

reported in the *Courier*: 'He wanted the Hon. T. C. Beirne to correct the statement he had made about the Presbyterians.' Now, in the list of Presbyterian ministers as being for and against the Bill that I read to the House, one only was put in the wrong column. The Rev. Scott Macdonald was put down as being opposed to the Bill when he was really and sincerely for it. This is the only mistake I made, and I apologize to the reverend gentleman for any annoyance or inconvenience that may have been caused him by this inclusion of him in the wrong list. A few of those who were put down as doubtful have since declared themselves as being in favour of the Bill, but on the whole my statement that a majority of Presbyterian ministers of Queensland is against the Bill is correct. The Rev. Mr. MacKillop was claimed by Archdeacon Garland as being on his side, yet here is a telegram I have received from that gentleman: 'While willing to teach religion in State school buildings I heartily oppose the present Bible Bill.' Then he goes on to say, 'If any further vindication or proof of my statement were needed, I have it here in a letter from the Rev. Allan MacKillop, addressed to the editor of the *Courier*: "The venerable secretary of the Bible League, in your issue of Tuesday last, referring to my telegram to Mr. Moderator, virtually addressed to me a question which strongly reminds one of that which the other sophists used to put to their pupils when the former would ask the latter, 'Have you ceased beating your mother—Yes or No?' He seems to leave me no alternative but to place myself under his banner or under that of the Cardinal." Then the letter goes on, "While it is true that the battle is now ended for the present, and that it is vain to inquire under which banner any one stood, or what induced him to take his position in that particular place, there is a certain matter which, for the sake of getting at the truth, ought now to be made clear, and that is the position of the Presbyterian Church in reference to State-aided religion. With your kind permission, sir, I should like to show what that position is. Your readers have hitherto been left in ignorance of it. Much has been said of the resolution of the General Assembly. It has not always been made clear which General Assembly was meant. We have two General Assemblies—one for the State of Queensland, and one for the Commonwealth. In the former all the members are Queenslanders. In the latter there are only twenty Queensland representatives out of a membership of 252. It is seldom that a dozen of the Queensland members are present in this Assembly of Australia. It will be readily seen that that Court does not reflect Queensland opinion to any great extent. That Court did pass resolutions, two years in succession, in favour of the Bible League." The letter then referred to the minutes in the blue-book of Queensland in 1906 and 1909, and then goes on, "The important fact which the above minutes disclose is that the majority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Queensland, on the two occasions on which the matter was put to the test recently, was opposed to the Bible Bill. That is a full vindication of Mr. Beirne's contention. He was stating a fact, but he put it in such a way as to leave it open to the criticism of men whose souls delight in quibbles."'" That is signed by one Allan MacKillop, of Queensland. I might say that the Rev. Mr. McGregor hasansardized in the Queensland *Hansard* the names of the Presbyterian ministers who were against the Bible in Schools League's proposal. He gave it as thirteen against and nine for. One name was incorrect, which made it twelve to ten. There were six others who were neutral, and three of those were afterwards found to be in favour of the Bill and three against, so that made it fifteen to thirteen as the majority against the Bill. Canon Garland then published in the Brisbane *Courier* a telegram saying that Mr. MacKillop was in favour of the system, but the telegram was evidently in reply to some other question. The Australian Assembly may have been in favour of the proposal, but the Queensland Assembly was against it. The Queensland *Messenger*, the official organ of the Presbyterian Church in Queensland, made this statement: "We do not think that this is a question that should be submitted to a referendum at all, nor do we think anybody should support it if he thinks it is against the interest of the country even if the majority vote for it."

35. From all that information you have made it clear that the Queensland Assembly did not pass a resolution against it?—They twice turned down a resolution in favour of it.

36. Did they or did they not pass a resolution in the Queensland Assembly against the proposal of the Bible in Schools?—On two occasions when a favourable motion was brought up the motion was turned down.

37. In your statement, Mr. Caughley, you speak of dogmatic secularism. Have you ever seen this statement by the Rev. Hastings Rashdall [statement handed to witness]?—No, I have not seen that before.

38. It reads, "The Rev. Hastings Rashdall, D.C.L., M.A., fellow and tutor of New College, Oxford, author of 'The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,' and also author of 'The Theory of Good and Evil,' the greatest book on ethics which has appeared in England since T. H. Green's 'Prolegomena to Ethics,' in a sermon before the University of Oxford preached in 1897, stated, 'Not to teach children that there is a God and something which we call duty is for all practical purposes to teach them that there is no God and no such thing as duty. Silence is a more effective teacher of negation than denial, for denial must at least convey a knowledge of the propositions denied. Whether children believe or disbelieve, their creed will be equally, in the first instance, based upon authority.'"?—No, I have not seen that before. I understand that is with the idea of showing that dogmatic secularism is taught in the schools.

39. No, that was not my object?—The point is that suppose we do not teach in the schools anything about astronomy, that is not a denial of the fact that there is such a science as astronomy. We do not deny everything that we do not teach in the school.

40. Coming back to what is meant by the word "Churches," do you know that in Victoria there is a movement similar to this which is being carried out by the official courts of the Churches?—Yes, I know that.

41. Then would you say that is evidence of satisfaction with a far higher level of religious activity in Victoria?—I would say it is a sign of dissatisfaction in ecclesiastical circles.