

3. Here again we have several contradictory voices in the League—(a) the voices which clamour in the League petitioner's ear that "the main thing" in the League movement is "the Bible," "the open Bible," &c., in the schools; (b) the voices which cry out to him that "the main thing" is, not "the Bible" or "the open Bible," but bits and scraps from the Bible; (c) the voices which call that "the main thing" is not "the Bible" in the schools—or "Bible extracts" in the schools—but the parson in the schools. How could the League petitioner be other than confused and bewildered by such a clamour of contradictions? How could he know the precise nature of a thing on which he petitioned for a so-called "referendum"?

#### *Proselytism.*

4. The following is taken from the report from the president's address at the fifth Anglican Synod in Sydney, 1880 (p. 16): "It has been a matter of surprise that not only has there been, on the part of some persons, a want of sympathy with the Church of England in our endeavour to impart religious instruction in the public schools, but extreme sensitiveness, approaching to jealousy, lest the children of other denominations should be permitted to be present at it. Our mission is, no doubt, to our own children, but if others, whose pastors do not attend the public schools, should desire to read the Scriptures, and even to learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, it seems to me to be a pitiful thing to prevent them."

5. Here we have almost as frank a declaration of the proselytizing spirit as was openly avowed, hundreds of times over, in the days when the present New South Wales Scripture lessons wrought such deep and bitter and intended wrong to the consciences of dissidents from the State Church in Ireland. Such abuses of the clergy's right of entry have been at least twice censured in New South Wales—once (at an unstated date) when the late Mr. W. Wilkins was secretary to the Council of Education, and later on in a fresh circular, which (after a preamble) quoted the former circular of Mr. Wilkins. The new circular was quoted in full by the Hon. Mr. Davey in the Queensland Parliament on the 9th November, 1910 (p. 1985). A cable message from Brisbane (18th July, 1914) states that he "quoted official documents." Its date, however (15th July, 1900), was evidently wrongly described in the Queensland Parliamentary Debates, for (says the New South Wales Director of Education, &c., Board) it is "obviously wrong." The authenticity of the documents is, however, neither questioned nor denied by Mr. Board in his cable message received by me on the 14th July.

6. The second of the two circulars condemns those visiting clergy who "consider themselves at liberty to take any children that will come to their class, and if that were sanctioned there would be obvious opportunities for proselytism, and the Council of Education would be in danger of being accused of giving unfair advantages to clergymen of some denominations by admitting children of other denominations of their classes." The substance of this provision forms part of the present New South Wales Education Act. The risk of tampering with conscience in such ways are touched upon by the Irish statesman, Isaac Butt, in his "Liberty of Teaching" (Dublin, 1865).

7. A similarly strong testimony in point comes from a New Zealand League clergyman, Rev. Wilfred A. Butler, M.A., in a letter in the *Stratford Evening Post* of the 12th March, 1913. Other and higher-placed League leaders favour the plan suggested by the Rev. Mr. Davies, a member of the League executive. As quoted by Rev. G. Knowles Smith he says, "In many cases, and especially in those of the smaller Churches, mutual arrangements are made between the Churches by which the children are grouped together and attend the class of a minister not of their own Church" (*Otago Daily Times* report, quoted in *New Zealand Tablet* of the 28th November, 1912). This arrangement prevails in Western Australia. The Rev. Wilfred A. Butler (Anglican Vicar of Stratford) opposes it as (to use the words of the New South Wales Education circular) offering "obvious opportunities for proselytism." Here, again, we have League voices in opposition, confusing and bewildering the already confused League petitioner. In the *Stratford Evening Post* of the date mentioned above the Rev. Vicar of Stratford condemns "the existing order of things which enables a clergyman to enter the State school and give religious instruction to a class comprised of children of several denominations. For two and a half years I have been attending the Stratford School, giving instruction to such a class, and I should estimate the number of children in the classes belonging to other religious bodies than my own at over 65 per cent. Now, sir, children lean towards the person they like best, and, if parents are not particular, are almost bound to favour the religion of the minister who takes their class if they like him better than their own clergyman. A clergyman or minister may be thoroughly honest in his attempt to give non-sectarian teaching, but even his presence in the class-room will have a certain amount of influence; and I for my part feel that, in my own case, however honest I may try to be in my teaching, I am bound to make some of those in my class favour the religious body I represent." The Rev. Mr. Butler is an adherent of the League.

8. Here we have a frank and manly statement, based upon personal experience, of the risks of proselytism by appointing the clergy to be, in effect, State teachers. Bear in mind that every word of this applies, with tenfold force, to the favourite teacher who conducts the Government biblical lessons. The clergyman is, at most, an occasional visitor; the popular teacher (belonging to some open and well-known Church connection) the children have always with them.

#### *Opposition to Clergy in Schools.*

9. Presbyterians were, until the present agitation, vehemently opposed to the right of entry of the clergy into the public schools, during working-hours, for purposes of denominational religious instruction. Only by way of compromise with Anglicans do those of them who favour the League now tolerate what they have hitherto viewed with intense dislike. Their view found