here advert to the representation of one of the witnesses whom we examined, to the following effect: He had "been told by a Presbyterian Minister who takes some interest in Sunday School teaching, that children taught in the Public Schools, as a rule, are the least competent of any to answer questions put to them. And he (the Presbyterian Minister) attributes this to what I have before stated,—the neglect of the Master." (Evidence, p. 21.) Viewing this statement as of sufficient significance, were it substantiated, to call for further enquiry and elucidation, we incorporated in the series of questions circulated among the lay and ecclesiastical visitors of the Schools the following: "Have you any knowledge whether in your neighbourhood the children in attendance at the Public Schools evince at Sunday Schools either less or more intelligence than other children, taking into consideration the relative social advantages of the children compared?" The answers to this question exhibited in the Appendix (p. 85-6) show that the conclusion arrived at by the Presbyterian Minister must have been based on partial data.

Among the measures adopted to promote Education in the Public Schools, an important place is assigned in the later Annual Reports of the Board of Education to the encouragement extended to meritorious or promising pupils' under the system of Exhibitions to Superior Schools. These rewards are of sufficient value to elicit public interest in the competition for them, and to make their influence perceptible not only among pupils, but also among Teachers. Between 1860, when the first examination for Exhibitions took place, and 1867, 196 boys competed for, and 36 succeeded in obtaining them. Of these, 3 subsequently obtained Exhibitions under the Council of Education, in the more advanced examinations and wider competition from all the Schools of the Colony, which these latter Exhibitions attract. The importance of rewards is an elementary truth in the science of Education founded in the laws of the human mind, and established by experience. To dispense with them must inevitably weaken the efficiency of any system, and thus prove inconsistent with genuine economy. Some modification of arrangement, however, appears to be necessary, so as to bring the Public Schools more generally than they are at present under the influence of the Exhibition System. A presentation to a Superior School, of the value of £16 yearly (equivalent to the maximum rate of school fees), is a tangible benefit to a youth whose home is within convenient proximity to a Superior School; but it is not so in the case of one whose ordinary residence is at a distance, and whose parents are not in circumstances which will enable them to supplement the Exhibition allowance with a sufficient amount to meet the cost of board, &c. away from home. In support of the system of School Exhibitions, we have pleasure in referring to the able Report and valuable evidence of the Royal Commission on Education in Victoria, 1867. Among the recommendations of that Commission is one of "Annual Exhibitions at the Grammar Schools, Queen's Scholarships in the Training School, and appointments in the Civil Service to be given to the pupils of Public Schools,"—a recommendation which it appears by the Report (of subsequent date) of the Board of Education in that Colony was anticipated by it, and is now partially given effect to, by the establishment of Scholarships of the yearly value of £50. In Canada rewards of this description have been in operation for many years; while, in advocating their extended application in England, that eminent educationist, Mr. Mathew Arnold,\* observes: "But if the State only granted for secondary instruction the sum which it originally granted for primary—£20,000 a year—and employed this sum in founding Scholarships for secondary Schools, with the stipulation that all the Schools which sent pupils to compete for these Scholarships should admit inspection, a beginning would have been made; a beginning which I truly believe would, at the end of ten years time, be found to have raised the character of secondary instruction all through England."

Rewards.  
Exhibitions to  
Superior  
Schools.

It has been stated in a previous part of this Report that when, in 1853, the present system of Education received the approval of the Legislature, the Board then called into existence was empowered to send to England or elsewhere for competent Teachers, to whom employment was to be guaranteed for five years, at incomes varying from £150 to £300 per annum. Under that authority six trained Teachers were introduced from England and Scotland, of whom three remain as conductors of Schools under the Board. But for the last twelve years no addition has been made to their number, excepting by casual arrivals from Home or from the neighbouring Colonies, which, however, are all

Teachers.

\* Lately Foreign Assistant Commissioner to the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the state of Popular Education in England.

but *nil*. The main reliance of the Board has been in raising up a class of Teachers trained at the best of the Public Schools. By a return which we have received we find, that since 1854, ninety individuals of both sexes have entered into training as Teachers, of whom thirteen are now employed either as Teachers or Assistant Teachers in the Government Schools, sixteen continue in the position of Pupil Teachers, and the remainder have resigned either on marriage, or to adopt some other pursuit than teaching, or have left the Colony, (some to become Teachers in other Colonies) or died, or been dispensed with on the ground of inefficiency.\*

While the advantages both educational and economic of training Teachers at the best Schools,—where their immediate efficiency is stimulated by the hope of promotion when vacancies arise—are undeniable, we are not of opinion that it is judicious to rely exclusively on the source indicated for obtaining a supply of Masters to carry on a sound and progressive system of Education. Teaching is an art not yet brought to perfection even in the most enlightened Countries of the Old World, but one which is still receiving continual improvements, as the result of widening experience and the reflections of thoughtful and practical minds. To deny the Colony the advantage of those improvements would not be merely to stand still, it would inevitably be to retrograde. It is too much to expect that methods of Teaching once rooted among us will receive from any local impulse that revision in the light of general principles from time to time, without which, anywhere, a system is sure to degenerate into a mere mechanical routine. The influences which must carry us on in Education, as in many other things, must for years to come be sought not among ourselves, but from older and more advanced Countries; and in the immediate case under our consideration they cannot be more conveniently or effectually realised than by the periodical infusion into our Colonial Schools of new Teaching power from England. We deem it to be neither at variance with our Commission, nor in excess of its objects, earnestly to press these views on the attention of those with whom the principal responsibility in this matter rests.

Local  
inspection of  
Schools.

While the control of the Public Schools is vested exclusively in the Board of Education, by the appointment of Special Visitors the endeavour is made to enlist local interest in their daily management. But from the evidence that has come before us we are forced to the conclusion that the check or stimulus thus contemplated is feeble and capricious in its operation. While some Schools are frequently visited, there are others of which not a single visitation is recorded in a whole year; and it is feared that, as a general rule, visits are most rare where liability to negligence, arising from other causes, is greatest on the part of Teachers,—negligence, we mean, in consequence of the station in life of the children attending the class of Schools referred to, being one on which a defaulting Master may with most confidence presume for impunity. A tabulated statement in the Appendix (p. 53) illustrates our observation in striking detail. Putting aside the consideration of the question of how far it is practicable by a different system of Public Education to create or increase local interest in the common Schools of the Colony, it is not a useless labour to compare the facts exhibited in that statement with those realised under different educational arrangements elsewhere. What is the value in quantity and quality generally of local School inspection of an unofficial description? Notwithstanding the inducements supplied by religious zeal and rivalry in connection with Denominational Schools, to which category the vast majority of the common Schools in England belong, the Education Commissioners of 1861 deplore “the want of local interest and of proper local support as the leading defect in the present system.”

Sir J. K. Shuttleworth emphatically observes:—

Let any person make enquiry in his own neighbourhood from the Masters of the Schools by which he is surrounded, how often the Schools are entered by visitors; whether there is a School Committee; when and where it assembles; whether, if there be a School Committee, it ever examines the Scholars, or how often annually; and whether the Master receives any and what amount of voluntary assistance in the instruction of the day School, or of the evening School; or the Mistress, in teaching the girls to knit or to sew. The lamentable fact is that, except at some public annual exhibition dignified by the name of an examination, few or none of the subscribers enter an elementary School, from the commencement to the close of the year; that the Schoolmaster is often without any other assistance, encouragement, or advice than that of the Clergyman, or in other cases of some single Member of the Committee of Managers.†

In the Report of the Senior Inspector of Schools in New South Wales for 1865, under the head of “*Local Supervision*,” that functionary writes:—

I am not aware that much improvement has taken place under this head. In one-fourth of the Schools the local patrons are of considerable service, and to some extent fulfil the ends of their con-

\* The total cost of training 559 Teachers, during the period from 1849 to 1865 inclusive, for service in Catholic Schools, was £50,882 7s. 5d.—Privy Council Report, quoted in *The Dublin Review*, April 1867. The amount paid for this service in Tasmania from 1854 to 1866 was £1253 13s. 11d.

† Four Periods of Education, p. 520.

stitution; in other localities they disagree, but more frequently are indifferent to the interests of the School, and very often the work of local supervision is left to him of the number, who by his intelligence, force of character, or disinterestedness, accepts the leading part, and takes the trouble of acting.

Similar in effect is the representation given in the Fifth Report of the Board of Education in Victoria, for 1866 :—

The Inspectors in their Annual Reports do not speak well of the attention devoted by local Committees to their duties. The general opinion appears to be to the effect that, although there is a slight improvement in their attention to their duties, and although they visit more frequently, yet petty jealousies often interfere with harmonious action, and they are apt to be lethargic unless some point of dispute arise. It appears also that, where a Clergyman is connected with a School, the other Members of the Committee too often leave the whole business to him.

In the several cases to which these quotations refer, it will not fail to be noted that larger powers or responsibilities are implied on the part of the local bodies or individuals whose fitful or lethargic interest in the Schools of their neighbourhood is described; than are vested in the Special Visitors of the Schools under the Board of Education in this Colony. It is, among others, of “*subscribers*” that Sir J. K. Shuttleworth makes mention; it is of “*local patrons*” that the New South Wales Inspector quotes the apathy; of organised bodies called “*local Committees*” that the Victorian Report speaks in almost identical language.

It follows that the Board of Education must rely for detailed information as to the condition of the Public Schools, the efficiency of the Masters, and the progress of the pupils, principally on the periodical reports of an official Inspector, whose appointment it has been already shown was made from the first a leading feature in the present Educational System. And it does not appear to us possible to dispense with such a functionary under any arrangements by which the State accepts a position of responsibility in respect to the education of the people, whether it undertakes the direct responsibility of providing Education, or that of making others provide it, who in turn are accountable for the fulfilment of this duty. In the well-known paper already quoted on National Education, by Dr. Temple, he says of inspection that “it is the letting in of the light. The first step to all real efficiency is to have a School well examined, and its deficiencies pointed out. Other steps may follow or not, but obviously till that is done nothing else can be done.” The office of a School Inspector is intermediate between local instrumentality and centralised direction or authority; and the reasons why it should exist are so intimately blended with those which establish the expediency of a central authority in Education, that they cannot be stated apart. Convenient or indispensable as local agency may be in supervising the routine of a system, immobility, if not degeneration, is the natural characteristic of systems entirely local. The influences which in the present century have wrought an entire change in the parishes of England in respect to the relief of the poor, extinguishing a system that was demoralising and burdensome; or those which are improving the police in counties and boroughs; or which have to a great extent supplanted gaols that were nurseries for criminals; or have abolished nuisances that abridged the average duration of human life; or introduced methods of teaching based on a correct philosophy and fitted to promote human progress, did not originate with Poor Law Guardians, County Justices, Borough Magistrates, or Parish Schoolmasters. So far from it, from *these* proceeded the most inveterate opposition to change. Improvement came at the instance, and was accomplished through the persevering labours, of men who surveyed existing systems from a more or less remote and independent position where larger views naturally prevailed. In the affair of Education, no experience more pertinent could be quoted in illustration of the consequences of a fragmentary system—one exclusively local in its machinery—than that of America. It is the experience of States which, from their birth, recognised the duty and importance of providing instruction for the rising generation, but failed to appreciate beforehand the consequences of the absence of centralised authority in connection with the Schools which they established. Those consequences are described in the following extracts from the *Edinburgh Review*,\* in a paper setting forth the measures adopted to correct them :—

Official  
inspection  
and Central  
control.

“The next step which followed was the appointment, in April, 1837, of a Board of Education with a Secretary. The Statute of that year, chap. 241, establishes a Board of Education for the State. The Governor, with the advice of his Council, was authorised to appoint eight persons, who, together with the Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, *ex officio*, constitute the Board. The persons appointed hold their offices for eight years, but one retires every year, commencing with the person first on the list. The Governor and Council fill up vacancies occurring by death, resignation, or other causes. The Board of Education, at its first meeting, appointed the Hon. Horace Mann, then President of the Senate of Massachusetts, to the office of Secretary;—a choice which, judging from the Reports named at the head of this Article, appears to have been highly advantageous to the State. He describes the condition of Education in the State, at the time of his appointment, in the following words :—The Common School system of Massachusetts, says he, has fallen into a state of general unsoundness and debility: a great majority of the School-

houses are not only ill-adapted to encourage mental effort, but in many cases are absolutely perilous to the health and symmetrical growth of the children: the Schools are under a sleepy supervision: many of the most intelligent and wealthy of our citizens have become estranged from their welfare; and the teachers of the Schools, although, with very few exceptions, persons of estimable character and of great private worth, yet, in the absence of all opportunities to qualify themselves for the performance of the most delicate and difficult task which, in the arrangements of Providence, is committed into human hands, are necessarily, therefore, without fault of their own, deeply and widely deficient in the two indispensable pre-requisites for their office viz.—a knowledge of the human mind as the subject of improvement, and a knowledge of the means best adapted wisely to unfold and direct its growing faculties. This representation of the results of the administration, for two centuries of the Common Schools, *by the public themselves*, without the aid of any controlling, advising, or enlightening central power, is highly instructive: It shows that in conducting Education, as in executing every other difficult and complicated process, the blind are not adequate successfully to lead the blind. The example of Massachusetts is calculated to prove instructive to Great Britain equally in those points in which her machinery for Education has failed, and in those in which it has proved successful. The evidence afforded by the "Reports," that the Schools had degenerated, and that public Education was rapidly declining, under the management of mere local Committees, is overwhelming and irresistible."

Similar in effect are the following passages from a "Letter relating to Education, by Edwin Chadwick, Esq., ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 21st March, 1862":—

"How respectable soever may be the Schools for the compulsory education given in Boston and the chief cities and towns of the Northern States of America, I am quite confident on administrative principle, that on the fragmentary township arrangement which appears to be analogous to that of the French Commune and the English Parish; the educational provisions, and the education of the great bulk of the population out of the largest towns, must be coarse and inferior, as indeed a number of local reports which I have received prove it to be."

"In that state of fragmentary isolation, whether of sect or of district, which fanaticism or sinister interest praises under the name of independence, success yields no example for imitation, failure no warning for avoidance. In illustration of the default of administrative principle, I cite the following passages from a paper sent to me by the late Hon. Horace Mann, of Massachusetts, an educationist of extensive observation and repute, with whom I corresponded: 'In the first place,' he says, speaking in New England, 'the best methods should be well ascertained; in the second, they should be universally diffused. In this Commonwealth there are about 3000 Public Schools, in all of which the rudiments of knowledge are taught. These Schools are at the same time so many distinct, independent communities, each being governed by its own habits, traditions, and local customs. There is no common superintending power over them; there is no bond of brotherhood or family between them. They are strangers and aliens to each other. The Teachers are as it were embedded each in his own School district; and they are yet to be excavated and brought together, and to be established each as a polished pillar of a holy temple. As the system is now administered, if any improvement in principles or modes of teaching is discovered by talent or accident, in one School, instead of being published to the world it dies with the discoverer. No means for multiplying new truths, or even for preserving old ones. A gentleman filling one of the highest civil offices in this Commonwealth, a resident in one of the oldest counties, and in one of the largest towns in the State, a sincere friend of the cause of Education, recently put into my hands a printed report drawn up by a Clergyman of high repute, which described as was supposed an important improvement in relation to our common Schools, and earnestly enjoined its general adoption, when it happened to be within my knowledge that the supposed new discovery had been in successful operation for 16 years in a town but little more than 16 miles distant. Now in other things we act otherwise. \* \* \* Do we not need, then, some new and living institution, some animate organization, which shall at least embody and diffuse all that is now known on this subject, and thereby save every year hundreds of children from being sacrificed to experiments which have been a hundred times exploded?'"

On a review of the evidence relating to the inspection of the Public Schools, our opinion is that it is totally inadequate. Nor do we look upon it as practicable for one Officer to discharge the duty of inspection for the whole Colony. Between 1857 when there were 80 Public Schools, and 1863 when the number had increased to 94, two Inspectors were employed. There are now in existence 106 Schools, and many of those established at recent periods are in remote situations, where the visits of an Inspector, while they are most necessary, also consume more time than is required for Schools in old and populous neighbourhoods. The existing defect, we understand, has been repeatedly pointed out in the Reports of the Education Board.

---

\* The following is given in a New York School Report as illustrative of the popular administrative conceptions in the Rural Districts as to the standard and value of the capacity for School Teaching:—A calls on one of the Trustees,—“Well, neighbour A, says the Trustee, we have hired a man to keep our School this winter.” “Oh! how much do you give him a month?” “Twelve dollars.” You must be a bright one to pay a man such high wages these hard times to keep a School. I’ve just hired a man to work for me this winter at chopping, and he is a real smart fellow too; he can thrash 10 or 12 bushels of wheat in a day, and clean it up in the evening; and he’ll chop his four chords of wood day by day and not wink at it; and I think it is a pity if we can’t employ a man to sit round the stove all day and have 30 or 40 to wait on him as cheap as I can hire one to do the work I have for a man to do, and I think it is a chance if he has much of a School.” “I know, says the Trustee, it is too much, but no one else came along, so we thought we had better hire him.” “Didn’t you try to beat him down any?” “I should think we did. We worked him from noon till nine o’clock at night, and got him down four dollars; he asked sixteen at first.” “You should have beat him down four dollars more, and that would be more than a Teacher ought to have.”—Note to Chadwick’s Letter.



By the return at page 109 in the Appendix the following results are shown in relation to the financial administration of the Education Board during the last eight years. In 1859 the cost per School from public funds averaged at £153; in 1860, £144; 1861, £118; 1862, £120; 1863, £125; 1864, £115; 1865, £110; 1866, £111. During that period the Schools have risen in number from 84 (in 1859) to 101 (in 1866), and the total sum expended by the Board diminished from £12,854 to £11,303, or to the extent of £1551 in the latter year. For the same years the per-centage of School fees to expenditure from the public revenue stood thus: 22, 23, 35, 35, 32, 35, 33, 34 per cent. It would be futile to expect more than general indications from the data quoted; as, obviously, the cost of each School must be influenced more or less by special circumstances beyond any administrative control; and the proportion which School fees bear to other sources of income must, in the same manner, fluctuate with the prosperity of the classes from whom these fees are derived. We feel ourselves, however, justified in pointing to the Return in question as showing that the economical disbursement of the funds placed at its disposal has not been lost sight of by the Board; and when we advert to the decline which has, without any interruption, taken place in the period between 1859 to 1866 in the wages and profits of labourers, mechanics, and small tradesmen, we regard the increase of 12 per cent. in the proportion of School fees as not unsatisfactory.

Financial  
administra-  
tion of the  
Board of  
Education.

In 1859 the numbers on the rolls of the several Schools is represented in the Annual Statistics at 2825, and the average amount of aid per scholar in daily attendance £3 3s. 5d.; in 1860 the figures were respectively 4194 and £4 4s. 7½d.; 1861, 4751, £3 13s. 3½d.; 1862, 5100, £3 6s. 9½d.; 1863, 4599, £3 4s. 9d.; 1864, 7791, £3 3s. 6½d.; 1865, 8294, £2 19s. 0½d.; 1866, 8198, £2 17s. 6½d.

It remains that we should state our conclusions on the different modes of reducing the Government liability for education which have either been distinctly propounded to us in evidence, or suggested by its tenor. There are two questions, however, of a general character the previous determination of which is desirable both on account of their intrinsic importance and their bearing on the economy of any system of Education, whether a State or a voluntary system. These are, (1) Shall education be made compulsory? and (2) Shall the profession of a Teacher be open to all who may choose to enter upon it, with or without authenticated qualifications, or shall a licence or diploma, as in some Countries, be necessary?

It needs scarcely be insisted on, that were every parent compelled by law to provide an elementary education of a prescribed and adequate standard for his children the income of Teachers would be augmented from pupils' fees in the proportion of the increased number of pupils which the law would send to School, and the extended duration of their attendance there,—and so far, the occasion for direct pecuniary aid from the State would be obviated or diminished. In the same way, if the competition of unqualified Teachers were eliminated, and the number of Teachers thus reduced, the average incomes of those who remained would be increased.

The admissibility of legal compulsion as a principle in public Education, and its expediency in practice, are by no means settled questions among educationists, and we do not profess to have arrived at a unanimous and thoroughly accordant conclusion in respect to them. That it is a duty on the part of parents, which they cannot neglect without injuring society, to educate their offspring, we are agreed in thinking. But it does not necessarily follow that society is authorised to interpose to enforce the discharge of the parental obligation in this, any more than in other familiar instances in which the well-being of society is involved in the acts or omissions of individuals. Intervention by legal process, even in cases which, abstractedly considered, would seem most unquestionably to justify it, must be determined by considerations of practical expediency. Is the advantage attained by compulsory means sufficiently great to outweigh the incidental moral disadvantages of a resort to legal coercion in any sphere of action in which the alternative of voluntary inducements affords reasonable ground to expect that the end proposed will be accomplished? Can a compulsory system of Education be carried out unless at a price in the machinery\* employed, and in the nature of the expedients which must be resorted to, which counterbalances the gain achieved? Provided these questions can be answered in the affirmative, we are so deeply sensible of the dangers to be apprehended from the growth of an uneducated population, so alive to the importance of the State affirming the principle that Education is a public concern as well as a private one,—a duty of the citizen as well as of the parent,—that we are prepared to recommend compulsory legislation. If society is anywhere in danger from the ignorance of its members, and called upon to protect itself, it is especially the case where political institutions have invested all classes and conditions with the power either to promote or retard not only their own prosperity and advancement, but those of others as well. At the same time, we have not failed to notice the most recent evidence on this subject. Mr.

Compulsory  
Education.

\* In Appendix (p. 110) a mode is suggested; but we offer no opinion on its feasibility.



Fraser, an authority already quoted in this Report, in the fourth of his series of Letters on the Education of the People, in the *Evening Mail* of April 22nd, 1867, remarks :—

“The other points upon which I ought, perhaps, to say one word is the point of Compulsory Education. Before people press this remedy of an admitted evil very strongly, they should at least read carefully what Mr. Pattison and Mr. Matthew Arnold have said of the effects of the compulsory system in Germany and French Switzerland. To the public spirit of the people, and not to legislative enactments, each of these gentlemen attributes the flourishing condition of German and Swiss education. ‘The schooling,’ says Mr. Pattison, ‘is compulsory only in name.’ Mr. Arnold ‘doubts whether the Swiss law is ever really executed at all;’ and adds, that, though primary instruction is most prosperous in Canton Vaud, ‘the making it compulsory by law has not added one iota to its prosperity.’ In the New England States the compulsory law is notoriously a dead letter on the Statute Books. Where the Schools are full—and that is not everywhere—they are filled solely by moral influences. ‘Truantism and absenteeism where they exist snap their fingers at the law.’”

In England the principle of compulsion is limited to the provision in the Factory Acts at present; but it has been proposed to extend its application to children in agricultural employments, and also to make the school attendance of pauper children a condition of out-door relief to their parents.

According to Mr. Flint,\* Registrar of the late Royal Commission on Education, the proportion of school attendance to population in England, without a compulsory law, is 1 to 7·7; in Prussia, under compulsory legislation, it is 1 to 6·27.

Certified  
Teachers.

We have less difficulty than with the preceding question in pronouncing an opinion on the expediency of requiring that all Teachers should be required to produce a certificate of competence from a recognized authority before being allowed to prosecute that calling. There is no principle on which such a condition could be deemed a hardship which does not equally apply to professions in which it has been immemorially established; and its certain effect would be to elevate the profession of Education, and protect those classes who are not competent to judge for themselves from the incapacity of persons by whom school-keeping is made a *dernier ressort*. Stress was laid by some of the witnesses whom we examined on the disadvantage under which the Teachers of Schools not subsidised by the Board of Education laboured in their competition with Schools aided by that body. Far greater disadvantage in our opinion ensues from the competition of unqualified Masters; and a considerable step would be made towards placing common Schools generally in centres of population on an equal and independent footing, without risk in the quality of education, if certificates of professional fitness were made indispensable on the part of all teachers. In the adoption of such an arrangement, of course due consideration would require to be shown, as is usual, for existing interests.

Modes of  
reducing  
Educational  
expenditure.  
Optional  
rates.

The modes in which it might be practicable to reduce the burden on the General Government for Education are of two kinds: (1.) transference of the liability, or a portion of it, to the Districts; (2.) reduction in the detail of the present apparatus or of the expenditure thereon. By one witness it appeared to be contemplated that the liability of the Districts might be of an optional character on their part; permissive powers of assessment being conferred upon them, but without any further inducements to give effect to those powers than that of rateable assistance from the public revenue. On this proposition our opinion is unqualified, that it would prove, if adopted, *most* inoperative precisely in those localities in which the need of public provision for Education was greatest. This is the ascertained result of experience in England; if not under a system of permissive rating, under conditions analogous in some respects, and more, not less, favourable in others than this Colony presents: “You never can unite really these three qualities,—that education shall be voluntary, that it shall be efficient, and that it shall be universal. \* \* \* \* You have too much in one place, too little in another, none in a third.” Such is the opinion formed after many years’ experience and observation by Mr. Lingen,† the Secretary of the Privy Council Committee on Education; and we are satisfied that it would be borne out under a system of permissive rating were it resorted to in this Colony.

School Rates.

If direct taxation for Education be advisable under any circumstances, it is evident in our opinion that it must be made imperative by the Legislature, not left to local option. The question which follows is, By what agency, that of local bodies or that of the Central Government, an Education rate (supposing it established) ought to be levied and expended? On this question the division of opinion among ourselves, added to a division on the previous question of the expediency, either through local or central agency, of a system of rating as a special means of providing for the support of the Public Schools, is such as to discourage our recommending that mode

\* Letter in *Evening Mail*, 24th April, 1867.

† Evidence before Commission on Schools in Scotland, 1865.

of accomplishing the object of our Commission. In arriving at this conclusion we have been guided by considerations which relate to the interests of Education; not by any which affect the merits of one expedient as compared to another in a fiscal light. We believe that it would be difficult, or impossible, to escape as a consequence of direct taxation for the maintenance of Schools the demand which would arise to vest in local bodies the appointment of Teachers, the power of fixing their salaries, and directly or indirectly determining the scope of education,—powers which it would, at least, be premature to entrust to local bodies, even if at any future period it should be desirable so to do. Although, by the previous tenor of this Report, we may have left no doubt as to our sense of the inexpediency of purely local educational arrangements, we deem the point one of sufficient moment to justify our quoting the most recent opinion of Educationists upon it in this place in which the question is revived in its economical relations. Mr. Fraser, in his third letter on Education, after admitting that a School system may be “too bureaucratic,” observes:—

“On the other hand, the attempt to elicit local interest through the medium of a local rate (the only form which the suggestion hitherto has taken) is not without serious dangers, threatening, as the Commissioners were careful to point out, the efficiency, the independent management, and the religious character of the Schools. I am aware that the American system is often pointed to by persons who have got their notions of what that system really is, and what it really produces, at second-hand, or perhaps from a hasty visit to some of the magnificent Schools in Boston or New York, as a triumph and refutation of all such anticipations. But I hope I shall not be doing wrong if, in the interests of a great question, I venture to transcribe a paragraph from the Report, as yet unpublished, which I have had the honor to make to Lord Taunton’s Commission on the Common School System of the United States and Canada: ‘I have found,’ I say, ‘that a rate-supported system of Schools, whatever may be its apparent superficial uniformity, really exhibits all the inequalities of a voluntary system, and labours besides under certain special difficulties of its own. The subdivision of Townships into School districts (which brings the School under the control of narrower local influences) is considered in all the New England States as the most mischievous step ever taken in educational legislation. In cities, where public spirit is higher and public opinion more enlightened, the evil is not felt so much, though even there the Schools often fall a prey to the politicians. But in the country all the short-sighted parsimonious motives which too often actuate agricultural communities in relation to Schools have full play; and if this is felt in America, how much more would it be felt in England, where the class who pay the rates would be found one, and the class who use the Schools another? \* \* \* If people suppose that every American rate-supported School is in a condition of efficiency, they are simply laboring under an entire misconception. There are as many degrees of goodness as badness in Schools there as here.’”

In confirmation of these views we take the following extracts from the Reports of Local Superintendents of Common Schools and Boards of School Trustees in Upper Canada, appended to the Annual Report of the Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada for 1865:—

“1. It cannot be doubted that a great drawback to the success of our Common Schools arises from the constant change of Teachers: before he can classify his scholars, or adopt a system, the Teacher is often removed. The annual change of Trustees is, in many cases, followed by the dismissal of the Teacher. The new Schoolmaster commences his duty under a disadvantage, as he is placed there by one party against the wish of another; the children are not slow in discovering this, and consequently have little respect for his authority.”

“2. The proposed alteration of the law with respect to district Trustees will effect a great improvement, provided the appointment is not vested in the Township Councils. Three Trustees might be nominated by the reeve, subject to the approval of the Chief Superintendent. This would, in a great measure, divest the appointment of municipal party influence; and it would also tend to render the office of Teacher more permanent. The constant change of a Teacher is a great evil. \* \* \* Again, Trustees, with a view to keep the School-rate for the District as low as possible, hire a Male Teacher for the winter (when the elder children can attend), and a female to attend to the little ones in the summer. The School might almost as well be closed altogether, as in this way the children learn next to nothing. This is the reason so few well-qualified Teachers look forward to School-keeping as a permanent means of support. They feel that, besides having only a very limited income at best to expect, they are at the mercy of Trustees who have no regard for their interests, and who generally are unable to appreciate a good Teacher, and therefore they are glad of an opportunity of getting out of a profession so precarious.”

“3. I have also to state, as in my last Report, that too many of our Teachers are employed, not for their ability or attainments, but because they offer their services for a small salary. While they take a third class certificate and draw the amount of Legislative grant and Municipal School grant apportioned to their Section, the Trustees are satisfied and these Teachers are continued.”

“4. The impure air of this kind of School-houses makes the visitor desirous of reaching the outside as soon as possible. If you remonstrate with the Trustees, and suggest to them the advisability of erecting more commodious buildings, they will plead poverty of the Section, and say that it is as good as their dwelling-houses. I am of opinion that some means should be used to compel Trustees to erect suitable School-houses.”

“5. On all hands it is allowed that those Teachers who do nothing but go from place to place, offering their services lower than teamsters and herd boys, are effectually destroying the system, and supplanting or rooting out the best Teachers, as a great many of the present Boards employ the lowest that offer as the best for them.”

In the Evidence (p. 11) appended to this Report, allusion is made to English

\* Letter *Evening Mail*, April 19, 1867.

experience under the Poor Law Amendment Act, which confided the selection of officers in the Unions, including Schoolmasters and Mistresses, to the Guardians. The consequence is stated by Mr. Senior in his "Suggestions on Popular Education :"—

"In 1846 the Government interfered. It seems to have despaired of persuading the Guardians to pay adequate salaries to their Schoolmasters, and to have been afraid to compel them. It therefore granted £30,000 a year to be applied in payment of Schoolmasters and Mistresses, and the Privy Council engaged to inspect the Schools," &c.

Nor do we deem the evils which we have deprecated to be of a description that it would be possible to counteract by any central instrumentality. Inspectors of Schools, even though they were invested with similar powers to those reposed by law in the Inspector of Police, would, we believe, prove a feeble check against the consequences of local sluggishness, parsimony, or narrowness. Where the means by which a school was supported were to be found, and the power of appointing and dismissing the Master lay, there everything else would rest also. The experience of the Colony in local administration under central checks has been too short-lived as yet to warrant further experiments, and Education is a department in which the effects of inadequate or faulty provision would be less palpable to common observation—therefore the risk would be greater—than in a matter such as Police, in which the inconveniences that ensue are immediate, local, and appreciable. The cry excited by insecurity to person and property would be heard in any district so as to lead to the proper remedy with a certainty and promptitude which it would be credulous to calculate upon in regard to the consequences of defective educational provision.

Inequality  
inseparable  
from Local  
Rates.

Allusion was made by a witness (p. 3) to the local inequalities of expenditure in the maintenance of Schools under the present system of Education. These inequalities, however, are inevitable in any country where widely different circumstances prevail in the component parts, and the distribution, of the population, or in the physical outline of the several districts; and in any case the test of local subdivisions, where those subdivisions are arbitrary in character, can be of little or no validity. But supposing school liabilities to be localised in Tasmania on the bases of present local expenditure and valuation rolls, what would be the rates imposed in the districts respectively? Discarding fractions, they would stand thus in the following Municipalities:—Hamilton, 1*d.* per £ annual value; Campbell Town, 1½*d.*; Launceston, 2½*d.*; Longford, 2½*d.*; Fingal, 2½*d.*; Oatlands, 3*d.*; Richmond, 3½*d.*; Ross, 3½*d.*; Evandale, 4*d.*; Hobart Town, 4½*d.*; Spring Bay, 5½*d.*; Westbury, 5½*d.*; Glenorchy, 5½*d.*; New Norfolk, 5½*d.*; Green Ponds, 6½*d.*; Clarence, 7*d.*; Brighton, 7½*d.*; Sorrell, 8½*d.*; Glamorgan, 8½*d.*; and in the following Police Districts—Horton, 3½*d.*; Selby, 6*d.*; Hobart Town and Kingston, 9*d.*; George Town, 9½*d.*; Franklin, 1*s.* 4½*d.* That rates so unequal would be patiently submitted to is not to be supposed; and any attempt to rectify this inequality by contributions from the General Revenue, as in the case of Municipal Police Districts, would amount to an abandonment of the principle of local liability for Schools, and reduce the arrangement to the character of a general direct tax for Education.

We do not desire to attach more importance than is due to the opinions expressed by the Special Visitors in answer to our query (23rd) as to the expediency of a local rate. Perhaps, from their situation generally, no other opinions could have been expected from them. But in a practical view their concurrence, with only a few exceptions, ought not to be under-rated. Probably at no former period could such a measure be adopted under less propitious circumstances, and an untimely resort to it now would in all likelihood impede its acceptance as an expedient at some future period when rateable property was less depressed than it is at present.

But, although it appears to us inexpedient to devolve such a liability as would entail any of those risks or objections to which we have adverted, we are impressed with the desirability of enlisting greater local interest in the Public Schools than what prevails at present,—an object which we do not believe to be attainable unless by imposing a direct charge in connection with them upon the districts. At present, one-third of the cost of the erection of a new school must be raised by subscription: we propose that, in addition to this, the cost of repairs to schools should be a local charge, and also the supply of fuel. For these and kindred purposes we would recommend the appointment of Local Committees; and in order to interest these Committees in the educational work of the Schools, and train them to exercise an enlightened influence over it, we would further recommend that the special reports of the Inspector should be forwarded by the Board to the Committee immediately interested therein.

Exclusively  
Free Schools  
in Towns.

A proposition to withdraw assistance from mixed Schools, and to provide education exclusively for free scholars in the two Towns, has occupied our attention. Waiving for the present those considerations which have been insisted on in a previous part of this

Report in favour of blending different classes in the same School, what would be the economical advantage of the change suggested? Its first effect would be to draw a sharper line than obtains at present between the two classes of paying and free pupils. The former must inevitably pay more in the shape of fees, at Schools from which other support is withheld, than at Schools at which the income of the Teacher is supplemented by the State. The latter, on the other hand, must either go without education, or lapse into the class of *free* pupils for whom special provision is contemplated. There is no place under such a system for that intermediate class who at present pay small and varying proportions of the cost of their instruction. It follows, that the number of free scholars for whom provision would have to be made ought not to be calculated as that of the number on the Public School Rolls at present, but at a considerable addition thereto. First, then, by the change proposed we have the cost of an augmented number of free scholars to meet. In the next place, a Pauper School is a school in which the total income of the Master is provided by the State or by the body which has established it. If, however, the salary which is paid to the Teacher of the Pauper School exceeds that paid to the Teacher of a mixed (Government) School, the economy of the change is so far defeated. Or, if the attempt is made to conduct the Free School by Masters at a diminished rate of salary,—according to the evidence of the most competent authorities, the education and general training of the classes in question is impeded. It is an ascertained fact, referred to by more than one witness, that children who have been reared in circumstances estranged from School influences, but at the same time calculated to induce a precocious development of practical acuteness, require the skill, patience, sagacity, and devotion of men who have been specially trained in the work of Education in a greater degree than children brought up under more favourable external conditions. For the services of such men it will be necessary, as it is reasonable, to pay the market value. They are not to be obtained by a system of under-bidding.

Then, it is not *one* Pauper School that would suffice to carry out the proposal under review. Probably not a less number would be necessary than it is expedient to maintain of mixed schools under existing arrangements. That number is determined not alone by the number of pupils for whom provision is required, but also by a reference to the contiguity of the Schools to the homes of the children who attend them. Irregular attendance, or non-attendance, is sure to follow if a school is inconveniently remote; and free scholars are not less fastidious in this respect than those whose education is a parental charge.

To these grounds of misgiving as to the saving that is practicable by establishing a separate class of Schools, we desire to add, that merely Pauper Schools invariably tend to acquire an eleemosynary character in other forms than Education—forms of which the expediency is often questionable, while the cost is certain. By different witnesses the substitution of free for mixed schools was coupled with that of holding out baits to secure attendance in the shape of food and clothing—baits, of which the influence is unfavourable to that self-respect and independence which it should be the object of Education to create and foster. Compared with any evils or defects which have been plausibly alleged against the Public Schools, the consequences, both social and economical, to be apprehended from the multiplication of schools branded with a pauper designation or character, where the poverty that now screens itself from remark, and thus escapes the worst effects of poverty, would be exposed to view side by side with the mendicancy which knows no feeling of shame, acquire a seriousness the more the question is considered, which restrains us from recommending any such change as that referred to. Charitable schools and other institutions are unavoidable, and it is the duty of the State, in reference to the exigencies for which they are indispensable, either to establish or to assist them. We are far from under-rating the good done by Industrial and Ragged Schools, or denying that they meet cases which are *not* met by a common Day School. But we deprecate those exclusive theories which would withhold help in all but extreme cases, which would deny it to those who are not abjectly poor, and which, instead of benefiting the necessitous through the mass in which they are found, insists that they shall stand out from it and be distinguished as the recipients of charity.

The question of increasing the scale of fees at the Public Schools suggested itself at an early stage of our inquiry, and accordingly the fourteenth query was introduced among the interrogatories addressed to the School Visitors and others. From their answers, as well as from information derived from independent sources, we are satisfied that any attempt to enforce a higher rate of payment would defeat the object of such a measure. That rate was fixed at a period when the classes principally interested in the Public Schools were more able than they now are to meet it; moreover, it is not exceeded by that in operation under the Victorian Board of Education. And it would not be wise to overlook the fact that the migratory elements of our population, skilled mechanics, &c., do not overlook the comparison between the relative cost of the different requirements or conveniences of social existence here and in the Colonies adjacent.

Increase in  
School Fees.

## Teachers' Salaries.

Only one witness has hinted at a reduction in the salaries of the Public School Teachers as a desirable retrenchment. He did not see any reason why the salaries here should be £50, £80, and £100, while they range in Adelaide from £40 to £80 only. (Evidence, p. 18.) Without entering into a discussion of the difference between the system of State assistance to Education in South Australia and in this Colony—which explains the difference of salary adverted to in the two cases,—since upon its merits we deem the system of Public Schools preferable to that of subsidising licensed Schools indiscriminately, we desire to advert to the income from various sources of the Head Teachers under the Board of Education. By a Return supplied to us by the Acting Secretary of the Board, we find that in 1866 there were 110 joint Teachers (husband and wife, brother and sister, or parent and son) receiving, in addition to house allowance, salaries amounting to an aggregate sum of £5292, or an average of little more than £48 each; and 13 Teachers receiving a total of £915, or of £70 each. The total emoluments of the former—which are comprehended under the heads of Salary, instruction of Pupil Teachers, instruction of Free Scholars, Fuel allowances, and School fees—amounted in that year to £8628, or an average of £78; in the latter, to £1556, or an average of nearly £120 each. The maximum income, in addition to house allowance or residence, of joint Teachers, appears to have been £392 15s. 10d.; the minimum, £58 8s. 6d., without residence or allowance in lieu thereof. For single Teachers the corresponding figures, and under similar conditions, were respectively £230 8s. 10d. and £67 4s. 4d. The number of joint Teachers in receipt of a total income exceeding £200 was only 9; of single Teachers only 2. Of the former, the incomes of 38 varied from £100 to £196; of the latter, 4 from £100 to £181. The remainder, 7 joint Teachers, or 14 individuals, received (jointly) £92 6s. 8d.; £89 2s. 7d.; £86 8s. 5d.; £81 18s. 8d.; £71 7s. 0d.; £66 10s. 11d.; £58 8s. 6d.; in some instances with, in others comprehending the lowest in the list, without, residence or allowance. Of the latter, or Masters not assisted by wives or relatives, or unmarried, the incomes were £99 10s. 4d., and £91 7s. 0d. without residence, £84 14s. 8d. with, and £74 14s. 1d., £73 16s. 10., £67 17s. 1d., and £67 4s. 4d. without, that adjunct. Upon a review of the details set forth, the question is raised of *which* is the more desirable system in order to secure an efficient class of Teachers, that under which a moderate and nearly equal income is secured to all Teachers, or that in which considerable inequality prevails, but the prizes held out to the most capable are sufficient to reconcile them to wait, while in the meantime they devote their best services to the work of education, stimulated by the hope of reaching them? In either point of view, however, we cannot commend the present rate or distribution of emoluments among the Public Schoolmasters. The prizes are too few to satisfy one theory in the remuneration of service; the compensation in general too small to satisfy the other. In communities in which the desire to improve one's outward position prevails to an extent unknown in old established communities, no matter what earnestness may be assumed to be brought to his vocation by the Teacher, we regard it as unsafe to calculate on any other motives to sustain his zeal and devotion than the motives which actuate those generally by whom he is surrounded; and we cannot arrive at the conclusion that incomes, which in many instances fall short of those realized in employments of a menial or very inferior character, can attract to the vitally important service of education competent Teachers, male or female. We regard this as the most dubious feature in the system of education as at present administered by the Board of Education in this Colony, and deprecate the consequences to be apprehended from the attempt to diffuse education more widely than the means placed at the disposal of that body will efficiently provide for. On this question we would direct attention to the evidence in page 23 of the Appendix.

## Payment according to results.

With a view partly to economy, and in part to improved educational efficiency, a scheme has been propounded to us of payments to teachers according to the results of their teaching. "Salaries of licensed teachers to range from, say, £36 to £72 per annum with fees, thus corresponding to present rate of remuneration in Schools with an attendance not exceeding 30 or thereabouts. The maximum of £72 to be a joint salary of Master and Mistress. Fixed salary (joint) of certificated teacher to be £72 per annum, to be supplemented by augmentation grants ranging from £12 to £72 per annum, and dependent upon classification of Teacher, and size of School." (p. 42.) "The Teacher's classification would depend on his attainments as tested by examination, and on the state of his School as tested by examination under the Programme of instruction. In principle but not in detail it would be precisely the same as the system in England." (p. 8, Evidence.) There is something in the theory of this proposal to conciliate opinion in its favour. It responds to that feeling which prompts the expectation of a similar correspondence between outlay and return in a moral sphere, which is habitually sought in a material one. But does the analogy assumed, exist, between the respective fields of action? Are the conditions in the one case as much under control as in the other? Or, are not the impediments by which we are met in the attempt fairly and consistently to give effect to the principle at issue such as to destroy confidence in it in any practical sense? "To do this (in the language of Sir J. K. Shuttleworth) the following arrangements

are indispensable:—An impartial examiner, on the entrance of each child (or within a short time afterwards—a week for example) must record its state of cleanliness, aptitude for School discipline and instruction, capacity, and actual acquirements. Then the Inspector, having before him these facts, and the number of days which the scholar has attended in each month of the preceding year, might form an approximate opinion on the work done in the School. He would still be ignorant of the amount of hindrances in the home of the child," &c. The inevitable cost incident to the adoption of the system propounded must be manifest. Not one or two inspectors would be sufficient, nor even half a dozen; and still, under a disproportionately expensive staff, only clumsy approximations to a correct estimate of results would be attained, in the determination of which there would be all the inconsistencies inseparable from the various temperaments, opinions, idiosyncracies of so many different judges. On the Masters of the Schools and on the Schools the influence could at best not be unmixed with evil. *Cramming*, or the production of those superficial results which suffice to obtain *marks*, would be induced, with the comparative neglect of children whose capacity was not such as to promise favourably in the arithmetic of the system. Constant misunderstanding and heart-burning between the inspectors and teachers would be unavoidable, and the complaint, whether it sprang from the inefficient who endured only the just penalty of their inefficiency, or from efficient masters whose misfortune it was to have a disproportionate number of indocile or migratory pupils, would be sure in time to upset an arrangement under which a large part of the incomes of persons in a position of trust and responsibility was dependent on the fiat of individuals. For these reasons we cannot recommend the change suggested.

The expediency of reducing the number of Public Schools in Hobart Town, in preference to reductions in sparsely populated districts, was naturally pointed out to us in the urgent pressure to relieve the public exchequer. But, unless to a very limited extent, we find this as an immediate measure of relief to be impracticable. The Teachers of the metropolitan Schools have been so long in the service of the Government, that the pensions to which they would be entitled were they now dispensed with would approximate so closely to the amount of their salaries as not to warrant the hardship which would be inflicted on individuals who had creditably acquitted themselves in their respective situations. We are, therefore, contented to indicate a diminution in the number of the Schools in Hobart Town as an object to be gradually accomplished as favourable opportunities arise. At the same time we do not contemplate that the retrenchment effected in that manner would reduce the total expenditure which would be necessary for education,—it would only enable the governing educational authority, whatever that might be, to meet the requirements of other places at present neglected, or in need of more efficient aid than they receive.

The necessity of a central authority, invested with all the powers requisite to ensure a sound education throughout the Public Schools of the Colony, is sufficiently affirmed in previous passages in our Report. The only question which remains on that head is, the constitution of this central authority. Is a Minister of Education holding office by a political tenure, or a permanent head of an Educational department, or a Board, the most desirable? To the first, the objections are obvious. Special fitnesses are required on the part of a chief to whom the administration of an Educational system is confided,—fitnesses not nurtured in a political arena, and not likely to be acquired in the usually brief period of official existence on a political basis. The real administrator of a department of Education with a Ministerial head would be the permanent chief clerk, from whom it would be too much to expect more than an acquaintance with details,—those enlightened inductions which are the germ of systematic improvements,—and his influence would be comparatively without responsibility. If these objections do not all apply to the second alternative, there are others of great weight which do. Public education is an affair in which many susceptibilities have to be considered,—susceptibilities of a religious, a personal, and a local character; and no matter how unimpeachable the discretion exercised by a single functionary charged with the general control of the Public Schools might be, we are persuaded that he would fail to command that acquiescence which is indispensable to harmony and success. The central authority should not only inspire confidence among all sects or parties, but be so fortified as to withstand that temporary clamour to which, whether reasonable or unreasonable, an individual is apt to succumb. Boards have, in an equivocal sense, been described as *screens*: in an unequivocal sense they are often valuable in that light. They are the safest depositories of interests exposed to the sinister influence of ignorance, prejudice, or transient disrepute, if they are also sometimes the refuge of obsolete theories and superannuated systems. We are cordially united in the opinion that the necessary constitution of the central authority in connection with public Education is that of a Board. We are not ignorant in arriving at this conclusion of the characteristic defects of administration by Boards; but these are of minor importance, and may be overcome

Central Administration.

by systematic pre-arrangement, and entrusting a judicious discretion with a properly selected Chairman.

The advisability of introducing a periodical change of members into the central body has been suggested. The difficulty in giving effect to this proposal by a system of retirements in rotation is, how to reconcile that process with the maintenance of a uniform representation of different religious communions, which we regard as of vital consequence. There are some communions in which the choice of available men is very contracted, while in none is it superabundant. And in respect to the object proposed, the infusion of "new blood," and by that means the infusion of new ideas, the substitution of new for outworn methods, the past history of the Board of Education shows, that by the operation of natural causes they are fully realized, while the continuity and uniformity which are also desirable in the administration of an extensive department are preserved.

The duties which devolve upon the central educational authority require that it should be invested with large discretionary powers. This was acknowledged in respect to England when the Education Committee of the Privy Council was first appointed\*; and the reasons in favour of the concession there, apply with greater force in a Colony like this in which local conditions are of a less settled or definable character, and consequently less susceptible of being classified and provided for according to fixed rules, than might be predicated in an older country.

In bringing our Report to a conclusion, we assure Your Excellency that we have prosecuted the enquiry which we were commissioned to make with an earnest wish to relieve the public finances. If we are unable as the result of our labours to contribute in any immediate sense to that object, the reasons are such as commend themselves. The education of those who will in due time constitute the adult population of this country, embodying its industry, its enterprise, its moral worth, and directing its course, not only by their individual but their public action also, as the framers of its laws and institutions, is an object far too momentous in our judgment to be abandoned to chance or tampered with according to fiscal convenience. Descending from considerations of duty—which on the part of a State embrace the interests of the unborn as well as of the living—to those of hard calculation, we are convinced that to curtail the means of diffusing education at the present time would prove a measure not of wise and genuine economy, but both short-sighted and unprofitable. And if the view which we have been led to take of the present system of education is, undoubtedly, in the main a favourable one, we are fortified in it by a witness whose evidence before us, and whose official Reports, show that he is very far from being a partial, while he is indubitably a competent judge; we allude to Mr. Stephens, from whose Memorandum (p. 42) we quote the following passage: "The advantages of the existing system should not be ignored. If the present grant be maintained, and such additional sums as are required by the increasing demand for Schools be annually voted, I have no doubt there will be a more general diffusion of the means of education than can be immediately secured under any new system." Nor should it occasion any surprise that we should have found so little to condemn, so little in the way of amendment to propose. Successive Governments have not been wanting in the vigilance which would have detected glaring defects or excrescences; Parliament, by Committee after Committee on Education, has maintained a salutary check; and the proceedings of the Board of Education itself are open to the public press, and exposed to the criticism which invariably attends proved abuse or failure.

Our conclusions may be thus summarily stated:—

1. That we consider the present system upon the whole to have worked beneficially for the country, in providing elementary education for all those children whose parents were unable to pay for their education.
2. That it has provided education of an elementary character for all classes of children throughout the Island, where the number fixed by the Regulations (21) could be assembled together.

---

\* "Could any maxims be prescribed in an Act of Parliament for a code of School Laws? Clearly not; because one law may suit a School in one place, and yet be wholly inapplicable to a School in a different District. Nay, one law may suit a School for one class of persons, and be wholly unsuitable to another kind of School in the same street of the same town. \* \* \* If, then, an Act of Parliament were to specify what should be taught, it would either contain the most absurd and impracticable of all provisions, or to make it tenable it must have a saving clause that would render the whole nugatory and inoperative,—to wit—if the Board and the local authority shall think fit. So that, under pretext of specifying, it would specify nothing at all, but only give rise to constant cavils among the parties, and to endless litigation upon the question of *imperative* and *directing*, so well known among lawyers."—*Edinburgh Review*, January, 1838.



3. That the admission of those children into the Schools whose parents were able to contribute towards their education has enabled the Board to extend its operations far beyond what could have been accomplished if the means at its disposal had been limited to the Government grant, and secured for the poorer classes a superior quality of education, and associations which must necessarily have operated greatly to their benefit, and tended to the removal of those distinctions between the different classes which prevent mutual sympathy.

4. That the contribution by the more wealthy portion of the population of one-third of the cost of erecting School-houses in the different Districts has secured, to a great extent, healthy and commodious School buildings for all the children of the neighbourhood without distinction.

5. That the Government did not interfere in the matter of Education until the Denominational and other systems had failed to supply the quantity and quality of Education which the safety and welfare of the Colony demanded.

6. That the admitted duty of the State to educate the children of the poor could not have been accomplished at less expense to the Colony, or so well, by any system which had in view the exclusive education of that class of children.

7. That the abandonment of the present system would entitle the Masters employed in the Public Schools to compensation for loss of office, and deprive the Colony of the valuable services of some who have been trained for their work and brought from England at the public expense.

8. That any material defects in carrying out the present system can be removed, and increased benefits secured under it, by legislation.

Our recommendations are :—

That the system of Public School Education be provided for by legal enactment; the Bill to be submitted to Parliament for that purpose leaving the following proposals to its decision :—

1. The compulsory education of neglected children,—where the parents are in a situation to defray the expense, at *their* cost; where they are *not*, at that of the State.

2. Providing that licences or certificates of different grades should be required from Teachers, and disqualifying uncertificated persons from prosecuting that calling. Also, that School-houses be licensed.

3. The appointment of a Central authority in connection with Schools, and with defined powers.

4. The appointment of Local authorities.

5. Also of Inspectors.

6. Providing for Education by a fixed grant instead of an annual vote, and the objects and the conditions of its outlay.

7. Securing reserves in various parts of the Island for School-houses and Teachers' dwellings, &c.

Pending legislation, and apart from it, we recommend :—

1. That, in the attempt to extend educational provision as widely as possible, due care be taken not to lower the standard of qualification on the part of Teachers, or of instruction in the Schools.

2. With a view to meeting the requirements of Rural Districts (where the fixed stipends of Teachers are necessarily their principal dependence), the expenditure in populous localities (where School fees are considerable) should be gradually diminished; and that the amount thus saved be applied so as to provide an adequate remuneration to competent Teachers in the Country. Also, that a reduction of one School, or if practicable two, in Hobart Town be immediately effected.

3. That Local Boards be appointed for the admission of children *free* whose parents are not able to contribute towards the education of their children, and for fixing the amount to be paid by parents who cannot pay a maximum fee of one shilling.

4. That the present Inspector of Schools and the Secretary to the Board of Education be relieved from any office duties but such as are incidental to the discharge of the duties of Inspection, and that both be employed continuously in visiting the Public Schools.

5. That no reduction be made in the amount estimated by the Board of Education and inserted in the Estimates for 1868 (£11,000) as necessary for the service of the ensuing year, unless as the result of such systematic changes as Parliament may deem advisable.



XXX

6. Although the Ragged Schools are not, strictly speaking, comprehended in the terms of our Commission, we desire to add a recommendation that they should be inspected from time to time by the Inspectors of Schools, and the reports forwarded to the Managers of those Institutions.

Witness our hands and seals this twelfth day of September, 1867.

FREDERICK MAITLAND INNES. (L.S.)

ALFRED KENNERLEY. (L.S.)

P. O. FYSH. (L.S.)

JNO. W. GLEADOW. (L.S.)

HENRY BUTLER. (L.S.)

STEPHEN SHEEHY. (L.S.)

---

# EVIDENCE.

---

FRIDAY, 31 MAY, 1867.

M. BURGESS, *Esquire, Secretary to Board of Education, and Deputy Inspector of Schools.*

In reply to Questions from the Chairman, states,—

I HAVE been rather more than twelve years in the Department. I have for many years given attention to the system of Education pursued in this Colony; and I have been referred to by the Chairman as to the means by which the cost of Education in Hobart Town might be reduced to the General Government. My conclusions will be found in a paper already printed as a Parliamentary document three or four years ago. They had reference to the reduction of certain Schools in Hobart Town by establishment of Infant Schools. The same number of Schools will be required now. We have now seven, all on the same system. I should still have seven, but five out of the seven should be constituted as Infant Schools. I am not prepared to say what reduction would be effected by this, but I will furnish the Commissioners with an estimate.

I am not prepared to recommend any reduction in the cost of maintaining Schools in the country. Except in a few instances the Teachers receive very small salaries. The present number of these Schools is not sufficient to carry out the objects of the Board. Every month brings fresh applications. In every instance, so far as my memory serves me, aid has been granted when a good case has been made out. The Board have required local subscriptions to be raised towards the erection of School-houses, to the extent of one-third of the cost. They have not required subscriptions towards the Teacher's salary, except in the shape of School fees. I only know of one case where the School fees were supplemented by subscriptions. This was at Emu Bay. The Circular Head Company made an annual grant of, I think, £20 to the Teacher. That grant has been withdrawn for several years.

In a few instances only have local arrangements been made, &c., to supply fuel to the Schools, &c. in the country.

We have had an accession to our masters from the other Colonies of a few,—only three. We depend generally upon the people already in the Colony. Two of the teachers we obtained were highly skilled, and the third was a very fair teacher. All held good appointments in Victoria, but the climate made them leave that Colony. We have had several applications from Victoria for employment, but are not able to offer the applicants sufficient inducements.

There has been an increase in the clerical staff of the office of a clerk at £50 since the first institution. The Colonial Storekeeper keeps an account of the books supplied.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—There are seven schools in Hobart Town. The Central School has accommodation for twice the number attending. Battery Point is full. Goulburn-street, full. At Harrington-street, I am under impression there is room for more. Macquarie-street, room for 200, where there are not 30. Murray-street, room for double the number; there are 60 on the Roll; there is room for another 60 at least. Trinity Hill is overcrowded, and has been so for years.

The children at the Schools whose parents are in a higher position of life, and able to send them to Private Schools, are not, in my opinion, very numerous; but a Return is being prepared which will prove this.

I think the Public Schools established in Hobart Town are not sufficient to meet the educational wants of this city, supposing there were no others.

The Schools do not, from the low rate which the children whose parents are capable have to pay, prevent the establishment of private Schools of a respectable character.

The supervision over those Schools to secure their being properly conducted, and to prevent imposition of children whose parents could pay the maximum but who only pay the minimum, is that of the Board, the Inspector, and the Special Visitors. How often the Inspector visits Hobart Town Schools I cannot say, but as often, I imagine, as his country duties will allow him. Special visitors were appointed in 1855 to Hobart Town Schools, and fresh appointments have been made from time to time. The Returns will show all Special Visitors' visits. I believe the same appointments were made for the Launceston Schools in 1855-6, and the Return to be made out for 1866 will show the inspection and visitation. In Country Schools the amount of supervision—in many Schools—has been frequent; in others the duty has been very indifferently performed. In some few Country Schools there has been an almost entire want of local supervision; in certain Schools it is so now. The fact was, some few years ago there was not much supervision, but the Return for 1865 gives more than 3000 visits, and in 1866 it will show still more. No Regulations that can be made with regard to Country Schools would secure ample supervision, and the objects desirable to obtain it, short of requiring the various localities to contribute to the support of the Schools.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—I am not aware of any offer made by private or public individuals to assist in the establishment of Schools in country localities. No Schools conducted or recognised as Denominational Schools are recognised by the Board. As a matter of fact we have three Schools in the Colony to which only Roman Catholics go, but these Schools are open to every other class of the community. They are under the same Regulations as the other Schools. They are situated at Hobart Town, Harrington-street; Launceston, Margaret-street; and Queenstown, Westbury: the latter is the centre of a large population of Irish

Pensioners. All these Schools are quite as well attended as the average of other Schools in the Colony. The mixed character of the denominations attending the various Schools does not prevent parents of strict religious tenets sending their children to Public Schools. I have found at my recent inspections that the Roman Catholic children were kept outside during the religious instruction in a few Schools, but in general they were present. There is no unnecessary clerical work in office.

The extent to which education in the Country Districts exists I cannot answer positively; but when the Census was taken I made certain extracts which I will furnish the Commission with. But I can say that it is large and increasing. In reference to the Hobart Town Schools, the masters would want assistance if the numbers were increased. The aid is now regulated by the numbers. With that aid they could give instruction to as many as they could get together.

There would be a diminution of expense *pro rata*. Trinity Hill owes something to its position; a large number of the labouring poor live in the neighbourhood, and the master is popular.

I can furnish a history of the progress of the different Exhibitioners from the Public Schools. It would be highly desirable to require all private teachers to hold certificates of competency. In Adelaide, certificates are issued by the Board of Education.

I have heard there is an objection on the part of some parents to send children to the Government Schools.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—I know of objections on the part of some masters to receive children free, but not where they are really paupers.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—The attendance of respectable children does certainly not tend to prevent poorer children being sent. I am aware that children of all classes attend the Schools, more in the country than in the towns. The Public School is probably the only accessible School in the country. I have never suspected that the master made any difference between the children on account of social position, except on one occasion. In this case I made enquiries. Irrespective of social position the children are ranked in classes according to their acquirements.

*By Mr. Innes.*—Have you any reason to believe that the Schools are often visited without the visitors recording the fact in the School Journal? Yes, especially by clergymen.

Has any noticeable improvement or the contrary taken place in the tone and state of education in the Public Schools in recent years? Very great improvement.

To what cause do you attribute this improvement? To the higher character and qualifications of the teachers, and the improved habits of parents.

From your long experience at the Board of Education, and your knowledge of the various questions referred to it from different districts widely differing in social and other circumstances, are you of opinion that the educational interests of the country would be promoted by an invariable system in dealing with localities, as well as by one in which considerable discretion is allowed and exercised by the Board? By one in which considerable discretion is allowed.

Have you had any applications from masters of Private Schools in the Colony to fill vacancies in Government Schools? Yes; appointments have occasionally been given to private teachers. They have, in general, been declined because they did not hold out a sufficient prospect.

Has the Board refused applications in some instances from masters of Schools which it has been compelled to decline on the ground of their moral character, those masters being left undisturbed in their Private Schools by any decision of the Board? Yes.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—No system has suggested itself of compulsory education that I should like to put forward. I am doubtful as to whether a system of compulsory education would be practicable. So far as I have seen, people in the country appear eager for Schools under the Board.

Mr. Burgess withdrew.

---

MR. P. CANAWAY *called in and examined.*

In reply to questions by the Chairman,

I am a Government Schoolmaster in Bathurst-street. I have been there since 1854, having previously been in one of the Denominational Schools. I have been altogether engaged 30 years in Education.

I have two classes, but I make no claim on the Government for payment for those who never pay me. I exercise proper precautions that I am not imposed on. Children generally bring me a recommendation from Ministers or another source when they claim an exemption from school fees. These recommendations are generally reliable. I have known persons imposed on, but it is impossible to guard against it. My aggregate income was last year £270 including gratuity for Pupil Teachers. In excess of the fees fixed by Government the pupils paying were about 20 per cent. The per-centage of non-paying pupils is at present about 25 per cent. About 4 years ago I did receive payment for free scholars, but I found such a difficulty in getting the certificates that I gave it up.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—I have 200 children in the School; the average attendance is 130; the number in attendance is not equal to what it was formerly. Somewhere about 1860 I had an average of 200, with 270 on roll. I cannot attribute the reduced attendance with certainty. We had then a larger staff of officers; and a separate Infant School Teacher, which is our great want. There are a great number of private Schools near the School. No public Schools have been established since the period I speak of.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—I do not know of private Schools in immediate neighbourhood. There are small Schools to be found in every street of the city.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—I could accommodate double the number of children, and could give proper attention to double the number with the regulated aid of the Board. Parents never ask me as to the religious teaching. I have had two occasions only in many years; one, a boy brought a message from his parents objecting to the religious teaching. I have had no interference by Ministers of Religion. Children mix in class without exception as to their social position. Parents wishing to pay a lower fee than 9d. drive a bargain with me, but whether unable or unwilling to pay I cannot say. A reduction of fees would not increase the number of children. The instructions of the Board urge us to take into consideration the position of parents.

*By Dr. Butler.*—As children of all ages of one family attend, it is desirable that the Infant School should be in the same building. Children of all denominations come to my School. In recommending to the Board for Pupil Teachers I do not regard their denomination, but only have regard to their qualifications; my last application was for a Roman Catholic as Pupil Teacher. The number of Catholics is 20 per cent. or thereabouts.

WEDNESDAY, 5 JUNE, 1867.

THOMAS STEPHENS, *Esquire, M.A., Inspector of Schools.*

In reply to questions from the Chairman, states—

I have been engaged in the Inspection of the Public Schools of this Colony for 10 years. I have given my attention to the question of an amended Educational System for the Colony, particularly during the last six years. The defective principle of the existing system is excessive centralisation with limited funds, most of the defects might be traced to this. I mean excessive centralisation as affecting both the cost and the character of the education. As respects the cost, the whole burden of maintaining the Schools and School-houses rests on the Board, and too great expense is thereby thrown on the general Government. It is too great as respects the relative burden thrown on the State. My financial objection is not that the whole cost of Education is too great. My financial objection is limited to the bearing on the Revenue of the Colony. The character of the Education is affected by the excessive centralisation, inasmuch as the distribution of the funds is not satisfactorily apportioned to the population of the country or the efficiency of the Schools.

Can you explain this? As regards distribution of funds, the cost per scholar to Government now varies in different schools from £1 4s. 2½d. (Infant School, Launceston), to £5 18s. 9½d. (Macquarie-street, Hobart Town). Taking the Electoral Districts as the basis of comparison, the cost per scholar to Government varies from £2 7s. 7½d. (Glamorgan) to £4 18s. 2¾d. (George Town). I quote from the last published Report of the Board of Education.

I think it practicable to escape that objection by general regulations without compromising the efficiency of the provision for Education. If the grant were simply a grant in aid given to districts requiring schools (on certain conditions), applied in fact as a stimulus, equal if not superior results might be obtained at a greatly diminished cost. I contemplate districts themselves applying for this aid from the State. In that respect I would adopt the English system, which is that grants in aid of Schools are given on certain conditions.

Was the operation of the particular English system successful or not? Mr. Innes here read Mr. Lowe's opinion,—“The first fault I find in the system, one which the Commissioners have also reported upon, is what I shall call its partiality. The Government abandons the initiative, and it leaves it to the Managers to say where the Schools shall be established, and, so to speak, follows their lead; the consequence is that the foundation of schools is regulated rather by the wealth and public spirit of the inhabitants than by the absolute wants of the locality.” (Mr. Lowe's Speech on the Revised Code of Regulations, February 13, 1862.) Such ill consequences as are mentioned by Mr. Lowe in his speech must occur under any system of grants in aid, but I do not anticipate that they would be greater than under the present system.

What conditions would be required on the part of localities? They should pay a portion of the expense of the erection of school-houses, say one-half or one-third. This condition would not differ with regard to school-houses from that now in force. They should also pay a fixed proportion of the Teacher's salary; also a portion of expense of educating pauper children: and they should keep the school-houses in repair. I do not indicate any compulsory measures further than that the grant should be conditional on these conditions being satisfied. I contemplate certain general rules being prescribed by the governing body on these heads, but more in detail.

Do you think the circumstances of the several populated districts of this Colony are sufficiently alike to render it expedient to apply the same rules to them all? I have always regarded the two towns of Hobart Town and Launceston as distinguished from the rest of the Colony; and I think general rules might be framed applicable to all the Country Districts. I am not prepared to say there would be no risk: there must always be a risk during a transition from State support to a system of Grants in aid.

In what description of localities would you be apprehensive of danger? I cannot say what Rural Districts would avail themselves of the government aid. I am presupposing that the sum raised should be by a local rate, and not by voluntary contribution as in England.

Have you sufficient knowledge of the Valuation Rolls of the different Districts and the centres of juvenile population in the Colony to be able to say whether on your proposal the necessary education rate (if a rate were adopted) would be nearly the same or widely different in the different Districts? It

would be difficult to give any comparative statement. The Districts would have it in their power to regulate the rate within certain limits. They could have expensive or cheaper education.

Taking education as at present dispensed by the Board, and at its existing cost in different localities, and applying your proposed rule there, do you know sufficient of the circumstances of the different Districts to say whether the education rate would approximate generally in the Colony, or widely differ? I think that it might be made to approximate generally.

In what respect has the excessive centralisation an injurious effect on the character of the education? Inasmuch as the State Grants are not proportioned with sufficient accuracy to the efficiency of Teachers and of Schools.

Can you illustrate the principle? I might say it is owing to the absence of any measures providing for such proportion. The objection would be removed if the Teacher's salary were strictly regulated by his qualifications, and the state of his School.

Where has it been possible to realise this? In England. It is attempted under every system of national education that I am acquainted with, with greater or less success.

In what way is the last objection now stated connected with the centralisation of the system in this Colony? I do not mean to imply that it is necessarily connected with it.

You have sufficiently matured your opinions on the system of education in the Colony to have drafted the outlines of an amended educational system? In 1862 I drafted such an outline at the request of a Select Committee of the House of Assembly. I proposed then, and do now, to decentralise the system as regards cost and management.

What local powers would you create? The functions of the local bodies would be to determine questions relating to establishment of schools; the selection of teachers under due restrictions; and the general management of schools.

What due restrictions? I presume that all persons wishing for employment in a Public School should be examined, classified, and certificated; I would restrict the choice of local authorities to the certificated teacher. The appointment and removal should be subject to approval by the central authority.

What central authority would you maintain? There are various modes of administration. The chief central authority might be vested in the Government, with the Colonial Secretary as the responsible head, and Inspectors or other officers acting under his direction. This would be the simplest and in many respects the most effective form of administration, though its liability to change with each successive Ministry is an objection which should not be overlooked.

A Board with a paid Chairman would constitute another form of central authority which would answer equally as well, but at much greater cost, and with more complicated machinery. The tardiness and other defects which usually attend the management of an extensive department by a Board are very greatly diminished under the existing system by the zeal and attention of the Chairman, who visits the office daily, and devotes a considerable amount of time to the business. But it is obvious that an honorary officer possessing both the ability and the inclination to discharge such duties could not always be met with.

Another arrangement would be the appointment of, say, three gentlemen as Commissioners of Public Instruction, to whom might be referred proposals for the establishment of schools, or for the confirmation of appointment and removal of teachers; questions relating to the alteration of old or introduction of new rules; and such other matters as cannot be left to the decision of any individual officer.

Of these three modes, the last is the one which I should be disposed to recommend. But whatever plan be adopted I think the chief paid officer should be held responsible for the whole of the ordinary business of the department, and should be required to devote his whole time to it. Under the term "ordinary business" I include inspection, correspondence, payment of salaries, supervision of school returns, and the administration of the system generally, the officer being guided in the discharge of these duties by definite instructions. Too much stress cannot be laid upon the advantage of direct personal responsibility in producing prompt and efficient administration, upon which the success of any system of Education mainly depends.

Could you expect the same skill in knowledge of the antecedents and dealing with the question from a Ministry as from a permanent Board? The functions of the central authority would be simply confined to seeing that the rules and regulations are carried out.

Are you aware of the results of a want of central authority in respect to education in some of the American States in which there was ample local provision for education? I don't know the special cases referred to. I can conceive that bad results would follow when no sufficient central authority exists. The consequence would probably be the inefficiency of the school, and too great dependence by teachers on local authorities. In fact no national system of education can be conceived to exist without an efficient central authority. I am aware that a central control is maintained in most of the American States, and in the adjacent Australian colonies.

Who should be the judge of the proficiency of the scholars? The Inspector, or other officer with similar functions.

Of the master's qualification? So far as regards efficiency as a teacher the Inspector should be the judge. Literary attainments should be by a Board of Examiners.

Of the general state of schools? The Inspector. I consider the mode of payment under the Revised Code in its details totally inapplicable to the circumstances of this Colony.

Dispensing with the regulations in detail, would not your arrangement leave a very large discretion with the Inspector, and one liable to provoke much controversy? I propose to leave nothing more to the Inspector than is left to him under the English regulations, or those of the neighbouring colonies. Under

my proposal he would be bound by fixed regulations, equally intelligible to the Inspector and teacher. I could only indicate the general outlines.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—What are your views with regard to support of Public Schools in Hobart Town and Launceston? Assuming that the State does not undertake to provide education for every child, I think that schools in the two chief towns might very well be left to private enterprise in a great measure; though I am of opinion that at least one public school ought to be maintained in each.

With what object? Generally to provide elementary education for those who might choose to avail themselves of it;—to serve as a training school for teachers; and also as a model school in which the most approved methods of teaching could be exhibited.

How would you maintain them? By school fees and a Government grant; in fact as at present. All beyond I would leave to private enterprise. I see no other way of giving grants in aid in these two towns except by giving assistance to religious bodies, who in that case would occupy the same relative position to the Central authority as is occupied by the Municipal Councils of the several Districts.

Then, except to secure a model school, why should not Hobart Town and Launceston be as the Country Districts? Only because the scheme as I explained it is inapplicable to large towns; and also because there are always means of education available in large towns that are not so in the Country.

Is not the aid in Hobart Town and Launceston out of all proportion, as compared with population, to what is granted to Country Districts? Taking the basis of population it is less; but such aid for the reasons stated is not so necessary as in the country.

Would not the cost of education be materially lessened by your proposal? So much would depend on the details that it would be impossible to speak positively.

By the plan you propose would not the population be educated to a much greater extent, and at a less cost than at present? What are the benefits of your scheme? In addition to those already named, I should anticipate a far greater local interest in the Schools, and a far greater general sense of responsibility.

Would it not secure a larger and better local supervision? Decidedly.

Is there any machinery in operation at present for inducing parents to send their children to School and to secure their more regular attendance at School? A Central Board is quite powerless to bring a pressure to bear on the parents to induce them to send their children to School.

Has the appointment of local visitors secured those requisites? It has in special cases, but not generally.

Would not your plan in the country districts, in your opinion, be the best mode of securing those objects? Yes; in the suggested alterations I have kept in view the improvement in the system of education generally, rather than the saving to the Government.

FRIDAY, 7TH JUNE, 1867.

THOMAS STEPHENS, *Esq., M.A., Inspector of Schools.*

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—Have you formed any idea of the expense which would fall upon each district under your proposal? I have calculated that the expense to the district would vary from £15 to about £35 per school.

What do you expect the Government to contribute? An equal amount to begin with; and, in addition, I should recommend a system of augmentation grants, which would be conditional on the efficiency of schools and teachers, and be also regulated by the number of children in attendance. The maximum total cost to the Government for each school would in no case exceed about £100 per annum.

You have said that, according to population, Hobart Town has less assistance from Government than could be claimed were the Government expenditure apportioned with reference to population? Yes.

Have not the densely populated towns great advantages over the thinly populated districts as regards education? Certainly.

Could not the children in Hobart Town, except the very poorest, get education if there were no public schools at the rates they now pay? I can't speak positively as to the rates actually paid in Hobart Town, but I think they could at the rates required by the Board, or at a slight advance on them.

Will masters run the risk of opening schools in thinly populated districts? No competent teacher would care to venture on such a speculation.

Does that fact, in your opinion, render it necessary for Government to render assistance to schools in such localities? Yes, I consider it the duty of Government to assist and foster education in places so circumstanced.

Looking then at the two towns in reference to their educational necessities, have they more expended on them now than is necessary? Yes, to a considerable extent in Hobart Town, and to a less extent in Launceston.

Could the payment of schoolmasters be more equitably regulated than at present in regard to their duties? I think it might be more closely proportioned to qualifications and other circumstances.

Could you, in a separate document, give your views in reference to an improved system of public education, both as regards cost and management, more clearly than you have done in your replies to the questions put to you? I shall be happy to furnish such an outline for the information of the Commissioners.

For education of what class of children is it necessary the Government should provide in the large towns? I have already defined the objects of such central schools as I would recommend; besides this, some provision ought to be made for education of pauper children.

If, instead of the Government maintaining the present system of aiding education, the State were to provide for the education of the poor by paying for their education in private Schools, to be selected by the parents, at a fixed moderate rate,—the masters of such schools holding certificate of competency, the schools being sufficiently commodious, and the schools subject to inspection by an officer of the Government,—would the obligations of the State be as faithfully discharged and equal benefit conferred on the children for whom such provision would be made as under the present system? If such a scheme could be carried out it would answer as well as the present provision for pauper children, but I fear there would be such practical obstacles in the way as would be insuperable. I could not give all my reasons without some consideration.

If such a scheme could be made practicable, would it not remove the objection made to the present as to the want of religious and moral instruction and training? It might provide for denominational instruction to a greater extent than at present.

As regards schools in thinly populated districts, do you believe the desirable amount of local supervision and management, the general education of the poorer class, and their regular attendance at school, could be secured by any other means than requiring such districts to contribute towards education, and take the management of the schools under Government inspection when Government aid is contributed? The only alternative is a voluntary system, and that I should regard as likely to be quite inoperative under the circumstances specified. I understand the question as excluding consideration of the present system.

Is it your opinion that Government assistance should be mainly confined to the thinly populated Districts? No; I do not think it possible to draw any line of distinction which would sufficiently separate those who might be able to support their own schools from those who might not.

Do the Districts at present contribute towards the expense of education except by school fees and for the erection of school buildings? In some instances the residence of Teachers has in past times been paid for by the District, but there is no such case at present as far as I know.

Have you had to complain of the indifference of the people generally as to providing education for their children? Generally speaking there is very little interest taken in the subject.

What is your opinion as to the desirability of allowing persons to practise as Schoolmasters or Mistresses who do not hold a certificate of competency? I think if incompetent persons could be restricted from establishing or conducting schools it would be a great advantage to the community, but I do not think it possible to carry out any such restrictions.

You are aware that some of the Public Schools in Hobart Town are only partially filled? I cannot refer at present to the attendance of the schools: there is one at which the attendance is very small at present.

What distance can children conveniently go to school? As much as 4 miles in Country Districts, where they have the inducement of an efficient Schoolmaster. Ordinarily, about 2 miles. I have known them to go about 4 miles. They might conveniently attend from a distance of 2 miles.

Have you any itinerant Master under the Board of Education? No. The experiment has often been tried, but has only succeeded in one instance where the Schoolmaster divided his time between two Schools, taking them on alternate days. This Master has been transferred to another District recently. In this instance it answered with tolerable success.

Was there anything peculiar in the circumstances in which this arrangement succeeded that did not exist in those places where you tried it and it failed? The difficulty is to account for the success in one instance. In this case it was the Teacher's only chance of obtaining employment, and the people's only chance of getting a School on any terms; and for a time the experiment succeeded pretty well. This lasted for about a year.

You have a regulation that religious instruction shall be given in all the Schools from 9 to 10 A.M. Is that regulation carried out? Yes, there is such a regulation. I have never been entirely satisfied with the way in which that regulation is generally carried out; but it is a very difficult question, and it is doubtful whether the enforcement of religious teaching is always desirable unless there are facilities for supervision.

Do the Masters generally attempt to carry out these regulations, or is it not almost entirely neglected? I think they generally attempt to carry them out. I make a point of enquiring into the subject when I visit Schools, and point out the way in which the instruction should be given.

Your instruction is that a portion of the Scriptures shall be read in the Protestant Schools? I recognise no distinction between the Schools under the Board in dealing with this subject.

In some of the places where Schools are established buildings have been erected for school purposes partly by grants from Government, but there are numerous other places where Schools are established where no buildings have been erected? Yes.

Amongst the papers given to us is a Return by the Deputy Inspector of inspection of Schools, Tabulated Results; I call your attention to this document? I have seen it before.

On the face of that document does it show on what standard it has been made? The results profess to be ascertained under the standards of the Programme of Instruction. I do not know the mode in which they have been applied. The Deputy Inspector is not under my direction.

Can you, from that document, tell how many of the children had attained Standard No. 1? No; The Paper simply states that a certain number have passed in reading, &c., without specifying the standards they had arrived at, whether high or low.

*By Dr. Butler.*—I understand you to recommend a different system to obtain in the towns and country? Yes.

You recommend one Central School in Hobart Town and one in Launceston? Yes.

Up to what age would children, in your opinion, be likely to attend these Schools? Up to about 12, from the commencement of education.

Would the children pay fees? Yes.

At what rate? I see no particular reason for modifying the present rate, although I doubt the expediency of allowing teachers to receive higher rates from any of the children.

Would all classes of children presenting themselves and paying fees be admitted? I am not prepared to give a positive answer to this question at present; it would be very difficult to lay down any rule for distinguishing between different classes. I should prefer to confine the benefit of the School to the class most in need of it, by regulating and limiting the character of the instruction.

You know the Programme of Instruction in force by the Board's Regulations? Yes.

Then you have not been able to devise any other plan by which the benefit of the Government contribution in the towns could be limited to those specially intended to receive it? No; except in the case of pauper children.

Would you limit the instruction given in this central or model School to the programme? Yes, just as it stands.

Do you contemplate the children attending this School who can only pay half the present fees? I think a scheme might be devised by which children could be admitted at reduced rates.

Do you contemplate free scholars attending this school? No.

Would the incomes of teacher and assistant be derived from Government salary and fees? Yes, as at present.

Have you made any calculation as to the necessary accommodation for the number of children attending this Central School? I should not propose to make provision for more than three to four hundred children.

In what way, beyond this provision for 400, do you contemplate education to be provided for the large class of those now paying fees in the Public Schools of Hobart Town and Launceston? The present Schools only provide accommodation for a portion of the class referred to. In answer to previous questions I have stated that in the chief towns I was of opinion that it was not necessary to interfere with private Schools to such an extent as at present. I see no way of making special provision further except by partially introducing a denominational system.

Would the salaries be as at present? Yes, I would not propose any increase.

MONDAY, 10TH JUNE, 1867.

THOMAS STEPHENS, *Esq., M.A., Inspector of Schools.*

*By Dr. Butler.*—How would you provide for the education of the pauper class in Hobart Town and Launceston? I have not matured a plan on this subject. It is surrounded with difficulties.

In the study you have given have you never contemplated any better plan that could be adopted? I have always contemplated some special provision; the difficulty is to define a local authority for determining the question of liability to pay fees. I think a responsibility might very well be left to the Municipal Council, the Government bearing a proportion of whatever expense might be incurred.

Do you contemplate the action of the Corporation to be voluntary or imperative? I see no way of making it imperative. I would place it on the same footing as the other portions of the general scheme I have proposed.

Do you think it advisable to compel parents of children not attending any School to send them to School? There is no objection to such a scheme except the difficulty of carrying it out.

From your experience as Inspector of Schools do you think any considerable portion of the pauper population receive any education whatever? Without specifying any proportion, I am satisfied that there is a large number of children who do not attend any School whatever.

Could not the children of that class, congregated in large schools, be educated cheaply? Yes, if they could be got to attend.

I believe it is the opinion of the principal educationalists that this class is usually clever, and requires better teachers than the other classes? They require more judicious management, but not a higher literary qualification in the teacher.

Do you think any form of inspection would be necessary over this class? In all cases where any portion of the expense of instruction is borne by the Government I think the right of supervision and inspection should be insisted upon.



Would the inspection be that of Inspector of Schools as hitherto, or would Inspectors of inferior qualification be sufficient for this duty? I think the chief paid officer ought to be responsible for everything of the kind, receiving such assistance as might be thought necessary.

Would you think it more advantageous that the sums derived from the Government for education of pauper children should be handed over to Corporate Bodies or Denominational Bodies? In order to preserve intact the national principle of the system, it is important to avoid granting aid to Religious Denominations, but they no doubt would interest themselves more in the maintenance of schools than a Corporation or Municipal Council.

Which, then, financially would be the more successful, or relieve the General Government? If grants in aid were offered to the different denominations, no doubt the expense to Government would be greater than if it were offered to the Corporation; for the latter would probably not care to make provision for any children beyond the pauper class.

What is the proportion of aid you contemplate the Government should apply for pauper children? Not less than one-half, but not more than two-thirds.

How is the remaining sum to be obtained—by rate or by voluntary contributions. I am still speaking of the two towns? In handing over these functions to the Corporation I am presuming that the amount required would be raised by rate.

Are you not aware of many objections to an educational rate by educationalists? I have never heard any valid objection to a rate levied in the way I propose. I refer to what I have stated in my evidence as to the mode. The late English Commission of 1861 dwelt strongly on the advantages which would result from local rates in aid of education, but it was seen that the denominational interests which had been created under the existing system of education were too important to be interfered with.

Then the extent of pauper education in the two Towns would depend on the funds provided by the public spirit of the Corporation? Yes, unless the State should choose to make some separate provision, as it does now in the case of the Ragged Schools.

Is it your opinion that it is the duty of the State in the two large Towns to provide education for that class who receive the entire education in Ragged Schools? Children attending Ragged Schools, and those admitted to Public Schools under free certificates, are presumably of the same class. I think a case might be made out for more liberal provision for this class, on the part of the Government, in large centres of population than in rural districts.

On what basis would the augmentation grants be given in country districts? They would be based on the classification of the teacher and the size of the school. The teacher's classification would depend on his attainments as tested by examination, and by the state of his school as tested by examination under the programme of instruction. In principle, not in detail, it would be precisely the same as the system in England; in the outline which I propose to give I will refer to this matter.

What proportion do you think the Government should contribute towards pauper education in country districts? Not less than half of the fee which the teacher might receive, nor more than two-thirds. I would have it fixed.

Do not you think a system of this character would lead to great partiality by the apportionment of Government money in greater amount to the richer districts than to the poorer districts? I think that the Government aid would be more fairly proportioned to the circumstances of the different districts than it is now, and as equitably as it could be under any system which could be established. I refer to my statement in paragraph 2, on page 3.

At what aggregate amount of emolument do you think you can obtain efficient teachers, or the same class as at present? Not generally at a lower rate than they get now.

Can you form any opinion as to the relative competency of our teachers with a similar class in England? Only a portion of our present teachers, probably not more than half, would be considered in England competent to conduct schools under the Committee of Council on Education.

In thinly populated districts, where the children attending school must necessarily be few, could a master under your system get a livelihood? I should not expect a competent master to waste his time on a small school of say twenty children, such as would occur in a thinly populated district,—the small schools might be maintained under mistresses at a cheap rate.

Would you adopt the English proposed plan of a larger aid to districts of less than 600 people? If there were any mode of classifying the districts according to their wealth or resources, there ought to be no objection to proportioning the Government grants to such a scale.

Has the system of appointment of teachers you propose been successful in other localities? It is the system in England, Ireland, New South Wales, Victoria, and, I think, South Australia.

Does it not require greater extent of supervision and inspection? No, in some respects less; and the reference to the central authority from districts would throw less work on the department. I mean that the districts would be guided by definite regulations, and the function of the central authority would simply be to ascertain that the prescribed conditions were satisfied.

You know the extent of inspection hitherto received by schools in this Colony? Yes.

Since the programme was instituted is it necessary, in your opinion, that one inspection should be made of each school yearly? Yes.

Should you propose that all the classes be examined yearly, or only the leading classes under the programme? I think such an examination ought certainly to extend to every class.

Ought not an Inspector to have an opportunity of a second visit, so as to give a report on the general character? The examination to which you refer could only be a partial test of the efficiency of a school:

on such an occasion notice ought to be given of the Inspector's visit, in order to give the teacher time to get a fair muster of his scholars; but the most important information as regards the real value of schools and teachers could only be elicited at visits paid by the Inspector without previous notice, during which he might have time for observing the modes of teaching employed, and for criticising the general details of school management.

Would not the prosecution of your scheme necessitate a larger staff of Inspectors? I think the present educational staff would suffice; it need not be increased, if differently applied. It is obvious that Hobart Town is a very inconvenient centre for the whole Island. The mode of rendering assistance under the head of inspection would be to appoint an Assistant Inspector with a separate district, the Chief Inspector being responsible for the working of the whole system of inspection upon one uniform principle.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—Do you mean that most of the defects of the existing system may be removed by a plurality of governing powers distributed through the Districts, and an increase in the amount appropriated for educational purposes? I mean that some of the defects may be removed by decentralisation, and others by increasing the grant under the present system.

To what extent should the grant be increased to effect this object? I mean only that no fixed grant will provide for that increase in a Teacher's salary which he ought to be taught to look for as the reward of industry and efficiency.

Have you any acquaintance with the work which the denominational bodies have in hand, and whether it would admit of their giving proper attention to a day school? I think that in some cases, at least, the denominations would gladly welcome such a system as affording them extra opportunities of influence. I am not prepared to say that the arrangement is a desirable one.

The grants in aid which you have suggested to be given to religious bodies should be on the same conditions as aid to the Municipal Bodies? Yes.

Do you not think that by the Municipality paying a part of the salary of teachers and bearing part of other expenses, and especially by their having the appointment of the Masters in their hands, the Masters would show partiality in giving more attention or otherwise to the children of parties having interest in his appointment and dismissal? I do not think so. It is a danger which must be carefully guarded against, but every provision would be made in the Regulations to prevent undue interference with the Teachers.

WEDNESDAY, 12TH JUNE, 1867.

THOMAS STEPHENS, *Esq., M.A., called in and examined.*

*By Mr. Fysh.*—Could one School in Hobart Town and Launceston of large dimensions be made applicable to the elementary educational necessities of all the children who at present have the advantages of education in part or wholly by Government expenditure? I do not think it could. I have known Schools of 700 in England where the population is much more dense.

Do you think, then, that without more available Schools, as to distance, the children generally would travel, say, 2 miles to obtain public education? Not generally in the two Towns.

Would not the concentration of all the educational machinery of the Board under one roof conduce to the advantage of the children by their being more systematically classified and thoroughly perfected under one standard before being drafted into classes of a higher standard? Yes, up to a certain extent. But the size of a School must be regulated, in the first instance, by the accommodation available, or likely to be available.

Would it not make the Master's duty more simple by giving to the Master whose forte might be arithmetic a class or classes for that study? The assignment of a special branch of study to a separate Teacher is often desirable, but much less so in these elementary Schools which are under consideration than in those of a higher character.

Would it not limit the expenditure on the principle that one large rent is proportionately less than several small ones, that fewer buildings would have to be kept in repair, and a few well-paid Teachers better than a number scantily paid? The conclusion almost necessarily follows from the premises given. I do not think that the circumstances quoted would apply to the case of the Schools under consideration.

Would this not enable a less number of Teachers to educate as satisfactorily the number of children at present on the books of the seven Schools, and by this means reduce the expenditure for Teachers' salaries? The Assistants now employed in the Schools are chiefly young Pupil Teachers. If the size of the School were greatly increased the place of some of those Assistants would have to be supplied by adult Teachers, so that I should not expect any great saving. Speaking generally, the result contemplated by the question would occur under ordinary circumstances.

Is not the education at some of our City Schools under the Board superior to that at others from the aptitude of Teachers? Yes.

Then it follows that concentration of Teachers and taught would give all the children more even advantages than they at present have? In theory, yes. I have already stated that I did not think such an amalgamation practicable here.

By attaching to such a School an infant class, or room, would not the probability be that a number of children who can't now be spared by parents would be enabled to attend by bringing the infants with them? We have already so called infant departments in the large Schools in Town,—but the consequence contemplated by the Question would be of a much more satisfactory and extended character if more special provision could be made for this object.

Are you of opinion that the present expenditure of and under the Board of Education can, by equitable distribution, be made sufficient to meet the necessities for education throughout the Island, including education to the eleemosynary classes, without being supplemented by local rates, or contributions further than at present? I am satisfied that education could not be kept up to an effective standard, and all the requirements of the community supplied, by means of the present grant, without such supplementary contributions. Under a fixed grant there is no way of providing for new Schools, except by reducing the Salaries of Teachers already employed.

In event of a free school of an elementary character being established are you not of opinion that a more limited programme than that at present issued by the Board would suffice, and that such children could by the age of 12 receive such an education as would enable them to enter the humbler walks of life? Certainly: if you wish to discourage pauperism, you must make some distinction between the instruction given to children of paupers, and that given to children of the industrious poor, who make an effort to pay the school fees.

Would not the elementary rules of reading, writing, and arithmetic be sufficient? The instruction might be limited to the standard prescribed for the 3rd or the 4th Class by the Programme.

Have the advantages for educating girls at our public schools improved of late years? There are as great advantages now as could be expected in mixed schools.

Has that portion of the school exercise relating to religious teaching operated to the disadvantage of the number who might otherwise attend? I am not aware that it has.

Are children of various creeds to be found in the generality of the schools throughout the Island? Yes; with one or two exceptions,—though when the ownership of the school premises is vested in a religious body it sometimes to some extent creates a prejudice in the minds of parents who do not belong to that body.

Name any regarded as denominational schools, though not recognised by the Board as such; say Trinity Hill; is that regarded as a denominational school? Not to my knowledge. There are three schools which, looking at the children who attend them, appear to be so regarded; and there are several schools which by some persons are considered denominational from the fact of their being church properties.

Does the religious teaching or training in these schools differ from that provided by the Regulations of the Board? No; I have no reason to suppose that there is a deviation from the Rules. Any such deviation I should report to the Board.

In what manner does the attendance of children at our schools of a higher social grade operate upon the numbers,—detering the presence of the poor or otherwise? I have reason to believe that occasionally the presence of a large number of children of what may be called a respectable class deters poor parents from sending their children. Such cases it is quite impossible for the present central authority to become acquainted with when no complaints are made.

Does their attendance with the prestige of paying better fees detract from the attention the master might otherwise give to the rest of the school? I think not. In one or two instances long ago I found a teacher attempting to distinguish between such classes in his school, but I peremptorily cautioned him against continuing such a practice.

Is not the interest of country settlers in schools already sufficiently guaranteed by the fact of their living on the spot and being necessarily compelled to take advantage of those schools for the education of their own children? There is generally a good deal of interest manifested among people at the first establishment of a school; afterwards they appear to think it is entirely the Board's business to look after the school and maintain its efficiency.

Has the feeling of local interest in schools improved of late years? Speaking generally, I don't think it has. It always varies according to the intelligence and character of the neighbourhood.

Can you state any reasons for your objection to schoolmasters receiving higher fees from scholars than the maximum fees permitted to be charged by the Board, say 1s. a week? I would limit the fees to 1s. a week.

Will you state your reasons for stating that it is inexpedient to allow teachers to receive higher fees from parents? Many parents who paid higher rates would no doubt expect more special attention to their children, and I object strongly to any teacher being placed in a position of such direct temptation.

Are you at all acquainted with the Ragged Schools of Tasmania; I mean by visitation? I have visited them, but have had no opportunity of doing so recently. There are only two, and those are in Hobart Town.

What is the standard of acquirement made by children in public schools under the Board here as compared with children in English schools of a similar character? In one or two of our best schools the standard of proficiency is about equal to that in what would be called a good school in England, but in the majority of our schools I should say that the standard is certainly inferior to that in the generality of schools receiving Government grants in England.

What comparison do these schools bear to schools in the neighbouring Colonies? I am not personally acquainted with the state of education in South Australia. Among the best schools of this class that I have ever seen are the public schools in Sydney. The country schools in New South Wales approach nearly to our own standard. In Victoria I think there is a greater number of good schools in the country, but only one or two of the Melbourne schools are decidedly superior to the best of our own.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—What attendance have free children to give to entitle the master to receive payment? On four days in the week.

Do you know whether there are many pauper children who attend school for less than four days who are not paid for? I do not know the number.

Is it the practice of masters to give returns of those free scholars? The usual practice has been for teachers to give a return of the attendance of all free scholars, leaving to the Board to decide for whom they would pay. I am aware that in many schools there are children for whom no fees are paid either by the parent or the Board.

FRIDAY, 14 JUNE, 1867.

THOMAS STEPHENS, *Esq., M.A., Inspector of Schools.*

*By the Chairman.*—Referring to your scheme, which, as I understand it, contemplates aid being given by the State towards the establishment and maintenance of Schools in localities where the inhabitants voluntarily engage to contribute to those objects, will you state whether you would require that such Schools should be on a general principle, or would you equally recognise Schools established on a denominational basis? Schools on a general principle only; distinct from any connection with any denomination.

Supposing your scheme to embrace both, which class of Schools do you believe, under the encouragement of state aid in the manner you propose, would principally arise in the rural districts,—Schools of a general, or of a denominational character? Of the former—a general character. It is only in centres of population that there are facilities for separate Schools.

Which system, in your opinion, would most probably acquire means of self-support by endowment from private sources in the course of time? I do not consider the establishment of denominational Schools practicable under a system of State grants in Tasmania, except as I have specified in centres of population. Regarding this as an abstract question, I should expect endowments from private sources to be given rather to denominational Schools than to general Schools.

Are you acquainted with Mr. Tremenhare's testimony as to the tendency of the Common Schools in Manchester to assume a denominational character? I have no distinct recollection of it.

Are you aware of any facts in the educational experience of the North American States illustrative of the greater or less readiness and liberality with which voluntary provision is made for educational purposes on a religious than on a secular, a sectarian than a general principle? I am not prepared to offer any evidence on the subject.

You are acquainted with the name of Mr. Horace Mann as a distinguished educational authority in respect to the United States? Yes, well.

You have not met with the following passage quoted in the travels of Mr. J. R. Godley from a speech of Mr. Mann?—"What a remarkable fact it is in the history of the Commonwealth that amongst all the splendid donations, amounting in the whole to many millions of dollars, which have been made to Colleges and Academies, and to Theological Institutions for the purpose of upholding the doctrines of some particular sect, only one man embracing the whole of the rising generation in his philanthropic plan, and acting with a high, enlightened disregard of all local, partisan, and sectarian feelings, has given any considerable sum to promote the prosperity of Common Schools." I have not met with the passage.

Assuming it to be the object of the State that education should be disidentified with sectarian religious teaching, does that fact not render it more necessary that it should itself provide the means of secular instruction than if it were indifferent on the point in question? Taking voluntary agency as the alternative to the agency of religious denominations, I should say, emphatically, it would be more necessary; but in the case of Schools to be partially supported, if maintained at all, by local taxation, it does not appear to me that the circumstances admit of a comparison.

Does your scheme contemplate that the salaries of masters in the Schools aided by the State should be fixed by the central or the local governing authority? By the central authority.

And paid directly by which? I don't think it of much moment so long as the local contribution is guaranteed.

In the event of a conflict of authority as to the salary of a Schoolmaster, how would you enforce the decision of the central governing authority so as to secure a sufficient recompence to an efficient teacher, and thus uphold good education generally? I presume a contract would be entered into between the local authorities and the teacher at the time of his appointment. This contract and the appointment itself should be subject to approval by the central authority.

Are you acquainted with the experience of the Committee of the Privy Council in England in dealing with the Poor Law Guardians in the circumstances suggested? I don't know of any case precisely similar. I am well acquainted with the dangers to be guarded against.

Would you expect that any central authority, whether vested in one or in several individuals, in this Colony, under a system such as you propose, would be as capable of withstanding local importunity or enforcing compliance with its requisitions as the Committee of the Privy Council in England? The difficulties in England chiefly arise from great complication of system, and absence on the part of central authority of personal acquaintance with circumstances and places; and under similar circumstances such a

central authority, as I have suggested for Tasmania, would probably fail to effect the object in view. But I conceive it to be possible to lay down such rules, and to impose such a check upon the executive authority, as to prevent the evil consequences anticipated by the question.

But which would be the more likely to maintain its position, enforce on local bodies the discharge of their functions, and guarantee to the country generally that efficient education is given in the Public Schools, authority vested in one individual or in several; in a political or non-political body? The third mode of central administration which I have described in a previous answer, inasmuch as it does not exclude direct personal responsibility in the Chief Executive Officer, appears to me to meet all these requirements more satisfactorily than any other form that I can conceive practicable.

In what respect, then, is the constitution of the present Board of Education at fault, supposing that in addition to it there were established throughout the districts local bodies bearing defined local functions? I do not think that any fault can be found with the constitution of the present Board except that while there are six Members the quorum is limited to three, the result of which is that, as the same quorum cannot always be present, there must be occasionally a want of uniformity in the decisions. This defect, if I may call it so, in the constitution, is perhaps unavoidable in the case of a Board composed of gentlemen who undertake onerous, and sometimes very unpleasant, duties without any remuneration whatever. The plan which I have suggested would very considerably lighten those duties.

Generally speaking, are the men who from their education, social position, fitness, and disposition to undertake the duties of school managers in the country districts, to be found residing in the townships, or at a greater or less distance remote from them? Judging from the present state of things, I should expect the local management to be vested in persons of influence residing partly in the neighbourhood of the local head-quarters, and partly scattered through the rural districts.

In proposing to remunerate masters to some extent in proportion to the general progress and proficiency of their pupils, have you considered how much these conditions are liable, in some localities more than in others, to be affected by the migratory character of the population? And how would you provide against the inequitable operation of your principle arising from the cause indicated? I recognise this character as existing to a very limited extent.

You have stated in evidence that in order to discourage pauperism you would make the course of instruction given to pauper or non-paying pupils at public schools inferior to that given to the paying class; would you insist on this after having adopted all necessary precautions against children not being paupers being exempted from the payment of school fees? Yes, I regard it as being in itself a most important precaution.

By making the education given to this class inferior to that given to others, do you believe that you would check the evasion of liability to school fees on the part of parents able to pay them, or not rather incline them more than at present to send their children to school at all? It is a choice of two evils. I consider the extension of pauperism the greater, and I should not despair of increasing the parents' sense of responsibility in time by judicious measures.

Do you attach any value to rewards in the shape of Exhibitions to Superior Schools as an encouragement to pupils at common schools, and as contributing to uphold the character of the education given in such schools? I consider such rewards highly valuable as giving a general stimulus to education throughout the country. In common Schools, where the ordinary course of instruction does not give sufficient preparation for the Exhibitions, the competition is practically limited to scholars who have opportunities of special or private tuition, and there is therefore some danger of a Teacher's being tempted to give too much of his time to clever pupils; but this danger may be guarded against by the Inspectors. The exhibitions now given by the Board of Education are only necessary because the Public Schools are precluded from competing for the higher Exhibitions given by the Council of Education. I am most strongly of opinion that all rewards of this kind provided by the State should be open to all Schools without any distinctions as to class.

Are you aware that they are established in connection with the Common Schools in Canada, and that they have been recommended to adoption in Victoria by one or more witnesses before the late Commission? Yes.

Do you believe that the Common School System of any country will be maintained at a proper standard where seminaries of a higher grade are wanting? In the absence of schools of a superior character common schools usually embrace some of their functions: in this way the character of the common schools may be elevated.

You have in evidence adverted to it as a fault of the present system of education the marked difference of cost per head for scholars in some schools as compared to others: do you think this avoidable under any system which meets the requirements of thinly populated and poor localities? Not entirely avoidable; but I consider the present difference excessive, especially as it is not greatest in the districts which most require assistance, and *vice versa*.

Are you aware that in England, where localities relatively so thinly peopled as are to be found in this Colony can scarcely be imagined, similar differences prevail—"A small school ordinarily costing from 35s. to 45s. per head on the inhabitants of the place, whereas a larger school could generally be conducted at a cost of between 18s. and 25s. per head"—(Speech of Mr. Bruce, Vice-President of the Committee of Privy Council on Education, April 5th, 1867), and that the last proceeding in reference to public education in England consequently has been to add to the State grant so as to meet the exceptional case of small districts? I have not read the speech quoted; I am aware that such an addition has often been proposed.

*By Mr. Gladstone.*—Do you consider sufficient precaution is now taken for ascertaining the condition of the parents before admitting their children to the Public Schools free? Though the restrictions which the Board has found it necessary to place upon the issue of Free Certificates are so strict as to cause some

trouble and annoyance to Special Visitors, it is still impossible to secure any adequate check upon the admission of children who are not properly objects of charity. The Special Visitors and the Board frequently put very different interpretations upon the term "inability to pay school-fees."

Under any system would it not be desirable to adopt some more efficient measures for ascertaining the condition of the parents? Yes, it is most important that the condition of parents should be rigidly scrutinised if it be wished to counteract the tendency to pauperise the people, and to put a premium on habits of intemperance and improvidence,—a tendency which is almost inseparable from any system of Free Certificates.

Could not measures be adopted for deciding what portion of the school fees, if any, should be paid by parents who represent themselves as unable to pay the full fees? If the local authorities were made responsible for a part of the cost of educating poor children, they would take such measures for their own protection.

Could not persons be induced to become visitors for different divisions of the large towns, their duties being to search out neglected children who do not attend school, and to induce them to attend regularly? I should not recommend sole reliance upon voluntary agency; it is generally too spasmodic and uncertain. But there is no doubt that most valuable aid might be rendered by benevolent persons, whose function would be to bring cases of destitution under the notice of the local authorities as suitable objects for free education, and afterwards to take measures for promoting the regular attendance of children admitted under certificates.

Would not one school in each of the large towns accommodate all the children who could not afford to pay such an amount as would enable them to get elementary instruction in other schools? I think it would accommodate all of this class not absolutely paupers.

You say, in one of your answers, "I have reason to believe that the presence of a large number of children of what is called the 'respectable' class occasionally deters poor parents from sending their children." Would not that deterring influence be removed by giving the free and partially free scholars the preference of admission into the schools you purpose to establish in the large towns? Understanding the term "partially free scholars" to mean those whose parents pay some fee be it ever so small, I reply that measures should be taken to prevent the exclusion of any scholars of this class from the central Schools. But those whose parents cannot or will not pay anything at all for their education constitute a peculiar class, and require an education of a special and peculiar character. This is best imparted in separate Schools, and should, if possible, be connected with industrial training.

Why, with the limited means at the disposal of the Government, should the State provide for the education in large towns of any children but those who cannot afford to pay school fees in whole or in part? I don't think it is necessary, except in connection with the other objects to be aimed at by the central Schools.

Could not the two examinations you refer to in your evidence of the 12th be made at the same time if the schools were under local supervision? I consider it essential to the utility of inspection that schools should be occasionally visited without notice, so that their ordinary condition may be ascertained.

Has not the denominational system been tried in this Colony and found to be undesirable? I am not well acquainted with the history of the attempt. I have heard of it incidentally.

*EXTRACTS from Report of Commission on POPULAR EDUCATION in England, 1861, (pp. 307-30), read by Mr. Stephens in reference to his Answer to Question on page 8, paragraph 6.*

\* \* "It is not to be denied that many of the arguments in favour of a rate-supported system, and especially that which lays stress on the importance of arousing and sustaining local interest, have great weight; the more so because the want of local interest and of proper local support is the leading defect in the present system. \* \* But the economy and the local interest which some amount of local payment and management secures, appear to us essential elements in a system of national education."

"The benefits of education are to a certain degree local benefits. There can be no doubt whatever that education diminishes pauperism, and that it tends to improve a population in every point of material well being. These are advantages which directly touch the proprietors of the neighbourhood, and towards the extension of which they should be willing to contribute. \* \* If education is to be paid for locally, those who pay for it should have a due share in the control of it. At present our evidence goes to prove that it would diffuse both greater interest, and a healthier tone in education, if other persons besides the Clergy took an active part in it."

#### GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF PLAN RECOMMENDED BY THE COMMISSIONERS.

"All assistance given to the annual maintenance of Schools shall be simplified and reduced to grants of two kinds.

"The first of these grants shall be paid out of the general taxation of the country, in consideration of the fulfilment of certain conditions by the Managers of the Schools. Compliance with these conditions to be ascertained by the Inspectors.

"The second shall be paid out of the county rates in consideration of the attainment of a certain degree of knowledge in the children in the School during the year preceding the payment. \* \*

"The two grants together are never to exceed the fees and subscriptions, or 15s. per child on the average attendance."

NOTE.—The whole annual cost at this time of the education of each child in average attendance was about £1 1s. 0d., of which about one-fourth was supplied by Government grants.—T.S.

MONDAY, 17TH JUNE, 1867.

MR. GEORGE W. BRYAN.

I am Master of the Watchorn-street Ragged School.

There has been an average daily attendance of 62 boys and 63 girls during the past month, for whose education payment is made by voluntary subscriptions, aided by a Government grant.

The branches of education taught are reading, writing, and arithmetic, a little drawing, and a little music—not from notes,—geography, grammar.

They receive clothing, and during winter food, in bread and butter, or jams. It is right to state that their food is from the benevolence of individuals in the city. I have no difficulty in maintaining the attendance in the school.

The position in life of the parents I can hardly say. The City Missionaries know them—some few, I know, are in very destitute circumstances.

Their attendance is irregular—one half regular, one half not once or twice a week.

The average age is from 4 to 12 or 13. The irregularity is about equal, big and little children. The cause is from employment abroad and at home found for the children. At the same time many parents are negligent of their children's attendance.

The school is inspected occasionally by the Committee, and the public are admitted at any time. My school was inspected during the past month three times. I keep a Visitor's Book. The inspections are entered there. I will furnish a return of the inspections and dates for the last six months, with the report or observations of visitors.

My remuneration is 25s. a week; it was 30s. when I first entered. No other remuneration. I have a female teacher to help; her remuneration is 20s. a week, I believe. I have been there 8 years last April.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—Some of the children—many of them—have attended the Public Schools. They have occasionally given me, when asked, their reasons for leaving the Public Schools, and these were that their parents were unable to pay. As to parents of children attending my school being able to pay the fees—say 6d. a week—I cannot say, not having sufficient knowledge of the condition of the parents.

Children pay no stated fees, but there is a box where the children put pence in, and this goes to the common fund.

The voluntary contributions come to about 2s. 6d. a week.

I have received a gratuity from the Committee during my period of service, in consequence of my reduction of salary.

The Government contribution towards my school is £100 a year, paid to the Committee of Management.

The school-room belongs to the Association; no rent is paid for it.

I mean by inspection visits by Mr. Smales and others. Mr. Stephens and Mr. Burgess have been there once or twice, as the book will show. The Rev. Mr. Cox comes once a week for religious instruction of the elder boys and girls. No other religious instructors.

The average number for the last three years is sometimes less and sometimes more. The attendance is greater in winter than summer. My summer average is about 52 of each sex.

The school would accommodate conveniently about 130 children.

We have more now than we can properly instruct. We have no regular monitors except the boys in the school, and their irregularity of attendance would render this almost impossible.

We have never sent away children for want of accommodation.

I cannot say how many children have attended for three years, but I think I can furnish such a return. I have no intercourse with the parents. I find children generally apt and intelligent.

There is a gallery in the Infant School only.

Instruction is given in Geography and Grammar to the 1st and 2nd Classes. These have attended the School for some time as far as I can recollect.

New children are classed according to their attainments.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—I cannot say what is the total expenditure of my School; the Committee manage it.

In Arithmetic I take the 1st Class up to Practice.

In Writing we use small-hand copy books.

In Reading the 1st Class read pretty well any book. We use the Fourth Book; occasionally we have books of the British and Foreign School Society.

The visitors sometimes have attended, and I think the Committee, without entering their visits. Two Members of the Committee visit the School each month, but who they are I don't know.

We use the authorised version of the Scriptures. I have heard no objection by parents. I have no intercourse with them; as I have said.

I think, so far as I remember, the upper end of Murray-street is densely populated by a poor class of people.

I think a large mass of the neglected untaught children of Hobart Town could be brought to the means of education by extending our Ragged School system.

I have found a general desire among the poorer classes to send their children to such Schools.

I am aware of many of the children attending Ragged Schools being unlikely, for want of proper clothing, to attend other Schools.

The physical condition of the children would operate against their being admitted into another class of Schools.

Are our Public Schools fit receptacles for the depraved and destitute children of the streets? No, they are unfit; the children have no shoes or stockings.

There are some children of dissolute parents, but the greater number of them are of poor parents whose employment is perhaps only one day in the week.

Some of the children come from a distance. Very few families living in Watchorn-street attend the School.

The girls are taught sewing. The boys have no industries.

My opinion is that teaching girls washing and ironing interferes with the object of education in the School.

Are you aware that the late Inspector and the late Bishop of Tasmania visited these Schools, and bore testimony in the following words: "This appears to be a most useful School, and deserving of encouragement."—Signed, T.A. 2nd. "If this School is continued on the same footing, and conducted in the same manner, it will doubtless be a great blessing to the community."—Signed, F.R. Tasmania? I am not aware. It was not in my time.

I was engaged six months in teaching in the Hutchins School as a junior teacher, and six months in St. John's School, Presbyterian. I was not trained as a teacher.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—The children who used to attend the Public Schools and now come to me are better as to dress, but not more apt or intelligent.

Sometimes we have a dozen who have been at Public Schools.

Four children from Green Ponds used to attend a Public School there, but the father was in Hospital in Town.

The Town children have attended Goulburn-street, Trinity Hill, and Mr. Canaway's.

The only objection I have had from the children (but I don't know how you can depend on it) is, that they did not learn anything; that the master only taught the 1st Class.

The attraction of the fire and the eating are the winter attractions to my School; also, parents may be out of work, and they send their children in preference to the streets.

The School stationery was supplied for the first 5 or 6 years from the Board of Education, and the books too; but now I tell Mr. Salier, and they are bought.

We allow a big boy frequently to bring a little one in arms, and these big boys are used as monitors. I devote my time to the 1st and 2nd Classes.

#### MR. THOMAS DAGNIA.

I am master of the Collins-street Ragged School. I have been there two and a half years.

I have 150 in attendance on the books. I have a female teacher.

The condition of the children is about the poorest in Hobart Town.

We have several there who have been there four or five years,—they came there as Infants.

The ages of the children vary from 3 to 14, boys and girls.

Their attendance is very irregular, with few exceptions, owing to, with the boys getting a day's work occasionally.

I have had a few, very few, who have attended Government Schools before there are none at present.

The Ladies' Committee furnish them with clothing every winter, and occasionally food is given.

I know most of the parents—they are some of them willing, others are very apathetic—much of the non-attendance is the fault of the parents.

The school hours are  $\frac{1}{2}$  past 9 to 12, and from 2 to 4.

The school is inspected by the City Missionary say 3 times a week, and by certain members of the Committee. I have a visitor's book. I will give a return from that book of the visits, with the records.

My income is 25s. a week. The Mistress has £52 a year and quarters.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—The children are admitted on the recommendation of any member of the Committee.

Do you admit any children under any circumstances whose parents are capable of paying 6d. a week at the public school? We admit them indiscriminately. I know no rule of the Committee.

I have connected with the School the means of washing the children. I cannot judge from their appearance of their fitness for the public schools. I don't know their standard of fitness.

The greater part of mine are barefooted.

My knowledge of the parents' habits leads me to believe that these Schools are not only educational, but the only existing means of rescuing the most destitute of our juvenile population from criminal habits.



I instruct the children in reading, writing, and arithmetic, the outlines of geography, grammar, and singing.

In arithmetic my best boys go up to Compound Division.

Some of the Ladies' Committee regularly every Thursday visit the School, and the lady superintendent more frequently. They have a Mother's Clothing Club—several of the women attend, and the ladies cut out clothing. Another branch of the Ladies' Committee are also employed in getting clothing for the children, which is supplied gratuitously. The children also have a Clothing Club, to which they subscribe.

They are not regularly supplied with food. At one time they got soup from the Benevolent Society, but not now.

No effort is made to secure situations, that I know of, as regards boys, but only as regards the girls.

I have had no previous training in a public school—but I came out with Mr. Smales from England. I used to help with the emigrants, and I used to teach on the Bendigo diggings. I have not been trained.

WEDNESDAY, 19TH JUNE, 1867.

MR. JAMES ALLEN *was called in and examined.*

*By Chairman.*—I have resided in this Colony for 4 years.

My personal acquaintance with the Colony does not extend beyond the city, but from the nature of my occupation I am familiarised with the state of things in most parts of the Colony.

I resided in South Australia for nearly 20 years prior to 1859, and in Victoria up to the year 1863.

I have bestowed attention on the systems of education in those Colonies and in this. In fact, my whole life has been taken up more or less in connection with examinations into questions of education as regards the internal arrangements of Schools, the course of instruction pursued in them, and the systems of Government education comprehended in the mode of appointing masters, paying them, and providing for education as a branch of the Public Service. More or less, my examination has been in connection with the whole; but I would add that I have never looked with any favour on Government interference with education at all; and, with the permission of the Commission, I would beg to hand in a document which would, perhaps, best assist the Commission in forming an opinion of my views on the subject generally:—

1. The spread of education should, in my opinion, be left to the voluntary efforts of the people.
2. If the Government interfere with education at all, it should rather be by aiding and promoting voluntary efforts than by centralisation and direct control.
3. Whenever the Government do provide for the education of the people, it should only be for those who would otherwise be altogether neglected, and not for those who are well able to pay for what they receive.
4. Under no circumstances should the education towards which the Government contribute, either in whole or in part, be denominational, although it should, in every case, be moral and religious.
5. Guided by these principles, I see very clearly a way to that reduction in the expenditure in the educational department of this country which the Government are understood to desire.

First,—The spread of education should be left to the voluntary efforts of the people.

I do not wish to say much on this point, because the difficulty, if not the positive injustice, of acting upon any other principle will be brought out more clearly hereafter. But these are my chief reasons for making that statement:—

(1.) It is as much beyond the functions of a Government to interfere with the education of a people as it is to interfere with their religion; and it is hardly possible for them to do the one, as I hope presently to show, without doing the other.

(2.) If this latter could, however, be avoided, that interference would not fail to convert the Government by whom it was largely exercised into a great centralising power, which would be in the highest degree inexpedient. But,

(3.) A still stronger objection, if that were possible, than either of the foregoing, to Government interference with education is, that it has failed to do more than the people would have done for themselves if left to their voluntary efforts.

This I hold to be no less true of this Colony than of any of the neighbouring Colonies, and no less true of any of the neighbouring Colonies than of Great Britain and Ireland. Its tendency is to lead people to look to others for help, when they should be helping themselves. It is opposed to all the principles of free trade, and, in its ordinary exercise, leads to protection in some of its worst forms. John Stuart Mill, although an advocate for Government interference in such matters, would only have it exercised under peculiar circumstances. He holds it to be the duty of a Government to give such pecuniary support to elementary Schools as to render them accessible to all the children of the poor, either freely, or for a payment too inconsiderable to be sensibly felt. But he goes no further. If not for leaving the spread of education exclusively to the voluntary efforts of the people, he cannot be claimed on the other side.

Secondly,—If the Government of a country interfere with education at all, it should rather be by aiding and promoting voluntary efforts than by centralisation and direct control.

This may be thought a surrender of the first point, and so to some extent it really is. It cannot, for instance, be strenuously insisted upon that education should be left to the voluntary efforts of the people, and at the same time be maintained if the Government interfere at all, that that interference should rather be in the way of aiding voluntary efforts, than in that of repressing them, without some compromise. But nothing was ever yet done in the management of the affairs of a country without compromise, and we need not look for anything to be done in this. I insist no further on the first point for the present then, but I come to the second. In other words, I take things as I find them. I find schemes of education adopted, professedly with the view of assisting voluntary efforts, when they are virtually paralysing or stifling them out of existence.

That I consider to have been the case in Great Britain and Ireland, and to be no less the case here now. When the two great Societies, the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society, took charge of the education of the neglected portion of the children in England, and the same was done for the neglected portion of the children in Ireland, I could have conceived of something being done towards assisting the voluntary efforts of the people by small grants of public money to such of those Societies as were willing to receive them. But when the Government took the administration of the funds voted by Parliament into their own hands, and resolved on patronising the conductors of such Schools only as complied with their rules, they departed from the principle of aiding and assisting the voluntary efforts of the people, and set up a system of centralisation and direct control. The same has also been the case here, but to a much greater extent, and in the other Colonies. At Home there is still a lingering exhibition of the voluntary efforts of the people in the cause of education, but on this side of the world they are, except in the matter of school-houses, virtually extinguished. That is doubtless to be ascribed to the educational grants being so much greater here and in the neighbouring Colonies, in proportion to the revenue and to the number of the children to be educated, than they are at Home.

In England the grants for educational purposes may be stated with sufficient accuracy at £1,000,000 a year, and the revenue at £70,000,000. In Victoria they amount to £125,000 a year, with a revenue of £3,200,000. Here they may be taken at £15,000 a year, and the revenue at £260,000. Consequently, we devote one-seventeenth part of our total revenue to education, whilst Victoria only gives one-twenty-fifth of hers, and England not more than one-seventieth of hers. Nor would an inquiry into the relative numbers of the children to be educated, I think, give a more favourable result.

Thirdly,—Whenever the Government do provide for the education of the people, it should only be for those who would otherwise be altogether neglected, and not for those who are well able to pay for what they receive.

This is so self-evident a principle, that the only wonder is that it should ever have been departed from in the disbursement of funds voted by Parliament for education. Yet that is more the case in this country than in any other with which I am acquainted.

It could never have been the intention of the Parliament that the Public Schools of this country should be alike open to the rich and poor; to the children of Members of Parliament and of the Government; to the children of Officers of Parliament and of the Government in receipt of large salaries; to the children of professional men, of lawyers, doctors, merchants, shopkeepers, landed proprietors, and others, totally above the want of any such eleemosynary assistance as that which is here afforded. Or, if it were, it is high time that this intention were reconsidered, with such lights as have been thrown upon the subject by the progress of events, and by the demands of the people for retrenchment in every Department of the Public Service. But that is not the worst feature in the system of education as at present administered in this country.

I look upon its neglect of those who cannot afford to pay the school fees demanded from others in comparatively easy circumstances as its greatest blot. There must be hundreds upon hundreds of parents in this town, and in other parts of the Colony, who cannot afford to pay ninepence per week for a single child, sevenpence per week each for two, or sixpence per week for three or more. Yet at no one time during the year 1865, which is the latest year for which we have any official returns, were there so many as 1000 children on the books in all parts of the Colony for whom the Government paid the capitation fee of threepence per week. The number of scholars on the rolls for that year was 5357; the average attendance, 4074. The cost of the establishment for the year was £12,671 10s. 8d. And out of this, the total sum appropriated to the children of the poor,—that is, to the children of those who could not afford to pay the school fees, was £354 7s. 6d. Whatever imposition might have been practised on the Board in other directions, there could not have been room for much, if for any in this. None of the claimants for a share in this £354 7s. 6d. could have been other than persons in comparatively destitute circumstances.

Attention is imperatively demanded to both these points: to the first,—so as to secure in the interest of the private schoolmasters, against whom this aid to the public schoolmaster operates as a protection, exclusion from the Public Schools of those children whose parents can well afford to pay for their education, without any assistance from the Government; and to the second,—so as to secure the attendance at the Public Schools of a larger number of the children of those who are not able to pay any school fees, however small. That numbers of this latter class of children might, with proper management, be induced to attend, I have every reason to believe. I may, indeed, state, on the authority of one of the public schoolmasters in this town, that there are hundreds of children in his neighbourhood that go to no school at all because they cannot pay the school fees. And, although this gentleman has written again and again to clergymen and others in his neighbourhood on the subject, he assures me, under his own hand, that he has failed to interest them in it. Whether it would not be very different if the schools were intended for the poor only, is well worth a trial.

Fourthly,—Under no circumstances should the education towards which the Government contribute, either in whole or in part, be denominational, although it should in every case be moral and religious.

But that cannot be said of education as it is administered in this Colony. It has been made as distinctly denominational as it well could be by the 4th regulation of the Board:—"In every Public School the hour

from 9 A.M. to 10 A.M. shall be set apart for religious instruction ; and a notice to that effect shall be posted up in a conspicuous part of the school-room. If the teacher be a Protestant, he shall not require the children of Roman Catholics to be present at the religious instruction, except at the expressed desire of their parents, and *vice versa* if the teacher be a Roman Catholic." Thus, there is not only an implied permission to teach two kinds of religion in the same school, or in different schools, under the Board, but an absolute injunction to that effect. The Board do not say that a certain time may be set apart for religious instruction according to the Protestant or Roman Catholic faith, but that it shall be done. That of itself is enough to show that the system is a denominational one. And it is worthy of note, that the schools under the Board are not to be opened with a short and simple prayer only, but that one whole hour of each day is, by direction of the Board, to be devoted to religious instruction, either according to the Protestant or Roman Catholic faith.

This is why I said, when speaking of its being as much beyond the functions of a government to interfere with the education of a people as it was to interfere with their religion, that it was hardly possible to avoid the one or the other in any other way than by leaving both to the voluntary efforts of the people. But the strictly denominational character of the system, as administered by the present Board, may be seen further from Rules 5 and 6 :—" In imparting religious instruction, the teacher will be limited to the use of the Scriptures, or such books as have been sanctioned for the National Schools of Ireland, or may be hereafter specially approved by this Board. The Board are, however, prepared to sanction any arrangement by which the different ministers of religion residing in the vicinity of the school may have opportunities of affording religious instruction on particular days, at the stated hour, to the children of their own denominations, or to those whose parents may desire them to be present, and, with this view, ministers desirous of affording their services are requested to communicate their wishes, and the days on which they are prepared to attend, to the Secretary."

Here we have superadded to the injunction to teachers to impart religious instruction, either according to the Protestant or Roman Catholic faith, the kind of books to be used by the teachers for imparting religious instruction, and permission to ministers of religion of all denominations to attend on certain days to impart whatever religious instruction they think best. It would, therefore, be a mistake to speak of this system as now administered as anything else but a denominational system. But what we gather in this way from the rules of the Board may be strengthened by the position of the schools, for which rent is, in many cases, paid by the Board. Take this for Hobart Town only. Four out of seven of the schools are more or less connected with places of worship. Battery Point School-house is connected with St. George's Church, Church of England, and the Board pay £70 a year for it. Goulburn-street School-house is connected with St. John's Church, Church of England, and the Board pay £30 a year for it. Harrington-street School-house is connected with St. Joseph's, Roman Catholic, for which the Board pay no rent. Trinity Hill School-house is connected with Trinity Church, Church of England, and the Board pay £30 a year for it. These facts may be left to speak for themselves. They require no comment.

I merely refer to them as showing how little ground there is to speak of the system of education administered here as National, instead of denominational; and, as justifying the preference I gave at the outset of these remarks to free trade in education, as well as in everything else, or, in other words, to education being left to the voluntary efforts of the people. But,

Fifthly and lastly, Guided by these principles, I see very clearly a way to that reduction in the educational department of this Country which the Government are understood to desire.

It is not for me in this memorandum to state, precisely, what that way is. I think the Government might, however, just as readily have reduced the expenditure on this department, as they did on every other department of the Public Service, without having had recourse to a Commission. And unless great reductions are made in this department, which is entirely supported by grants-in-aid, I do not see how the withdrawal of the grants-in-aid to the Municipalities is to be insisted upon. They both appear to me to stand on the same footing.

Whilst not prepared, however, to lay before the Commission at the present moment any specific plan of reduction, I desire to state, in very general terms, where I think reductions might be made. There are too many Public Schools in Hobart Town, by one half at the very least, and they might, perhaps, be conveniently reduced to two, instead of being seven, as at present. That of itself would be a great saving. Similar reductions might be made in the number of Schools in different parts of the Country, regard being had in each case to the want of a School in any particular neighbourhood for those who are not able to help themselves. That would carry the saving farther,—nearly to its utmost limit, perhaps, without a total change of system. But something might be done with the salaries of such Teachers as are retained. I see no reason why the salaries here should be £50, £80, and £100, whilst they range in Adelaide from £40 to £80 only; or why the stipends received from the Board here for 102 Schools should amount to £9700 a year, when, for 279 Schools in South Australia, they do not amount to more than £13,600 a year. Except in a few cases, the rent of the school-houses should, I think, be discontinued. Again, it is impossible to look at the charges against the Establishment, and at what falls under the head of miscellaneous and indirect charges, without seeing that some of these might be reduced, or be altogether dispensed with. And although it would not be possible to make any such reduction in the charges for superior education as might be desired for the present, still there are some that ought to be made with the least possible delay, and steps should be taken for bringing that branch of the system to an end.

It will be seen from this that I do not agree with the suggestions of Bishop Bromby in his lecture at the Mechanics on Friday last, for a remodeling of the scheme. A Normal School could not be established and kept up, except at a great expense; and if the status of the Teachers was raised, they would not stop here, when they could get larger salaries elsewhere, as was seen with reference to the trained Teachers brought out from England some years back. Nor do I see how payment by results in the strict sense of the term could be adopted here, without a large increase of expenditure. A much more efficient inspection of the Schools would be required under that system than under the present, and a greater number of

Inspectors. If the system of payment by results could be introduced, I think Bishop Bromby's plan of dividing the Schools into three classes, and of paying those Masters best who most stood in need of payment, would be admirable. But this principle without payment by results, would not, I fear, be found workable.

I do not submit this as a full and thorough digest of my views on this very important subject. I have merely thrown a few thoughts hastily together, although not hastily adopted, as a guide to my views on these matters generally, and I am now prepared to answer any questions the Commission may think fit to put to me to the best of my ability.

You have stated that Government education has failed to do more in England than voluntary efforts would have done? My belief is, that Government has done no more than voluntary efforts would have done if left to themselves, and had not been interfered with by the Government, and I will give my reasons for this. I can remember when there were no Government Schools in England, in Ireland, or in South Australia, and I don't think the efforts to educate the people standing most in need of help there are greater now than they were then. The education now given in England, in Ireland, and in South Australia, and, I may add, in this Colony, is not to those who need it, and who could not have obtained it in any other way, but to those who are well able to pay for it. The system of education adopted in all these countries falls short at the very point in which it is most needed. I have no statistics at this moment by which to justify that remark in reference to Ireland, but I have no doubt whatever of the fact. It is, however, world-wide notorious that after increasing the grants in England to £1,000,000 a year, there is the greatest outcry from one end of the country to the other for another million. It is said that there are  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions of children within the educational age, of whom only one million are educated, and  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million left uneducated. The uneducated portion of the children are principally in the large towns, such as Manchester and Birmingham, and in the small rural parishes.

Conflicting statements are made on this subject; still no one doubts but that the education provided by the State in England has failed to meet the case of those who most need it.

On this point I would refer the Commission to an able paper by Mr. E. Brotherton, in the Social Science Reports for 1865, and to a series of letters by Mr. James Fraser, that appear in the *Times* of April last. Mr. Fraser combats some of the views put forth by Mr. Brotherton, but leaves the facts untouched.

Then, the Report of the South Australian Education Board for 1865 will show that it is only those that could afford to pay the school fees there that are principally educated; and the same may be deduced from the Report of the Tasmanian Board of Education for the same year. After a careful examination of those Reports, I feel convinced that the great majority of those now educated at the Public Schools would have been educated by the voluntary efforts of the people, if there had been no State interference.

In respect to those whom you have represented as being without education in England, how has State Education prevented their receiving any education? First, I have nowhere said that the grant of such a large sum of money has interfered with the education of any portion of the community in England by voluntary effort. All I have said is, that that money has been squandered on those who would have been educated either by their parents or by the aid of voluntary societies without it, and to that extent the granting of this money must be admitted to have interfered with the full development of the voluntary principle in the cause of education. But, secondly, I think it may fairly be charged on the Government scheme of Education that, if it has not prevented this large number of persons from being educated, the Government is, at all events, chargeable with what must be considered very culpable neglect.

Has not a very large part of the money which you say has been squandered by the State for education in England been expended through voluntary educational channels, and in favour of voluntary schemes of education? Yes; and by far the largest portion of it through voluntary efforts in connection with the Church of England, but that does not at all affect the question of this money having been spent on the education of those who would not have been educated if it had never been granted. I feel no disposition, therefore, to withdraw the term squandered. Though it has been administered through a certain description of voluntary channels, and has been supplemented by those who are made the instruments of its disbursement, that does not at all affect the question of its having been wasted.

You mean in reference to the class who have had the benefit of the education given through these channels? Yes, I mean that those children would have been educated without any State grant for education; and probably the voluntary efforts would have taken the direction of a lower level had not the Government insisted on teachers and schools of a particular class being provided. By insisting on trained teachers and schools of a particular class, what could be spared for voluntary efforts has been absorbed in the education of those who ought to have been left to themselves, whilst those who most needed to have been looked after have been neglected. That is my opinion.

Were the voluntary societies which received the State grants in aid controlled by the State in respect to the classes for whose benefit those grants were expended? They were controlled by the requirements just now set out, *i.e.*, by the demand of certificated teachers and schools of a particular class.

Is it not the fact that English experience established this, that even for the lowest classes the lowering of the standard of qualification in the master and attainment in the pupil defeated the end of education? I don't know such to be the fact. I hold a contrary opinion, and can support it by statements from the most advanced writers on education. That is, as far as I understand the question.

You have adverted to statements of Mr. Brotherton, and also to letters of Mr. Fraser, and to Mr. Fraser's letters as leaving the fact undisturbed of a million more being desired for education in England. But do Mr. Fraser's letters support your representations as to the proportion of uneducated children in England at the present time at the education age? I have never said that they do; but I should prefer putting in, in answer to the question, extracts from the documents on which what I have stated was based.

Mr. Brotherton's statistics are of date 1865? Yes.

Mr. Fraser's 1867, April? Yes. I would add with respect to Mr. Fraser's of 1867, that he takes as a basis for them Reports of the Privy Council of a much earlier date, and then assumes all the rest.

The fault of the systems of education in England, South Australia, and this Colony is, that they have not embraced the lowest and most needy classes. Do you think it would be possible to accomplish their education by the State without doing it with compulsory powers, or do you believe it would be accomplished by leaving education at their option, the kind of education being expressly adopted by them? The faults of the system are, in my opinion, twofold. It patronises those with whom it should have nothing whatever to do, and it leaves untouched those about whom it should most care. With regard to the education of that class of persons who most need it without compulsion, I have no manner of doubt, if proper means were taken, and I give my own experience and observations in confirmation of that opinion. I long had charge of Schools on the West Coast of Ireland, with Inspectors under me, and saw that the children were ready enough to attend School where no fee was charged. I can state the same with regard to Schools connected with other Societies than that which I represented. I also remember the time when there were no Government Grants in England, and then a much larger number proportionately of the poorer classes of children attended the Public Schools than there did when I was last in England. The improving the character of the Schools, and insisting on certificated teachers, combined with the School fees charged, has had the effect of driving the poorer classes of children out of the Schools. I do not therefore think that any compulsion would be necessary; it would only be such an alteration of the system as to adapt it to that class. I refer to Mr. Mill's Political Economy, not to any of his fugitive thoughts on this subject.

Would you gather it to be the opinion of Mr. Mill that the poorer classes are the best judges of the education their children should receive, and as to the selection of the masters competent to impart it? Certainly not, he having stated to the contrary; but I do gather from him what I have already stated, that his inclination is to have Government interference with education limited to those who are not able to pay for it—and that is going no further than he would do with respect to a poor-law.

Can you mention any Country favourably known for the state of education in it where that has been the result of voluntary agency exclusively? I mention England, before the Government Scheme was started. I look on the state of education in England as comparing favourably with that of any other Country, and I believe that it did so before the late Government Scheme was adopted, dating back about 30 years.

You have referred to the difference between the rate of remuneration given by Government to Schoolmasters in South Australia as less than that given here; but does not the South Australian Scheme of Education subsidise masters having a certain minimum of pupils? The Rules and Regulations of the Board are the best guide as to what they require in order to a School being subsidised. I believe, however, they do in some cases give aid to Schools in which the number of children is so low as 40, not only in the remote agricultural districts, but even in scattered outlying villages.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—I take it from your evidence that you condemn the system of Government education in this Colony? I should not like to go so far as to say condemn, but I greatly disapprove of it.

Do you believe that the expenditure for Government purposes far exceeds what is necessary or desirable? I do: even supposing the present system to be maintained.

What do you consider to be the imperative duty of the State in reference to education? I believe it to be the imperative duty of the State to provide for the education of those whose parents are not able to educate them, just as I believe it to be the imperative duty of the State to provide the destitute with food and clothing, but no further. The State oversteps its proper functions the moment it begins to interfere with the education of any other class of people.

Do you believe that the best mode by which the State could discharge that duty would be the establishment of Schools for the education of those whose parents could not afford it? I do not say that it is the best mode, but that it is the only mode that the State should hold itself at liberty to adopt.

Would any injury or injustice be done to that class of children by educating them in such Schools? I think not; I see it stated for instance, in some of the last Reports of the Parochial Unions in England, that the education imparted there has been productive of results both intellectual and moral quite equal to those exhibited in any class of the higher schools.

Do you think the object would be accomplished better by the establishment of such Schools, or by the Government through some instrumentality to issue certificates for admission of those children at a fixed rate into such schools as they might select, the masters being subject to inspection? I have already said I object to the Government establishing Public Schools at all; but supposing such to be in existence, and it to be one of the objects contemplated, I think it would be much better to admit these children by certificates than in the way in which they are now admitted. I will, however, take time to consider this.

In your opinion would the attendance of children at a Public School in better circumstances deter the poorer children from attending those schools? I have no doubt but that it would have a deterrent effect in many cases.

Has the establishment of Government Schools prevented parties equally competent both in education and character from establishing schools? In numberless instances; and I may mention in connection with this that it has led to the abandonment of private schools after they have been established. I would like to call the attention of the Commissioners here to the state of things on Battery Point, which forms a large division of this City. There is one Public School there, and the payment to the Master and his Assistants is such as to enable him to conduct it vigorously. If there was no such school there, the smaller schools on the Point would be better able to support themselves, and the number would be increased. A lady lately told me that in canvassing for children on the Point she found there were 13 schools in number, and that most of them complained of being in a starving condition owing to the Public School. I know several of these schools myself, and can speak as to the competency of some of those in charge of them. They may not be trained teachers as the Public Schoolmaster is, but they are in no respect inferior to him in education, in intelligence, or in the power of imparting what they know.

Is it desirable in your opinion, except on economic grounds, that so large a portion of the community should be educated in the Public Schools as they are necessarily conducted? I very much doubt whether the massing of so many children together could be justified even on economic grounds. I know that that provides ostensibly for the education of a larger number of children with an apparently smaller expenditure of means; but I doubt very much, if the matter came to be really inquired into, whether the education imparted will not be found so defective as to show that there is no economy in it. I will give what I understand to be literally the case. Here is a Master and Mistress, with Pupil Teachers and Monitors, having a large number of children to teach, but what is the quality of the education? When there are 250 children in a school, it is impossible that more than a limited number of those can come under the personal supervision of the Master. The Master's class, as I am informed, consists for the most part of some 20 to 30 of the most advanced pupils, for whom he receives the highest fee allowed by the Board, and to whom he pays his almost exclusive attention. The consequence is, that the less advanced children are remitted almost exclusively to the care of the Pupil Teachers and Monitors. Whilst, therefore, there seems some reason to look on these schools as affording a better education than that which would be got in private schools of a third-rate character, it really is not the fact. The children taught in the Public Schools by the Pupil Teachers and Monitors are not by any means so well taught as children attending private schools of a second or third-rate class. I have been told by a Presbyterian Minister, who takes some interest in Sunday-school teaching, that children taught in the Public Schools, as a rule, are the least competent of any to answer questions put to them. And he attributes this to what I have before stated,—the neglect by the Master.

The moral influence of such a master must be very slight? It is so, and is only exerted in a particular way.

Supposing the large number of children collected together in the Battery Point School were distributed amongst the 13 individuals to whom you have referred, would not the moral influence and training be far greater than could be brought to bear on the same number collected in one school? Immeasurably greater. A greater moral influence would be exerted by the conductor of almost any one of those schools, than could be exerted by any one where so large a number of children as 200 to 300 are collected.

Would not the children, in consequence, become much better and more useful members of society? I believe they would. They would have more respect for their teachers, and for one another, than they can possibly have now; and their teachers would take a deeper interest in their future welfare. The connection of a private teacher with his pupils in after life is very different to that exercised by a public master.

Do you think there is anything peculiar in our country which would render it desirable that persons opening Schools should be required to obtain a licence? No; I should no more think of licensing a private schoolmaster, than I should of licensing a merchant or a cabinet-maker.

In referring to the remuneration of the masters in South Australia, are the amounts you have named the whole of the remuneration they receive for their services? No; they receive School fees not exceeding 13s. a quarter, 4s. a month, or 1s. a week; but that is not to prevent a higher voluntary fee from parents. I believe on the whole a much higher rate and amount of fees are paid in South Australia than here. On referring to the Report for 1865 it will be found that the fees are quite equal to the sum given by the Government.

Would you be in favour of a school-rate in support of the maintenance of country Schools? Always reserving to myself the right of private judgment on the matter, I think a rate of this kind might be of great use, and I should prefer it much to a Government grant: that is the principle on which they act in Canada and United States. In fact, notwithstanding all the money that has been voted in England for this purpose, they have been reduced to the necessity, in some parts of Yorkshire, of levying a penny rate for Schools of this description.

Could adequate local supervision be secured without the parties having the control being pecuniarily interested in the local school? I am not prepared to answer that question with any definiteness; but I see no more reason why that should not be the case, than it is now with regard to Municipalities and Road Trusts. I should, in fact, be inclined to think that the interest taken by parents in the schools would exceed that taken by local bodies in the material interests of the Districts.

Are you of opinion that, if schools were established in the two large towns for the education of the children whose parents could not afford to educate them, there would be no occasion for further interference by Government in those towns with education matters? I most decidedly take that view.

Are you acquainted with Normal Schools? Yes.

Could not the Schools established for the education of the poorer class of children be made use of for the training of teachers as well as any other Schools? Yes; that would not only be possible, but it would be just to revert to the state of things that existed before the National system was established in Ireland, and the Privy Council system in England. The Kildare-street School was just one of this description in Dublin, and the Borough Road School another of the same description in London. They were, in fact, the two great Model Schools of the United Kingdom for the education of the poor.

Would it not be desirable, on account of the brief period such children would remain in School, that the most efficient masters should be retained to conduct them? Undoubtedly; and if anything of the kind is attempted, the best masters should be picked out of those in the Colony, rather than send Home for them.

And would not the introduction of young persons into these Schools for the purpose of training be very beneficial, and exercise a better influence than the mere employment of assistants in Public Schools? It appears to me the effect would be much the same, only that they would be trained in this case for that peculiar class of children to whose education they would afterwards have to attend.

*By Chairman.*—Will you state the number of Public Schools you have inspected in the Colony? I am not an Inspector of Schools. That does not come within my province.

*By Mr. Kennerley.*—From your experience in these Colonies, do you think the voluntary system may be as much depended upon as in England? Yes, in these Colonies; and I point to South Australia in proof of it.

Are not voluntary subscriptions contributed by a few, and not by the community at large? There can be no doubt whatever of there being a few philanthropic individuals in every community always called on to contribute to everything for the moral, social, and religious advancement of society, and who do contribute very largely; but there is still a large number everywhere who contribute their smaller amounts.

Would you be in favour of meeting the case of those not willing to contribute by a local rate for educational purposes in the Colony? I would much rather see a system of education by local rates than by grants from the public revenue, if the Colony were in a position to bear it; and in that case it would make no matter whether the people were willing or not.

As respects private Schools in Hobart Town, do you consider a large number of second and third class private Schools could give a good elementary education to the working classes, and support themselves, without any aid from the Government, presuming that all the Public Schools were reduced to two in Hobart Town? I have no doubt whatever of it. I believe education would be better cared for, and a large number of persons now deprived of the opportunity could then make an honest and respectable livelihood by School teaching.

Could they do so, charging not more than the maximum rate now in force in the present Board of Education Regulations? I can give no answer to that question that would deserve to be considered satisfactory, for these reasons—1st. There would be no necessity whatever for teachers so employed restricting themselves to the fees allowed by the Board. 2nd. It would be most unjust to expect them to do so, when the public schoolmasters receive these fees and the salary from the Government in addition. 3rd. I know some Schools, one in particular, a mixed School in which scarcely higher fees than those authorised by the Board are charged, and that School, although the master is struggling, yields a respectable support to himself and his family. 4th. At one of the first-class private Schools in Hobart Town, although not ranked as one of the Superior Schools, the charge per quarter is only £1, and the master has the reputation of making a highly respectable living.

Presuming that the Public Schools should be reduced to two in Hobart Town, and one in Launceston, would you recommend the Government to give any aid to denominational efforts for the education of the poorer classes in these towns? I should like to reserve my answer on that point.

FRIDAY, 21ST JUNE, 1867.

*The Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF TASMANIA.*

Your Lordship has bestowed considerable attention on the question of primary school education? I have.

Do you hold it to be the duty of Government to see that the means of education are placed within the reach of the children of the working classes? I think so.

But will not the appreciated advantages of elementary education ensure such a demand for it, and such a supply, as to obviate the necessity of State intervention? I don't think so.

Can you not point to any country in which education has reached all classes without State interference in some form? I cannot point to any at the present moment; perhaps the past history of Scotland may point out a case. The Scotch system, founded on endowments, is now however supplemented by State grants.

What was the state of education in England at the period at which the Government interposed, first by a grant dispensed through the Lords of the Treasury, and eventually, in 1839, through the Committee of the Privy Council? It was so unsatisfactory as to demand the special intervention of the State.

And yet at that period were there not in operation large endowments, the accumulation of a century or more, for the maintenance of common Schools in various parts of England, besides two great Educational Societies, the National and the British and Foreign School Society? The Grammar Schools gave free education, though limited to Latin and Greek, and their number bore no proportion to present population.

From what religious bodies and political party was the British and Foreign School Society mainly formed,—I mean was it from that party which, as a general rule, is in favour of enlarging the obligations of the State or the contrary? Were not the Quakers, the Independents, and other Nonconformist bodies much identified with that Society? It was commenced by joint action of all the religious bodies, but practically it has chiefly fallen into the hands of the Nonconformists.

And did the British and Foreign School Society eventually, after struggling with inadequate voluntary resources, not find itself unable to overtake the primary educational wants of the country, and therefore compelled to seek the aid of the State? Yes, it is true. I may add that some eminent Nonconformist Ministers, opposed to Parliamentary interference, gave their adhesion as soon as they felt the improved working of the Society through the system of subsidiary grants.

Looking at the circumstances of this Colony, the total, or all but total, absence in it of Educational Endowments of any kind,—discarding for the time abstract principles as to the duty of the State—are you of opinion that voluntary agencies can be relied on to ensure such a secular education as is given in the Common Schools in England? My opinion is, that voluntary agency will fail here, unless stimulated and



supported by State Aid. It is only powerful when stimulated by religious zeal, but such a zeal is weakened and scattered by our divisions.

As respects the character of Schoolmasters, don't you think the parents of children attending Common Schools will for the sake of their offspring select the fittest, in a free market where competition is open to every one without restriction or licence? There will only be a few instances where the opportunity of selection will be afforded,—say in the large towns; and even in such cases ignorant parents are insufficient judges of the educational wants and progress of their children.

What is the result of experience on this point, in so far as it is known to you, in Europe or America? My experience justifies the opinion I have just expressed.

You concur, then, in an opinion expressed by Mr. Stuart Mill in a paper on the Claims of Labour: "Schoolmasters, like other public officers, are seldom inclined to do more than is exacted from them; but we believe that teaching the poor is almost the only public duty in which the payers are more a check than a stimulant to the zeal of their own agents?" In a system, which only provides for the lowest class, such appreciative power is very small.

But for that modicum of education which is imparted to children whose attendance at any school is irregular, and terminated at an early period of life, would you insist on having a class of teachers approved according to some fixed standard, or would not success in attracting pupils be itself a sufficient test of fitness? I think such standard is absolutely necessary, when we look on education as a lever by which to elevate the neglected classes.

Do you, then, contend for education, and for skill in imparting education, on the part even of those who so to speak, teach the very lowest classes? The lower the class, the more does education as an art become necessary,—the object of such education being to quicken the intelligence and to develop the faculties of children neglected at home.

Which, in your opinion, would be the more disadvantageous alternative, that of lowering the standard of common school education both in respect to teachers and scholars, or submitting for a time to the deprivation of established means of instruction in some localities? Although the interests of the few, if necessary, should yield to those of the many, I should be in favour of diffusing education as widely as possible, even if its quality were somewhat deteriorated.

Do you not think it would be perilous for Government, in a system under its auspices, to acquiesce in an inferior character of Masters, and inferior modes of education? Decidedly, understanding the question to refer more to the teaching power of the Master than to the number of subjects of instruction. I look on education as an art which needs to be mastered as much as any other.

Do you know the name of Mr. Bellairs as an educationist of experience and authority in England in respect to Primary Schools? Very intimately, as a personal friend of my own.

"Which would be the greater evil in your mind, the lowering of the standard, or the leaving of all this immense district of country unaided and neglected? Lowering the standard would be the greater evil in my opinion.

"Do you not think that it is a much more useful object to have education extended largely in proportion to the population, than to have merely such education as to qualify the pupils to become gentlemen? Yes; I have not the least idea of sacrificing the sound education which is requisite for a labourer to the education necessary for the fine-wheat flour of the School; but if you lower the standard, you make the education inefficient for every class of society. You cannot afford to go down, because the thing has been tried. Originally there was a debatable ground between the two classes of registered teachers. We had the higher class, who were allowed to have pupil teachers, and a lower class, who were entitled to the capitation grant, just the type of teacher which you would get at unaided Schools, supposing that you at all lowered your standard. We found from experience that that class of teachers was perfectly unsuited to teach elementary subjects in our Schools; that they were incompetent to do so,—and the consequence is that they have been removed. A fourth standard of certificate has been introduced which represents the higher class of registered teachers. The question was brought to the lowest possible line. We represented that this type of registered teachers was totally incompetent to teach the small rural Schools. Therefore, it is not as if it were a new experiment. The experiment has been tried, whether that low class of registered teachers was competent to teach the laboring poor, and we found that they were not."—(*Mr. Bellair's evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, 1866, page 40.*)

If it were a question simply whether half the Masters should be made able teachers, or the whole half-educated to their work, I should agree with Mr. Bellairs' sentiments; but I regard such question as distinct from that which was first put to Mr. Bellairs, and this I have already answered. I would rather send forth half the number well up to their work, as in that case a higher standard of teaching power would be held up before the public, and its benefits made a matter of proof.

Supposing a system of education to exist with central and local machinery in this Colony, what functions would you deem it expedient, to assign to the central authority, and what to the local? I would leave to the local all administrative action, such as the election of Masters, the distribution as well as raising a local rate if contemplated, and the general management of the schools. On the other hand, all disputes should be referred to the central authority, and the determination of all questions connected with instruction, results of school teaching, and efficiency of school appliances. It should also have the distribution of State grants.

Would you assign to the local bodies the determination of the scope of education, or the remuneration of Masters? The latter—not the former—the object of the State being to measure the various schools by one common standard.

What has been the tendency of all modern arrangements on these points, whether in England or in other countries having improved systems of common School Education? The question, in my experience, is best answered by my previous remarks. The appointment of Masters has been left to local Boards, the



local contributions being regarded as the purchase of such right; while the central authority has reserved in its own hands the character of the education which shall be given, and become responsible for the competence of the Masters.

In reference to the non-paying class of pupils, does it occur to you that it would be expedient to separate them, in separate schools, from pupils who pay the fees exacted under the rules of the Board of Education, so as to discourage pauperism on the part of parents? In putting this question I contemplate that school attendance is optional, not compulsory? Such separation is only possible in towns; but in such localities the separation would be advisable, first, because the struggling parent who pays the school fee would not be injured by remission of fee to others who improperly plead poverty; and secondly, because the second class requires different treatment. I feel this at the present moment; many plead poverty who are not poor, but who spend their money in drink. The State is, in those cases, only giving the money to the public-house. If it were a *bonâ fide* inability to pay, I would make no separation.

In your opinion, is free education one of those things which exercises a lowering influence on those who either accept—the case of parent—or immediately receive it—their children? I think it interferes with the healthy action of the principle that should lead a parent to make sacrifices both for the bodily and mental improvement of his children. Free education should only go along with compulsory, or education in behalf of those who are proved to be unable to contribute. Free education, supported by rates, has been already paid for by the parents, and is free from this lowering influence.

Are you aware that the children of the assisted poor are sent as free scholars to the Parish Schools, where all classes attend, in Scotland? No; I was not aware of it.

Have you any acquaintance with the great public Schools in England—Eton, Harrow, Rugby, Westminster, &c.? Yes; I have some acquaintance; I was brought up in one of the public Schools myself.

Of what classes are the pupils at those Schools principally composed? Middle and higher classes.

But is there not a class of scholars at these seminaries known as “foundationers,” whose education is on an eleemosynary footing? There is a class called “foundationers,” who receive eleemosynary education.

Are you aware of the opinion expressed by Her Majesty’s Commissioners of Enquiry into the revenues and management of certain Colleges and Schools in England, in respect to the blending of scholars of different social origin and circumstances at those Schools? Their opinion on the whole was favourable.

I will quote it, and ask whether, advertng to the differences of social status—all but insensible—between the preponderating class of pupils who pay for education at our Public Schools, and those who do not pay, any valid objection occurs to you why they should be dissevered? From the Report of the Public Schools’ Commission, First Part, 1864; page 9:—

“The position held by foundation boys among their school-fellows varies much at different Schools. We shall advert hereafter to the consequences which appear to flow from the existence within a very large School like Eton of such an institution as is there called “College.” The evidence leads, however, to one general conclusion. It seems tolerably clear that in none of the Schools is a foundation boy lowered in the estimation of his companions by the mere fact of his being a foundation boy; in other words, of his receiving an eleemosynary education. If he is a day scholar, he has not the same opportunities of forming friendships and gaining rank among his school-fellows as if he were a boarder. If he is very inferior in birth and breeding to those who surround him, he has the same disadvantage in a much greater degree. If, being a boarder, he is badly lodged, fed, or cared for, and his situation is thus rendered undesirable, we might naturally expect the same result to follow. And a traditional feeling or prejudice which has once taken root among boys is very difficult to eradicate. But, apart from causes which judicious management may repair, there seems to be nothing to prevent the foundationers from taking, socially as well as intellectually, an equal or (as in some cases they do) even the foremost rank in the School. And we may add, that to promote a thorough amalgamation in play as well as at work appears to be the general desire of the masters, as it is clearly their true interest as educators.”

The parallel between such “Public Schools” as Eton and our own elementary schools is a very imperfect one. Foundation scholars in Public Schools in England may be in their social antecedents equal to the others, and their very nomination presupposes certain meritorious qualities.

But, supposing the social antecedents of the non-paying pupils at our Public Schools to be as good as those of the paying, does the parallel fail? No; not in that case.

I place in your Lordship’s hand the Programme of education at our Public Schools, and, supposing it to be expedient, in order to discourage the evasion of payment of school fees by parents who can afford to pay them, to establish a difference in the amount of education given to the paying and non-paying scholars, does it occur to you that that programme can be reduced, consistently with the main ends of education, at all? I think any such distinction would be undesirable in the same School. When free Schools exist, ragged or industrial, &c., I would compel the alternative of passing to such School, if the school fee were improperly shirked.

Does that programme exceed the standard of education at Schools for the poorer classes in Europe, or even that adopted in Juvenile Reformatories? No; I think it a very fair average. It is decidedly in advance of the debased standard sanctioned by the revised code in England.

Is not that degree of proficiency in the simple branches of education which will enable a person to use his knowledge with facility necessary to stimulate self-improvement, and thus lead to the achievement of the moral ends of education? I think so. The object of school, however, is less directed to the mastering of given subjects of instruction than to the advantage arising from the processes by which knowledge is gained.

Your Lordship is aware that a system of rewards, in the shape of Exhibitions to Superior Schools, is in operation in this Colony; may I ask if this is a novelty, or not a method of stimulating both Masters and pupils which has been approved by experience elsewhere? It is a novelty that furthers the end the Government had in view. The only precedent is in the case of schools from which boys carry Exhibitions to the Universities.

What contributes to the efficiency of a system then, being an element in judging of its economy, both on grounds of efficiency and economy, such encouragements exercise a useful influence? I think so. A child of marked merit has the power of rising from the lowest position to higher offices, to the great advantage of the State.

Do you regard it as immaterial to the maintenance of a good common school education that there should be seminaries for more advanced education? Yes, as certainly not indispensable. Experience, however, goes to show that State money expended on the improvement of the education of the lower orders in regard to organisation, school appliances, and methods of instruction, produces a corresponding advance in those higher schools which have the power of self-improvement.

Your last answer is founded on English experience and English circumstances; but, adverting to the circumstances of this Colony, which kind of education is the more liable to degenerate or to fail altogether if left without extraneous support—dependent, that is, entirely on pupils' fees,—common school education, or what is known as middle class? Both would be more precarious here than at home. It becomes a legitimate subject of enquiry with the State in what way it can best measure the results of education in middle class schools. This might be done by a system of inspection or competitive examinations. The lower the school, the less can it be trusted to the principle of self-support.

*By Mr. Gladow.*—Keeping in view the object of the Commission, what class of the community would have the greatest claim to aid from the State? The class which is least able to help itself.

Presuming then the necessity for immediately reducing, should the reduction of expenditure commence in the Towns or in the thinly populated parts of the Island? I think in the large Towns, but it should be an urgent necessity.

Should it not then be the object to establish or continue in large Towns such Public Schools as are necessary to afford education to that class,—the lowest class? Yes: it is the duty of the State *in loco parentis* to take charge of its forlorn children.

I mean to those classes who require aid in whole or in part? Yes.

I recollect from your previous answer that in your opinion the education of such children would be best promoted by separate Schools for that purpose? That is my opinion.

For conducting of those Schools would you not consider it necessary to procure thoroughly trained and competent masters? Such a class of children require more particularly special qualification in their teacher.

Would they not require more efficient assistance than is afforded to the masters under the present system—I refer to pupil teachers and monitors—for the uncertain and brief periods for which they usually continue in the Schools? Higher qualifications of a particular kind are required in all that are charged with their mental and moral training.

Would you consider injustice would be done to that class by placing them in separate Schools? They would not feel the injustice themselves. It frequently happens that inferior clothing, and a consequent sense of shame, will keep them from the Public Schools.

Would the parents of such children object to send their children to such Schools? Not if the admittance were free.

You have some acquaintance with our present School System, the sort of education that is given, and the regulations made to prevent differences on religious matters? I have.

Are you of opinion that it is desirable that a large portion of the children of the Colony should be educated in such Schools? If the pecuniary circumstances of the Colony justified the expenditure, or if a part of such expenditure were borne by any religious community as the purchase-money for its control, separate Institutions would work the best. Otherwise, bearing in mind the instructions given to this Commission, I assume that combined Schools are only possible, and I do not see why the religious differences need necessarily impede their healthy working, as in Holland and the Canadas.

And you would tolerate them as a compromise merely? I think that separate systems would work the best, especially in the non-industrial Schools. I should deem it less of a compromise with the lower class than with the class above them.

Is it your opinion that the continuance of so many Public Schools in Hobart Town, and the comparative smallness of fees charged, must necessarily prevent many competent individuals from engaging in educational work? I do not think so, if proper care be taken to demand fees commensurate with the social standing of the parents. All inducement to bribe such children by reason of a small School fee should be taken away.

You are aware that under the present system the Masters may admit a child on payment of the minimum fee of 6d. a week? Do you not believe then that with the large aid furnished by Government he is likely to submit to, it may be, the dishonest exactions of parents and receive the minimum fee rather than persist in demanding a larger amount, or a fair and reasonable amount, according to the ability of parents? Such abuse might be easily kept in check by the Inspector's access to the Master's receipt book. The best check, however, would be secured by the adoption of capitation fees, after examination, on the principle of payment by results, from which examination children of a higher grade should be excluded. I point out in my answer a mode of discouraging that abuse.

Would that mode of discouraging be consistent with the inducement held out by Government of pre-

sentations to Superior Schools? I think the questions are quite independent. The State should decline to pay anything on the behalf of a higher class of children, and should limit these presentations to needy competitors.

Have you thought of any system of larger amount of supervision to schools aided by Government? Unless it is contemplated to assess the different localities, it would be undesirable to appoint local Boards.

In your opinion could the amount of local supervision and control to the extent intimated by you be secured unless those parties had a pecuniary interest in the welfare of the schools? I think not. There would be frequent occasions of collision between the Master and the Local Board unless he were appointed by them, and subject to their dismissal of him, which would not be likely to be the case except on the rate principle.

You are aware that in a great many of the thinly populated parts of Ireland there are no Schools but those under Boards of Education? I am not aware of any existing without Government help.

Would it not be impossible in such localities to maintain two Schools? Has it not been found impracticable to establish other Schools when one existed under the Board? It would be impracticable.

There being no other Schools, the smaller settlers are obliged to send their children to such Schools? They are.

Is it not also desirable in every way that competent persons should be employed in such localities? For the reason that the smaller settlers, who are enterprising, have no other opportunity of securing for their children what they honestly aim at.

Would it not then be just and right that the persons resident in those localities should contribute by a rate to support of such Schools? Either by rate or by payment of School fees proportioned to their status—such rate to be subsidised by the State. A Master, or a superior Pupil Teacher, in some localities, might pay itinerant visits to farm-house centres each week.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—What are the prominent defects of the present system of education? Three defects strike my mind: 1. The present system fails to help the class who can least help itself. 2. It fails to carry its influence into sparsely populated Districts. 3. It fails to give a suitable preparation in the art of teaching and training children by a Normal or Model School.

Can you suggest any means by which without greater, or at the same expenditure, more good can be obtained for education? The first failure might be remedied by the conversion of some of the Town Schools into free Industrial Schools and Night-schools,—inducements being offered in the shape of meals or clothing, or simply in the shape of rewards of industry. The second failure might be met by adopting a scale of payments for support of schools bearing an inverse proportion to extent of population or children in average attendance. The third failure would be met very inexpensively by constituting the chief school in Hobart Town, and perhaps in Launceston, as a Normal or Model School to which selected pupil teachers, at the close of their apprenticeship, should be drafted to prepare for their future work. On their appointment to a Public School charge they should receive, after examination, a certificate of merit which would carry with it a money value as an inducement not to pass at once from the school in which they were apprenticed, and at an immature age, to an independent charge.

You spoke of aid to religious bodies; are you in favour of the denominational system in the Towns? Yes; as an abstract principle.

*By Mr. Innes.*—Your Lordship has said that one of the defects of the present system is, that it “fails to help the class that can best help itself.” Do you think it practicable thoroughly to overtake this class under any system in which school attendance is optional? Not completely; but the adoption of indirect compulsion would considerably lessen the evil; such as the withholding eleemosynary help to parents who refuse to send their children to schools, or the making it penal on the part of employers of labour to make use of children who have not a school certificate.

Is not the tendency in all schools based on an eleemosynary principle, if they adhere to their principle in the description of pupils received at them, to enlarge the scope of its application beyond mere school education? Yes; except where the industry of the child can be turned to money account.

The fact of these large schools in Hobart Town or Launceston being occupied by a poor class of children would not prevent their being made use of as training schools? Children in a Normal School should be just those with whom the student would come in contact in after life.

Then, these being so difficult to teach, it would be to their advantage? Yes, they would be of the same class, and it would be to their advantage.

MONDAY, 24TH JUNE, 1867.

MR. H. M. PIKE.

In reply to questions by the Chairman, states—

I am head master of a Private School in Hobart Town, which I have presided over for nearly seven years; prior to that time I was in connection with that School under my predecessor.

The branches taught are Latin, French, Mathematics, Drawing, and English, and occasionally classes when required in German and Greek, but there is not much attendance on the latter.

The social position of my pupils ranges over a wide field. There are sons of barristers, doctors, and clergymen, and generally of the higher class of trades-people.

My regular fees are £10 10s. and £12 12s. a year, according to age. This fee does not include Drawing, French, or German.

My School has occasionally had pupils from the Public Schools, and sometimes my boys are taken away to go to Public Schools,—but not often.

I have had scholars from the Public Schools in Town, and sometimes from those in the Country; but these are only sent to finish with me as boarders.

I need scarcely ask you whether the fees you charge are not necessary to afford you a reasonable compensation for the kind of education you give? Quite necessary, and scarcely sufficiently high.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—I have never been connected with a School under the Board of Education.

I have never received any training in my profession in a public establishment.

I have read the system of training pursued in large public establishments for training masters in England, but I have not undergone any training in one of those establishments.

I have not had many boys from the Public Schools. I may say under 12 in number.

The boys coming to me from the Public Schools are not equal in proficiency to those in my establishment, but I don't reflect on the Public Schools in consequence. I remember one case of a boy being proficient in English and Arithmetic, but he was 16 years old, and was classed with younger boys in my School.

I should not come to the conclusion that the system pursued in the Public Schools is calculated to promote the intelligence of children to the extent which would have been the case under more private tuition. The system I don't say is a bad one, but the numbers treated in the Schools are too large. I don't think the system in Public Schools is as beneficial as that pursued in Private Schools.

My School is conducted by myself and tutors; a few monitors are employed, but all lessons are heard by myself or assistants; all exercises are supervised by me. Monitors set sums from the class-books, &c., and do other mechanical work.

Is it your opinion that the Public School comes unfairly into competition with Private Schools? Yes, in some cases as referring to myself.

From my conversation with other parties in the profession, I can safely say this is the general opinion among private schoolmasters. I know of one or two persons who agree with me. It prevents Private Schools from getting scholars, and parents from paying a fair remuneration for services given.

The means resorted to by the Government to give education to those whose parents cannot pay would not create jealousy. I should like to see this carried out; of course the nature of the education should be such as suited the social position of the parties.

In this City would all parents not in destitute circumstances be able to procure a fair amount of education for their children if the Public Schools were used only for securing the education of the destitute? I think so.

From your experience as an educator of youth, is it your opinion that a larger amount of moral influence and training in right principles would be secured in the Schools where the influence of the master was brought to bear on a comparatively small number of children, to a much greater extent than can possibly be the case in the large Public Schools? Yes.

And, except on economical grounds, such large schools are undesirable? I think the public at large would be gainers by breaking up the public schools. A large number of children at present attend the public schools, but I question if they are educated properly.

If the education of destitute children was provided by Government, would there not be as many children under education as under the present system? I should think so.

Is it your opinion that there would always be a sufficient number of private schools opened, in the absence of Government competition, to meet the educational wants of the city? That is my opinion.

As a citizen, are you aware of the feeling of the citizens in reference to the present system of public education, and how far Government have exceeded, or otherwise, their legitimate bounds by providing education for other than the destitute class of children? I am hardly in a position to say what the public feeling is. I have not spoken to many on the subject.

*By Mr. Kennerley.*—If the working classes, as distinguished from pauper classes, are left to provide education for their children, what, in your opinion, would such education amount to? This embraces a large number of persons of varying means. My opinion is that schools would be opened to provide education for all the different grades of working classes, for which they would have to pay accordingly.

Is it a fact that a large number do not pay for education when they might well afford it? I know of instances of persons of property sending their children to public schools, and who therefore hardly give them the education their position requires.

Are you aware what amount of fees in excess of the regulation fees are paid to Government Schoolmasters? I am not aware, of my own personal knowledge.

Do you consider that a number of second and third class private schools could be supported in town at moderate charges, such as people of small incomes could pay? Yes, sufficient to meet the requirements. At the lower schools the routine has very little variety in it, and boys could be grouped in larger numbers than in higher class schools. In such schools there would be less diversity of age than in the public schools, and the boys would be of the same educational grade.

Supposing a shilling a week to be the fee, how many would be required to enable a Master to make a living in Hobart Town, paying rent for his premises? Fifty would be enough for a single man.

What would the education amount to given by such a master? A plain English education,—geography, arithmetic, grammar, history, reading, and writing.

Would the scholars in a number of those schools obtain as good an education as in the public schools? Yes, as good or better.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—Children come to me from 8 years upwards; some younger.

I have no boys with brothers in public schools.

The Masters of the kind before mentioned would impart a better education than in the public schools, but I think some boys in public schools get a better education than others. Generally, the education in public schools is inferior to private schools.

I do not know personally of any distinction in scholars in public schools.

A boy on having passed through such a school ought to be able to read any ordinary passage in English intelligently.

In arithmetic? I should say the first four rules, and Practice, Rule of Three, and Mensuration, Vulgar and Decimal Fractions. At a shilling a week I should say that a Master could be obtained to give a sound grammatical education to boys. Assuming the Master to be single; I don't think any man who has not a love for teaching would undertake it.

Do you think that 50s. a week would secure the services of a man to whom the education of a class of children should be entrusted? I should think so,—a responsible man could be got for that.

Do you think that persons entrusted with education should hold certificates of competency, or should there be free trade? Individually I think a licence would be desirable. It would have the effect of raising the standard of teachers.

*By the Chairman.*—Is it usual for masters of similar Schools to that which you conduct,—the Grammar Schools of England,—to undergo that kind of special training which is known in connection with certificated masters of elementary Schools? I can only answer with regard to London. I think not. They are generally University men.

Is it not very much the case for persons unsuccessful in other occupations to adopt, without respect to qualification, the profession of Schoolmasters? I believe so.

From your knowledge of the lower classes in this City, do you think them qualified to appreciate the difference between a qualified and unqualified master? I know so little of the Public Schools that I cannot give an answer. If they are like those in London, I should say not.

Under a system of unlimited competition, and no security taken for the skill or competence of teachers, do you not think that the lower classes, including many who can afford to pay thirty or forty shillings *per annum* for a child's schooling, would be liable to serious imposition in the character of the education given to their children? I hardly think they would be more liable than at present. I think very few of the Public School children are educated.

You say that you think very few of the children who, under present circumstances, attend the Public Schools get education: to what cause do you impute this,—the incompetence of the teaching, or the irregularity of attendance in that class? I think it is partly owing to irregular attendance, and partly to the numbers being so great that the master is unable to give due attention to the pupils.

Have you had much or any personal experience among the lower orders in reference to the education of their children? None whatever.

You have referred to a distinction in the amount of education of some pupils at Government Schools as compared to others: do you know this to be the case as the result of personal enquiry? No: common report.

You have said that fifty scholars, at 1s. per week each, would afford sufficient encouragement to a competent teacher in those branches of education imparted at our Public Schools? No: unless the education were limited to grammar, geography, history, arithmetic, reading, and writing.

Do you not think thirty scholars would be enough at the same rate? Not sufficient; but thirty to commence with would induce a man to begin.

Is not the number of fifty scholars a considerable one for any private School to collect? Besides my own, I can speak with certainty of only two in Town, one of which has considerably more than 50, the other less.

What number of pupils of varying ages from six to twelve, without assistance, can one teacher properly conduct the education of? I could not answer the question as regards such a School as I refer to.

WEDNESDAY, 26 JUNE, 1867.

VERY REV. W. J. DUNNE, *Vicar-General.*

In reply to questions from the Chairman, states—

I have resided in this Colony 22 years; 21 years in Richmond, and the last year in Hobart Town.

You have, no doubt, been led to make yourself acquainted with the Public Schools? Yes, I have been accustomed to visit the Public Schools in my district, and for a portion of time I had a Denominational School under my pastoral charge.

As a general rule, from your knowledge of the classes of children attending Public Schools, were they likely to attend any School if a high fee was exacted for their education? The greater portion of children

would not; indeed they could not. But to give an accurate reply to the question the term "high fee" should be defined. If all the children were obliged to pay 9d. a week, the great majority could not go to school at all. In Sorell, the children generally pay; there were no free scholars in the Public School there when I visited it.

From your knowledge of the class of parents of children attending our Public Schools, is it not necessary to make the School as attractive as possible to them? It would be very desirable to do so.

Is it not the case that the time of their children, particularly their elder children, represents a money value? It is so. In the harvest time or busy seasons of the year they are generally employed at home.

And in so far as there is a sacrifice of the earnings which children lose by School attendance, ought not credit to be allowed to their parents in estimating the price demanded for the education of their offspring? Certainly, a loss is incurred by such sacrifice, and it is proper to take such loss into consideration on fixing a charge for education. But this is a loss common to all parents, and the advantages derivable from the education of their offspring are always considered more than an equivalent for such a loss.

What in your opinion are the most prominent defects in our educational system? There are two defects which occur to me just now as most prominent, one of them general, and the other special. The general defect is, that the present system does not convey that amount of education to the poorer classes which might be expected from the amount of the education grant. The special defect is, that, considering the manner in which Rule 4 is interpreted, the present system does not afford sufficient security against the proselytism of Catholic children attending the Public Schools. Not only are proselytising practices carried on under cover of the Board's Rules, but are actually justified by them. I am aware that a modification has been made in the rule referred to, but it has not been acted upon. I remember when the rule was first framed by the Venerable Archdeacon Davies, Rev. Dr. Lillie, and the late Vicar-General. Their intention in framing Rule No. 4 was, that no child attending the Public School should receive religious instruction at the cost of conscience, or on principles of which their religion disapproved. With that view they made use of the word "require" in the sense that no child should be asked to receive religious instruction by a Teacher not of the same religion, unless at the expressed request of the parents of the child. This rule I am aware is now generally infringed as regards Catholic children, who are invited and even required by Protestant Teachers to attend religious instruction in common and in class with the Protestant children without any intimation to that effect from the parents of the children, and even without their knowledge. I remember one instance of a Teacher continuing, against my remonstrance, to make the Catholic children read the Protestant Bible in class, and thus induce them to become disobedient Members of their Church. The modification that has been made in Rule 4 does not afford sufficient security against proselytism to the Catholic children.

In reference to the special defect, is it not susceptible of remedy without disturbing the principle of our existing educational system? Possibly it is; but the confidence of the Catholic Clergy and the Catholic people in the system is completely shaken, and it will be, I am sure, difficult to restore it.

In respect to the general defect which you have alleged, in what way do you consider the present outlay excessive in comparison to results? I think it is excessive in this respect, that many persons who could pay for their children receive the advantage of the Board's Schools at a trifling cost, whilst many children of the poorer classes receive no education at all.

Is your reference made to a class of pupils which pay nothing? By the poorer classes I mean those who either can pay nothing, or cannot pay in accordance with the scale of school-fees prescribed by the Board.

In the Country Districts is not the sending a boy to the Public School or no School at all the alternative between which parents above the lowest orders are placed? In most localities parents have no other alternative than that of sending their children to a Public School. Generally speaking, there are very few Private Schools in the Country Districts.

Are there no advantages, in your opinion, in the blending of different classes in one School? There may be social advantages, but with respect to Catholic children the mixed system of education has always proved to have an injurious effect, for, excluding the influence of religion, it tends to train the youthful mind in indifference to every creed, and in practical infidelity.

Referring particularly to the Country Schools, and to such Districts as Richmond at the present time, is it not a very small fee that the larger number of our small farmers could pay for the schooling of their children? I think the generality of farmers could pay the fee charged, either in money or value. It is in the Townships, where the labouring classes and idlers congregate, that poverty is most prevalent, and parents are more incapable of paying for their children's education.

What fee would you think a reasonable one, as a general rule, in reference to this class of small tenant farmers? As a general rule, the fee would vary in relation to the circumstances of the settlers. In case no Public School existed, some farmers could afford to pay 2s., some 1s., and some 6d. a week. There are, of course, some small farmers so poor that they could afford to pay nothing.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—Seeing that the means at the disposal of the Government for educational purposes are limited, what class should be first cared for? The poorer classes, most certainly.

Are you of opinion, then, that the education of the poorer classes should be secured before any attempt is made by the Government to promote the education of those who could afford to educate their children? I think there is a greater obligation on the part of the State to provide for the education of the poorer classes.

Should not that obligation be first performed? In the absence of abundant means at the disposal of the State to provide for superior education, I think so.

In your opinion should or should not the obligation of the State to the poor be first performed before the education of others is undertaken? I believe so. To provide for the education of the poorer class is a duty on the part of the State. To provide for the education of the higher class is an act of generosity.

You have stated the general defect of the present system. Do you speak to the quality of the education, or the extent to which education is given to the lower classes? I mean the extent to which it is given.

Seeing that, according to regulations, all children are entitled to be admitted to Public Schools free of charge whose parents cannot afford to pay School fees, how is it that under the present system the education of the poor has not been accomplished to its fullest extent? The causes which prevent the accomplishment of this end differ in respect to the country and in respect to the towns. In the country where the population is scattered the cause may be traced to the difficulty of travelling long distances to attend at school. This impediment could be partly removed by the employment of itinerating Teachers. In the towns there are two preventing causes; viz., neglect on the part of some parents, and poverty and want of clothes for their children on the part of others.

Then the latter is not a defect in the system? No.

Has the presence of respectable children in the Schools the effect of deterring the attendance of the poor classes? I have observed no instances of the kind.

Would Schools established with the exclusive object of educating those whose parents could not educate them be more effectual in securing the education of that class than the present system,—such Schools being conducted at the expense of the State? I think in Hobart Town and Launceston such Schools would have the effect of bringing home education more immediately to the poorer classes, as they would then have the undivided attention of their Masters, but such special Schools would not be adapted to the requirements of the Country Districts.

*By Dr. Butler.*—Are not the Schools now in operation under the Board of Education in Hobart Town and Launceston free Schools for the poorer classes? They can become so upon certificates being given of the parents' inability to pay school-fees, but practically the number of free scholars is comparatively few, owing, I presume, to the neglect of parents, and the want of clothes for the children.

Then in what way would the establishment of Free Schools provide for that defect? I would not be in favour of a compulsory law. I should prefer that some reward in the shape of clothing were offered as an inducement to children to attend. By offering such a reward, I mean that the State should supplement contributions of clothes given by the religious denominations to which the children belong. With respect to Catholic children, the establishment of schools conducted by Members of Religious Orders would have the effect of attracting large numbers of poor children to them.

Do you think children would go as freely to a pauper School as to a mixed School? Without doubt the natural pride of parents would, in many instances, lead to objections; but generally, if the school were well conducted, there would be no practical difficulty on that head.

How do you define the poorer classes whom the State should educate in the separate Schools? At present many pay only in accordance with the scale of school fees who could pay more. Those whose circumstances do not enable them to pay 3*d.* a week, or even that sum, may be said to constitute the poorer classes which the State should educate freely.

What weekly payment would be enough to enable a child to obtain education without Public Schools? 1*s.* a week for a plain education, embracing reading, writing, arithmetic, history, grammar, and geography.

Then those who could not pay a shilling a week would be taught from the Government grant? No. In private schools some would pay more and some less, in proportion to their attainments. A pupil learning geometry would pay more than a child learning to spell. Children who could pay 6*d.* a week would not be excluded from some private schools.

Are you aware of the character of the instruction given at these private Schools? The instruction given at some of the private schools, viz., Miss Bennett's and the Misses Hogan's, is of a very high character. There are three other private schools in my Parish, viz., Mr. Mulhall's, Miss Gormley's, and Miss Gillon's. The character of the instruction given in these schools is very good. Mr. Mulhall is a certificated Teacher, and has recently been appointed to a situation in the Queen's Asylum.

As to the advisability of establishing Free Schools in Hobart Town, would there not be great objections among parents to sending their children such long distances? Yes, great inconvenience would be experienced in this way. Indeed it would be impossible to send children from the suburbs to a school in the centre of the city. Were free schools determined upon, there certainly should be two of them established; one a denominational one for the Catholics, and the other for the Protestants. This would not do away with the objection to sending children a long distance, but it would do away with the objection as to sending Catholic children to a school where, probably, all the Teachers are Protestants. Children would go more freely to Denominational Schools, because in these schools religious and secular education are so blended together that distinctive religious teaching enters into the course of daily secular instruction, and religion underlies and is made the groundwork of education. Harrington-street school is not a Denominational School. Religious instruction is given there, but it is not so involved and interwoven with secular instruction as happens in schools conducted by Members of Religious Orders, to which large numbers of children are always attracted.

*By Mr. Kennerley.*—Do you think sufficient interest is shown in the Country Districts on the subject of education? I think great lack of interest exists in the Country Districts on the subject of education.

As the means of the Government are limited, would you be in favour of local rates in Country Districts rather than that the present rates should be reduced? I would not be in favour of local rates. A great outcry would be raised against them. It would lead to considerable evils if appointments and removals of masters were left to local Boards. Such appointments and removals should be vested in a central authority.

Would you give local Municipalities power over the supervision of the Public Schools beyond that at present given to them? No; they have sufficient power at present in their being appointed Special Visitors.

As to Schools in Country Towns,—are there more than should be supported by Government, considering the population? I do not think there are any more in existence than are required.



Supposing the Schools in Hobart Town were reduced to two, would the Government be required to give denominational aid for educating the poorer classes? Yes, it would be necessary to do so; and by supplementing the contributions of religious denominations it could do so without any increase of expense.

Do you think a system of denominational aid would be better than the present? I do; it would create a rivalry among several Denominations, the result of which would be the bringing of an increased number of children into the Schools.

Would it meet the wants of children now receiving no education? I think it would have that effect.

Do you think it advisable to provide Industrial and Reformatory Schools? There is a great want of such Schools, but Reformatory are more required than Industrial Schools.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—Do you not think some such system could be adopted to induce the poorest class of children to attend Day Schools as is at present adopted by Religious Bodies to fill the Sabbath Schools: personal canvass of benevolent individuals? I do not think so. It would be difficult to find benevolent persons to interest themselves in that way. Religious bodies regard it as a religious duty to induce children to attend the Sunday Schools, but they would not consider themselves bound by any such obligation on week days.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—Do you think the duty of the State is confined to the poor classes? Considering the limited means of the State, I think its greater obligation is to educate the poor classes; it is also its duty, in a lesser degree, to encourage and aid the education of the higher classes.

Do you think masters should be certificated or otherwise? There would be a difficulty with respect to private masters, but I am of opinion that all masters should be certificated.

*By the Chairman.*—Would you consider that the State discharged its duties in respect to the education of pauper children at a School devoted to them if it omitted to give them a religious education? In devising a system of education for pauper children, I think the State should provide that they should receive religious instruction, but always in accordance with the doctrine of the Denomination to which the children belong. It would be an act of injustice on the part of the State to force pauper children to attend religious instruction of which their Parents and their Clergy disapprove.

In your opinion can an education entitled to the designation of religious be given without inculcating the doctrines either of Catholics or Protestants? I do not think so. No religious instruction, properly so called, can be inculcated without dogma. It would be impossible to impart religious instruction to Catholic children, for instance, without reference to the dogmas of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Resurrection, and the Ascension of our Lord.

Even on the footing of giving a good secular combined with a denominational religious education, do you not think that it would be necessary, in order to induce regular school attendance, to hold out the encouragement of decent clothing to the pauper classes, supposing compulsory education out of the question? It would be a greater attraction to children if a reward of clothes were offered to the really destitute. Charitable persons, I think, could be found to assist in providing clothes for pauper children, in order to enable them to attend at school.

What is the main cause of hindrance at present to school attendance; the burden of fees and the loss of wages being excluded from consideration? The main causes, as I have already stated, are neglect of parents and want of clothing.

Supposing the object of the State to be to maintain an efficient system of elementary education, do you think that the existence of a provision by which a more advanced education is made attainable to meritorious pupils at Public Schools is calculated to further their efficiency? There is no doubt such provision is a great incentive both to Masters and Pupils in Public Schools, and calculated in a very high degree to further the efficiency of the Public Schools throughout the Colony.

In reference to the special defect in the present system of education to which I have alluded, I would respectfully add, that in my opinion the best remedy would be to change Rule 4, so as to fix the time for religious instruction at the end of the school hours, strictly requiring that it should not commence for the majority of the pupils, or any of them, until after the departure of every one of the minority professing a different creed.

---

#### MR. A. IRELAND.

In reply to questions from the Chairman, states—

I have been 13 years presiding over the School which I now conduct.

I conducted the School at first as a private speculation. In Scotland I was in communication with Dr. Nicholson, and he said he would be happy to have me out as teacher in connection with his Church; but otherwise it was entirely a private speculation.

I have no connection with the Church now; I have not even the school-room.

I have about 85 pupils at present; for whose education I have to assist me a second English Master, a Writing Master, a Drawing Master, and a Junior Assistant for manual work.

The fees I charge vary from one to three guineas per quarter, according to the branches of education taught.

I know none of the Public Schools here except from hearsay.

I know generally the classes from which the public-school pupils come. I have had some of them, —I may say a good many,—from both town Schools and country, principally the former.



Supposing the State to withdraw provision from the Elementary Schools in town, what, if any, reduction would that enable you to make in your charges, so as to attract such pupils as now attend Public Schools? I am not quite prepared to answer the question without consideration at home.

Would you be favourable to a system under which certificates of competence would be required from all teachers? I would have no objection.

At present do not competent masters find themselves injured in their profession by its being undertaken by incompetent persons—not merely incompetent in education, but other causes? I should like time to consider this question.

I have two boarders.

I pursued the profession of teacher before I came to the Colony.

You are aware that at the present time encouragements are given by the State in the shape of exhibitions to Superior Schools, obtainable by competition from all Schools. Does this system operate favourably, as testing the skill of masters, and encouraging pupils? I think it does so very much.

It shows to the world at what Schools an education is given that will stand an independent and impartial examination? It does.

What age were the boys you had from Public Schools? All ages,—5 to 15.

Was your observation of the attainment of the boys sufficiently minute to lead you to remark either superiority or inferiority on their part as compared with a similar number of boys from miscellaneous schools? Their general knowledge was good in many instances, but as to scholastic details they were not so well grounded. In some instances they were bad in both respects.

You have had an opportunity of appreciating the value of education, and the sacrifices which will be made to obtain it on the part of parents in Scotland and in this Colony? I have. The result is, that I find some parents here make great sacrifices, while others are indifferent as compared with those in Scotland, where greater sacrifices are made than here in general.

I know little personally of the lower classes, only from hearsay.

[Mr. Ireland hands in the following written statement.]

The following are my opinions on the working of Public Education, with a rough outline of the scheme which I think would be most likely to satisfy all parties, and to meet the demands of the State without pressing too heavily on the public Treasury.

I presume that in the present state of the question we have to deal with two classes of persons; and, if possible, to satisfy or conciliate both. First, we have that class of persons who believe that the State should not interfere at all in regard to education; and, next, we have the very antipodes to that class, who believe that the State should do everything, and who advocate State Aid in favour of every class,—“Justice and liberality to all classes and all persons; no sort or condition of people being exclusively favoured or protected.”

It is clear to me that the Commission now sitting will be unable to go with either party. The laudable efforts of voluntarism have fallen far short of complete success, and it is certain that Tasmania at the present time cannot afford to assist all parties alike; nor is it, indeed, just that the public should be taxed in any degree for the education of the children of well-to-do parents, whose duty it clearly is to pay the expense of that education themselves.

In order to put my views on Public Education in a more definite form, I shall arrange them under the following heads:—

### 1. *Should the State aid Education?*

This is a question which a few years back occupied a very large amount of attention, but which has, I think, been settled beyond dispute by the united assent of Christendom. There can no longer be a doubt that society in every country is bound to protect itself from the dangers of ignorance in the generations which are being reared in the midst of it, if it would avoid being inundated by a criminal population, and made to maintain the enormous expense entailed in supporting the extensive machinery of law with an adequate amount of prison accommodation. Happily, too, moral obligation has been recognised in the settlement of the question; and it is on all sides admitted to be the duty of the State to see that every child within its bounds is so far educated as to be able on attaining manhood or womanhood to play a responsible part, and to maintain itself by its own industry in a position of respectability. The requirements of civilised countries, too, have contributed not a little to bring about this result. Wherever civilisation is established, there is a great demand for trustworthy dependants; and experience has shown that by far the best are those whose intellects have been awakened under the influence of a moderate education. Hence Public Schools are now considered absolutely necessary, alike to supply the labour market, to raise up industrious and intelligent artisans and tradesmen, to assist in developing the natural and material wealth of a country, and for the maintenance of law and order in society.

While, however, the principle is universally admitted that the State should aid Education, it is still a vexed question as to—

### 2. *How far State Aid to Education should go.*

I presume it will not for a moment be denied, that superior even to the obligation of the State is to be considered the obligation of the parent. One of the principal duties of parents to their children is that of giving them an education suitable to their station in life. A parent has no right to allow his child to grow up like a beast, and to lead a life which would be alike useless to others and shameful to himself. In dealing, then, with the subject of Public Education the State should keep the natural responsibility of parents always in view, and it should never attempt to invade those obligations in the smallest degree.

To orphan children and children without natural protectors the State stands clearly in the position of a parent, and should in regard to the education of such children discharge strictly a parent's duty. In regard to pauper children the position of the State is not quite so clear.

I think, however, that when the parents of children are too poor to bestow upon them an adequate education, the State ought to step in and discharge that duty. The term "adequate education" ought, however, to be clearly defined, and should mean simply such a primary education as would fit the children to fill any ordinary position in life. It is, I conceive, no part of the duty of the State to provide a superior kind of education for the children of a superior class of paupers, any more than it is the duty of the State to provide superior asylums, or superior food or clothing for them, when they are thrown upon State liberality for such necessities.

As regards that class of the population who cannot afford to provide adequate primary education for their children in the whole, but could nevertheless contribute a portion of the cost of such education, I think it would be within the province of the State to countenance, and even to encourage, such arrangements as tending to maintain parental obligations. In all such cases the children should receive their education at a National School, and the contributions of the parents should be paid to the central authority, and not to the master.

The State has no right to place the masters of its Public Schools in competition, on terms of superiority, with masters of private educational establishments. Its interference in the matter of education should be confined to the maintenance of National Schools for the education of its poor, and to insisting that an adequate primary education be given to children by all parents who can afford to pay for it. Everything beyond this should be left to voluntary effort, at all events until the country is in a position of financial prosperity sufficient to warrant a large expenditure upon superior educational establishments, and in the endowment of universities.

### 3. *Education in Tasmania.*

By the Report of the Board of Education for 1865, it appears there were in operation under that body during the year 102 Public Schools, having 194 teachers, assistant teachers, pupil teachers, and paid monitors. In those schools there were 8294 distinct scholars on the rolls; but the average daily attendance was only 4074. According to the census of 1861, there were 19,349 children in the Colony between the ages of 5 and 15 years. The average daily attendance in our Public Schools was therefore less than one-fifth, leaving the remaining four-fifths entirely dependent upon voluntary efforts, and, I fear, at least three-fifths devoid of education altogether.

In respect to the object for which our present system of education exists, then, it may be set down as a great failure. It is clear that the children do not attend school, and we have the astounding fact before us that by far the greater proportion of our juvenile population is receiving no education at all. Of those who do receive education at the hands of the State, there can be no doubt that a very large number are the children of parents who are well able to pay for that education themselves, and who should be made to do so by some means.

No doubt the system of rewards adopted by the Council and Board of Education is good, inasmuch as it tends to stimulate both teachers and pupils to greater exertion in the prosecution of their respective duties, and to excite a healthful competition among the educational establishments of the Colony. I think, however, the amount expended is, under existing circumstances, extravagant. The same system of rewards might be continued with equally satisfactory results at one-half the present cost.

The average amount of Government aid per annum paid for each scholar in daily attendance during 1865 was £2 19s. 0½d., or about £12,000 for the education of 4074 children; while the average amount of School Fees charged for each scholar in daily attendance was only 19s. 7½d., or about one-third of the amount paid by Government.

My chief objections to the present system of Public Education, then, are:—

1st. That it does not serve the end for which it was established,—only one-fifth of our juvenile population being educated in the Public Schools.

2nd. That it goes altogether beyond State obligations, and trenches upon the duty of parents.

3rd. That it has a great tendency to check voluntary efforts, and interferes with that free and healthy competition which should be open to the preceptor of youth, as well as to the representatives of every other calling.

The legitimacy of this conclusion is not only supported by the repeated complaints of parents, and by the actual facts of the case, but it is a natural consequence of the latitude given to the Public School teacher by the regulations of the Board of Education. These regulations authorise him to receive, when obtainable, a higher rate than the prescribed scale of fees; thereby tempting him, or at least giving him sufficient latitude to bestow an undue share of his time and attention to the instruction of that class of children for whom he receives the high fee to the consequent neglect of his less fortunate pupils, and to the detriment of private institutions.

To meet these objections, I should propose a system of education to be established by a special Act of Parliament, and to be under the management and control of a responsible Minister of the Crown.

The leading features of such an enactment I think should be:—

1st. That it be made compulsory upon every parent, under the penalty of fine or imprisonment, to send children between the respective ages of 5 and 13 years to some national or private School at least three days a week, for the space of say four or five hours each day, except in case of sickness or during periods of epidemic, when a medical certificate could of course be produced.

2nd. Rewards to informers on conviction of parents for not sending their children to School.

3rd. The enactment of a moderate scale of fees to be paid by parents for the education of their children in National Schools, or for their maintenance and education in industrial Schools or Reformatories: such fees in every case to be paid to the central authority, and not to the masters.

4th. Providing for the free education of children in Public Schools on affidavit sworn by the parents or guardians as to their inability to pay for such education,—persons swearing false affidavits to be proceeded against for perjury.

#### *Schools.*

1st. In the two principal towns (in each) one, or at most two, National Schools for children who require mere primary education. One reformatory or industrial school; such school to be also of the nature of an Orphan Asylum, and to receive all children who have been deprived of their natural guardians and are thrown upon the State. N.B.—A training ship for boys might be established on the River Derwent at a very trivial cost, and with immense advantage to the Colony.

2nd. In the leading townships and centres of population (in each), one National School under the same regulations as those in the two principal towns.

3rd. In sparsely populated localities, the attendance of a Travelling Schoolmaster, weekly or fortnightly according to the locality: school in such cases to be held in the most convenient building available.

#### *Teachers.*

As at present, I think teachers should be classified as teachers, assistant teachers, pupil teachers, and paid monitors; and liberal salaries paid by the State to each class, according to the work to be performed; the teachers to understand clearly that they are prohibited from accepting any fees whatever, or from entering into competition in any way with private preceptors. It is very desirable that a Normal School for the training of teachers should be established; but in the present state of the finances I think that impracticable. I should therefore advocate, as a temporary measure, the allowance of gratuities to trained teachers for the instruction of assistant teachers, pupil teachers, and monitors.

As far as cost is concerned, I believe such a scheme as I have sketched could be worked with vastly less expense than the present Public School system, and would at the same time succeed in educating that class for whom primary education was originally intended, but to do which the existing system has proved a complete failure.

*By the Chairman.*—You have referred to all civilised States having recognised the obligation of providing elementary education,—can you mention one of these which has not at the same time recognised the obligation of aiding education by means of universities or schools of an advanced description? I want time for consideration.

Unless under a system, such as you suggest, of compulsory attendance at some school, do you not apprehend that anything done by the Government will fail to alter the state of things which you represent to exist at present, under which a large proportion of children are uneducated? Unless some compulsory effort is adopted, any effort would be useless.

*By Dr. Butler.*—You speak of 8000 children at schools, and only 4000 average attendance, and you calculate that the latter only get education: would it not be the case that all the children who attend receive some education? Of course, some; but their irregular attendance would render this partial.

Would not the average attendance make it appear that only half are instructed? I suppose that in country districts the head master could only attend three days a week at each place.

In supervising the lower class in your school, how many children can be taught by a master? I will say, after consideration, how many my master can arrange his work for that he can alone instruct in simple elementary instruction.

Do you think the amount of instruction in primary schools should be inferior to that in the programme which I hand you? I will answer this.

What amount of income should a master expect to derive from his occupation? From £120 to £150 sufficient,—over and above rent of building.

Is it the fact that in Scotland children of various classes and sexes are educated together at general schools?—If so, did those of higher ranks receive a better education than the others? I will answer this to-morrow.

Can you recollect to memory any general inconvenience to arise from mingling the sexes? In Scotland I have. In schools I was acquainted with the females were in different parts of the school, but still there were inconveniences.

---

#### MR. R. G. GRAY, *City Missionary.*

You have had considerable experience in connection with the Hobart Town Ragged Schools? I have, for nearly 14 years. I have been connected with the Hobart Town Ragged Schools, and have been Superintendent for 10 years.

You know what exertions are necessary in order to obtain attendance at these Schools? Visiting parents, stirring them up to do their duty to their children.

The parents I suppose are poor from a variety of causes? Yes, very poor and miserable; arising from drunkenness, improvidence, want of employment, &c.

Many of the children have fathers who, if they did their duty, could send them to school, paying for their education? Yes.

Even after getting the children to school, you require to superadd something to mere education to keep them there? Yes; clothing, food, and assisting the parents as well.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—Are there many children of indigent parents who attend no school whatever? Compared with the mass of the population, I should say few. I have myself last week taken what may be called a census of the poor from Old Wharf up to extreme end of Argyle-street, Elizabeth-street, Campbell-street, and Cross-street, and the result amounts to this, there is about 1 out of 8 who are not attending any school whatever. On the Old Wharf 56 families under visitation there, of these 30 have children varying from 2 to 7; out of these 30 families I found only 3 children not going to school who ought to go to school. There is a part of that district which brings up the per-centage of non-attendance at school,—that is Ware, Worley, and Smith-streets, where there is no Public School. In that locality a very large per-centage are not going to school, simply because there is no school to go to. The nearest is Trinity Hill, but this is at a distance of upwards of half a mile, which is a good deal for little children. This is the reason why they don't go to school.

Have that class of children any prejudice against attending Public Schools, or is there anything in the Public Schools which prevents them from attending? Yes, there is; they say they are neglected, they represent it is because they are very poor. From what I know of this class of children they would be more likely to attend schools for educating their class in preference to Public Schools where others were admitted. Their parents would have no prejudice against sending children to such schools, not in the least.

What is your opinion as to the advantages or disadvantages of sending them to the Public Schools as now established? I don't consider the present schools Public Schools in the proper sense of the term—answering the purpose of educating the poor. The trouble and difficulty I had in getting children into Public Schools led to the establishment of Ragged Schools. The same difficulty does not exist now, but if the admission is easier the children are neglected when admitted. I have been in the habit of visiting the Public Schools. I have observed in the classes of those schools that the feeling of those children is well-founded—extra attention paid to those in first or highest or Master's class, while junior classes are left to the care of monitors. I have visited the schools at all hours and have observed the same thing. I know parties who keep private schools, some where education given is simply elementary. The fees charged for such instruction by properly competent persons were regulated by the circumstances of the parents, in most if not in all cases,—in a family of 4 or 5 the teacher will take 4 for, say, 2s. or 2s. 6d. a week—in other cases he will charge 1s. or 2s. for one. There are not many schools kept by parties of this character—and I may say that I have had complaints from these that they could not get on with their schools because of competition of Public Schools; in this way, the fact of education in Public Schools being for such as were willing to pay, he would have got more for his scholars.

If desirable to provide for the education of poor children, would it be necessary to locate schools easy of access? Yes.

Then if easy of access, and admission with little trouble, numbers now uneducated would avail themselves of education? I believe so.

If one central school were established, would they travel from all quarters? No; and it would prevent many elder ones. I think the schools must be dispersed over the town. A few more Free Schools should be established in thickly populated districts.

That extra attention is given more to the Master's class according to the fees they pay, as well as their age and qualification? If I go to the Public School at 10, 11, 12, or 2 o'clock the Master is always with the senior class, of which grade composed I cannot say.

Do you certify to admission of free scholars? Yes, Murray-street.

Do you think there is much opening for imposition on the part of parents in that school? I should say not. I know the circumstances of all the parents. The difficulty was to get the parents to send them to school. I know the free scholars in other schools.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—Are you of opinion that many of the free scholars are children of parents who can pay for education? I believe there are a great many whose parents are able to pay, but how to get the money is the question. I have been told in one case, if it was only a penny they had to pay for the education of their children they would prefer spending it at a public-house.

*By Mr. Kennerley.*—You consider a compulsory mode advisable? Yes, I consider legislation required.

What number attend the Ragged Schools at present? About 280.

Do you think that it would be advantageous to extend the system of Ragged Schools in another part of Town, from your long experience? Yes, I think so; a fourth School. There is a third on the Cascade Road. The system has worked well in proportion to the means and assistance from Government,—and were it not for that we should have had hundreds of children running about the streets without any education whatever. The system has a beneficial interest in the parents as well as children, and in many instances they are reclaimed from drunkenness.

*By Mr. Fysh.*—Is there not much room in Upper Murray-street for free education? Yes, if we had the Infant School and a Ragged School in same premises, with some small expense for additions.

Have you ever heard of objections to send children to School from your reading Scripture there? Never. The religious instruction is of the simplest kind; in reading the Scripture the instruction of the clergymen who visit are in some cases simply explanatory of passage read; in others the instruction assumes the form of moral teaching. The children are addressed on some subject, as covetousness, truthfulness, and kindred subjects, but no dogmatic teaching; no catechism is taught. I have been present at clergy-

men's instruction. Two Members of the Committee are appointed monthly to inspect the Schools, and some visit once a week.

Would a free Government School meet the requirements of the class of children who at present attend Ragged Schools? Not quite; it would approach it. We want that too; but nothing would meet the requirements like the present Ragged School system with its voluntary efforts and the exertions of benevolent persons. The ladies have in connection with the Schools, mothers' meetings, penny savings' banks, mothers' clothing clubs, and children's clothing clubs; they visit parents at their homes, and assist and counsel them in their troubles and distress. Individual members of the Committee have given direct contributions to the Schools in the shape of bread, meat, soup, and articles of clothing for the children. The physical condition of these children would prevent them from attending the Public Schools as at present constituted, but it should not be so; the Schools should be for that class. I have already stated the reason of free scholars leaving the Public Schools to be, that they were neglected. Children are admitted to the Ragged Schools whose parents could pay, but they won't pay. I should think none are taking advantage of Ragged Schools who could send their children to higher Schools.

Are you aware of contributions by parents to Ragged Schools? Yes, a box is kept in each School; the children are asked and encouraged to bring pence or even half-pence on Monday morning to put into these boxes; they are told it is not a payment, but simply the voluntary contributions of the children themselves when they can spare anything to put in the box to pay for fire and stationery. In Watchorn-street School it is about 2s. 6d. a week; Collins-street 2s. 6d. a month; Cascades School nearly £14 a year, or 8s. or 9s. a week. In Collins-street the children have a penny savings' bank there. The parents of children who attend the Watchorn-street School live in the immediate neighbourhood, but some children come from a distance. The rule of admission is the poverty of the parents, seeking out children of the dissolute and depraved. We are continually seeking out the neglected. Mr. Smales, Mr. Pratt, and myself, the City Missionaries, are constantly engaged seeking out children, and it is on our recommendation that the children are admitted; and the Members of the Committee can also admit children.

Have you thought of Denominational Schools? Yes.

Are you of opinion that such Schools subsidised by Government could be made to answer the purposes of educating the poorer class? I am decidedly against the denominational class of Schools.

FRIDAY, 28TH JUNE, 1867.

THOMAS M'DOWELL, *Esq.*, Member of the Board of Education, called in and examined.

*By the Chairman.*—You are a Member of the Board of Education, and have been so for many years? For 6 or 7 years.

In your opinion might not the duties which devolve on that Board be curtailed with advantage? I can't see how they can be. In matters of detail the machinery is peculiar; everything goes before the Board for approval, even the plans of the Architect. I don't see any great advantage from altering the present system.

You mention the plans, &c. of Schools; are there not certain established rules as to dimensions, ventilation, and accommodation of Schools, with reference to number of pupils, of which a body entrusted with educational interests is presumed to be informed? Yes, there is, but in general it is not accurately followed out; it depends on the means. It would cost too much to carry out such buildings. Some of the buildings in the North have been imperfect—as at Circular Head, Deloraine, &c.

Do you not think that a Minister of Education would be able to act with more efficiency and promptitude? This opens up another question. I scarcely think so. Schools should be non-political; and unless the Minister of Education should be held responsible, I don't think it could be carried out satisfactorily. There would be no security for the general discharge of duties.

You have given attention to the fact of a number of children paying no fees attending the Public Schools? I have given attention to the fact that no children pay fees at Public Schools.

It was the habit of masters to admit pupils not paying, but since then a plan has been adopted to stimulate masters. I drew up the plan myself, at the time when the reduction took place in salaries. It was limited, and was closely looked after to prevent abuse.

Do you think that any prejudice, either to the paying or non-paying class, results from their being commingled at the same School? Oh no, not in the least.

Even with the facility afforded to poor children of attending Schools free of charge, do not many fail to avail themselves of the advantage? They do; but I think this might be obviated by a more constant inspection of the Schools than at present. And I would remark, that a greater number attend Schools than appear to attend them. For instance, a family of 5 would send 2, and replace them by others; so that really more get some education.

You have referred to the inspection, is one Inspector enough to maintain it with efficiency? I don't think so. I think two Inspectors should be constantly employed, and report to the Board or Head of the Department; I look on the inspection as the main point. Schools should receive a thorough examination twice a year.

In your opinion would a system of local management, without central control, be sufficient to maintain a sound common-school education in this Colony? All depends on the district and place. In some they

might keep it up, but elsewhere it would be a failure. The master being paid from local funds would be a politician. The interest shown is small, except by Clergymen. You may stimulate a little interest, but it soon dies out. It could not be done here by the Municipalities of Towns, and I may say the same of the country.

Is it within your knowledge, or has any complaint ever reached the Board, that distinctions have been made by masters between the paying and free scholars? I have never heard it, and I have visited a great number of Schools, and have never seen it.

In a Government or any other School which class of pupils does the head master generally take, the least advanced or the most advanced? Generally, most advanced. The others are under pupil teachers.

But such a thing as a classification of scholars, unless with respect to attainments, is unknown in the Public Schools? No, utterly unknown to the Board. It might exist, but it is utterly unknown to the Board.

Could you suggest any amendment in the constitution and powers of the Board of Education? I can't say that I can. I speak as to my knowledge of the Board as at present constituted. We have always had good men here, well educated, and quite as equal as Officers to form an opinion on any subject which arose. Mr. Henty was Chairman, and took great interest in it. Mr. Nairn succeeded him; and Dr. Butler is now Chairman. There is the defect of want of sufficient inspection.

Do you think that a separation could be advantageously made in town of Schools for paying and for non-paying pupils? I think the result would pauperise both. The non-paying would have the majority. The fees are not high, nor are the salaries.

Do you think a larger rate of payment could be insisted on without producing the effect of diminishing the numbers in attendance? I don't think it could. Much better to leave it as at present. Now it turns out that the father instead of giving £2 gives £4, if left entirely to himself.

What has been the effect on the Public Schools of the rewards of Exhibitions to Superior Schools? Very good indeed; most beneficial effect on the Schools and upper Schools; many subjects are studied which used not to be studied. It has not been cultivated enough at Launceston till lately; but it is, I hear, now beginning to have some effect.

Will you be good enough to furnish a Return of the number of scholars at Public Schools who have competed for these Exhibitions; distinguishing the free from the paying class of candidates; and showing the numbers in each class who have been successful: Return to be of each year since the system began? Yes.

*By Mr. Gleadow.*—The Hobart Town Board is the only administrative body (except the Governor in Council) to whom details could be referred? Yes.

Though the system at present in operation affords the opportunity to parents unable to pay for the education of their children to get them educated free, has the securing education to such children been the special object of the Board? Yes, in so far as making the Public and the Masters acquainted with it, and generally throughout the Island by the Municipal Bodies. The only check exercised being to see that imposition is not practised in it; that a man may not pay for one when he has two or three free.

How do you prevent imposition? By Returns revised every quarter. The Mayor or chief person of Municipalities sends in all particulars about the person. When I sketched it I thought £400 would cover the expense, and it has not much exceeded it.

Then you believe that the means employed for preventing imposition have secured that object? To a very great extent.

Has the system been found adequate to secure the education of a very large portion of those children whose parents are unable to educate them? Yes, it has without compulsion.

Are you sufficiently acquainted with the poorer class of persons in Hobart Town to be able to say whether a much larger number between the ages of 6 and 12 are not receiving education at Public Schools than those educated in them? No, I don't think so,—far from it, for besides the Board's Schools there are others—the Ragged Schools, for which there need be no necessity, and a great many others, some of which are kept by private individuals of doubtful and dissipated habits; and it is strange that, though parents can send them to Government Schools, there is still a prejudice against them amongst the lower classes as a badge of servitude, and they will send them to schools where the habits of the Masters are doubtful and dissipated. I think in the upper part of one street there are half a dozen such schools.

I think you said the object of admitting free scholars was to assist Masters? Yes; in some schools they send them in all as free scholars, and objection has been made to them. I think not more than one-third should be free scholars in a school.

When the funds of the State are inadequate for an extended system of education, which do you consider has the greatest claim on the State for education, those children whose parents cannot afford to pay for them or those who can? Of course the former, but all have a right, more or less, admitting that the State provides education,—all have an equal right as far as expediency is concerned.

But it is a question of policy which induces the interference of the State in these classes? No, the policy of the State takes all classes in England and in Prussia.

Can you suggest any improvement in the present system whereby a larger amount of good could be accomplished without increasing the expense? No, I had a hope at one time in my Report on Education (1863) that it would have grown so as to stand of itself. The Colony has not progressed, and I see no hope of its doing so, nor can I suggest any plan by tax or transfer which would relieve the Government. It might be said it shall not exceed a certain amount, and the Board could cut its coat accordingly; the money

is distributed, and the system works well, very well; any sudden change would not tend to benefit the Colony. To the north west there is a large population to be looked after.

Has not the attention of the Board been confined to meet demands made on them from various localities? Yes.

Has that mode secured an equitable distribution of funds at the disposal of the Board through the Colony? Yes, I think so at the present time; there was a demand made by the Northern Board for an equitable distribution, but striking out Hobart Town and Launceston altogether the distribution is equal.

*By the Chairman.*—What would be the effect on the state of education among the children of the operative and small trading classes in Hobart Town were the assistance now extended in the Public Schools by the State withdrawn from these schools, and the children referred to left wholly to a voluntary system? Some would get on, though inferior altogether; the character of the school would be completely altered. There would be no inspection to keep them alive. The best schools that could be established are those now established; the character of the education is good, as evinced in the answers that the Candidates have recently given in examinations.

Do you not apprehend that many who have to make sacrifices in order to meet the small charges in force at the Public Schools would be compelled to the alternative of relying upon schools where they would be exempt from all charge? Yes, I think they would do so. They would fall into them. The end would be difficult to foresee. In the present state of political partisanship it would be difficult to lay hands on it.

Would you recommend the adoption of a system of licensing Schoolmasters? I would not here. It might be desirable, but it would be looked upon as persecution; I should scarcely think it a prudent measure. An examination would aid some if they wished it. You can't get good Masters here owing to the competition in Melbourne, where there is a wider and better field.

From your experience of the variety of local and social conditions in this country, do you think that any system based on one set of principles only would meet the requirements of every locality? No; I have paid attention to the system since I came here. The system works as well as we can expect it to work.

In order then to meet local requirements you think it expedient that education should be confided to a body to which considerable administrative discretion is allowed? Yes, I think so. Every case is discussed and considered on its merits. I have nothing to add to my evidence but that I consider additional inspection absolutely necessary.

MONDAY, 8 JULY, 1867.

MR. RULE.

In reply to questions from the Chairman, states—

I am Master of the Public School at Battery Point. I am a trained Schoolmaster. I have been in the Colony employed in Education for 12 years, and have been for 6½ years at Battery Point.

You have children of different ranks in life at your School, some paying more and some less? Yes, a few pay more and some pay less than the stipulated Fees.

By what rule are you governed in the classification of the children? By the programme of the Board of Education which came into force last year.

Have you ever classified the children in your School with any reference to the fees paid by them? Never: I had on three occasions within the last three years grown up men from the East Coast, whom I could not classify, and these sat apart,—they formed a class by themselves. At no time were there more than two in such a class.

With that exception, you have never made any distinction in the position of scholars unless as the result of their respective attainments? Except as the result of their respective attainments, never.

Has any question ever been raised, either by the Board of Education or anyone else, as to your doing so? Not to my knowledge.

Does it fall within your knowledge to say that there is any repugnance to send children to your School as contradistinguished from any other School? I never heard of any, and I have no reason to suppose there is. There is a general repugnance to the name of a Government School, and many who are proper objects of education at a Government School are not sent to my School because it is a Government School.

That repugnance which you allege, has it resulted in the sending of children to other than the Government School? Yes; I think so. It is not so apparent now as it was, when I went to that School; my School is fuller now than it ever has been before.

You infer that the repugnance is disappearing? I think so.

Has it been the result of the want of sufficient clothing on the part of children? Cases have come to my knowledge that children have been kept away for want of clothing, but I have no reason to believe it would be otherwise if it were not a Public School. I have never known any case of children being so kept away, except for want of necessary clothing.

What Schools had the children instead of yours to resort to? Chiefly a Private School at the end of Harrington-street kept by Mr. Lowe; and others are educated by young women at Private Schools kept at their own houses. Very many Schools of this nature are on Battery Point.

Do you know anything of the rate of fees at these Schools? The fees range much about the same as at Public Schools.

About what is your income apart from that which you derive from the Government? My income last year was about £145 in excess of the Government aid.

Supposing you were thrown entirely upon pupils' fees, would it answer you financially to increase the rate of these fees. In other words, would an increase in the rate of charge for education be attended by a corresponding increase in the aggregate income derived from that source? My impression is that it would diminish it. My reason I will give in writing. I may state as a fact, that if parents pay fees equal to those charged in higher Schools, they expect their children to be taught more than is in the programme.

*By Mr. Kennerley.*—Are you of opinion that a less number of Schools would answer in Hobart Town? Not without materially altering the system of Education; *i. e.* making these Schools such, that the richer of the parents who now send their children to these Schools would not do so. It would not be possible to do with less. I believe it is notorious, that in Hobart Town a great number of children do not attend School. As regards Battery Point I do not think the number is large.

Free Schools, one or more established in Hobart Town, would not (unless compulsory education were required) remedy the evil. I can think of no other remedy than a law to force parents to send children to some School, or to show that they are getting a fair education at home. It is most unadvisable that private Teachers should be licensed. It would give the Government too much power. I can refer you to a short passage in Mill's Political Economy. I approve of free trade in Masters, subject to my former answer. Some of the Private Schools mentioned in my Return are in my belief efficient Schools, but with regard to young women's Schools very many of them are indifferent. The Harrington-street Master I refer to is energetic and painstaking; but I hardly think the circumstances under which he works are such as to enable him to give a proper education. I mean by circumstances the charge he makes, and the number he is obliged to teach in order to make a living.

If the Government system were abolished, would the children of small tradesmen and the humbler classes now being educated in School get as good an education at unaided Private Schools in Towns? It is my opinion that the mass of the children who now attend the Government Schools would not receive so good an education. About a tenth would receive a better education, because their parents would send them to better Schools; the remainder would receive a worse education.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—Have you had many children from private schools? Yes, I have had many.

As a rule, how do their attainments compare with those of the same class at your school? There is a mixture; some are sent from private schools for the Exhibitions, and they are generally better educated; some are sent decidedly worse—as a last resource.

Do you know any radical defect in the present system? One is the failure to reach the very lowest class of children. I don't think very many could afford to send their children to Private Schools who now send them to Public Schools.

But I suppose the same difficulty would exist under any system of education? Yes. The efforts of individual Clergymen and others might be supposed to induce many parents to send their children to school; but experience has shown that such efforts are far from being effectual.

Have you many irregularly attending children in your school? Yes, a large per-centage. I attribute it chiefly to parents' want of a proper idea of the value of education.

Has the value of the children's services much to do with it? Yes, but very little.

Do you find children of the same family change about at School? Lately two or three cases have come under my notice; but, knowing the circumstances, I found the parents doing the best they could.

*By the Chairman.*—Will you ascertain the children at your School who attend any Sunday School, and acquaint this Commission with their names and addresses, and with the School they attend? Yes, I will.

#### MR. ROPER, *Master of the Harrington Street School.*

In reply to questions from the Chairman, states—

I have been at the School since October, 1851. I have had on my books an average of 120 or 130 children for the last three years.

How do you classify the children in your School? According to their attainments: the reading and arithmetic classes vary.

Do you make any distinction between pupils paying less or more than others, or paying nothing at all? Not the least; I never did.

You repeat to this Commission that you never did so, that no complaint of the kind was ever alleged against you? Never that I am aware of.

You have children of every class—I mean among the humbler classes? Yes, of respectable tradesmen and the poorest.

Is there any repugnance on the part of the poorest classes to attend your School? Certainly there can't be, I have so many of them.

But I suppose occasionally you experience that repugnance which results from a want of sufficient clothing? Yes, frequently children stay away for want of clothes—boots or other articles.



What, generally, is your income from pupils' fees? I don't suppose now that it averages more than 12s. or 14s. a week; it is under £1. It has been greatly less than last year.

By being placed in a position in which you must either abandon the School or insist on a higher rate of fees in order to recompense you, could you successfully do the latter? I think I could derive a larger income from the pupils, but I should reduce the number of pupils by making it a superior class of school.

In other words, you must make the School of such a kind that the larger number of your pupils could not attend it? Yes.

Will you ascertain the children at your School who attend any Sunday School, and acquaint this Commission with their names and addresses, and with the School they attend? The whole of the children attend the Catholic Sunday School, except one boy who attends St. David's.

*By Mr. Kennerley.*—Does it come within your knowledge that a large number of children do not attend School at all? I should think there is not a large number who are not attending, but there is a large number who, from irregular attendance, do not receive much benefit from their Schools. I should think there are few who do not attend either Day or Sunday Schools.

If the present system were abolished, would the children of small tradesmen and the humbler classes now being educated in your School get as good an education at unaided Private Schools? Not an equal education; but it is likely that many would attend Schools with a certainly lower grade of masters, both in moral character and attainments.

Do you think a less number of Public Schools would answer in Hobart Town? I think there would not be so many attending school if there were fewer. Respectable parents send their children any distance to school, but poor people will not do so.

Supposing one or more Free Schools to be established in Town, would it be desirable as attracting more children than now attend? I don't see why they would.

Then you don't consider the mixture of classes any detriment to the lower grades? Certainly not. I think it an advantage to the lower grades.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—My school provides for the wants of the very poorest of the Catholic children. It is in fact a Catholic school.

Is there any inducement to the children to attend school? No, none; they get no rewards in the school. I have known children unable to come to school; and I believe the Nuns give them boots to enable them to attend.

Do you know of any striking defect in the present system of Education? I do not. It strikes me it must give general satisfaction, as we don't hear any serious complaints against it. I think it is the best system that can be established in the Colony.

Are the children irregular in their attendance? Yes, the children of the poorest have to supply the place of servants; the boys get wood from the bush; the girls nurse while their mothers wash or go out to work.

Can you suggest any remedy for this irregularity? Not unless you pay them to come. It is a defect as common in England as here.

Do you know if any distinction is made by the boys or children amongst themselves? I don't think there is any feeling amongst them; they meet as equals.

Then a poor scholar does not feel demoralised by having to attend school in ragged clothing? No. I encourage cleanliness amongst the children, and give them marks for it.

#### MR. JOHNSTON, *Master of Trinity Hill School.*

In reply to Questions from the Chairman, states,—

Have been in charge of the school since 1859. I am a trained Master from the Normal School, Glasgow. The children at my school are principally from the labouring classes. A few are children of shopkeepers and mechanics. They pay different rates of fees. The average attendance for 8 years has been 219. The children are classed according to their attainments. No distinction is made between the class of paying and non-paying children. No such imputation has been made against my school that I am aware of. Out of school the children play together, and make no distinction of classes amongst themselves. The blending of classes has operated beneficially. I know Scotch schools of similar description, having taught many years in Scotland; and there is a greater admixture there than here.

Supposing the school to be left entirely dependent on school fees, could you materially increase the rate of fees charged, or what would be the effect? Some years ago the Board of Education deducted £50 from our salaries, leaving us to charge a higher amount of fees. I tried to do so, and found that with a few exceptions I could not succeed. I had to adopt the plan of taking what money I could get from parents. A parent with three children would offer 1s. a week, and I took it. Some pay me 1s. a week, and some 3d.

You have scholars for whom the Government pay? I have; free of any charge to the parents.

Is their attendance regular? No, very irregular; and punishment must be given to make them attend.

What comparison is there between the classes in Scotland and here as to education? Far greater in Scotland: there it is disgrace not to go to school; here coercion has to be resorted to.

Are children less acute here? They are generally as acute, but have not so much ability. There is a want of application here.

But is not a money value represented by the time of many of the children at your school? Most of those who attend me are not wanted at home. It is a want of appreciation on the part of parents that keeps them from school.

*By Mr. Kennerley.*—Are there many children in your neighbourhood not receiving any education whatever? A great many; several hundreds: parental neglect and poverty are the causes.

Can you propose any remedy? I know of no remedy except such as exists in Prussia or Massachusetts—the compulsory system.

Are you acquainted with the working of Ragged Schools? I am not.

Do you think the establishment of one or more Free Schools in Hobart Town would meet the evil? I think not. There are already Schools open for the class in question. You would constitute a second class of Ragged Schools.

If the present system were abolished, would the children of small tradesmen and the humbler classes now being educated at your School get as good an education at unaided Private Schools? Decidedly not for the same money value.

Do you know many of the Private Schools? I sometimes visit some of the Ladies' Schools.

Do you consider the children at present in the Public Schools could be received into such Schools? No, certainly not.

Do you think masters of Private Schools should be certificated? I think so; it is highly important. If you think it important to license a clergyman, a doctor, and a chemist, you should certainly license a man who has to educate a child.

Are you aware of a much larger number of children confined in a private schoolroom than is good for health? Yes; in one room, 20 by 14 feet, I have seen 40 girls of the age of 18 to 12.

I think the Government should have a supervision over the whole system of education.

*By Mr. Sheehy.*—Do you know of any prominent defect in the present system? I do not.

---

MR. REYNOLDS, *Master of the Goulburn-street School.*

In answer to questions by the Chairman, states—

I have been at the Goulburn-street School 18 months. I am a certificated master from home, and have had experience in education for ten years. I was two years at a Training College.

You have children in different circumstances in your school? Yes.

By what principle are you governed in the classification of children? According to their attainments.

What is the comparative educational docility of children here and those you have been accustomed to at home? Equal to them: I speak of the capacity of receiving education. I do not speak of the lowest class. There is not so regular an attendance here as there would be at Home, especially with free scholars.

Do you know anything of the system of payment by results at Home? Yes.

In the circumstances of the Colony would such a system be more or less expedient or inexpedient, as the case may be, than in the circumstances of the scholars in England? I am of opinion that "payment by results" would not be so successful here as at Home, but I do think that such a system would be conducive of much good. The unsettled state of the poorer classes at the present time prevents that regularity of attendance at one school which is looked for in England, and consequently the progress is less satisfactory.

Have you witnessed any injurious effects from the blending of different classes in your school? I should say the effect was good as upon the lower class.

Is your experience sufficiently great to judge whether you could enforce a higher rate of fees without materially diminishing the number of paying pupils? By careful enquiry into the pursuits of the parents, I am perfectly satisfied that, were a higher rate of fee enforced than that which I at present receive, one-half at least of the paying scholars would of necessity be kept at home. I am further convinced, that if a fixed rate—say, 1s. 6d.—were compulsory at this school, there would not be an attendance of more than half a dozen.

I came direct from Home to this Colony, with a view to being engaged as I am. I wrote to the Bishop for information, and he encouraged me to come out.

As a certificated master, would you have come out to take charge of an adventure school? Certainly not.

Or would you be induced to conduct a common school in Hobart Town on the chance of the returns from fees? I should not.

---

## SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE.

### MEMORANDUM.

IN preparing the accompanying sketch, at the request of the Commissioners, I have assumed that the object of the Legislature in making grants for purposes of Elementary Schools is, primarily, to provide means of education for the children of the independent poor; not to the exclusion of other classes from the benefits of the instruction thus afforded, but with an implied proviso that the original purpose is to be steadily kept in view and carried out. Very different opinions are entertained on this subject by different persons, and it would be well if the question of the liability and functions of the State in reference to popular education were authoritatively defined.

The advantages of the existing system should not be ignored. If the present grant be maintained, and such additional sums as are required by the increasing demand for schools be annually voted, I have no doubt that there will be a more general diffusion of the means of education than can be immediately secured under any new system. The efficiency of teachers and schools may also be promoted by the introduction of such amendments as I have elsewhere indicated, without any radical change of system. The advantages which cannot be secured under the present Regulations, are an adequate local interest and sense of responsibility in connection with the schools. These cannot be obtained apart from some local pecuniary liability; and the longer the duty of local self-reliance is ignored by the State, the more difficult will it be to call it forth.

### OUTLINE OF SYSTEM OF GRANTS IN AID OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

#### GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

#### I. *Grants in Aid of Erection of School-houses.*

The existing Regulations under this head require little or no modification.

#### II. *Grants in Aid of the Maintenance of Schools.*

Grants to be made to the extent of one half of Teacher's fixed salary, conditionally upon payment of an equal amount by local authorities. Also augmentation grants, to be regulated by attendance of children, efficiency of schools, and qualifications of Teachers.

#### *Teachers.*

Classification to be determined by a Board of Examiners. Competency of Teachers to be decided by examination into literary attainments, and by condition of schools as reported by Inspector. To be arranged in Three Classes, with sub-divisions, comprising all certificated Teachers; with a Fourth or Probationary Class of licensed Teachers, comprising such as might be deemed worthy of a trial, but not eligible for certificates. Satisfactory testimonials as to character and conduct to be indispensable preliminaries.

Salaries of licensed Teachers to range from, say, £36 to £72 per annum with fees, thus corresponding to present rate of remuneration in schools with an attendance not exceeding 30 or thereabouts. The maximum of £72 to be a joint salary of Master and Mistress.

Fixed salary (joint) of certificated Teacher to be £72 per annum, to be supplemented by augmentation grants ranging from £12 to £72 per annum, and dependent upon classification of Teacher and size of School. Augmentation grants to be appropriated as under:—

CLASS I .....	{ Division 1 .....	£ 72
	{ Division 2 .....	60
CLASS II .....	{ Division 1 .....	48
	{ Division 2 .....	36
CLASS III .....	{ Division 1 .....	24
	{ Division 2 .....	12

Minimum attendance necessary to constitute claim to augmentation grants attached to Class I. to be, say, 65; to Class II., 50; to Class III., 35. The attendance to be estimated upon a six months' average.

Assistants, if required, in the larger schools to receive salaries according to a fixed scale, and paid in equal proportions by government and local authorities.

NOTE.—The above rates are specially constructed for rural schools, but the scheme may with slight modifications be made equally applicable to schools in the two chief towns.

It is to be noted, in connection with the foregoing Regulations, that schools with an attendance of less than 30 may be conducted by Female Teachers at a moderate expense; that highly qualified Teachers are not needed in small schools; and that the attendance depends to a very great extent upon the energy and industry of the Teacher. That such provisions as I have described were contemplated by the framers of the present system is evident from the following clause, which, in the absence of detailed Regulations on the subject, and under financial pressure, has practically fallen into abeyance:—"In determining the class, and also the amount of salary, the Board will take into consideration not only the literary qualifications of Teachers or candidates as tested by examination, but also the nature of their testimonials, their previous character, the condition of their schools (in the case of masters already employed), and their method of conducting them, and the average daily attendance of children." (Rules and Regulations, Sec. II., 3.)

#### *Local Authorities.*

In Municipalities, which comprise the great mass of the population, the Corporations or Municipal Councils to be the authorities responsible for all local agency; to be empowered to appropriate out of their funds the sums required to meet Grants in Aid.

NOTE.—In Districts not yet formed into Municipalities it would be necessary for the Governor in Council to appoint suitable persons to act as a School Committee for carrying out provisions for local agency.

Local authorities to make application for Grants in Aid of erection of School-houses, or maintenance of Schools; to exercise general supervision over Schools; to certify to Teachers' conduct, and to correctness of Returns; to forward monthly claims for Teachers' salaries, supported by vouchers, showing that local contribution has been actually paid; to sanction admission of poor children into Schools at reduced rates; to appoint or remove Teachers, the appointment or removal being subject to approval by chief central authority.

#### *Central Authority.*

Various modes of administration defined elsewhere. Central authority to confirm classification of Teachers; to consider and decide applications for Grants in Aid, or for appointment or removal of Teachers; and generally to decide all questions not specially provided for by the Regulations.

#### *Inspection.*

The Chief Inspector, or other Officer with similar functions, to be responsible for the inspection and examination of all Public Schools once a year or oftener, according to amount of assistance afforded him; to send a copy of each Report on a School to local authorities; to submit to chief central authority matters requiring its decision; to check Returns, and supervise payments; to assist in examination of Teachers; to conduct correspondence with local authorities; and generally to carry out provisions of the system.

#### *Central Schools.*

Provision to be made for the maintenance of a good standard of elementary education, and for the training of Teachers, by the establishment of a Central or Model School in each of the two Chief Towns. These to be supported by means of fees and government grants; to be under the control of the chief central authority, and the supervision of the Inspector; and to be open to all paying scholars, but with special regard to the children of the independent poor. Rate of school-fees to be reduced, at the discretion of the central authority, in the case of children whose parents might be unable to pay the full amount.

NOTE.—It is to be noted that the benefits derivable from the central schools would be *general* rather than *local*, the chief objects being to exhibit a model system of school management, and to furnish a regular supply of competent Teachers for rural schools. They would be to a great extent self-supporting, and the cost per scholar to Government would not exceed the amount payable per scholar under grants in aid to rural schools.

### III. GRANTS IN AID OF THE EDUCATION OF FREE SCHOLARS.

The foregoing sections have had special reference to the education of children whose parents are able and willing to pay some school fee, be it ever so small. There is still a large class requiring the interposition of the State, comprising two divisions distinct from each other and demanding different modes of treatment. The first includes children whose parents, not being prevented by the smallness of their earnings or income, refuse to pay anything towards the cost of their education. The number of these has greatly increased during the past few years; and the increase may be traced partly to the inefficiency of schools, and partly to the operation of the system of Free Certificates. There are only two ways in which such cases can be legitimately dealt with—by the agency of private benevolence, or by the introduction of a compulsory enactment.

The second division embraces the children of those who are really unable to pay any school-fee. In the rural districts these do not form a class separated from others by any marked distinction except that of poverty. There is, therefore, no objection to their admission into the ordinary Public Schools, at the discretion of the local authorities, the Teacher being remunerated by capitation-fees paid in equal proportions by the District and the Government. In the large towns they form a separate class, not always distinguishable from the former division, but differing in many important respects from the children of the independent poor. They require, not an inferior, but a different kind of education; a moral and religious training of a special character; and, generally, a system of management which is out of place in an ordinary school, and has always been separately provided for in the mother country.

Here I should propose that the State should provide, as in the rural districts, for the education of this class, by assisting the Corporations in maintaining suitable schools, payment being made by capitation-grants. Or, the co-operation of organised voluntary agencies might be enlisted in a similar manner, care being taken that the purpose of the State's assistance should be strictly carried out.

#### CONCLUSION.

The foregoing suggestions embrace nearly all the important matters not already included in the existing Rules and Regulations, which ought to form the basis of any new system. I do not claim any originality for the details of this scheme. I have simply adopted those features of the systems of other countries, and those only, which are applicable to our local circumstances, and which admit of harmonious association. I may be permitted to remark, that all the defects of the present system are vastly increased by its liability to be upset at every meeting of Parliament, and to express an earnest hope that efforts will be made to secure some degree of permanence for any scheme that may be adopted. Nothing can be worse for the interests of education than the uncertainty in which the prospects of Teachers and Schools have been involved during the past six years.

T. STEPHENS, M.A., Oxon.,  
Inspector of Schools, Acting Secretary to the Board of Education.

*A FEW stray Thoughts and Suggestions in reference to the subject of Education, respectfully submitted to the Royal Commission on Education, by R. G. GRAY, City Missionary.*

EDUCATION, to be universally diffused among the rising generation, must be made compulsory on the part of the parents, as it is apparent that many do not value education,—and where there may be even a desire for it, there is a strong disinclination to pay for it.

The education which the State is bound to provide is of a purely secular character; viz., reading, writing, and arithmetic,—abundant provision being already made for the religious instruction of all classes in the community by the grants in aid, &c.

1st. Let it be enacted that every parent or guardian shall cause every child in his or her care between the ages of and to attend a School within a reasonable distance of his or her place of residence, and such child or children shall so attend at least times every week unless hindered by sickness or other reasonable cause.

2nd. Any parent or guardian neglecting to do so shall be liable to a penalty of fine or imprisonment.

3rd. That the general Government or Municipal Corporation, as may be deemed expedient, establish and provide for the maintenance of Free Schools in suitable localities as near as may be to the centre of that locality where the poor chiefly reside.

4th. That all persons professing inability to pay, and such being proved satisfactorily, shall receive a certificate entitling their child or children to admission into any Free School, such certificate to be cancelled whenever it is proved that they have the means to pay for education.

5th. That the education in such schools be limited to reading, writing, and arithmetic, and that the girls be taught plain sewing and knitting.

6th. That a Master with a salary of £100 per annum, and a Mistress with a salary of £50, be appointed to each School; no fees or other perquisites to be allowed.

7th. That all other excepting *bonâ fide* free Schools shall be left to private enterprise and voluntary effort.

8th. That a Minister of Education be appointed who shall have the control of all matters connected with education throughout the Colony.

9th. That all persons claiming to be Teachers shall, according to their attainments and capability as ascertained by examination or previous employment, receive certificates as 1st, 2nd, or 3rd class Teachers; and none others shall be recognised as such for the purposes of the Act; and those of the 2nd or 3rd class may be promoted to the 1st class as they may afterwards improve in capability.

10th. That all self-supporting and free Schools shall be registered, and be required annually to furnish a return of all scholars who may have been under instruction, with the number of days they have attended during the year.

11th. That the charges in all such Schools be regulated by the Minister of Education, and may be varied according to the branches taught, ability of the parents, &c.

12th. Schools other than free Schools may be assisted in the form of money grants, school books, materials, &c. to a limited amount.

13th. That superior Scholarships be awarded to children (in free or other Schools) who may distinguish themselves in learning or show indications of talent which may benefit the community.

14th. That any School may be kept open for a reasonable time, before or after the usual hours, so that clergymen of any denomination may impart religious instruction to children who are of their persuasion, or others who may choose to attend.

Objections to a Denominational System of Education:—

1st. To be fairly carried out the system is expensive, inasmuch as that instead of one School no less than six would be required; viz.—Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Independent, and (say) other bodies.

2nd. While in the free Schools the attendance might be made compulsory, in all others the children would be sent where they were most likely to attain the greatest proficiency in secular learning, irrespective altogether of denominational distinctions.

3rd. Because it places the teacher in an embarrassing position, under two authorities whose instructions may at any time be contradictory the one of the other,—and such instances have occurred before now.

4th. That in every well-regulated School the hours are fully absorbed in secular lessons, and religious instruction, which a denominational system will insist on, disturbs the order of the School: the great majority of Schoolmasters with whom I have conversed at home and in the Colonies have mentioned this to me as a grievance when they have been subject to it.

5th. The denominational system implies a desire or a hope on the part of each for increased facilities for imparting sectarian views or for proselytising; and under no circumstances ought the School for secular learning to be converted into such an arena.

6th. The facilities which each body already possesses of spreading their own peculiar tenets are already abundantly provided in the form of Sunday Schools, Bible and Confirmation Classes, &c., and these carefully attended to will be amply sufficient for the purpose of imparting religious instruction.

7th. From remarks which I have heard made by children, and that even under the present system which professes to be *undenominational*, the conclusion has forced itself upon my mind that a denominational system fully carried out would exercise a baneful influence on the minds of children.

8th. Various other reasons might be stated, but I may just refer to one more: In thinly peopled and widely scattered districts in the country, to think of carrying out a denominational system would be to bid adieu to all hope of establishing a School at all, and leave the children to grow up in ignorance; and we might in a few years have the late terrible tragedies of New South Wales and elsewhere transferred to our present peaceful country.

I beg to submit these few observations with all diffidence, and hope they will be received by the gentlemen of the Royal Commission as coming from one who is sincerely desirous of forwarding the cause which is entrusted to their consideration, and who hopes the result of their deliberations will be the carrying of the blessing of education to every child in this Colony.

*REPLIES to Questions from the Commissioners, forwarded by MR. JAMES ALLEN, in continuation of his Evidence of the 19th June, 1867.*

Answer to the Chairman's question as to the Statistics of Mr. Brotherton and Mr. Fraser.

I referred in my former examination to a paper by Mr. Brotherton in the Social Science Reports for 1865, the latest received at that time in the Colony, and to certain letters by the Rev. Mr. Fraser in the *Times* of April, 1867, for confirmation of statements I then made as to the Privy Council system of education in England having fallen short at the point in which it was most needed, and I proposed to put in extracts from those documents in support of that position.

I then admitted, so far as figures were concerned, that the statements on this subject were conflicting, although the failure of the Privy Council system to meet the educational wants of the most necessitous was undoubted. And I will, with the permission of the Commission, give an extract from a paper read on this subject before the Social Science Congress at York in 1864, by the Rev. Canon Randolph, before I come to the statements of Mr. Brotherton and the Rev. Mr. Fraser.

The Rev. Canon Randolph says:—"The investigations of the Commissioners appointed to enquire into the state of popular education in England and Wales elicited the fact that there are about twenty-five thousand elementary schools in England and Wales, and that of this number about fifteen thousand are not in receipt of aid from the parliamentary grant. That the number of children of the poorer classes under education is about  $2\frac{1}{4}$  millions, and that of these  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million are children to whose education the State renders no assistance. Estimating the parliamentary grant in round numbers at a million per annum, it appears that the State contributes something like £1 per head for the education of a million of children, but leaves  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million of the same class unassisted." In my examination I stated the number of children within the education age at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  millions, and those educated by the State at a million, thus making the unassisted  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million. And, as will be seen presently, Mr. Fraser takes this larger number of children as those within the education age, although he does not admit that the estimate of the neglected children is the correct one.

Mr. Brotherton's paper does not deal with the question of numbers at all, except in so far as Manchester is concerned. But on the failure of the Privy Council system to meet the educational wants of those standing most in need of it, and on the state of things in Manchester, he is very explicit. He says:—"Something has been accomplished in the improvement of schools, and in the training of teachers, but scarcely anything has been done to bring the lower strata of society under educational influences." Again,—“The truth is, that government grants as now administered scarcely reach the poorest part of the population at all, either in towns or in the country districts. They are devoted to the aid of those who can afford to pay school fees, while those who cannot pay anything are left in ignorance.” Once more,—“Unhappily, there is a vague notion widely entertained that school fees are now so trifling as to put education within the reach of all. A very little enquiry and reflection would dissipate this mischievous notion. Many parents are careless, it is true, but a still greater number find an insuperable barrier in school fees.”

In the paper from which this is taken Mr. Brotherton gives the state of education in Manchester in 1834 and in 1861, as deduced from returns by the Manchester Statistical Society for these two periods. In 1834 the population of Manchester and Salford was 255,000, and the number of children attending day schools 24,676. In 1861 the population was 460,428, and the children 41,848. Consequently, there were fewer children attending day schools in 1861 than in 1834 in proportion to the aggregate numbers, although the Privy Council system had then been in operation for a period of five and twenty to thirty years. At the first-named date there was one day scholar for every ten of the population. At the latter, only one for every eleven. Or to give Mr. Brotherton's exact words:—"There were in 1834, 967 day scholars in every 10,000 of the inhabitants; while in 1861 there were only 908 day scholars in every 10,000 of the inhabitants." To which he adds,—“It is very probable that similar results would be found if similar enquiries were set on foot in other of the large towns of England.” Mary Carpenter confirms Mr. Brotherton in this view of the case. In a paper read by her before the Social Science Congress, at or about the same time, she gives a deplorable account of the state of education in Bristol and Liverpool. It exceeds that given by Mr. Brotherton of Manchester.

What the Privy Council system could not do for Manchester, however,—Manchester, Mr. Brotherton informs us, is trying to do for itself. He says:—"In the beginning of 1864 a society was established in Manchester called the Education Aid Society, its primary object being to send to school the children of people who are too poor to pay the whole of the school fees. The choice of school is, in all cases, given to the parents. Generally, about half the school fees are paid by the Society, but in a few exceptional cases the whole are paid. No grant is made until the family has been visited and reported upon to a sub-committee, which sits weekly, and by which the necessary grant is made. About 7000 children are now attending day schools, who have been sent by this society, and the number is constantly increasing."

I now come to Mr. Fraser's letters of April last, about which I was particularly interrogated at my examination. And I should observe that Mr. Fraser is an Assistant Inspector of schools; and is, consequently, interested in upholding the Privy Council system. He is, moreover, most anxious for its wider extension to the rural districts in connection with the Church of England Parochial System. He, therefore, seeks to undermine what is said by such witnesses as the Rev. Canon Randolph, Mr. Brotherton, Mary Carpenter, and others. Let us see, however, what he is obliged to take from the mouth of others in his first letter. First, he is obliged to admit that the Manchester and Salford Education Aid Society found 49,000 children in that town unaccounted for in 1865, and only 55,000 children attending day school out of 104,000 within the education age, after all their efforts to supplement the Privy Council scheme. He is also obliged to admit, on the authority of the Principal of the Saltley Training College, that there were considerably less than one-third of the children within the education age in Birmingham in 1866 under day-school education. But let us see what Mr. Fraser says when he has not figures, but only words to quote.

He gives this from the Rev. Mr. Green, of Birmingham, with regard to the country generally. "Can we rest content as members of a great State, as citizens of a great municipality, with the fact staring us in the face that less than half our population of the school age are being fitted by education for their future duties?" He then quotes from Mr. Chester as follows:—"The present condition of education in Great Britain may be stated thus. One-half of the children of the working classes between three and thirteen years of age are under no scholastic education at all; and of the other half, it cannot truly be said that under our present system they will ever be half-educated." Again, speaking of the diocese of London, Mr. Chester says:—"The lamentable picture of this diocese represents but too faithfully the general condition of Great Britain. London is not worse than other towns, nor worse than the rural districts. They are all as bad as London, though the evil in London is most huge." This is not the testimony of men opposed to the Privy Council system of education; or, at any rate, to grants out of the public purse for education. It is the testimony of men who know that a million of money is spent annually on public education, and who are yet obliged to confess that the work is not half done.

I know Mr. Fraser combats this view of the case, as I stated in the course of my examination, and I now proceed to his figures. But the same source of information was open to those gentlemen as to Mr. Fraser; and it must be observed that whilst he complains of their rapid and extensive generalisation, he indulges in the same thing himself. I turn to his second letter, and give his summing up of a series of assumptions based upon ascertained results in 1858. He says:—"We have in this country three millions and a half of children between the ages of four and twelve, of whom 2,625,000 ought to be at school. There are actually in the schools only about 2,160,000. Of these, not much more than three-fourths would be in average daily attendance, and not three-fourths would be receiving what can be called a satisfactory education. So that there would be in the whole country,—I cannot tell how or where distributed,—about half a million of children to whom education needs to be extended, and half a million more whose education needs to be improved."

I said that some of these figures were assumptions, and so they really are, on Mr. Fraser's own acknowledgment. He takes 2,500,000 as the number of scholars of all ages in 1858, and he thinks now they should be 2,700,000. But it has been shown that there were fewer under education in Manchester in 1861 than in 1834. He then distributes this 2,700,000 children assumed to be at school in 1867 thus: In aided and inspected schools, 1,250,000; in private schools, 850,000; in unaided public schools, 600,000. So that granting him his highest figures, the Government are only rendering assistance to 1½ million of children with grants assumed at a million sterling. But he makes a reduction on this 2,700,000 children assumed to be at school of 20 per cent., thus bringing it down to 2,160,000 actually at school; and that reduction should, of course, be made rateably on the children in the assisted public schools. That, however, would reduce the 1,250,000 children assigned to the aided and inspected schools to exactly 1,000,000, which is what they are assumed at by those whose representations Mr. Fraser attempts to combat, but not, as I think, very successfully.

Answer to the Chairman's question as to the working of State-assisted Education here and in England.

In many respects I think it works far less satisfactory here than in England. I will mention a few of these. In both cases the schools are open to all who choose to attend them. But here we have none of the checks against the abuse of the system that they have in England. No Member of Parliament would think of sending his children to one of the Public Schools in England, that is, to the schools provided for the working classes. But here it is done without scruple. There are Members of Parliament on this Commission whose children, I am informed, either have been or are now being educated partly at the public expense. That I consider a great abuse of the system. In England the number of children educated at the private schools, and in the unaided public schools, is far more than the number of those educated in the assisted public schools. The actual number cannot be very accurately stated. But, according to Mr. Fraser, the number for which the Privy Council pay is 1,250,000, and the number for which the Privy Council do not pay is 1,450,000. To that there is nothing analogous here. We have no authorised or official statistics on the subject. But outside the two chief towns the number taught at private or unassisted schools is, I am informed, very trifling indeed. And in those towns the number taught at private or unassisted schools bears no proportion to those taught at the assisted public schools. That I regard as another abuse of the system. It shows that those for whom it was never intended avail themselves of it. There are other respects in which the system works worse here than in England. Here the amount of voluntary effort on the part of the system is very small indeed. It is almost exclusively limited to some aid towards the building of school-houses. There it exhibits itself in many ways,—in the building of school-houses, in the training of teachers, in effective superintendence of the schools, and in subscriptions for various purposes in connection with them. It leaves, moreover, a wide scope for middle-class education, which is practically extinguished here to the detriment of a large class of persons who would otherwise devote themselves to education. This, I think, is greatly to be regretted, and a matter deserving of the most serious consideration.

Answer to the Chairman's question as to what I gather to be the opinion of Mr. Mill with regard to the education of the poorer classes, in continuation of what was before given.

At page 577 of his "Political Economy," Mr. Mill says:—"The education provided in this country on the voluntary principle has of late been so much discussed that it is needless in this place to criticise it minutely, and I shall merely express my conviction that even in quantity it is, and is likely to remain, altogether insufficient; while in quality, with some slight tendency to improvement, it is never good except by some rare accident, and generally so bad as to be little more than nominal. I hold it, therefore, the duty of the Government to supply the defect by giving pecuniary support to elementary schools, such as to render them accessible to all the children of the poor, either freely, or for a payment too inconsiderable to be sensibly felt. One thing must be strenuously insisted on; that the Government must claim no monopoly for its education either in the lower or the higher branches; must exert neither authority nor influence to induce the people to resort to its teachers in preference to others, and must confer no peculiar advantages on those who have been instructed by them. Though the Government Teachers will probably be superior to



the average of private instructors, they will not embody all the knowledge and sagacity to be found in all instructors taken together, and it is desirable to leave open as many roads as possible to the desired end. It is not advisable that a Government should, either in name or in fact, have a complete control over the education of the people. To possess such a control, and actually exert it, is to be despotic." That I take to be a standing condemnation of the system adopted in this country, so far as the opinion of any one man can go. The system is not designed for the support of elementary schools for the children of the poor only, nor is it so worked. It is as much designed, if we are to judge from what we see, for the children of the rich as for the children of the poor; and it is so worked as to give a monopoly of education to the Government Teachers, whether that is claimed or not. The Government, contrary to Mr. Mill's express stipulation, do exert an influence to induce the people to resort to their teachers in preference to others by providing education at a cheaper rate, and by rendering it next to impossible for any but a few other teachers to live by teaching. Although not professing to do so, it practically takes the control of education out of the hands of others, and places them in those of the Government, as is proved by the small and diminishing number of private schools in the Colony. In a word, it removes all the safeguards that Mr. Mill would have thrown around a system of education to which government aid is extended.

Answer to Mr. Gleadow's question as to the issue of certificates for the admission of the children not able to pay school fees into any schools their parents might select.

I did not so well understand the bearing of this question as to the issue of certificates when it was last put to me as I think I understand it now. It must be taken on the assumption that there are already schools in existence, either public or private, to which children might be sent whose parents could not afford to pay the school fees. And in case of there being such schools, I think it would be far better to have those children admitted by certificate in the way thus suggested than as they are now admitted; that is to say, by some such authorised agency or instrumentality as the Government might hereafter fix upon. That would, in fact, be precisely the course adopted by the Manchester Education Aid Society to meet the wants of the more neglected portion of the children in that large borough, where public and private schools are already in existence. To make the two cases precisely analogous, the Government should drop their public schools, and then, in issuing such certificates, they would be doing just what the Manchester Education Aid Society does. They would be issuing certificates for the admission of such children into some school or schools in the neighbourhood, and would be leaving the parents to make choice of the school for themselves. That would get rid of all objection to schools on denominational grounds, and it would provoke the conductors to do all in their power to give their schools a reputation for the quantity and quality of the instruction imparted in them. In that case, however, I think the miserable pittance that is now given for such children should be increased. At present only 3d. per week is paid here for the poorer class of children, whilst in Adelaide 6d. per week is allowed by the Government. Even this latter sum would be hardly sufficient if there was no public school in the neighbourhood. Or if there even was, it would be well worth considering whether it would not be better to leave the master dependent for his support on the fees he got from such scholars as were able to pay; supplemented, as they would be, by the payment he would get for the children to whom certificates were issued by the Government. That would give him a greater interest in this class of children, and the reproach of having them neglected would to that extent be wiped away. I can think of no better machinery for this purpose in the country districts than the rural municipalities. They would know best who were able to pay for the education of their children, and who not. They might also for this class of children be entrusted with the task of inspection, and they would then have an interest in getting as many to attend as possible. Their influence in such a case would be very considerable. It would, in fact, amount to a sort of gentle compulsion, without being attended with any of the dislike that all Englishmen attach to that word. Great care would, however, have to be taken in this case against the creeping in of abuses, and especially against the demands on the public purse outgrowing our means. All government interference is attended with these two great evils; the latter in particular. When the Home Government began to meddle with education they had no thought of what it would lead to, and they now know not where to stop. They have given an additional £70,000 for education this year, and will have to give more yet.

Answer to Mr. Kennerley's question as to State Aid to denominational efforts in the event of the Public Schools in Hobart Town being reduced to two in number, and in Launceston to one.

I feel great difficulty in saying what the Government should or should not do in such a case. I have already expressed an opinion adverse to denominational teaching in schools in any way supported by the State. But there is a wide difference between denominational efforts in the cause of education and denominational teaching. If denominational efforts for the education of the poorer classes of children in the towns were made, without any sectarian teaching being mixed up with it, such as the teaching of the catechisms or other formularies of any particular church being mixed up with it, I should not object to any aid the Government might have it in their power to afford. I have, in fact, already given it as my opinion that the Government is bound in some sort to provide education for the really destitute; or, at any rate, to supplement the voluntary efforts of the people in their endeavours to provide it. But if the schools were to be strictly denominational schools, as Bishop Perry, of Melbourne, maintains that all schools with which he and his clergy can in any way connect themselves should be, then I think that those who establish such schools should be prepared to do what Bishop Perry declared the readiness of himself and his clergy to do, that is, to throw themselves for the support of their schools entirely on the voluntary principle, just as the Roman Catholics do in Adelaide.

#### Schools in poor or thinly-populated Districts.

I have been desired by a member of this Commission to direct my attention to those districts in which no schools could be established on account of their being so thinly populated, and of so large a number of the parents being unable to pay the school fees, were it not for the resident gentry contributing, say, £20 to £30 a year towards the support of the schoolmaster, with the view of getting their own children partly, if not wholly educated at them. This I suppose to be not an unusual case, and it is certainly not one of any great hardship. I have in the course of my experience known many such cases, and I never knew any of the



gentry in such a case not willing to contribute more towards the support of the teacher than the amount of benefit they supposed themselves to derive from his personal exertions. They were ready to pay for the education of their own children first, and then to contribute something towards the education of those who could not afford to pay for themselves, particularly if a large portion of those residing in the district were their own tenants. That used to be the rule in Ireland, and it is clearly the rule now in England, or we should not have, as Mr. Fraser says, so large a number as 600,000 children in the unaided public schools. Other means are found for supporting schools in such districts without any grants in aid. But supposing greater difficulties to stand in the way of that being done here than in England, what is there to hinder the adoption of the certificate system to which Mr. Gleadow referred in one of his questions? Any gentleman then, or any number of gentlemen in the same neighbourhood, might contribute as much as they thought fit for the support of a schoolmaster, and he might be left to look for the rest of his support from payments to be made by the Government for certificated pupils. No gentleman or body of gentlemen ought, at any rate, to look for the establishment of a school in their neighbourhood supported chiefly at the public expense, when they themselves are deriving the largest amount of benefit from it. That is abusing the present system, and not working it properly.

Number of children within the educational age unaccounted for, either in Public or Private Schools.

I find, on reference to pages 11 and 15 of the Report of the Board of Education for 1865, that the population at the date of the last census, April 7th, 1861, was 89,977, and the children in the Colony within the educational age were 19,349, the educational age being from five to fifteen. But the average number of scholars on the rolls of the public schools during 1865 did not exceed 5357 nor did the average daily attendance exceed 4074. For the sake of round numbers let us assume, after making allowance for the increase of children within the educational age from 1861 to 1865, their number at the latter period at 20,000, the number of those on the rolls at 5000, and the average number in average daily attendance at 4000, and what is the result? Taking the number of the children on the rolls of the public schools at 5000, we have three-fourths of the children within the educational age unaccounted for. Or taking the average number of those in daily attendance at 4000, we have four-fifths of those within the educational age unaccounted for. At the private or proprietary schools the number of children taught must be comparatively small, owing in no small degree to the conductors being unable to compete with the public teachers, who not only get a salary from the Government, but fees from their pupils. Assume them at one-half the number of those taught at the public schools, and we should then only have 7500 on all the school rolls in the Colony, and 6000 in average daily attendance, which would leave nearly two-thirds of the children unaccounted for on the first estimate, and far more than two-thirds on the second. It is quite evident, therefore, that the present system of education does not, as is often represented, reach the wants of the whole of the children of the Colony. And it is equally evident that no grants of public money we can spare can ever be made to reach them.

Amended answer to a former question.

When asked whether raising the standard of education in the teacher did not defeat the end of education, I did not understand the question from the very peculiar form in which it was put; and I, therefore, desire to amend the answer then given. I could not have been so obtuse as to have hazarded the opinion that the qualifications of the teacher have nothing to do with his efficiency, much less have offered to support it. All I meant to say was, that I do not admit it to be a fact established by English experience that the qualifications of teachers are higher either in England or Ireland now than they were before the present Government system was introduced,—that is, for their special vocation, that of teaching the children of the poor. The gallery system of teaching, of which so much has been said here of late in terms of high encomium, is not adopted outside the normal school in one case out of ten, or even twenty. It is all sham, and no substance. It is a mere device for children to teach the master, not for the master to teach the children. That was all I intended in reply to an imperfectly understood question.

---

*MEMORANDUM transmitted to the Commission, with the following Note from the Honorable the COLONIAL TREASURER.*

---

*Colonial Treasury, 8th July, 1867.*

MY DEAR SIR,

Herewith, I beg to hand you a Memorandum on State Aid to Education, which has been handed to me by a gentleman who has had considerable experience in the education of children in this Colony.

I could have wished that the writer of the Paper had attached his name to it, so that you might have had the benefit of his evidence before the Commission; but the writer declined coming forward in person, and wished his Paper to be forwarded to you. In compliance, therefore, with the request I send you the Paper, which may be useful in helping you and your Colleagues to a satisfactory solution of the question of State Aid to Education.

I am,

My dear Sir,

In haste, yours truly,

THOS. D. CHAPMAN.

*The Hon. F. M. INNES.*

## PUBLIC EDUCATION.

1. Government shall pay the head Teachers £2 per head for every child who shall satisfactorily pass the Inspector's Annual Examination; provided, that no aid be given for any number beyond 30, or for any pupils under 5 years of age.

[NOTE.—The effect of this would be to raise the salaries where they most want raising, namely, in thinly-peopled places, and to make pay proportionate to work done. No child should be recognised as a pupil under 5, as a man cannot do justice to older children if he has babies to manage; and in country places they would be drafted in to make up the full number, 30, to gain the minimum capitation fee.]

2. Assistant Teachers £40 each; one to be allowed where there are 60 passed pupils, and an extra one for every 50 over 100.

[The Pupil Teachers would be swept away; they are useless as Assistants, and never get educated enough to be worth much as Teachers. A. A. boys will in time find their way into these masterships. A Mistress at £40 or £50 is the best Assistant in a Public School. The present plan of dribbling out £20 and £25 is money wasted. These Assistants would only be wanted in Hobart Town and Launceston and the larger townships. The Mistress should not be the Master's wife if any other person can be got, for he has a direct interest in her irregular attendance.]

3. Master to charge what fees he likes, and to be responsible to no one; provided, that he shall refuse no child over 5 who offers 1s. per week.

4. There shall be one Inspector of Schools, and he shall do all the work.

[At present the Board keeps a book store, upon which it always loses money. This, being of no benefit to any one, might be shut up. Some Masters even now never use it, as the difference between Walch's prices and the Board's is nothing compared to the routine they have to go through to get what they want from the Board. No Clerks wanted: Teachers and Inspector should do all—an annual visit to a School, a Return of Masters, &c., to the general Statistician, would be sufficient. Nearly all correspondence at present is in connection with the book store, or with elaborate but perfectly useless Returns. A Government wants to know the number of children at School, their ages, and what they are worth educationally: all this should be done by the Teachers and Inspector on the spot. A Rule of the Board's, making attendance of the Inspector at their meetings necessary, increases travelling expenses very much. Some "man of all work" would be Secretary to what little business a Board would have to do under this system, and also act for the Council of Education. I allow nothing for him, because I cannot say whether or not any of the present Government Clerks would have time to act without injury to other business.]

*Present Cost of Public Education.*

	£
(a) Public School Grant .....	11,000
(b) Officers, &c. ....	1150
	<u>£12,150</u>

NOTE.—In this is included the losses on the book store and the salaries of two Clerks. Strictly, a great part of what figures as money for Superior Education ought to be put down to Public Schools.

*Proposed Cost.*

	£
(a) 120 Schools, all at full rates (30 at £2) .....	7200
15 Assistants at £40 .....	600
Inspector .....	400
Travelling Expenses .....	150
Miscellaneous .....	20
	<u>£8370</u>

Saving of £3780.

NOTE.—It would not come to this in reality, for there are not 120 Schools in Tasmania that could pass 30 pupils each. This plan would enable the Board to sanction small gatherings of children in out-of-the-way bush places, and it would pay for the results and no more.

## POOR SCHOOLS.

At present the Board pays a small fee to the Teachers on account of such children as are certified to be incapable of making payment. This would be still continued, and would add about £400 to the total cost. A better plan would be a Compulsory Education Act, and two State Schools, one in Hobart Town and one in Launceston, at which all should be *obliged* to attend 3 hours a day who could not show that they were at the ordinary Public or some other School. In the country the pauper element would have to be drafted into the Public Schools. I think the support of those who are compulsorily educated should fall upon the local rates. This would prevent Magistrates and Clergymen giving pauper certificates to unworthy subjects, and stimulate them to make as many as possible pay for their own education. I suppose there are 400 or 500 children in Hobart Town who have never been to School, and never will go. These can only be reached by the Law. There should be a School in town capable of holding this dirty and ignorant mass of young rascals; it would add £600 or £700 a year to the expenses, but would be money well spent. If the Orphan School were in town, and had a room large enough for 1000 children, it could be made a Boarding School (as it is now) for Orphans, and a Day School for the Arabs. A man of Roberts's rare ability would be worth his weight in gold to the community if he could be got to bring his administrative powers to work upon the city vice and ignorance all concentrated in one room.

*LETTER from J. D. BALFE, Esq., M.H.A., to the Chairman Royal Commission on EDUCATION.**Lisadern, Franklin, 10th July, 1867.*

SIR,

I THINK it would assist the Royal Commissioners now investigating the subject of Public Education, were a list of all the children capable of attending school in the Police District of the Franklin properly prepared and furnished to them. But to be of any practical use it should be accompanied by a map of the District in which the various settlements should be set out; the means of communication which exist between those settlements and the Public Schools now instituted; and persons having a thorough knowledge of the District should be examined, in order to show the extent to which the settlers are enabled to avail themselves of even the present very inadequate means of education afforded by the State under the present system.

I take, for example, Miss Jarvey's School in my neighbourhood. It is a private one, but it supplies a want to parents and children which the Public School at Port Cygnet cannot possibly provide for. But although it is not more than a mile and a half from our little settlement here, parents will not permit their children to go to and come from school by a track which lies through a dense forest. We should be all glad to avail ourselves of Miss Jarvey's School, but the imperative consideration I have just mentioned deters us. There are here, consequently, as many children totally destitute of the means of education as attend Miss Jarvey's School; and what is stated in reference to the want of the means of educating children in this instance is true of many other settlements in this District, which, only looking at the map and judging by distances, might be considered amply supplied by the Public Schools already established.

I throw out these hints merely for the consideration of the Commissioners.

Yours, &amp;c.,

J. D. BALFE.

*The Chairman Royal Commission on Education.*


---

# APPENDICES.

## A.

*SCHOOL STATISTICS for the Year 1865, compiled from the Reports and appended Statements of the respective Boards.*

	No. of Elementary Government Schools, not Eleemosynary.	No. of salaried Teachers, including Assistant Teachers and Pupil Teachers.	Average Daily Attendance of Scholars.		Total Cost of Schools, exclusive of New Buildings, Inspection, and Departmental Expenditure.	Departmental Expenditure.		Maximum and Minimum Salaries of Teachers.		Maximum of Income of Teachers from all Sources.	Amount paid by Scholars as School Fees.	Proportion per cent. of School Fees to Total Cost of Schools in Col. 5.	No. of Children educated as Free Scholars.	Payments for Free Scholars.	Proportion per cent. to Cost of Schools.
			For the whole No. of Schools.	For each School.		Total.	Proportion per cent. to Cost of Schools.	Maximum.	Minimum.						
					£ s. d.	£ s. d.		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.			£ s. d.	
Tasmania (for 1865) .....	102	194	4074	40	9966 13 3	1336 4 11	13·40	100 0 0 <sup>a</sup>	20 0 0	264 7 8	4003 18 5	40·17	896	359 7 6	3·60
Victoria (for 1865) .....	676	1615 <sup>b</sup>	49,218	73	132,931 14 5 <sup>c</sup>	10,129 3 5	7·62	100 0 0 <sup>d</sup>	60 0 0 <sup>d</sup>	—	63,942 3 8 <sup>e</sup>	48·1	9988 <sup>b</sup>	8123 16 6 <sup>e</sup>	6·11
New South Wales, National Schools, 1865 .....	268	386	12,683	47	31,249 12 0	5366 15 4	17·17	132 0 0	30 0 0	—	14,105 10 10	45·14	—	—	—
Ditto, Denominational .....	351	448	17,075	49	25,800 3 7	1522 5 9	5·90	140 0 0	12 0 0 <sup>f</sup>	673 17 3 <sup>g</sup>	17,766 8 1	68·86	2893	—	—
South Australia .....	278 <sup>h</sup>	278	10,717	38	13,608 8 0 <sup>i</sup>	1566 13 9	11·51	80 0 0	40 0 0 <sup>k</sup>	—	14,026 14 11	103·28	—	979 4 9	7·19
Otago .....	48 <sup>l</sup>	67	2333 <sup>m</sup>	48	4920 8 9 <sup>n</sup>	617 4 0	12·54	—	—	250 0 0 <sup>o</sup>	— <sup>p</sup>	—	—	— <sup>q</sup>	—

<sup>a</sup> In some cases House Allowance is granted in addition.

<sup>b</sup> Mr. Archer's "Progress of Victoria," p. 76, Mr. Archer remarks: "There is reason to believe that the bounty of the State in regard to destitute scholars is in many cases abused."

<sup>c</sup> Including payments on account of 1864.

<sup>d</sup> 1st Class—Male, £100 max.; Female, £80. 2nd Class—Max. Males, £75; Females, £60.

<sup>e</sup> For half-year to 30th June, 1865, doubled.

<sup>f</sup> Salary of an Assistant Teacher. The lowest ordinary salary of Teachers seems to be £50.

<sup>g</sup> Salary, £96; Fees, £577 17s. 8d.

<sup>h</sup> Not including Government Free School for Destitute Children and Orphans.

<sup>i</sup> For Teachers' Salaries only. The Returns do not mention any other expenses which would be classed under this column.

<sup>k</sup> Increased according to the number of Scholars and efficiency in teaching. Licences are granted to Teachers annually, and lapse on removal to another locality.

<sup>l</sup> Appears to include two Free Schools at Dunedin, the expenditure of which is also included with that of the other Government Schools, and cannot be separated from it.

<sup>m</sup> Exclusive of about 150 at Dunedin Free Schools. If these be added the number will be 2480; the number in each School 52.

<sup>n</sup> The High School at Dunedin, which is also under the control of the Board, is not included.

<sup>o</sup> 31 Teachers have residences and glebes worth from £15 to £80 per annum in each case.

<sup>p</sup> Ten shillings per annum is the rate of payment by the Government for each Free Scholar.

<sup>q</sup> Amount paid for Free Schools and Fees for Destitute Children are included in one sum; viz., £358 17s. 11d.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIA. From Reports.

For each Child per annum.	Payment by Government for Destitute Children .....	0 0 6 per week.
	Amount paid for ditto .....	1 0 11½
	Average Cost, including Destitute Children .....	1 1 3¾
	Ditto of School Fees—ditto .....	1 1 11
	Ditto Total Cost of Education, including Fees, but not cost of Inspection, &c. ....	2 1 9¾
	Ditto of Teachers' receipts .....	105 4 0
	Ditto of Teachers' stipends from Board .....	50 0 7¼

### NEW SOUTH WALES.

Denominational Board. (See Table in Report 1865.)

Fees and Local Contributions, (half-year to 30 June.)

### VICTORIA.

Fees for Children paid for are at the rate of 87·35 per cent.

Local Contributions, 1·55 per cent.

Payments for Destitute Children, 11·10 per cent.

Per-centage to salaries respectively, 67·74, 1·20, and 8·60; total, 77·54 per cent.

Payments for salaries, 81·60 per cent., 18·40 for results, in proportion to total payments for these two items.

### OTAGO. (From Report for 1865.)

Calculated for an attendance of 3100.

Average cost per Scholar per annum, excluding Management and Inspection, but including Buildings .....	£ s. d.
Ditto, including Management and Inspection .....	1 18 0
	2 1 3¾

### TASMANIA. (From Appendix C. for 1865.)

Government aid per annum for each Scholar .....	2 19 0½
Average amount of Fees paid for each Scholar .....	0 19 7¼

E. C. NOWELL, Statistician.

## B.

## BOARD OF EDUCATION, TASMANIA.

*PROGRAMME of Organisation and Instruction for PUBLIC SCHOOLS.*

To be kept suspended in the School Room in a conspicuous place.

		READING.	WRITING.	ARITHMETIC.	
CLASS I. <small>NOTE.—Each Class may be subdivided into two or more Divisions, the lowest being styled Division I.</small>	STANDARD I.	Narrative in monosyllables.	Form on black board or slate, from dictation, letters, capital and small, manuscript.	Form on black board or slate, from dictation, figures up to 20; name at sight figures up to 20; add and subtract figures up to 10, orally from examples on black board.	Besides satisfying the literal requirements of the Standard, Children in the 1st Class will be expected to read monosyllabic lessons with distinct articulation and readiness, and to form on slates all the letters and figures with neatness and accuracy.
CLASS II.	STANDARD II.	Narrative next in order after monosyllables in an Elementary Reading Book used in the Class.	Copy, in manuscript character, a line of print.	A sum in Simple Addition or Subtraction, and the Multiplication Table.	In the 2nd Class—To read with ease and intelligence; to write words from copy, and numbers up to three places of figures from dictation, with neatness and accuracy.
CLASS III.	STANDARD III.	A short paragraph from an Elementary Reading Book used in the Class.	A sentence from the same paragraph, slowly read once, and then dictated in single words.	A sum in any simple rule as far as Short Division, inclusive.	In the 3rd Class—To read with fluency and intelligence; to write a fair text hand; to understand notation, and to know the Tables of Money; to name the Noun, Adjective, and Verb in a sentence; and to show some acquaintance with the Map of the World and of Australia [Girls to sew neatly, and, in the higher Classes, to show a progressive improvement in their Needlework.]
CLASS IV.	STANDARD IV.	A short paragraph from a more advanced Reading Book used in the Class.	A sentence slowly dictated once by a few words at a time, from the same book, but not from the paragraph read.	A sum in Compound Rules (Money.)	In the 4th Class—To read with fluency, expression, and intelligence; to write neatly on paper from dictation; to know all the common Arithmetical Tables; to parse an ordinary sentence; and to be familiar with the Map of the World and of Australia.
CLASS V.	STANDARD V.	A few lines of poetry or prose, from a Reading Book used in the Class.	A sentence slowly dictated once by a few words at a time, from the same book, but not from the paragraph read.	A sum in Compound Rules (Common Weights and Measures.)	In the 5th Class—To show greater proficiency in Reading, Writing, Grammar, and Geography; and to be thoroughly grounded in Arithmetic as far as Reduction inclusive.
CLASS VI.	STANDARD VI.	A short ordinary paragraph in a newspaper or other modern narrative.	Another short ordinary paragraph in a newspaper, or other modern narrative, slowly dictated once by a few words at a time.	A sum in Practice or Bills of Parcels.	In the 6th Class—Besides showing greater proficiency in the subjects prescribed for the 5th Class, to be able to analyse an ordinary sentence, and to understand Proportion and the theory of Fractions.

SCRIPTURE HISTORY.—Children in the 3rd Class will be expected to show a general knowledge, and in the higher classes, a proportionately fuller and more intelligent knowledge of the outlines of Scripture History.

READING BOOKS.—Class I.—The 1st Book (Irish National Board), and the 2nd Book to the end of Section II. Class II.—The 2nd Book and 1st Sequel. Class III.—The 2nd Sequel and the 3rd Book. Class IV.—The 4th Book. Class V.—The Supplement to the 4th Book. Class VI.—The 5th Book. No other Books are to be used without the written sanction of the Board.

NOTE.—The *minimum* of attainments required to qualify Children for promotion is indicated by the standards assigned to the several Classes. Promotions are to be made at stated times, the individual and collective proficiency of the Children in each Class having been previously ascertained by the Head Teacher.

By Order of the Board,

MURRAY BURGESS, *Secretary.*

9th January, 1865.

## BOARD OF EDUCATION.

*GENERAL and Local Inspection of Schools for the Year ending 31st December, 1866.*

ELECTORAL DISTRICT.	SITUATION OF SCHOOL.	Number of Visits made to the School during the Year, by—								
		Ministers of the Church of England.	Ministers of the Presbyterian Church.	Ministers of the Wesleyan Church.	Independent Ministers.	Roman Catholic Ministers.	The Board or its Officers.	Special Visitors not Clergymen.	Other Persons.	TOTAL.
HOBART .....	Bathurst-st. Central School	50	—	—	—	—	6	—	2	58
	Battery Point .....	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	4
	Goulburn-street .....	127	—	—	—	1	3	—	21	152
	Harrington-street .....	—	—	—	—	8	1	—	—	9
	Macquarie-street .....	15	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	19
	Murray-st. (Infant School)	—	—	—	—	—	4	61	15	80
	Trinity Hill .....	71	—	—	—	1	8	3	83	166
GLENORCHY .....	Bridgewater .....	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	1	3
	New Town .....	18	—	—	—	—	1	—	12	31
	O'Brien's Bridge .....	2	45	—	—	—	1	—	4	52
QUEENBOROUGH .....	Sandy Bay .....	10	—	—	—	—	4	32	3	49
KINGBOROUGH .....	Birch's Bay .....	—	—	—	1	—	—	8	—	9
	Brown's River .....	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	5
	Long Bay .....	5	—	—	—	—	—	7	10	22
	Port Cygnet .....	1	—	—	—	26	—	2	6	35
	Oyster Cove .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	15	9	25
	Victoria .....	2	—	—	2	1	—	17	23	45
	Glazier's Bay .....	—	—	—	—	9	—	8	14	31
	Wattle Grove .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	4	10
FRANKLIN .....	Castle Forbes Bay .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Franklin .....	45	—	—	—	40	—	—	13	98
	Ramsgate .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	25	12	37
	Lightwood Bottom .....	2	—	1	4	—	—	—	7	14
NEW NORFOLK .....	Fenton Forest .....	—	—	1	—	1	—	5	58	65
	Macquarie Plains .....	38	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	40
	New Norfolk .....	28	—	—	—	3	1	—	5	37
BRIGHTON .....	Black Brush .....	—	—	—	3	—	1	1	16	21
	Broad Marsh .....	50	—	—	1	—	1	2	35	89
	Green Point .....	2	—	—	5	—	1	5	7	20
	Green Ponds .....	43	—	—	48	—	1	53	19	164
	Pontville .....	6	—	—	7	1	—	7	7	28
	Constitution Hill .....	32	—	—	6	—	—	12	1	51
	Old Beach .....	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	3
CLARENCE .....	Kangaroo Point .....	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	2	6
	Rokeby .....	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	3
	South Arm .....	58	—	—	—	—	1	—	9	68
	Cambridge .....	—	—	—	—	5	1	1	11	18
RICHMOND .....	Jerusalem .....	8	1	—	—	31	—	—	22	62
	Richmond .....	—	—	—	—	18	1	1	—	20
SORELL .....	Bream Creek .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
	Carlton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Forcett .....	1	—	—	—	1	1	2	8	13
	Orielton .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Prosser's Plains .....	5	—	—	—	—	—	4	11	20
	Sorell .....	69	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	71
OATLANDS .....	Jericho .....	27	—	—	—	—	2	1	18	48
	Mona Vale .....	4	6	—	—	—	2	4	20	36
	Oatlands .....	149	9	42	1	38	2	4	19	264
	Mount Seymour .....	—	1	—	—	3	1	8	9	22
	Tunnack .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CUMBERLAND .....	Bothwell .....	17	7	4	—	—	2	3	12	45
	Hamilton .....	91	—	—	—	1	—	4	28	124
	Ouse Bridge .....	26	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	35

ELECTORAL DISTRICT.	SITUATION OF SCHOOL.	Number of Visits made to the School during the Year, by—								Total.
		Ministers of the Church of England.	Ministers of the Presbyterian Church.	Ministers of the Wesleyan Church.	Independent Ministers.	Roman Catholic Ministers.	The Board or its Officers.	Special Visitors not Clergymen.	Other Persons.	
GLAMORGAN .....	Lisidillon .....	15	1	—	1	—	2	6	33	58
	Swansea .....	32	—	—	—	33	2	15	12	94
	Glen Galla .....	2	5	—	—	4	2	—	—	13
LAUNCESTON .....	Elizabeth-street .....	34	—	29	—	—	5	—	1	69
	Margaret-street .....	—	—	—	—	85	3	—	3	91
	Infant School .....	21	—	—	—	—	3	34	16	74
CAMPBELL TOWN .....	Campbell Town .....	36	4	—	—	—	1	—	—	41
	Ross .....	—	1	2	—	—	1	1	30	35
	Cleveland .....	1	2	—	12	1	2	—	14	32
DELORAINE .....	Deloraine .....	50	—	—	—	—	2	—	4	56
	Red Hills .....	9	—	—	—	—	1	5	—	15
DEVON .....	Torquay and Formby ....	1	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	6
	Emu Bay .....	3	—	—	—	5	1	1	1	11
	Northdown .....	6	—	—	—	—	—	4	10	20
	Stanley .....	9	—	1	—	1	1	12	7	31
	Table Cape .....	3	—	—	—	—	1	13	2	19
	Forest .....	6	—	—	—	3	1	2	10	22
	Somerset .....	3	—	—	—	—	1	3	9	16
	Wynyard .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	3
FINGAL .....	Avoca .....	1	—	—	—	—	1	2	24	28
	Fingal .....	4	—	—	—	—	2	—	4	10
GEORGE TOWN .....	George Town .....	9	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	14
	Low Head .....	7	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	11
MORVEN .....	Breadalbane .....	7	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	8
	Evandale .....	—	2	—	—	—	3	—	3	8
	Lymington .....	30	—	—	—	—	3	26	13	72
	Deddington .....	—	5	—	—	—	2	—	29	36
NORFOLK PLAINS .....	Carrick .....	7	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	9
	Illawarra .....	10	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	12
	Longford .....	38	—	6	—	18	2	—	—	64
	Perth .....	22	—	—	—	—	1	3	9	35
RINGWOOD .....	Cressy .....	2	—	6	—	—	2	—	20	30
	Bishopsbourne .....	2	—	—	—	4	2	—	—	8
SELBY .....	Bridgenorth .....	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	3
	Hadsen .....	13	—	—	—	—	3	1	6	23
	Newnham .....	3	—	—	—	—	1	—	3	7
	St. Leonards .....	3	—	—	—	1	3	—	1	8
	St. Michael's .....	28	—	—	—	2	1	—	13	44
	Winkleigh .....	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	11	13
	White Hills .....	7	—	—	—	—	1	—	2	10
WESTBURY .....	Exton .....	10	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	11
	Hagley .....	55	—	—	—	—	2	22	31	110
	Quamby Bend .....	20	—	—	—	—	—	6	2	28
	Queenstown .....	—	—	—	—	25	1	—	—	26
	Westbury .....	35	—	—	—	1	1	—	2	39
	Whitemore .....	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	7	10
	Bracknell .....	—	—	3	—	—	1	—	1	5
TOTAL .....		1555	91	95	91	376	124	475	909	3716

## BOARD OF EDUCATION.

INSPECTION of SCHOOLS between the 14th November, 1866, and the 1st May, 1867.

## EXAMINATION UNDER STANDARDS. TABULATED RESULTS.

No.	Name of School.	Electoral District.	Date of Examination.	Reading.			Writing.			Arithmetic.					
				No. examined.	Passed.		Failed.	No. examined.	Passed.		Failed.	No. examined.	Passed.		Failed.
					No.	Per centage.			No.	Per centage.			No.	Per centage.	
1	O'Brien's Bridge.....	Glenorchy.....	13 Feb. & 8 Mar., 1867...	19	16	84.21	3	28	21	75	7	18	3	16	15
2	<sup>a</sup> Birch's Bay.....	Kingborough.....	5 March, 1867.....	9	2	22.22	7	9	4	44.44	5	9	2	22.22	7
3	Long Bay.....	Ditto.....	1 March, 1867.....	15	4	26	11	15	6	40	9	15	2	13	13
4	Port Cygnet.....	Ditto.....	25 February, 1867.....	26	25	96.15	1	26	22	84.61	4	26	19	73.17	7
5	Oyster Cove.....	Ditto.....	4 March, 1867.....	27	20	74.07	7	21	11	52.37	10	21	2	9.52	19
6	Victoria.....	Ditto.....	22 February, 1867.....	33	33	100	—	32	27	84.37	5	33	25	75.75	8
7	Glazier's Bay.....	Ditto.....	20 February, 1867.....	13	8	61.54	5	13	5	38.46	8	13	7	53.84	6
8	<sup>a</sup> Wattle Grove.....	Ditto.....	26 February, 1867.....	6	4	66.66	2	5	5	100	0	6	1	16.66	5
9	Franklin.....	Franklin.....	21 February, 1867.....	51	31	60.78	20	46	32	69.56	14	45	19	42.22	26
10	Lightwood Bottom.....	Ditto.....	27 February, 1867.....	22	17	77.27	5	21	18	85.71	3	21	11	52.37	10
11	Mona Vale.....	Oatlands.....	1 May, 1867.....	27	24	89	3	27	23	85.18	4	27	13	48.15	14
12	<sup>a</sup> Lisdillon.....	Glamorgan.....	7 December, 1866.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13	Swansea.....	Ditto.....	6 December, 1866.....	13	12	92.31	1	13	7	53.84	6	13	5	38.46	8
14	<sup>a</sup> Glen Gala.....	Ditto.....	5 December, 1866.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15	Elizabeth-street.....	Launceston.....	3, 18, 19 December, 1866.....	158	128	81.12	30	155	102	55.80	53	156	68	43.59	88
16	Margaret-street.....	Ditto.....	3 & 20 December, 1866.....	59	37	62.71	22	55	27	49.09	28	57	9	15.79	48
17	<sup>b</sup> Infant School.....	Ditto.....	19 December, 1866.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
18	Campbell Town.....	Campbell Town.....	29 April, 1867.....	34	25	73.53	9	31	14	45.16	17	34	20	58.82	14
19	Ross.....	Ditto.....	30 April, 1867.....	48	37	77.08	11	48	31	64.58	17	48	32	66.66	16
20	Cleveland.....	Ditto.....	13 December, 1866.....	10	6	60	4	9	3	33.33	6	10	—	—	10
21	Deloraine.....	Deloraine.....	29 March, 1867.....	18	11	61.10	7	18	11	61	7	18	8	44.44	10
22	Torquay.....	Devon.....	13, 15, 27 March, 1867.....	13	8	61.54	5	13	6	46.15	7	11	2	18.18	9
23	Emu Bay.....	Ditto.....	22 March, 1867.....	19	9	47.35	10	19	8	42.10	11	17	4	23.53	13
24	Northdown.....	Ditto.....	14 March, 1867.....	12	10	83.33	2	12	11	91.66	1	12	3	25	9
25	Stanley.....	Ditto.....	18 March, 1867.....	25	19	76	6	25	22	88	3	25	15	60	10
26	Table Cape.....	Ditto.....	20 March, 1867.....	15	9	60	6	15	13	86.66	2	15	3	20	12
27	Forest.....	Ditto.....	18 March, 1867.....	32	29	90	3	32	22	68	10	32	11	34	21
28	Somerset.....	Ditto.....	21 March, 1867.....	13	10	76.92	3	13	11	84.61	2	13	5	38.46	8
29	<sup>b</sup> Kentishbury.....	Ditto.....	28 March, 1867.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
30	Avoca.....	Fingal.....	4 December, 1866.....	11	11	100	—	11	10	90.91	1	11	9	81.82	2
31	Fingal.....	Ditto.....	11 December, 1866.....	20	18	90	2	19	13	68.42	6	19	7	36.84	12
32	George Town.....	George Town.....	15 April, 1867.....	9	7	77	2	9	4	44.44	5	9	4	44.44	5
33	Low Heads.....	Ditto.....	15 April, 1867.....	11	10	90	1	11	9	81.82	2	11	9	81.82	2
34	<sup>b</sup> Breadalbane.....	Morven.....	17 December, 1866.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
35	Evandale.....	Ditto.....	17 December, 1866.....	41	32	78.05	9	37	28	75.67	9	28	18	64.28	10
36	Lymington.....	Ditto.....	14 December, 1866.....	17	12	70.59	5	17	10	58.82	7	16	9	56.25	7
37	Deddington.....	Ditto.....	15 December, 1866.....	25	24	96	1	16	13	81.25	3	21	16	76.18	5
38	Carriack.....	Norfolk Plains.....	22 December, 1866.....	22	10	45.54	12	22	12	54.54	10	22	4	18.18	18
39	Illawarra.....	Ditto.....	29 November, 1866.....	15	14	93.33	1	16	12	75	4	11	2	18.18	9
40	Longford.....	Ditto.....	19 November, 1866.....	30	30	100	—	30	23	76.66	7	17	9	53	8
41	Perth.....	Ditto.....	24 April, 1867.....	25	19	76	6	24	18	75	6	25	13	52	12
42	Cressy.....	Ringwood.....	24 April, 1867.....	11	10	90.91	1	11	8	72.73	3	11	10	90.91	1
43	Bishopbourne.....	Ditto.....	24 November, 1866.....	38	32	84.21	6	37	25	67.57	12	34	19	56	15
44	<sup>b</sup> Bridgenorth.....	Selby.....	27 November, 1866.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
45	<sup>a</sup> White Hills.....	Ditto.....	25 April, 1867.....	4	3	75	1	4	3	75	1	4	2	50	2
46	<sup>a</sup> Hadspen.....	Ditto.....	22 Nov. & 21 Dec., 1866.....	13	4	30.77	9	12	3	25	9	13	—	Nil.	13
47	<sup>a</sup> Newnham.....	Ditto.....	22 November, 1866.....	10	10	100	—	4	2	50	2	—	—	—	—
48	St. Leonards.....	Ditto.....	25 April, 1867.....	20	12	60	8	20	12	60	8	20	7	35	13
49	<sup>a</sup> St. Michaels.....	Ditto.....	12 April, 1867.....	16	12	75	4	16	10	62.50	6	16	12	75	4
50	<sup>c</sup> Winkleigh.....	Ditto.....	13 & 16 April, 1867.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
51	Exton.....	Westbury.....	9 April, 1867.....	52	51	98.77	1	52	47	90.38	5	52	35	67.30	17
52	Hagley.....	Ditto.....	8 April, 1867.....	17	16	94.12	1	13	12	92.30	1	17	12	70.59	5
53	<sup>a</sup> Quamby Bend.....	Ditto.....	22 April, 1867.....	11	8	72.73	3	11	5	45.45	6	11	2	17.27	9
54	Queenstown.....	Ditto.....	10 April, 1867.....	36	35	97.22	1	36	34	94.44	2	36	29	80.55	7
55	Westbury.....	Ditto.....	8 April, 1867.....	27	21	77	6	28	22	78.57	6	28	24	85.71	4
56	Whitemore.....	Ditto.....	28 November, 1866.....	47	39	82.98	8	38	29	76.32	9	35	14	40	21
57	Bracknell.....	Ditto.....	2 April, 1867.....	19	12	63.16	7	19	11	57.89	8	19	11	57.89	8
TOTAL RESULTS.				1264	996	78.80	268	1214	836	68.86	376	1181	566	47.92	615

MURRAY BURGESS, Deputy Inspector of Schools.

<sup>a</sup> Children not classified or presented according to Standards.<sup>b</sup> A visit of simple inspection.<sup>c</sup> School not in operation.<sup>d</sup> Children presented in Lower Standards only.<sup>e</sup> Exclusive of Infant Classes.



## BOARD OF EDUCATION.

*RETURN showing the Religious Denomination of Teachers, Assistant Teachers, Pupil Teachers, and Paid Monitors for the Year 1866.*

ELECTORAL DISTRICT.	SITUATION OF SCHOOL.	Church of England.	Presbyterian.	Wesleyan.	Independent.	Roman Catholic.	Others.	TOTAL.
HOBART .....	Bathurst-st. Central School	3	1	—	—	1	—	5
	Battery Point .....	4	1	—	—	—	—	5
	Goulburn-street .....	3	—	1	—	1	—	5
	Harrington-street .....	—	—	—	—	5	—	5
	Macquarie-street .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Murray-st. Infant School	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Trinity Hill .....	3	2	2	1	—	—	8
GLENORCHY .....	Bridgewater .....	1	—	—	—	1	—	2
	New Town .....	3	—	—	—	1	—	4
	O'Brien's Bridge .....	—	1	—	—	1	—	2
QUEENBOROUGH .....	Sandy Bay .....	3	—	—	—	—	—	3
KINGBOROUGH .....	Birch's Bay .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Brown's River .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Long Bay .....	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
	Port Cygnet .....	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
	Oyster Cove .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Victoria .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Glazier's Bay .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
FRANKLIN .....	Wattle Grove .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Franklin .....	3	—	—	—	—	—	3
	Ramsgate .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
NEW NORFOLK .....	Lightwood Bottom .....	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
	Fenton Forest .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Macquarie Plains .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
BRIGHTON .....	New Norfolk .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Black Brush .....	1	—	—	—	1	—	2
	Broad Marsh .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Green Point .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Green Ponds .....	1	1	—	—	1	—	3
	Pontville .....	1	—	—	1	—	—	2
	Constitution Hill .....	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
CLARENCE .....	Old Beach .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Kangaroo Point .....	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
	Rokeby .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	South Arm .....	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
RICHMOND .....	Cambridge .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Jerusalem .....	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
	Richmond .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
SORELL .....	Bream Creek .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Carlton .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Forcett .....	—	—	2	—	—	—	2
	Orielton .....	—	—	—	2	—	—	2
	Prosser's Plains .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Sorell .....	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
OATLANDS .....	Jericho .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Mona Vale .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Oatlands .....	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
	Mount Seymour .....	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
CUMBERLAND .....	Tunnack .....	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
	Bothwell .....	1	—	2	—	—	—	3
	Hamilton .....	—	—	—	3	—	—	3
GLAMORGAN .....	Ouse Bridge .....	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
	Lisdillon .....	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
	Swansea .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
LAUNCESTON .....	Glen Gala .....	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
	Elizabeth-street .....	5	—	—	—	—	—	5
	Margaret-street .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
LAUNCESTON .....	Infant School .....	—	—	1	1	—	—	2

ELECTORAL DISTRICT.	SITUATION OF SCHOOL.	Church of England.	Presbyterian.	Wesleyan.	Independent.	Roman Catholic.	Others.	TOTAL.
CAMPBELL TOWN..	Campbell Town .....	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
	Ross .....	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
	Cleveland .....	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
DELORAINE .....	Deloraine .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Red Hill .....	No Return.						
DEVON .....	Torquay .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Emu Bay .....	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
	Northdown .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Stanley, Circular Head ..	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Forest .....	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
	Table Cape .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Somerset .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
FINGAL .....	Wynyard .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Avoca .....	—	—	—	—	—	2	2
GEORGE TOWN ....	Fingal .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	GeorgeTown .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
MORVEN .....	Low Heads .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Breadalbane .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Evandale .....	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
	Lymington .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
NORFOLK PLAINS ..	Deddington .....	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
	Carrick .....	—	—	—	—	—	2	2
	Illawarra .....	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Longford .....	3	—	1	—	—	—	4
RINGWOOD .....	Perth .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Cressy .....	—	—	2	—	—	—	2
SELBY .....	Bishopsbourne .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Bridgenorth .....	No Return.						
	Hadspen .....	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
	Newnham .....	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
	St. Leonards .....	1	—	1	—	—	—	2
	St. Michael's .....	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
	Winkleigh .....	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
WESTBURY .....	White Hills .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Exton .....	—	—	—	3	—	—	3
	Hagley .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Quamby Bend .....	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
	Queenstown .....	—	—	—	—	3	—	3
	Westbury .....	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Whitemore .....	—	—	—	2	—	—	2
	Bracknell .....	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
	TOTAL .....	112	25	16	18	18	6	195

## BOARD OF EDUCATION.

*RETURN showing the Religious Denomination of Scholars in each School for the Year 1866.*

ELECTORAL DISTRICT.	SITUATION OF SCHOOL.	Church of England.	Presbyterian.	Wesleyan.	Independent.	Roman Catholic.	Others.	TOTAL.
HOBART .....	Bathurst-st. Central School	132	22	41	71	57	1	324
	Battery Point .....	135	42	12	36	24	16	265
	Goulburn-street .....	216	28	7	7	28	10	296
	Harrington-street .....	—	—	—	—	368	—	368
	Macquarie-street .....	39	—	11	1	20	—	71
	Murray-st. Infant School.	16	—	58	14	26	17	131
	Trinity Hill .....	233	29	63	32	64	2	423
GLENORCHY .....	Bridgewater .....	38	7	2	4	8	—	59
	New Town .....	78	—	25	15	57	—	175
	O'Brien's Bridge .....	21	23	20	—	32	—	96
QUEENBOROUGH .....	Sandy Bay .....	72	9	12	1	14	2	110
KINGBOROUGH .....	Birch's Bay .....	16	—	—	4	17	—	37
	Brown's River .....	36	—	2	—	10	—	48
	Long Bay .....	33	5	—	—	5	—	43
	Port Cygnet .....	31	5	2	1	30	—	69
	Oyster Cove .....	33	—	3	13	—	—	49
	Victoria .....	23	—	—	25	13	—	61
	Glazier's Bay .....	5	—	—	—	51	—	56
	Wattle Grove .....	8	—	6	—	21	—	35
FRANKLIN .....	Franklin .....	67	1	11	4	61	—	144
	Ramsgate .....	27	—	—	—	6	—	33
	Lightwood Bottom .....	5	—	—	21	18	—	44
NEW NORFOLK .....	Fenton Forest .....	47	8	5	—	19	—	79
	Macquarie Plains .....	32	2	—	—	—	—	34
	New Norfolk .....	38	—	17	—	41	—	96
BRIGHTON .....	Black Brush .....	26	—	—	1	20	—	47
	Broad Marsh .....	45	3	—	—	—	—	48
	Green Point .....	22	7	1	4	21	—	55
	Green Ponds .....	27	3	2	29	31	5	97
	Pontville .....	41	—	—	28	23	—	92
	Constitution Hill .....	33	—	2	3	19	6	63
	Old Beach .....	20	—	8	1	17	—	46
CLARENCE .....	Kangaroo Point .....	35	—	—	36	—	—	71
	Rokeby .....	26	—	—	17	1	—	44
	South Arm .....	19	—	—	—	5	—	24
	Cambridge .....	22	—	—	—	16	—	38
RICHMOND .....	Jerusalem .....	28	4	—	—	19	—	51
	Richmond .....	55	5	6	2	57	—	125
SORELL .....	Bream Creek .....	24	—	—	8	5	—	37
	Carlton .....	14	—	—	8	2	—	24
	Forcett .....	58	4	—	1	1	—	64
	Orielton .....	26	2	—	4	2	—	34
	Prosser's Plains .....	30	—	—	—	6	—	36
	Sorell .....	67	1	—	—	15	—	83
OATLANDS .....	Jericho .....	29	—	4	—	—	—	33
	Mona Vale .....	11	25	—	1	8	—	45
	Oatlands .....	54	24	11	—	77	—	166
	Mount Seymour .....	13	22	—	—	14	—	49
	Tunnack .....	8	13	—	—	17	—	38
CUMBERLAND .....	Bothwell .....	71	18	19	2	22	1	133
	Hamilton .....	46	3	—	2	29	—	80
	Ouse Bridge .....	25	—	2	—	1	—	28
GLAMORGAN .....	Lisdillon .....	37	1	—	—	—	—	38
	Swansea .....	11	1	—	—	19	2	33
	Glen Gala .....	11	11	—	—	6	—	28
LAUNCESTON .....	Elizabeth-street .....	175	16	83	24	30	14	342
	Margaret-street .....	4	—	—	—	223	—	227
	Infant School .....	44	12	95	22	14	24	211

ELECTORAL DISTRICT.	SITUATION OF SCHOOLS.	Church of England.	Presbyterian.	Wesleyan.	Independent.	Roman Catholic.	Others.	TOTAL.
CAMPBELL TOWN ..	Campbell Town .....	36	10	21	—	14	—	81
	Ross .....	49	18	26	—	8	—	101
	Cleveland .....	20	6	8	—	7	—	41
DELORAINE .....	Deloraine .....	45	10	24	—	29	4	112
	Red Hill .....	No Return						
DEVON .....	Torquay .....	27	—	12	—	5	—	44
	Emu Bay .....	23	—	—	—	14	—	37
	Northdown .....	24	—	7	—	—	—	31
	Stanley, Circular Head ..	52	12	—	—	10	—	74
	Forest .....	46	1	—	—	18	—	65
	Table Cape .....	17	4	—	1	14	6	42
	Somerset .....	20	3	—	—	11	—	34
	Wynyard .....	15	6	—	1	5	1	28
FINGAL .....	Avoca .....	44	—	2	—	9	3	58
	Fingal .....	29	—	—	—	10	—	39
GEORGE TOWN ....	George Town .....	46	4	1	—	1	—	52
	Low Heads .....	11	13	—	—	2	—	26
MORVEN .....	Breadalbane .....	21	—	6	—	2	—	29
	Evandale .....	27	39	13	1	4	9	93
	Lymington .....	26	2	6	—	8	—	42
	Deddington .....	5	25	—	—	2	—	32
NORFOLK PLAINS ..	Carrick .....	36	6	2	—	14	6	64
	Illawarra .....	No Return						
	Longford .....	76	5	36	—	31	—	148
	Perth .....	49	—	2	—	20	20	91
RINGWOOD .....	Cressy .....	23	8	26	—	6	—	63
	Bishopsbourne .....	35	4	22	—	11	—	72
SELBY .....	Bridgenorth .....	No Return						
	Hadspen .....	40	—	7	—	3	—	50
	Newnham .....	16	4	9	6	11	—	46
	St. Leonards .....	28	11	2	—	16	—	57
	St. Michael's .....	23	7	2	—	7	—	39
	Winkleigh .....	11	15	4	2	1	—	33
	White Hills .....	24	—	6	—	—	—	30
WESTBURY .....	Exton .....	29	4	48	2	17	15	115
	Hagley .....	56	10	10	—	6	—	82
	Quamby Bend .....	9	3	—	—	22	—	34
	Queenstown .....	19	—	10	—	98	—	127
	Westbury .....	37	2	12	—	56	4	111
	Whitemore .....	18	8	26	7	—	—	59
	Bracknell .....	11	—	32	—	6	3	52
	TOTAL .....	3661	596	912	462	2208	171	8010

## RETURN of Rates of Payment by Pupils from 1st January to 31st December, 1866.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.	SITUATION OF SCHOOL.	Admitted under Free Certificate.	Admitted Free but not paid for by Board.	Under 3d. per Week.	3d. to 6d. per Week.	6d. per Week.	6d. to 9d. per Week.	9d. per Week.	9d. to 1s. per Week.	1s. per Week.	Above 1s. per Week.	TOTAL.
HOBART .....	Bathurst-st. Central School	17	38	..	..	99	37	75	..	51	7	324
	Battery Point .....	66	..	..	..	49	..	30	..	83	37	265
	Goulburn-street .....	133	25	11	26	8	8	2	..	..	..	296
	Harrington-street .....	196	..	..	..	169	..	8	..	..	..	373
	Macquarie-street .....	32	..	..	8	25	..	4	..	2	..	71
	Murray-st., Infant School	91	..	14	19	1	..	..	..	..	6	131
GLENORCHY .....	Trinity Hill .....	140	10	..	21	202	..	15	..	29	6	423
	Bridgewater .....	..	20	..	..	24	4	3	..	8	..	59
	New Town .....	31	23	5	28	55	7	17	..	9	..	175
QUEENBOROUGH ..	O'Brien's Bridge .....	3	5	..	..	76	1	2	..	..	9	96
	Sandy Bay .....	18	3	4	15	15	2	23	..	25	5	110
KINGBOROUGH ..	Birch's Bay .....	..	29	3	5	..	..	..	..	..	..	37
	Brown's River .....	16	12	..	..	10	..	2	3	2	3	48
	Long Bay .....	..	18	..	..	14	..	..	7	4	..	43
	Port Cygnet .....	33	2	..	4	26	2	2	..	..	..	69
	Oyster Cove .....	11	21	..	8	5	..	4	..	..	..	49
	Victoria .....	18	2	..	..	14	..	4	..	14	9	61
	Glazier's Bay .....	8	8	..	..	36	..	4	..	..	..	56
FRANKLIN .....	Wattle Grove .....	6	5	..	..	6	..	18	..	..	..	35
	Franklin .....	55	24	..	..	46	5	4	4	6	..	144
	Ramsgate .....	..	8	..	..	22	..	..	..	3	..	33
NEW NORFOLK ..	Lightwood Bottom .....	..	4	..	..	29	6	3	2	..	..	44
	Fenton Forest .....	..	50	..	..	..	2	1	..	23	3	79
	Macquarie Plains .....	6	6	..	..	13	4	2	..	3	..	34
BRIGHTON .....	New Norfolk .....	33	3	..	4	41	2	8	..	2	3	96
	Black Brush .....	..	9	..	..	..	..	3	..	9	26	47
	Broad Marsh .....	3	5	..	..	26	1	5	..	1	7	48
	Green Point .....	9	12	..	..	23	..	5	..	6	..	55
	Green Ponds .....	21	4	..	..	25	9	..	10	4	24	97
	Pontville .....	..	24	..	3	40	2	4	..	2	17	92
	Constitution Hill .....	24	4	..	10	..	..	4	..	9	12	63
CLARENCE .....	Old Beach .....	6	5	2	1	26	5	1	..	..	..	46
	Kangaroo Point .....	20	10	9	2	19	..	2	..	9	..	71
	Rokeby .....	..	12	..	..	13	..	5	..	8	6	44
	South Arm .....	6	..	..	10	8	..	..	..	..	..	24
RICHMOND .....	Cambridge .....	11	..	..	..	20	..	1	..	..	..	38
	Jerusalem .....	4	20	..	..	14	..	..	..	13	..	51
SORELL .....	Richmond .....	..	60	..	22	25	..	4	..	2	12	125
	Bream Creek .....	..	15	..	..	2	..	..	..	..	20	37
	Carlton .....	..	15	..	..	..	8	..	..	..	1	24
	Forcett .....	..	12	..	16	20	6	1	..	1	8	64
	Orielton .....	..	9	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	25	34
	Prosser's Plains .....	10	5	..	8	..	5	..	..	..	8	36
	Sorell .....	..	5	..	..	25	5	12	..	4	32	83
OATLANDS .....	Jericho .....	..	4	..	..	17	6	3	..	2	1	33
	Mona Vale .....	12	..	..	..	30	..	2	..	1	..	45
	Oatlands .....	67	54	..	..	25	2	4	..	7	7	166
	Mount Seymour .....	19	7	..	6	16	..	1	..	..	..	49
	Tunnack .....	..	6	..	..	22	4	..	6	..	..	38
CUMBERLAND ..	Bothwell .....	32	..	4	..	26	30	39	..	2	..	133
	Hamilton .....	7	4	..	..	43	21	5	..	..	..	80
	Ouse Bridge .....	2	4	..	3	7	10	2	..	..	..	28
GLAMORGAN .....	Lisdillon .....	7	..	8	11	2	10	..	..	..	..	38
	Swansea .....	8	..	..	..	21	1	3	..	..	..	33
	Glen Gala .....	11	..	..	4	13	..	..	..	..	..	28
LAUNCESTON .....	Elizabeth-street .....	130	6	..	..	129	6	40	6	25	..	352
	Margaret-street .....	168	..	..	7	42	..	4	..	3	3	227
	Infant School .....	46	3	1	77	84	..	..	..	..	..	211
	Cleveland .....	..	8	..	..	31	..	1	..	1	..	41

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS.	SITUATION OF SCHOOL.	Admitted under Free Certificate.	Admitted Free but not paid for by Board.	Under 3d. per Week.	3d. per Week.	3d. to 6d. per Week.	6d. per Week.	6d. to 9d. per Week.	9d. per Week.	9d. to 1s. per Week.	1s. per Week.	Above 1s. per Week.	TOTAL.
CAMPBELL TOWN	Campbell Town .....	..	6	..	..	..	44	..	21	8	1	1	81
	Ross .....	..	11	..	..	..	69	12	9	..	..	..	101
DELORAINÉ .....	Delorainé .....	10	23	..	..	..	23	20	25	..	11	..	112
DEVON .....	Torquay .....	..	2	..	..	..	25	..	..	..	17	..	44
	Emu Bay .....	4	5	..	..	7	21	..	..	..	..	..	37
	Northdown .....	..	..	..	..	15	8	3	..	..	1	4	31
	Stanley .....	..	3	..	..	..	17	..	52	..	2	..	74
	Table Cape .....	..	8	..	..	..	..	24	8	..	2	..	42
	Wynyard .....	..	16	6	..	..	6	..	..	..	..	..	28
	Forest, Circular Head....	14	1	..	..	8	42	..	..	..	..	..	65
FINGAL .....	Somerset .....	..	8	..	..	..	26	..	..	..	..	..	34
	Avoca .....	..	8	..	..	..	4	..	15	..	20	11	58
GEORGE TOWN..	Fingal .....	..	9	..	..	..	..	..	22	..	8	..	39
	George Town .....	5	4	..	..	..	25	7	6	..	5	..	52
MORVEN .....	Low Heads .....	..	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	24	26
	Breadalbane .....	..	1	..	..	..	21	..	3	..	4	..	29
	Evandale .....	..	15	1	..	..	7	..	2	19	12	37	93
	Lymington .....	..	3	..	..	..	..	29	1	2	..	..	42
NORFOLK PLAINS	Deddington .....	..	..	..	..	..	18	..	11	..	3	..	32
	Carrick .....	8	13	..	..	1	20	7	13	..	2	..	64
	Illawarra .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Longford .....	3	3	..	..	..	60	10	13	..	45	14	148
RINGWOOD .....	Perth .....	24	29	..	6	1	23	2	3	1	1	1	91
	Maitland .....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Cressy .....	9	11	..	..	..	10	5	21	..	7	..	63
SELBY .....	Bishopsbourne .....	..	2	..	5	..	26	..	23	..	16	..	72
	Bridgenorth .....	No Return	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
	Hadspen .....	..	19	..	10	5	16	..	..	..	..	..	50
	Newnham .....	..	1	..	..	..	25	20	..	..	..	..	46
	St. Leonards .....	..	12	..	..	4	16	18	7	..	..	..	57
	St. Michaels .....	5	7	..	..	..	19	..	7	..	1	..	39
	Winkleigh .....	6	6	..	..	..	..	12	..	9	..	..	33
WHSTBURY .....	White Hills .....	..	..	..	..	..	17	13	..	..	..	..	30
	Exton .....	..	5	..	..	..	3	58	21	..	11	17	115
	Hagley .....	7	15	..	..	10	5	4	2	8	7	24	82
	Quamby Bend .....	..	10	..	..	..	24	..	..	..	..	..	34
	Queenstown .....	85	5	..	..	19	14	3	..	..	..	1	127
	Westbury .....	60	4	..	4	..	25	..	7	2	3	6	111
	Whitemore .....	..	3	..	..	6	..	3	..	..	..	47	59
	Bracknell .....	10	4	..	..	3	21	7	3	3	1	..	52
		1786	912	29	112	356	2568	448	677	90	553	484	8015

*ESTIMATE of the probable Cost of maintaining the Public Schools, Tasmania, during the Year 1867.*

RURAL MUNICIPALITY.	Number of Schools.	Estimated Cost.	Estimated Amount of School Fees.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Bothwell.....	2	194 0 0	118 13 6
Brighton.....	5	452 0 0	200 6 0
Campbell Town.....	2	184 0 0	63 8 9
Clarence.....	4	292 0 0	108 0 0
Deloraine.....	2	200 0 0	142 8 4
Evandale.....	4	440 0 0	183 8 11
Fingal.....	4	290 0 0	152 18 6
Glamorgan.....	5	307 0 0	172 18 11
Glenorchy.....	2	226 0 0	83 13 6
Green Ponds.....	3	283 0 0	170 0 0
Hamilton.....	2	184 0 0	54 12 10
Longford.....	5	540 0 0	330 0 9
New Norfolk.....	4	360 0 0	107 14 10
Oatlands.....	5	432 0 0	82 3 6
Richmond.....	2	253 0 0	74 7 0
Ross.....	2	252 0 0	136 16 6
Sorell.....	6	460 0 0	236 16 6
Spring Bay.....	2	164 0 0	36 0 0
Westbury.....	7	860 0 0	415 5 0
Hobart.....	7	1871 0 0	520 0 0
Launceston.....	3	732 0 0	228 10 0
<i>Police Districts.</i>			
Franklin.....	8	637 0 0	188 16 0
George Town.....	3	215 0 0	79 10 0
Hobart and Kingston.....	7	818 0 0	286 19 4
Horton.....	3	235 0 0	115 15 0
Table Cape, Division of Horton.....	2	108 0 0	116 4 0
Launceston (Selby).....	8	624 0 0	201 5 0
Port Sorell and Emu Bay.....	5	300 0 0	71 0 0
South Longford or Lake District.....			
	114	£11,913 0 0	£4677 12 8

T. STEPHENS.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

*RETURN of Occupation of Parents of Children attending Public Schools between 1st January and 31st December, 1866, as stated in the Teachers' Annual Returns.*

OCCUPATION OF PARENTS.	CENTRAL SCHOOL.	BATTERY POINT.	GOULBURN STREET.	HARRINGTON STREET.	MACQUARIE STREET.	INFANTS SCHOOL, NON-RAY STREET.	TRINITY HILL.	BRIDGEWATER.	SEW TOWN.	SANDY BAY.	BIRCH'S BAY.	LONG BAY.	ST. JOHN'S CHURCH.	VICTORIA.	GLAZIER'S BAY.	WATLIE GROVE.	FRANKLIN.	RANSGATE.	LIGHTHOUSE BOTTOM.	PESTON FOREST.	MACQUARIE PLAINS.	BLACK BRUSH.	BROAD MARSH.	GREEN POINT.	GREEN POND.	CONSTITUTION HILL.	OLD BEACH.	KANGAROO POINT.	FOXLEY.	ST. JOHN'S CHURCH.	JERUSALEM.	BRIGHTWOOD.	BIRCH CHALK.	CARLTON.	FORGETT.	ORIELTON.	POSSUM PLAINS.	FRIGGLO.	MOSA VALLE.	OATLANDS.	MOUNT SEYMOUR.	TUSMACK.	NOTHILL.	KILGILTON.	QUEENSBOROUGH.	LISBOLL.	SWANSEA.	GLEN DALE.	ELLENDALE.	HARRINGTON STREET.	MARGARET STREET.	LAKEVIEW.	TAYLOR STREET.	MARTINSON.	CLAYFIELD.	CAMPBELL TOWN.	ROSS.	DEBRINE.	TORQUAY.	NOTHDOWN.	STANLEY.	TARLE GATE.	WINDYARD.	SOMERSET.	AYCO.	FINCH.	GEORGE TOWN.	ST. JOHN'S CHURCH.	BRADDALE.	EVANDALE.	LIVINGSTON.	DIDDINGTON.	CARLICK.	LONGFORD.	PERH.	CREST.	HARRINGTON STREET.	NEW SHAM.	ST. MICHAEL'S.	ST. MICHAEL'S.	WINDYARD.	WHITE HILL.	STON.	HAGLEY.	QUARRY BEND.	QUEENSTOWN.	WESTBURY.	WHITMORE.	BRACKENELL.	TOTAL NUMBER OF OCCUPATIONS OF PARENTS.	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBURBAN PARENTS.	TOTAL NUMBER OF PARENTS OF EDUCATION.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																							
Auctioneers . . . . .				2														2																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																	



## WATCHORN STREET RAGGED SCHOOL.

*RETURN of the ATTENDANCE of the CHILDREN at Watchorn Street Ragged School.*

	BOYS.	GIRLS.	TOTAL.
Number of children who have attended for 3 years and above..	24	17	41
Ditto ditto 2 years and above..	28	28	56
Ditto ditto 1 year and above...	25	24	49
Ditto ditto under 1 year .....	23	21	44
	100	90	190

GEO. WM. BRIANT, *Master.**The Royal Commission on Education.*

## WATCHORN STREET RAGGED SCHOOL.

*RETURN of ENTRIES made by VISITORS in the Visitors' Book kept in Watchorn-street Ragged School, for the past Half-year.*

1866.  
December 17. J. H. Smales. Children well employed. The dismissal orderly.
1867.  
January 10. Visited the School; examined the writing on slates both of girls and boys: satisfactory.—J. H. Smales.  
29. Heard the first class, boys and girls, read a portion of the Gospel of St. Luke, and examined them in it; their attention and their intelligence being good.—F. H. Cox.  
31. Visited. Examined the writing from dictation, generally correct; and also the arithmetic, (compound multiplication) with one exception correctly worked and well understood.—J. H. Smales.
- February 5. Scripture reading as last week.—F. H. Cox.  
12. Ditto.—F. H. Cox.  
20. J. H. Smales. A good and orderly attendance; busily employed.—J. H. S.  
26. Scripture reading.—F. H. Cox.
- March 5. The same. F. H. Cox.  
5. Mrs. Calvert visited; found the attendance good and the children orderly; the girls require needle-work.  
8. Inspected the three Schools. About 95 children present. The Teachers appear to have the scholars under good command.—Henry T. C. Cox.  
12. Continued reading of St. Luke with the first class. Reading and attention good.—F. H. Cox.  
26. The same.—F. H. Cox.
- April 3. Addressed the children upon Covetousness, and obtained the elder scholars' continued attention.—Richard Rogers.  
9. Scripture reading, and questions thereon.—F. H. Cox.
- May 7. Ditto.—F. H. Cox.  
8. J. H. Smales.  
14. H. B. Bromby. The children quiet and attentive.  
14. F. H. Cox. Scripture reading.  
16. Mrs. Gore Browne and Captain Stewart.  
22. F. H. Cox. Scripture reading. The class large and attentive.
- June 4. Addressed the children upon Great and Good Men, and was pleased with their conduct.—R. Rogers.  
11. Scripture reading.—F. H. Cox.  
18. Ditto.—F. H. Cox.

GEO. WM. BRIANT, *Master.**The Royal Commissioners on Education.*

## LOWER COLLINS STREET RAGGED SCHOOL.

	BOYS.	GIRLS.	TOTAL.
Number of children on books January 1st, 1865.....	56	71	127
Number admitted from 1st January, 1865, to 31st May, 1867..	201	194	395
Number left, ditto.....	185	186	371
Number on books May 31st, 1867.....	72	79	151
Average daily attendance.....	51	50	101

THOMAS DAGNIA, *Master.**The Royal Commissioners on Education.*

## LOWER COLLINS STREET RAGGED SCHOOL.

*RETURN of VISITORS to the SCHOOL for the Six Months ending June 18th, 1867.*

1866.  
December 19. Revds. H. B. Bromby and J. H. Smales.  
29. Rev. J. H. Smales.
1867.  
January 8. Rev. J. H. Smales.  
16. Miss A. C. O'Meagher.  
22. Miss Greenwood.  
29. Rev. F. H. Cox.  
February 4. Miss A. C. O'Meagher.  
5. Miss Greenwood.  
12. Rev. J. H. Smales and Miss Greenwood.  
15. Mr. S. W. Westbrook.  
17. Miss A. C. O'Meagher and Miss Smith.  
19. Miss Greenwood.  
22. Rev. J. H. Smales.  
26. Miss Greenwood.  
March 12. Miss Greenwood.  
18. Miss Greenwood.  
25. Miss M. F. O'Meagher.  
26. Miss Greenwood.  
April 1. Misses O'Meagher, Luke, and Skene.  
2. Miss Greenwood.  
8. Visited the School, and addressed the children on Covetousness, when their behaviour was excellent.—  
Rev. R. Rogers.  
8. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
9. Miss Greenwood.  
15. Miss M. F. O'Meagher.  
22. Miss Greenwood.  
29. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
May 1. Visited the School this afternoon, and found a number of ragged children, but apparently hearty and  
cheerful. It would be a great improvement if some industrial teaching could be introduced for  
the boys.—Henry T. C. Cox.  
1. Miss Greenwood.  
6. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
7. Miss Greenwood.  
9. Rev. F. H. Cox.  
13. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
15. The scholars were under control as I entered the School, and continued so until I had finished an  
address on Goodness, when they sung a few melodies very well.—Rev. R. Rogers.  
16. Rev. H. B. Bromby.  
19. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
19. Miss J. Davidson.  
27. Mrs. A. B. Thorne. Very much pleased.  
29. Miss A. C. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
31. Rev. J. H. Smales. A good attendance.  
June 3. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
4. Revds. F. H. Cox and H. J. Poole.  
9. Miss Greenwood.  
10. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
17. Miss M. F. O'Meagher and Miss Skene.  
18. Miss Greenwood.

THOMAS DAGNIA, *Master.**The Royal Commissioners on Education.*

## D.

*RETURN of SCHOOLS in TASMANIA not under the Board of Education, as far as Information concerning them can be ascertained.*

	<i>Schools for Boys.</i>		<i>Schools for Girls.</i>		<i>Schools for both Sexes.</i>			TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS.	TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOLARS.
	<i>No.</i>	<i>Scholars.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Scholars.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Boys.</i>	<i>Girls.</i>		
<b>HOBART.</b>									
Bathurst-street . . . . .	..	..	..	..	6	45	64	6	109
Battery Point . . . . .	..	..	2	23	3	26	45	5	94
Goulburn-street . . . . .	..	..	1	1	1	4	3	2	8
Harrington-street . . . . .	2	111	..	..	3	71	62	5	244
Macquarie-street . . . . .	3	146	4	44	9	94	135	16	419
Murray-street . . . . .	..	..	1	13	5	88	77	6	178
Ragged Schools . . . . .	..	..	..	..	2	149	150	2	299
Other Streets . . . . .	6	250	6	149	31	253	400	43	1052
<b>GLENORCHY.</b>									
New Town . . . . .	1	26	1	8	4	21	48	6	103
O'Brien's Bridge . . . . .	..	..	..	..	3	..	..	3	..
<b>QUEENBOROUGH.</b>									
Sandy Bay . . . . .	..	..	..	..	2	..	..	2	..
<b>KINGBOROUGH.</b>									
Brown's River . . . . .	..	..	..	..	2	2	18	2	20
Long Bay . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..
Port Cygnet . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	15	12	1	27
<b>FRANKLIN</b> . . . . .	..	..	..	..	2	12	27	2	39
<b>NEW NORFOLK.</b>									
Macquarie Plains . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	10	12	1	22
New Norfolk . . . . .	..	..	..	..	3	44	59	3	103
<b>BRIGHTON.</b>									
Green Ponds . . . . .	..	..	2	..	2	6	19	4	25
Pontville . . . . .	1	..	..	..	1	5	16	2	21
<b>CLARENCE.</b>									
Kangaroo Point . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	2	10	1	12
Cambridge . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	7	5	1	12
<b>RICHMOND.</b>									
Richmond . . . . .	1	17	1	6	1	30	63	3	116
Spring Hill Bottom . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	6	12	1	18
<b>SORELL</b> . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	3	11	1	14
<b>OATLANDS.</b>									
Jericho . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	8	1	1	9
Oatlands . . . . .	1	8	..	..	3	20	38	4	66
<b>GLAMORGAN.</b>									
Lisdillon . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..
Swansea . . . . .	..	..	1	3	..	..	..	1	3
<b>LAUNCESTON</b> . . . . .	2	54	4	100	10	245	165	16	564
<b>CAMPBELL TOWN</b> . . . . .	1	..	..	..	2	7	20	3	27
<b>DELORAINÉ</b> . . . . .	..	..	..	..	3	14	22	3	36
<b>DEVON.</b>									
Torquay . . . . .	..	..	1	..	3	65	37	4	102
Kentishbury . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	9	7	1	16
Stanley . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	..	..	1	..
<b>GEORGE TOWN</b> . . . . .	1	6	..	..	..	..	..	1	6
<b>MORVEN.</b>									
Evandale . . . . .	..	..	..	..	3	31	22	3	53
<b>NORFOLK PLAINS.</b>									
Carrick . . . . .	..	..	..	..	4	9	10	4	19
Longford . . . . .	..	..	1	..	4	22	42	5	64
Perth . . . . .	..	..	..	..	2	25	31	2	56
<b>RINGWOOD.</b>									
Cressy . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	12	6	1	18
<b>SELBY.</b>									
Newnham . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	12	15	1	27
St. Leonards . . . . .	..	..	2	37	1	12	16	3	65
<b>WESTBURY.</b>									
Hagley . . . . .	..	..	..	..	1	2	9	1	11
Queenstown . . . . .	1	..	..	..	1	..	..	2	..
Westbury . . . . .	1	28	..	..	1	1	19	2	48
<b>TAMAR</b> . . . . .	1	8	..	..	..	..	..	1	8
	22	654	27	384	131	1387	1708	180	4133

E.

AREA, Population, and Annual Value of Property in Districts.

	Area of Districts in Acres.	Population.	Annual Valuation of Property.	Remarks.
	ACRES.		£	
MUNICIPALITIES.	Hobart Town.....	19,449	96,263	The Area has been furnished by the Survey Department; the Population has been taken from the Returns of the Inspector of Police. The Valuation of Property is extracted from Returns supplied by the Municipalities; and, as regards the Police Districts, from the totals of the Rolls computed in the Audit Office.
	Launceston .....	10,359	74,600	
	Bothwell.....	1300	17,564	
	Brighton.....	2808	14,346	
	Campbell Town....	1600	24,505	
	Clarence .....	1600	10,000	
	Deloraine .....	3600	27,355	
	Evandale .....	3260	26,008	
	Fingal .....	1956	23,750	
	Glamorgan.....	1200	8386	
	Glenorchy .....	1265	9600	
	Green Ponds.....	1206	10,545	
	Hamilton.....	1497	38,500	
	Longford.....	5050	46,700	
	New Norfolk .....	2690	14,617	
	Oatlands .....	1879	34,500	
	Richmond .....	1660	18,086	
POLICE DISTRICTS.	Ross .....	950	15,911	
	Sorell .....	1928	13,330	
	Spring Bay .....	750	6955	
	Westbury.....	6237	36,371	
	Franklin.....	2759	9396	
	George Town.....	1350	5503	
	Hobart .....	4627	23,308	
	Horton .....	2036	16,404	
	Kingborough.....	3454	6736	
	Selby.....	2781	24,769	
	Torquay .....	3358	17,520	
	Great Lake.....	—	5832	

E. C. NOWELL, Statistician.

## F.

*ESTIMATE of Expenditure for Hobart Town Public Schools.***FIVE INFANT SCHOOLS.***Estimated Attendance, 300.*

	£	s.	d.
5 Mistresses, each at £50	250	0	0
5 paid Monitors, each £12	60	0	0
Rent of School Buildings	60	0	0
Repairs	25	0	0
Books, Stationery, &c.	25	0	0
	<u>£420</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

**CENTRAL SCHOOL.***Estimated Average Attendance:—Boys 165, Girls 95 = 260.*

Principal Teacher	140	0	0
Mistress	80	0	0
Six Pupil Teachers (including Instruction)	198	0	0
Repairs, &c.	50	0	0
Books, Stationery, &c.	10	0	0
Miscellaneous Charges	15	0	0
	<u>£493</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

**HARRINGTON STREET SCHOOL.***Boys 95, Girls 95 = 190.*

Principal Teacher	140	0	0
Mistress	50	0	0
Two Pupil Teachers, (including Instruction)	60	15	5
Rent	30	0	0
Books, Stationery, &c.	5	0	0
Miscellaneous	5	0	0
	<u>£290</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>5</u>

	£	s.	d.
1. ....	420	0	0
2. ....	493	0	0
3. ....	290	15	5
4. ....	80	0	0

Fees for Free Scholars.

£1283 15 5 or, £1 14s. 2d. per head.

Cost in 1865 ..... £2015 1 3 or, £2 13s. 5d. per head. (£2 9s. 8d. if per-centage spent on building Central School be omitted.)

M. BURGESS.

*QUERIES addressed to all the Special Visitors to the Schools under the Board of Education.*

---

1. What knowledge have you of the working of the Public Schools in your neighbourhood?
  2. Do these Schools appear to you to make sufficient provision for the education of the children in your neighbourhood?
  3. Can you state approximately the number of children between the ages of 4 and 7, and 7 and 12, respectively, not attending any school?
  4. What are the causes, so far as you know them, of the non-attendance of the children mentioned in the last question?
  5. Can you suggest any means of securing the attendance of those children who ought to be, but are not, receiving instruction?
  6. What amount of local supervision is given to the schools?
  7. What is the general opinion prevailing in the neighbourhood as to the value of the instruction imparted at these schools?
  8. State generally what appear to you to be the advantages or defects in the working of the Public School system in your district?
  9. Would it be expedient or practicable, in your opinion, to make it compulsory upon parents to send their children (not attending other Schools) to the Public Schools?
  10. Does any harm result, in your opinion, from the intermixture of children from different ranks of life at the Government Schools?
  11. At the Public School or Schools in your neighbourhood, have you witnessed any separation of the pupils in reference to their different social position or circumstances, or any invidious distinctions calculated to repel children of the poorer classes from the school?
  12. Do parents of the classes whose children, principally, are in attendance at the Public Schools generally attach a high value to the opportunities of education afforded by these schools, or are they in the habit of withdrawing their children from school for frivolous reasons?
  13. Is the inspection at present maintained by the Inspector of Schools sufficiently frequent to test the progress of pupils from time to time, and to stimulate the diligence of the masters?
  14. What in your opinion would be the effect on the attendance at the schools in your neighbourhood of increasing the rate of school fees twenty-five or fifty per cent.?
  15. From your knowledge of the total emoluments of the Masters of Public Schools in your neighbourhood, do you think that it would be expedient to reduce them?
  16. Could a reduction in the item of fixed salary not be made without incurring the risk of being unable to supply the situations they fill with equally efficient Teachers?
- NOTE.—The maximum salary of town and country Masters is £100, and the minimum £40. The salary of Mistresses varies from £70 to £25.
17. Have you any knowledge whether in your neighbourhood the children in attendance at the Public Schools evince at Sunday Schools either less or more intelligence than other children at the same schools, taking into consideration the relative social advantages of the children compared?
  18. Have you a sufficient number of children of parents unable to pay any school fee to justify the establishment of a separate school for their benefit?
  19. Would it be desirable to have such a school exclusively for the class referred to?
  20. Are there any private schools suited to the various classes of pupils who attend the Public Schools in your neighbourhood?
  21. Would such schools, if started as a private adventure, be likely to meet all the objects sought to be attained by Public Schools, and derive adequate support without aid from the State?
  22. Would it be expedient to establish a system of State aid to Education proportioned to the amounts raised in the districts by voluntary contributions?
  23. Would it be expedient or practicable to maintain education in your neighbourhood, wholly or in part, by means of a local rate?
  24. Supposing it to be so, would you recommend that the appointment or dismissal, and the salary, of the Masters in Public Schools should be left at the discretion of a local governing body?
  25. Would a Denominational System be likely to secure more local support, in pupils' fees and in voluntary subscriptions for school purposes, than the present system?
  26. Will you state generally any views which you may have to communicate on the question to which this Circular relates?
-

*ANSWERS have been received from the following Persons:—*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rev. J. T. Gellibrand, Hobart Town.</li> <li>2. Rev. Dr. Turnbull, Campbell Town.</li> <li>3. Rev. E. P. Adams, Deloraine.</li> <li>4. Rev. Robt. Russell, Evandale.</li> <li>5. Rev. H. O. Irwin, Haglev.</li> <li>6. Rev. A. N. Mason, Carrick.</li> <li>7. Rev. A. Davenport, Hobart Town.</li> <li>8. Rev. W. A. Quick, Horton College, Ross.</li> <li>9. Rev. John Dixon, Windermere.</li> <li>10. Rev. J. Mayson, Swansea.</li> <li>11. Rev. J. Holehan, Port Cygnet.</li> <li>12. Rev. A. Wayn, Green Ponds.</li> <li>13. Rev. S. B. Ffookes, Perth.</li> <li>14. Rev. M. O'Callaghan, Campbell Town.</li> <li>15. Rev. A. Stackhouse, Longford.</li> <li>16. Rev. Dr. Butler, Launceston.</li> <li>17. Rev. W. W. F. Murray, New Norfolk.</li> <li>18. Rev. H. E. Drew, Circular Head.</li> <li>19. Rev. E. C. Marum, Jerusalem.</li> <li>20. Rev. John Murphy, Franklin.</li> <li>21. Rev. Dr. Browne, Launceston.</li> <li>22. Rev. James M. Norman, Bishopsbourne.</li> <li>23. Rev. James Hogan, Westbury.</li> <li>24. S. H. Thomas, Esq., Port Sorell.</li> <li>25. Lieut.-Colonel R. C. D. Home, Quamby.</li> <li>26. M. Ralston, Esq., Evandale.</li> <li>27. R. M. Ayre, Esq., Quamby.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>28. Mr. Thos. Walton, Huon.</li> <li>29. W. C. Simmons, Esq., Warden, Richmond.</li> <li>30. J. D. Toosey, Esq., Longford.</li> <li>31. Captain F. E. Chalmers, J.P., Bagdad.</li> <li>32. The Hon. Edwd. Abbott, M.L.C., Warden, Clarence.</li> <li>33. John Murdoch, Esq., Sandy Bay.</li> <li>34. Robert Blyth, Esq., J.P., Warden, Sorell.</li> <li>35. Mr. T. J. A. Frankcomb, Victoria, Huon.</li> <li>36. Mr. W. A. Kidd, Evandale.</li> <li>37. A. Blackwood, Esq., Three Hut Point.</li> <li>38. James Laffer, Esq., Port Cygnet.</li> <li>39. Rev. Wm. Richardson, Avoca.</li> <li>40. Rev. Edward Freeman, Brown's River.</li> <li>41. Thos. Cruttenden, Esq., J.P., Prosser's Plains.</li> <li>42. Robt. Clerk, Esq., J.P., Warden, Fingal.</li> <li>43. John Meredith, Esq., M.H.A., Warden, Glamorgan.</li> <li>44. Mr. F. Lipscombe, Sandy Bay.</li> <li>45. Rev. George Wright, Hamilton.</li> <li>46. Captain Fenton, Fenton Forest.</li> <li>47. Thos. Grove, Esq., Long Bay.</li> <li>48. J. S. Dandridge, Esq., Oyster Cove.</li> <li>49. George Wilson, Esq., J.P., Oatlands.</li> <li>50. Rev. John Burrowes, Pontville.</li> <li>51. W. A. B. Jamieson, Esq., J.P., Warden, New Norfolk.</li> </ol> |
|--|---|

[The figures indicate the parties whose Answers are given to the several Questions as they correspond with those in the list above.]

*Query 1. What knowledge have you of the working of the Public Schools in your neighbourhood?*

1. That which I have obtained during the past six months; but I have had 14 or 15 years' experience in watching the Schools of the Colony.
2. Such as may be obtained by sometimes visiting the Schools in my neighbourhood, and by conversing with the Conductors.
3. I am special visitor, and regularly visit them.
4. I am one of the resident Clergymen in the District.
5. I am well acquainted with the condition of the two Schools in my own Parish.
6. There is but one School in the Carrick District, two having been closed by the Board of Education since the beginning of the year. My knowledge of the Carrick School is confined to an occasional visit.
7. I visit frequently, and give religious instruction in the Trinity Hill School. I also visit occasionally the Murray-street Infant School. I know pretty well the working of the former.
8. My knowledge arises principally from a free intercourse with parents whose children are taught in the Schools, and with their children in their Sabbath School.
9. That obtained by frequently visiting the Public School established by the Board of Education at St. Michael's, West Tamar.
10. I am special visitor of the School at Swansea, and occasionally, but not often, visit two other Schools in the District.
11. I think the Public School works pretty well.
12. Such as may be obtained from a pretty regular weekly visit to the Kempton and Constitution Hill Schools. My visits have been specially for biblical instruction, but the general progress of the School has always been a matter of interest.
13. From constant visits to the Schools my knowledge is considerable.
14. I think a fair knowledge.
15. I only know the School in Longford, but of that I can speak from constant personal observation.
16. A fair average knowledge.
17. Twelve years' attendance as a special visitor.
18. Complete knowledge of the working of Schools in this isolated locality.
19. I visit them frequently.
20. I have a practical knowledge.
21. Visiting those in my Parish at least twice a month, at uncertain times.
22. Sufficient.
23. Such as I have acquired by visiting them for the last 16 years—for many years as special visitor.
24. I frequently visit the School, and approve the method pursued.
25. As one of the special visitors appointed by the Board of Education I periodically visit the Hagley School.
26. My knowledge is gained from occasional visits to the School, and from what I gather from the parents of the pupils.
27. What I acquire in frequently visiting the Schools in the neighbourhood.
28. I have had a good opportunity of observing the one in this District; I think it works well.
29. But a limited knowledge.
30. Not a very intimate one.
31. I have taken considerable interest in the School lately established in my neighbourhood, and I believe the working all that can be desired.

32. From living near one, and visiting others occasionally.
33. I am appointed a special visitor.
34. In following answers.
35. My experience in this respect is most favorable.
36. I have been a Teacher under the Board for nearly 12 years, and therefore know something of the working of the one here.
37. I have visited the School once a month, and sometimes twice, during the last 3 years.
38. As special visitor.
39. My knowledge is obtained from being the only resident Minister of Religion on this Township. But having been requested by the Board of Education to act as visitor, it became my duty some time back to forward to the Board a complaint formally made to me of a serious nature by one of the parents. Since which time I have not visited the School as before. My reasons would require too long an explanation.
40. I have had considerable knowledge and experience, having been in this Colony connected with Government Schools for more than 30 years, and always having taken an active interest in Education.
41. Occasional visits.
42. My knowledge of the working of the Public School at Fingal has been chiefly obtained from general report, and the fact of being frequently brought in contact with the children, as also the parents of those attending the School.
43. I have from time to time made it my business to enquire into the management, &c. of each Public School in Glamorgan.
44. Being a special visitor of the School, and living only a few yards from it, I have a full knowledge of the working of our Public School.
45. I have had two Public Schools in my Parish for the last 21 years. One I have visited twice a week, and the other twice or thrice in each month. My remarks will apply solely to Country Schools.
46. There is but one School in this neighbourhood, which is occasionally visited by members of my family and visitors. The Mistress is attentive to her duties.
47. I feel satisfied that the Public School in this neighbourhood is, and has been for the last eight years, well conducted, and from the general conduct of the children has proved most beneficial.
48. I have acted as special visitor to the Public School at Oyster Cove since its formation.
49. Only of one School.
50. I have been 26 years in the Colony, have had the Schools under my sole management for a considerable portion of that time, and have still official access to those in my immediate neighbourhood.
51. Very little.

Query 2. *Do these Schools appear to you to make sufficient provision for the education of the children in your neighbourhood?*

1. The Public School in St. John's Parish cannot accommodate all the children of the neighbourhood.
2. They do; that is, each makes sufficient provision within a circle having a radius of (say) three miles.
3. Yes.
4. With the exception of Girls' Schools, where music, &c. are required (of which there are two, kept by widow ladies), I think they do.
5. For the education of children in the *immediate* neighbourhood.
6. No.
7. The Public and Private Schools together render, I think, sufficient provision.
8. Yes.
9. Yes, at the present time.
10. There are many isolated families beyond the reach of the Schools at present established.
11. There is no complaint made.
12. They do not. Many of the children of the poorest are not sent, while those who can afford to send their children to Private Schools almost invariably do so.
13. They do.
14. In the abstract, yes; but practically the Public School is not attended to meet the intention of the Legislature.
15. This School provides, I think, sufficiently for Longford, but not altogether for the neighbourhood.
16. Yes.
17. On the township, yes. Not in the surrounding neighbourhood.
18. Not at present. The difficulty is, in scattered populations, to secure the attendance of 20 children, without which a School is not established.
19. The machinery appears to be sufficient for the secular education of the children.
20. I think so.
21. Yes, excepting the pariahs chiefly living in the lowest part of the town.
22. No.
23. In and about Westbury, yes. In the outlying districts, no.
24. Yes, I believe they do.
25. Quite sufficient.
26. They do.
27. Ample.
28. Yes.
29. Yes, for that portion of the community for which these Schools are, or should be, established.
30. Yes.
31. Quite sufficient.
32. They do.
33. Yes.
34. Yes, where sufficiently near to the residence of the pupils.
35. I believe they do.
36. Sufficient provision.
37. Yes.
38. They do not.
39. I consider they do, if the rules of the Board were strictly observed.
40. They make provision to a great extent, yet alterations might make them more efficient.
41. I think they do.
42. Ample.
43. In the vicinity of existing Public Schools, yes. But in all Glamorgan, no.
44. Yes.
45. They do.
46. Yes.



47. The School in this neighbourhood is good, but many children do not attend to receive instruction.  
 48. Yes.  
 49. Yes.  
 50. There are five Public and one Private Schools in this neighbourhood, within five miles of my church. They are all of the one class, and afford ample means for elementary education.  
 51.

Query 3. *Can you state approximately the number of children between the ages of four and seven, and seven and twelve, respectively, not attending any School?*

1. About 30 of the first, and 35 or 40 of the second.  
 2. It must be always fluctuating. I could not venture upon any approximate number; but I think that about a fifth part of those who ought to attend do not.  
 3. Cannot say, owing to the extensive district and its scattered population.  
 4. I cannot; but there are not many, in my opinion, between the ages of seven and twelve not attending any School.  
 5. I could not state the number.  
 6. There are three Private Schools in Carrick. It is, therefore, quite impossible to answer this question, except by visiting every house and obtaining the required information. I am ready to do this, if the information here asked for is particularly required.  
 7. No.  
 8. I only know that many children do not attend.  
 9. There are only a few within reach of the School who do not attend during those months of the year when the roads are passable and the weather mild.  
 10. At Swansea, about 12 from seven to twelve years of age, and 9 from four to seven years.  
 11. There are a great many children of the former ages whose parents are not able to send them decently to School, and therefore keep them at home.  
 12.  
 13. I should think there are about twelve in all.  
 14. Almost all Catholic children in this township (Campbell Town) attend some School: there are exceptions, however.  
 15. There are a considerable number in the neighbourhood, particularly to the north of Longford proper.  
 16. I cannot.  
 17. At a rough guess only, and of all ages, there may be 90 such children, in the township and within a radius of six miles.  
 18. On the township very few. In the Forest and bush the majority.  
 19. Not conveniently, just now.  
 20. Twenty between the ages of four and seven, and 22 between the ages of seven and twelve.  
 21.  
 22. No.  
 23. No.  
 24. I cannot state exactly, but should imagine about 20.  
 25. I am unable to answer this.  
 26. I believe almost every child of the age of four years and upwards, within a radius of three miles of the School-house, who can be spared from assisting their parents in farming operations, attend the Deddington School.  
 27. I cannot say unless making enquiry.  
 28. I have been informed that there are upwards of 40 children between four and twelve at the Upper Huon not attending any School.  
 29. By the Census of 1861 it would appear there were 120 between four and twelve: the number at present I cannot state, even approximately.  
 30. I am not able.  
 31. We have very few between the respective ages of four and seven, and seven and twelve, that do not attend School.  
 32. I should say half the children do not attend—perhaps more.  
 33. I know of none but attend occasionally.  
 34. No; but there are many, very many.  
 35. I think the number very few, but I am unable to answer the question exactly.  
 36. I have no doubt that there are 30 from four to twelve.  
 37. Four to seven, 14; seven to twelve, 18: total, 32. Exact number.  
 38. Fifteen of the former, and 25 of the latter.  
 39. I cannot; but I think about one-half of the children of the township (not exceeding twelve years) are not in attendance at the School.  
 40. Unanswerable.  
 41. There are a considerable number; but am unable to state particularly.  
 42. At Fingal there are 17 between the ages of four and seven; 26 between the ages of seven and twelve.  
 43. I cannot; but can obtain the information, if required. But is it intended *all* children, or only those for whom Public Schools are provided? And where is the line to be drawn?  
 44. From the Watch-house, Sandy Bay, to the old Station on the Brown's River Road, as far as I know, there are about 8 from four to seven, and about 4 from seven to twelve.  
 45. About 20 between four and seven, and 15 between seven and twelve.  
 46. There are 73 children between the ages of four and seven, and 11 between the ages of seven and twelve, belonging to families I do know; but there may be others I am not aware of.  
 47.  
 48. Thirteen between four and seven. Of these, six are thought too young for the state of the roads; one was withdrawn through a dispute with the Master respecting fees; one is taught at home; two from want of decent clothes; three said to be required at home. Fourteen between the ages of seven and twelve. Of these, three are taught at home; three were withdrawn through a dispute about the fees, or rather through bad temper; one from want of decent clothes; and seven said to be required at home. The whole reside within a radius of two miles.  
 49. No.  
 50. The proportion of absentees between the specified ages, four and twelve, is very small,—I think not ten per cent. of the whole.  
 51. No.

Query 4. *What are the causes, so far as you know them, of the non-attendance of the Children mentioned in the last question?*

1. They are kept away for all sorts of frivolous reasons, or for no reason, just because their parents do not care a straw what becomes of them.

2. Children living at a distance of more than three miles from school can scarcely be expected to attend, especially in winter. As for those nearer who do not attend, I can only attribute it to the criminal indifference of the parents.

3. Distance from schools, and in some cases neglect.

4. The non-attendance is to be accounted for partly from the non-appreciation by some of the benefits arising from education, partly from the distance of the children from the schools, but chiefly, I believe, among the lower classes from the poverty and improvidence of the parents.

5. There is a considerable number of children scattered through the bush, too far for attendance at our Schools.

6. Neglect on the part of the parents, poverty, and the employment of the children at home in nursing the younger children.

7. Many children are kept at home to be useful in house-work; others, a smaller number, because the parents cannot get clothes for them; a still smaller number through the mere neglect of vicious parents; a few because they are taught at home.

8. The vice and indifference of the parents.

9. Some parents consider the condition of the building used as a school-room unfit for occupation during the winter months. To the School there is no objection.

10. Poverty, to some extent; but chiefly the dissipated habits of the parents.

11. Of the other class, some are kept at home for the value of their labour.

12. Poverty and indifference of parents; or, on the other hand, dislike of the mixture of classes.

13. In two cases, severity of a master; in others usefulness of the children at home, and indifference of parents about education at all.

14. Poverty on the part of parents not being able to clothe their children, and also neglect; the desire also to send their children to work and earn for their parents.

15. Distance; some children do attend the School from some distance to the North and South, but others cannot. Some children also in Longford cannot go to any school for want of clothes.

16. The indifference of the parents; and, in some cases, poverty.

17. Poverty, carelessness of parents, and distance of place.

18. The scattered character of the population.

19. Want of clothing principally.

20. The want of decent clothes in some instances, but generally the neglect of the parents.

21. Chiefly the low character and indifference of the parents.

22. 1st. Poverty of parents who cannot afford to pay fees, and are unwilling to place their children upon a different footing from others in the school; and, this partly from false pride, partly because they fancy that children admitted free will not be properly attended to. 2nd. Some are kept at home to help their parents. 3rd. Some live at too great a distance.

23. Poverty of parents and want of clothes generally, the children of 11 or 12 years of age being found useful at home. Were these children supplied with clothes when within a reasonable distance of a school, they would attend.

24. The poverty of the parents, which obliges them to employ their children in field labour.

25. Inability or unwillingness on the part of the parents to pay the fees, and a desire to retain the services of the elder children for domestic purposes.

26. This is answered by No. 3.

27. I cannot say unless making enquiry.

28. Because there is neither school nor master.

29. See answer to question No. 3.

30. The children are detained at home by the parents for the work of their farms.

31. Distance, and the danger attending young children walking through the bush.

32. Want of means combined with parental neglect.

33. I know of none but attend occasionally.

34. In some cases the distance is too great; in some, as small farmers, the value of the children's labour; in most the apathy of the parents.

35. The great distance from the school is the chief reason. I am not aware of others.

36. Nothing but the indifference of the parents, for their circumstances are equal to those of the parents who do send them. One woman, a little time ago, who had left her husband and gone to service, sent two, paying for one and I taking the other free. She rejoined him lately, and now both boys are away from school. I cannot tell the reason.

37. Indifference on the part of the parents. A few of the above will attend the school when the roads are better, as they are covered in mud at present.

38. The great distance from the Public School.

39. I think the chief cause is the private charges for tuition and books, &c.

40. Generally, indifference shown by parents for the education of their children, coupled with a desire to avail themselves of the labour of their children.

41. Indifference of parents, and some residing a distance of from three to four miles from the school.

42. In many cases a disregard of education for their children by parents, and preferring often the services of their children at home; but more frequently the drunken, dissolute habits of parents.

43. The great distance from any Public School, though a few instances do occur of disinclination to pay fees, or inability to do so.

44. Those from 4 to 7 are detained at home, the parents not being able to pay for all their children, and not being willing to send them as free pupils. Those from 7 to 12 employed at work.

45. Some parents have grown-up daughters who instruct the younger children. Some do not send their children to school until they are 5 or 6. Others give occasional instruction themselves for an hour or two in the evening; and a few are utterly indifferent as regards education.

46. Poverty and ignorance.

47. In some cases poverty, but more commonly from indifference on the part of the parents.

48. See answer to No. 3.

49.

50. In some cases poverty, displayed in the want of decent clothing.

51. Not known.

Query 5. *Can you suggest any means of securing the attendance of those children who ought to be, but are not, receiving instruction?*

1. By a compulsory clause inserted in an "Education Bill" by the Parliament.

2. See answer to query No. 9.

3. Without contradicting my answer of No. 9, it might be made competent for the special visitors to present to some Civil Tribunal any parent who wilfully neglected education.

4. The most effectual means would be, in certain cases, to reduce the school fees so as to render the payment easy to the poorest. I am decidedly opposed to the abolition of fees. Education, like everything else, if furnished gratuitously will be little valued; and I know it to be a fact that when fees were charged the attendance of the children was regular, and that after they had been remitted their attendance was exceedingly irregular.

5. I know no means except the establishment of additional schools, built and supported by the State.

6. I know of no means of compelling parents to send their children against their inclination. If the school fees were paid, the excuse would be want of clothes.

7. No.

8. No.

9.

10. Imposing a school-rate on the parents whether the children attend or not, or placing the children on the free list, might perhaps secure their attendance.

11. See the reasons above stated.

12. Private and personal explanation of the requirements of the Board of Education may do something, for very few understand the rules regarding fees.

13. I cannot.

14. A fully gratuitous education, and I am inclined to think, compulsion on the part of the Government.

15. Another school is much required in the neighbourhood called Muddy Plains.

16. A compulsory system.

17. One means would be the establishment of Bush Schools, with active teachers who would go round to the various families and induce parents to send their children.

18. The only chance, since it is the only way of rendering it possible, is to send the teachers to them, *i.e.*, to their neighbourhood. Are itinerant teachers in the bush possible—teaching on alternate weeks in different localities? If not, a gratuity to some resident, who would be generally a female, of say £20 a year, might have the desired effect; her school being liable to inspection.

19.

20. Compulsory education, when it can be shown that the parents are able to procure the necessary clothing for their children.

21. Only by pressure on the parents.

22. Not under the present system.

23.

24. I know of none.

25. I know of no other means than by lowering the fees, already very trifling.

26. This is answered in No. 3.

27. I cannot say unless making enquiry.

28. Only by establishing a school in that neighbourhood.

29. See answer to question No. 3.

30. No, except by compulsory education as exercised on the Continent of Europe.

31.

32. Nothing but a law of compulsion.

33. I know of none but attend occasionally.

34. Making the attendance, where practicable, obligatory on the parents.

35.

36. I have suggested the formation of a Committee of influential persons to overlook the wants of the district in this respect, with funds to provide an education for those who might be really in poor circumstances.

37. I have tried persuasion, but of no use. The only plan would be to compel the parents to send them.

38. By having more Schools conducted by Mistresses at low salaries.

39. A strict adherence to the table of fees in all cases, as well to meet the circumstances of parents, as to prevent the idea of partiality towards those children whose parents are able to pay larger fees.

40. I would recommend, on the one hand, that 3d. per head should be allowed to parents of poor families for each day they attended the Public School, provided they attended four out of the five days per week. But, on the other hand, I would recommend the Government to impose a fine on the parents of all children not attending Government or Private Schools, or not being adequately instructed. Extrême cases must be exempted.

41. I cannot.

42. None, unless a system of compulsory education.

43. Establishment of Public Schools at such places as a more equitable distribution of the funds will justify.

44. None.

45. Those belonging to the last-mentioned class of parents might be secured as pupils under the free admission system; but I think that would create discontent, and be felt as an injustice by hardworking, industrious parents who pay school fees.

46.

47. By endeavouring to excite the interest of the parents. (*Vide 24.*)

48. Not unless compulsory means be adopted. Every legitimate means has been tried without success; several of the younger ones, however, will attend as they grow older.

49. None, except by compulsory law.

50. In each of the Schools there are children who pay no fees, the teachers displaying an almost uncalled-for generosity; but the desire of instruction is tolerably manifest in all, and needs no stimulus.

51. Compulsory.

Query 6. *What amount of local supervision is given to the Schools?*

1. I am special visitor. Mrs. Gelliband also inspects the needlework.

2. Very little, except from time to time by Ministers of Religion.

3. None except my own.

4. The Clergymen are in the habit of visiting the Schools. They are also visited occasionally by the Magistrates and the Parents, or others interested in the children, but the supervision is little more than nominal.

5. There is some but not sufficient local supervision.

6. I am, as far as I know, the only resident who ever visits Carrick School, and I have seldom done so during the last three years, not wishing to have to report to the Board of Education,—a matter well known to the Inspector of Schools.

7. None of which I am aware, my own visits don't amount to supervision.

8. They are visited by most of the Clergy, and occasionally by other friends of Education.

9. This School is visited by myself as the Chaplain of the Church of England about once a week, occasionally by a Chaplain of the Church of Rome from Launceston, and occasionally by parents of the children in attendance.

10. The Presbyterian Minister and myself visit the School weekly, other residents occasionally.

11. Pretty fair.

12. In the Kempton School there are two regular visitors, each of whom visits once a week. In the Constitution Hill School there are four besides myself. The visits, however, are by no means so frequent.
13. They are visited by myself chiefly; occasionally the Magistrates of the District attend.
14. The visits and inspection of Clergymen and others.
15. It is chiefly by myself. I attend every week. I am constantly passing the School.
16. None as far as I know.
17. The Church of England and Roman Catholic Clergymen are the only regular visitors at present to the Public School at New Norfolk.
- 18.
19. The Priest and the Minister (Church of England) frequently visit the Jerusalem School, occasionally other persons; the other two Schools are rarely visited by any body but the Priest.
20. On the part of the Clergyman a large amount of supervision is given to the Schools.
21. I notice only the Town Missionary and myself.
22. Visited by the Clergy, and by some Sectarian Ministers, also by a few of the lay residents.
23. A special visitor generally calls at each of the Schools once a week. They are occasionally visited by non-resident Clergymen and other visitors to the District.
24. The Clergyman of the District and myself are the principal visitors.
25. I am not aware of any other than that afforded by the Clergyman and the special visitors.
26. The School is visited by the inhabitants and the Clergymen occasionally.
27. The Clergyman and special visitors attend periodically.
28. Very little.
29. It would appear last year the number of visits by local inspection was 35, and by the Inspector of Schools 2.
30. I am not aware, but I think very little.
31. A fair amount of visitors.
32. Comparatively none.
33. Four visitors and the Rev. G. B. Smith devote as much of their time as convenient.
34. I ought to know, but do not.
35. Moderately good.
36. No actual supervision, Mr. Russell is the chief visitor.
37. I visit the School once a month, and sometimes others in the neighbourhood.
38. Very little.
39. I believe there is none.
40. Visits and inspections made by Mr. District Constable Scott and myself. I examine the children in the various branches, and scold some and encourage others; such visits strengthen the hands of the Master.
41. Very few casual visitors.
42. Little or none, unless by the Clergyman, the latter only occasionally.
43. The Public Schools are visited by the Clergy and others taking an interest therein, but they have no power to interfere, and properly so too.
44. The School is visited by the special visitors and the Rev. B. Smith.
45. I am the only regular visitor, other persons look in occasionally.
46. I refer to the first question and register of the visitors to the School.
47. Not much.
48. There are two special visitors who pay frequent visits, and occasionally examine one or other of the classes.
49. Limited.
50. But very little.
51. The Clergymen visit.

*Query 7. What is the general opinion prevailing in the neighbourhood as to the value of the instruction imparted at these Schools?*

1. The general impression is, that the Public School works much good.
2. I think the parents are pretty well satisfied. The public generally do not visit, and have no means of forming an opinion.
3. Opinions differ; on the whole satisfactory.
4. The general opinion (at least among those who are capable of forming an opinion) is decidedly favourable.
5. The people are well satisfied with our principal School.
6. Great dissatisfaction has for a long time been expressed in this village at the incompetency of the Mistress of the Public School to perform her duties, owing to her peculiar state of mind. It is to this that I chiefly refer in my previous answer.
7. I believe that people generally know nothing and care nothing about it. Those that do are, I think, pretty well satisfied with it.
8. The general opinion is favourable.
9. There is no public opinion in this portion of the District of West Tamar on the subject. There was a strong sense of the urgent need of education for the children of the neighbourhood, and there is a general feeling of gratitude for the instruction imparted at the Public School.
10. I believe people are generally satisfied.
11. I hear of no objection raised.
12. The general opinion as to the value of the instruction given is not unfavourable:—the thinness of attendance is attributable to other causes for which neither the Master nor the system can be held accountable altogether.
13. Good.
14. Whatever is the cause, the education of the Public Schools is not valued by the people.
15. That the boys' department is most efficiently conducted, and that the instruction generally is good.
16. That a sound education may be obtained where regularity of attendance can be relied upon.
17. Of the Boys' School—good, of the Girls'—not so favourable.
18. It is not held in very high esteem.
19. The value of the instruction is variously estimated, but the prevailing opinion is a favourable one.
20. Generally speaking, the parents of the children attach much value to the instruction imparted in these Schools.
21. Nothing can be better than the conduct of Mr. Leach's School to which I refer—but the public, religious or lay, take no interest in them.
22. I fear that it is not appreciated as it deserves.
23. I think the opinion is generally favourable as regards the District.
24. Generally speaking, they are much appreciated.
- 25.
26. The Deddington School has since its commencement given great satisfaction, both to the parents of the children and the visitors.
27. Good.
28. Very favourable.

29. I have heard none expressed.
30. The general opinion seems to be favourable, but the parents as a body undervalue Education.
31. Parents express themselves satisfied and grateful, and consider the instruction imparted a great boon.
32. The general opinion is in their favour.
33. Generally considered as of great importance to the neighbourhood and families.
34. High, if I may believe the regret expressed by those who cannot avail themselves of it, and the fact that I never hear complaints.
35. Favourable.
36. They are bound to admit that a thorough substantial Education is given.
37. Very good.
38. Good.
39. Some parents are satisfied, and some express a contrary feeling. I consider the Master an efficient Teacher and disciplinarian.
40. Among the higher and more respectable classes education is duly valued, and the instruction imparted at these Schools is considered satisfactory, but among a few of the worst families the education now offered is not appreciated, and upon the slightest interference or correction, which must necessarily be exercised by the Master to keep up regularity and the credit of the School, the Parents unjustifiably withhold their children, under a pretext that their children shall not be subjected to undue severity or unnecessary interference.
41. Sufficient for the class of children.
42. Generally appreciated as sound, useful, and sufficient.
43. Many are of opinion that it is not necessary that a superior education should be provided by the State for the poor or labouring classes—and that those who require a superior education for their children should pay for the same.
44. Highly appreciated.
45. Favourable.
46. I believe there is general satisfaction with regard to the instruction given, but it is impossible for the Mistress to attend to needlework and other instruction without the aid of a male assistant.
47. Highly valued by many.
48. Satisfactory.
49. Good.
50. I have heard of no complaint, save in the case of one or two who wish for a classical Education for their sons at the Government price of the free Schools.
- 51.

Query 8. *State generally what appear to you to be the advantages or defects in the working of the Public School system in your District.*

1. I think the efficiency of the School might be greatly increased here as elsewhere by a stronger local interest, to be obtained by the appointment of a local committee.
2. The advantage is, they give respectively a good education to at least four-fifths of the children within a circle of six miles diameter. Their defect is, that they are not supplemented by itinerating masters to teach the scattered families in the intermediate country; the country I mean lying outside of their respective circles.
3. The advantages are quite equal to those in other Districts, as far as I have seen. The defects are also the same as elsewhere.
4. The advantages are obvious. Education is easily accessible to all. The defects, where they exist, are due partly to a want of tact and ability in the Teachers, but chiefly to the apathy of Parents, who attach little importance to regularity of attendance on the part of their children, thus preventing the Teachers from admitting such absentees into their proper classes.
- 5.
6. It has never had a fair trial since I came into the District. In Illawarra District, until the decrease of population made it necessary to close the School, the present system worked well, and was generally approved of.
- 7.
8. My attention has not been called to any marked peculiarity in my District. Judging generally of the system, it may be pronounced inexpensive as compared with a Denominational system, and, for secular purposes, equally efficient. It also opens the school to religious teaching and influence.
- 9.
10. The non-attendance of many children in the immediate neighbourhood of the Schools is the great evil.
- 11.
12. We have in Kempton 3 or 4 small Private Schools which should have no existence if the working of the Public School were satisfactory. In this School there should be a competent female teacher for the whole day, and not only (as now) for afternoons' instruction in sewing. I hear of no complaints except that the very young do not get on as they ought to do, and that the moral standard of some of the poorest is such that parents cannot allow their children to go.
13. In my opinion the advantages of these Schools to the poor are everything that could be wished. The defects consist principally in want of stated inspection, and the restriction laid on visitors of non-interference by advice or suggestion.
14. Poor parents think their children are often neglected. Parents able to pay object to their children mixing with others, the children of the lower class.
15. The great advantage is that a better education is provided for the children of poor parents than they could provide for themselves.
16. Education is placed within the reach of the poor, but many do not take advantage of the facility afforded.
17. There have been defects of discipline and classification, which might be partly owing to small and inconvenient school premises. These may, I hope, be obviated in the new and spacious building just entered upon.
18. In an isolated spot like Circular Head where there is no Private School for Boys, and none within a hundred miles and more, and where a master can learn nothing from neighbouring Teachers, the great requirement is a trained Teacher. A Teacher who might have been adequate to the requirements of a place when the scholars numbered 20 may not be where they numbered 100. The great evil in the present system, in my opinion, is the not classifying the Schools properly and transferring Teachers in accordance with such classification; and secondly, in a too rigid adherence by the Board to regulations and principles applicable to Hobart Town, perhaps, but not to this neighbourhood.
19. I would rather not.
20. The great defect in these Schools appears to me to be the little provision made for the religious education of the children.
- 21.
22. I consider the present system altogether unsuitable, but chiefly because it does not supply local wants or excite local interest.

23. In the neighbourhood of the Schools the advantages are great, for all children may receive a good rudimental education there. The outlying Districts are generally deprived of this great benefit. The children, consequently, in too many instances are allowed to grow up without education.

24. The system pursued in teaching the children I consider to be a good one.

25. There being no other Schools in the District, public or private, the advantages are of course very great,—there not being as far as I am aware any defects in the working of the Public School system, although the repeated change of Masters in the Hagley School has operated very prejudicially.

26. The advantages are all in favour of the present School system: all the parents so far as I am aware are pleased with it,—this is so far as the Master and his system of teaching are concerned.

27. The present management appears all that is required for the District.

28. Advantages, the only means we have of educating our children. Defects, nothing to speak of.

29. The advantages are obvious; as to defects, I am not aware of any.

30. The system is good, and not generally defective.

31. The advantages as above stated. Defects, *nil*.

32. Want of inspection.

33. It works well under the present efficient Master.

34. A general advantage, but I am not sufficiently acquainted with the system to name any special defects.

35. I am not aware of any disadvantages.

36. The advantages are, that a substantial education is within the reach of the very poorest, for my charges range from fifteen shillings to nothing per quarter; and those of the more wealthy can, with extra charge and extra time, get an education fitting them to take an honorable position at any of the colleges they may choose afterwards to attend. The defects are the too lengthened period the School is open during the year, the want of fixed periods for entering School, and the liberty to enter and leave whenever they think fit, all tending to create such irregularity as to defy the proper working of any School. Wherein would the superiority of the Superior Schools lie if they were carried on on the same system?

37. There is a great advantage, the few that could pay fees could not support a School, so both classes are educated together.

38. I consider the advantages very great; the defects but small.

39. The absence of authoritative local supervision, and the superficial knowledge which an Inspector can acquire on a hasty and occasional visit, are among the defects. The advantages that occur to me are,—the Board being free from local prejudices, a select and competent body to select Teachers and decide questions submitted; also the aid secured to localities which from the paucity of inhabitants would be unable from School fees alone to maintain an efficient Master; and to a certain extent the protection and independence which that aid affords the Master against local changes and jealousies.

40. The advantage is, that with a good Master the amount of instruction, as now imparted, is sufficient for local requirements. The chief defect is in not providing education in thinly inhabited localities.

41. Those children who attend the Public School also attend the Sunday School, which works a wholesome influence.

42. The advantages are, that parents can give their children a most excellent education at very trifling cost to themselves. The benefits also of moral training the children who attend the School receive are, generally speaking, very evident in comparison with those who do not. The defect of system being the fact of the country paying for such expensive Educational Establishments, whilst a very large proportion of children do not attend the Public School, and the parents of a very great many of those who do attend could afford to pay for education: in fact the want of power to compel attendance.

43. 1st. There is practically no distinction made between the really poor man and one who can afford to pay for the education of his children, each demanding as a right to send his children at the lowest fee. This has occurred at the Swansea School when Mr. Barlow was master. 2nd. The absence of a local body to examine into trivial complaints made by or against the Schoolmaster, &c., to report to the Board of Education also. To have the power to fix the fees, as per scale approved, at which the children of parents in different circumstances, or at such distances that the children cannot attend regularly, should be admitted; and 3rdly. The power of parents without any justifiable reason to take their children from School, with a view to starve out the Schoolmaster (as has been done here), by which the children suffer and the system is abused.

44. Advantages that we get in the neighbourhood,—An education for our children which we could not get unless by sending them to Hobart Town. Defects; I see none.

45. Its advantages are obvious, as it affords an education amply sufficient for various classes of the community from the tradesman to the labourer. A stricter regard to results as bearing upon the Master's salary might impair the working of the system.

46. This question can be more correctly answered by the Inspector of Schools.

47. The present system does not induce sufficient local interest. Parents of pauper children will not send their children because their doing so would be right in abstract.

48. It provides a sufficient general education up to a certain point for all classes and creeds; its principal defect seems to be its permitting so many to be deprived of its benefits through the mere caprice, pride, or ignorance of parents.

49.

50. They are open to all, without exception. This, however, is no change for better or worse from the system in the old time. The great advantage is, the having a better class of Teachers, secured by having a greater certainty of pay.

51.

Query 9. *Would it be expedient or practicable, in your opinion, to make it compulsory upon Parents to send their Children (not attending other Schools) to the Public Schools?*

1. Yes, most expedient and thoroughly practicable. Look at the United States and Prussia. A compulsory clause would not in the least interfere with the "liberty of the subject."

2. With reference to Questions Nos. 5 and 9, I should say it would be highly expedient could it be done; but it is only the worst class who neglect instruction, and what could you do in the way of compelling those who have nothing and care for nothing? Send them to gaol, and their children would run about the streets.

3. I should say not.

4. Even were it practicable, I do not think it would be expedient to make education compulsory. It would render it odious in the estimation of those who stand most in need of it.

5. Employers might be obliged to send children in their service to School (when there is one within reach) for a part of the day.

6. Such a Law, in my opinion, amongst Englishmen would be inoperative.

7. I think it would be expedient and practicable to enforce the attendance of children who are now absent only through the neglect of their parents. I would recommend an enactment of the Legislature making such neglect criminal, and imposing penalties,

8. No system can secure the attendance of all classes of children, nor would I make attendance compulsory: a power given to the Magistrate to compel might be greatly abused. Only in the case of juvenile offenders against the Law, and of children habitually begging, should liberty be interfered with; and for these a Reformatory should be provided.

9. I think it would be expedient to make it compulsory on parents, living within three miles of the School, to send their children between the ages of four and nine to the Public School. Between these ages they could be taught the rudiments of Education, and afterwards could avail themselves of Evening Schools. It is not unfrequently pleaded by the poor that they cannot support their children without their help in work. But as crime is proportioned to ignorance, it may be the duty of the State to prohibit the employment of children between the ages of four and nine at daily work, and to require their attendance at the Public Schools. It is much that society may suffer by their ignorance, and much that they may personally suffer from the same cause. It is sometimes said that society may suffer the more by the training of certain classes in the Public Schools. Education may increase the skill of individual thieves, but Education must diminish the number of thieves.

10. I believe compulsory attendance to be the only trustworthy remedy, although perhaps it would be regarded as un-English.

11. If parents were compelled to do so, the Schools would be better attended.

12. I think it would be both expedient and practicable. The reasons for it seem to me immeasurably to exceed in importance what can be brought against it. I know many cases where the children must grow up in ignorance and vice through the drunkenness and immorality of the parents.

13. I think that it would be very unwise.

14. I think so, if practicable.

15. I think not, unless it were accompanied by a provision for clothing.

16. See answer to Question 5.

17. Not practicable in the bush, and of very doubtful expediency even on the Township.

18. No.

19. I don't think it would be expedient.

20. In my opinion it would be highly expedient, and also practicable, to make it compulsory upon parents to send their children to the Public Schools.

21. Yes, to some School.

22. No; unless exception were made in favour of the upper classes.

23. I think it would be both expedient and practicable, but in many cases they should be supplied with clothes. A decrease of crime, and a higher moral feeling, would be, I think, the result.

24. I do not consider that such a measure would work satisfactorily.

25. Neither, I should say.

26. I think not.

27. If it can be done, decidedly so.

28. Here, compulsion is not needed, all attend who can.

29. Scarcely.

30. No, this would be invidious and distasteful: make compulsory education the rule, but not the exception.

31. I certainly have not as yet seen the expediency of such a measure. Parents seem but too anxious to have their children educated.

32. I am in favour of compulsory laws on this subject.

33. No.

34. *Vide No. 5.* I believe it to be practicable by legislation, but the trouble would be great to the local governing bodies or special board.

35. I think not, so far at least as this place is concerned.

36. I think some sort of compulsion ought to be exercised, for it seems to me unjust that the public should be compulsorily taxed for an object that is not secured to them—viz., an educated community.

37. Yes, otherwise they are brought up in ignorance, and will have nothing to guide them in the paths of virtue.

38. I believe it would be expedient, but am afraid not practicable.

39. I believe it would be inexpedient and impracticable to do so, nor would compulsion be necessary under such modifications and supervision as the present system would admit.

40. Yes, where children live within a certain distance of a Government School, but otherwise it would be impracticable. The Government compels paupers to provide food for their children, and when necessary assists them in so doing: similarly they ought to provide education for their children, and with this view I recommended in No. 5 an allowance of 3d. per head or a fine.

41. Some would feel it a hardship, their children being required on field labour.

42. I consider it both expedient and practicable.

43. I believe it would, and should be done; except where it can be shown that children receive private tuition of a certain standard.

44. Not in this neighbourhood.

45. I think not.

46. I do not believe it would.

47. It would be advisable to compel parents to send their children.

48. I think that making parents pay a certain weekly sum for children between certain ages would be sufficiently compulsory.

49. Yes.

50. I do not think it expedient. It might be practicable, but in this District it is not requisite.

51. Difference of opinion.

Query 10. *Does any harm result, in your opinion, from the intermixture of children from different ranks of life at the Government Schools?*

1. No.

2. None whatever.

3. None.

4. The intermixture (within the Schools) does good instead of harm.

5. No harm; but the advantages of (1) adding to the Master's income, and (2) making the School to be esteemed by the poor.

6. I have had no opportunity of judging. The children attending the School here are of much the same rank.

7. I think the intermixture beneficial to all classes.

8. No.

9. I think there can be no question about the harm resulting from the intermixture mentioned. The morals of certain classes are bad; and if the morals be under restraint, the manners are bad. The evil is very great. The children from certain families will contaminate many in a School. This evil seems to be unavoidable in the Public Schools.

10. No.
11. I am not aware of any.
12. So long as we have such parents, how can their children be other than depraved and accustomed to vile language? The intermixture of other children with them must be attended with evil consequences to the one class.
13. The children of the Schools I visit are all of the poor class; therefore I cannot say.
14. I think not, if the Master and Mistress are sufficiently careful.
15. I do not think it desirable, and I would not send my own children to such a School; but some other parents have not the same objection, and I do not know of any particular harm.
16. None, I believe.
17. There is little intermixture of this kind, if any, in the Public School here.
18. Harm arises to the children of the upper ranks,—their tone is lowered; but the School undoubtedly is benefited,—its tone being raised.
19. No, not in this quarter.
20. I think not.
21. No.
22. Such intermixture is rare, but is, I know, the cause of both good and evil: good to the children of the lower, evil to those of the upper, classes.
23. I have never seen or heard of any, nor can any arise from such a cause in a well-conducted School.
24. Not more so than in any other public institution.
25. None whatever in this district.
26. The harm is more than compensated by the advantages derived from the School.
27. None is likely to result, if cleanliness and the good behaviour of the pupils are looked after by the Master.
28. Good, rather than harm.
29. None that I have heard of or experienced personally.
30. I am not aware of any.
31. None whatever.
32. Harm to whom? To the children, I should say not.
33. None.
34. Not that I have seen; but I dare say the children of the man of influence are in some cases rather more favourably than those of the vile or very poor.
35. None whatever.
36. It is advantageous, rather than injurious.
37. No.
38. None.
39. In the cases where the relation of master and servant obtains in after years, the feeling of equality taught and enforced in the Schools in many ways is a bad foundation for the superstructure of subservience, obedience, and reverence required in after years; and here the admixture does harm, as I have seen. In other cases, generally, the grades of rank are not sufficiently defined to lead to the apprehension of any harm. I think the principle of our monarchical constitution would be a safe guide as to the encouragement of a recognition of ranks. The inequality in the School fees, from the varied means of the parents, I believe does harm and causes jealousies: at the same time it may require the combination of all classes in some localities to provide a sufficient emolument.
40. There may be some slight evils, but they cannot be avoided in country districts; neither do I think them of any great magnitude, provided a proper supervision be kept by the Master, to be extended to the conduct of the children both in and out of school.
41. None in this locality.
42. From my own personal experience I cannot say, but my feelings are strongly opposed to the admixture of children of extreme different ranks of life at the Government Schools.
43. None from intermixture, so far as I know; but an injustice or fraud is practised upon the public purse by demanding the right to have children educated at the low charges when parents are able to pay for the instruction of their children.
44. No, but much good.
45. I am afraid that the comparatively few children of the upper class who attend are injuriously affected, in a moral point of view, by the intermixture.
46. Not to my knowledge.
47. In my opinion, no.
48. I think not.
49. Where properly conducted, no harm.
50. I have heard complaints, and they have given rise to a private School, but the shades of difference between the classes are almost imperceptible amongst us.
- 51.

Query 11. *At the Public School or Schools in your neighbourhood, have you witnessed any separation of the pupils in reference to their different social position or circumstances, or any invidious distinctions calculated to repel children of the poorer classes from the School?*

1. No, not in the least.
2. None whatever.
3. No.
4. There are no such separation and invidious distinctions in any of the Public Schools in this District.
5. I have seen nothing of these abuses.
6. No.
7. No.
8. No.
9. No.
10. There is no cause for any complaint of that sort, and I have heard no such complaint.
11. No, I have not.
12. No.
- 13.
14. No.
15. No.
16. No.
17. No.
18. None whatever.
19. I have not.
20. I have not.
21. I never noticed or heard of such.
22. No.



23. I have never witnessed any such distinction or separation. The Master's independent position prevents that, generally.
24. Decidedly not.
25. No,—no instance in either case has ever come under my observation.
26. I have not.
27. None.
28. None whatever.
29. I have not noticed any, or heard of any invidious distinctions likely to cause such a result.
30. No; nor do I think any class distinctions exist.
31. I certainly have not, nor do I believe such invidious distinctions exist among children that attend Public Schools.
32. There are no distinctions, as far as I know.
33. No.
34. I do not believe that it exists to an extent to affect the value of the Schools. I think it is a good thing for the children of the poor when parents of a better grade send their children. Children have other things besides lessons to learn, decency and clean living.
35. None at all.
36. The thing has never been for one moment thought of.
37. No, all are treated alike.
38. I have not.
39. I have not.
40. No difference has ever been allowed, equal rights and equal privileges prevail, and equal attention is bestowed upon all classes alike.
41. I have not.
42. None whatever.
43. No, certainly not, but the reverse.
44. Not any.
45. I have not.
46. No.
47. Decidedly not.
48. None whatever.
49. All of one class.
50. I have not observed any of such serious character as to repel the children of the poorer classes from attending. I have never met with any cause for their absence except want of clothing.
51. None.

Query 12. *Do parents of the classes whose children, principally, are in attendance at the Public Schools generally attach a high value to the opportunities of Education afforded by these Schools, or are they in the habit of withdrawing their children from School for frivolous reasons?*

1. I think the advantages are fairly estimated.
2. It is too common a practice to keep children from School for frivolous reasons, or even to withdraw them altogether from mere caprice; but the labouring families of the better class attach a very high value to the means of instruction afforded to their children. I know a School where for years no child was ever absent except from illness. The attendance was scarcely ever 2 per cent. less than the number on the roll.
3. In the Country Schools there are few frivolous withdrawals, and Public Schools are looked upon as a boon. In the Township the School is not so regarded, and very slight reasons cause withdrawals, because of other Schools offering the opportunity of education elsewhere.
4. Parents generally do attach a value to the education afforded by these Schools. When children are withdrawn, the chief reasons are:—1st. Alleged inability to pay the fees. 2nd. Elder children are required at home, either to take charge of younger children or to assist their parents in their work.
5. Children are too often withdrawn or sent irregularly, but not, I think, owing to dissatisfaction with their teaching.
6. No; children are removed from School, even where free certificates have been granted, for frivolous reasons.
7. I think they generally attach a high value, but sometimes withdraw children for reasons I think frivolous.
8. I should say that the Public Schoolmasters have no more reason to complain of irregular attendance than Private Schoolmasters have.
9. The parents of the children in attendance at St. Michael's, West Tamar, attach a high value to the opportunities afforded their children.
10. Of course there is a great difference, but the majority appreciate the advantage of regular attendance.
11. Yes, they do attach a great value to the opportunities afforded by these Schools.
12. Many of the parents have little or no education themselves, and are in the habit of keeping their children at home, or of withdrawing them altogether from School, for reasons frivolous and insufficient.
13. I think that generally speaking parents are well satisfied with the instruction afforded in the Public Schools of the Colony.
14. They do not value the Public School, and frequently withdraw the children for frivolous reasons.
15. I think they do generally value the education which their children receive at the School.
16. I believe they attach great value to education, but unfortunately on the slightest grounds children are withdrawn from the Schools.
17. On the township they do appear to value these opportunities, generally speaking; but when there have been Public Schools in the outlying parts of the District, children have been withdrawn for frivolous reasons.
18. In this neighbourhood parents (especially the uneducated) seem to desire education for their children; but still children are removed from school for frivolous reasons.
19. Parents here attach much importance to the opportunities of education afforded whilst their children continue to improve.
20. Generally speaking, the parents attach much importance to the value of the education given by these Schools, yet in too many instances withdraw their children from school for very frivolous reasons.
21. I think they do, but the Master has a difficulty in securing regular attendance and punctuality when parents do not pay; but this is not always from indifference, but from difficulties arising from poverty and, more frequently, sickness in some of the family.
22. The latter.
23. Parents generally set great value on the opportunities thus afforded them for the education of their children. Some, however, withdraw them for frivolous causes from the Public Schools, and send them to the private ones.
24. Generally speaking, they do value such means of gaining instruction.
25. Generally, I fear, the advantages are not sufficiently appreciated, as some of the children are withdrawn on the slightest pretext. Such was the case until lately. Since the appointment of the present Master, however, a decided improvement is taking place.

26. All the parents whom I have heard speak of the Deddington School are very much satisfied.
27. Generally so, but I dare say some are withdrawn for various reasons.
28. See answer to question 9.
29. I believe generally the parents are satisfied, but in some instances they withdraw their children sooner than they should, in order that they may be made of use at home.
30. The parents generally, and as a body, do not attach sufficient importance to the advantages of education in their children, and are too frequently in the habit of withdrawing them from school, or not regularly sending them when they could with convenience do so.
31. I know of no instance where children have been withdrawn from frivolous or other reasons.
32. Parents appreciate the Schools, otherwise it is presumed they would not send their children to them. As to the second query, I am not aware.
33. I believe they attach a proper value to the opportunity of having their children educated.
34. *Vide* No. 7.—(Children are seldom withdrawn from frivolous reasons. It is wrong not to send them at all, but when sent in a tolerably regular manner I should be slow to blame the parents for occasional absence. To nurse the child, to mind the pigs, to drive the bullocks, are occupations that parents are compelled to make their children perform. A local supervision and control would limit this, but not altogether prevent it.
35. To the first part of the question I can answer affirmatively, and negatively to the second.
36. Generally they do attach a high value.—I believe not very often.
37. Yes.—No.
38. They are not; and I think the opportunity is generally appreciated.
39. I think generally the opportunity of education is highly appreciated, and that children are rarely withdrawn for frivolous reasons.
40. These remarks are expressed in No. 7.
41. The children are often withdrawn on frivolous reasons.
42. I think the parents of the children regularly attending the Public School appreciate the instruction offered, and are not in the habit of withdrawing them for frivolous reasons.
43. Generally parents consider they are conferring a favour by sending their children to school rather than otherwise, and are in the habit of withdrawing their children from school for frivolous reasons.
44. The parents generally attach a high value to the education their children receive here, and only detain them at home in the busy season of the year to assist them.
45. For the most part they do value and avail themselves of the opportunities afforded them; but of course there are some in every neighbourhood who are apt to take offence without just cause, and withdraw their children. But they generally send them back again after a time, if the Master is a man of tact and discretion.
46. The number who daily attend should decide this question.
47. Parents in general do attach a high value to this privilege, but others often keep their children from school to assist in domestic labour without absolute necessity.
48. I think the majority do, though certainly some do not, and these are frequently in the habit of keeping their children away for little or no reason.
49. Some do attach a high value and others do not, and withdraw their children for very slight reasons.
50. I cannot answer the former part. I believe the latter to be highly probable.
51. We do not know.

Query 13. *Is the Inspection at present maintained by the Inspector of Schools sufficiently frequent to test the progress of Pupils from time to time, and to stimulate the diligence of the Masters?*

1. Of course frequent inspection would do much good; but if all the Schools of the Island are to be often inspected and regularly there must be two Inspectors.
2. I think not.
3. Yes, *i. e.* twice a year generally, or once a year; occasionally local special visitors being employed.
4. Were the Schools thoroughly inspected three times in the year, at uncertain periods, I think that the inspection would be sufficient.
5. The inspection, though very valuable, does not seem to me adequate in point of frequency.
6. I do not think so.
7. I think not.
8. I do not know what inspection the Schools have. As any system of Public Schools must possess a power to depress and destroy private Schools in most localities, (an evil, I think) thus preventing all healthy competition, it is the more necessary that inspection should be thorough.
9. It might be advantageously increased.
10. I think the Inspector comes about once a year. I presume his duties in all parts of the Colony prevent his paying more frequent visits.
11. I do believe not. Mr. Murray Burgess visited the School on the 25th of February, 1867, but it is a very long time since we had the Inspector down.
12. No, certainly not.
13. Most decidedly not.
14. I cannot say how often the Inspector attends.
15. I think it is.
16. I believe not.
17. Certainly not, at present.
18. Our position is such as to render frequent inspection impossible; but twice a year, the number of visits formerly paid by the present Inspector, is, I think, quite sufficient for the purpose named.
19. I think the Schools should be visited by an Inspector quarterly to keep them up to their work.
20. I think not.
21. I think it is. The great evil is want of local interest, and fancy for something new.
22. Yes.
23. Could the Inspector visit more frequently, I have no doubt in many cases it would stimulate the indolent teacher and pupils.
24. I do not think it is, the Inspector from his numerous duties being only able to visit them once a year.
25. I do not think so.
26. I cannot say.
27. Until lately, I should think so.
28. I think more frequent inspection by Inspectors very desirable.
29. As a rule, yes.
30. I am unable to answer this question.
31. Without a frequent local supervision the Inspector's visits should be more so.
32. There is no Inspector in reality. The fault of the present system is the want of inspection at all times and hours.

33. The Inspector's visits for this purpose are so very seldom made, that it cannot be said his inspection can sufficiently test the progress of the children or stimulate the diligence of the master.

34. Whether to merit the approval of the Inspector or from a higher motive I do not know, but I believe the Masters here do their duty.

35. Hitherto I have no fault to find with the progress of the pupils, yet if the inspection could be more frequent it would be better.

36. So far as this School is concerned I believe it is.

37. Yes.

38. I think not.

39. I believe that under the new Inspector a considerable improvement has taken place, and if maintained such regular inspection will have the effect referred to, having the great advantage of being authoritative.

40. No, the Inspector cannot be expected to visit every Government School more than twice a year; consequently the local supervision alone can test the progress of the pupils, and encourage both master and children.

41. I think not.

42. Not to test the progress of children, but sufficient to stimulate masters.

43. I believe one visit in the year by the Inspector is sufficient.

44. Yes, with the Scholarships that are offered.

45. I do not think an annual inspection of 3 or 4 hours nearly sufficient for either purpose.

46. Certainly not.

47. Organised local supervision is required.

48. If it were practicable, a more frequent inspection would be desirable.

49. No.

50. The visits of inspection by the authorised Inspector have been very few and far between.

51. We do not know.

Query 14. *What in your opinion would be the effect on the attendance at the Schools in your neighbourhood of increasing the School fees 25 to 50 per cent.?*

1. The School would be greatly reduced, and much harm done.

2. Very little; the Master might get a shilling or two a week more from one or two well-to-do families, and he would have to remit a larger proportion of the fee than he does now to the poorer families.

3. In the country, to impede Education. In Townships, to drive children to inferior Schools.

4. It would probably diminish the attendance in the same ratio.

5. The fees generally could not be increased, but it would be desirable, if possible, to get some parents in good circumstances to pay more liberally.

6. This is a very poor District, and the effect would be, if the fees were increased, to empty the School.

7. Many would be withdrawn to private Schools, and many more would claim admission as free scholars, or at a reduced rate.

8. I think that the number in attendance would be lessened.

9. Any increase of the rate of School fees would have an unfavourable effect on the School in this very poor District.

10. The parents are poor, and fewer children would be likely to attend.

11.

12. The effect would be to empty the Schools of the majority of the present pupils, and to fill them with those now in attendance at private Schools, in which the system is not so good, but which are more select.

13. If such a regulation were made in a poor Parish like this, it would certainly, I think, be the means of a great number of children being withdrawn.

14. For those able to pay I would increase the School fee, and give free education to the really destitute on certificate of Clergymen.

15. It would paralyse the School.

16. A lamentable falling off in the number of paying fees.

17. To lessen the attendance very considerably.

18. Greatly to diminish the attendance.

19. To close the Schools.

20. The effect would be disastrous to the best interests of the Schools.

21. Injurious.

22. To diminish the attendance in the same ratio.

23. The effect would be to increase private Schools, and keep away many children altogether. The parents might promise the School fees, but the Teacher would have in many cases to recover them at the Police Office.

24. The non-attendance of the children.

25. A certain falling off in numbers.

26. I do not think the School fees could be increased with advantage: if such were the case, the attendance would be considerably less.

27. Would diminish the attendance.

28. A dangerous experiment.

29. To decrease the attendance in a corresponding ratio.

30. A very bad effect: it would increase both the difficulty and indifference on the subject of the Parents.

31. The withdrawal of a large number of the children from an inability to pay an increased rate.

32. The number of Scholars would decrease.

33. It would be the means of numerically reducing the attendance of the children; the parents being poor.

34. I do not approve of fixed fees. If the attendance be compulsory, the rate of fees should be named by the local powers, according to the means of the parents.

35. I do not think more than  $\frac{1}{3}$ rd would attend.

36. If the increase were insisted on, it would lead to the withdrawal of a good many from School.

37. The most of those paying School fees would be compelled to withdraw their children from the School, as they could not afford to pay any more.

38. Doing away with the School entirely.

39. I think it would have the effect of reducing the attendance 50 per cent., if not of closing the School.

40. Utter and certain destruction to the School.

41. The withdrawal of many.

42. I do not think an increase of 25 per cent. on the School fees would in any way affect the attendance, neither under the present circumstances would 50 very materially: as a rule, the children regularly attending School are not those of Paupers.

43. Some parents could not pay such increase, others ought to be made to pay more. I think there should be a higher maximum fee or rate, but I would not disturb the minimum fee or rate.

44. More than half the children would be kept at home.

45. It would either drive many children from the School, or greatly increase the number of free scholars.
46. The School would probably be abandoned.
47. Would not answer at all.
48. Very little, for the reason that not more than 3 or 4 ever pay fees, and they would be the last to object. In these small Schools the Masters are only too glad to get the children with or without payment, in order to keep up a good daily average of attendance.
49. Parents are not able on an average to pay present fees.
50. The Masters find a very considerable difficulty in exacting the present fees,—many are in constant arrear, and many will never be paid,—an increase of rates would empty the School of at least one-half of the present attendance.
51. Decrease in number of Scholars.

Query 15. *From your knowledge of the total emoluments of the Masters of Public Schools in your neighbourhood, do you think that it would be expedient to reduce them?*

1. No, I think it would in most instances be highly injudicious.
2. Far from it. There is to me, so inadequate do I deem even the present salaries, something shocking in the very idea.
3. No.
4. The emoluments of the Teachers, instead of being reduced, ought to be raised.
5. I do not think the salaries could be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the Schools.
6. No.
- 7.
8. I see no reason for change while the poor can receive a gratuitous education.
9. The Master at St. Michael's has but £50 per annum. An increase of salary in this case would doubtless have a beneficial effect. £50 is inadequate to the support of a married man with a family of 5 children. For a school of boys and girls a single man would not be as eligible. This neighbourhood is too poor to add to the salary of the Schoolmaster any appreciable sum.
10. No.
11. I believe not.
12. No, unless you change the character of the Schools, and make them such as Mistresses would be fitted for.
13. It would not.
14. I would reduce the Master's fixed salary where he could charge fully parents able to pay, but not otherwise.
15. No.
16. No, I believe the salaries, where there is efficiency, should be increased.
17. I do not think so.
18. Certainly not.
19. No.
20. I certainly think not.
21. Certainly not. Those in my parish are well worth what they get. They are the best Teachers I know of in any educational establishment in the Colony.
22. No, they are already in most cases too small.
23. I think it would be very injudicious to do so.
24. I do not.
25. Certainly not.
26. I do not, as far as Deddington School is concerned; they are at present little enough.
27. Certainly.
28. Certainly not.
29. Decidedly not.
30. Most certainly not.
31. Decidedly not.
32. Certainly not.
33. No.
34. Certainly not.
35. No.
36. I would by no means reduce the emoluments (at least in this neighbourhood).
37. No.
38. I do not.
39. I would not think it expedient to reduce the emoluments of the Masters beyond enforcing a strict adherence to the scale of fees appointed by the Board, and charges for school requisites being regulated.
40. Certainly not. The labourer is worthy of his hire. The success of the School depends on the exertions and ability of the Schoolmaster himself.
41. No.
42. No.
43. I do not. The emoluments are sufficiently low now to ensure the services of an educated, energetic, moral mind. The emoluments at Lisdillon amount to very little, and at Glen Gala less.
44. No.
45. I do not think it would.
46. It would be more expedient to increase than diminish the salary here to the extent originally allowed, which enabled the mistress to employ an assistant, approved of by the Board.
47. No.
48. I think not. I know that the present Master can hardly live as it is.
49. No.
50. Except in the case of the Master of St. Mark's School, who is in a rather better position, their emoluments are but barely sufficient for their maintenance.
51. No.

Query 16. *Could a reduction in the item of fixed salary not be made without incurring the risk of being unable to supply the situations they fill with equally efficient Teachers?*

NOTE.—The maximum salary of Town and Country Masters is £100, and the minimum £40. The salary of Mistresses varies from £70 to £25.

1. No, except it might be in one or two instances where the fees are large in amount.
2. No, certainly not.
3. No.
4. Where the Teachers are really efficient, I believe that any considerable reduction in their fixed salaries would involve not the risk, but the certainty of their resignation. As an obvious consequence, their places, if supplied at all, could only be supplied by inferior men.
5. See answer to No. 15.

6. I do not think so, although I believe there are many Masters now engaged under the Board of Education who are able to give a superior education to that which is necessary for the children of the labouring classes.

7.

8. No, it would be better for the State to have no system of education, and to content itself by paying private Schoolmasters for teaching pauper children, than having a system to reduce these reasonable amounts.

9. A considerable reduction may be advisable in towns and villages where good schools are supported as a private adventure. The support of such schools in Hobart Town, Launceston, and other places in the Colony, shows that a reduction in the item of the salaries of Teachers in the Public Schools in those places is possible. Why should the State do so much in planting and supporting Schools in places where good Schools are established without assistance from the State? A Government diploma from the Master, and Government inspection for the Schools in such places, might prove sufficient. In the poorer districts in town and country where the parents in the aggregate raise the tithes of a decent salary the State might require the district to do what it could, and the returns show the ability of most districts, and the State might justly in such cases supply the deficiency. Possibly such a measure would reduce the annual expenditure of the State in the item of education.

10. I am inclined to think not. In more populous localities it might be different.

11. Not in this district.

12. The fixed salary might be reduced in large centres of population, where the school fees would make up a sufficient sum. But I think the present system of the Board, which encourages the Master to get as much as he can from the several parents, is radically bad. The effects are injurious to the Master himself, to the parents, and to the School.

13. It could not.

14. In some localities I think so.

15. I am decidedly of opinion that it would be most inexpedient to reduce the salaries of the Masters. To secure the services of competent men, a sufficient inducement must be offered.

16.

17. I should very much doubt it.

18. I believe a reduction in the present emoluments would degrade the office of Teacher,—low enough at present. But in this reply I refer, of course, to my neighbourhood. The fees and voluntary payments in excess of fees are very much greater in Hobart Town.

19.

20. In my opinion, no reduction in the fixed salary ought to be made.

21.

22. Most certainly not. It would be preferable to close the Schools altogether, and leave the field open for private enterprise.

23. Very serious injury to many of the Schools would be the result.

24. I do not think it could.

25. I am decidedly of opinion that the very greatest risk would be incurred were any reduction attempted.

26. I think not, so far as my neighbourhood is concerned.

27. No.

28. I should very much fear the experiment in our country districts.

29. I should say not.

30. It could not be made without seriously incurring the risk alluded to.

31. The salaries appear to me to be at the extreme minimum for efficient Teachers; any reduction must prove detrimental.

32. This is a question more fitted for the Board of Education to answer. I cannot.

33. No.

34. Most certainly not.

35. No.

36. Could not positively say; but I think not. Something must be wrong somewhere if Teachers can be got for £40.

37. Yes; I consider £50 for the Master and £30 for the Mistress, with the school fees, ample remuneration. By giving £170 it only places them in a false position; they can scarcely condescend to teach the little ragged urchins.

38. It could not.

39. I think a reduction of the fixed salaries would decidedly affect the status and efficiency of the Masters, and be injurious.

40. Good Teachers are not overpaid. Any attempt at reducing the present salary would not be a risk, but a certainty of destroying the School.

41. It could not.

42. No, not under the present system.

43. This I believe to be possible; and I am inclined to think under an improved system good will result to the Master, to the children, and to the country; but without a change of system no reduction of salary can be made, without, as a certainty, lowering the standard of Schoolmasters.

44. I think it could not.

45. I think not.

46.

47. Decidedly not.

48. I think not in such a district as this.

49. Not in Country Schools.

50. I think not.

51. No.

Query 17. *Have you any knowledge whether in your neighbourhood the children in attendance at the Public Schools evince at Sunday School either less or more intelligence than other children at the same Schools; taking into consideration the relative social advantages of the children compared?*

1. I am prepared to say that children attending the Public Schools are not a whit behind any others.

2.

3. No noticeable difference.

4. I am not aware of any such difference as is referred to. If there is, I should say that it was rather in favour of the children attending the Public Schools.

5. Children attending Public Schools show, at our Sunday School, and otherwise, a marked superiority.

6. I have never observed any difference.

7.

8. The State having given to the Public Schoolmaster advantages which are not possessed by the private Teacher, he is driven away,—and the question cannot be applied to my neighbourhood.

9. At the last annual examination and festival of the Sunday Schools in this chaplaincy, an educated lady remarked the disadvantage at which the children on the eastern side of the river were placed, where they have no Public School. The class from St. Michael's on the western side evinced more intelligence than the difference in social position would account for.

10. The children in attendance at Public Schools are certainly more intelligent, for the others attend no School.

11. Not much.

12. There is no sufficient means of forming a fair opinion here on the subject of this question. So far as we can judge, the children in attendance at the Public Schools have the advantage, and evince more intelligence.

13. My experience is, that there is an immense difference in favour of children attending Public Schools in intelligence and knowledge.

14. I could not well say; I have not marked a special intelligence or superiority in them over others at Schools not public.

15. Children attending the day school are generally superior in their attainments, most decidedly.

16. This would depend in a great measure on the amount of religious instruction taught at Private Schools. The question I take to refer to religious instruction.

17. The advantage, I think, in this respect, is upon the whole in favour of the Public Schools.

18. I have remarked that the children here are remarkably intelligent, and entirely untrained, whether they attend the Public School or no.

19.

20. I cannot see any difference.

21. Difficult to say.

22. More.

23. They evince more intelligence than those who are kept away from School altogether. In some instances less than those who are educated at Private Schools where religion forms part of their education.

24. I think not.

25. I have had no opportunities of forming an opinion.

26. I have no means of judging, there being no Sunday School at Deddington.

27. I am not in a position to say so.

28. All who attend the Sunday Schools attend the day school, therefore cannot have any comparison.

29. Cannot hazard an opinion. The clergyman of the District should be the best able to answer this question.

30. I have not.

31. Certainly not less. The advantages of Sunday School teaching are immense.

32. This query answers itself, for naturally children attending the day schools are more orderly and attentive than others.

33. No.

34. I do not think I quite understand this question.

35. I believe they compare advantageously with those who do not attend the Public School.

36. At our Sabbath School there is no opportunity of testing, as, with one or two exceptions, all are at School during the week.

37. No we have only the one School.

38. I am not in a position to say.

39. I do not think there is any notable difference here; indeed the same children generally attend both Schools, and are classed at the Sunday School without reference to any social distinctions.

40. This is not applicable to Kingston, as there is now only one lady with a few pupils. One or two small Schools have been lately discontinued, and the pupils for the most part removed to the Government School. All children attend my Sunday School, even Roman Catholics, in addition to whom there are many children who obtain no other instruction than that they get in the Sunday School. Of course there is a marked difference between these and those who have the advantage of attending the Government School.

41. Decidedly more intelligence.

42. From competent and reliable authority, I have often heard the remark made of the superior intelligence and good conduct of children who regularly attend the Public School over others who do not, when both are assembled at Sunday School.

43. I do not understand the question. All the children attending the Sunday Schools are in attendance at the Public Schools.

44. They are nearly all the same children.

45. I am unable to attend the Sunday School myself, but I believe that the children attending the Day School exhibit more intelligence, *ceteris paribus*, than those who do not.

46. None.

47. The Public School children attending Sunday School are evidently most intelligent.

48. With the exception of two, all who attend the Sunday School attend the Day School.

49. No knowledge.

50. My knowledge of the working of Sunday Schools is not very great: with one exception the children attending Sunday School at my Church, attend also at the Day School.

51. We do not know.

Query 18. *Have you a sufficient number of children of parents unable to pay any School fee to justify the establishment of a separate School for their benefit?*

1. I think all the children would do better in one School provided the building would hold them.

2. No.

3. No.

4. No.

5. We have scarcely any children whose parents could not pay something.

6. This District is too small for such an arrangement.

7. I think the establishment of such a School would be unwise.

8. I think not.

9.

10. No.

11. I think not.

12. Yes, but the attendance of such children being within the distance of 3 miles should be made compulsory.

13. No.

14. No.

15. No.

16. I cannot advocate a purely poor School.

17. No.

18. No.

19. No.
  20. I think not.
  21. For the whole Town there might be if parents were compelled to send them somewhere.
  22. No.
  23. In some of the outlying districts, Quamby Bluff for instance, there are 40 or more children without a School, mostly Catholics.
  24. I should say not.
  25. No, I think not.
  26. No.
  27. No.
  28. No.
  29. No.
  30. No.
  31. With one or two exceptions all pay the fees.
  32. No.
  33. No.
  34. No.
  35. No.
  36. No.
  37. No.
  38. There are not.
  39. We have not.
  40. No, certainly not.
  41. We have not.
  42. No, with very few exceptions all could afford to pay if willing to do so, and were it not for the drunken, dissolute habits of parents in many cases.
  43. No.
  44. No.
  45. No.
  46. No.
  47. No.
  48. No.
  49. No.
  50. There may be sufficient, but they are too much scattered to be available for the purpose.
  51. No.
- Query 19. *Would it be desirable to have such a School exclusively for the class referred to?*
1. No, I think not.
  2. No, certainly not; the idea is not a practical one.
  3. No.
  4. Decidedly not. It would act as a bounty on pauperism and profligacy.
  5. It would be very undesirable to have a School for such children exclusively.
  - 6.
  7. I do not think it would.
  8. No.
  9. Yes,—Charity Schools where they are required. State Aid wherever poverty prevails, as in this District.
  10. The population throughout the District in any given locality is small, and such distinction could not be made.
  11. Not here in this place.
  12. Yes.
  13. I think not.
  14. Where there are sufficient children, by all means, in the chief cities, and in populous localities.
  15. I think not here.
  16. I think not.
  17. Not in this District, certainly.
  18. No.
  - 19.
  20. I think so.
  21. See answer to No. 18.
  22. No.
  23. It is desirable that a School be established there, Quamby Bluff, and that the School fees be as low as possible.
  24. No, as the same objection would apply as to the non-attendance of the children.
  25. Were such established, I fear too many parents would find themselves "unable to pay."
  26. No.
  27. No.
  28. No, but query at Upper Huon.
  29. No.
  30. I think not.
  31. Certainly not.
  32. See above.
  33. No.
  34. Not for that class.
  - 35.
  36. No.
  37. No.
  38. No.
  39. I think in populous places it would be desirable for reasons ethical, political, and financial.
  40. It would not.
  41. No.
  42. No.
  43. No.
  44. No.
  45. I think it would if there were a sufficient number, as a Teacher of inferior attainments, and a lower standard of education, would suffice.
  46. No.
  47. Decidedly not.

- 48. No.
- 49. No.
- 50. I think not in this neighbourhood.
- 51. No.

Query 20. *Are there any private Schools suited to the various classes of pupils who attend the Public Schools in your neighbourhood?*

- 1. No.
- 2. There are Schools suited, it may be, to some of the classes who attend the Schools, not to all.
- 3. Yes.
- 4. There are two Ladies' Schools where music, &c. are taught. There is also one private School, intended, I believe, chiefly for boarders, where boys and girls are admitted indiscriminately. These are the only private Schools in the District.
- 5. There are a few private Schools.
- 6. Yes, if the parents could afford to pay the fees.
- 7. There are many private Schools.
- 8. See answers to questions 13 and 17.
- 9. No.
- 10. No.
- 11. There is one.
- 12. There are three private Schools, but all kept by female Teachers, and only commanding the smallest possible support. Not one is really suited to the wants of the place.
- 13. Three.
- 14. Yes, almost in all the towns, and pretty well attended, and paying.
- 15. There is no School suited to the higher and more advanced class of pupils. Mrs. Winwood is an excellent teacher for very little children, and her School answers to prepare them for the Public School.
- 16. No.
- 17. Yes.
- 18. No, none whatever.
- 19. There is one.
- 20. None.
- 21. Yes, except for those last mentioned.
- 22. Such have from time to time been opened, but they seldom last long.
- 23. There are four private Schools, two for boys and two for girls.
- 24. Not any.
- 25. No.
- 26. No.
- 27. No.
- 28. None.
- 29. None, except that conducted under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church by a body of Nuns belonging to same; which, I am afraid, if not admitted to be denominational would not be taken advantage of, for fear the religious views of the parents should be interfered with.
- 30. Yes, one here; and these private Schools appear and disappear, according to whim, caprice, or circumstances.
- 31. No private School exists for 8 miles, and not suited for the children of the poor.
- 32. No.
- 33. None.
- 34. No.
- 35. Not within 7 miles.
- 36. At the one gentleman's private School, I believe the fees are too high for the working classes.
- 37. No.
- 38. One.
- 39. There is no private School in this neighbourhood.
- 40. There are not.
- 41. There are none.
- 42. No.
- 43. No.
- 44. No.
- 45. Not any.
- 46. None of any description.
- 47. None whatever.
- 48. No.
- 49. No.
- 50. But one only, with an attendance of about twenty-five.
- 51.

Query 21. *Would such Schools, if started as a private adventure, be likely to meet all the objects sought to be attained by Public Schools, and derive adequate support without aid from the State?*

- 1. No.
- 2. I think not. Education would fall into the hands of female Teachers, and then how could the elder boys when boisterous and unruly be kept in order, especially in large Schools?
- 3. I should not think so.
- 4. In my opinion, such schools if so started would prove a failure.
- 5. I do not think so.
- 6. No, the inhabitants of this village with very few exceptions are very poor. The private schools at the present time have very few pupils.
- 7. I think they would receive adequate support, but would be very far from meeting the objects sought to be attained by the Public Schools. Many of the Teachers would be immoral, ignorant, or otherwise incompetent persons.
- 8. No inducement will bring the children of vicious parents to any school, and as it is a principal object of the State, in its school system to educate these, the private school as well as the public school will be so far a failure. If the education of children of the poor be now the only object of the State, I think it might be gained without any Public School system. Such children might be sent to private schools as they are now to the Public Schools—the State paying for them as at present. I think private Schools would be sustained.
- 9. Not in this District or neighbourhood.



10. I may safely say that the Teachers would not be adequately remunerated, and the Schools would prove a failure.

11. I believe not.

12. A free school being provided for the very poor, there would be room for the establishment of a good private School, likely to be satisfactory to the parents, and fairly remunerative to the Teacher.

13. The managers of these three Schools get a very indifferent living. The instruction imparted I cannot commend, as far as I know it.

14. I think so, always allowing aid for the really destitute.

15. This has been tried several times here, and has always failed.

16. No.

17. No; because so many of the Public School children pay very small fees or none, and these would be excluded from private Schools; which, consequently, would have to raise the scale of charges for those who could pay.

18. No, I think not. If a trained master,—a being unknown in these parts,—were to try the experiment, he might possibly excite such admiration by taming the untamed (and, as most persons here believe, untameable) youth of Circular Head as to gain universal confidence, leading to a large School, and many boarders from the forest eventually, but in the meantime his income would be inadequate.

19. Very far from it.

20. They would not. The Schools in my neighbourhood are sectarian, and would not receive the support of parents generally.

21. No, and I shall regret to see the Public Schools given up.

22. No.

23. I think not.

24. I do not think it would answer.

25. Not in this District.

26. No.

27. I don't think so.

28. No.

29. The objects might be attained, but I am afraid, from the paucity and peculiar position of the inhabitants generally, the support would be inadequate.

30. I think they would in the essence of rivalry start up, but only moderately succeed.

31. I should say not.

32. No.

33. No.

34. I presume that Public Schools are intended to educate all; but as a private adventure they would take only those who could pay, and they would not meet adequate support.

35. No.

36. They would not.

37. No.

38. They would not.

39. I am certain they would not here.

40. Without aid from the State, no private Schools could supply adequate education for this District.

41. I think not.

42. I think a private School would receive fair support if no Public School existed; but a very great majority of the children would remain uneducated, except in villainy.

43. I believe not.

44. No.

45. Certainly not.

46. I believe not, the inhabitants being generally too poor.

47. Certainly not.

48. No.

49. No.

50. There was one attempted a few years back, but the pupils were chiefly boarders from a distance, and it failed.

51.

Query 22. *Would it be expedient to establish a system of State Aid to Education proportioned to the amounts raised in the Districts by voluntary contributions?*

1. No, I am positive that such system would fail, especially in these times of distress.

2. No, you would thus tax the liberal, and let the others go free.

3. No.

4. I do not think that it would be expedient to attempt such a system in this District at present.

5. I fear not; there has been found great difficulty in raising the amount required for school-buildings.

6. By this arrangement the Districts would be unequally taxed, unless the State aid grant was made in proportion to the ability of each District to provide for its own wants.

7.

8. No. To secure extensive voluntary aid a denominational system would have to be adopted, and this I think undesirable. (See question 8.)

9. If State aid to education were proportioned to the amount that could be raised in this District by voluntary contributions, the School would be closed. State aid should be proportioned not to the power a District has to help itself, but to its weakness. The rule should be to help where poverty prevails to an extent which prohibits all private adventure; where no adequate School could exist without an emolument or State aid.

10. I cannot speak positively on this point. It is a poor District, the local rates press heavily, and an additional rate would no doubt be very unpopular, voluntary contributions uncertain.

11.

12. Such a system would be a heavy burden upon the best people in the community, and would be left to them alone for its support.

13. I think that voluntary contributions would usually be so small that it would not be expedient.

14. Voluntary contributions do not work well; they are uncertain and fluctuating.

15. I doubt the success of such a plan.

16. The State should educate the poor; the mode of doing so I am not prepared at present to say.

17. It might answer for a year or two, but would soon fall off.

18. This would be a most unjust burden upon a few generous spirits.

19. By no means.

20. It would not, I think, be expedient.

21. Voluntary contribution would be sure to fail where sectarian interests are not affected.
22. No.
23. It would not.
24. I am of opinion that such a scheme would be utterly impracticable.
25. Generally, the establishment of such a system would, I think, be very advisable; but in this District the voluntary contributions would not be sufficient for the purpose.
26. No.
27. I cannot see it desirable from the antipathy against local rating.
28. I should be very sorry to see the present system disturbed.
29. Not less at an increased expenditure than that now paid.
30. Voluntary contributions do not answer in this Colony, and this would be no exception.
31. Neither expedient nor advisable.
32. Never answer: the present system with efficient and continuous inspection cannot be improved.
33. No.
34. I think not.
35. I do not believe it would be expedient.
36. No.
37. It would not do at all.
38. Not in this District.
39. I am afraid any system founded upon a voluntary support would fail in a locality so thinly populated, and where the proprietors are frequently (as here) absentees.
40. No; such an attempt would certainly fail at Kingston. Nothing would be given.
41. The voluntary contributions would be very limited.
42. See answer to 21.
43. This is a very large question, requiring much thought. I disapprove of the voluntary principle. At present the misfortune is that from various surrounding circumstances many of those who ought to regard the Public School as a privilege and a blessing, look upon it as a right, and rather fancy they are conferring a favour by sending their children; thus, those deriving most advantage would contribute least, and the door would be opened to denominationalism.
44. No.
45. No.
46. No.
47. No.
48. Any system based upon voluntary contributions would, in such a district as this, be sure to fail; in fact, no master would take this school under such a system.
49. No.
50. There can be no voluntary aid obtained in the District, save only the children's fees. The old penny-a-day system did not meet the requirements of efficient masters.
51. No.

Query 23. *Would it be expedient or practicable to maintain Education in your neighbourhood wholly or in part by means of a local rate?*

1. I think that a local rate and a compulsory clause would work together well if embodied in a well-framed Bill.
2. I think it might be practicable in part, more especially were the whole charge of the schools devolved upon the Municipalities.
3. This district could bear such a rate if the principle was applied fairly throughout the Colony.
4. Quite practicable, either wholly or in part, were the rate made compulsory.
5. My objection to a local rate would be that it would throw the management into the hands of incompetent people, especially in regard to the appointment and dismissal of masters.
6. It would, I think, in part. Parents being compelled to pay a rate towards education would make an effort to send their children to school.
7. Practicable, and very inexpedient in my opinion. I answer with reference to my own neighbourhood. I think a charge on the General Revenue preferable to local rates for education.
8. I cannot see the expediency of such a plan.
9. The taxation for roads and bridges and police absorbs everything in this neighbourhood.
10. See answer to No. 22.
11. It would not be expedient.
12. I have heard decided objections expressed against a local rate for such a purpose, but I myself consider it both expedient and practicable to maintain education in part by such means.
13. As many of my parishioners are unable to pay the present rates levied on them, I think there would be serious objections raised to this arrangement.
14. I think not.
15. I think not, but the Municipal authorities will be better judges upon this point. I should withdraw my opinion if they took a different view of the question.
16. I cannot answer this question.
17. I think not, because such local rates would fall heaviest upon those who from distance could derive the smallest benefit from the school.
18. Better far a local rate.
19. It would not.
20. It would not.
21. I believe it would be abused.
22. Yes, if locally administered by trustees elected by the ratepayers.
23. Neither, at least without much irritation.
24. I believe many objections would exist as to such an Act being put in force.
25. No.
26. I think so.
27. I cannot see it desirable from the antipathy against local rating.
28. I think it very inexpedient.
29. I should say decidedly not.
30. I think the schools would flourish better if thrown upon the Municipalities, under local supervision.
31. Neither expedient nor practicable.
32. We are taxed enough already.
33. It would not be expedient unless it was the intention to abolish the present system.
34. Whence or however obtained, the same money expended in the same way would have equal results; but the rate to effect this could not be borne.

35. I do not think so.

36. It might be practicable, but for my own part I think I would prefer a general rate. Some think a direct tax would be very beneficial, as it would make the careless feel they had to pay whether they sent their children or no.

37. No.

38. It would not be either expedient or practicable.

39. It would seem to be one of the duties of property to provide education for the children of the working classes, as well as an act of political wisdom and wise economy; and from the interest taken in those affairs for which local rates are levied, such a course would promise good results.

40. No local rate would be levied if left to local discretion, and if compelled by law it would be reduced to the lowest possible figure.

41. It would not.

42. See answer to No. 21.

43. This is equally important as the last, and some of the same objections exist. In the poor districts such as Glamorgan and Spring Bay any additional tax would be very oppressive, having to tax ourselves so much for police and roads. The question requires ventilation.

44. No.

45. It would be far preferable to the voluntary system, and I think practicable.

46. No.

47. I think partly.

48. A local rate upon property, such as the Rural Police Rate, of Sixpence in the Pound, would not, I think, produce more than about £10 a year, and would be very unpopular.

49. Although it might be practicable, yet not expedient for the following reasons:—That the class of persons benefited by the Public Schools would often be exempt from any payment towards the education of their children, while at the same time squandering their means at public-houses: that is, they have no property that would pay local rates, and they would not contribute through the Customs as at present.

50. It would give very great offence. When a poll-tax for the purpose was proposed some years ago it caused a great outcry through the whole Colony.

51. No.

*Query 24. Supposing it to be so, would you recommend that the appointment or dismissal, and the salary, of the Masters in Public Schools should be left at the discretion of a local governing body?*

1. No, but I think that a local governing body should have some influence, but the ruling and decisive power should be central.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. This would depend entirely on the constitution of the governing body. Were a local Board instituted of the Warden, Magistrates, the resident Clergymen, and Medical Practitioners, I should be disposed to leave the questions referred to to their decision. But I would recommend, that in no case should a Teacher be appointed or dismissed without the concurrence of a General Inspector.

5. See answer to No. 23.

6. Yes.

7. In such a case, I think the discretion of a local body ought to be limited.

8. In case of a local rate the local governing body should have all power.

9. No, decidedly not.

10. No, the public good might be sacrificed to party spirit, the bane of many country districts.

11.

12. No, only the recommendation either of appointment or dismissal, and as to the salary, should rest with any local Board.

13. In such a case, I think that the Master's appointment, &c. should rest with a responsible Minister of the Crown, to be called Minister of Education, in much the same way as the Colonial Treasurer is now styled Postmaster-General for similar purposes.

14. In case of a local rate, I think the control of the school should be in the hands of local authorities.

15. This I should think would depend very much on the character of the governing body. Educated Masters should not be subjected to the discretion of uneducated men; in fact they would not submit to it.

16.

17. Believing that private interests and party feeling would prevail more in the local selection of a Master than in that by a central Board, I could not recommend the adoption of such a course as is indicated in question 24.

18. No, decidedly not, unless the appointment or dismissal were subject to approval by a Board in Hobart Town. Even then I should think it unwise.

19. I would not indeed.

20. The appointment or dismissal of the Masters should not be left at the discretion of a local governing body.

21. Certainly not.

22. Yes, with right of appeal to a Central Board.

23. I prefer the present system.

24. In that case I should most certainly.

25. Certainly.

26. Not entirely.

27. Certainly, if such could be accomplished.

28. Of all other things this is to be feared: our local jealousies would be sure to be visited upon the Master.

29. See answer to question No. 23.

30. I would.

31. Under any circumstances I should recommend a central governing body as at present.

32. What governing body would you have but the Municipal Council, and they are not competent to have such control.

33. Not wholly, nor even by a majority of a local governing body.

34. Most certainly not. I am the head of the local governing body, and have good reason to know the evil influence of the patronage that we already possess. Recommend, if you like, the enactment of laws that shall render the attendance upon school compulsory; impose on us the task of naming or remitting the fees that parents may be compelled to pay; give us some control; and invite as much local supervision as you can; but if your deliberations have for their object the welfare of the children of all grades, let the appointment, the amount of salary (fixed) from whatever source, and all appeal be to a Central Board.

35. I would not.

36. Never, never, never.

37. No.

38.

39. I think such a course would be a necessary consequence, but some safeguards might be requisite.

40. I would recommend 2d. in the pound be insisted upon by the Government, and I am glad to find that this suggestion has been made to me by parents who would greatly contribute by this assessment. I would urge the necessity for Government to reserve in its own power the appointment or dismissal, and the salary, of the Master in the Public Schools. Too great powers given to local governing bodies might produce great abuses. A local governing body might watch over the interests of the school, and give information and suggestions to the Secretary or Inspector of Public Schools, but the Government should have the patronage and responsibility.

41. The Master, in my opinion, should be independent of local influence, and let the State appoint or dismiss.

42. I would strongly recommend that no power be given a local governing body for the appointment, dismissal, or fixing of salary of Public Schoolmasters.

43. It will never do to confer such powers on Local Boards. No Master will be safe; minorities will combine to defeat majorities, dissension will be created, and everlasting mischief follow: let the attempt to smother the late schoolmaster at Swansea (Mr. Barlow) act as a warning. As long as we have Public Schools let them be under the control of the Board of Education. One system, one head, one responsibility. To break up the schools and place them under the Municipalities will be a great mistake, and in its way misfortune, as the breaking up the Police of Tasmania, and placing them in detachments under separate local authorities, who are responsible to no one.

44. No.

45. If education were maintained wholly by means of a local rate, the ratepayers would doubtless expect the appointment, &c. of Masters to be vested in the local governing body. I question, however, whether it would work well, and certainly the internal discipline and system of instruction should not be under the direction or control of such a body.

46. Certainly not.

47. Yes, acting with the Inspector of Schools, or some other Government Representative.

48. Certainly not. I consider that a Master should as much as possible be kept free from, and independent of, local influence. A man may be a very good judge of road-making, &c., yet utterly unfit to form any opinion as to school matters: in fact the Road Trustee residing in this part of the district is neither able to read nor write.

49.

50. In any case, the appointment or dismissal of the Masters had better be continued in the hands of some central body.

51.

*Query 25. Would a Denominational System be likely to secure more local support, in pupils' fees and in voluntary subscriptions for school purposes, than the present system?*

1. No, decidedly not.

2. The great inherent defect in the National system is, that what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and so far the answer must be in the affirmative; but in many Districts in the interior there could be only one such School, exciting the special interests of its own denomination, but the dislike and distrust of all the others.

3. I cannot say.

4. A denominational system would be of detriment to the District, and land its abettors in confusion.

5. A denominational system would be found, as in New South Wales, to have little effect in stimulating liberality, and would be ill-suited to our circumstances in Country Districts.

6. This system could only be carried out in large townships. In a small village there would not be sufficient children to employ more than one Master.

7. I think it would ensure an increase of voluntary subscriptions, but not of fees. I prefer, on the whole, the Irish National System now in operation to a Denominational System, and think them both preferable to that of the British and Foreign School Society, once in vogue in Tasmania.

8. It would secure more local support, but this would be no gain to the State, since the demands of the many competing denominations upon the State for its aid would be heavier than those of the present system.

9. I think all denominational considerations should be excluded, and help be proportioned to the poverty of the district, so as to help the poor, and not those who are able to establish and support Schools without help.

10. No; the District is too thinly peopled for more than one School in the same locality.

11. Yes, I am of opinion such would be the case.

12. There is no room for the Denominational System here.

13. I think not.

14. Yes, where the number of children would justify a Denominational School being established.

15. I think not. I believe that a general system like the present is best adapted to the circumstances of this Colony, and is the only system which would be generally supported.

16. I am decidedly in favour of the Denominational System where practicable. As to fees and voluntary support, I cannot say.

17. Not having heard any dissatisfaction expressed with regard to the present plan, I see no likelihood of a Denominational System being more zealously supported.

18. No, we have not children for the Denominational System.

19. Yes, where the Denominational System is practicable.

20. I think so.

21. Yes, in subscriptions, and would be less objectionable than local rates. But the present plan is far the best in Town: I give no opinion for the Country.

22. No.

23. In some instances it would. Generally, the increase in pupils' fees and in voluntary subscriptions would be very trifling.

24. I do not think it would.

25. No; at all events, only with a very small section of the community.

26. I think not.

27. No.

28. No, decidedly not.

29. I think not.

30. I cannot say; but a Denominational System would, it appears to me, be much more expensive if followed out to the letter.

31. The present system gives (to us) universal satisfaction; any change to a Denominational character would certainly not benefit us.

32. No.

33. No.

34.

35. I do not think so.

36. The worst thing that could happen to the education of this Country.

37. No.

38. It would not.

39. A Denominational System would not in this locality obtain more support in pupils' fees or voluntary subscriptions than the present system.

40. No, it would act injuriously; and so long as doctrinal extreme points be excluded, there is no great difficulty in preserving harmony in the Country Schools.

41. It would not.

42. Most certainly not.

43. Certainly not in this District, and I hold the Denominational System to be a very great mistake in Tasmania.

44. No.

45. I think it would in towns, but it would not be workable in the rural districts without great additional expense.

46. No.

47. No.

48. In this District the numbers are not sufficiently large.

49. No.

50. In my own case I should prefer a Denominational System, as it would give me more unrestrained power for instructing the children belonging to the Church; although when such was the case, I never found any difficulty with children of other denominations. I had but to ask the parent's consent, and I do not recollect having ever met with a refusal.

51. No.

*Query 26. Will you state, generally, any views which you may have to communicate on the Question to which this Circular refers?*

1. I have to state, in conclusion, that I have taken a deep and anxious interest in the great subject of Education for the last 15 years. I have studied much and seen much, both here and all over England, and I am persuaded that a Compulsory Clause is absolutely necessary for the well-being of the poorest classes of society.

2. As a whole, I think the present system admirable. I should grieve to see it changed, except by the appointment of itinerating Teachers (see answer to No. 8). The necessary funds might be gradually withdrawn from the Ecclesiastical Department, should the Legislature decide to discontinue State aid to Religion.

3. It appears to me that the present system of Education in Tasmania is fairly effective and economical. For I suppose that the whole rising population of the Colony has by its means the opportunity of education; and considering the salaries of the masters, they can scarcely be said to be too highly paid. But I have often heard objections to the present system that it aims at too high an education, and that in consequence those classes avail themselves of public education which ought to use private Schools. That I do not concur in such objections my answer to Question 10 shows: for I cannot see why all classes should not avail themselves of the Public School, if so inclined, just as high and low avail themselves of public roads, or the public supply of water. The risk is that of the higher classes alone, if they choose to use the Public Schools instead of more select and private establishments. I am convinced that if the better brought-up-at-home children go to the Public Schools, the moral tone of the School is thereby elevated. I have never heard a complaint from the poorer classes of the better sort of people sending their children to the same School with their children; and I speak from some experience. Therefore, I presume that the masters with whom I have had to do, do not neglect the poor for the higher class children. And, I presume, that the Inspector or central authority of Public Education would always severely check any such attempt at favouritism on the part of masters. But if this be an objection, it is one which will never be got over: people will send their children where they choose. And though the Schools are not intended for those who can pay for education elsewhere, yet if the better classes choose to use them, and the poor are not neglected, but compelled, perhaps, (as in answer-5) to attend, I will venture to say that the education of the poor becomes all the better. I think if this amalgamation of the different classes of children be allowed and acquiesced in by the central authority and the public, it would help to create rewards for good masters without additional expense to the Government. The masters may have one or two uniform rates of salary from Government, but their pay from parents in different localities will vary according to the ability of parents to pay. These fees should, of course, be known by the Inspector, and the School rated accordingly. There is little or no local interest taken in the Schools that I have had anything to do with. I hardly know whether much can be expected. Everybody is busy; and the educated people are not so numerous and leisurely as in England,—even the Clergyman is only able to visit occasionally. But it would be a great thing for the Schools if the Clergy to whom the Schools chiefly belong could take that interest and pleasure in the Schools which they ought to do. This, however, they cannot do if the School is looked upon by them merely as the State's engine for perfecting the children of his District in the three R's. If all restrictions on his visitations of the Schools were withdrawn, if he might if he liked teach his children as he liked, he would feel a greater interest in the whole School, and in every part of its progress. To this end, every School ought to have a class room for the Clergy to teach his children in; and masters ought to understand from the central authority that they were to assist the Clergy in every way: the Clergy and the Schoolmasters working thus harmoniously would greatly tend to the good of the School. With regard to Question 21, if education were left to private adventure it would often fall into improper hands, and where different interests, as in each township, exist, education would fall into the hands of those who would find highest favour with the chiefs of different parties. For the above reason I think the central authority should ever have the appointment or dismissal of masters—removing him altogether from local bias, unless his conduct required public examination. I have ventured to make these few observations, written hurriedly, but in the hope that they may be of service to the Commissioners.

4. I have always been, and still am, in favour of keeping up the status of our public teachers, both as to respectability of character and intellectual as well as professional acquirements. To do this they must be properly remunerated. If (as some advocate) nothing more than the mere elements of education be required, so that men in any number might be found able and willing to act as teachers at a merely nominal salary, the inevitable consequence will be the deterioration of the teachers as a class; the Educational Department will become a mere refuge for the destitute, and very probably of the culpably destitute, and scenes often enacted in the olden time will be repeated, when master and pupils were sometimes found so intently engaged in card playing as not to perceive the Inspector until he was standing in the midst of them. My idea is that the teacher of every Public School ought to be a man of high moral standing; that he should be well up in the more modern modes of training, discipline, and teaching; and that he ought to be qualified to lay the foundation of a system of instruction embracing Greek, Latin, mathematics, and algebra, so that rich and poor alike might benefit by the public educational institutions of the Colony. This view has been completely borne out by the working of the school at Evandale under the present teacher, Mr. Kidd. There the children of the wealthiest in the neighbourhood have, either as boarders or ordinary day pupils, received the elements of their education, and when transferred to higher schools they have not failed to take and to maintain a respectable place. As an instance in point I may mention that Douglas Stewart, a pupil of Mr. Kidd, after being only 18 months at Horton College, at the recent examination for exhibitions "obtained a number of marks considerably larger than the highest obtained heretofore." At the same time I can honestly testify

(and I believe the Inspectors and visitors will bear me out in my statement) that the children of the very poorest are as well attended to and as carefully instructed as those of the highest in points of wealth and social position.

With regard to fees, the amounts payable ought if possible to be made dependent on the means of the parents. The charges should be graduated proportionably. At one time there might have been a difficulty in giving practical effect to this suggestion, but now, that there are Valuation Rolls over the whole Colony, there can be little or no difficulty in the matter. Let the occupiers of houses or other property rated, say at £10 per annum, pay for their children the present fee; viz., One Shilling each per week, and where the rating is higher or lower let the school fee be increased or diminished accordingly. If an individual is rated at £50 or £5, let the fee (assuming One Shilling on a rating of £10 per annum as the basis) be determined by the rating, with a fixed maximum and minimum. An allowance might also be made to the parent who sends more than two children,—for example, three might be charged as two. A variable scale of charges for attendance at the same classes or schools has been in force from time immemorial in Britain. It is so in Oxford and Cambridge at the present day; and when I attended the University of St. Andrew's, in Scotland, I found it in operation there. The fees for each class varied from 30s. to £10, the only advantage derived by the higher paying students being some trumpery ornamentation on their gowns. At St. Andrew's the payment of the higher or lower fee was optional,—here I think that it should be defined and made compulsory, the basis (as I have said) of the amount chargeable being the rating of the property in each Municipal district.

I am decidedly in favour of local rates and also of local Boards for educational purposes, provided the Boards are constituted as I have suggested in my answer to the 24th question. By such Boards the claims of pauper applicants could be thoroughly investigated, and the fees might be partially or wholly remitted without reference to the teacher. Another beneficial effect would be that the magistrates, the influential men in the district, would become in a manner pledged to see that the educational interests of the district were properly attended to.

I have no sympathy whatever with those who would import the religious element into the question. If the Bible is read without note or comment, if its preceptive and ethical teaching be alone explained, and if no mention be made within the walls of the school-room of the articles, or standards, or creeds, or catechisms of any particular church, this, I think, is all that ought to be insisted on under any system of instruction partially supported and patronised by the State. Those who would desire more I should be disposed to put aside as mere obstructives; and any Commission that would listen to them should be condemned to a 12 months' study of the history of the dark ages. With reference to compulsory education, I would suggest that no individual who could not read and write should have the benefit of the political franchise. He should be peremptorily debarred from voting either for a Municipal Councillor or a Member of Parliament.

5. I should like to see local Boards with defined duties and power, in subordination to a Central Board.

6. I think the suggestion made in question 23 would be more satisfactory than any other, although a difficulty would arise as to the collection of the rates in Districts like this, not under Municipal Government.

7.

8. My opinion is, that if the country can afford to give an education to the children of the people which is somewhat in advance of the actual need of the poor, it may do so to great advantage; and I think that no system of education will answer so well as that at present in operation. If it be retained, its efficiency ought not to be diminished by reduction of salaries or fees. If, however, it be determined that the only object the State shall contemplate in its educational measures shall be the education of the really poor in elementary knowledge, I can see how such a reduction in expenditure might be made as would enable the Government to support or subsidise Reformatories for juvenile offenders, in addition to bearing the expense of educating all pauper children. Were the present system ended, private Schools would everywhere be commenced, many of them under the patronage of and assisted by the Churches, and to these private Schools the State might send its needy children; laying down, however, a few judicious conditions for the purpose of securing a sufficient amount of instruction, and to prevent interference with religious convictions. The school fees of such children, even though fixed at a high rate as an encouragement to the Masters, especially to those who commence their Schools in remote places, would be but a light charge on the revenue compared with the amount it is now paying for Public School Education.

9.

10. There are places in this District, and no doubt in many others, where a small number of children, say a dozen, might be collected. If a very small grant were made to some one in the neighbourhood for teaching them, they would not be entirely neglected, as at present.

11.

12. I am afraid that any Public School, however admirable, would not command the support of all classes in the community, through fear of the evil results from the intermixture of classes. I believe that there is a very general opinion that schools of the most elementary character are all that should be supported by the State; and that in them (conducted in most cases by Female Teachers) there should be no charge, and that attendance should be made compulsory in all cases where the children were residing within 3 miles of the school, unless proof could be had that the children were attending any other school.

I myself like the present system of the Board of Education very much; but I cannot shut my eyes and ears to the great danger of the intermixture of classes, believing that there is no civilised country in the world in which the objections to such intermixture are so grave and momentous. I acknowledge the wisdom with which the rules of the Board encourage a sliding scale for different parents according to their station, in the matter of fees; but I believe that the position in which the Master is thus placed is one injurious to his own character and to the best interests of the school. It is the one fruitful source of quarrel and dissatisfaction. I know as a fact that very few, if any, of the poor are aware of the advantages of prepayment by the quarter, and that this information is withheld, so far as may be, by the Teachers. These poor people would never think of asking for a sight of the rules, even if they could read and appreciate them.

There are three Public Schools in this District, and out of them the condition of one is a proof that no Teacher should be employed by the Board who has not had some special instruction in teaching in a Normal School.

The remarks and replies to questions of the Royal Commission given above are offered with hesitation from a sense of the many difficulties surrounding the subject—from fear of pauperising the poorer people on the one hand, and from the evils of intermixture so much complained of on the other. Still the replies have not been given without thought and consultation with those in the District who have taken any interest at all in the subject of Public Education.

13. I am strongly of opinion that, whether the present system of education in this Colony be continued or an alteration (no matter what) be made, it is indispensably necessary to success that a Normal School be established, to provide a succession of competent Teachers, to be placed under the sole direction of a Minister of Education. It must be evident to any one in the habit of visiting Public Schools now that unless some such provision be made at the cost of the State, in no long time the instruction afforded by Masters and Mistresses casually selected will be of a very irregular, and consequently indifferent character. My own idea of educating the poor is confined to reading, writing, spelling, and arithmetic; but I would have instruction in these imparted well. What often seemed to me a very unnecessary addition to the Master's labours is, that his time should be occupied in imparting to poor children branches of knowledge, very good in themselves, but quite inconsistent with the future of labouring men and women. I should be well satisfied with the present system (and much doubt if a better can be devised) if: 1st. The inspection

was something more than a name. 2nd. If in the absence of the Inspector some one, having shown an interest in a particular school, were empowered to hold periodical examinations and report thereon, such person to be recognised as one to whom complaints may be made in the first instance with regard to any misconduct on the part of the Master or Mistress. 3rd. The appointment of no unmarried man to the charge of a mixed school. 4th. In cases where the school premises will permit, the erection of a screen in the centre of the principal room, so that, as much as may be, the sexes may be separated.

14. I should strongly recommend a free Education for the poor, and the comparatively poor, and curtail the Teacher's salary from the State so as to cause him to make a full charge for children able to pay. In my opinion the class receiving the benefit of the Government aid are not the poor, but those who are well able to pay for their children.

15. Whatever changes may be recommended by the Commission, I hope that the importance of upholding the status and qualifications of the Teachers will be maintained, at least of those in the most important places, and elsewhere as far as possible.

16. 1st. Every system of Education should be based on religion,—secular education being its accessory. 2nd. Teachers' salaries should enable them to maintain an honourable position, and so induce them to continue their occupation. 3rd. That particular attention should be had to the calling each pupil was likely to fill in after life.

17. I beg, in conclusion, to call attention to my reply to Question 13; and to say that if half-yearly examinations were required and encouraged by the Board, and more facilities given to the pupils in country schools to compete for the exhibitions, &c., the standard of such schools would be raised, and they would be better supported than at present.

18. I wish to point out the great difference between the towns and the bush as to their Educational requirements. In my own neighbourhood, for instance, during the last 9 years there have sprung up 3 different bush settlements; viz.—at Rocky Cape, Duck River, and Montagu. The children at these places and a hundred others similarly situated must, as far as the Educational grant is concerned, grow up altogether uneducated, because 20 children cannot be got in one spot regularly attending or guaranteeing to attend, so as to justify the Board in establishing schools. To meet these cases, I have suggested above itinerant Teachers, who might hold their schools in private rooms, or a bonus to a resident opening a school in such a locality. It comes then to this, we want more money for the bush all over the country. On the other hand, if every Public School in Hobart Town or Launceston was done away with, (with the exception of one Ragged or Free School in each Town) paying private schools could and would be established in their place. My suggestion then, broadly stated, amounts to this—re-distribution in the inverse ratio of population.

19.

20. I would recommend the adoption of the Denominational system throughout the Island, and that more attention be paid to the education of children in the scattered Districts. Towns and populous districts now enjoy all the advantages of Education, while poor children in the bush are almost entirely neglected. This is a crying injustice.

21.

22. I believe that some such scheme as the following would work well, relieve the public purse, and meet with general approbation:—

(1.) Tasmania to be divided into two Educational Districts, North and South, and these again into sub-districts, say, *e. g.* co-extensive with Municipalities or Police Districts. Governor in Council to have power to proclaim fresh sub-districts.

(2.) Trustees in each sub-district, elected by ratepayers.

(3.) Such trustees to levy rate for support of Schools. Special rates, &c. for erection of school-houses, &c. to be authorised by a meeting of ratepayers publicly convened.

(4.) Management of Schools, appointment or dismissal of masters, &c. to be committed to these trustees.

(5.) Two central boards, South and North (one only would never work well). These should, if practicable, be elected by the sub-districts, or might be composed of the Chairmen of several sub-districts. To them would lie right of appeal, &c.

(6.) An Inspector of Schools, liberally paid, to see that the system approved by Parliament should be adhered to, &c.

Were some such scheme as this adopted there would be no necessity for compulsory attendance. Those who paid rates would endeavour to get some benefit in return. Or if compulsion were resorted to, those rated over a certain amount might be exempted.

I mention the election of central boards. We had a Board of Education in Launceston appointed by the Government, and so far as I can judge the qualification for the position was not general fitness for the office, but solely denominational. The Board seemed to be composed of an individual taken hap-hazard from each religious body: such a board would never succeed.

23. The above answers have reference to the Queenstown School, with which I am more immediately in connection.

24. The parents of the children in this neighbourhood are very poor, and I believe if the present Public School were closed that they would remain utterly without any means of obtaining instruction.

25. I am of opinion that no beneficial results would be obtained by interfering with the working of the present system. The difficulty in collecting the school fees constitutes the chief ground of dissatisfaction or complaint. The Hagley School when under the management of a former master, Mr. Greenway, was in a very creditable and efficient state; and I have no doubt that under the Teacher who has been recently appointed, and who appears to be well qualified for the performance of his duties, the School will in time regain its former satisfactory condition.

26. I would recommend that Public Schools be placed under a local management, and inspection of the Clergy, the Wardens, and Magistrates of the districts, and that there should be some means adopted for appointing masters to the Schools independent of the above gentlemen. I would further recommend a local rate on the annual value of properties in each district for the maintenance of these Schools, to be imposed and collected by the Warden and Magistrates. Schools only to be established where there is an average attendance of 25 pupils.

27. The unsteady attendances at school is caused by parents making the children in their ages useful in assisting work at home, which I look on as a great mistake, and instead of a saving is in reality a loss to both.

28. Whilst our School here has not been free from defects, it has worked well, and I should very much regret to see it disturbed. I know of no system that could supply its place. (Note my reply to question 24.)

29. I simply desire to observe, 1st, that there is generally a reluctance on the part of the lower orders to pay for the education of their children; but I am happy to be able to state that in the head School of this District, viz. the Richmond School, the rule with regard to the payment of fees has not been enforced to compel parents to pauperize their children at the expense of their education. 2ndly, to strongly recommend the establishment of Public Schools throughout this District where practicable, a want much felt in some localities.

30. The education of the poorer class is a difficult subject to embrace; and in this Colony it ought either to be made compulsory by a local rate, or, if the present system be abandoned, thrown upon the Municipalities, supplemented by State aid. I am a great advocate for Compulsory Education,—it would be the best check against the rising generation falling into heathenism.

31.



32. My opinion is that the present system cannot be improved or altered, except as to the inspection, which, as I have stated before, should be frequent and continuous, and at all hours. For instance, if the Inspector were at the School at its opening at 9 o'clock in the morning occasionally, a fillip would be given to the School, which would spread far and wide in the District, and parents would send their children with more regularity. Let the Commissioners call for a return of the number of Schools, and the time and hour they were inspected in the course of the year, and I fancy a glaring want of supervision will be found, hurtful to the School and damaging to the attending pupils. There is another matter that my opinion is very strong on, it is that half-yearly moderate prizes should be distributed: the local authorities should be invited to attend and distribute them, and the names of successful children should be published,—particularly a small prize for regular attendance, for the bane of the Schools at present is irregular attendance.

33. The present system to all appearances works very well in this neighbourhood, and from what I hear I believe is well appreciated no change would be for the better, is the general opinion.

34.

35. I have no further remarks to offer. The above embody my views on the subject.

36. The inhabitants of this Country ought to be thankful that such machinery is in motion, which, if properly worked, improved, and extended, would secure to this Colony an education for her youth at once substantial and within the reach of the very poorest. With a class of Teachers eminent for their high moral qualities and educational standing and skill in teaching, and an Inspector well qualified for his duties,—which implies that he is not only a man of education, but that he possesses a practical knowledge of school-work, so as to be able to understand the difficulties with which a Teacher has to contend,—and a Board composed of men who would secure equally the rights of the Teachers and the interests of the people, together with the co-operation of influential persons in the various districts;—all these acting not antagonistically as parts of one system, this Country would be a thoroughly educated one. This I think not mere theory, but with proper encouragement to Teachers might be secured. One difficulty will always stand in the way of this, and that is the jealousy of those interested in private Schools when witnessing the efficiency of the public ones, whereby the more wealthy classes feel it a privilege to take advantage of the substantial education given at the latter.

With regard to the religious element there can be no difficulty, as all are agreed upon the reading of the Bible, and the exclusion of distinctive religious teachings in Public Schools. Neither would a Teacher worthy of his place take advantage of his position to teach his own religious belief. What would the well-wishers of Scotland give to have established there a system similar to ours?

37. In my opinion the Board of Education should have the power to compel parents to send their children to school in Country Districts like this, where there are no Ministers of any Denomination to persuade the parents to send them; and even if that would fail the State ought to interfere and compel them: a slight fine would be all that would be required so long as they got them educated free of charge. It is a pity to see so many nice children growing up in ignorance, and learning any vice that may come in their way.

38. It has been my opinion for some time that the special visitors should have the power to investigate and report upon any charges that might be made against the Schoolmaster, otherwise they might be placed in the invidious position of prosecutors; and, as I have stated before, I think that when the population is so scattered more Schools conducted by Mistresses at small salaries would be far better than one Central School, because, as a rule, those children that do attend are removed at an early age, consequently the amount of instruction taught is very limited, and many would then be taught the rudiments who are now totally excluded from the distance which they reside from the Public School.

39. I consider, on the whole, the present system is good, and a blessing to the Country, but requires, if possible, slight modifications in certain localities to meet circumstances. For instance, in a township where there is a Minister of the Church of England resident, and none other, a Master of an antagonistic Denomination is a defect either in the system or its application. Then, it seems to me, effective local supervision is impracticable at present. Visitors at the School are merely on sufferance, and even the Minister of the Parish, if not of the same Denomination with the Master, or for some interference of his in the discharge of his duty, or for the good of the School, may be practically debarred by the demeanour of the Master, or the pupils through him, from visiting the School at all, unless he is prepared to be continually involving himself in annoyance by preferring complaints; and the jealousy of the Board of the interference of Ministers perpetuates the evil, and through the lack of the proper spirit pervading the tuition, education acquires a dangerous tone. The Masters will, of course, be careful to commend themselves to the Inspector for the hour he is in the School; but it requires an intimate, almost daily, knowledge of the parents, children, and system to be able to form a just estimate of the results that system is likely hereafter to produce for good or evil. The presence and influence of Ministers of Religion in the Schools I think it essential to encourage; for, generally speaking, no class in the community takes a deeper interest in the education of the young, and none more competent to judge of and give counsel as to what is going forward; at the same time, of course, caution must be reasonably taken that the feelings of those of a different denomination should not be offended. But I must add, I would prefer a Denominational System to one that, in pandering to any class, did not make full provision for the entwining of religious and moral training with the secular instruction imparted.

40. At your solicitation, I venture to make my candid remarks. The system of education is beset with difficulties, yet not insurmountable, and instead of substitution for a new system, I would recommend alterations and improvements in the present educational system. I have already, in No. 9, expressed my opinion as to compulsory education. Great complaints are made of the Arabs of Hobart Town, but the evils of neglected, uneducated children are visible also in Country Districts. Boys from 9 years to 14 years old who do not attend school are constantly about public-houses, hearing and seeing all that can degrade human nature. And even uneducated girls, left to idleness and vice, acquire such habits and learn such language as in no previous age disgraced their sex. Where knowledge and religion are excluded, morality cannot exist. Educate the youth, and instil proper ideas of the Deity, and, as a consequence, morality and self-respect will prevent the commitment of those crimes which disgrace the community, fill the gaols, and impoverish the Government.

Next, I approve of gratuitous education, in which books for all children should be supplied. The parents of those children who now pay fees would then contribute by the educational rate, and an increase of pay should be given to the Master, in order that he might suffer no loss. The funds should be provided from an assessment throughout Tasmania of a rate of 2d., or, if necessary, 3d. in the pound for educational purposes. The rate could be collected together with some other local rate, as police, road, &c., and by this arrangement the expense of collection of the educational rate would be saved. The sums so collected should be forwarded to the Government Treasurer, and distributed to the various Districts as determined at the suggestion of the Secretary or Inspector of Schools.

In determining the amount of education supplied by Government, a due regard should be paid to the consideration that while Government aid is supplying a certain amount of education, the grant ought not to be extended to recipients of superior education: there are colleges and superior schools provided for the reception of children belonging to parents who can afford to pay for the instruction of their children in the more advanced branches of science, without trenching on the funds raised for the education of the poor.

While a due regard be paid to the acquirements and proficiency of the master, an additional consideration should not be overlooked as to whether he possesses an aptitude to teach. Many men possess a considerable amount of knowledge, yet not a few seem to be entirely destitute of the power of imparting it to others. For the country



districts, a master with too refined ideas would not submit to the necessary drudgery of instilling the first principles of education.

A half-yearly distribution of prizes in every school would not fail to produce a healthy stimulation among the pupils.

To provide education for those children in thinly populated districts is a difficulty not easily surmounted, yet a latitude of a grant by capitation, regulated at the discretion of Government, might be a course not altogether attended without beneficial results.

Should the Royal Commissioners adhere to the system of admitting paupers' children free of fees and charges, a scale should be laid down whereby it should plainly be determined who should be considered paupers, and what rate per head should be allowed for maintenance before the Government should assist. This would prevent the suspicion of favour or affection: moreover a certain rule having determined what constituted a just claim, the Special Visitor would not unnecessarily trouble the Secretary with unsustainable applications.

I would recommend the discontinuance of the Board of Education, as being detrimental to the well working of the present educational system, and in place thereof creating local Boards, composed of all ministers of every denomination, of all magistrates, and other intelligent gentlemen who take an active interest in the education of the rising generation. I beg to direct the attention to a comparison between a local and the present general Board, between the knowledge possessed by the Special Visitor and the Board: the former can collect every information and represent the particulars of every claim, but he is powerless; but the Board, on the other hand, can, at will, allow or reject any applications:—in point of fact any sensible person must perceive the absurdity of giving absolute power to a Board, possessing no local knowledge, to override the judgment of local Trustees. The one cannot work with the other; consequently it is a matter of choice whether the present Board be retained in preference to local Boards, or whether upon the abolition of the present Board the local Boards would not be more effective. I would studiously guard against any power beyond recommendations, explanations, and remonstrances being given to local Boards.

I beg to refer to my remarks already made in No. 24, to show the necessity of reserving to the Government all patronage, power, and responsibility.

Apparently to me, the Secretary or Inspector of the Government Education should relieve the Government of almost all trouble, and only in extreme cases should Government be called upon to interfere. I admit that the responsibility of the Inspector would be great, and a man of more than mediocrity of ability required to fill such an office; but the handsome salary allowed would always command an abundance of able-minded applicants.

In conclusion, I would observe that education without religion is as ineffectual and dangerous as a propelling power being given to a vessel without a rudder.

I have given the subject my most mature consideration, and should any one of my observations prove of utility to the Royal Commission I shall deem my labour not in vain.

41. I have heard the Prussian system works well, having had families of much intelligence from that country, where those who attended Public Schools went free, those who did not send their children were taxed to pay for those who did attend.

42. My views of the present system of Public Education are, that the country is cruelly taxed to pay for the education of children of a superior class who can afford to educate their own children privately, and also the children of those generally styled poor man or pauper, who as a rule could, if not entirely so, in a very great measure pay for their education if compelled. The majority of this latter class know, and boast, that Government provides every institution for them, and that they can afford to lead the drunken, idle, dissolute life they usually do.

43. I avail myself of the invitation to state some of my views on the subject of State Grants to Education. With reference to Nos. 4 and 5, I am of opinion that the advantages of Public Education could be extended to very many parts of the Colony, where say 10 or 12 children can be found who are at present brought up in great ignorance, and this too by a change of system and dealing differently with the funds. It strikes me that too large a sum is expended in the Towns, and too little in the poor out of the way places. Owing to an error in the Parliamentary Return, furnished by the Board of Education up to 31st December, 1865, describing the Spring Bay School to be in Glamorgan, I cannot furnish correct calculations, but take the liberty of offering suggestions as to change. First, the Board of Education and Inspector must remain. Masters to be appointed as at present, but may be recommended for appointment or dismissal by local Boards, who shall be appointed by the Board of Education every year; local Boards to have no power to interfere in the management of schools, but to have power to fix the rate (per scale) at which each child shall be admitted to the school. Masters to be paid so much per head for the first 10 scholars, so much for the second 10, ditto ditto 3rd, 4th, 5th, &c., up to the last scholar in actual attendance, in lieu of salary; localities to be taken into consideration, and to be classed as 1, 2, 3, 4 for Country, and 1, 2 for Towns; one Teacher to be required to teach children, and no two schools (except Infant Schools) to be nearer than say 2 miles to each other in Town, nor nearer than 8 miles in the Country.

Upon an application being made to the Board by any responsible persons, and certified to by a Minister of Religion of the Church of England, Scotland, or Rome, Magistrate or Medical Practitioner, that there are 10 children of sufficient age, &c. within a certain radius who have no instruction, and distant 10 miles from any Public School, and that the applicants are prepared to provide a proper room or building for a school, and to supplement the amount to which any one commencing the school would be entitled as classed 1, 2, 3, and 4, to an amount sufficient to secure a competent Teacher, the same upon being referred to the local Board and approved, recommended, or certified to as being correct, the Board of Education shall appoint some Teacher to open a Public School, subject to all the conditions of Public Schools generally.

It might be desirable for local boards to inspect each Public School quarterly or half-yearly, and to receive a fee for each of such inspections upon reporting fully to the Board of Education. At such inspections any complaints could be investigated. This plan might, perhaps, do away with the necessity of such frequent inspections by the Inspector, and also effect a saving.

No. 9. It surely is as justifiable to enforce compulsory education as to compel all to subscribe to the maintenance of a police force. We have sanitary laws to compel people to preserve their health, and why not a law to compel people to preserve and improve the minds of their children? If this were done, the cost to the Treasury would be decreased, and after a time end altogether.

44. I think it would be a great pity to make any experiment on a system that seems to be working so satisfactorily.

45.

46. My view with regard to the expenditure of the Government is, that where a home is provided and residence for the teacher, such School should be entitled to the larger salaries, by which the Government would be saved the outlay in building and repairs, besides the annual cost of providing proper accommodation for the school and residence of the instructor and assistant, which I have done here at my own cost. This School is the worst paid under the Board,—the original salary having been reduced from £80 to £50, a great portion of which was appropriated to paying an additional teacher, the want of which renders the instruction less efficient.

47.

48. I think that in a district such as this, poor, sparsely populated, and containing members of different creeds, the present system is as good as any that could be devised: it should, however, be so modified as to compel parents to let their children partake of its benefits: at present the contribution from the State is only doing half the

amount of good that it is capable of. Calculating that there are 48 children within a radius of 2 miles from the School capable of attending it, a compulsory payment of 8*d.* per head, deducting one-tenth for those unable to pay, would bring to the Treasury about £28 per annum; out of which the master might receive a certain additional amount to his salary as compensation for loss of the fees that at present he is entitled to charge, but seldom gets.

49.

50. With regard to question 26, I had better give no opinion. It has too great a connection with the present state of colonial politics. With respect to question 13, I believe the duties of the public Inspector have in this District been utterly neglected. This may have arisen from want of physical power, for the inspection of all the Schools, if properly performed, is certainly beyond the power of one man. Eight or ten authorised Inspectors, whose stipends on the whole need not amount to more than is paid to the present Inspector, would certainly discharge the duty more efficiently.

51. We know little or nothing of Public Schools,



*ADDITIONAL Answers have been received from the following Persons :—*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 52. Rev. F. H. Cox, St. David's, Hobart Town. | 60. John Dunbabin, Esq., Bream Creek.          |
| 53. Rev. John Fereday, George Town.           | 61. G. A. Kemp, Esq., Warden, Green Ponds.     |
| 54. Rev. T. Garrard, Macquarie Plains.        | 62. William Gibson, Esq., Perth.               |
| 55. Rev. F. Hudspeth, New Town.               | 63. Rev. James Garrett, West Tamar.            |
| 56. Rev. D. F. X. Beechinor, Richmond.        | 64. Rev. Dr. Parsons, All Saints, Hobart Town. |
| 57. Rev. W. M. Hesketh, Bothwell.             | 65. Very Rev. Wm. J. Dunne, Vicar-General.     |
| 58. C. Mann, Esq., Broadmarsh.                | 66. Henry Douglas, Esq., Warden, Deloraine.    |
| 59. A. M'Dowall, Warden, Bothwell.            | 67. Rev. R. Smith, Wynyard, Table Cape.        |

*Query 1. What knowledge have you of the working of the Public Schools in your neighbourhood?*

52. I know well the working of one School, that called "St. John's, Upper Goulbourn-street," having for some years daily, and of late years frequently, visited and taught in it.
53. From personal visits to the George Town and Low Heads Public Schools.
- 54.
55. I have visited the New Town Board of Education School once or twice a week during the last six months.
56. Visiting them often.
57. I know the working of the Public School at Bothwell. It is the only Public School in the District, except Apsley, in the Black Marsh.
58. They work well.
59. We possess sufficient knowledge to enable us to make the following replies, although not so intimately acquainted with the present working of the School as we have been.
60. Not very much.
- 61.
62. I have been in the neighbourhood for many years and taken particular notice; I consider the system bad.
63. The only School in this District is one kept by a lady, gratuitously, in the vestry of the Church.
64. The only Public School in the Colony of which I have any knowledge is that situate in Macquarie-street, which I visit frequently.
65. Such as is derived from my being Special Visitor of St. Joseph's School, and of several Country Schools for many years.
66. Very little.
67. There are three Public Schools in this District, which I visit.

*Query 2. Do these Schools appear to you to make sufficient provision for the Education of the Children in your neighbourhood?*

52. I think so for the boys, but perhaps hardly for the girls.
53. Yes.
54. No.
55. I think this School does, for the immediate neighbourhood. Some children come from a considerable distance along the Main Road, for special reasons.
56. For secular, yes; for religious, no.
57. This School does not entirely meet the wants of the District, the outlying population being dispersed.
58. Yes.
59. These Schools should be sufficient for the education of the children resident within a certain radius.
60. To those near.
61. I do not think they do.
62. No.
63. Attendance from 15 to 20, and twice that number if it was known that a Public School was established. I have already applied for a Public School. We have got ground from the Government.
64. I think it might.
65. All children are admissible in accordance with the regulations of the Board of Education.
66. I cannot give an opinion.
67. No.

*Query 3. Can you state approximately the number of children between the ages of four and seven, and seven and twelve, respectively, not attending any School?*

52. I cannot; I only know that there are not a few.
53. At George Town about four between 4 and 7, and four between 7 and 12. At Low Heads, none.
54. A very large number.
55. I know of some thirty between the ages of 4 and 12.
56. Very few here, because of the Convent School.
57. I have no means of making any probably approximate estimate.
58. Not accurately, but there are many.
59. Cannot state; but about 84 children between the age of 5 years and 15 years, and living within a few miles of the School at Bothwell, do not attend.
60. Under 12 and above 4, about forty.
61. As near as can be ascertained, there are 180 children under 7 years old, and 134 over 7 and under 12 that do not attend any School. Out of 528 children in this District only 114 attend School.
- 62.
- 63.
64. The number of children not attending any School must be large, judging from the number idling about the streets during the hours usually devoted to instruction, but with a population constantly changing their residence from street to street, I could not state with any accuracy the number.
65. I should say about 20 per cent. of the former and 25 per cent. of the latter class.
66. I believe a great number of children attend no School.
67. Eighty of the former and seventy of the latter would be an approximation.

Query 4. *What are the causes, so far as you know them, of the non-attendance of the Children mentioned in the last question?*

52. Poverty, (showing itself in want of clothes), neglect, employment of children at home in nursing, &c.
53. Want of decent clothing.
54. 1st. In some instances, neglect. 2nd. In others, living at too great a distance. 3rd. In some cases objection to the conduct of the School. 4th. In others, impossibility, there being no School.
55. The parents are small landholders, living in the bush. The elder children work with their parents. The younger ones cannot be trusted by themselves along the bush roads.
56. Poverty, principally; and also the Clergy do not urge the parents to send their children, for they cannot in conscience do so.
57. The scattered population, together with the ignorance and poverty of many parents.
58. In some cases distance prevents; in others, expense.
59. From the inability or unwillingness of the parents to pay School fees, some from indifference, while many are otherwise unemployed.
60. Distance and neglect.
61. Many causes may prevent the attendance. Poverty, unable in consequence to send the children decently clothed; distance from the School, and I am sorry to add, apathy in the parents as to the education of their children.
- 62.
- 63.
64. The blame lies chiefly with the parents.
65. Partly the neglect of parents and partly the want of clothes. There is another cause, owing to the manner in which Rule No. 4 is interpreted, the Catholic Clergy do not encourage children to attend some Schools.
66. In a great many instances the distance in a measure is a prohibition.
67. Distance, poverty, bad roads, home-work, and trifling causes.

Query 5. *Can you suggest any means of securing the attendance of those children who ought to be, but are not, receiving instruction?*

52. Nothing short of either compelling them to attend, or paying them for attending, the latter being of course out of the question.
- 53.
54. 1st. Compulsion. 2nd. Provide a Master; there is only a Mistress at Macquarie Plains, and I quite agree with those parents who think a Master requisite to manage large boys. 3rd. Provide Schools; at the Plenty I have asked assistance in vain at various times for years; they are at least seven miles from any School.
55. The majority of the children mentioned in the preceding answers reside near the Franklin Museum. If that building were borrowed from the Bishop and put in repair, I think the School would be fairly attended.
56. If the Schools were Denominational.
57. I am unable to suggest any such means.
58. Not unless the parents were obliged to send them.
59. See answer to No. 9.
60. No.
- 61.
62. By putting the Schools under Local Boards.
- 63.
64. See No. 9.
65. The establishment of Free Schools of a Denominational character, especially if conducted by Members of a Religious Order, and the providing aid towards procuring clothes for the children in want of them.
66. I cannot.
67. I think a great stimulus would be given both to the parents and children if an annual festival were given, with rewards to those most regular in attendance.

Query 6. *What amount of local supervision is given to the Schools?*

52. Very little more than that given by the Clergyman (Church of England) and his wife.
53. Two special visitors to both Schools, and a School Committee at Low Heads.
- 54.
55. I have been with three exceptions, single visits, the only visitor. I have endeavoured partially to remedy the want, as in No. 5, by an afternoon Sunday School, with an efficient corps of masters.
56. The visits of the local clergy, and the Inspector twice a year.
57. I constantly visit the Public Bothwell School. Occasionally the School is visited by the neighbouring Magistrates and by some ladies.
58. Not much.
59. The visits of the Clergy, with occasional visits from others.
60. Very little.
61. They are visited frequently by the Clergyman, and occasionally by the special visitors.
62. Very little; as, under the present system, very little interest is taken.
63. Continual supervision of the Clergyman of the District.
64. The School is *sometimes* visited by the Inspector; independent of this I am the only person who visits with any degree of regularity.
65. There are Special Visitors and other occasional visitors, besides the Inspector of Schools, to supervise them.
66. I believe very little.
67. A few persons in the neighbourhood visit occasionally.

Query 7. *What is the general opinion prevailing in the neighbourhood as to the value of the instruction imparted at these Schools?*

52. It has varied according to the Master under whom, for the time being, the School was placed. Generally the opinion has been good.
53. Generally satisfactory.
54. That it ought to be, and might be, sufficient.
55. I think people hold a high opinion of Mr. Hughes and of his mode of instruction.
56. The prevailing opinion at Richmond is that the Teacher knows his business and does it well.
57. It is generally acknowledged that the instruction given is valuable.
58. The instruction is valuable.
59. Beg to decline giving any reply based upon general opinion.
60. Good.
- 61.

- 62. Not favourable to the system.
- 63. Parents in general value highly the means of instruction for their children.
- 64. I cannot say.
- 65. That it is good so far as secular instruction is concerned.
- 66. I really do not know.
- 67. The School at the Cam has a good reputation.

Query 8. *State generally what appear to you to be the advantages or defects in the working of the Public School system in your District.*

- 52. Reserved for answer 25.
- 53. Advantage of instruction in the Public School. Defects—want of authorised local control, which might be given to Special Visitors.
- 54.
- 55. The great advantage is a centralisation of children by a recognised Public School, with an authorised certificated Master. The village rival pedants and charlatans are thus kept out of the field, and children do not run from School to School.
- 56. Not sufficient religious instruction for Catholic children.
- 57. The advantage is a cheap system of instruction; the defect is that the system fails to meet the wants of a scattered population.
- 58. The system works well here.
- 59. See answer to query No. 26.
- 60. The defect is the distance from the School of several children who cannot come.
- 61.
- 62. I know no advantages, but the defects are many, as no one feels an interest in the Schools.
- 63.
- 64. A more systematic inspection would be beneficial: Teacher and pupils would be equally stimulated thereby to exertion.
- 65. The advantages are particularly in favour of those who are in comfortable circumstances, who pay but little for the education of their children. The defects are that the poorer children do not derive advantages in proportion to the amount of the Education grant.
- 66. Same answer.
- 67. The system works well when carried out by trained or competent Teachers.

Query 9. *Would it be expedient or practicable, in your opinion, to make it compulsory upon Parents to send their Children to the Public Schools?*

- 52. I think it would be desirable at least to *try* the effect of a compulsory enactment, always provided the Government could secure its not becoming a dead letter. But I certainly would not compel parents to send their children "*to the Public Schools*:" it would be enough to oblige them to educate them in some way. This, I think, the State could fairly insist upon—the other would be too great an infringement of lawful liberty.
- 53. Expedient, but doubt the practicability.
- 54. Yes, I think so; and find this to be the opinion of persons (parents) of all ranks whom I have called on and consulted personally on this subject in this District.
- 55. It would be expedient, and I think practicable, to make education compulsory by some means; *e.g.*, in cases four and five authorised Pupil Teachers, under the control and supervision of the Public Schoolmaster, might, at a small salary, do much good.
- 56. Could not oblige Catholic children to attend.
- 57. It would be desirable, but (I fear) impracticable, as it would often involve penal action.
- 58. It would be well if possible.
- 59. Desirable if practicable, provided the liberty of the Parents be not endangered by the penal clauses which might be introduced into any law passed for that purpose.
- 60. No.
- 61. Expedient, but I fear impracticable.
- 62. No.
- 63. Not practicable.
- 64. If practicable, I think it would be *most expedient* to compel Parents to send their children (not attending other Schools) to the Public Schools. The children now have bad examples before them at home, and without education it is to be feared that the rising generation will only too surely follow in the steps of their Parents.
- 65. I do not think so.
- 66. Desirable, but utterly impracticable.
- 67. Perhaps compulsion should go no further than an exacting of the School fees whether the children attend School or not, Magistrates or a Board being empowered to exempt.

Query 10. *Does any harm result, in your opinion, from the intermixture of Children from different ranks of life at the Government Schools?*

- 52. Some harm, no doubt; *e.g.*, the better nurtured children are apt to carry home *vermin* and *bad words*, both of which are objectionable.
- 53. None whatever.
- 54. Not much where the School is properly conducted.
- 55. Parents would be the best judges of this. Their keeping their children at the Schools without protest seems to answer this question in the negative.
- 56. Not that I am aware in this District.
- 57. I think that some harm, morally speaking, has resulted from this mixture.
- 58. It does not appear so.
- 59. None, so far as we have had an opportunity of judging.
- 60. Not here.
- 61. There cannot be a doubt that some degree of injury is inflicted by the mixture that must take place at the Public Schools; children's minds are easily warped to evil, and the mixing of them at play-hours (which is almost impossible to prevent) is far more likely to injure than the being together when in School.
- 62. It quite depends on the Master.
- 63. None.
- 64. No.
- 65. I don't think so. Good may result from such intermixture in a social point of view. But the intermixture of Catholic with Protestant children works injuriously to the former.
- 66. No harm ought to result, but very much depends on the Master.
- 67. Not in our District.

Query 11. *At the Public School or Schools in your neighbourhood have you witnessed any separation of the Pupils in reference to their different social position or circumstances, or any invidious distinctions calculated to repel Children of the poorer classes from the School?*

52. I do not think there is any such distinction, or any more than is unavoidable.
53. No.
54. No.
55. I believe no distinction whatever is made.
56. If any, not very marked.
57. None.
58. There is no separation in the Broadmarsh School.
59. We have not.
60. None.
61. No.
62. I have not witnessed it, but frequently heard there is.
63. I have never discovered any. A great deal depends upon the good sense of the Teacher.
64. None whatever.
65. No.
66. I have not.
67. No.

Query No. 12. *Do parents of the classes whose children principally are in attendance at the Public Schools generally attach a high value to the opportunities of education afforded by these Schools, or are they in the habit of withdrawing their children from School for frivolous reasons?*

52. They value a good School; and the majority of them would not remove their children unless for something like a sufficient reason.
53. Generally. In some few instances children have been withdrawn for frivolous reasons.
54. Yes, I think so; except the lowest and most ignorant class who certainly have the habit mentioned.
55. I am quite sure the Public Schools are, in general, very highly prized. The poorer, not paying parents are the most capricious, and are apt to remove their children, or question the discipline of the School, for frivolous reasons.
56. No importance on the part of Catholics, who often withdraw children for very frivolous causes.
57. I consider that, on the whole, the parents do, to some extent, value the education given. But they often take away their children capriciously, and as soon as they are able to be turned to any sort of use. Thus they are withdrawn just as their capacity becomes available, say from 9 to 10 years of age.
58. Some parents do, but others are too ignorant.
59. We fear they do not attach that high value to the education afforded which might be expected, and that many do withdraw their children from insufficient causes; this is not general, however.
60. Yes. Not withdrawn for frivolous reasons.
61. I do not think the parents attach as much value as they should do to the advantages afforded by the opportunity given them of cheap education for their children, and I have known children removed, or not sent, for the most frivolous excuses.
62. No, but generally prefer private Schools.
63. They do.
64. I do not believe the parents attach a proper value to the advantages provided for them or they would more gladly avail themselves of them. But I don't think, generally speaking, that they evince a greater love of change than may be witnessed in parents of a higher class, who constantly remove their children from school to school without sufficient reason.
65. Many of them do. Many do not. And very many are in the habit of withdrawing their children often for the most frivolous reasons.
66. Judging from the attendance, no; but frequently withdraw their children for frivolous pretences.
67. In many cases children are withdrawn from trifling causes.

Query 13. *Is the inspection at present maintained by the Inspector of Schools sufficiently frequent to test the progress of pupils from time to time, and to stimulate the diligence of the masters?*

52. Even if it were a good deal more frequent than it is, I doubt if it could do much in testing the progress of pupils, but it might do good to the masters, and through them to the pupils.
53. I do not consider the visits of the Inspector of Schools have been sufficiently frequent to test the progress of pupils, or to stimulate the diligence of the masters.
54. I think not.
55. The progress of pupils can scarcely be fairly tested at shorter intervals than six months. This seems about the period which has elapsed between the Inspector's visits. The diligence of masters is more likely to be affected by local visitation than by the sparse visits which the Inspector from his wide range of duty is enabled to pay.
56. From the two visits annually we could scarcely imagine it.
57. By no means sufficient.
58. Yes.
59. We think not.
60. The Inspector of Schools has been once here within these five years.
61. I do not think the Schools are visited as often as they should be by the Inspector; indeed, from the number of Schools in the Colony, and the distance they are apart, it is almost impossible for one Inspector to do his duty effectually. I think one Inspector for the North and another for the South absolutely necessary.
62. No, I do not look upon the visits of the Inspector as of any importance.
63. I think it is sufficient if the master does his duty.
64. Owing to the illness of the Inspector, his visits have not been so frequent as would have been desirable.
65. It would have a good effect if the Inspector were to pay quarterly visits to the Schools.
66. I think not.
67. A half-yearly inspection is certainly desirable, both for pupils and masters.

Query 14. *What, in your opinion, would be the effect on the attendance at the Schools in your neighbourhood of increasing the rate of School fees twenty-five or fifty per cent.?*

52. I believe they are at present too high for the children in the neighbourhood I refer to, and ought to be reduced. To raise them would be a ruinous step.
53. The effect would be the reduction of attendance at least one half.
54. It would empty them.

55. At present, of those who pay School fees two-thirds do not pay more than two-thirds of the amount authorised by the Board. The conclusion is obvious.

56. A very bad effect indeed.

57. To destroy the Schools.

58. Nearly all the children would leave.

59. To empty the Schools, or nearly so.

60. Take them all away.

61. Empty the Schools.

62. The parents would remove their children to other Schools.

63. Bad effect where the parents are generally poor.

64. I fear the attendance would be diminished.

65. It would have the effect of reducing the number of children in attendance.

66. It would do harm.

67. The numbers would be considerably diminished.

Query 15. *From your knowledge of the total emoluments of the Masters of Public Schools in your neighbourhood, do you think that it would be expedient to reduce them?*

52. I should think not.

53. Certainly not.

54. No.

55. No; the total emoluments of man and wife being, exclusively of house, about £240 for an average of 110 children.

56. I would never reduce a Master's salary, for then we could never get good Teachers.

57. I do not.

58. It would not be expedient.

59. We do not think it desirable to reduce the emoluments of the Masters. Their pay ought to be ample, as the office is both arduous and of much responsibility: too much care, however, cannot be exercised in the selection of thoroughly competent and efficient Teachers.

60. No.

61. Most certainly not.

62. I could not answer; but think it ought to be left to local Boards.

63. It would not be expedient to reduce the emoluments.

64. No.

65. I think not.

66. No, certainly not.

67. I think not.

Query 16. *Could a reduction in the item of fixed salary not be made without incurring the risk of being unable to supply the situations they fill with equally efficient Teachers?*

NOTE.—The maximum salary of Town and Country Masters is £100, and the minimum £40. The salary of Mistresses varies from £70 to £25.

52.

53. No.

54. I think if any alteration is made the minimum should be raised.

55. I cannot say how necessity would act under this proposition, but lower salaries would not represent the value of the instruction given by the Teachers with whom I am acquainted.

56. No.

57. If you reduce the payment you will have inferior men.

58. I think such a reduction would not be made safely.

59. The fixed salaries being reduced, less efficient teaching will be the consequence.

60. No.

61. I do not think it possible to reduce the salaries of the Masters without inflicting great injury on the cause of Education throughout the Island.

62. I think if the salary was done away with altogether under present management it would be no loss.

63. No reduction can be made without endangering the supply of efficient Teachers.

64. To ensure good and efficient Teachers their emoluments must be adequate to support them, and at present the salaries do not seem to be too high.

65. It could not.

66. I think not.

67. Not in our District.

Query 17. *Have you any knowledge whether in your neighbourhood the children in attendance at the Public Schools evince at Sunday Schools either less or more intelligence than other children at the same Schools, taking into consideration the relative social advantages of the children compared?*

52. I think both more intelligence and better discipline, always supposing the Public School to be in good hands. Otherwise, I would rather have Sunday School children who had nothing to do with the Public School.

53. Nearly all the children who attend the Sunday School attend also the Public Schools.

54. Certainly more.

55. The Church of England children at the Board School in my neighbourhood are carefully instructed in religion during the week, and those of them who attend my Sunday School are certainly not less intelligent than other children in like circumstances.

56. They evince far greater intelligence who go to the Catholic Schools, as is very evident here at Richmond.

57. I think that the children attending Public Schools are, on the average, more intelligent than the others. Their mental faculty is more exercised.

58. I have no means of judging.

59. We have not, but believe they evince greater intelligence than others.

60. Cannot say.

61. I have no knowledge on this subject.

62.

63.

64. The children attending the School in Macquarie-street are for the most part very young, and I do not think any comparison can be fairly made between them and the other children on my Sunday School roll.

65. The children attending the Public Schools evince less religious intelligence than children who attend Private Schools.

66. I have been informed they evince more intelligence.

67. Those attending the Public Schools are more intelligent at Sunday School than others.

Query 18. *Have you a sufficient number of Children of Parents unable to pay any School fee to justify the establishment of a separate School for their benefit?*

- 52. I think not.
- 53. No.
- 54. No.
- 55. About 16 pay nothing at all.
- 56. We have a considerable number of poor children, but still not enough to establish a separate School.
- 57. Not a sufficient number.
- 58. There are not sufficient.
- 59. There are not in the immediate neighbourhood, under the present system.
- 60. No.
- 61. The establishment of a School for the very young, that is a Dame's School, in some localities would be very useful and advantageous.
- 62. No.
- 63. No, there is not a sufficient number.
- 64. There are quite enough of children in the neighbourhood whose parents are unable to pay School fees to justify the continuance of the School.
- 65. Yes.
- 66. I think not.
- 67. No.

Query 19. *Would it be desirable to have such a School exclusively for the Class referred to?*

- 52. Judging by the Schools called "Ragged Schools" (an objectionable title), which I am sure do considerable good, I think it is desirable to have such Schools in towns; and many of the poorer children (though not all) would be better sent to such Schools than to such Schools as are at present supported by the Board of Education.
- 53. No.
- 54. No.
- 55. I see no reason for it in New Town. (See answer 5.)
- 56.
- 57. No.
- 58. It would not be desirable.
- 59. We think not.
- 60. No.
- 61. The neighbourhood where I reside is inhabited by many very poor people, and I think a School where none pay would be very desirable.
- 62. No.
- 63. No.
- 64. I would prefer leaving things as they are.
- 65. I think it would be most desirable.
- 66. Same answer.
- 67. No.

Query 20. *Are there any Private Schools suited to the various Classes of Pupils who attend the Public Schools in your neighbourhood?*

- 52. Two or three fairly suited to the girls and young children.
- 53. No.
- 54. Yes.
- 55. There are one boys' School and five Dames' Schools in New Town. I know nothing of their working, but presume they do not admit half-paying or free pupils.
- 56. Yes, for the present at Richmond, grown boys excepted who cannot attend the Convent School.
- 57. None.
- 58. There are none.
- 59. None at present.
- 60. No.
- 61. No.
- 62. Two.
- 63. There is no School of any kind here, except, as I have said, a small School of poor children, kept gratuitously by a lady.
- 64. There are many Private Schools in the neighbourhood, where the children of those able to pay may be educated; but if the Public School be closed, very many must be brought up in ignorance.
- 65. There are.
- 66. Parents, as a rule, I believe, would rather send girls to a Private School when conducted by a Mistress.
- 67. Two Private Schools have been opened within the last few days at Wynyard.

Query 21. *Would such Schools, if started as a private adventure, be likely to meet all the objects sought to be attained by Public Schools, and derive adequate support without aid from the State?*

- 52. Such Schools are started as a private adventure. They would not meet all the objects contemplated by Public Schools, but they would some of them, and some which the Public Schools cannot attain. The degree of their support would probably vary with their merits.
- 53. No.
- 54. No.
- 55. Certainly not all the objects, &c. for the reason given in the last answer; see also No. 8.
- 56. Not at all.
- 57. Not so.
- 58. A Private School could not be supported.
- 59. Too many considerations are involved in this question to enable us to reply thereto without time for consideration and enquiry.
- 60. No.
- 61. If the Government educated the young children exclusively, they might answer, but not without.
- 62. The two mentioned above live from the School fees.
- 63. No.
- 64. See answer to No. 20.
- 65. It would be necessary for them to receive some aid from the State.
- 66. Certainly not.
- 67. I think not.



Query 22. *Would it be expedient to establish a system of State Aid to Education proportioned to the amounts raised in the Districts by voluntary contributions?*

52. I think not, unless it were in an inverse ratio. Ordinarily the District that most needs help would have the least to contribute.

53. This would depend on the amount of State aid.

54. No.

55. No; voluntary contributions would, in this District, be confined to men of small means, the rich not feeling a personal interest in the Board School.

56. Yes, if denominational.

57. I do not believe that the voluntary system would be likely to apply in this case.

58. It would not be expedient.

59. Decidedly not.

60. No.

61. If attempted would prove a failure.

62. No.

63. In some Districts it would, but not in poor places.

64. The amount likely to be raised by voluntary contributions would, in my opinion, be wholly inadequate to maintain a really good School. Far better levy a local rate than depend upon voluntary contributions—the expenses would devolve upon a few generous individuals and the majority would give nothing.

65. In centres of population it would be expedient to establish a system of Denominational Education, which would aid denominations in proportion to their voluntary contributions.

66. Voluntary contributions in this District not to be relied on.

67. Poor Districts such as ours would receive but little, and rich Districts a large amount, unless the grant could be inversely proportionate to the ability of the District to contribute.

Query 23. *Would it be expedient or practicable to maintain Education in your neighbourhood, wholly or in part, by means of a local rate?*

52. I have no knowledge, and decline to hazard an opinion.

53. No.

54. No.

55. The idea of a local rate seems to make the education of other people's children compulsory; the burden being borne by individuals instead of the State, the recognised nursing mother of the subjects of the State.

56. No, no.

57. Decidedly not.

58. I think it would not do.

59. No.

60. No.

61. It might be possible for the education of the very young, but I have great doubts on the subject.

62. I think so, if managed by the District.

63. It would not be practicable in this District.

64. See answer to 22.

65. I think not. There would be a universal outcry against such a rate.

66. I have heard no objection to the present system.

67. I think it would be expedient, if practicable.

Query 24. *Supposing it to be so, would you recommend that the appointment or dismissal, and the salary, of the Masters in Public Schools should be left to the discretion of a local governing body?*

52. See answer to 23.

53. It is most desirable to have a local governing body, but the appointment and dismissal should remain with Government.

54.

55. Laying aside the supposition, it is desirable that public education should be directed by a Judicial Board as at present. Any local body must be composed of heterogeneous elements with local prejudices and sectarian predilections.

56. By no means.

57. Those who pay ought locally to govern.

58. I would not recommend it.

59. In the event of such a scheme being carried into effect (which is neither expedient nor necessary) we would recommend that the appointment or dismissal, and the salary, of the Teachers in the Public Schools should be at the discretion of a local governing body.

60. No.

61. Might recommend, but not appoint or dismiss.

62. Yes.

63. The appointment, dismissal, and salary of the Masters in Public Schools should not be left to the discretion of a local body.

64. I think in any case the appointment ought to rest with a Board free from local prejudices and partialities.

65. I should not. Great evils would arise from such an arrangement. The appointment and dismissal of Masters should rest with a central authority.

66. Supposing the education to be maintained by a local rate, the appointment and dismissal ought to be in the hands of the local body.

67. I think not.

Query 25. *Would a denominational system be likely to secure more local support in pupil's fees and in voluntary subscriptions for School purposes than the present system?*

52.

53. No.

54. No.

55. I think not. Expense would be increased and unhealthy rivalry fomented.

56. Decidedly yes.

57. I feel persuaded that it would not.

58. It would not.

59. Such a system would, in our opinion, prove pernicious. No necessity whatever exists for the introduction of denominational distinctions.

60. No.

61. Most decidedly not.  
 62.  
 63. It would not. The denominational system is altogether impracticable.  
 64. I believe not.  
 65. I believe it would.  
 66. Same answer as to No. 23.  
 67. Not in our neighbourhood.

Query 26. *Will you state generally any views which you may have to communicate on the question to which this Circular relates?*

52. Referring to the last question on the paper, in which I am asked to make any general remarks that may occur to me, I would observe:—

I. That one defect in the working of the Public School system (see question 8) which I have often had occasion to notice is, that it fails to make sufficient provision for the education of girls.

(1.) I refer to the fact that there is not one Public School in Hobart Town where girls can be educated separately from boys. I am aware of the arguments commonly urged in favour of mixed schools; but I believe that the common instinct of the people, which never thinks of establishing a private school upon such a plan, is right. I can conceive that boys and girls whose life is chiefly in the streets can be taught together, as in Ragged Schools, without much harm; but girls who have good homes where they have learnt to be modest and gentle must be more or less injured by being thrown into the rougher atmosphere of a school with boys. They will too easily learn free bold ways, which may lead to something worse. Of course, the evil; but I do not think it can ever be altogether avoided, and it is of so serious a nature that it must outweigh all the advantages that can be urged on the other side. I know that many parents feel this, and on this account prefer to send their girls to a quiet little school where their instruction will very likely be imperfect, but where they will be in the way of good influences, under the care of some respectable woman.

(2.) Assuming that girls are in their right place when in the Public Schools, they are still at a great disadvantage when compared with boys. Needlework, which is essential to them, is often indifferently taught, partly from the disposition of a hard master to depreciate its importance and postpone it to other studies, and partly from the incompetence of its teacher. (In proof that assistant teachers are too often indifferent needlewomen, I may refer to the published Reports of Examinations of Pupil Teachers). The consequence is, that girls leave school unable to take their own proper place in their homes, unable, when they marry, to make and mend their own children's clothes.

(3.) Again, the rewards of diligence which are open to boys, are withheld from girls. They can attend no general examinations, be candidates for no prizes or exhibitions. They may become pupil teachers, and that is all. From my point of view, as long as mixed schools are the rule without exception, I do not complain of this, I have no desire that girls should be encouraged to attend such schools; but those who uphold the practice ought in fairness to make it as worthy of their commendation as it can be.

My answer to question 21, "that Private Schools for girls meet some objects not attained by Public Schools," will be understood from the above remarks.

II. I think there is a tendency in the working of the Public School system to overlook the wants of the poorest of the people, and to aim at educating children whom the State (in my opinion) is not bound to educate, and who would be educated without its interference. Parents who are already alive to the advantages of education for their children, and able to provide for it, do not need to be stimulated or assisted. Still less when there are so many who do need either stimulus or assistance, or both.

(1.) I trace this tendency in the yearly examinations for Exhibitions. They assume a much higher grade of scholarship than we can expect to find among the great body of the working classes. They actually depreciate the common useful branches of a poor man's education, (e.g. the Examiners this year, men who from their position must have regard to the wants of the higher, not of the lower Schools, actually recommended that in future less encouragement shall be given to writing from dictation, and more to Euclid!). Then as to the Exhibitions themselves, I much doubt if any of them are gained, or can be gained, by poor men's children. And if not, these last not only have no reward within their reach, but they are too likely to suffer by having less of their teacher's attention than they would have if it were less worth his while to care for the advancement of his more promising pupils. The "prize gooseberry" can be but one on a branch, but it is the object of the State to keep all the branches full. Practically, I believe that the real work of a School among the general body of its children would be much better encouraged by the bestowal of £2 or £3 worth of books or other rewards to be competed for within itself; or else let the competition (of course for a larger amount) be among the "Public Schools" but without any exhibition to a (so-called) "Superior School." The rewards would then be gained by the children, who would under any circumstances belong to the Public Schools, and would not be carried off (as they are now, too often) by children who are sent to these Schools for the mere sake of being qualified for the Exhibition, and who, but for this, would be sent to one or other of the "Commercial" or "Grammar Schools" of the place. By the present system, injury is done both to the poorer classes and to the "Commercial Schools" at a cost to the State which might just as well be spared.

(2.) I trace the tendency also in the suggestion, which seems to be present to the minds of the Commissioners, that School fees might with advantage be raised. My own conviction, derived from a knowledge of the poorer people of this City, who, as I believe, ought chiefly to be cared for in this matter, is that such a step would be quite in the wrong direction. I would have the maximum fee kept low, and would have it clearly understood that it is not expected that persons able to pay a higher fee (at least in Town where many other Schools are within reach) will send their children to these Schools. Of course they have liberty to do so if they please; but as in the case of the Exhibitions, so here, I would by no means encourage them to do so, or give a master leave to take higher fees from such persons, as though they were conferring a benefit upon him or upon the School. My feeling is, that if such parents wish to deal fairly by the State and by their neighbours, they will prefer to send them to Schools where the masters will of necessity charge more for their education.

53. I think the Schools would work better if there was a local body appointed consisting of the Clergy and Magistrates of the Districts, who should have the power to control the Masters of the Schools, and to interfere when any complaints are made by the parents against the Master or Mistress of neglect, &c.

54. I think that much good would be effected by giving assistance to places at great distances from any Public School. At present the poorest and most ignorant, who require aid most, get least. I give as an instance the Plenty, where there are 30 children and the parents have subscribed an annual sum, but we cannot as yet get aid from Government, though the Board has been petitioned.

55.

56. Any remarks that I have to make are more or less embodied in the above answers. I would, however, strongly suggest a Denominational system, which will go very far to satisfy all parties, and result with more advantages to the children.

57.

58.

59. One of the greatest advantages is that the parents living within a certain distance of the Schools have the means afforded them of educating their children at an inexpensive rate, many of whom could not otherwise give their children any education whatever. The Schools, however, do not meet the wants of a scattered population: those residing beyond a very few miles from the Public Schools cannot avail themselves of them. Much difficulty exists in the matter of granting free certificates. Dissatisfaction exists both in the Schools and out of doors, in consequence of parents whose improvidence renders it necessary to educate their children wholly at the public expense, while others whose opportunities are not greater of acquiring means pay School fees. The foregoing is intended to apply exclusively to the Bothwell Public School. That at Apsley, under Mr. Webb's management, has only been recently established: all that we know of it is that a School was much required in that locality, and we believe it will prove beneficial.

60. I think that the salaries of the Masters should be paid by results, as regards the number of children in attendance, and progress made by them, in proportion to the number of children in the neighbourhood.

61. The number of children in this District that are without education is deplorable, and I must attribute it in a great measure to the injudicious system adopted by the landholders of letting small patches of land at a high rental to married couples without any means. They have the greatest difficulty to find food and clothing for themselves, and if they are blessed with families—and many of them are, and large ones, too—their children are only half clad (indeed, I have seen some without any clothing), and very indifferently fed. This being the case, it is not surprising that the education of their children is thought little of by their parents: it must necessarily be a secondary consideration with them. I can suggest no remedy for this state of things, alike injurious to the landholders and demoralising to the tenants. The Government are powerless in the matter, and this evil must be left to work its own cure.

62. It is my opinion if the Public School at Perth were closed the District would sustain no loss.

63.

64.

65. Rule IV. of the Board's Regulations should be so worded that no objection could be made with respect to religious instruction being given to children of which their Pastors and parents disapprove.

66. I am not prepared to answer this question.

67. I would venture to suggest the use of an attendance card, to be filled up by the Master every week and taken by the pupils to their parents. This would always keep before them their title to reward at the end of the year. Perhaps articles of clothing would be valued by the poor, which might be paid for by contributions from the District, assisted by a grant from the State.

---

*MEMORANDUM by the Hon. A. KENNERLEY, Esquire, of his Visit to the Parents of Free Scholars.*

---

HAVING received from the Secretary of the Board of Education Nominal Lists of the Parents of the Free Scholars attending the Public Schools situated in Macquarie and Goulbourn-streets, I proceeded, in compliance with the request of the Royal Commission on Education, to visit the same, and have the honor to report as follows:—

The attendance at the School in Macquarie-street (which is a good sized building, and the property of the Board) is now reduced from various causes to less than fifty children, of whom sixteen are admitted free. The general condition of the parents of these free scholars appeared to be that of poor but decent people, striving to obtain an honest livelihood. Two are widows endeavouring to earn a living by taking in washing at reduced prices; two were depending mostly on charity, one having a husband in the Hospital, the other at the Brickfields. One of these women went out washing for a day's work whenever she could obtain it; and one poor woman who sent five children to School had lately been confined of twins, and seemed in delicate health, but was anxious to earn a little by needlework to assist in the support of her large family. Her husband was a sailor who, when able, was employed as cook on board one of the small coasters, and received £4 per month, but was sometimes laid up for weeks together with an affection of the ungs.

At the Goulbourn-street School, where the average attendance is about 134, there are between fifty and sixty free scholars. On visiting the homes of these children, I found some of them very poor and comfortless. Of the parents, two are widows receiving relief from the Benevolent Society. Some of the women have husbands who, from age or sickness, can do but little towards the maintenance of their families. One decent looking woman (keeping a small shop) had been deserted by her husband who had gone to New Zealand, leaving her with eight children to support. Several were paying for the elder children; the younger ones being admitted free. Some complained that their husbands, who were labourers, could not get constant employment, or they would most willingly pay the School fees.

Called upon several parties who did not send their children to School; but allowed them to roam about the streets uncared for. They stated that they had not sufficient clothing for their children to appear decent. No doubt this was the case, but I fear that intemperate habits was in a great measure the cause of their extreme poverty.

I would observe, that the result of my visitation was satisfactory on one point; namely, as confirming the correctness of the statements made by the Special Visitors and others upon which free certificates had been granted by the Board.

In conclusion, I would add that, so far as my observation extended, the number of children not receiving any education is much less than I had anticipated from the statements I had heard and read upon the subject, and cannot, in my opinion, exceed eight or ten per cent. on the number of children between the ages of five and twelve in this city.

A. KENNERLEY.

*Davey-street, Hobart Town, 9th August, 1867.*

*MEMORANDUM by the Hon. P. O. FYSH, Esq., of his Visits to Parents of Free Scholars.*

*Hobart Town, Tasmania, 2nd September, 1867.*

MR. FYSH, having visited the Parents and Guardians at their dwellings of 106 out of the 182 free scholars receiving instruction at two of the Hobart Town Schools under the Board of Education, prefers to recapitulate the information so gathered, as giving a better idea than a condensed report will do of the class of children reached by the free instruction offered by the Government.

There were but three instances discovered of children receiving free instruction where the circumstances of the parents indicated by appearances a necessity for further enquiry; and judging from what was visible of the homes and people of the remaining instances visited, it is not that they *will not*, but *cannot*, afford to pay the School fees:—

Father, mariner; 4 children; earns 20s. a trip to and from Port Arthur coal mines; frequently out of work.

Father, mariner; 4 children; cripple for years, occasionally earns a few shillings (in which mother helps) sail-making.

Father, prisoner; mother picks up a few shillings occasionally at indiscriminate work.

Father, barrow man; 2 children; precarious earnings of an average of 12s. a week.

Father, barrow man; very poor, earns sometimes 1s. or 2s. a day, often nothing.

Stepfather; bed-ridden for a long period.

Orphan; lives with grandmother, who is partially supported by Benevolent Society.

Orphan; Government pays 2s. a week to a distant relative towards her support.

Orphan; adopted by a poor barber.

Widow; 6 children; washing the only means of support.

Widow; 3 children; ditto.

Widow; 3 children; lives rent free at a tannery, the proprietor assisting her with food, &c.

Widow; 4 children; washing the only means of support.

Widow; 6 children; one girl at service and mangling done by mother are their means of support.

Widow; 5 children; Government partly supports with 6s. a week.

Father missing for seven years; 2 children and aged parents supported by the mother's needlework.

Father away in Sydney, a clerk or writer; 4 children; Government partly supports with 10s. a week.

Father missing for several years in New Zealand; 3 children; partly supported by Benevolent Society.

Father missing, in the country; 2 children; mother in wretched state, earns 3s. or 4s. weekly sewing cotton bonnets.

Father missing for nine years; 6 children; eldest daughter is chief support of the family by washing.

Father absconded; 4 children; daughter and mother support family by washing.

Father, sawyer; 9 children; very often out of work, averages about 20s. a week, can earn 30s. in full work.

Father, sawyer; 3 children; not on half work, but can earn 25s. to 30s. a week when in full work.

Father, blacksmith; 5 children; very often out of work, but can earn when in full work 30s. a week.

Father, brass-worker; 8 children; not earning 20s. a week since gas was introduced.

Father, labourer; 6 children; out of work for 11 weeks, but can earn 30s. a week if in full work.

Father, labourer; 4 children; laid up 4 out of 12 months with bad legs, mother partly supports family by washing.

Father, labourer; ill for 4 years, mother supports them by washing.

Father, labourer; 6 children; laid up one out of every four months, when in work earns 30s. a week of Corporation.

Father, labourer; often out of work for months, mother is the chief support of the family by washing.

Father, labourer; 4 children; an epileptic invalid seldom earning anything, mother a sempstress.

Father, labourer; 5 children; can earn 30s. a week but seldom has sufficient work to make up 20s.

Father, labourer; 6 children; pays 6d. a week for one child at one of the Board of Education Schools, has been three or four months at a time out of work, but is now earning 22s. a week out of which has 5s. to pay for rent.

Father, labourer; 3 children; paralysed, the mother and two boys supporting family by sale of vegetables.

Father, bootmaker; 6 children; earns about 24s. weekly, not sufficient work.

Father, bootmaker; 5 children; not more than half employed, but can earn 30s. in full work.

Father, bootmaker; 6 children; pays 9d. per week at one of the Board Schools and nothing for two, earns 26s. to 30s. a week.

Father, porter; 6 children; pays for one child at one of the Board Schools and nothing for one, wages 30s. a week.

Father, mason; 7 children; not earned 40s. for 12 months, very asthmatical, the girls and mother support them by washing.

Father, fish-hawker; 5 children; can earn 20s. a week but so very frequently laid up.

Father, ship's carpenter; 3 children; out of work nearly 12 months, mother works sewing machine.

Father, carpenter; 7 children; average earnings weekly 20s., so often out of work from its scarcity.

Father, crippled old soldier; 6 children; pension 14d. a day, earns a few sixpences repairing neighbours' boots.

Father, violinist; 2 children; only earned a trifle for six months, mother works at needle and washing.

P. O. FYSH.

## BOARD OF EDUCATION, TASMANIA.

*RETURN showing Amount expended by Board, and School Fees received by Teachers, from 1857 to 1866 inclusive; distinguishing between Schools in Hobart Town, Launceston, and the Country Districts.*

SCHOOLS.		No. of Schools in operation.	Amount expended by Board.			Amount received in School Fees.		
			£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1857....	Hobart Town .....	9	2694	17	6	719	13	6
	Launceston .....	3	689	12	2	220	19	6
	Country Districts .....	59	6164	19	0	1981	8	9
	TOTAL 1857 .....	71	9549	8	8	2922	1	9
1858....	Hobart Town .....	8	3363	7	5	574	5	4
	Launceston .....	3	638	15	0	Returns incomplete. Ditto.		
	Country Districts .....	67	7619	4	10			
	TOTAL 1858 .....	78	11,621	7	3	Ditto.		
1859....	Hobart Town .....	7	2618	15	7	566	9	11
	Launceston .....	3	716	15	3	181	17	5
	Country Districts .....	74	9519	6	11	2081	7	10
	TOTAL 1859 .....	84	12,854	17	9	2829	15	2
1860....	Hobart Town .....	6	2911	15	10	585	16	3
	Launceston .....	3	779	6	2	201	15	5
	Country Districts .....	81	9310	14	10	2256	15	0
	TOTAL 1860 .....	90	13,001	16	10	3044	6	8
1861....	Hobart Town .....	7	2314	10	8	714	4	5
	Launceston .....	3	724	10	11	200	0	6
	Country Districts .....	85	8177	15	8	3121	14	5
	TOTAL 1861 .....	95	11,216	17	3	4035	18	11
1862....	Hobart Town .....	7	2385	14	10	648	1	10
	Launceston .....	3	761	12	6	156	17	1
	Country Districts .....	85	8313	3	0	3298	0	9
	TOTAL 1862 .....	95	11,450	10	4	4102	19	8
1863....	Hobart Town .....	7	1876	5	10	546	9	3
	Launceston .....	3	832	1	10	137	6	9
	Country Districts .....	78	8297	12	4	2935	15	8
	TOTAL 1863 .....	88	11,006	0	0	3619	11	8
1864....	Hobart Town .....	7	1953	2	10	562	1	4
	Launceston .....	3	760	15	5	194	7	10
	Country Districts .....	87	8500	16	10	3177	0	2
	TOTAL 1864 .....	97	11,214	15	1	3933	9	4
1865....	Hobart Town .....	7	2015	1	3	526	15	6
	Launceston .....	3	776	15	3	228	10	1
	Country Districts .....	92	8512	18	7	3248	12	10
	TOTAL 1865 .....	102	11,304	15	1	4003	18	5
1866....	Hobart Town .....	7	1956	5	8	581	7	6
	Launceston .....	3	792	6	9	251	8	8
	Country Districts .....	91	8555	6	9	3054	16	0
	TOTAL 1866 .....	101	11,303	19	2	3887	12	2

T. STEPHENS, *Acting Secretary.*

*MEMORANDUM by DR. BUTLER, M.H.A., suggesting Compulsory Education.*

---

THE Inspector of Police to be requested annually to furnish the names of all the persons resident in the District, with the names and ages of the children between the ages of 6 and 12 years. (This duty can easily be performed by the constabulary at the time they make up the Population Returns from their several Districts for the Inspector of Police.)

That the Master of each Public School furnish a Monthly Return to the District School Board of the names of all the children attending the School, together with their respective ages and classes.

That in the event of the absence from one of the Public Schools of the District of any children known to be within the school age (6 years to 12 years), the District School Board shall call upon the parents of such children to send their children to one of the Schools, unless it is proved to their satisfaction,—

1. That such child is privately educated, and that the education is sufficient.
2. That the state of health of such child renders it unable to attend the School.
3. That the parents cannot do without the labour of such child.

The District School Board shall give to the parents of such child a certificate stating the reason of exemption.

That the parents of children who have been duly warned by the District School Board to send their children to the School failing to comply with the order, such parent shall be summoned before a Justice of the Peace to answer for his refusal or negligence in obeying such order; and such Justice of the Peace, after due enquiry, may give an order that such child be sent to one of the Public Schools in the District, and may determine whether the parent of such child shall be admitted free from charge, or what sum per week not exceeding , the parent shall pay to the Master of the School for the education of such child.

If the parent of such child fails to obey such order made by a Justice of the Peace in Petty Sessions, he shall be liable to be fined for the neglect to obey the order of the Court; and such fine may be recovered under the provisions of the Summary Procedure Act.

HENRY BUTLER.