

already at their command they would reach far more children than they could under the League scheme. They would not be making religion a matter of politics, with that compromise which is the death of morality and religion, even if it is the soul of politics. They would not have to make the Bible a cover for injustice, and our children would receive religious training in the only atmosphere that is consistent with religion. In this work large numbers of day-school teachers who are repelled by the League's scheme would gladly take an active share. In fact, it is safe to say that in no class in the community is there, in proportion, a larger number of Sunday-school teachers or Christian workers than in the teaching profession. Though we thus help in the spiritual training of the children under proper auspices, we can never approve in or consent to be compelled to take part in the League's unscriptural and, in the light of their gross injustice, its utterly un-Christian proposals.

4. *Canon Garland.*] In your statement, Mr. Caughley, you quote Archbishop Temple, when Headmaster of Rugby, as saying, "Secular schools would not be irreligious. I am by no means sure that they would not be more religious." What is your authority for saying that, because that is not my version of what he said?—I took it from a book of quotations bearing on the subject. I should like to hear your version.

5. Archbishop Temple never used the words, and neither did Bishop Temple. The words in question were employed by the Rev. Mr. Temple in 1856, when he was an employee of the Education Office, long decades before he rose to the rank of Archbishop of Canterbury. My authority for that statement is your colleague in this matter, Bishop Cleary. You will find it in his book, "God or no God in the Schools"?—It is the same gentleman under a different title.

6. It is the same person, but there is a great difference in speaking as you spoke here of Archbishop Temple when Headmaster of Rugby saying so-and-so—it conveys an inference. Were you not aware that that statement attributed to Archbishop Temple was made by him when he was a very young man and an employee in the Education Office?—I am not aware of that, but I generally find men's opinions when younger are nearer to the true ideals than when they get older.

7. That is a matter of opinion. In your statement you spoke of a large number of Protestant ministers who are in support of the present secular system. How many signatures did you get to that petition which was sent in the other day as a result of your own work?—Some more have come in since. I think the number now is about ninety.

8. How many ministers of religion are there in New Zealand, exclusive of the Roman Catholic clergy, who we know are opposed to use?—I do not know.

9. I think the number is well over a thousand?—From my point of view the proportion is quite immaterial. If even ninety ministers in New Zealand are opposed to the League's proposal, that is sufficient to redeem it from being called materialistic and agnostic.

10. My point of view is as to what a "large number" means?—I think it is a large number to come out against the declared views of the Church.

11. You think thirty-three Presbyterian ministers is a large number?—I do not refer to the number. No, that is not a large proportion, but I know there is a number who have the same idea but who will not put their signature to the petition because their Church is opposed to it.

12. Do you consider that seven or eight Methodist ministers is a large proportion?—No.

13. In your statement you say, "On such grounds Luther, Knox, Wesley, the Puritans, and the Covenanters could have been called secularists." The name Knox strikes me as surprising. Do you mean John Knox of the Presbyterian Church?—Yes.

14. I am speaking entirely from memory, but are you not aware that he said in effect, and put it into practice, that there should be a school beside every church?—Yes, but I did not refer to John Knox with regard to secular schools. I mentioned those men to show that, simply because they opposed a certain form of religious work advocated by other people, they could not be branded as secularists because they opposed it on account of its nature. John Knox could have been called a secularist by the Anglican Church, because he opposed their methods of spreading the gospel.

15. You admitted that John Knox took care to say that there should be a parish school beside every church?—I object to that form of questioning. I did not admit anything of the sort, and those matters you are trying to get me to admit have no bearing on this question at all. You are trying to get me to admit things which it does not matter whether they are admitted or not.

16. I want to make it clear that John Knox advocated practically the same thing that the Bible in Schools League is advocating?—I perfectly freely admit that he was in favour of religious education in schools, but they were denominational schools, and that is not the system the Bible in Schools League wants.

17. Do you not know that John Knox's system provided for the teaching of dogmatic catechism as well as the Bible?—Yes.

18. And that that was to be done by the teacher under the control of the Church?—That is quite another matter. We are not under the control of the Church.

19. I did not say it was?—You said it was the same system as that advocated by the League, and it is not.

20. That is a matter of opinion?—Are we under the control of the Church?

21. No, I did not ask you that?—Then the system is not the same.

22. Do you not know that masters in ethics state distinctly that the absence of religious teaching in school is dogmatic secularism—for instance, Hastings Rashdall so speaks?—I should like to see the connection in which he states that. While I am teaching geography I am not teaching religion, yet I am not teaching dogmatic secularism. If I do not teach astronomy in school I am not denying the existence of stars.