

The almost frantic efforts of the League to make us believe that the teacher does not need a conscience clause because he is not to teach religion point to three things: First, that the League tacitly admits that the State and the State teacher ought not to teach religion; second, that if the teacher would have to teach religion he should have a conscience clause; third, that some of the official expounders either do not know what the scheme involves, or they are trying to conceal its real nature.

The League apologists further confound themselves when they say the teacher must not teach religion, yet he must use the Bible as an authoritative basis on which to found the teaching of morality. Rev. J. Mackenzie, secretary of the League, gave an official exposition of the teacher's work in the *Christchurch Press* (15/8/13): "The teacher will see that the children understand what they read, and that the appropriate moral lessons are from time to time enforced." The same gentleman shortly after, in a very able sermon, showed conclusively that the great and vital difference between morality and religion is that the former depends on mere precept, while religion is morality founded on the authority of the Word of God and His law contained in it. Thus Rev. J. Mackenzie showed that morality taught on the direct authority of the Bible is religion, yet he says that the teacher is to found his teaching of morality on the authority of the Bible without teaching religion.

That what the League says it wants is not really what the Bible-in-schools advocates really do want is shown by the statement of the spokesman of the Anglican Synod in Sydney in May, 1912. He said, "For the past eighteen years the provisions of the Act regarding religious instruction have not been carried out as was intended. The time formerly given by the State teachers to general religious instruction is now to a large extent devoted to the teaching of history, civics, and morals." Yet Dean Fitchett, of Dunedin, a notable champion of the introduction of the Australian system into New Zealand, declared that "The book was put into the hands of the teacher that he might teach from it history, literature, and morals"—the very thing his Church on the other side complains about. The above is surely sufficient to prove that the teacher would be compelled to teach religion without a conscience clause.

The Right of Entry.

But we are told that after the teacher has used the Bible in a way opposed to its very nature, and has treated it below the level of any school text-book, the clergyman will come in and teach the Bible in the way in which it should be taught. We have yet to learn that God has two such divergent purposes for His revealed word. We do not believe that the Bible changes its nature as it passes from the hand of the teacher to that of the clergyman. Neither does the child who is to have secularized Bible lessons on four days a week change his nature when the clergyman enters. But the experience of Australian States shows that in a very large proportion of cases the clergyman does not come, and so the Bible, on the League's showing, remains divorced from religion. The report of the Royal Commission of New South Wales, 1904, shows that practically the religious instruction of the children of New South Wales depends on the State teacher's lessons, and we are assured he does not teach any religion. Chapter XV (page 149) states, "It must be admitted that the clergy of the various denominations have availed themselves of this provision only to a limited extent; and, speaking generally, the religious instruction in the State of New South Wales is, so far as the State is concerned, largely confined to the general religious instruction" (i.e., to the State teacher's work). On page 62, Chapter VIII, a recommendation commences thus: "In view of the insufficient amount and often complete absence of religious instruction"; and in Chapter XV, page 157, "The provisions relating to religious education . . . are not availed of by the clergy of the various denominations as it might have been hoped. It would be well therefore if a circular were issued calling their attention to the provisions of the Act and inviting the co-operation of the clergy in providing for the moral-religious education of the people of the State." This in a State where the scheme has existed for fifty years!

The Commonwealth Year-book, 1908-9, page 88, also points out this neglect by the clergy, even after generous allowance has been made for scattered districts: "The advantage of the provisions permitting religious instruction to be given to children in State schools has not been used to a very great extent by the various denominations. The total number of visits are as follows. After referring to the apparently large total of 44,921 visits, the Year-book continues, "If the visits be compared with the number of opportunities for religious teaching available under the Act a less favourable light is thrown on the subject. . . . It is found that the visits by all the denominations taken together represent only a little more than 10 per cent. of the opportunities offered." The Year-book then makes a liberal allowance of 50 per cent. for scattered districts, and concludes thus: "It does not appear that the visits approximate in a material degree to the opportunities afforded by the law."

The New South Wales Year-book, 1911, page 53, confirms the statement of neglect. The Hon. Mr. Perry, when Minister of Public Instruction, said publicly, "Clergymen had facilities under the Act to give moral training to the children, but neglected to do so. The schools only received eight visits each in a year from ministers, who had daily opportunities to teach the tenets of their faith"! Mr. Carmichael, Minister of Public Instruction, said in 1913, "The clergy were not taking advantage of their opportunities. . . . If religious instruction were not given in the schools the onus fell on those who had the right and had not availed themselves of it" (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 6/5/13). The editor, commenting in a leading article, said, "Mr. Carmichael is perfectly correct in his surmise that the clergy have been lax in this matter."

The Anglican Synod Report of the session 26th September to the 4th October, 1911, says, "There are some 462 public schools in this diocese, and little more than half that number receive regular religious instruction from the Church." "It should be noted that a school is counted